

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1239th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 13 February 1962,
at 3 p.m.



SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 78:</i>	
<i>Complaint by Cuba of threats to international peace and security arising from new plans of aggression and acts of intervention being executed by the Government of the United States of America against the Revolutionary Government of Cuba (continued)</i>	415

Chairman: Mr. Mario AMADEO (Argentina).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Enckell (Finland), Rapporteur, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 78

Complaint by Cuba of threats to international peace and security arising from new plans of aggression and acts of intervention being executed by the Government of the United States of America against the Revolutionary Government of Cuba (A/4832 and Add.1, A/5072, A/C.1/845, A/C.1/847, A/C.1/851, A/C.1/854, A/C.1/866, A/C.1/L.309) (continued)

1. Mr. COLLET (Guinea) said it was regrettable that Cuba's complaint against the United States had been discussed within the context of the cold war. He intended to confine his observations to the important issues involved in the dispute, in the hope of thereby contributing to a solution. The policy of non-alignment pursued by Guinea and the other participants in the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade in September 1961, was not a policy of indifference or negation; it was a positive policy designed to promote freedom, democracy and peace throughout the world. His Government would do everything in its power to help prevent the dispute between the United States and Cuba from leading to a breach of the peace.

2. The question under consideration must be viewed against the background of the efforts being made by many countries to throw off foreign economic domination and carry out economic and social reforms with a view to promoting the well-being of their people. All States must accept the right of a sovereign nation to choose its own political system. Any attempt to intervene in the domestic affairs of another State for the purpose of imposing a particular type of régime was a violation of the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter. The small countries had an important part to play in promoting the peaceful settlement of disputes and in encouraging States to live together in a spirit of mutual tolerance, without regard to differing ideologies.

3. Cuba's fears of aggression were understandable, in view of the invasion which it had suffered in April 1961.

It was therefore encouraging that the United States had raised no objection to the inclusion of the present item in the agenda and that the United States representative had given formal assurance that his Government was not preparing to commit aggression in any form against Cuba. Moreover, the United States representative's observations during the debate on Angola in the General Assembly (1097th plenary meeting) concerning self-determination, the peaceful settlement of disputes and peaceful co-operation between States applied equally to the present situation. It was also to be noted that the Cuban Government had stated (A/4701) that its foreign policy was based on the principle of peaceful co-operation without regard to ideological differences. Since the two parties to the dispute had thus indicated their adherence to the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, the General Assembly should appeal to them to settle their differences by negotiation. Any constructive solution of the problem must take account of the declaration adopted by the Belgrade Conference, which affirmed the right of Cuba or any other nation to choose its own political and social systems in accordance with its needs.

4. His delegation would consider all draft resolutions relating to the present item in the light of the considerations he had just set forth. The General Assembly should, at the very least, take note of the assurance given by the United States Government that it was not preparing to commit aggression in any form against Cuba.

5. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) said that in 1959, after Cuba had destroyed the Batista dictatorship and put an end to decades of exploitation and political control by foreign monopolies, the United States could have established friendly relations with the Cuban people by recognizing their right to build a new life. Instead, it had initiated an economic embargo of Cuba, in the hope of replacing the Revolutionary Government by one which would permit the United States monopolies to continue their exploitation of the country's natural resources. In April 1961, after Cuba had defeated that strategy by developing trade relations with countries which were willing to deal with it on the basis of equality, the United States had organized an armed invasion.

6. Although the defeat of the 1961 invasion had demonstrated the popular support enjoyed by the present Cuban Government, there were increasing indications that the United States was planning new aggression. According to an article in The New York Times of 11 February 1962, the purpose of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States, held at Punta del Este in January 1962, had been to gain support for "further strong action against Cuba". Since virtually all forms of economic and political pressure had already been exhausted, such "strong action" could only be mili-

tary. The locations of the military training centres for Cuban counter-revolutionaries in the United States, Guatemala and elsewhere were well known, and Cuba had presented evidence of the infiltration of its territory by persons sent for the purpose of carrying on sabotage and guerrilla warfare. In the light of those facts, little credence could be given to the United States representative's assurances that his Government was not preparing to commit aggression against Cuba. It should be recalled that similar assurances had been given before and even during the April 1961 invasion.

