

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1389th MEETING: 27 JANUARY 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1389)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 25 January 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8360) .	1

out
ork

ces
i ã:

X H
10X
110

bras
de

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINTH MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 27 January 1968, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1389)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Letter dated 25 January 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8360).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 25 January 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8360)

1. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, first, let me welcome you as our President. We are fortunate, I am sure, to be working at this time under a President so widely respected for thoroughness and fairness, and so determined to lead us to success. You will, Sir—we are confident—maintain and enhance the high standards of impartiality set by those who preceded you in your high and exacting office. It is especially to be welcomed that we work under your leadership as we now face a challenge not only to peace but also to the authority of this Council.

2. I have spent the past few days in my own Parliament where there is deep concern about the events which have led to this meeting of the Council. I have participated in discussions with other Ministers of my Government not only about the gravity of the situation but also about the crucial interest of everybody to achieve early and effective action by this Council.

3. It was in response to the general and deep concern in my country that my Foreign Secretary spoke in the House of Commons yesterday, and expressed the sense of outrage felt in my country at the seizure of a ship on the high seas, a ship peacefully carrying out a legitimate purpose. As the representative of the Soviet Union well knows, there are many other ships carrying out an exactly similar task—some close to the shores of my country. I have, of course, studied

this morning the record of the debate yesterday evening [1388th meeting]. I must admit that I am astonished that the suggestion should have been made in this Council that we should not even discuss the dangerous situation reported to us, that we should turn away from our duty in negative impotence.

4. We pride ourselves on being ready to meet in this Council at any time to deal with tension or conflict. And so it should be. And it was well that it was yesterday decided that we should at once face the grave report made to us. It is all-important that we should not only face it but also act upon it, and act with a sense of clear urgency.

5. My delegation yesterday reminded the Council of the consequences of obstruction and delay in dealing with the dangers of the Middle East early last summer. It was salutary that we should be so reminded, and that we should realize that the alternative to prompt and positive action by the Council, now as then, can be disastrous.

6. May I also say that as I read the report of yesterday's debate about inscription of this item I was especially impressed with the timely and persuasive—indeed the overwhelmingly convincing—argument put forward by the representative of Canada, who so often at a critical time gives us the benefit of his constructive leadership?

7. We all know from past experience that the most important time in the consideration of any question in this Council is the time immediately following the opening statements. Then is the time for initiative. Then is the time when all of us must give our minds not so much to what should be said but to what should be done. If this moment of challenge, of initiative, is missed our speeches may lead us not nearer but further away from a peaceful solution.

8. Yesterday, the Council heard the thorough and detailed and documented and convincing report on the seizure of the United States ship *Pueblo* on the high seas. We also heard confirmation of most disquieting evidence of the increase in violations of the Korean Armistice Agreement.¹

9. Certainly we feel a sense of indignation and outrage at what Ambassador Goldberg rightly described as “nothing less than a deliberate, premeditated armed attack on a United States naval vessel on the high seas” [1388th meeting, para. 86].

¹ For the text of the Armistice Agreement entered into in Korea on 27 July 1953, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1953*, document S/3079, appendix A.

10. We cannot disregard Ambassador Goldberg's sombre summary of the evidence. Again, I use his words:

"... the *Pueblo*, clearly on the high seas, was forcibly stopped, boarded and seized by North Korean armed vessels. This is a knowing and wilful aggressive act—part of a deliberate series of actions in contravention of international law and of solemn international arrangements designed to keep peace in the area, which apply not only to land forces but to naval forces as well."
[Ibid., para. 87.]

Those were the words used in the summary given us yesterday by Ambassador Goldberg. Certainly we must deplore in the strongest terms all breaches of the Armistice Agreement.

11. All our energies and endeavours must now be concentrated—this is the argument I should most like to urge on the Council this morning—not on exchange of accusation but rather on an immediate effort together quickly to restore the situation.

12. As to the mounting violations of the Armistice Agreement there is, I trust, some comfort to be gained from the fact that all concerned, I believe, claim to accept the Agreement.

13. Very well, let the need for respect for the Agreement be reaffirmed by this Council. To the profound relief of the world the Agreement was reached fifteen years ago. It brought to an end a destructive war which threatened even greater dangers. We must at all costs not go back to those dangers. Our duty is clear—to require all concerned to maintain and respect the Agreement which everyone claims to support.

14. Often when we meet in this Council to consider a dispute or a conflict we have to endeavour to work out a framework for a settlement. Sometimes we have succeeded in doing so, as we did recently in regard to the Middle East. It is often a hard, long, frustrating task to find common ground of agreement on which we can go forward. But now we have no such problem. That work was done for us fifteen years ago. The Agreement was worked out and accepted. No one challenges its binding authority now. All can honourably confirm it. All must honestly carry it out. It is on this firm ground that we can confidently advance.

15. There is no need therefore today to talk about a framework for an over-all settlement. We have it already. What we need to do now surely is to concentrate on an immediate overriding need. We need to clear the ground to go forward on the basic agreement which is not in dispute. How can that be done? By restoring the situation, by quickly reducing tension, by allowing the ship and her crew to go free. If that can be quickly achieved then we can return to good sense, and in goodwill we can go ahead with the more satisfactory implementation of the Agreement, the Agreement which will restore peace and remove tension for the future.

16. What means, what method, can most quickly achieve that first step to avoid mounting dangers and to return to

order and peace? The first step is often the most important and the most difficult. It is to this first step that I trust we shall now all give our undivided and genuine and urgent consideration.

17. As so often before in this Council, we search not for a victory for anyone but for a success for everyone—a success in the interests of all and in the overriding interests of peace. I trust that in that search for means to take that first essential step we shall all be ready to co-operate together.

