



CONTENTS

Agenda item 78:

	Page
<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>	409

Chairman: Mr. Mario AMADEO (Argentina).

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. PAVICEVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had always endeavoured to adopt positions in keeping with its policy of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence. In the present instance it shared the desire of all States Members of the United Nations to safeguard international peace, to foster good neighbourliness between countries, to promote international co-operation and to ensure that the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter governing relations between States were strictly observed in general as well as in specific cases, such as that which the Committee was now called upon to consider. In that connexion he thought it might be helpful to recall the principles which should serve as a basis for the peaceful and equitable solution of the dispute which currently divided two States Members of the Organization.

2. It followed from Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter that every nation had the right to adopt by whatever means it chose, including revolution, the political and social system which best suited it, and to carry out the social, economic or other reforms which it deemed necessary. Furthermore, respect for the sovereignty of States and non-interference in their domestic affairs were principles which lay at the root of international relations; they were embodied in Article 2, paragraphs 1 and 7, of the Charter, and in article 15 of the charter of the Organization of American States,^{1/} according to which no State or group of States had the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State.

3. The United Nations reflected the diversity of existing social and political systems. It was clear that in the present day the peoples of the world had no alternative but to apply the principle of peaceful coexistence and, in the words of the Charter, to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours. He recalled in that connexion General Assembly resolutions 1301 (XIII) and 1236 (XII); the latter, which had been sponsored by his delegation together with the delegations of India and Sweden, called upon all States to make every effort to strengthen international peace, and to develop friendly and co-operative relations and settle disputes by peaceful means. In elaboration of the principle embodied in Article 2, paragraph 3, the Charter of the United Nations set out in Article 33 the procedures for the pacific settlement of disputes. His delegation considered that any theory or policy which was contrary to the principles he had recalled would be incompatible with the letter and the spirit of the Charter; and it did not believe, notwithstanding the serious tension which marked current relations between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, that all the means of peaceful settlement had been exhausted.

4. Mr. BUDO (Albania) stressed the gravity and great international significance of the issue under consideration. The revolutionary régime which the Cuban people had adopted after a long and heroic struggle for national liberation displeased the United States, which saw in it a threat to its imperialist system based on the subjugation and exploitation of peoples. In its attempts to return Cuba to the status of a dependency of the United States in which the latter's monopolies might re-establish themselves, the United States trampled underfoot the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and those of the charter of the Organization of American States.

5. The United Nations could not ignore the dangerous and intolerable situation created by the United States, and in order to discharge the responsibilities conferred upon it by the Charter it must act urgently to terminate that situation.

6. The policy of aggression and open intervention which the United States had pursued towards Cuba since that country had put an end once and for all to the fascist régime of Batista had become even more vigorous since the new United States Administration had assumed power. Among the actions characterizing that policy were provocations, slander campaigns, the organizing and financing of counter-revolutionary groups to engage in sabotage and subversion, the bombing of unfortified towns and sugar-cane fields, a rigid economic embargo, the unilateral severing of diplomatic relations, and pressure on other Latin American countries for a collective severance of relations with Cuba. To all that had been added the armed aggression of April 1961 which, though prepared and supported by the United States authorities,

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

had been repelled in less than seventy-two hours by the heroic Cuban people.

7. The Cuban victory had delivered a serious blow to the prestige of the United States throughout the world. It had also clearly shown that no force could overcome a people which enjoyed the support of all progressive humanity. It was that, in fact, which worried the leaders of the United States.

8. Despite its defeat and the world's condemnation, the United States had not renounced its plans of aggression and acts of intervention. In his statement at the 1231st meeting, the representative of Cuba had cited new facts. There was the intensified action by the State Department to bring the countries of Latin America into collective support of the plans for aggression; the establishment in October 1961, on the initiative of the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency, of a Central American defence board to co-ordinate preparations and future operations; the recruitment of counter-revolutionary Cubans into the United States armed forces; the accelerated training of mercenaries; the transport of arms and troops to various strategic points which were to serve as bases for the attack; and the dispatch to Cuba of agents assigned by the CIA to bring about, among other things, the assassination of Fidel Castro and other Cuban leaders.