7. In the past, the United States Government had been able to achieve its aims in Latin America by means of the famous Monroe Doctrine. That doctrine was now out of date, and a new concept had therefore been invented to justify United States intervention in Cuba—that of incompatibility. The theory of the incompatibility of the Cuban system with the principles and objectives of the inter-American system—which had been the main theme of the meeting at Punta del Este—had no legal basis in the charter of the Organization of American States; and indeed, any provision to that effect and any action taken in pursuance of it would constitute a serious breach of the Charter of the United Nations, for in all matters of international life and conduct the latter must prevail, as was clear from Article 52. As the representative of Brazil had pointed out—and Brazil was a member of the OAS—respect for the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples was one of the basic tenets of the United Nations Charter. Thus, no regional organization could abrogate the right of a nation to choose its own form of government; if it did, it would place itself outside the framework of the United Nations Charter and deprive itself of the rights provided in its Articles 52 and 53. Accordingly, it was the duty of the United Nations to defend Cuba's rights, not only against military aggression and political or economic intervention, but also against any unjustified and illegal decision of a regional organization which, as the OAS had done at Punta del Este, acted in a manner inconsistent with the law of the United Nations.

8. The United States Government's policy towards Cuba had at first been determined by the American monopolies which in 1959 had lost control of Cuba's economy and the profits they had derived from it. Recently, however, it had been affected by a new factor, the fear of the possible influence of Cuba on other Latin American countries, particularly those still ruled by dictatorships similar to that of Batista. What was feared was not any direct action Cuba itself might take in those countries—for as everyone knew, revolution could not be exported—but rather the fact that Cuba's achievements since its revolution in improving the country's economic situation and the living conditions of its people were an inspiration to other Latin American countries. Cuba had won the sympathy and support of all the countries of Latin America, and also of the people and Government of Poland and the other socialist States. It found sympathy, too, in the African and Asian countries, whose problems and aspirations were identical with Cuba's.

9. The present debate was important not only for Cuba, which was seeking justice and protection against threats to its independence and territorial integrity, but also to all small countries which were striving to achieve full independence and to free themselves from poverty and exploitation by foreign interests and monopolies. The Cuban problem must thus be seen, as

the Indonesian representative had strikingly demonstrated (1237th meeting), against the background of the social revolutions taking place all over the world. The United States Government must realize that its assurances of goodwill towards the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America now undergoing revolutionary changes could not be accepted at their face value while it conducted a policy of intervention, pressure and threats against Cuba. Clearly, then, a lasting solution to the problem now before the Committee could be achieved only if the United States changed its policy towards Cuba. As a first step, the United States Government might agree to settle its differences with Cuba by peaceful negotiations. That, precisely, was the suggestion made in the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia and Romania (A/C.1/L.309), which his delegation would support, the more so as the representative of Cuba had already said that his Government was fully prepared to engage in negotiations with the United States Government. If the principle of negotiation and peaceful settlement were rejected, it could only mean that the recent course of intervention and the preparation of new attacks on Cuba would continue, to the great danger of international peace and security. His delegation, like so many others, could only express the gravest alarm at the possible consequences of such a policy.

10. Mr. BA (Mali) said that the Cuban question was not simply an American or inter-American issue but one which, in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 1 of the Charter, should concern all Members of the United Nations. Moreover, it was a question in which the small neutralist States were more likely to offer objective and just solutions than the parties to the dispute. Some might perhaps object to the intrusion of the small States in a matter which was involved in the great struggle between the two principal economic and social systems in the world, forgetting that the small States, for their part, might be tired of the intervention of the great Powers in all the affairs of Africa and the Far East. The small States had no interest but to ensure the strict observance of the principles of the United Nations Charter, for as the representative of Brazil had rightly said at the Committee's 1234th meeting, without due respect for international law the principles of international coexistence would become illusory, and the main sufferers would be the small States, whose only strength was that of law. No objection could be raised if a State Member of the United Nations called for compliance with the provisions of its Charter, in the present instance, those of Article 33 relating to the pacific settlement of disputes, and with the high principles of the Organization set forth in the Preamble and Articles 1 and 2. The United Nations Charter was the paramount instrument of international law, and there could be no conflict between it and the charter of a regional organization such as the Organization of American States: the laws of the regional organization must conform to those of the world Organization. Conflict could only arise if the OAS took decisions likely to infringe the international law of the United Nations or took action fraught with danger to international peace and security.