18. Lij Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): My intervention at this stage of our deliberations will be necessarily brief for the simple and, I believe, valid reason that it would not seem to us opportune to enter into a substantive debate on the matter before the Council has had all available information and all possible verification of the involved and unfortunate incident that has been reported to us. My observations at this stage will therefore be of a preliminary character.

19. This is certainly not the time, in the view of my delegation, to make any assessment of, let alone pass judgement on, an event regarding which we do not as yet have full information. We have listened with great care and keen attention to the respective statements made by our colleagues, the representative of the United States and the representative of the Soviet Union, and we shall continue to study these submissions, together with all the other information available to us so far.

20. We voted for the inscription of this item on the Council's agenda as an urgent matter for consideration because we have sensed real danger to world peace in the developments that have surrounded this incident, and also because we fully realize and recognize the role and primary responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

21. Having thus brought the matter into the hands of the Council, it becomes our duty and urgent responsibility as Council members to find a suitable way and some effective means whereby the Council can exert its conciliatory influence in a situation which bears the risk of further escalation and conflict.

22. It would seem to my delegation that, for the time being at any rate, the Council finds itself at the great disadvantage of not having verified information on what actually happened. In order to overcome this handicap to its efforts the Council needs to take some agreed action to initiate an immediate investigation of the incident involved. I am encouraged to learn that such an investigation of the incident need not take undue time if the action has the concurrence and the co-operation of the parties concerned; but it would, in our view, be appropriate and in the established tradition of the Council to extend an invitation to North Korea, as a party to the dispute, to take its full part in the carrying out of the investigation and to appear and to present its case before the Council while this item is being debated. This would have the obvious advantage of enabling the Council to be possessed of first-hand submissions from all sides and to gain fuller and more balanced information on the matter as a whole.

23. We believe, therefore, that investigation of the incident should be a necessary step for the Council to consider at this opening stage of the debate on this item.

24. In the meantime there is the imperative need to reduce tensions and to create the climate for the appropriate negotiated settlement which, after all, is the objective of this present Security Council effort. While the Council undertakes its investigations, the parties concerned must help the council in its efforts by exercising maximum restraint and by agreeing to make certain gestures of conciliation and goodwill which will help reduce the risks and the miscalculations inherent in the kind of explosive situation in which the world finds itself at the moment.

25. It would perhaps be premature for me to specify the kind of reciprocal gestures of goodwill and conciliation that may be envisaged and that will have to be, in any case, the subject of very intensive consultations. But all those who have followed the rapidly developing situation of the past days must agree, I believe, that if we are to avert the danger of a widening conflict, we need to ensure that both sides will "play it cool", and that they will avoid taking any action which is likely further to aggravate an already serious situation. The announcement by the United States that it is intensifying its military preparations both here and in the general area of the incident and, likewise, the announcement by North Korea that it intends to put the personnel of the United States naval vessel *Pueblo* on trial in North Korean courts are two examples of the kind of area of action where both sides can make gestures of conciliation and restraint which can help reduce tensions and thus enable the Council to perform its vital mission as the guardian of world peace.

26. The more we can have of these gestures, the more we can expect to resolve this problem in peace and without the danger of a military conflict. Experience has clearly shown that when the Council has been given a fair chance and a breathing spell to exert its healing influence through the proper use of good offices, and when all sides to a dispute have been willing to co-operate, the Council can have the capacity and the means to play its vital role of averting imminent danger to international peace. This is the chance and opportunity that we should strive to obtain in the present crisis so that, by buying time for appropriate action based on verified information, we can avert a crisis the consequences of which would otherwise be extremely grave not only for South-East Asia, but also for the world as a whole.

27. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): The Security Council has been convened in urgent and emergency session at the request of the delegation of the United States of America contained in a letter dated 25 January 1968. I have already had the occasion to state the objection of my delegation to a meeting on the subject indicated in the United States letter. That letter states that the Security Council should:

"... consider the grave threat to peace which has been brought about by a series of increasingly dangerous and aggressive military actions by North Korean authorities in violation of the Armistice Agreement, of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations." [S/8360.]

28. It should come as something of a surprise to many Member States of the United Nations and the Security Council that it is the delegation of the United States of America which takes it upon itself to accuse another State of aggressive military actions in violation of international law and our Charter. Surely the record of the United States of America in Viet-Nam and elsewhere is not one of compliance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations. For a country which has for years been conducting a cruel and aggressive war on a nation which has no other aims than to secure its independence, it is indeed strange to appear before us in defence of the very principles which it is daily violating in its international conduct.

29. In his statement at yesterday's meeting the representative of the United States went to great lengths to accuse the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of activities that are apt to increase international tension. We entirely reject those allegations. It is not the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that is endangering peace and security in Asia and elsewhere in the world. It is not its Government which is maintaining military forces and military bases all over the world. It is not the Democratic People's Republic of Korea whose aircraft carry nuclear weapons in the air space of other countries and thus gravely menace their security in case of an air crash, as happened a few days ago with an American military aircraft. It is not the Democratic People's Republic of Korea whose military is systematically intruding into other States' territories and territorial waters, as recently happened in the case of Cambodia and has for years been taking place in the coastal waters of other States. The doctrine of considering the frontiers of other sovereign States as mere lines on a map that can be crossed impudently has been enunciated not by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea but by a former President and a high-ranking General of the United States of America. And, last but not least, it is not the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which has been giving active military and diplomatic assistance to countries which invade their neighbours, occupy their lands, annex their territories. All this is done by the United States, as the recent painful events of the aggression against the Arab States have clearly shown.

