

1
have taken at least 500,000 tons of soybeans from Manchuria. They had still considerable availabilities of rice from Korea whereas in previous years they had had rice from Southeast Asia. Their food imports during the war almost approximated the diet of pre-war years--not quite. There is certainly much less difference between the diet of the Japanese in the war years and pre-war. Now that doesn't mean that there is not an accumulated effect. I think the Mission concludes that there is a somewhat accumulated effect.

DR. KOO: Of course the Mission had a special purpose of finding out the food situation in Japan and from the standpoint of the Commission you are calling our attention to the situation in Japan without regard to the food situation in other countries, particularly countries which have been victims of Japanese aggression. We feel that if the Japanese could tighten their belts and fight or something of that type obviously we think they would have been fitted. Of course, at the same time, we recognize the food policy is to give them a good diet because that in itself would be conducive to a stabilization and make them become democratic, et cetera, because we all agree on such principles. But, at the same time, we must take into mind the situation in other countries.

MR. WHITMAN: Well, the presentation of this report, I am sure I do not need to say, was not in any sense an attempt to make a complete final statement of any kind on the Japanese food situation. It was merely promised to the Far Eastern Commission that when this Mission went its findings would be available for such use and information as there might be. I think you can purely see that a Mission operating only in Japan is in no position to try to compare Japan with the rest of the world.

MR. SEN: It will probably interest you to hear that in India in 1946 and since 1946 the basic staple food ration for self-suppliers is 16 ounces as against that 21 ounces. That is 2100 calories - 1600 calories, and I am sure that the situation in parts of China is even worse.

MR. GRAVES: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to say that, having listened to Mr. Whitman's very interesting remarks, I can only say that the Japanese seem to be a remarkably fortunate people in the matter of food. We have heard that the urban population has had more than 1500 calories available to them. Well the position in some of our territories--I quote Malaya, for example, the Malaysians at the moment and after many years of suffering through Japanese aggression are only getting 4 ounces of rice a day. Now we know that in Japan the Japanese are getting at least a ration of 12 ounces a day. Three times. We listen to a series of recommendations for increases in food supplies for the Japanese, but what seems to me a most deplorable disregard of the needs and the justice that should be given to the countries that have been subject to Japanese aggression. It seemed to me to show a most undue tenderness for the Japanese food supplies.

GEN. MCCOY: The same responsibility, I think you will find, from the British authorities in Germany. Is it not a fact that Australia is supplying large shipments of food to Germany through the British responsible authorities in Germany? It's like the law of nature in its effects. But from the time I heard ~~that~~ Marshall Montgomery tell about his fight with his home Government for food for the occupation of Germany I am conscious that whoever has the responsibility in a particular part of the world is naturally

going to be concerned with that. But this report, I think, will give the representatives of particular countries such as Malaya, India, and China, where we are all conscious of the terrible stress and strain, bases for consideration here, and this report, I think, will be useful in helping the Commission make their studies and recommendations in the committees. There will be plenty of chance to discuss this from the particular points of view, but from the point of view of the Commission we recognize it is a world problem and that the responsible commanders in each part of the world are going to be faced with exactly this same problem. It's a world-around problem and here gives an opportunity for that part of the problem to be considered.

b. Announcements

MR. JOHNSON: There will be a meeting of the ad hoc subcommittee of the Steering Committee to consider amendments to the Far Eastern Commission policy on Allied Trade Representatives in Japan in the conference room on Monday morning, July 7, at 10:30 A.M., and the subcommittee on the Commission's statement connected with the basic policy will meet in the conference room at 5:00 P.M. on Monday or upon adjournment of the committee which sits Monday afternoon.

GEN. MCCOY: We will adjourn, gentlemen.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 12:30 P.M.)

FAR EASTERN COMMISSION

Transcript of Sixty-Fifth Meeting of the Far Eastern Commission,

Held in Main Conference Room, 2516 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.

Thursday, July 10, 1947

FAR EASTERN COMMISSION

Transcript of Sixty-Fifth Meeting of the Far Eastern Commission,
Held in Main Conference Room, 2516 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Thursday, July 10, 1947

Representatives Present

Major General Frank R. McCoy, Chairman	(United States)
His Excellency Norman J. O. Makin	(Australia)
Mr. R. E. Collins	(Canada)
His Excellency Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo	(China)
Mr. Paul Guerin	(France)
Mr. B. R. Sen	(India)
Mr. O. Reuchlin	(Netherlands)
His Excellency Sir Carl Berendsen	(New Zealand)
Mr. F. Rodriguez	(Philippines)
Mr. S. K. Tsarapkin	(U.S.S.R.)
Mr. H. A. Graves	(United Kingdom)

Secretary General

Mr. Nelson T. Johnson

Reporter: Mr. R. Holtz, Department of State

(The sixty-fifth meeting of the Far Eastern Commission, 2516 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, convened at 10:35 A.M., 10 July 1947.)

GEN. MCCOY: Gentlemen, we are around the table and we will open our session.

ITEM 1 - APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 64th MEETING

GEN. MCCOY: The minutes of the previous meeting are before you. The Secretary General has an apologetic correction to make here.

MR. JOHNSON: On page 2 in making the stenzil we noticed that there is a blur at the end of the first paragraph stating the point of view of Mr. Tsarapkin. That should read at the bottom: "Only the peace conference itself, he said, could make a decision on the scope of its deliberations." Is that correct?

MR. TSARAPKIN: Yes.

MR. SEN: I have a slight correction to make on page 2. It should be: "Mr. Sen said that it seemed to him inconsistent to refer to final approval being given if the principles had been actually followed by the Commission since the day of its organization." The word "which" is to be omitted.

GEN. MCCOY: Are there any other corrections, gentlemen? There seems to be none. The minutes will be made a matter of record with the corrections indicated.

ITEM 2 - DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE NO. 1: REPARATIONS
(FEC-004/27)

GEN. MCCOY: The Steering Committee on the 8th of July unanimously approved the recommendation of Committee No. 1 that Dr. R. H. van Gulik, the Netherlands member of the Committee, be elected its deputy chairman vice Dr. Weyer.

Unfortunately we are losing our old friend, Dr. Weyer, but I'm assured by my friend from Holland that he's replaced by a very distinguished oriental, scholarly man and one that can worthily represent this very fine group. If there are no objections or other recommendations, the report of the Steering Committee will be accepted and Dr. van Gulik will be elected deputy vice chairman in succession to Dr. Weyer.

ITEM 3 - TEXT OF PUBLIC REPORT ON COMMISSION ACTIVITIES
(FEC-215/11; 215 series)

GEN. MCCOY: FEC-215/11 contains the final version of the text of the proposed public report. A general motion to authorize the Secretary General to publish the report was passed by the Commission on 12 June and is included as paragraph 2 of the cover page of FEC-215/11. The proposed text contains a summary of the decision to extend the policy on Temporary Retention of Electric Steel Furnaces, although release of that policy to the press has not so far been approved, on the assumption that the Commission would wish that decision included with the others. The proposed press release to accompany the text of the Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan is also included, subject to its approval by the Commission.

Are there any further discussions desired on this text? Is there any objection on the part of any member to making this finally a matter of Commission approval for publication? There seems to be none. The Secretary General will take the necessary steps for publication, and copies will be furnished the Commission. That is, we hope to have quickly to have this published in such form that it will be useful to the members.

MR. SEN: May I know, sir, if this report will be printed?

GEN. MCCOY: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: Eventually we will have it printed.

GEN. MCCOY: For the moment you will be given mimeographed copies but we expect to have it printed shortly for more convenient use of the Commission.

ITEM 4 - SECRETARY GENERAL'S PRESS STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY
RELEASE TO THE PRESS OF TEXT OF THE BASIC POST-
SURRENDER POLICY FOR JAPAN (FEC-238/4; 238 series)

GEN. MCCOY: FEC-238/4 is a statement for release to the press by the Secretary General together with the text of the Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan (FEC-014/7) and was prepared by the Basic Policy Subcommittee of the Steering Committee in accordance with instructions from the Commission at its meeting of the 3rd of July. The Australian position is reserved on the second paragraph of the proposed statement. The Secretariat is informed that the text of the Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan has been received in Tokyo and the Secretariat is therefore prepared to release it to the press as soon as agreement on the proposed statement is reached. I might add that I saw a dispatch from SCAP the last few days in which they were quoting the basic policy paper, so that it's already, you might say, being made use of. The Australian position was reserved on the second paragraph of the proposed statement. Mr. Ambassador, have you any further action you wish to put before us?

MR. MAKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would wish to just make some further observations at this stage.

