

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1469th
MEETING

Wednesday, 30 November 1966,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda item 98:</i>	
<i>Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (concluded).</i>	255

Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 98

Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (*continued*) (A/6399, A/C.1/L.369, A/C.1/L.385-387)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia) believed that the item before the First Committee was urgent and could not be ignored if world tensions were to be diminished and a solution found to the problem of general and complete disarmament.

2. Like the other socialist States, Czechoslovakia had often expressed its views on the question of the total elimination of all foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of other States. In a declaration on the strengthening of peace and security in Europe, adopted at Bucharest on 5 July 1966, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty had confirmed their readiness to work towards the elimination of such existing alliances as the military organizations of the North Atlantic Treaty, and the Warsaw Treaty, as well as foreign bases. However, the West had opposed all proposals by the socialist States. Negotiations on the subject, particularly in the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, had shown that the members of NATO had systematically refused to seek a way to eliminate foreign military bases in Europe, and had in fact hampered discussion of the bases. The Soviet Union's initiative in calling upon the First Committee to take up the question of the elimination of foreign military bases in Asia, Africa and Latin America should therefore be considered an attempt to break the present deadlock. The existence of military bases on foreign soil was a source of constant tension, while the bases of imperialist Powers in the newly created States were nothing but instruments for intervention and the policy of force and the threat of force. The role of foreign bases was concealed behind various doctrines and so-called obligations towards certain countries, even certain regions.

3. Hundreds of thousands of United States soldiers, stationed on all continents and oceans, were ready to use armed force against independent States that wished to free themselves from foreign domination, as was the case at the moment in Viet-Nam. That policy was a constant threat to international peace, inasmuch as so-called local conflicts which were directly linked to the bases and troops on foreign soil might grow into a world holocaust. A mere glance at the international situation clearly showed that where there was a large concentration of foreign troops, there was a crisis.

4. The aggressive war unleashed by the United States in Viet-Nam was a glaring example of the purposes of United States military bases. The war in Viet-Nam had led the United States to make increased use of its bases in South-East Asia and in the Pacific area. United States military officials had themselves admitted that the strength of the bases far surpassed the requirements of the war in Viet-Nam. In violation of the principles of international law and of the United Nations Charter, the ruling circles in the United States had gone so far as to refuse to heed the demand of the Cuban Government and people for elimination of the Guantánamo base. That base was a source of tension and a constant threat to peace in the Caribbean. It was therefore essential that the Assembly condemn military occupation of a part of the sovereign territory of the Republic of Cuba, a Member of the United Nations.

5. The military bases of the imperialist Powers in certain countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America were intended for use against the struggle of the peoples of those continents to throw off colonial domination, and that policy ran counter to United Nations efforts to accelerate the total elimination of colonialism. History showed that the imperialist Powers had never whole-heartedly abandoned their colonial privileges, and that applied equally to the elimination of military bases. Thus, the United Kingdom would not have accepted the elimination of its base at Aden had it not been forced to do so by the inhabitants' national liberation movement.

6. The non-aligned nations had already accomplished a great deal in their campaign for the elimination of foreign military bases. The imperialist Powers had been compelled to eliminate their bases and withdraw their troops from a large number of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and in many countries the peoples' opposition to the presence of foreign bases and troops had obliged the imperialists to reduce the number of their armed forces stationed there. Through obligations and treaties, the United States and the United Kingdom were

trying above all to maintain their influence in the developing countries, even after the complete elimination of the colonial system.

7. In recent years, the United Nations had devoted even more attention to the problem and had adopted several important resolutions relating to it. They included resolution 2105 (XX) on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; resolution 1913 (XVIII) on Territories under Portuguese administration; resolution 2066 (XX) on Mauritius; resolution 2023 (XX) on Aden; and resolution 2074 (XX) on South West Africa. Finally, there were the conclusions and recommendations which the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had submitted to the twenty-first session of the General Assembly (A/6300/Rev.1). That list showed that the elimination of foreign bases was of capital importance if colonialism was to be speedily and finally eliminated.

8. The need to eliminate foreign military bases had also been stressed in the resolution adopted at the Summit Conference of Independent African States, held at Addis Ababa in May 1963, and in the Declaration of the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1964. In demanding the elimination of foreign military bases, the non-aligned countries had drawn their inspiration from their own experience in their struggle for freedom and independence as had been made clear by the statement of the representative of the United Arab Republic (1465th meeting). Their experience showed beyond doubt that the major purpose of foreign military bases was to protect the strategic, political and economic interests of colonialism and neo-colonialism, which restricted the right of peoples to self-determination.