30. That is the country which is now levelling charges against the peaceful Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. What are those charges? They are in essence charges of "wanton lawlessness against a naval vessel of the United States operating on the high seas", in the words of the United States letter. The United States Government contends that the *USS Pueblo* was, on 23 January, "illegally seized by armed North Korean vessels ... while operating in international waters". [*Ibid.*]

31. To substantiate those charges, the representative of the United States even utilized large maps on which he proceeded to demonstrate this accuracy by showing us the alleged route of the vessel and informing us not only of the alleged declarations of the American ship, but even of those of the vessels of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

32. Now, as newcomers to this Council we wish to be the last to show disrespect to any member of this organ. But we

are constrained to say that we had not expected the delegation of the United States of America to inform us about the position of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. We have our own channels for doing this and we feel that the burden of representing the United States point of view in this matter must prove sufficiently heavy for the delegation of the United States to shoulder. We shall therefore base our judgement concerning the respective positions of the parties in this case on the information supplied by both sides, instead of looking for it from the United States delegation alone. We wish all the more to proceed in this manner since the subsequent versions put out by various United States agencies in the last few days make it difficult enough for us to accept any one of them as the United States version. Thus, a *New York Times* dispatch, appearing on page 14 of its issue of 24 January and quoting the Defense Department, states that "the ship had been in international waters about 25 miles off the eastern coast of North Korea when she was boarded by . . . North Korean sailors". Another dispatch, in the same issue of *The New York Times* and on the same page, says that the details given by the Pentagon on the ship's position when it was boarded "would have put her about 20 miles from the peninsula that forms the northern arm of Wonsan Bay and about 30 miles from the Port of Wonsan". And finally, Rear Admiral John V. Smith of the United States Navy stated, according to press reports from Panmunjom, that the vessel was "over 16 nautical miles from the land".

33. In the light of these conflicting statements, how are we expected to acquiesce in the information handed to us by the delegation of the United States when the Captain of the intelligence-gathering ship in question, in his statement broadcast by the radio stations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, admitted that his ship "sailed up to the point 7.6 miles off Nodo . . . when the navy patrol craft of the Korean People's Army appeared"? The representative of the United States attempted to question the statement of Captain Bucher and stated that the facts given by his delegation were incontrovertible. This is not something absolutely new to hear. Similar assurances have been given on many occasions in the past by the United States representatives here and in other official positions. One that comes immediately to our minds is the one concerning the position of United States warships in the Gulf of Tonkin in January 1965. Must I remind members of this Council that those "incontrovertible" facts, then announced, have never since been accepted by the international community, and that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States Senate is even now probing into the veracity of those statements? May I say that statements put out by official United States agencies concerning the spy flight of Gary Powers over the Soviet Union; the so-called minor navigation error of his U-2 plane resulting in a mere 1800 kilometres of overflight over the Soviet Union; statements denying any knowledge on the part of the United States Government concerning the armed invasion of Cuba in 1961 for which the President of the United States of America later accepted the entire responsibility—that all these do not encourage us to take at face value similar assurances by the United States delegation in this case. We may be excused if we have doubts about the credibility of United States declarations.

34. It is for all these reasons and because of our conviction that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a socialist State deeply devoted to the pursuit of its policy of peace and the peaceful development of its economy, in the wake of the terrible destruction resulting from the earlier aggression against it, that we are convinced of the sincerity of its declarations. We have no doubt whatsoever that the United States vessel violated the territorial integrity of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea when it penetrated into its coastal waters in order to gather intelligence data on the radio signals of that country.

35. In this connexion, I wish to quote the views of an authority on codes who, in an interview appearing in *The New York Times*, on page 9 of the 26 January issue, says that "for the obvious reason that weaker signals fade out . . . they"—that is the ships—"wanted to get in as close as they could to get as many signals as possible and as loud as possible." The same person, further in his interview, after describing the mission of the ship to tape radar signals, states, concerning the use of these taped signals: "If we know the wave shapes, we can send out a phony signal from our bombers—a signal that looks just like the one the North Korean radar sends out. Their radar will accept it as valid, and this signal will be so timed as to make it appear that our bombers are farther away than they really are." So one of the functions of the ship was to prepare for an eventual attack on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, to facilitate the bombers' evasion of the defensive fire of the installations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

36. Is it not clear in the light of all these things that the ship's mission was not the first move against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, but only the last in a chain of events, the difference being that this time the illegal act of the ship in violating the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has not passed without consequences?

37. All this makes it obvious that the issue before the Council is not the one case of the *Pueblo*, but the entire policy of the United States—a policy of hostility, of threats and of aggressive actions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has repeatedly warned the United States of the grave dangers its hostile acts entail. These warnings have all been ignored and those provocative acts have thus far continued.

38. In view of the constant attacks against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in the course of which, between 23 December 1967 and 20 January 1968, the United States ordered its warships, spy ships and South Korean fishing vessels on twenty-four occasions into the territorial waters of the East Sea; the many border violations committed against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea concerning which the representative of the Soviet Union gave detailed information yesterday at the 1388th meeting; the continuing occupation of South Korea by the armed forces of the United States; and the misrule of the erstwhile servants of the Japanese colonial rulers in that unhappy land—in view of all this, is it not clear that it is precisely the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which should expect the United Nations to put an end to

United States intervention in the affairs of the Korean people? My delegation completely shares the position of those who feel that the Council must put an end to manifestations of the outdated period of gunboat diplomacy. As we sit here, we are, in our deliberations, placed under the threat of quasi-ultimatums. Mobilizations, military preparations, the dispatching of warships go hand in hand with an alleged peace move in the Security Council. The danger of "other remedies" being utilized was referred to by the United States delegation yesterday. The news media in this country are full of discussions of aggressive military plans, naval moves against Wonsan harbour, and the like.

39. I regret to say that we are not surprised. What else can we expect from a country which keeps half a million men under arms in a war against a small heroic people in South East Asia, ignoring the world-wide indignation of distinguished individuals, organizations, church leaders and movements of all kinds? But our conviction is all the stronger that the United Nations must not tolerate that violation of the most basic principles of our Charter, the sovereignty of nations and their territorial integrity and, last but not least, that the peace of the world should be threatened by a Member State which clearly puts itself beyond all the universally accepted norms of international conduct.

40. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a peaceful State which makes no war preparations. It does not send its ships into the other corners of the globe, and as it was put by a newspaper comment which appeared in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in recent days:

"What we have arrested is not an American fishing vessel fishing in the Gulf of Mexico, but criminals who took it upon themselves to intrude into our territorial waters and who undertook actions of provocation against our country."

41. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is conscious of the threats directed against it by the United States of America and its South Korean puppets. But the Democratic People's Republic of Korea also knows that in resisting aggressive designs on its sovereignty it is not alone. It is a member of the family of socialist nations and enjoys the sympathy of many other nations of the world. Thus there is no point in trying to intimidate the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and it would be well for everyone to remember that.

42. Reference was made in the letter of the representative of the United States to conditions in South Korea. Without wishing to go into details, I cannot fail to state that it is in the continuing American occupation of South Korea, in the servile dependence of its rulers on the United States and in the deep economic crisis which does not guarantee a decent life to the South Korean people, that reasons should be found for the unrest in that country and for resistance to the ruling clique.

43. Social forces are as much at work in South Korea as elsewhere, and no foreign intervention can change that fact. It should be stated clearly that tension all over the world is mainly caused by and linked to the presence of United

States military forces and bases. We cannot find a single place where tension grows in the world without encountering there large forces of the United States. This is the essence of the present problem that we are facing. It shows the dangerous irresponsibility of a great Power which does not seem to understand that not only rights but also responsibility are the attributes of a great Power.

44. To sum up, my delegation feels that: first, it is the United States which bears the responsibility for the present tension; secondly, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea wants nothing more than peace and an end to the hostile acts of the United States; thirdly, the Council should strive to put an end to the policy of provocations practised by the United States—it should ask the United States to cease its threats of armed intervention against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and to abide by the principles of the Charter; fourthly, the foreign occupation of South Korea must end, and its people must be enabled to exercise their right of self-determination; fifthly, the United States must recognize and respect the sovereign existence and rights of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

45. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Despite the various contentious issues which had been raised before the Council, the discussion so far of the item on our agenda has in the view of my delegation revealed one simple but important point of common ground, namely, the degree of seriousness which is attached to the rising state of tension in the Korean area. The *Pueblo* incident has been a serious source of exacerbation of this tension. I was impressed in listening to the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union that, while he differed profoundly as to the cause of the tension and as to the best means of reducing it, he readily admitted that tensions had been growing especially in the last few months as reflected in a growing number of incidents in the Korean area. In this sense he seems to be at one with the representative of the United States.

46. When I spoke about the importance of inscribing the item before us and proceeding promptly with its consideration I stressed the gravity of the situation in justification of the Security Council's taking up this matter with a view to bringing the influence of diplomacy to bear. This is the main issue before the Council. I made a suggestion to you, Mr. President, yesterday, as to what could be done to help reduce tension and deal with the immediate problem of the *Pueblo*.

47. I feel sure that other members of the Council may have ideas or suggestions, having regard to the interests of those directly concerned as well as to the extreme urgency of the matter.

48. I believe that progress would now best be achieved by urgent consultations which might commence without delay and take place over the week-end among members of the Council before we meet again, I hope on Monday.

49. The PRESIDENT: There are no other speakers on my list for this morning, but the representatives of the United States and of the Soviet Union have asked to be allowed to speak in the exercise of their right of reply.

50. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): In exercise of my right of reply I shall attempt to be very brief and factual since I share the conviction expressed so well by Lord Caradon that the obligation of this Council is to seek a diplomatic, peaceful solution of this very grave crisis. It is not my desire to score debating points; it is, rather, my desire to set the record straight so that the facts can speak for themselves and control the decision of this Council so that the Council can make a contribution to the cause of peace in the area.

51. The representative of Hungary, our colleague Ambassador Csatorday, having voted against inscription yesterday, today reverses his course and has spent considerable time in arguing that there is grave danger to the peace in the area. I agree with his conclusion, but I certainly disagree with the type of reasoning by which he arrived at it. He has argued at length, as he argued in the First Committee and in the General Assembly, that all of the danger in the area arises from the actions of the Government of the Republic of Korea and that the authorities in North Korea have not engaged in any provocative or dangerous action, that they merely desire to live in peace and that they are without any aggressive designs and intentions.

52. But my colleagues on the Council, I am sure, will want to examine the evidence a little more carefully than this conclusion and examine the evidence coming from them—and perhaps not from other sources. Yesterday in the course of my discussion I pointed to the aggressive and dangerous activities in violation of the Armistice Agreement by the North Korean authorities. Yesterday I also pointed to evidence out of the mouth of North Korea as to the location of the ship *Pueblo*.

53. Let me turn to the first subject. I referred yesterday to the latest incident—very grave and portentous in its character—of armed assassins being sent by the authorities in North Korea across the demilitarized zone, with the design of storming the capital, Seoul, and the presidential palace with the object of assassinating the President of the Republic of Korea. We do not have to rely upon extrinsic evidence in support of that. We have the proof from the very mouths of the North Korean authorities:

“On 22 January a loudspeaker broadcast by the North Koreans in the demilitarized zone boasted that ‘the North Korean combat unit advanced from Kwuhg-Bok to Sudae-Mun’—these are both in South Korea—“The unit killed a Korean national policeman and the Chief of Police and destroyed four military trucks . . . The combat unit escaped from Park’s clique and continued their mission’ ”.²

This was a loudspeaker broadcast by the North Koreans, who broadcast over the demilitarized zone daily. The other relevant facts are set forth for the information of the Council in this same document.

² Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1968, document S/8366.