"Mr. Chairman, I should like to review briefly the events leading up to our desire to have an Australian statement embodied in the press release from the Secretary General.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that it was the desire of the Australian Government to introduce an amendment to the basic policy document itself. You will recall too all the circumstances which lead us to believe that although the amendment would have been acceptable to everybody, members would have to refer it to their governments in order to receive formal approval, which would have meant a considerable delay in the passage of this document which had been before the Commission for so long.

"Rather than hold up approval of the basic policy itself, my Government did not press for its amendment. It agreed to record its understanding when the Australian member voted for the paper. It was duly recorded in the minutes when we voted for this paper that 'the policies laid down are subject to and without prejudice to discussions which will take place during the negotiations of the peace treaty with Japan'. In the discussion which ensued, there was no objection raised to this statement. In fact, the feeling of the Commission was that the Australian statement, far from being objectionable, contained ideas which members had already taken for granted.

"In all the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, it was natural that we should desire that at the time the Secretary General issued a press release concerning the passage of the basic policy paper, the understanding of the Australian Government at the time when it voted for the paper should be included in such a press release.

"The Australian representative stated that he felt that it would be appropriate to add a statement to the end of the Secretary General's press statement outlining the Australian understanding.

"However, there were others who had made statements in connection with this paper, and it was at your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that the subcommittee endeavour to draft a press statement which would be comprehensive enough to include the substance of these various statements, none of which, I might add, were in conflict with one another.

"The draft which is now before the Commission may meet the requirements of the other members who presented statements, but as far as the Australian statement is concerned, in our view the draft before us does not go far enough. The subcommittee has been reluctant to state what we require, not because there is any disagreement with our statement, but because in their opinion it is so self-evident as to make any specific statement unnecessary. As I interpret the Soviet attitude, they consider the Australian statement unnecessary, and furthermore feel that it is a little presumptuous on the part of the Far Eastern Commission to even mention the peace conference or to think that anybody could possibly imagine that the passage of the basic policy paper by the Far Eastern Commission could in any way restrict the field which the superior peace-making body will cover or the decisions which it will make.

"We are not really debating this morning a matter of substance. The issues raised by our statement were fully debated on the morning the policy paper was passed. The only issues involved now are:

Whether it is necessary or desirable for the Far Eastern Commission to issue a press statement which will embody the ideas expressed by the Australian representative.

"It would be our preference that the Far Eastern

Commission approve some form of wording for a press statement which would adequately embody the Australian statement." And that clearly was the understanding of this Commission at the time when the basic policy paper was carried, and I ask now that the Commission shall honor that implied agreement at the time of the passage of that basic policy paper.

GEN. MCCOY: There were several statements referred to that committee with no definite instructions, as intimated, I think, that they were honor-bound to accept every suggestion that was made. In fact, the purpose of the reference was to have it properly considered, both the statement from Australia and the statement from the representative of India, so that I don't think there was any intimation or instructions to the committee that they were bound to issue these statements as they were presented. They were sent to them for their consideration and to work out a statement that was proper for the Commission to make. That was my understanding of it.

MR. MAKIN: Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed to speak again. You will remember that when the question of the basic policy paper was before us for consideration there were certain reservations that the Australian representative felt he should take with regard to that matter. But finally when registering a vote upon it there was a very clear indication to the Commission that we felt the position might be met by there being included in any press statement made the feeling that actuated the Australian representative upon this matter and the reasons which justified us registering a vote in favor of the basic policy paper, and at that stage when I indicated that I voted on that understanding no one at this Commission raised any objection to that being an accepted right that I should have in respect to the view that Australia's position might be made perfectly clear in respect to the matter. And it is with that in mind that I press upon the Commission what I think is equivalent to an obligation that there is to Australia that its view upon this matter and upon which it gave its vote for the basic policy paper shall at least be made clear in any press statement

that is made.

GEN. MCCOY: Were you chairman of that subcommittee, Dr. Blakeslee, or who was?

DR. BLAKESLEE: Major Plimsoll.

GEN. MCCOY: I believe he was succeeded by Mr. Sterling, was he not?

DR. BLAKESLEE: Yes.

GEN. MCCOY: Do you care to have Mr. Sterling report from the subcommittee on the subject?

MR. MAKIN: Mr. Sterling, unfortunately, is not here.

GEN. MCCOY: Then I might ask Dr. Blakeslee. Who were the other members, Doctor?

DR. BLAKESLEE: Mr. Chairman, Admiral Ramishvili; Major Plimsoll, Chairman; the Chinese representative part of the time; Mr. Graves; it fluctuated somewhat, Mr. Chairman.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: India.

DR. BLAKESLEE: And in my judgment, speaking as a member of the committee, it was not our understanding that we had any directions or commitment of any kind. We were to consider the various amendments and on the basis of them make a report, which we did.

MR. SEN: Sir, may I ask a question. I was not present at the deliberations of the committee, but would someone please explain what objection they found to this amendment proposed by the Australian delegate? That is, "The policies laid down in this paper are subject to and without prejudice to discussions which will take place during the negotiations of the peace treaty with Japan, and the provisions of the peace treaty with Japan" As I read this and also the final draft, I really don't see much difference between the two. It would seem to express the same meaning and I would like

to know if any member of the committee could explain what objection they found in the wording of the Australian delegation?

GEN. MCCOY: I think while we're going back to the background, we ought to call attention to the report of the subcommittee which is before you under FEC-238/4:

"The Far Eastern Commission authorizes the Secretary General to issue the following statement as a press release to accompany the text of the Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan:

1. The Far Eastern Commission in adopting the Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan on 19 June 1947 gave final approval to a set of fundamental principles which had been under continuing examination since the organization of the Commission.

2. The Commission's Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan will be effective until such time as the treaty of peace comes into force."

Now that is the report of the committee to which the Australian representative takes exception or would like to have in it included his statement, and in referring this subject to the committee, I quote from the minutes:

"GENERAL MCCOY: How would it be, Major Plimsoll, since this is a subject that involves all here who made statements for the record, including the amendment of the Indian Representative, to consider them all together in the subcommittee?

"MAJOR PLIMSOLL: Yes, that is quite all right.

"GENERAL MCCOY: If that is agreeable these statements will be considered by the subcommittee apart from the basic paper. The basic paper is now a matter of record as a policy paper. These statements will be, if there is no objection,

considered in the subcommittee and reported on, but not as part of this basic paper. Is the Soviet Representative on that subcommittee?

"MR. TSARAPKIN: Yes.

"GENERAL McCOY: So it can be considered there in that subcommittee.

"MAJOR PLIMSOLL: The Basic Policy itself will not be published until we get that report?

"GENERAL McCOY: Well it will be some time before it gets around. There will be time for the committee to consider it. We will see to that."

That is the reference to the committee as quoted from the minutes. I'm informed that there wasn't unanimity on the subject. It was considered as was intended by the committee to prepare a statement that would represent the opinion of the Commission, so that there is a hard fact there that the subcommittee was unable to agree excepting as reported to the Commission.

MR. MAKIN: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that in respect to FEC-238/2 it has been reported to us that Major Plimsoll did indicate his agreement with the text that is set forth in this particular suggestion to the Commission, and that being so, I am ready to accept that as expressing what we would wish. The distinguished Indian representative has already indicated that he feels that that does incorporate as clearly as words can really the wish that we have in mind. So if that is acceptable to the Commission I am prepared to accept that as being sufficiently expressive of our view to comply with what I would wish myself on the matter.

GEN. McCOY: That is the original paper that is before the Steering Committee?

MR. MAKIN: That is right.

GEN. MCCOY: "The Far Eastern Commission authorizes the Secretary General to issue the following statement as a press release to accompany the text of the Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan:

The Far Eastern Commission in adopting the Basic Post Surrender Policy for Japan on 19 June 1947 gave final approval to a set of fundamental principles which had been under continuing examination since the organization of the Commission.

It is the understanding of the Commission that the peace conference for Japan will have full authority to discuss and to include in the treaty of peace whatever it desires, and that the Commission's Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan will be effective until such time as the treaty of peace comes into force."

That was not forwarded by the Steering Committee because they couldn't reach agreement on it, so that, as I take it, the Australian representative would like to have that considered now by the Commission?

MR. MAKIN: That is right.

GEN. MCCOY: I am informed that that paper was before the Commission last week and was not agreed to and was referred back to the subcommittee with the statements of the Indian representative and the Australian representative, which now comes up in the new form which I take it you don't accept, so that we're on the horns of a dilemma with two statements to which there are exceptions. Do you desire a vote on this now or would you wish to make a motion following your statement?

MR. MAKIN: I think it would be very helpful, sir, if there could be some discussion about it and we could get to know really what is in the minds of the Commission. I think

that is very desirable before we should ask for a vote upon it.