11. Mali, for its part, had grave misgivings about recent events in connexion with Cuba. In April 1961, despite all reassurances, Cuba had been the victim of an act of aggression, for which the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, had later assumed entire responsibility. The representative of the United States was now again assuring the world that no one,

and certainly not the United States, was threatening Cuba; it was to be hoped that those assurances would not again be contradicted by events. Mali's desire was that there should be no act of violence whatever against Cuba. His delegation was firmly attached to the principle of the peaceful coexistence of States with different economic and social systems, and was profoundly convinced that a country's internal political system was its own concern. Neutral African countries like his own, which were anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist, had accepted the idea that they must sit in the United Nations, and work with representatives of countries of whose systems they entirely disapproved—countries which were obstinately colonialist and racist, like Portugal and South Africa—and they were entitled to expect others to do likewise.

12. Nor should the Cuban revolution be regarded as an isolated phenomenon; it was part and parcel of the disintegration of the colonial system. The Cuban revolution represented a continuous and consistent endeavour to transform the semi-colonial structures of Cuba's economy through wide-scale agrarian reform and industrialization. Many Latin American representatives in the Committee, and in particular the representative of Chile, had stressed the urgent need for far-reaching economic and social, and even political, reforms throughout Latin America, and the need to put an end to poverty and exploitation. What the Cuban people had done was simply to choose the road they wished to follow to end poverty, ignorance and exploitation and the imperialist oppression originating in a series of provisions successively reinforcing their country's economic domination by the United States.

13. In the light of those considerations, his country was convinced that the only solution to the difficulties separating the United States and Cuba lay in peaceful conciliation and in the adoption in the rest of Latin America of economic and social reforms which could counterbalance developments in Cuba. That, in any event, was the only course compatible with the high principles of the United Nations Charter, the only course likely to ensure peace and security.

14. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) said that the Cuban Government, in bringing its well-founded complaint to the United Nations, had acted in self-defence and out of its desire to safeguard peace. Despite its efforts to minimize the importance of the Cuban complaint, the Government of the United States was obviously greatly embarrassed by the evidence of its aggressive imperialist policy presented in the United Nations. The newly independent States had clearly been shocked by what they had seen of the much-advertised system of American democracy in action.

15. During the debate, the United States delegation had sought to divert attention from the shameful actions of its Government against Cuba by accusing Cuba itself of being the "real threat to peace"; however, that charge had been refuted conclusively both by the Cuban representative and by other speakers. The United States was unable to justify its earlier aggression of April 1961; yet it did not want to abandon its preparations for further aggression against Cuba. The United States Cuban policy was condemned not only by the people and Government of Cuba, by the socialist countries and by Latin American countries, but by world public opinion, including public opinion in the United States itself. In the light of those facts, United States charges against Cuba had a hollow ring.

16. The Cuban revolution represented the first reverse suffered by the United States in its efforts to maintain its hegemony on the American continent by all means, including violence. The United States had been forced to recognize that the Monroe Doctrine, once the principal instrument of its domination, had become obsolete, not only as a result of the Cuban revolution but because of the tide of history. The policy of the United States, and its willingness to violate international law in the Western hemisphere, had been dictated by the interests of American private capital; the United States Government was prepared to sacrifice young people, especially those of other countries, on the altar of profit. The oppressed peoples had learned from experience the price the United States was prepared to pay in order to maintain its exploitation. The American monopolists had not succeeded in deceiving anybody at home or abroad by their falsification of the facts; indeed, they had revealed their own moral weakness.

17. The United States had rejected the Cuban Government's offers of co-operation, and had sought to resolve the question by violence. Mr. Stevenson's statement that the United States had been sympathetic to the Cuban revolution at the outset, and had turned against it only because Castro had betrayed its original purposes, had been exposed as hypocrisy. In an open letter to President Kennedy published in The New York Times of 10 May 1961, a group of American professors had stated that the major premise of United States policy on Cuba since as early as May 1960 had been that Castro must be crushed. The United States Government had resolved to oppose Cuba not because that country had adopted the system of Marxism-Leninism, but because the Cuban people had gained full freedom and were fighting to safeguard their national independence. The only alien intrusion in Cuba was of a physical, not a philosophical nature; it was the United States naval base at Guantánamo, which the Cuban Government had several times asked the United States Government to remove.