54. The Hungarian representative, Mr. Csatorday, today has reverted to the information-gathering mission to which the *USS Pueblo* was assigned when it was illegally seized on the high seas in violation of all international law. He did so and said that there was something illegal and heinous and improper about this type of activity. It is a very strange double standard that the representative of Hungary finds the mission of the United States ship to be improper, while he is entirely silent about the activities of the Soviet Union which maintains exactly such ships in close proximity to the United States and many other countries of the world. Soviet information ships performing precisely the same functions are currently located at numerous places in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, in the Mediterranean Sea and near the shores of a number of countries. And the activities of the Soviet Union in the Sea of Japan are by no means novel. They are of long standing. For the last eight years Soviet intelligence-gathering ships have patrolled the seas and coastal areas of the Sea of Japan, collecting electronic and other information from a wide variety of sources and places.

55. Today, this very day, a Soviet vessel is operating in this area, as I indicated yesterday. For the information of the Hungarian representative, the vessel is the T-48 class submarine ship *Gidrolog*. Ambassador Morozov will correct me if my pronunciation is wrong. This ship is roughly the same size as the *Pueblo*. It is even larger than the standard Soviet trawler used for these purposes. It is an 840 ton ship, 220 foot over-all length, 30 foot beam, 20 knot speed, diesel engined twin-screw ship.

56. It may be of interest to the members of the Council to know that such ships of the Soviet Navy in the Sea of Japan frequently sail closer than twelve miles to the shores of neighbouring States in the area.

57. A final word. At our meeting yesterday Ambassador Morozov complained that the United States in its presentation had concentrated too much on the matter of the *Pueblo*, in which he said he had found it difficult to interest himself, and not enough on another major aspect of the threat to the peace in Korea, namely, the violations of the Korean Armistice Agreement and the consequent deterioration of that Agreement as an instrument of peace and tranquillity in the area. Perhaps after reviewing the provisional verbatim record of yesterday’s proceedings [*1388th meeting*] Ambassador Morozov will notice that in fact I did discuss in some detail the gross infractions of the Armistice Agreement by North Korean infiltrators, leading up to the particularly outrageous attack on the city of Seoul this past week with, as I have said, the admitted aim—fortunately not achieved—of assassinating the President of the Republic. There is much more to that story, and we are given the details of the latest incident in the report which I have just referred to [*S/8366*].

58. I think that Lord Caradon has helped us very much in this area by pointing up the fact that all members of the Council should support the strict enforcement of the Armistice Agreement. It is precisely because the North Korean authorities are not respecting the Armistice Agreement but are violating it that a very grave threat to the peace has occurred. Part of the difficulty has been that the

machinery set up by the Korean Armistice Agreement and related agreements to which the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a party includes joint observer teams to investigate complaints of violation of the Armistice. Unfortunately, owing to the adamant refusal of the North Korean side, this observer-team machinery has been almost completely blocked from the beginning, and much can be said of the Military Armistice Commission which meets at Panmunjom.

59. Specifically and in line with their past performance, the North Korean side at these meetings continues to refuse to act in any way on complaints which are made to it, to agree to investigations by the joint observer teams—the best way to determine the accuracy of these complaints that are lodged before the Armistice Commission—or indeed to make any use of the Panmunjom meetings, except for the most violent and intemperate propaganda tirades.

60. It is our very sincere hope that out of this current meeting of the Council will come a strong reaffirmation of what I am sure is the will of the membership of the United Nations, manifested by General Assembly decisions throughout the years, that the Armistice Agreement be scrupulously adhered to and that the machinery of the Armistice Agreement be utilized in order to preserve peace in the area.

61. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union in the exercise of the right of reply.

62. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In view of the statements made by certain members of the Council at this meeting, I do not think there is any need to explain why, despite the detailed presentation of all the factual material on the question which we gave in our statement yesterday to the Council [1388th meeting], we shall have to devote some time to replying to the ever-increasing number of unfounded and repetitive assertions that are being made in contradiction of the facts of the case. These assertions are apparently intended, by their very number, to give at least some semblance of conviction to the one-sided version which the United States is continuing to propagate intensively in its appraisal of the situation in the Korean peninsula, and particularly in its appraisal of the special incident involving the detention in Korean territorial waters of a vessel of the United States Navy, the *Pueblo*.

63. We have already noted in our statement to the Council, and we wish to affirm once again, that the intrusion of this vessel into the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a typical example of the many provocations, whose number runs into the hundreds and thousands, included in the 52,000 violations of the Armistice Agreement committed by the American militarists in the years since it came into force. These provocations have of late been growing very noticeably in number and importance. The spy ship *Pueblo* was, we repeat, detained by the competent authorities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, since it was carrying out illegal and hostile activities against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the territorial waters of that sovereign State.

64. We should like to refer to the publication in Pyongyang today of a statement by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the effect that the measures taken by that Government in connexion with the intrusion for hostile purposes of the spy ship *Pueblo* into the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were measures taken in self-defence which in no way violated international law. In its statement the Government says:

"Equipped with various kinds of intelligence apparatus, the specially armed spy ship *Pueblo*, on the instructions of the United States Central Intelligence Agency, intruded deep into the territorial waters of our country and was carrying out reconnaissance into a number of such military or state secret matters as the location of military equipment, armed forces and industrial undertakings in the ports and coastal regions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; but it was detained on 23 January of this year by vessels of the naval forces of the Korean People's Army in the East Korea Gulf, in the territorial waters of our country, at latitude 39° 17' 4" North and longitude 127° 46' 9" East."

This is the exact point which we expected would be indicated while we were waiting yesterday as we listened patiently in the Council to the lecture given with such an array of so-called visual aids by the representative of the United States.

65. The statement of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea goes on to point out:

"The provocative acts of the American imperialists' armed spy ship *Pueblo* constitute a further flagrant violation of the Korean Armistice Agreement, and an open aggression directed against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It is an integral part of the wilful schemes of the United States imperialists to launch a new war in Korea, and a serious threat to peace in the Far East and throughout the world."