GEN. MCCOY: All right. We have three matters before the Commission, not in a formal way yet but for the purpose of discussion: first, we will call this paper which was not agreed to and the one I have just read, FEC-238/2, which did not receive approval at the discussion of the last meeting; there is then the report of the subcommittee to which the Australian takes exception and the statement of the Australian position this morning, in which I take it he would accept either this original paper or the motion that you would embody based on your statement this morning.

MR. MAKIN: Yes, sir.

GEN. MCCOY: So that that gives you the whole field for discussion. I am very glad to have you discuss it around the table and see if we can find some way of getting together on a statement that will represent the Commission.

DR. KOC: Mr. Chairman, as I recall, this question was discussed more than once in the Commission and the original statement of the Australian representative went much further than the position which is now in the text, and I also recall that when the paper, FEC-238/2, was before the Commission a discussion took place which resulted in a number of views being expressed. Most of them considered that the matter was to be understood naturally but that the wording was somewhat not appropriate and I recall several amendments that were proposed. I myself made one amendment and I believe some others did also. And the Australian statement together with the suggested amendments were referred to this particular subcommittee.

According to the report that I received from our representative on the subcommittee, the various amendments

plus the original Australian proposal were discussed and the views expressed were very close to one another, and it settled really upon whether or not any reference should be made in the second paragraph to the scope of the work of the peace conference. I believe the United States representative also submitted an amendment based upon the view you expressed, Mr. Chairman, in the Commission which would seem to approach very closely also the Chinese point of view. The United States amendment says to add at the end of the second paragraph "and will in no way prejudice the scope of the work of the peace conference". Our amendment, which was originally submitted in the Commission and which was afterwards referred to the subcommittee for consideration along with other amendments: "and of course without prejudice to the scope of the work of the peace conference". From the point of view of the Chinese delegation either of these two clauses would be preferable to the original second paragraph which you just read out in FEC-238/2. So it seems to me that, in order to facilitate agreement, if we are to discuss at all here in the Commission in connection with the report of the subcommittee, it would be perhaps more practical to consider whether or not either the United States amendment or the Chinese amendment--it doesn't make any difference to us--we are ready to accept--naturally we are ready to support our original amendment--but we are quite ready to accept the United States amendment, if that would meet with the views of the other members including, of course, the Australian representative. Our amendment and I believe yours also was offered in a spirit of compromise on a matter about which no principle is involved; it is something that everybody understands, and to refer to it in such a way as has

been proposed perhaps would not carry any false impression and it might meet the approval or agreement of the Australian representative. Personally I think that, although we did not at all see eye to eye with the Australian point of view presented in the original Australian statement, which, as I said, proposed to go much beyond that, we believe nevertheless that in the form as it is now proposed, either in the original Chinese amendment or in the United States amendment, a simple reference to that, which might even be desirable, not only to facilitate acceptance by the Australian representative but also others--there might be some confusion in the mind as to what really is the relation between the Far Eastern Commission and the peace conference and a reference of this nature might make it very clear to the public that what we are doing here is the determination of Allied post-surrender policy for Japan and that the work of the peace conference is something which will take care of itself. From that point of view, some reference as has been proposed in the Chinese amendment or in the American amendment might even be desirable for us to act with. So, if we are to discuss anything, it seems to me that it would be better perhaps to discuss either the American amendment or the Chinese amendment, if that would also impress the Australian colleague as something which he would be in a position to accept.

MR. GRAVES: Mr. Chairman, we would support either the version in FEC-238/2, though the Australian Ambassador has mentioned that it isn't acceptable, or its modified version, which could no doubt be arrived at for discussion, or the version shown in FEC-238/4. But, speaking with a knowledge of what has happened in the subcommittee where we have had very substantial considerations of all these versions, we

must not overlook the fact, the hard fact, that the objection to the version in stroke FEC-238/2 comes from our Soviet colleague who has maintained opposition to the words "peace conference". That is really what it amounts to. So I think we've got to look that in the face that the real objection is in the words "peace conference", and up to the last meeting that we had it in the subcommittee that was the position. I don't know whether it still is.

GEN. MCCOY: Are there any other remarks before I refer to the Soviet representative?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, in view of what our United Kingdom colleague has just said, I wonder whether the version of the Chinese proposal and the proposal, I understand, which has been made by the United States might not be incorporated without reference to the peace conference, which would be somewhat as follows: "The Commission's Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan will be effective until such time as the treaty of peace comes into force and without prejudice to the provisions of that treaty"?

GEN. MCCOY: I believe that was not accepted in the subcommittee. The last proposal was the Chinese compromise which I understood was not acceptable to you on the committee. Am I correct in making that statement?

MR. TSARAPKIN: We maintain the proposal of the subcommittee.

GEN. MCCOY: Are you satisfied now with the discussion, Mr. Ambassador?

MR. MAKIN: Well, we don't seem to have advanced the situation very far, do we, sir? I feel that the suggestion of the Chinese Ambassador does go ^a along way toward what would be acceptable to me.

GEN. MCCOY: But that is not acceptable to the Soviet representative.

MR. MAKIN: Well, of course, I regret that very much, but should that be the final determining factor?

GEN. MCCOY: Oh no, not at all. You asked for discussion. Now we have had it. I am now about to cut the Gordian knot and put it to a vote unless you wish to make a further statement, because apparently the others are together on the report of the subcommittee now before the Commission. This has all been discussed very thoroughly in the committee and in the Steering Committee and I was simply giving you an opportunity to present your case before bringing it to a formal action.

MR. MAKIN: Well, sir, I was wondering whether this might be a way out of what appears to be an impasse in regard to the matter, whether, "If, however, because of all the difficulties which become apparent--difficulties about finding the exact wording, doubts as to whether it is necessary to be so explicit, et cetera--in all the circumstances we would be inclined to return to our original suggestion, namely, that to a press statement from the Secretary General, it merely be added that the Australian member, when voting for this paper, did so on the understanding that the policies laid down in this paper are subject to and without prejudice to discussions which will take place during the negotiations of the peace treaty with Japan." That is, I think that that is certainly due to myself and to the Australian Government for the position to be made clear, and if that will help to facilitate matters, then I would accept that provision that as long as the position of the Australian Government is made perfectly clear I would be prepared to accept it under those

circumstances.

SIR CARL BERENDSEN: Mr. Chairman, I haven't taken any part in this discussion. I don't think anything that we decide, if we could agree on a form of wording, is actually going to alter the jurisdiction--of the powers and functions--of the peace conference and I think that the suggestion made by the Australian Ambassador is possibly the best way out of what is purely a verbal difficulty. I have a difficulty of my own which I would like to have recorded. I don't know exactly what the implication of any one of these proposals is. What is the peace conference? If it's a peace conference including New Zealand, okay by me. What is the peace treaty? If it's a peace treaty to which New Zealand is a signatory, then I am perfectly satisfied. But there may be more than one peace treaty. We have seen the difficulties that have arisen in Europe. We might have more than one peace treaty. All the members sitting around this table may not be party to any particular peace treaty. I am quite content with either of these provisions provided that is the understanding--that the peace treaty referred to is for a conference to which New Zealand is a party. But I do suggest that we might talk for weeks on this matter which, I repeat, is not a decision that is going to bind the peace conference in any way at all. I think the best way out of this verbal difficulty is to accept the last suggestion made by the Australian Ambassador.

GEN. MCCOY: Have you any remarks to make, Mr. Ambassador?
(Mr. Tsarapkin, the Soviet representative, spoke by means of an interpreter.)

MR. TSARAPKIN: Mr. Chairman, as far as the Soviet delegation is concerned we would prefer, of course, the text that

was worked out by the subcommittee. The text of this document precisely enough defines the jurisdiction of this document and in no way does it affect the jurisdiction of the peace conference. Any statements other than the statements worked out by the subcommittee would inevitably cause statements on the part of other delegations. In order not to complicate the matter, Mr. Chairman, the Soviet delegation would prefer to limit ourselves only to the statement that has been worked out by the subcommittee and decide this question on this.

GEN. MCCOY: Any other comment, gentlemen?

MR. SEN: Sir, I would like to support the amendment which has last been proposed by the Australian Ambassador. The amendment would mean that the Far Eastern Commission as such, as a whole, would not support or will not be a party to that statement but the Australian member will have carried his own position in the matter.

GEN. MCCOY: Do you wish to have this put to a formal vote?