9. The importance of eliminating foreign military bases had also been emphasized in the 1966 Special Committee on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation Among States, especially during the discussion of the principle of the sovereign equality of States,^{1/} where the need to confirm the right of any State to eliminate foreign military bases had been stressed.

10. At the present time, when there were powerful rockets and nuclear weapons, every foreign base increased the danger of reprisals, which would wreak destruction on countries where there were foreign military bases. The maintenance, expansion and modernization of military bases and troops on foreign soil and the creation of a network of new bases were now among the principal methods the Western Powers used to expand their military potential. Military bases were an important factor in the acceleration of the arms race and in the increase in military budgets. They were thus contrary to the very essence of disarmament. They also ran counter to the efforts of countries of Africa, Latin America

and other parts of the world to create nuclear-free zones. Their part in the plans of certain Western Powers, particularly the United States, was a major obstacle to the solution of important problems of general and complete disarmament and to negotiations to reduce international tensions.

11. As a first step towards complete elimination of the outmoded phenomenon of foreign military bases, the adoption of partial measures such as those proposed by the Soviet Union would help create an atmosphere favourable to solution of the disarmament problem and would eliminate one of the sources of tension and conflict threatening world peace. That was the aim of the Soviet draft resolution, and the delegation of Czechoslovakia supported it.

12. Mr. ODHIAMBO (Kenya) said that he was grateful to the USSR for drawing the General Assembly's attention to a problem which his delegation considered important because its discussion followed logically from the elimination of colonialism and because it was intimately related to disarmament and world peace.

13. The motives for the establishment of foreign military bases were the same as those which had given rise to colonialism: the desire for power and the economic and ideological interests of the metropolitan country. It was no accident, therefore, that only those countries with a colonialist past or those which sought to establish a new form of colonialism were involved in the establishment of the bases. The members of the Committee had no doubt noted during the debate that only two or three countries found it necessary to establish foreign bases.

14. The motives remained the same when the bases were established ostensibly under defence agreements between two independent States. Of course every State had the right to conclude whatever agreements it saw fit. In the case of the establishment of military bases by foreign Powers, however, that right was never truly exercised by the host country. In practice, the host country was usually relatively small and weak, while the foreign Power was an economically and militarily strong State which used all means, including coercion, to make the Government of the host country enter into agreements allowing the establishment of bases. As a result, the bases formed a network which fitted into the detailed strategic plan drawn up by the foreign Power in its own interest.

15. Mention had been made of the needs of collective defence. Where the countries involved had reached similar stages of development, as in Europe, and had established the social system which suited them best, the creation of foreign military bases was conceivable. In principle, the parties to collective defence agreements were almost equal, and none of them dominated the others. Experience showed, however, that that was never the case, even in old collective defence organizations such as NATO.

16. The situation was worse when collective defence agreements were concluded between great Powers and the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. What happened to the agreements when a new Government did not accept the policies

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 87, document A/6230, paras. 389-392.

of the foreign Power which owned the military bases? What happened when the Government which had signed the defence agreements was repudiated by the people, but attempted nevertheless to keep itself in power by repressive measures? Again, experience showed that the foreign Powers which owned the bases usually took sides in a purely internal matter in order to continue to exercise control over the host country.

17. The Government and people of Kenya were opposed to all forms of colonialism and hence to foreign military bases. For that reason, when Kenya became independent it had insisted on the elimination of the United Kingdom's military base at Kahawa, which had been used in the suppression of the struggle for independence.

18. Some had said that the main danger the foreign bases were designed to avert was subversion. States which must continually occupy themselves with rooting out subversion and subversives would, of course, associate themselves with those who gave them the means to put an end to subversive activities. But if it were recognized that subversion was merely a symptom of a deeper disorder which had its origins in the alienation of the masses of the people from national leadership, then the bases could no longer be justified, since they served only to thwart the people's march to self-determination.

19. The Kenyan Government and people believed in general and complete disarmament. They accepted non-alignment because it contributed to a relaxation of international tension. But the presence of foreign bases did not promote such relaxation, and all of them should therefore be eliminated. In that matter he could not but associate himself with the views expressed by the representatives of India and Sierra Leone at the 1467th meeting.

20. Lastly, there was another form of military base which was not often mentioned. It was becoming common for great Powers to arm small countries beyond their justifiable needs; in that way the great Powers disguised their military presence in the recipient country and could continue to exercise control over it. Kenya was equally opposed to that kind of base.

