This danger would be removed if action was taken forthwith to secure the release of the USS Pueblo and its eighty-three man crew, to bring to an end the pattern of armed transgressions by North Korea against the Republic of Korea and to restore to full vigour and effectiveness the Korean Armistice Agreement.617

The representative of the USSR maintained that the charges levelled by the United States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were unfounded and that the aggressor in Korea was not the Democratic People's Republic but, rather, those who invaded the soil of the Korean people. The current aggravation of tension in Korea was a result of the aggressive acts undertaken by the United States and South Korean armed forces, on land and on the sea, against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the main source of tension in Korea being the continuing presence on the territory of South Korea of United States armed forces. It was well known that on the Demarcation Line in Korea, on the 38th parallel, there were systematic incidents and troubles. After citing a number of violations by the United States and South Korean armed forces of the Armistice Agreement from its conclusion in July 1953 to September 1967, the USSR representative stressed that it was necessary to withdraw all United States and other foreign forces from the territory of South Korea and to give the Korean people, at long last, the right to settle its own affairs by itself. Turning to the United States version of the events linked to the detention of the USS Pueblo, he remarked that the representative of the United States did not mention the statement of the captain of the vessel when it was detained by a North Korean ship. The captain left no doubt about the intrusion of the Pueblo into the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, or about the hostile aims with which that vessel penetrated the territorial waters of the Republic in violation of its territorial integrity and sovereignty, and that it was engaged in espionage activities. It was obvious that the detention of a foreign military vessel in the territorial waters of any State came within the internal jurisdiction of that State. Consequently, it was not for the Security Council to consider such matters.618

At the 1389th meeting on 27 January 1968, the representative of Ethiopia stated that the Council was at a great disadvantage for not having verified information on what actually happened, and suggested that it should initiate an investigation of the incident involved. To enable the Council to obtain first-hand submissions from all sides, he further suggested that an invitation be extended to North Korea, as a party to the dispute, to appear and present its case before the Council while this item was being discussed.619

The representative of Canada suggested that in order to bring the influence of diplomacy to bear in the grave situation considered by the Council, it would be advisable to undertake urgent consultations among the members of the Security Council before its next meeting.620

After further deliberation, the President (Pakistan) referred to the suggestion of the representative of Canada and stated that since there were no objections, he would adjourn the meeting until 29 January, in the afternoon, in order to permit consultations among the Council members.621

The question remained on the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized.622

COMPLAINT BY HAITI

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter 623 dated 21 May 1968, the representative ad interim of Haiti requested the President of the Security Council to convene the Council, as soon as possible, to consider a situation created by an “armed aggression” against Haiti which threatened international peace and security, and that appropriate measures be taken in accordance with Article 39 of the Charter of the United Nations. In the letter, reference was made to an earlier letter 624 dated 20 May 1968 addressed to the Secretary-General, in which the latter had been requested, in pursuance of Articles 99 and 39 of the Charter of the United Nations, to draw the Security Council’s attention to this situation which threatened not only Haiti’s internal security but also international peace and security.

At the 1427th meeting on 27 May 1968, the Council, after including 625 the item on its agenda, invited 626 the representative of Haiti to participate in the discussion. The question was considered by the Council at that meeting.

Decision of 27 May 1968 (1427th meeting):

Adjournment

At the 1427th meeting, the representative of Haiti stated that over the years a series of repeated acts of aggression had been committed against his country, and that they had been carried out from outside creating a situation which might lead to international friction in the sense of Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter. These acts of aggression had reached their climax on 20 May and had been directed against the territorial integrity and political independence of Haiti, in violation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. He maintained that this invasion of Haiti had been planned by exiles residing in the United States, and executed by American pilots living in the Bahamas. Furthermore, the invasion could not have been carried out without the tolerance of certain United Nations Members. Those acts of “international brigandage”, coupled with the serious political crisis prevailing in the Caribbean area, constituted a threat to the peace of the hemisphere and the world. The Government of Haiti consequently requested the immediate cessation of activities infringing upon Haiti’s territorial integrity and national sovereignty; the punishment of
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those who, contrary to international agreements and the Charters of the Organization of American States and the United Nations, used the territories of certain countries, principally the United States and some islands of the Caribbean, for their criminal actions; the necessary measures by the Council to prevent repetition of acts infringing upon the fundamental rights of the Republic of Haiti, its Government and its people, and impeding the development and progress of Haiti in the community of nations; and that the guilty parties be compelled to pay the Government of Haiti and its people equitable reparations for the loss of life and destruction of property.\textsuperscript{a47}

The representative of the United States stated that his Government was always ready to investigate all information indicating activities on its soil allegedly directed against the Government of Haiti and which might involve a violation of United States law. It had taken action in every case to punish any violation found. However, his Government could only proceed on the basis of established facts. Haiti’s Government had been immediately requested to supply the maximum information available concerning the events of 20 May, but that request had remained unanswered. From information received and from statements made by the Government of Haiti, it was the United States Government’s understanding that the situation was fully under control. In the circumstances, the most appropriate course would be for Haiti to pursue the matter with any Government it deemed necessary. The United States remained prepared to co-operate, as in the past, with the Government of Haiti in such an effort, and to take whatever action may be appropriate in the light of the facts that might be ascertained.\textsuperscript{a48}

The President (United Kingdom) drew the Council’s attention to two communications received through the Secretary-General from the permanent representatives of Jamaica \textsuperscript{a49} and the Dominican Republic\textsuperscript{a50} respectively. The letter of the representative of Jamaica stated that his country was not associated in any respect with aircraft that attacked the Republic of Haiti, while the letter from the representative of the Dominican Republic stated that his Government maintained a position of complete neutrality and non-intervention in the matter. The President, in his capacity as representative of the United Kingdom, also made a statement to the effect that after careful investigations, the Governor of the Bahamas had reported that there was no positive evidence of any flights to Haiti from the islands’ territories such as had been alleged.\textsuperscript{a51}

At the end of the 1427th meeting, the President (United Kingdom) adjourned the meeting after stating that he would, after consultation with members of the Council, announce the time of the next meeting on the question in due course.\textsuperscript{a52}
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