MR. MAKIN: I would just like to offer this observation about what has been said by the Soviet representative. I am not now seeking for any alteration to the motion that has been submitted from the subcommittee, but I do feel that it is surely due to myself or to any other government to have its view placed perfectly to the world so that there can be a proper understanding as to the attitude that we have adopted upon this matter. And I do not feel that any member around this table will surely wish to involve any other fellow member in being falsely or wrongly represented in its view upon the situation. That being so, I only ask at this stage in a desire to try and be as helpful as I possibly can, and again to assist in facilitating the business of the Commission, to make the suggestion that as long as my view on behalf of the Australian Government can be set out with any other

statement that is issued by the Secretary General, then I am prepared to accept the view that has already been expressed by the subcommittee. But only with that understanding that the Australian view can actually be expressed in the way that I have mentioned as supplementary to that particular motion. Now, I think that that is a very reasonable attitude and I don't think that any government surely should deny to another government the right of at least having its own position made perfectly clear.

GEN. MCCOY: Isn't it possible for you to make that clear both in Canberra and here by your own statement without wanting the Commission to make the statement?

MR. MAKIN: But, as the Chairman will thoroughly understand, when an official advice is issued by the Secretary General, that going out would have quite a separate existence to any statement that I may make subsequently or the Government of Australia may make subsequently. To be able to have it in its proper relation with the question that is under review and to at least make the position of my Government perfectly related to the situation it surely must have joint expression with any statement made by the Commission. I think that you will realize, sir, that any statement made today--you cannot chase it effectively with a statement that you may make tomorrow. And that's unfortunately the position of the way in which today public mind is informed that if it is that there is issued a statement from here today, it is taken as incorporating the view of every member of the Commission unless ~~it~~ it otherwise specifies. And any statement made subsequently, either by myself as the Ambassador here or in Canberra, does not catch up with the effectiveness of that statement that has been made formally by the Secretary

General himself. That being so, that is why I do feel that I am certain that any member around this table who did not feel that the motion under review satisfied their mind and wished to have a rider incorporated with the official statement would regard it as the only just and right and reasonable circumstance to associate itself with any difference that we may have upon that question. And therefore I do press my request, sir, that at least associated with the statement issued by the Secretary General there shall be this supplementary reference to the question of the Australian representative's views upon the question and as to the reasons which actuated us in the consideration of this matter.

GEN. MCCOY: You are conscious that this is the first time this has been done?

MR. MAKIN: No, sir. I would beg to bring to your notice that this is not the first occasion in which it has been done. The minutes of the 57th meeting of the Commission will bear that out. But, may I also say that I do not feel that we should be slaves to even precedent. We are here to make precedent as well as to follow it and we're surely masters of our own position as long as we work within the Terms of Reference which actually gives composition to this Commission. Because it hasn't been done before is not a circumstance which would justify us not doing it now. But I do say that there is in the minutes of the Commission such as even justifies on precedent it being done.

GEN. MCCOY: I think that heretofore when any one representation wanted to make their position plain for the record it was done in the way of a statement in the minutes--not in any action of the Commission itself to the public. That is the difference, I think. Still, I'm ready to hear the wishes

of the Commission on that. It would also not seem so simple as the Australian representative states because I would assume then that everybody would want to make some statement to go with the action of the Commission. It's not Australia alone that has certain reservations and that's what this round table is for--to work them out and act as a commission, and if there is any reservation in the sense such as this heretofore it has just been a matter of record in the minutes and not in the formal action of the Commission. That's my remembrance of our action throughout the last two years. But, as you say, we can always make a precedent if considered necessary.

SIR CARL BERENDSEN: Sir, I have only to add, I am for peace and progress. I think it's a pity that we should devote the whole morning to a discussion such as this. We all agree that no resolution we can pass is really going to alter the functions of the peace conference. It was, I think, by reason of the Australian desire that paragraph 2 or its various forms were proposed at all. Might I make this suggestion--eliminate paragraph 2 altogether. I am not very fond of paragraph 1 but I am prepared to accept it, but let's eliminate paragraph 2 altogether and give to the Australian Ambassador what he desires, a statement which is not of the views of the Commission but a statement of the views so warmly expressed by the Australian representative. My suggestion is, omit paragraph 2 and in the press statement, which is merely the Secretary General's press statement--it is not binding on the Commission at all and it makes no reference to what the Commission thinks--no other individual member on the Commission is held to it at all--simply a statement of what the Australian representative said. It may be

a precedent or it may not be a precedent; I don't see any harm in it.

MR. MAKIN: That would be perfectly acceptable to me.

GEN. MCCOY: I would be willing to drop the whole statement and make no public statement.

SIR CARL BERENDSEN: So would I, sir. Fair enough.

MR. SEN: Sir, I have not been able to follow. What is the proposition before us now? Is it to omit the entire press statement or to omit the second paragraph, or what is it?

GEN. MCCOY: Well, I will proceed in the usual informal^{way.} if there are no objections we will not make any statement. Are there any objections?

MR. MAKIN: We thought that there should be some statement of some kind made, but I am exercising my mind about the fact of what is the nature of the statement. I think that what Sir Carl has suggested is the best proposal, and that is to eliminate the second paragraph and to incorporate with the official statement the intimation that I have indicated. I think that that would meet the position quite satisfactorily surely for everybody.

GEN. MCCOY: Well I am not sure about that. I informally made the statement that if there are no objections we not make any statement. Now there is an objection on the part of the Australians.

MR. SEN: Sir, there is also the objection that we owe an explanation to the public as to why we have taken two years to evolve this policy.

GEN. MCCOY: Well I will accept the objections. I just wanted to clear the atmosphere. Now I will ask, are there any objections to eliminating the second paragraph of the

subcommittee report? Are there any objections to making that statement of the subcommittee less the second paragraph without reference to the Australian statement at all-- just to get the wishes of the Commission down to brass tacks?

DR. KOO: Mr. Chairman, we attach great importance to this paragraph as it is because it is necessary, we think, for the public to know what is the character of our post-surrender decisions and how long they are to apply, and I think a statement such as is embodied in the second paragraph is very necessary.

GEN. MCCOY: All right. We will conclude that that is not the wish of the Commission. Now, I will make the same proposal accepting the subcommittee's report and with it the proposal of the Australian Ambassador, that the Secretary General issue the statement of Australia as part of the public statement. Is there any objection to that?

MR. REUHLIN: Mr. Chairman, for the reasons which you yourself have set forth I think we should be creating a dangerous precedent, and as every decision, as you have pointed out, of an international commission such as this one, is the result of a compromise, we could always when we publish one of our policy decisions have to state the views of the different governments which are not incorporated in the final policy statement. That, I should think, is a dangerous precedent and therefore I am against the inclusion in the statement which we are going to make of the proposal of the Australian delegate. I want to make it clear, however, that I am in favor of the original Australian proposal; I am in favor of this proposal; in favor of omitting it; I am in favor of all those things; but I am not in favor of inclusion of a statement such as has been proposed now.

GEN. MCCOY: I am also of your opinion, so that is out of the picture.

MR. MAKIN: Would it be possible to have a registering of the view by vote of the Commission on that matter?

GEN. MCCOY: Well I don't think it is necessary since I, as one of the veto powers, would vote against it. I will take that responsibility and I know that there would be others also. But if you wish a vote around the table--

MR. MAKIN: No. If you state that, sir, I think not.

GEN. MCCOY: So, I think we have cleared the board for the report of the subcommittee, which I submit to the Commission in the form as submitted by the subcommittee.

MR. MAKIN: I would just like to ask one question, sir, and that is as to whether you rule that this is a question of substance and not a procedure?

GEN. MCCOY: I rule this a question of substance.

MR. MAKIN: All right. I just wish that to be registered for recording purposes, sir, so that we would be quite clear in regard to just how this matter is being observed and registered.

GEN. MCCOY: Well in that case I will call for a formal vote on this report of the subcommittee because that question of my ruling would then be involved, you see, if I were the only one. I will now put before the Commission the report of the subcommittee and poll the Commission.

The Soviet representative? Are you in favor of the report of the subcommittee?

MR. TSARAPKIN: Yes.

GEN. MCCOY: The United Kingdom member?

MR. GRAVES: This is on the matter of substance, is it?

GEN. MCCOY: That is involved, yes.

MR. GRAVES: I have already stated that I would vote for this or for the earlier paper, FEC-238/2, and as this is the only one which is before us at the moment I would have to say that I would vote for this.

GEN. MCCOY: I vote for it. And the Australian Ambassador?

MR. MAKIN: I wish to indicate, sir, that I would have voted for FEC-238/2 as set out originally to the Commission, but in the present form, and especially as objection has been taken to any statement setting out clearly the Australian position to this matter, I vote against.

GEN. MCCOY: The Canadian member?

MR. COLLINS: For.

GEN. MCCOY: The Chinese Ambassador?

DR. KOO: I vote for it, but I would like to add that I would have voted for an additional clause to that also, if that should be put.

GEN. MCCOY: The French representative?

MR. GUERIN: We vote for it.

GEN. MCCOY: The Indian representative?