66. The statement stresses that:

"The defence of the security and sovereignty of its homeland against the encroachments of the enemy is the sacred right of every independent State and its own internal affair, which no one may infringe."

67. Today, the representative of the United Kingdom attempted, by adding his unsubstantiated assertions to the unfounded contentions of the United States representative, to arrive at certain arithmetical results. I must say that, on the basis of the terminology used in the four rules of arithmetic, the multiplication of nought by nought, according to all the arithmetic primers, always equalled nought. This was the brilliant result achieved today by my United Kingdom colleague with his characteristic skill.

68. Today the representative of the United States continued to quote various excerpts from intercepted radio broadcasts which are alleged—and I stress the last word—to have fallen into the hands of the United States authorities concerned. This assertion is certainly no more convincing

than the extreme attempts to which the United States had recourse yesterday and today to convince us that we should accept the one-sided United States version of what happened to the *Pueblo*.

69. Nothing has been added today in this way to what was said yesterday about the factual side of the matter. Today I should like to add something to what we said yesterday about the totally unfounded nature of the one-sided American version concerning the actual events of 23 January in territorial waters when the *Pueblo* was detained. I wish to refer to details published today in *The New York Times*, in a special article dealing with the question which we are now discussing in this Council. According to the article, in answer to questions put by members of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States as to whether it was possible for the United States Secretary of State to assert categorically that, at the moment of its detainment, the *Pueblo* was on the high seas, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, replied as indicated in the following paragraph:

"When pressed on this point within the Committee, Mr. Rusk was said to have explained that he could not be categorical because the *Pueblo*, until the time of her seizure, was maintaining radio silence and was not reporting her position. But he was said to have emphasized that the ship was under strict orders not to come any closer than thirteen miles from the North Korean shore. North Korea claims a twelve-mile territorial sea."³

70. In Russian, this amounts to the following:

"When Mr. Rusk was asked to clarify this question (and I myself would add here—the question of the co-ordinates of the ship's position at the moment of its detention), he replied that he could not make a categorical affirmation because the *Pueblo*, up to the time it was detained, was not carrying out any radio broadcasts and had given no information on its position. He stressed, however, that the vessel was under strict instructions at the time not to approach closer than thirteen miles from the Korean coast, as North Korean territorial waters extend twelve miles from the coast."

71. I would ask the United States representative how he explains the remarks he made yesterday and today, which contradict the assertions made by the United States Secretary of State. In this case it would seem that the customary references to the freedom of the press in the United States and to the fact that American newspapers can write anything they like will be of no avail, because then he would have to make an accusation against the publishers of that material of having deliberately distorted what occurred in the Senate Committee. It is hardly likely that such a responsible and respected United States newspaper, which enjoys a considerable reputation in this country, should take it upon itself to make such a distorted statement.

72. We repeat, therefore, that the intrusion of the American military vessel *Pueblo* into the territorial waters of the

Democratic People's Republic of Korea was a provocation. This vessel violated the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and the authorities of that sovereign country took steps to protect its sovereignty and its territorial inviolability.

73. I should like to draw the Council's attention to one further point. Yesterday, *en passant* as they say in French, the United States representative made a reference to the courses followed by Soviet vessels on the high seas. He may be better informed than I about these courses and the matters relating to them, but I should not like to say anything at this time concerning the courses followed by United States military vessels, aircraft, and the rest, because if I began a discussion on this subject I should be helping my colleague, the United States Ambassador, to shift the centre of gravity of the discussion to an area which has nothing to do with the item before us, an item which was raised and formulated within the limits to be found in the letter addressed to you, Mr. President, by the United States representative.

74. It must be said that the arguments and evidence advanced by the United States representative are in a bad state if he has to have recourse to such manoeuvres and justify or prove what he has called here the legal character of activities and experiments such as those carried out on the naval intelligence vessel *Pueblo* by making excursions into a field that has nothing at all to do with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which detained a United States vessel for having made a hostile intrusion into North Korean territorial waters, nor with the accusations levelled by the United States representative. I venture to decline the temptation to assist the United States representative in this connexion and shall confine my remarks to the lengthy exposition, quite irrelevant to the matter in hand, made by the United States representative yesterday and again, in greater detail, today.

75. Once again we deem it necessary to stress that the chief cause of tension in Korea is the continued presence of American and other foreign troops in South Korea. The chief cause of tension continues to be the aggressive acts committed by the United States of America and its South Korean puppets against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. We have repeated over and again that the occupation troops must be withdrawn immediately from South Korea. That is the real way to peace in Korea.

76. We reject as unfounded the accusation levelled here against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by the United States of America and its supporters. In connexion with today's remark in the statement made by the United States representative, we should like to state that the struggle for the withdrawal of foreign occupiers and against the puppet régime is being waged by the South Korean people itself, we repeat, by the South Korean people itself. We condemn the repressions and reprisals which the South Korean authorities, whose existence is due solely to the presence of the bayonets of the American armed forces in that area, are carrying out against the patriots in South Korea itself. We stress these circumstances, and reject as utterly unfounded the assertions that we have just heard in the statements of the United States representative.

³ Quoted in English by the speaker.

77. Nor can we pass over the fact that at this time, while the Council is meeting, the United States of America is, in effect, issuing ultimatums to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Responsible representatives of the United States are uttering direct threats to use force, including the use of all modern forms of weapons, if their demands and importunate claims are not met.

78. Those points warrant the most serious attention of the members of the Security Council.

79. In this connexion, it is appropriate to mention that the statement published on 27 January in Pyongyang by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, some parts of which I have already referred to, included the following:

"The heroic Korean People's Army and the whole Korean people are in full readiness to resist any provocation or intrusion on the part of the American imperialists, and will deliver crushing blows to the enemy if he dares to attack us."