21. It was in the light of those considerations that his delegation would examine the draft resolution and amendments now before the Committee.

22. Mr. SHARIF (Indonesia) said that the elimination of foreign military bases in the country of Asia, Africa and Latin America as a first step towards the elimination of foreign military bases in general, as the Soviet representative had explained (1463rd meeting), was undoubtedly an important question, particularly when considered in relation to disarmament. The elimination of foreign military bases, wherever they were, was in fact one of the collateral measures that could serve to reduce armaments, points of friction, tension and suspicion and strengthen mutual trust so as to arrive at an agreement on general and complete disarmament. None of the bases would be necessary when the prevailing distrust between the two major political blocs had been completely eliminated. Unfortunately, such distrust still existed, not only between the two major opposing

political blocs, but also between many States Members of the United Nations.

23. As a non-aligned country, Indonesia had no foreign military base on its soil and refused to join any military alliance or bloc. Similarly, it opposed the establishment of foreign military bases in any country, since it regarded them as a source of distrust and agitation within the population itself and likely to create friction between neighbouring countries. In view of its experience during the Second World War and in view of present scientific and technological advances, Indonesia did not believe in the effectiveness of foreign military bases in guaranteeing the security and defence of a country. Every country was fully responsible for its national defence and could not leave it to foreign Powers without running the risk of becoming a battleground for those Powers.

24. Indonesia subscribed to the United Nations Charter, to the ten principles adopted at the Asian-African Conference at Bandung in 1955 and to the declarations of the Belgrade and Cairo Conferences of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, and it respected the right of every sovereign State to enter into defence agreements with other States. In return, it expected other countries to respect its right to maintain an independent non-aligned foreign policy. It was common knowledge that foreign military bases were used to support secret activities to subvert neighbouring Governments and as arsenals for military intervention in the internal affairs of other States. Against the statements quoted by the United Kingdom representative (1464th meeting) in praise of that country's military bases in some of its former colonies, he could quote many other resolutions of mass meetings and statements of eminent political leaders in those countries protesting against the presence of the very same bases. Indonesia had not forgotten that the worsening of its relations with some neighbouring countries had resulted from the establishment of foreign military bases there. It therefore opposed the establishment of new military bases and hoped that those already in existence would soon be dismantled.

25. Indonesia strongly opposed the establishment of foreign military bases in dependent countries. No colonial Power would give up its former colonies of its own volition without taking steps to safeguard its economic and other interests, and consequently, during the preparation for independence, the metropolitan Government concluded defence agreements with the future national Government. In view of the unequal positions of the contracting parties, agreements of that kind were doomed to failure, and experience showed that they became important causes of friction between the former colony and the metropolitan Government. In addition, the continued presence of the former colonial Power's troops in a newly independent country deprived its people of the national pride of being citizens of a new sovereign State when the troops were not under the jurisdiction of its national Government, not to mention the fact that the national Government often found itself unable to control, or even know, what was happening in its own territory. Furthermore, since defence

agreements concluded before independence were designed solely to serve the economic and other interests of the former colonial Power, they were contrary to the interests of the host country and its people. Indonesia, as one of the original sponsors of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), had not found it difficult to support resolution 2105 (XX), on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and it now repeated the request made to all colonial Powers in that resolution to dismantle the military bases installed in colonial territories and to refrain from establishing new ones.

26. The newly independent nations which had no armaments industry would for many years to come continue to be dependent on the industrialized countries for the weapons they needed, both for the maintenance of peace and order in their territories and for the defence of their national security and integrity against any foreign intruder. Indonesia earnestly appealed to weapon-manufacturing countries not to misuse the present position of the non-aligned newly independent nations and press them to abandon their policy of non-alignment by making the regular supply of arms conditional on joint defence arrangements or by granting them payment facilities in return for military facilities and bases. As his delegation had stated before, there was need for some kind of regulation of the trade and supply of weapons to the non-aligned newly independent nations, so as to enable them to use more of their limited foreign exchange for economic development.

27. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in requesting the inclusion of the question of the elimination of foreign bases in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union had been guided by the peaceful interests of the young developing nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who were struggling to remove the last vestiges of colonialism and to strengthen their national independence. The Soviet Union had always urged the elimination of all foreign military bases. It was regrettable that certain NATO Powers were obstinately opposed to any proposal along those lines. For that reason, and because many States were concerned over the maintenance of bases by the members of the Western military bloc in the territory of former colonies, the Soviet Union had proposed, as a first step to a solution of the overall problem of foreign military bases, the elimination of such bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

28. The discussion that had taken place on the subject in the First Committee was eloquent proof that the Soviet proposal was just and timely. The discussion was evidence of the vital interest taken in the subject by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and of all peace-loving States. Many representatives of African and Asian countries and socialist States had reacted favourably to the Soviet initiative and had stated that foreign military bases were one of the chief sources of international tension and an extremely dangerous instrument when used for direct or indirect interference in the domes-

tic affairs of States. During the debate, attention had been drawn to the fact that the war of aggression against the Viet-Nameese people was being waged from United States military bases in South-East Asia. On the whole the discussion had been serious and thorough, but that could not be said about the statements of the United States and some of its allies. The United States representatives had been unable to put forward any convincing arguments and, as they always did when in difficulty, they had asserted that the Soviet proposal was a piece of propaganda. However, the attention and interest which the Soviet proposal had aroused in the First Committee, and the lively discussion which had followed, were the best refutation of the United States representatives' unfounded allegations.

29. Various representatives of African and Asian countries had stated that the dangers created by the presence of military bases in Asia, Africa and Latin America were only too real, as they had discovered from their own experience in the course of their struggle against colonialism and imperialist aggression. That point had been convincingly made by, among others, the representatives of the United Arab Republic, Syria, Algeria, India and the United Republic of Tanzania. His delegation was grateful to the delegations which had supported its proposal.

30. The United States representative had referred in his statement to a resolution adopted in 1946, at the first session of the General Assembly. There could be no better proof of his dearth of arguments than the fact that to defend his position he had quoted a resolution adopted twenty years previously, when the international situation had been entirely different. The twenty years which had elapsed since the adoption of that resolution had witnessed the victorious struggle against imperialism, the downfall of former colonial empires and the emergence on the world stage of over sixty newly independent States which today were Members of the United Nations. The new situation required different solutions.

31. The United States representative's allegation that the question of the elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America had no connexion with the problem of colonialism was preposterous. The representatives of the countries of Africa and Asia themselves had stressed the direct connexion between the policy of the colonial Powers and their military bases in Africa and Asia. Thus, at the 1465th meeting, the representative of the United Arab Republic had stated that all territories under colonial rule had in fact been bases for the colonial Powers, which had usurped the attributes of sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and freedom of peoples under their yoke. At the 1467th meeting, the Tanzanian representative had also pointed out that military bases in colonial territories were used to stifle national liberation movements and thereby retard the process of decolonization. Lastly, the General Assembly at its previous session had adopted resolution 2105 (XX) in which it requested the colonial Powers to dismantle the military bases installed in colonial territories and to refrain from establishing new ones.

32. The discussion which had taken place on the Soviet proposal in the First Committee showed that the attitude of the United States and some NATO countries was still the chief obstacle to the elimination of foreign military bases. By rejecting the Soviet proposal, they had rejected the aspirations and demands of most of the States of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Their attitude was an indication that Washington meant to maintain and continue establishing military bases in the future in the territories of the States of those three continents. The United States Government thus intended to perpetuate the hotbeds of tension, aggression and interference which foreign military bases represented and to use them for the suppression of the national liberation movements in the territories in which those bases were situated. Nevertheless, the debate in the First Committee was evidence of keen interest in the question of the early elimination of foreign military bases, and the Soviet Union was determined to have that disarmament measure implemented in the interests of international peace and détente.

33. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) thought it fair to say that the debate had been fruitful in that it had clarified positions and trends on the important issue before the Committee. The Committee had before it a draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.369) and amendments submitted by Togo (A/C.1/L.385) and Liberia (A/C.1/L.386). Since, in the little time left, the Committee could hardly study in detail and adopt a substantive resolution, India, Yugoslavia and the United Arab Republic had thought fit to submit a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.387) which was procedural.

34. He emphasized that the initiative taken by the sponsors of the draft resolution did not alter their position on the substance of the issue. He urged the Committee to adopt the draft resolution unanimously so as to be able to proceed to the remaining agenda items.

35. On behalf of the sponsors, he therefore moved, under rule 132 of the rules of procedure, that draft resolution A/C.1/L.387 should be voted on first. If it was adopted, the Committee might then decide not to vote on the other proposals before it.

36. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) appealed to the representative of the USSR to withdraw his draft resolution in favour of the one just introduced. That would facilitate matters, since there would then be only one draft before the Committee.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that when the time came to vote he would, under rule 132 of the rules of procedure, invite the Committee to decide whether it wished to give priority to draft resolution A/C.1/L.387, as the representative of the United Arab Republic had requested.