MR. SEN: I vote for it, but I would also vote for the original statement.

RE. REUHLIN: For it.

GEN. MCCOY: Sir Carl?

SIR CARL BERENDSEN: I shall abstain, sir.

GEN. MCCOY: The representative of the Philippines?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I would vote for it, but I should like to state that I would have also voted for the other paper.

DR. KOO: May I, Mr. Chairman, just make it clear--when I said I would have voted for an additional clause to it, I meant either the American amendment or the Chinese amendment.

GEN. MCCOY: Those abstentions and reservations and additions will all be made a matter of record in the minutes.

The action of the Commission is announced as voting for the report of the subcommittee.

ITEM 5 - JAPANESE WHALING (FEC-231/4; FEC-231/5; 231 series, FEC-035, FEC-035/2)

GEN. MCCOY: This proposed policy decision was approved by the Steering Committee on 17 June. The Chinese, Philippine, and Soviet positions are reserved, and a statement of the United States position in opposition to the proposal was presented at the Commission meeting on 19 June. The statement by the Australian representative at the meeting on 26 June is contained in FEC-231/5. Is there any comment? I believe that was postponed from meeting to meeting pending diplomatic negotiations which are still in progress. Is there any comment or statement desirable at this meeting on the subject?

MR. TSARAPKIN: Mr. Chairman, the Soviet delegation removes its reservation on this subject.

GEN. MCCOY: The Soviet announces that they remove their reservation on the subject.

ITEM 6 - CONTROL OF JAPANESE MILITARY ACTIVITY IN JAPAN (FEC-017/5; SC-020 series)

GEN. MCCOY: FEC-017/5 was approved by the Steering Committee on 24 June. The action was opposed by the Soviet member and his position is reserved on the amendments in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the cover page. The Commission on 26 June agreed to postpone further consideration to afford time to the Soviet representative to seek further instructions. Have you had any further instructions?

(Mr. Tsarapkin spoke by means of an interpreter.)

MR. TSARAPKIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

"In accordance with the instructions of the Government of the USSR the Soviet delegation proposes for the approval by the Far Eastern Commission the following amendments to document

FEC-017/5: Control of Japanese Military Activity in Japan:

"1. In view of the fact that the present heading of document FEC-017/5 proceeds from the assumption of permission in Japan of a military activity in some form, it is suggested that the heading be amended to read: 'Prohibition of Military Activity in Japan and Disposition of the Japanese Military Equipment.'

"2. Para. 2:

a. Delete the words 'of certain specified types and quantities of arms and ammunition' and substitute the following: 'of rifles and pistols and the necessary quantity of ammunition for them'.

Such wording would exclude the possibility of using by the police of cannons and other types of weapons.

b. Delete subparagraph b for the reason that hunting guns do not come under the category of military equipment and there is no necessity, therefore, to mention specifically of permitting hunters to possess weapons.

"3. Para. 3:

In the end of the paragraph substitute a comma for the period and add the following: 'with the exception of a strictly limited quantity, purchased abroad, of rifles, pistols and ammunition to them for the permitted personnel of police'.

"4. Para. 6:

a. Delete subparagraph a.

The question of unique and new types of armaments has already been discussed in Committee No. 2 in

connection with consideration of FEC-084 series, and the majority of the Committee has agreed that this type of armament should be subject to destruction on general principles.

- b. In subparagraph b delete the last part of the sentence beginning with the words 'or for the lawful activities..1' and instead of the deleted portion substitute the following: '...in accordance with the list submitted to the Far Eastern Commission with the enumeration of items required for such purposes. For the armament of the permitted personnel of the Japanese civilian police there will be left a strictly limited quantity of rifles, pistols and ammunition for them.'
- c. In subparagraph c delete the words 'such equipment... ' until the end of the subparagraph.
- d. Delete subparagraph 1, 2, 3, of paragraph 6 completely as the contents of these subparagraphs are fully covered by subparagraphs 'b' and 'c'.

"5. Para. 9:

After the words 'the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers add the words 'for subsequent destruction'.

"6. Para. 10:

- a. Delete the words 'Reestablishment of the following should be prohibited' and substitute this wording: 'The following will be finally abolished and their reestablishment in any form shall be prohibited'.
- b. Delete the second sentence of paragraph 10 beginning with the words 'Such demobilization agency' and substitute the following new sentence: 'The Demobilization agency should be immediately dissolved and its functions for the completion of

demobilization will be transferred to a civilian body'.

"7. Para. 11:

Substitute the words 'ex-military men of the Army, Navy and Gendarmerie' for the words 'ex-officers of the Army and Navy' in both places in this paragraph.

"8. Para. 13:

Begin this paragraph as follows: 'For the purpose of prevention of the revival of Japanese militarism the following should not be nominated' and further as it stands in the text of FEC-017/5."

That is all.

GEN. MCCOY: May I have a copy of that, please? The amendments proposed by the Soviet delegation are of such substance that they can't be considered before the Commission at this time, and I would take it that you would like to have it referred back to the committee for full consideration?

MR. TSARAPKIN: Yes.

GEN. MCCOY: If that's agreeable to the other members, the amendments proposed will be referred back with the paper to the working committee.

ITEM 7 - ADVANCE TRANSFERS OF JAPANESE REPARATIONS (FEC-201/1)

GEN. MCCOY: Item 7 is passed over this morning.

ITEM 8 - THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION (FEC-105/2, SC-049/2)

GEN. MCCOY: Unless there is some member of the Commission who wishes to comment, we will go to other business.

ITEM 9 - OTHER BUSINESS

a. Announcement

GEN. MCCOY: The Secretary General has an announcement.

MR. JOHNSON: Because the trees in the front court will

be sprayed on Friday and Monday it is requested that members park around the flags rather than outside edge of the court on those two days.

GEN. MCCOY: Is there any other business?

b. Commission Recess

MR. REUCHLIN: Mr. Chairman, is it on the purpose that on the agenda we don't find back an item which I think perhaps the Secretariat is more interest in than the delegates? That is the question of the recess. I thought that at the last meeting that wasn't decided.

GEN. MCCOY: No. What is the latest on the subject of the recess?

MR. JOHNSON: Well there was so much objection to the plan that we offered that we have just dropped the matter and left it for the Commission to decide. I think the matter was more or less in abeyance; the delegations could arrange their recess or leave it as they wished.

MR. REUCHLIN: Of course there is no difficulty for the delegations or deputies, but I am thinking of the hard-working body called the Secretariat.

MR. JOHNSON: Oh, we're all taken care of. We arrange our vacations among ourselves.

GEN. MCCOY: Possibly before the end of the month we may bring it up again after we see how things develop on reparations and one or two papers now before the Steering Committee, which, if we are able to get them through in the next couple of weeks, possibly we can make some provisions such as we did last year or some modification of that idea. At any rate we will be glad to have your suggestions on that and we will keep the subject alive.

We stand adjourned, gentlemen.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 12:00 Noon.)

FAR EASTERN COMMISSION

Transcript of Sixty-Sixth Meeting of the Far Eastern Commission,

Held in Main Conference Room, 2516 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.

Thursday, July 17, 1947

FAR EASTERN COMMISSION

Transcript of Sixty-Sixth Meeting of the Far Eastern Commission,
Held in Main Conference Room, 2516 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Thursday, July 17, 1947

Representatives Present

Major General Frank R. McCoy, Chairman	(United States)
His Excellency Norman J. O. Makin	(Australia)
Mr. R. E. Collins	(Canada)
His Excellency Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo	(China)
Mr. Robert Douteau	(France)
Mr. B. R. Sen	(India)
Mr. O. Reuchlin	(Netherlands)
Colonel G. R. Powles	(New Zealand)
Mr. F. Rodriguez	(Philippines)
Mr. S. K. Tsarapkin	(U.S.S.R.)
Mr. H. A. Graves	(United Kingdom)

Secretary General

Mr. Nelson T. Johnson

Reporter: Mr. R. Holtz, Department of State

(The sixty-sixth meeting of the Far Eastern Commission, 2516 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, convened at 10:35 A.M., 17 July 1947.)

GEN. MCCOY: Gentlemen, we seem to be around the table and the session is declared open.

ITEM 1 - APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 65th MEETING

GEN. MCCOY: The minutes are before you for correction or any changes or suggestions that may occur. Are the minutes as before you ready for the record? It seems so and that will be ordered.

ITEM 2 - DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE NO. 5: WAR CRIMINALS (FEC-004/31)

GEN. MCCOY: Item 2 involves the election of a Deputy Chairman of Committee No. 5: War Criminals. The Steering Committee on the 15th of July approved the recommendation of the Secretary General that Mr. F. C. Rodriguez, Philippine member of Committee No. 5, be recommended to the Commission for election as Deputy Chairman of that Committee, vice Mr. C. Coronel in absence. Is there any comment? If there are no comments or objections the recommendation of the Steering Committee will be that of the Commission.