80. In conclusion, we should like to stress that all the commotion and war hysteria that are being whipped up in the United States of America in no way help to reach a solution of the question in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. We should like to say that emotions should not be given free rein. All those who seek to strengthen international peace and security should now display a high sense of responsibility and not permit the creation of a new hotbed of war in the Far East.

81. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Hungary has also asked to be allowed to exercise his right of reply, and I now call on him.

82. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): I shall take only a few minutes of the Council's time. The representative of the United States, Ambassador Goldberg, referred to several points in the statement that I made this morning. I was partially gratified that he did not attempt to refute the series of facts I mentioned, and that can be considered as a sort of recognition of the validity of my statement that the United States is conducting a policy of violating the sovereign territories of other countries, thereby deplorably violating the charter as well. But he mentioned some alleged facts. For instance, he stated that the seizure of the ship *Pueblo* occurred at a location that was beyond the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, whose Government, he said, had recognized this fact in its statement.

83. I do not want to dwell at length on this question. The representative of the Soviet Union already quoted from the statement of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. I also have the text of that statement and I could quote the same data, which clearly prove that the North Korean authorities never said that the seizure took place beyond the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

84. Ambassador Goldberg also stated that the broadcasting station of the Democratic People's Republic of

Korea was spreading some news of infiltration committed by the Koreans themselves. I also have texts of broadcasts emanating from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Those broadcasts speak of partisan or guerrilla action in South Korea conducted by the South Korean people as a result of the prevailing social tensions and difficulties of which I had an opportunity to speak in my statement this morning. However, it is not unusual for conservative forces to attribute any kind of revolutionary movement to foreign forces. This has been happening since the French revolution in connexion with all revolutionary and progressive movements. But in this case, I think that the data given by the representative of the United States lack any foundation as far as my information is concerned and as far as logic can conceive.

85. The representative of the United States has taken many words from my statement and added some other words of his own, to put it in a context of his own choice, and on this pretext he has tried to accuse another country of the same illegal actions that the United States is committing. The main point that I raised was not that ships are moving around on the high seas; the question was where those ships were moving around. We should take as our point of departure in considering this problem the universally accepted rules of international law, including the Charter of the United Nations; and on the basis of those rules, no one has the right to violate the territorial waters of other countries. That is the issue we are seized of. I do not believe that the United States representative, Ambassador Goldberg, could make the accusation that naval units of the Soviet Union are violating territorial waters of the United States. If he had such an example, he would certainly have cited it to us. What I was wondering about and what I failed to hear was why the Ambassador of the United States was not willing to commit the United States to a policy of respecting the sovereign rights of other countries, of respecting the territorial integrity of other countries and not undertaking any action that might violate their territorial sovereignty.

86. The policy that every day, even every hour, risks international conflict by violating the sovereignty of other countries can lead only to further international tension and to ominous consequences. My delegation is of the opinion that we should raise our voices here and everywhere else, whether in the Security Council, the General Assembly or the First Committee, in defence of the sovereignty of all States. It is only in this way that we can really pursue a policy of peace and preserve peaceful relations.

87. We hope that the United States will recognize the validity of this rule and the applicability of international law in this matter, and that it will abide by the provisions of the Charter.

88. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has again asked to exercise his right of reply, and I now call upon him.

89. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): I am very glad that our colleague, Ambassador Morozov, is such an assiduous reader of *The New York Times* and I am glad that he shares my high regard for that eminent and

world-famous newspaper. But if you are as assiduous a reader of *The New York Times* as I am, you start on page 1 and not on the much later page to which Ambassador Morozov referred. And since he, as I said yesterday, is such a distinguished lawyer, he will remember another legal rule: that you must not merely excerpt quotations, you must give the whole record and not a partial one.

90. Starting at page 1, and if you wish to have the record complete, you will start with the article which refers to the Soviet intelligence ship I referred to in the course of my remarks, and you will read that into the record. I shall read only a few paragraphs, since it is a very comprehensive account, of the article appearing on page 1 of *The New York Times* of today, 27 January:

"Defense Department officials said tonight that a Soviet intelligence-gathering vessel was shadowing the nuclear aircraft carrier *Enterprise* off the coast of South Korea.

"The Soviet vessel, identified as the *Gidrolog*, was said to be sailing in the midst of the *Enterprise's* task force, which includes a guided-missile ship and several destroyers.

"The trawler is on essentially the same sort of mission as the *Pueblo* was engaged in when she was seized by the North Koreans on Tuesday, the officials said."

I have referred to this specific article, and it illustrates that by picking selected excerpts you can come to one conclusion, but when you read the whole article, then, as it appears, you arrive at another conclusion.

91. In the first place, I am sure that there was some mistake, perhaps in the interpretation that I heard. At the end of the other article, there is no assertion by our Secretary of State that North Korea claims a twenty-mile territorial sea, which is what I heard in the interpretation. In that article, continued on page 7 of today's *New York Times*, I read:

"But he"—the Secretary of State—"was said to have emphasized that the ship was under strict orders not to come any closer than thirteen miles from the North Korean shore. North Korea claims a twelve-mile territorial sea."

Therefore, I think that there was perhaps some mistake in the interpretation or in what Ambassador Morozov received from his briefing-paper.

92. That statement too, I think, should answer Ambassador Csatorday. We adhere strictly to international law and do not intrude or seek to intrude upon the sovereign right of other countries, even though our own conception of international law is different from theirs and we adhere to a three-mile limit, not a twelve-mile limit, as I said yesterday.

93. There were certain omissions in what Ambassador Morozov said about what Secretary of State Rusk was reported to have said to the United States Senate Committee. One of the things he omitted was that:

"The Rusk briefing was understood to have put to rest the suspicions of some committee members that before

the seizure, the *Pueblo* might have intruded into North Korean territorial waters, as has been charged by North Korea."