9. Since its defeat in April 1961, the United States had been seeking to give the planned aggression the character of a joint regional action. It was to that end that it had had recourse to the OAS, first unsuccessfully at the Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States at San José in August 1961 and later at the Eighth Meeting of Consultation at Punta del Este in January 1962. Whatever the officially stated purpose of the second meeting, it had been convened in order to obtain the support of at least a majority of the region's countries for the aggressive plans against Cuba, and to achieve the application of sanctions. That was what the State Department had demanded in a secret note sent on 12 January 1962 to all Latin American Governments except the Cuban Government.

10. Nevertheless, several countries, among which were the largest in Latin America, had opposed the application of sanctions against Cuba, and the resolution concerning that country's expulsion from the OAS had been adopted only by a bare majority. The importance of that fact could not be underrated, especially when the pressures exerted by the United States Government were borne in mind.

11. The United States wished to use the resolutions of Punta del Este, under the pretext of anti-communism, in order to interfere in the internal affairs of Cuba, violate the sovereignty and independence of that country and fabricate excuses for a new aggression against it. The American imperialists wanted once and for all to destroy any national democratic movement in Latin America.

12. The representative of the United States had expressed surprise at a non-existent problem being discussed. However, experience had shown that the words and the deeds of the leaders of certain Western Powers were quite different things.

13. In order to justify its aggressive policy, the Government of the United States claimed that the Revolutionary Government of Cuba was endangering the Western hemisphere, and tried to prove that

claim by lies and calumnies. In particular, it blamed the Republic of Cuba for maintaining friendly relations with the socialist countries, as though that were contrary to the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter. In fact, imperialism invoked the bogey of communism each time it attacked the peoples that were struggling for their independence.

14. If the Cuban revolution was attracting the sympathy of other peoples of Latin America, that was because of the social and economic conditions prevailing in the countries concerned. In the twentieth century, all peoples were struggling to obtain better living conditions; the process was inescapable, but in that connexion the United Nations should accomplish the task entrusted to it by the Charter.

15. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cuba had defined his Government's foreign policy in his letter of 9 October 1961 to the President of the General Assembly (A/C.1/847). The Revolutionary Government was following a domestic and foreign policy consistent with the aspirations and well-being of its people that was serving the interests of peace and co-operation between nations and had enabled it to achieve outstanding successes. Indeed, that was why the United States Government was in such a hurry to put into effect its plans for aggression against Cuba.

16. Any new aggression was undoubtedly doomed to failure. Revolutionary Cuba was invincible, because it drew its strength from the justice of its cause. Furthermore, the Cuban people enjoyed the support of all peaceable peoples of the world, and particularly of the Latin American peoples, whose cause was inseparable from its own. In that connexion, mention should be made of the popular demonstrations which had taken place throughout Latin America during the Punta del Este meeting. Moreover, eminent public figures had spoken in favour of defending the just cause of the Cuban people—in particular on the occasion of the Conference of Iberian-American Peoples, held at Havana from 23 to 26 January 1962. In the declaration which it had adopted at the conclusion of its work, the Conference had stated, *inter alia*, that the appearance of different social systems on the American continent, as elsewhere, was an inevitable product of the age. It had also stated that the proclamation whereby Cuba had declared itself to be a socialist country represented a legitimate and unchallengeable decision. And as reported in the Argentine newspaper *Los Principios*, the Brazilian Minister for Foreign Affairs had recently expressed his opposition to any military intervention against Cuba, and had stressed that sanctions would have no legal basis and would be politically unproductive.

17. All those facts clearly showed that it was not Cuba which was isolated, but American imperialism, which was exerting itself to stifle the Cuban revolution. Yet the United States was feverishly preparing a new aggression. The United Nations could not afford to be again taken by surprise, by events which would be much more serious than those of April 1961 and which would have grave consequences for world peace. It should intervene in time and prevent the United States from embarking on that adventure. The draft resolution submitted by Romania and Czechoslovakia (A/C.1/L.309), which was very moderate, met the requirements of the situation. The Albanian delegation would therefore support it, and hoped it would be adopted by a large majority.

18. In conclusion, he recalled that the people and Government of Albania supported the struggle of the Cuban people. He expressed the hope that the United Nations would fulfil its obligations towards the Republic of Cuba, which was one of the Member States most respectful of the Charter and whose foreign policy was based on peaceful coexistence, good neighbourliness, international co-operation and the settlement of disputes through negotiation.

19. Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) thought that the complaint of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba against the United States of America was, for the Latin American republics, the most regrettable of the burning international questions of the day. For Haiti, American unity had an importance equal to that of freedom. Unity was, in fact, the surest safeguard of American freedom. Haitians had gone to its defence every time it had been threatened. As Mr. François Duvalier, President of the Republic of Haiti, had recalled in a message to the Haitian people, life without freedom was inconceivable in the land of Toussaint Louverture and Dessalines.

20. Haitians had given the triumph of the Cuban revolution a welcome in accordance with their traditions, since they had seen in it the overthrow of a régime incompatible with the charter of Bogotá. However, freedom should evolve smoothly from a sentimental fact to a reasoned fact, and that transition was the great drama in the practice of representative democracy in the American continent. Freedom without control engendered tyranny, which created misunderstood and martyred Governments. When it was no longer possible to see where freedom ended and where tyranny began, the peoples, lured by deceptive promises, rebelled, and the infiltration of subversive ideas threatened to shatter American unity. It was because their ancestors had understood that fact that a free America had begun to be safeguarded when the American peoples could still barely pronounce the words "independence" and "freedom". That accounted for the well-known statements by Juan Egaña in 1810, by Simón Bolívar in 1815 in his "Letter from Jamaica", by Manuel Torres in 1821, by President Monroe in 1823, and by other statesmen of Latin America.

21. The sole aim of the Congress of Panama of 1826 had obviously been to embody, in a joint declaration, the ideas expressed between 1810 and 1823. After 1826, the declaration of President Monroe had been applied on several occasions by the American republics and, in 1848 and 1864 at Lima and in 1856 at Santiago de Chile, the American States had affirmed that they regarded themselves as a single family of nations, bound together to reject certain influences which they considered to be incompatible with their ideals. In 1861, the Argentine Republic had declared that it would, if the freedom of an American State were to be attacked, once again be one of the first to defend the honour and dignity of the American cause.

22. Thus was recorded the determination to defend American unity in a way of life consistent with Christian civilization and the republican institutions which, despite certain imperfections in their use, acted as a shield against the infiltration of ideas which the American countries considered to be fatal to their freedom and independence. Following the same train of thought, President Porfirio Díaz of Mexico had proposed that an attack by a Power outside America against the independence, territorial unity or form of government of one of those countries should be

regarded as an attack directed against each of them individually.

23. All those statements reflected the universal concern of statesmen in the second part of the nineteenth century to secure recognition of a particular American international order which required the taking of precautions ensuring political stability and peace on the continent.

24. In 1945, at San Francisco, the twenty-one American republics had signed the United Nations Charter as founder Members of the Organization. Nevertheless, three years later, in April 1948, the American States had met at Bogotá to set up a regional organization of their own choice. It might be asked why that had been done, seeing that the two charters proclaimed the same ideals and had the same purposes. The answer was that the twenty-one republics had had imperative reasons for setting up a regional organization of their own choice which would answer certain specific needs and correspond to the distinctive legal standards of the American hemisphere.

25. The charter of Bogotá declared that the purpose of the Organization of American States was to provide them with the means for fulfilling their regional obligations, and it was stated in article 5 of that charter that the solidarity of the American States and the high aims which they sought required the political organization of those States on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy.

26. The communist ideology being as dangerous in the eyes of Americans as had been the ideas of the Holy Alliance, the Americas, as the sole judges of their own affairs, were therefore once more, after an interval of more than 150 years, taking measures which they considered necessary for the defence of the hemisphere. Representative democracy was, for the republics of the hemisphere, an absolute imperative, even though human wisdom made a distinction between those who were temporarily unable to apply it but did not give up hope of achieving it through their endeavours and those who repudiated it systematically as its adversaries.

27. It was therefore important to draw attention to the obligations of a constitutional nature to which all Americans had freely subscribed in the charter of Bogotá and to ask whether, in the name of the principle of sovereignty, an American State could, without repudiating that charter, ally itself with a system incompatible with the American system, such as international communism. Haiti replied to that question in the negative, believing that in such a matter only the principle of relative sovereignty could apply. In consequence, the American State which, through the Head of its Government, declared itself to be Marxist-Leninist and organized its country socially and politically on the basis of its newly professed economic, social and political faith, had already, from a legal standpoint, broken the bonds making it a member of the OAS. The only course open to the other members was simply to consider it as having resigned its membership and, in legal parlance, to take cognizance of that fact.

28. At the Punta del Este meeting, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs had once more affirmed their unshakable faith in the charter of Bogotá. The OAS, with its priority of jurisdiction, was already seized of the Cuba-United States dispute in which the issue was the

essential element of the Bogotá charter, namely, American solidarity.