ITEM 3 - DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE NO. 7: DISARMAMENT OF JAPAN (FEC-004/32)

GEN. MCCOY: Item 3 also covers the Deputy Chairman of Committee No. 7: Disarmament of Japan. The Steering Committee, on the 15th of July, approved the recommendation of the Secretary General that Rear Admiral Ramishvili, Soviet member of Committee No. 7, be recommended to the Commission for election as Deputy Chairman of Committee No. 7, vice General Vasiliev. If that is your wish we will confirm the action

of the Steering Committee.

ITEM 4 - JAPANESE WHALING (FEC-231/4; 231 series, FEC-035, ~~FEC-035/1~~)

GEN. MCCOY: Item 4 is the subject of Japanese Whaling that was approved by the Steering Committee, paper FEC-035/1. This proposed policy decision was approved by the Steering Committee on the 17th of June. The Chinese and Philippine positions are reserved, and the United States is opposed. I understand the diplomatic exchanges on that subject are still going on, so that, if there is no objection, the item will be retained on the agenda.

MR. MAKIN: Mr. Chairman, in regard to that matter, is it right to say that diplomatic exchanges are still taking place in regard to that? I think that almost had been brought to a conclusion. I would certainly like at least this matter to be brought to a vote of the Commission at the earliest possible moment, and I would like it to be made clear as to whether diplomatic exchanges are still expected upon this situation. I have reason to believe that what possibilities there might have been in this direction have been fully explored and I don't know that the position at the moment can be advanced very much further. That being so, I would ask as to whether the Commission is not approaching the time when a decision should be registered here and I was hopeful that possibly this morning member States who are represented on the Commission would be in the position now to register a vote upon the paper concerned. I cannot feel at all happy at the idea of this matter being deferred indefinitely and then ultimately having to be removed from the agenda because of the fact that it no longer can serve its purpose. The position is this that, as a country very deeply concerned in the effect of this

situation, I am expecting the Commission to at least register a decision upon it, and I am hopeful that member States will be in a position, if not today then at some very immediate time, to be able at least to finalize this position. I would like, therefore, just to say that I think possibly the matter as it has been standing over because of exchanges that have taken place--I don't know that anything further can be undertaken in the way that you have mentioned which can serve the purpose further, and that being so I think it finally will have to be left to this Commission to make its determination and I would like that that might be done at an early date.

GEN. MCCOY: I am informed - this morning - passing over the implication that there is an intentional postponement or delay on the part of the United States--I don't like that habit of your intimation and insinuation--

MR. MAKIN: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to allow you to express in regard to my views that I make insinuations that are not intended. I am quite honorable and straightforward in saying the thing that I believe on behalf of my country, and I am not going to allow you or anybody else to infer from my words those things that are not intended.

GEN. MCCOY: Well the intention was very plainly put in your statement of what you intended and it has been lying on my mind since. It has not been the custom of any member of this Commission to insinuate or state that there were ulterior motives on the part of his colleagues. You have done that twice.

MR. MAKIN: Mr. Chairman, I ask that you will at least accept my assurance that such a thing has never been in my mind and the propriety of you saying such a thing I feel

certainly should be subject to question. I am very, very unhappy in the thought that you should endeavor to insinuate this morning that I have in any way sought to convey impressions that there has been some improper action or intention on the part of any member government of this particular commission, and I say that any member of this Commission will recognize that in the statements that I have made, and they are all here on record, there cannot be that reference taken from what I have said that you have sought to infer this morning.

GEN. MCCOY: It's not a question of inference. All you have to do is to read your own statement and the statement that you have made this morning insinuating that we are purposely postponing this action.

MR. MAKIN: The position is this, that the very fact that there have been circumstances which have required this matter to be subject to certain postponements, I think we have arrived at a time when surely we can have some vote registered upon it and I am asking that that shall be done and surely that is not beyond my right to be able to do it.

GEN. MCCOY: It's a perfectly proper request, but in view of the number of countries represented at this table that have gone outside of the Commission--very properly from their points of view--I am not questioning that--but they have done it and they are still doing it, so that Australia is not the only country concerned. The freedom of the seas is concerned and three other countries represented here at the table are still in the matter of exchange with my Government.

MR. MAKIN: As long as they are exchanging--

GEN. MCCOY: I have told you that twice. Now I don't

feel that there should be a mountain made of this mole hill, except that I will in due time present the position of my Government and also answer your insinuations against members of my staff.

MR. MAKIN: Again I say, sir, I am deeply unhappy at the thought that you should make an ungenerous reference to any statement that I have made and I offer my formal protest at your doing so.

GEN. MCCOY: Well I think after you read your formal statement of two weeks ago that you would probably instead of protesting offer an apology to the members of my staff who worked so thoroughly and fully and freely with your representatives here for a year and a half and have appreciated the attitude of your subordinates and your predecessors heretofore. If you will read the newspaper report of your Premier you'll see that he has at least an understanding of the action of my Government that doesn't seem to be expressed here.

Are there any other comments or suggestions or wishes on the subject of Japanese whaling this morning? There seems to be none. It will remain on the agenda, and the Commission will be informed as soon as these diplomatic exchanges between the United States and the United Kingdom and New Zealand and Norway have been finished. I will also then present a statement at the same time giving the position of the Chairman and his staff.

ITEM 5 - ADVANCE TRANSFERS OF JAPANESE REPARATIONS (FEC-201/1)

GEN. MCCOY: The advance transfers of Japanese reparations was first considered by the Commission on the 3rd of April and has since been retained on the agenda at the

request of one of the representatives. It will remain unless there is objection.

ITEM 6 - THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION (FEC-105/2, SC-049/2)

GEN. MCCOY: Are there any suggestions on the part of any representative as to the work of the Commission?

There has been a great deal of work done on our faithful working committees, and with regard to two of them I am being under pressure as a matter of urgency on the part of the Supreme Commander for the action of the Commission. One of these papers is the Restitution of Looted Property (Cl-002/33), which is now in the Reparations Committee, and the Interim Import-Export Policies for Japan (FEC-032/24), which is now before the Steering Committee. These papers, I am informed, are matters of urgency and the United States Government is deeply concerned at the-- is very much concerned--no, they use the term "deeply concerned" that the Far Eastern Commission should give early permission for the establishment under the first paper, Restitution of Looted Property, of a revolving fund to be used for the rehabilitation of Japanese industry. Provisions for that fund are contained in both these papers mentioned, so that I bring it to your attention with great urgency for action. I am informed that agreement on the major issues has been reached and that there are certain reservations and a few amendments that still need further consideration. I hope that we can at the next meeting have these papers before us in the Commission.

ITEM 7 - OTHER BUSINESS

GEN. MCCOY: Are there any comments on other business? There seems to be none. The meeting stands adjourned.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 10:50 A.M.)

FAR EASTERN COMMISSION

Transcript of Sixty-Seventh Meeting of the Far Eastern Commission.

Held in Main Conference Room, 2516 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.

Thursday, July 24, 1947

FAR EASTERN COMMISSION

Transcript of Sixty-Seventh Meeting of the Far Eastern Commission,
Held in Main Conference Room, 2516 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Thursday, July 24, 1947

Representatives Present

Major General Frank R. McCoy, Chairman	(United States)
His Excellency Norman J. O. Makin	(Australia)
His Excellency Hume Wrong	(Canada)
His Excellency Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo	(China)
Mr. Robert Douteau	(France)
Mr. B. R. Sen	(India)
Mr. O. Reuchlin	(Netherlands)
Colonel G. R. Powles	(New Zealand)
Mr. F. Rodriguez	(Philippines)
Mr. S. K. Tsarapkin	(U.S.S.R.)
Mr. H. A. Graves	(United Kingdom)

Secretary General

Mr. Nelson T. Johnson

Reporter: Mr. R. Holtz, Department of State--FEC

(The sixty-seventh meeting of the Far Eastern Commission, 2516 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, convened at 10:35 A.M., 24 July 1947.)

GEN. MCCOY: Good morning, gentlemen, the session is open.

It's not a good day, when we get down to Other Business, to bring up the subject of the month of August. I will defer that to probably a later meeting when the conditions are more favorable to our planning for the hot month of August.

ITEM 1 - APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 66th MEETING

GEN. MCCOY: Our minutes are before you for consideration, suggestions, or criticism. Are there any comments or correction? There seem to be none; it will be made a matter of record.

At the request of one of the members who is later forced to withdraw, I am asked to move up Item 4 on Japanese Whaling to Item 2.