18. United States hypocrisy with respect to Cuba was evident from the remarks which United States representatives had made on a number of occasions concerning the right of self-determination. That principle had become extremely important in recent times now that so many former colonial countries had achieved national independence. Unless it was fully observed, the new nations would be unable to develop freely or to safeguard their achievements. The right of all peoples to self-determination was recognized in Article 55 of the United Nations Charter and in articles 9 and 15 of the charter of the Organization of American States.^{1/} It had also been recognized by the representative of the United States, Mr. Stevenson, during the debate on the situation in Angola in the General Assembly (1097th plenary meeting). Mr. Stevenson had also stated in the Committee (1231st meeting) that there was room in the hemisphere for a diversity of economic systems. However, United States actions towards Cuba contrasted sharply with Mr. Stevenson's professions; in setting himself up as an arbiter and declaring that the Cuban Government did not reflect the desires and aspirations of the Cuban people, Mr. Stevenson was clearly intervening in the internal affairs of Cuba. Moreover, it was significant that throughout the many years when the Cuban Government had been under United States influence, the United States had never used that influence in the interests

^{1/} United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 119 (1952), No. 1609.

of the Cuban people. Mr. Stevenson apparently interpreted Cuba's right to self-determination as a right to complete subjugation by American capitalist interests.

19. In order to foster its aggressive plans, the United States Government had exerted strong pressure on the Latin American countries to meet at Punta del Este, where it had planned to isolate and destroy the achievements of the Cuban revolution. It had invented the principle of incompatibility, according to which the Cuban political and social system was defined as contrary to the principles and purposes of the OAS. That principle constituted a dangerous precedent in international relations. It was inconsistent with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the charter of the Organization of American States, it indicated complete disregard for the principle of the equality of peoples and the sovereignty of States, it served to promote the domination of the weaker by the stronger nations, and it served imperialist purposes, thus threatening peace and security. Nevertheless, the United States had pushed through a resolution embodying the principle of incompatibility, by exercising pressure on the Latin American countries with promises of large-scale economic aid. As had been pointed out in the *New Statesman* of 2 February 1962, without the bargaining power of the \$20,000 million Alliance for Progress scheme, the United States would have got no action at all; but it had been made abundantly clear that participation in America's anti-Cuban crusade was the price for United States aid. The blackmail exercised at Punta del Este had once again exposed the interventionist policy of the United States in all of Latin America. In the circumstances, it was not surprising that the six largest Latin American countries had abstained in the voting, and that the Foreign Minister of one of them had declared that the expulsion of Cuba would be illegal.

20. The Eighth Meeting of Consultation at Punta del Este, instead of initiating definite action against Cuba, had brought into the open the decreasing influence of the United States. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Brazil had quite rightly pointed out that what the meeting had not done was more important than what it had done. The six countries abstaining had prevented the adoption of resolutions which would have legalized intervention in Cuba and violated Cuba's right of self-determination. The United States conception of the world, and particularly of Latin America, had proved to be untenable because it failed to take into account the existing situation and the aspirations of peoples for independence.

21. In general, the aggressive plans of the United States had suffered a heavy defeat. Not only had the

military intervention of April 1961 failed, but the economic blockade of Cuba had also proved ineffective. However, there was a danger that those failures might goad the American monopolies, which had powerful military support, into other ill-advised adventures; the peoples must be vigilant to safeguard peace. Since war, even so-called limited war, raised incalculable risks, there was no alternative to a peaceful settlement. But the United States, in defiance of international law as laid down in the United Nations Charter and the charter of the Organization of American States, was refusing to negotiate with Cuba.

22. Cuba had achieved great progress despite United States intervention. It had dealt successfully with problems which still plagued the Latin American countries receiving assistance from the United States, among them land reform, illiteracy and economic growth. In that connexion, it was significant that the United States had now announced its intention of promoting economic, social and political reforms in Latin America, through the so-called Alliance for Progress programme, and was taking a new interest in the well-being of the Latin American peoples. That change of policy—which was clearly an indirect effect of the Cuban revolution—was welcome. As the representative of Chile had pointed out (1235th meeting), the same conditions which had precipitated the social transformation in Cuba existed in the other Latin American countries, and the need for structural changes of a social and economic nature had become urgent. That was sufficient answer to the representative of Colombia: there were common interests between Cuba and the other countries of the American continent. However, the Alliance for Progress programme would not prevent revolutions in other Latin American countries; the interests of the United States monopoly capital were so diametrically opposed to the needs of the Latin American peoples that there was no hope of reconciling them. The aspirations of the peoples for freedom would prevail, and Cuba's example would inspire their struggle.

23. In the light of those considerations, Hungary would vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.1/L.309).

24. Mr. MACKEHENIE (Peru) said that the position of his Government with respect to the Cuban complaint had been made abundantly clear in the OAS and in the United Nations. It regarded the Cuban charges as wholly unfounded, and would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.