38. Mr. Orhan ERALP (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that in their statements regarding the Baghdad Pact and CENTO the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Syria had misrepresented the aims of those two regional defensive groupings, set up in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter and in accordance with Article 52, and designed,

just like other regional organizations for collective defence to which the United Arab Republic and Syria belonged, to deal with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as were appropriate for regional action. The two organizations had been consistently inspired by the desire for regional security and collaboration and by peaceful intentions towards all neighbouring countries, including the United Arab Republic and Syria; and their value was proved by the fact that they had given rise to the Organization of Regional Co-operation for Development, which was intended to promote economic, commercial, technical and cultural co-operation between Turkey, Iran and Pakistan.

39. He added that it would be well to bear in mind the difference between bases afforded by one country to another in the exercise of its sovereign rights for purposes of collective defence, and those forcibly acquired.

40. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the polemical nature of the statements made by certain delegations, especially those of Eastern Europe, gave clear evidence that the purpose of the original draft resolution was to tip the military balance by the elimination of defensive arrangements on which the United States and many other countries depended for their collective security. That approach was also unacceptable because it implied a wholesale disregard for Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which recognized the right of Member States to enter into bilateral and multilateral agreements for their common defence. Indeed, some of the statements made in the course of the discussion could only be described as a form of blatant interference in the domestic affairs of Member States. It had been suggested that Governments which had found it necessary to enter into arrangements with others for their common defence were not serving their own national interests, but those of others. Those deplorable allegations had been properly rejected by a number of the delegations concerned, and he was sure that other delegations would also reject them.

41. He was confident that the Committee would not be misled by the unconvincing attempt which had been made to disguise the one-sided approach to the problem as a righteous anti-colonial measure. Such an effort to exploit for propaganda purposes the sincerely held feelings of a great many delegations must not be allowed to succeed.

42. As to the persistent allegations concerning the use of certain bases in connexion with the conflict in Viet-Nam, he repeated that no amount of verbal gymnastics could alter the fact that the United States was engaged in helping the population of South Viet-Nam to resist aggression from the North. The United States sought no bases there and its forces would leave when the aggression had ceased. If those who had mounted that propaganda attack on his Government sincerely desired to discuss the issue of Viet-Nam, he wondered why they had frustrated the attempts of the United States to bring the matter under discussion in the appropriate organ of the United Nations.

43. The representative of the USSR had suggested that General Assembly resolution 41 (I) of 1946, to which the United States delegation had referred, had been adopted in circumstances different from those which now prevailed. He was partly right, but he had carefully refrained from mentioning events which had taken place in the years following the adoption of that resolution, events in which the Soviet Government had played a leading part and which had required the establishment of some of the very bases which he now called into question.

44. Allegations made against the United States regarding the Guantánamo naval base were unfounded. The United States had conducted negotiations with a sovereign State, the Republic of Cuba, regarding the right to maintain coaling and naval stations in Cuban territory. That right dated from the 1934 Treaty on relations between the United States and Cuba reaffirming the validity of earlier agreements relating to the lease of certain territory at Guantánamo Bay and specifying the terms of the lease. Article III of the 1934 Treaty^{2/} provided that, until the two contracting parties agreed to the modification or abrogation of the stipulations of the Agreement signed in 1903 regarding the lease of the Guantánamo Bay territories, those stipulations should continue in effect. The validity of the various agreements between Cuba and the United States had been implicitly accepted by the Castro régime when it had announced, on 6 January 1959, that it would respect all existing international treaties to which Cuba was a party.

45. It was obviously incongruous to charge the United States with maintaining the Guantánamo base for aggressive purposes against Cuba, considering how the Castro régime, together with the Soviet Union, had tried to convert Cuba into a base of nuclear-capable offensive missiles aimed at the United States.

46. It was utterly false to say that the Guantánamo base was being used for aggressive purposes against Cuba. The United States had scrupulously adhered to the provisions of the applicable agreements in conducting its affairs at Guantánamo. On the other hand, the base had been subjected to repeated harassments by the Cuban authorities, who had tried to inflate those incidents and to treat them as acts of aggression against Cuba.

47. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to enlighten the representative of Thailand who, referring to the statement in which the Hungarian delegation had mentioned the participation of the United States Air Force in attacks against the territory of Thailand launched from United States bases situated in Thailand itself, had denied the existence of foreign military bases in his country.