He also omitted the sentence:

"The ship was in international waters at all stages, according to every indication we have. And there are indications that the other side also knew that."

94. Now, I wish to be very frank with this Council because this is a very grave incident. The Secretary of State and I have been in constant communication; we have been constantly meeting and in touch with each other at all times and we have revealed to the Council, in the interests of informing it, the indications that we have. As you saw, we revealed them to the Council quite specifically.

95. I come now to the radio silence of the ship. The report I gave yesterday indicated very specifically that the North Koreans were not preserving radio silence—and the dispatches which I gave were from North Korean sources. I also gave some from the *Pueblo*, which broke its radio silence at the time of the incident in question. Therefore, what the Secretary of State said and what I said yesterday are entirely compatible and do not represent any contradiction in the statements which I have furnished to the Council.

96. But there is something in addition to that which is very important. I wish to add that from the time at which submarine chaser No. 35 first reported contact with the *Pueblo* at 11.10 a.m. Korean time, until the *Pueblo* was boarded in international waters and taken to Wonsan we have monitored at least a dozen position reports from the North Koreans which place the activity outside the twelve-mile limit. We have the exact co-ordinates reported at that time, all outside the twelve-mile limit. This is entitled to far more credibility than this fabricated co-ordinate published after the event by the North Korean authorities. Their own naval forces on the spot reported in a series of messages the exact location of the ship outside the twelve-mile limit.

97. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): First of all, I should like to express the conviction that step by step—since we have been drawn into consideration of this question—members of the Council will feel more and more their high responsibility for the fate of international peace and security, and that those emotional feelings which have been aroused by the desire to impose at all costs a one-sided version of the events which we are now investigating will diminish hourly and will give way to sober reason guided by feelings of the high responsibility of the council for its duty, incumbent upon it under the Charter, to maintain international peace and security. That is why I shall confine myself to a brief reply to the further lengthy quotations and digressions which the United States representative has made once again, for the fourth or fifth time, in an attempt to give the semblance of some kind of conviction to that one-sided and unfounded version which the United States delegation so persistently continues to put forward.

98. I am, of course, ready to read the first, second and third pages of *The New York Times*. I did so as soon as the

newspaper appeared, in fact, before the ink on its pages was dry. If I confined myself, in my quotations, to one small extract, it was not because I wanted to break the rule mentioned by the representative of the United States. The rule can be taken to mean that it is not permissible to drag anything out of its context and to draw any conclusions from anything that is said in such an extract from a context. Had I ventured to do that, the United States representative would have been in the right. But I have taken nothing out of context and I have not distorted anything.

99. Justice Goldberg knows full well that, after a witness has given evidence in a high court, he undergoes his worst moment: the practice adopted in criminal court procedure in all the countries of the world, known as cross-examination. Its purpose is not merely to hear what the witness has to say, but to give the parties and the judge the right to ask clarifying questions. With his great legal experience, the United States representative cannot fail to know that often, after the evidence given by witnesses seems so convincing as to leave no doubt whatsoever as to what actually happened, the replies to the questions put for purposes of elucidation in the course of the procedure I have just mentioned are what determine the significance of, or even sometimes destroy, that evidence.

100. I took the liberty, in respect of the key element of dialogue which occurred at the highest level in this country, to refer to the part which has a direct bearing on the reply to that clarifying question. I do not intend to try the patience of the Council by reading the text again. I read it in English to avoid any mistake. I did not hear it said here that such a question had not been put in the course of the procedure which I have just mentioned, or that, if the question was put, some answer was given other than the one to which the fresh pages of today's issue of *The New York Times* bear witness, the answer, I would emphasize, to the said question asking for clarification.

101. With regard to the continued references to the one-sided American version concerning the co-ordinates for the location of the *Pueblo* on 23 January at the time it was detained by the North Korean authorities, I should like to add the following to what we said before. When mention is made of a one-sided version, the meaning is exactly what the word "one-sided" implies. One-sided means a version which is controlled and presented by that party which is interested, for one reason or another, in presenting the facts in a light favourable to itself. For that reason, it is called, in all languages in the world, "one-sided", and a one-sided version has never been accepted as sound or solid evidence.

102. Permit me to say something which has already been heard within the walls of this Council chamber. Walls are, unfortunately, silent witnesses of all that takes place here. But there are also people here, who were present at the meeting of the Council when what I am about to say now was first heard. In the case of the flight of the United States U-2 spy plane, were not false co-ordinates given in respect of its position? Was it not asserted that, if it had been shot down, it could only have been in the area of the southern borders of the Soviet Union, which was allegedly shown by references based on data relating to the location of the aircraft, which were given in the same one-sided way as we are seeing today? The aircraft, however, was shot down not over the southern borders of the Soviet Union, as was asserted, but near Sverdlovsk in the Central Urals, which is roughly equidistant from the northern and southern frontiers of my vast country.

103. That is why, when we have had political experiences of this kind and when more and more attempts are being made to justify actions by prejudiced and one-sided versions of the events, we are inevitably bound to ask what the intentions underlying such attempts and assertions are. Do those intentions coincide with what has been stated here by the United States representative as to his country's desire and efforts to achieve a peaceful solution of the matter?

104. Permit me to conclude by stressing once again the heavy responsibility which rests upon the members of the Council for the fate of peace.

105. The PRESIDENT: There are no more names on my list of speakers.

106. We have heard full statements from the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union setting forth their respective versions of the situation confronting the Security Council, and the other members of the Council have also expressed certain views and ideas. The time has now come for the Council to consider how it should proceed to meet the situation facing it.

107. The representative of Canada has proposed that the members of the Council utilize the weekend to enter into consultations. Therefore, as there is not objection, I now propose to adjourn the Council until Monday afternoon in order to permit consultations among the members.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