ITEM 2 - JAPANESE WHALING (FEC-231/4; 231 series, FEC-035, FEC-035/1)

GEN. MCCOY: This proposed policy decision was approved by the Steering Committee on 17 June. The Chinese and Philippine positions are reserved, and the United States is opposed. The subject is before you and will be considered for further discussion.

The Secretary General calls my attention to the fact that the statement of the United States representative, presenting the views of his Government on this subject and the reasons for the United States being opposed to the paper, was circulated last night and is also before you this morning. There is also a statement of the United States representative

explaining or attempting to explain his position, in view of the statement made by the Australian Ambassador in a formal paper presented to the Commission some weeks ago.

MR. MAKIN: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the paper that has been presented setting out the statement of the United States Government's views regarding the Antarctic whaling by Japanese-manned ships under the supervision of the Supreme Commander, I should like, sir, to make a few observations at this stage, if I may be allowed to. I would like to say,

"At this stage it would hardly seem necessary for me to remind the members of the Commission of the reasons for the Australian attitude towards Japanese whaling. Those reasons have been expounded at great length in committee discussions. In the Commission itself on 26 June I made a lengthy statement of the Australian position which has been circulated as document FEC-231/5. Our official position is as firm and insistent today as it was then. I should like to confine myself for the moment to the United States statement before us this morning.

"We are told, Mr. Chairman, that the United States perceives no security threat in the proposed whaling expedition. Members will realize that I speak for a country in the minds of whose people the memories are still very vivid of the dark days in 1942 when we stood exposed and alone and watched the full force of Japanese aggression advancing rapidly toward us. The memories of the invasion of New Guinea and Portuguese Timor and the destruction of our northern port of Darwin are not erased from the minds of the Australian people overnight, and we are determined that the Japanese will not have the slightest opportunity to menace our security again. We have a long and painful experience of the activities of the Japanese in waters close to Australia over the past 15

years. To the Australian mind the presence of Japanese ships, and in particular pearling fleets, in the neighborhood of Australia has been synonymous with spying. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that our experience in the past entitled us to be the best judge of what constitutes a potential threat to our security. This argument has all the more relevance when the report of the Australian observer on the last SCAP expedition shows that 90% of the catch was obtained in waters adjacent to Australian Antarctic possessions.

"Furthermore, we cannot overlook the adverse report of the Australian observer on last year's expedition which was under the scrutiny of SCAP inspectors, and it would, therefore, be asking too much for us to share the Supreme Commander's confidence that the Japanese will in future adhere to the international whaling agreements which they have traditionally violated so flagrantly.

"The bald United States statement that the yield of oil plus meat and other products per blue whale unit on the last expedition was actually higher than that achieved by other nations in no way refutes the calculations based on the report of the Australian observer that 3000 tons of whale oil were lost to the world pool. The fact that the 4424 metric tons of blubber should have been shipped to Japan was inefficient and wasteful in itself. Blubber is the rich oil-bearing matter and should be processed for oil and not salted. If this had been done, an additional 1798 tons of oil would have been produced. If that is an argument advanced in relation to Japanese efficiency on the part of those concerned with conducting the whaling expedition, then our lack of confidence in the possibility of the Japanese increasing the quantity of oil available to the world this year is very well founded indeed.

"You will recall that when we were first informed by the United States Government that an expedition would take place this year, the argument advanced was that the protein food products and whale oil provided would be a vitally necessary component of the Japanese food and oil supplies. We have never been convinced that the amount of protein so obtained would mean more than a trifling amount of consumption per head in Japan. This view has been particularly favorably expressed by the United Kingdom member. Nevertheless our offer which we made to conduct a whaling expedition either separately or with other Allies and to hand over to SCAP all the catch for distribution by SCAP would have solved whatever difficulties the absence of whale meat would make to the Japanese food shortage.

"At this stage, Mr. Chairman, an entirely new argument was advanced, namely that the Japanese economy needs the foreign exchange resulting from the sale of the oil abroad. We feel that such an argument should not be allowed to cloud the real issue. Once the principle of an Australian or non-Japanese expedition is determined, the manner in which Australia or the other countries concerned can be compensated as a result of making over the catch to SCAP can easily be determined. We are well aware of the financial burden on the United States taxpayers. We are also shouldering a large burden in providing occupation troops and we have never shirked our responsibilities nor shown any lack of willingness to cooperate in lessening the burden on the United States Government. Furthermore, to say that considerable quantities of foreign exchange would not be available under the Australian proposal would seem to indicate that the United States has in mind that Australia would have to be

paid by the Japanese whereas the Japanese expedition would be a clear gain to the Japanese economy. We do not deny the need for some sort of viable economy in Japan, but an attitude which indulges the Japanese economy in total disregard of the interests of several of the main belligerents against Japan must be deplored.

"In conclusion we must protest against the unilateral action on the part of the United States Government in authorizing this expedition while the matter was still under discussion in the Far Eastern Commission, which is obviously the body which determines policy. Furthermore, it is a matter of great regret to us that the United States Government cannot associate itself with the strong views of the other members of the Commission which they have expressed at committee level."

I do hope, sir, that it will be possible for the Commission to be able to arrive by vote at some decision upon this matter.

COL. POWLES: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the position of the Australian Government in this matter is fully supported by the New Zealand Government. It is not necessary for me to traverse any of the arguments which have been so very well covered by the Australian Ambassador and which in previous discussions in the committee have been very fully mentioned and explained. But we also feel that now that the attitude of most of the members of the Commission has become crystallized the proper method of disposing of the situation is to deal with it by vote.

MR. GRAVES: Mr. Chairman, in the penultimate paragraph of the paper just put before us, FEC-231/6, it is stated that the reply of the United States Government to the British and New Zealand Governments was given on July 23. That was a reply to two of our Aide memoire and that reply was received by us last night and has not, of course, yet been read by my Government in London. It has been sent but they haven't had an opportunity of studying it yet, and so, in view of that and in view also of the very interesting statement made this morning by the Australian Ambassador, we should like to have time to study both these documents, and if it is convenient to my colleagues, I should ask that there should be still further postponement of this paper in order that these two important documents can be studied with the time that is necessary to give to such important statements. So, if it is convenient to the rest of the Commission, I would ask that there should be still further postponement and discussion of the paper before the Commission.

GEN. MCCOY: Mr. Ambassador, in view of the United Kingdom statement, have you any--

MR. MAKIN: I was hoping, sir, that we might have been able to arrive at a decision this morning, but, if it is that any member of the Commission does desire further time, I will not raise objection.

GEN. MCCOY: Is there any other comment on this point?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the request of the United Kingdom for postponement. We have not received final instructions on the whaling paper.

GEN. MCCOY: Plainly the wish of the Commission is to postpone the vote, and, in view of the expressed wishes, I will postpone and keep the item on the agenda for the next meeting.

ITEM 3 - INTERIM IMPORT-EXPORT POLICIES FOR JAPAN (FEC-032/25, -032 series)

GEN. MCCOY: The paper before us, FEC-032/25, is a proposed policy decision approved by the Steering Committee on 22 July. The Australian and Soviet positions were reserved, generally, and the United States position also was reserved on paragraph 16. The action of the Steering Committee did not include a recommendation as to press release.

That paper, as I remember, was agreed to up to the point of an amendment on the part of the United Kingdom, was it not, Mr. Graves, for the deletion--

MR. GRAVES: Yes. It came up to the Steering Committee, Mr. Chairman, in the form of FEC-032/24, which included a proviso. The proviso was in relation to the first sentence that stocks of gold should be disposed of as reparations provided this would not prejudice the defraying of the costs of occupation and the maintenance of a minimum civilian standard of living, in accordance with the principles of FEC-219/7. We said in the Steering Committee that we thought that would open the door for these stocks of gold being used for trading purposes, that is, for an import program, and we have always held the view that stocks of gold should be available for reparations, the reparations count solely, and we moved an amendment in the Steering Committee that that proviso be deleted. That was accepted in the Steering Committee by a vote, I believe, of eight to one or two abstentions, the Soviet member and the Australian member reserving their position on the paper and the United States reserving its position on paragraph 16. I believe paragraph 16 g was the important reservation. That is how it came up to the Commission.

The history of the paper is rather a long one,

and from the beginning we, and I believe most of the members of the working committee, held the view that stocks of gold should not be exported. That went along in that form for a very long time until the United States member said that he would have to propose an amendment to that particular paragraph which eventually came in the form of FEC-032/24 which, if my recollection is correct, was the drafting of the United States member.

GEN. MCCOY: Is there any other comment on this paper?