29. The United Nations and the Organization of American States were two international organizations as between which the question of degree of jurisdiction did not arise. One was not dependent on the other. From the point of view of competence and moral authority, they were both on the same level and it was not possible to appeal from one jurisdiction to the other. And according to an undisputed principle, a single case could not be heard simultaneously before two courts of equal jurisdiction, since the moral authority of justice would be undermined if the decisions given were contradictory. Should such confusion arise between the United Nations and the OAS, the General Assembly would bear the heavy responsibility of having taken the road leading to chaos.

30. For that reason, the Haitian delegation believed that it was inappropriate to consider the complaint of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba and would accordingly vote against the draft resolution.

31. Mr. QUAISON-SACKY (Ghana) said that he would have liked to see the two States involved find a satisfactory solution by means of bilateral negotiations or through the medium of their regional organization, without recourse to the United Nations. However, it seemed that the problem went beyond the question of normal relations between two States and was a matter of deciding how those States, which were situated ninety miles apart and had different political, economic and social systems, could coexist peacefully.

32. The position of the Ghanaian delegation, as stated in the Committee (1157th meeting) at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly had not changed. It was still based on the principles of non-intervention, equal rights and the peaceful settlement of international disputes. It had derived added strength from the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade in September 1961, at which the participating countries had recognized the right of Cuba, as of any other nation, freely to choose its political and social systems in accordance with its own conditions, needs and possibilities. The non-aligned countries had also declared that no intimidation, interference or intervention should be brought to bear in the exercise of the right of self-determination of peoples, including their right to pursue constructive and independent policies for the attainment and preservation of their sovereignty.

33. The Ghanaian delegation did not think that there was any purpose in examining the merits of democracy, as practised in the Western hemisphere, as against communism or any other system of political and social organization. In present circumstances, it was best to leave to each State the right to choose the form of government best suited to it. Nor was it appropriate for the Committee to pass any judgement regarding the decisions taken by the Foreign Ministers of the American States at Punta del Este. Regional agencies could play a useful role in the pacific settlement of local disputes, but it must not be forgotten that Article 52 of the United Nations Charter required that such agencies and their activities should be consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. In that regard, his delegation noted with satisfaction that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Brazil and several other representatives had argued that it would be a mistake to shut the door to all chances of

mediation. On the other hand, it had been disquieting to read in The Economist of 3 February 1962 that the United States Congress was using certain tactics to constrain the American States to take a firm line over Cuba.

34. With regard to the exclusion of Cuba from the OAS on the grounds of the incompatibility of Cuba's Marxism-Leninism with the inter-American system, that was a matter which must be left entirely to the American States themselves, provided that Article 52 of the United Nations Charter was observed. In endorsing or rejecting, even implicitly, the decisions taken at Punta del Este, the Committee would be creating a dangerous precedent which could have serious implications in relation to similar decisions which might be taken by such organizations as NATO or the Warsaw Treaty system.

35. The clear duty of the United Nations, now that it was seized of the item, was to contribute by all available means to the maintenance of international peace and security, the pacific settlement of disputes, and peaceful coexistence within the framework of the Charter. The Government of Ghana, for its part, would be happy to see normal relations between Cuba and the United States restored. Both countries had great challenges before them. The United States, being a great Power, had an overriding responsibility to help maintain friendly relations among nations on the basis of equality and self-determination and to uphold the principles and purposes of the Charter. The Government of Ghana cherished the friendship of the United States and had no doubt as to its willingness to fulfil that responsibility. At the same time, Ghana had followed with sympathy the valiant and enthusiastic efforts made by the Government and people of Cuba to achieve the transformation of their political, economic, social and cultural life. Nevertheless, it was hard to escape the fact that the Cuban people were haunted by the fear of an impending invasion from the United States. Ghana therefore welcomed the assurances given by the representative of the United States and hoped that they would go far towards allaying those fears. It was also reassuring to note the statement that had been made by the representative of Cuba to the effect that his country had not exported—and had no intention of exporting—revolutionary ideas to neighbouring countries.

36. The world of today was characterized by the existence of different social and political systems. It could indeed hardly be otherwise, if all peoples were given the right to solve their own political, economic, social and cultural problems in accordance with their own conditions, needs and potentialities. Those differences did not constitute an insurmountable obstacle to the maintenance of peace, provided that States refrained from all interference in the internal development of other States.