48. The existence of such bases was attested by the Government of the United States and by United States journalists. The December 1966 issue of the *Atlantic Monthly* contained a great deal of information about the United States military units and

weapons in Thailand. *The New York Times* on 3 November, referring to the argument within the United States Government over whether the United States should become physically involved in putting down a communist rising in north-east Thailand, had said that United States Air Force bases were established in Thailand to prosecute the air war against North Viet-Nam. On 27 November *The New York Times* had described the increasing military involvement of the United States in Thailand. In the course of a year, the United States military forces in Thailand had more than doubled. The 34,000 men currently stationed there were mostly airmen assigned to the fighter-bomber squadrons taking part in operations against North Viet-Nam and Laos.

49. All those facts and figures had been gathered from United States sources. If the accuracy of the information given by the Pentagon or by journalists using statements by the United States Secretary of Defense was open to question, the representative of Thailand should criticize those sources, not the Hungarian delegation, which was merely quoting them. In any case, in waging war from such military bases, the United States was endangering international peace.

50. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the statements of the Iranian representative (1467th meeting) and the Turkish representative contained nothing new which might make the United Arab Republic change its position so far as the elimination of military bases was concerned. The only novelty was the claim that both countries maintained very friendly relations with everyone, including the Soviet Union. In that case, he wondered why they found it necessary to conclude defence agreements, unless it was to ward off some imaginary danger. He also assured the Turkish representative that the United Arab Republic did not need the protection of CENTO or of any other military pact.

51. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the United States representative had merely repeated the same old arguments about the Guantánamo base, without replying to the argument put forward by the Cuban delegation at the 1467th meeting. Cuba had not acquired full independence until 1959, and the Government in power in 1934, when the treaty continuing the Guantánamo base had been signed, had been subject to and under the pressure of United States imperialism, as was shown by the fact that the clause in the Platt Amendment giving the United States of America the right of intervention, which had been incorporated in the Cuban Constitution and the treaty of 1903, had been in force until the conclusion of the 1934 treaty. That treaty had been merely the formulation of a fait accompli.

52. Furthermore, he doubted whether the United States representative could find arguments to prove that the Guantánamo base served for the mutual defence of Cuba and the United States and to show how its presence contributed to Cuba's defence and security. He also denied the United States representative's charges of "harassments" by the Cubans against the Guantánamo base. Those charges had been

^{2/} Treaty concerning the relations between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba, signed at Washington on 29 May 1934 (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CL, 1934, No. 3456).

refuted by the Cuban Government in a document entitled "Además de asesinos, mentirosos" ("Not only murderers, but liars"). His Government was prepared to exhibit on request films and photographs showing that all the acts of aggression had taken place on Cuban territory and that all the victims had been Cuban. The United States representative would find it difficult indeed to produce photographs or to mention the name of a single American soldier killed by Cuban bullets to prove that the acts of aggression had come from Cuba.

53. He reaffirmed the Cuban Government's position: the Guantánamo base had been imposed on Cuba and was illegal, and Cuba firmly intended to go before whatever tribunal it deemed appropriate to demand the restoration of the usurped territory and the dismantling of the base.

54. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he saw no connexion between what the Hungarian representative had said in his first statement (1465th meeting), the Thai statement at the 1467th meeting and what the Hungarian representative had just said. He, too, read The New York Times and the Atlantic Monthly, but he was not in the habit of accepting blindly statements made in newspapers and periodicals. He referred the members of the Committee to the statement made by the Thai representative at the 1467th meeting regarding the situation in Viet-Nam and the subversive and terrorist activities organized

in Thailand from the other side of the frontier, particularly by the Hanoi régime and by certain communist-controlled organizations in northern Laos and North Viet-Nam.

55. The Hungarian representative had gone further and had made charges against Thailand of involvement in the war in Viet-Nam, charges which were at variance with what the Thai representative had said at the 1467th meeting. The Hungarian representative might be well advised to give less credence to the sources from which he obtained his information and to read the records of the First Committee more carefully.

56. Mr. Orhan ERALP (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had not presumed to give advice of any kind to the United Arab Republic or to suggest that CENTO would be good for that country. He failed to see how his words (para. 38 above) could have been interpreted in that way.

57. Mr. ZAND FARD (Iran), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that as he could see nothing new in what the representative of the United Arab Republic had said, he maintained his delegation's statement. However, he could not agree that the Middle East was a very calm area and that there was absolutely no necessity for certain precautionary measures.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.