MR. MAKIN: I think so, sir. I require really to set the Australian position to the Commission and to say that we had two reservations on this paper. I now remove my reservation on paragraph 4. I am also prepared to remove my reservation on paragraph 5. I should like to state, however, that my Government some time ago introduced a paper into the Far Eastern Commission which provided that the resumption of private trade should await the peace conference. That view did not prevail and events have moved very rapidly since. Nevertheless, we still believe that resumption of private trade should not have been allowed. In order to protect our trading interests we have had to participate by sending private trade and we will not oppose this paragraph. In regard to the last paragraph we have stated that we expect that one of the consequences of the operation of the fund will be that a substantial number of imports will now be obtained from Japan from non-dollar areas. That is the statement I wish to make upon the matter.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out one minor correction if I may. On page 2, in paragraph 10, the second to the last line, it seems that the word "other" is misused, "...and other costs of the other occu-

pation". I think that the second "other" ought to be deleted.

GEN. MCCOY: Thank you, Mr. Representative. That is a misprint and the second "other" will be deleted.

MR. TSARAPKIN: Mr. Chairman, I remove our reservation on paragraph 16 and we agree with the text of this paragraph proposed by the Steering Committee.

GEN. MCCOY: Well, I'm very glad that we have been able to screen out the objections to this paper. It has been considered of considerable importance and great urgency by the Supreme Commander, in view of the situation in Japan and the fact that he assumed the without any funds. Also, the arrival of some hundreds of business people forced the issue from his point of view. In view of the obvious agreement on this paper, the United States will also accept the deletion of the paragraph proposed in the amendment by the United Kingdom and at the same time I will make a statement for the records that: "The reparations shall be in such form as would not endanger the fulfillment of the program of demilitarization of Japan and which would not prejudice the defraying of the costs of the occupation and the maintenance of the minimum civilian standard of living." That is from the basic paper, FEC-014/10, so that the United States also withdraws its reservation, and if there is no objection, the paper as such, with the amendment of the United Kingdom, proposing the deletion of a clause in paragraph 16-- My attention is called to the fact that the deletion has been made, so that the paper as presented to the Commission from the Steering Committee is acceptable from the point of view of the United States, so that, if there are no objections, we will make it a matter of policy.

MR. GRAVES: Mr. Chairman, just so that there should be no question of misconception later, if this paper FEC-032/25 is adopted it would make quite clear that stocks of gold would be disposed of as reparations and they would not be available for the trading account. That, of course, is the intention of the paper--that stocks of gold would be preserved as it says in the paper. They would ultimately be disposed of as reparations and they would not be available for the trading account.

MR. SEW: Mr. Chairman, I was also going to ask what the effect of the statement that you have made would be on this paper. I mean, this paper says that this gold and silver will be available for reparations and not for trading, but you made a statement on behalf of the United States Government for the purpose of record. What would be the effect of that statement on the policy that you have adopted in this paper?

GEN. MCCOY: Well that is the position of the United States in the basic paper and we make that for the record as interpreting our position. Now I take it you are making a statement also for the record.

MR. GRAVES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The statement for the record is this, that on the adoption of FEC-032/25 stocks of gold shall ultimately be disposed of as reparations, and I would like to state for the record that we regard that as the stocks of gold being preserved for ultimate disposal as reparations. They would not be available, in our opinion, for the trading account.

GEN. MCCOY: Well we seem to have a direct difference of opinion there. I should like to consult my advisers. I will declare a recess of five minutes for that purpose.

(The meeting recessed at 11:00 A.M.)

(The meeting reconvened at 11:05 A.M.)

GEN. MCCOY: Gentlemen, will you please come to order.

We have had an opportunity to consult with the representative of the United Kingdom and I think that we understand each other now. I hope that the representative of the United Kingdom can clarify it for the Commission.

MR. GRAVES: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to report that we are in agreement on this. The whole point is this, that either the stocks of gold or their equivalent in acceptable currency will be preserved. So my point is made and I think the matter is clarified. Paragraph 16 g meets the case completely. What I was anxious to make clear was that the stocks of gold or their equivalent would not be dissipated, but I think that we are in complete agreement.

GEN. MCCOY: These statements will go into the minutes and they themselves will clarify that point, I think.

MR. GRAVES: Yes.

GEN. MCCOY: So that if there is no further comment or objection, we will declare this a policy paper. I am very glad to do it as I was under such pressure from the urgent need in Japan. Thank you very much.

ITEM 4 - EXTENSION OF THE FAR EASTERN COMMISSION POLICY ON TEMPORARY RETENTION OF ELECTRIC STEEL FURNACES
(FEC-239/6; 239 series, FEC-059/30, -059/13)

GEN. MCCOY: Item 4 brings up the subject we have had before us at various times in connection with the extension of the Far Eastern Commission Policy on Temporary Retention of Electric Steel Furnaces. FEC-239/6 is a proposed policy decision for the extension of the authorization granted in FEC-059/30, and was approved by the Steering Committee on

22 July. The Chinese and French positions are reserved, and the United States position also as to the deletion from FEC-239/1 of paragraph 2 and the word "interim" in paragraph 3.

I had an old agenda instead of the revised one, so I will make a corrected statement. The same statement is made down to the point of reservations, and now I make this corrected statement, that the Chinese and French positions are reserved. FEC-239/2, extending the authorization in FEC-059/30 for one month, was approved on 26 June. This temporary extension will expire on 31 July, so that my corrected statement would leave out any reservation on the part of the United States. I look around for any comment.

DR. KOO: "Mr. Chairman, at the 63rd meeting of this Commission I requested certain information concerning the capacity of electric steel furnaces in Japan in order to determine our position with reference to the paper. In response to the questions which I presented, you were good enough to call upon one of your technical advisers who furnished us with certain information. Your adviser said, among other remarks: "...the United States delegation was informed that approximately 2,000,000 tons of rated electric furnace capacity existed in Japan. Should the Commission approve the Supreme Commander's request for an extension of authority under FEC-059/30 to retain up to 400,000 tons of actual productive capacity, then the remaining electric furnace productive capacity would be available for removal as reparations'. This information was gratifying to us.

"Later the whole problem was referred to Committee No. 2, the Committee on Economic and Financial Affairs, for consideration. In the course of discussion in the Committee,

I have been advised, it was stated by the United States member that, while he was unable to supply any further information beyond what had been given in the Commission, he believed that the approximate answer already given was about as complete as it could possibly be. This was equally gratifying to us, although we wished on our part fuller information might have been given, if that had been possible.

"In these circumstances we would like to express emphatically the earnest hope that in selecting plants and facilities of electric steel furnaces for temporary retention, the SCAP would bear in mind the desirability of making a balanced selection so that such selection will not bring about a disproportionate reduction of the value, type, or quality of electric steel furnaces available for reparations removals.

"In the second place, we wish to express the view that, if the remaining capacity of electric steel furnaces, after deducting the capacity for retention as provided for in FEC-059/13 and FEC-059/30, should be insufficient to meet the claims made by claimant countries for reparations removals, or if the situation of coal supply in Japan, which, I understand, has been the main reason for the request for additional allocation of electric furnace capacity for Japan, improves prior to June 30, 1948, the authorization of temporary retention granted under this policy paper should be subject to review by the Far Eastern Commission. This is quite in accordance with the Terms of Reference of our Commission.

"With those two understandings, Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to vote for the paper as it stands."

GEN. MCCOY: As I understand it, you would like to have that recorded in the minutes?

DR. KOO: Yes. And I would like also to express the hope that you will find it possible to send this statement along with the paper, ^{if} and when the Commission adopts it, to SCAP.

MR. DOUTEAU: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say that we have to maintain our reservation, but I will not vote against the paper. I will abstain from voting. This is due to lack of information. We are not convinced that this policy decision should be extended until 30 June 1948. That is the only reason for which we reserve our position, which now is still reserved. We consider that we might come back on that question in time, and again I wish to state that I will not vote for or against the paper but simply will abstain.

GEN. MCCOY: Are there any further comments on this extension paper itself? If there are no objections, it will be a policy paper and the comments of the Chinese Ambassador and the French representative will be made a matter of record and furnished, as you request, to SCAP.

ITEM 5 - ADVANCE TRANSFERS OF JAPANESE REPARATIONS (FEC-201/1)

GEN. MCCOY: Item 5, if there are no objections, will remain on the agenda.

ITEM 6 - THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION (FEC-105/2, SC-049/2)

GEN. MCCOY: Any comment under the work of the Commission? Any suggestions or recommendations for improving our work or for extending our consideration?

ITEM 7 - OTHER BUSINESS

GEN. MCCOY: In stating the background for the Interim

Import-Export Policies for Japan, I stated that the Steering Committee did not include a recommendation as to press release. If there is no objection, that will be released under the normal procedure of the Commission.

If there is no further business, the meeting stands adjourned.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 11:20 A.M.)