37. The delegation of Ghana would be guided by those considerations when the time came to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/L.309 and any other draft resolutions that might be submitted. In conclusion, he felt that in view of the need to reduce existing tensions, the least the Committee could do was to remind Member States that they had a duty, in the words of General Assembly resolution 1236 (XII), to develop friendly and co-operative relations and settle disputes by peaceful means.

38. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) recalled that when the First Committee had considered the Cuban question

at the fifteenth session, it had done so in an atmosphere of crisis and tension because the fighting that had broken out in Cuba called for urgent measures. At the current session, although one could hardly say that there was peace, there was at least an absence of war. The situation was nevertheless explosive and the United Nations should keep a watchful eye on developments in that region, where the people were now demanding all the benefits that had been denied them by centuries of colonialism and misrule. The Iraqi delegation had been particularly struck by the depth of feeling manifested by the representatives of Cuba, the United States and several other countries, in speaking of the great drama now unfolding in that part of the world.

39. It was not for the First Committee to debate the merits or shortcomings of the Cuban revolution, or to evaluate the domestic policies of the Cuban Government. Nor was it entitled to undertake a detailed examination of the charter of the Organization of American States, or to pass judgement on the resolutions recently adopted at the Punta del Este meeting. Similarly, an inquiry into the nature of Marxism-Leninism or a discussion of the nature of "representative democracy" would scarcely be conducive to the proper and expeditious handling of the item before the Committee.

40. One Member State had complained that another Member State was planning acts of aggression and intervention against it. The United States Government had replied that it was not the United States but the present Government of Cuba that was endangering the peace and security of the Western hemisphere. The Iraqi delegation welcomed the assurances of the representatives of the two contending Governments that their countries had no intention of disturbing the peace or of intervening in the domestic affairs of other States in the region. On the other hand, the United Nations was not a court of law to render judgements on those conflicting accusations. Instead, the Organization had an obligation to adopt measures to prevent any breach of the peace and to promote friendly relations among neighbouring countries.

41. Having said that, it would be idle to ignore the fact that the present crisis in the Western hemisphere stemmed from the far-reaching consequences of the Cuban revolution. That revolution was no ordinary event or passing phenomenon. It had raised issues of fundamental importance for the peoples of Latin America and, indeed, for all the peoples of the underdeveloped countries who were engaged in a desperate struggle against poverty, ignorance and disease. He recalled in that connexion the eloquent words of the representative of Chile (1235th meeting).

42. The problem facing all underdeveloped countries was how to complete the transition, in the course of a few decades, from mediaeval to modern conditions. The less developed countries could not afford to wait for several centuries, as the countries of Western Europe had done, to emerge from the darkness of the Middle Ages into the era of technological revolution. Apart from the question of speed, there was an overriding human consideration that could not be overlooked: how to progress rapidly without sacrificing freedom and justice. There could be no categorical answer to that agonizing dilemma, which perhaps represented the greatest challenge to the less developed countries. It was nevertheless certain that representative democracy by itself was no longer sufficient to meet that challenge. He recalled what he had said on the subject in the Committee (1155th meeting) at the fifteenth session.

43. In many countries that challenge had been met in various ways and with varying success. But the task, far from easy at the best of times, had been made infinitely more difficult by the tensions and suspicions that were now besetting the world. No small State could escape the cold war and its demoralizing effects. Many of the less developed countries found their freedom of action impaired and their motives often questioned. That was why the States meeting at Belgrade in September 1961 had sought ways and means of strengthening their capacity for independent action and of increasing the effectiveness of their collective efforts for peace.

44. Considering the paramount role which the United Nations had to play in relieving tensions in all parts of the world, the Iraqi delegation would support any draft resolution reiterating the provisions of the Charter which were of special relevance to the present question. In particular, reference should be made to the necessity of developing friendly relations among Member States and ensuring stricter observance of non-intervention in domestic affairs, a principle that was jealously guarded in Latin America and which had become one of the pillars of the Latin American system of jurisprudence. There could be no harm in reiterating, in a resolution, those principles which were essential features of inter-American life. Iraq was not taking sides or attempting to pass judgement on the claims of the parties to the dispute. It was merely guided by a desire to relieve present tensions in the Caribbean and to promote friendly co-operation and good neighbourliness among the States of that region.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.