

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1243rd
MEETING**

(Closing meeting)

Thursday, 15 February 1962,
at 3.30 p.m.

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 (concluded)</i>	435
<i>Completion of the Committee's work.</i>	438

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) (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN, noting that the general debate on the item had been completed, invited explanations of vote, which he would limit to five minutes, on the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia and Romania (A/C.1/L.309).
2. Mr. IFEAGWU (Nigeria) said that whatever the results of the voting might be, the debate had proved extremely useful. It had enabled the Committee to hear the arguments of both sides, and in particular, to hear the solemn assurance given by the United States that it did not contemplate any aggression against Cuba and that given by Cuba that it did not seek to change the form of government of any other State.
3. The position of the Nigerian delegation on the item before the Committee was dictated by its adherence to the principle of self-determination and by its conviction that nations could coexist peacefully despite all divergencies in their political and economic systems. It would be remembered that the principles of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States and respect for their sovereignty, territorial integrity and inalienable right to independence had been reaffirmed by the African and Malagasy States at the Lagos Conference in January 1962. The corollary of those principles so far as the Cuban complaint was concerned was twofold. First, it was necessary to allay Cuba's fears of military and other aggression resulting from its adoption of a particular political and economic system; and secondly, it was necessary to allay the fears of Cuba's neighbours that Cuba was actively engaging in subversive activities in their countries.

4. In view of the assurances given by both the United States and Cuba, the Nigerian delegation requested a separate vote on each of the paragraphs of the draft resolution. It would abstain on the first preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 1, but would vote for the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2. It felt that those votes would be consistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter and with General Assembly resolution 1616 (XV). Nigeria was convinced that all disputes between nations should be settled by peaceful negotiation.

5. Mr. NONG KIMNY (Cambodia) said that his Government's position on the item under discussion was based on the principles proclaimed first at the Asian-African Conference held at Bandung in 1955, and more recently at the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Belgrade in September 1961. At the latter Conference, the participants had declared that the right of Cuba as that of any other nation freely to choose their political and social systems in accordance with their own conditions, needs and possibilities should be respected, and had expressed their determination 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. While the system Cuba had chosen did not seem to be to the liking of most of the American States, events had shown that it was supported by the overwhelming majority of Cubans; and to disregard that fact would be to violate the Charter precept of friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

6. Cuba's complaint arose from its fears of unilateral intervention by the United States; the United States, for its part, feared that Cuba planned to export its revolution, thus imperilling hemisphere security. However, the United States had declared that it was not preparing aggression against Cuba and was not training anyone for an invasion of Cuba at the bases mentioned by the Cuban representative. The Cuban delegation, in turn, had stated that its revolution was not exportable. Cambodia had been gratified to hear those assurances, of which the General Assembly should take note. It had also been encouraged by the Brazilian representative's statement that his country preferred co-existence, subject to certain freely-accepted limitations, to any formula such as exclusion.

7. Cambodia believed that all Member States should adhere strictly to the principle of non-intervention and that no State should permit the use of its territory or resources for action against Cuba. Its vote would be guided by those considerations.

8. Mr. COLLIER (Sierra Leone) said that while the debate had revealed the existence of a potentially

explosive situation in Latin America, the Committee had been assured by both the United States and the Cuban representatives that their countries had no aggressive intentions.

9. As a small nation in the process of consolidating its newly-won independence, Sierra Leone believed that the United Nations should take every opportunity to demonstrate its faith in the principles of non-intervention, self-determination and the peaceful settlement of disputes between nations. Consequently, it would vote in favour of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution and it would abstain on operative paragraph 1.

10. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had been gratified to note the assurances given by all the parties concerned, and in particular by the United States and Cuba, of their adherence to the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, which principles included the equality of sovereign States, non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and the rejection of the use of force in the settlement of disputes, whether of an ideological nature or arising from the direct material interests of the parties. Its vote would be guided by those principles.

11. Mr. ILBOUDO (Upper Volta) said that the situation in the Caribbean area could be improved only by the adoption of a solution acceptable to both Cuba and the United States. Accordingly, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the first preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 1 because they introduced elements of mistrust. It would vote in favour of the second preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 2, and abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

12. Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria) said that the charge of United States interference in the internal affairs of Cuba had been fully substantiated. He wished to explain some of the legal reasons for which his delegation would support the draft resolution. The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States, held at Punta del Este in January 1962, by excluding Cuba from various organs of the OAS, had acted in violation of Article 53 of the United Nations Charter, which prohibited a regional agency from taking enforcement action without the authorization of the Security Council. Article 41 of the Charter enumerated the enforcement measures of a non-military nature which could be decided on by the Security Council. Yet the participants in the Punta del Este meeting had decided to apply measures of the kind referred to in that Article, and one of them, the United States, had broken off all economic relations with Cuba. It had been made clear at Punta del Este that those measures were aimed at overthrowing the Castro régime; that was a violation of the Charter and a flagrant demonstration of interference in the internal affairs of Cuba.

13. Mr. LOKMAN (Mauritania) said that his delegation had been gratified by the assurances given by Cuba and the United States that they would abide by the principles of the United Nations Charter. It believed that a peaceful settlement of the differences between them was possible, and its vote would be guided by those considerations.

14. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia and Romania (A/C.1/L.309). At the request of the representative of Nigeria, a separate vote would be taken on each of the component paragraphs.

15. He put to the vote the first paragraph of the preamble.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Mali, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

Against: Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg.

Abstaining: Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar.

The paragraph was rejected by 47 votes to 11, with 42 abstentions.

16. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph of the preamble.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

The paragraph was adopted by 41 votes to none, with 59 abstentions.

17. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Israel, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

Against: Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland.

Abstaining: Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq.

The paragraph was rejected by 50 votes to 11, with 39 abstentions.

18. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Dominican Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

Against: Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark.

Abstaining: Finland, Gabon, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia, Cameroun, Cyprus.

The paragraph was rejected by 46 votes to 39, with 15 abstentions.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that rule 130 of the rules of procedure provided that if all operative parts of

a proposal had been rejected, the proposal was considered to have been rejected as a whole. As a result of the voting, the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.309) had been rejected.

20. He would allow further explanations of vote.

21. Mr. DAROM (Israel) said that his delegation had been unable to support the draft resolution because to do so would have implied agreement with the charges of aggression and intervention made against the United States Government in the title of the item. He had abstained on operative paragraph 2 for the same reason, even though his Government believed, as a matter of principle, that differences between States should be settled by peaceful means.

22. Mr. AHMED (United Arab Republic) said his delegation had hoped that, in the interests of allaying the fears of the parties to the dispute, a resolution could be adopted which took note of the pledges of non-aggression and non-intervention given by the United States and Cuban representatives. Since no such draft resolution had been introduced, he wished to request that the Committee's report to the General Assembly should record the desire expressed by a number of speakers that note should be taken of those assurances.

23. Mr. MACKEHENIE (Peru) said that, notwithstanding Peru's firm adherence to the principle of self-determination, his delegation had abstained on the second preambular paragraph, in the belief that it had nothing to do with the substance of the item under consideration.

24. Mr. JHA (India) said his delegation's votes had been prompted by the belief that in view of the assurances given by the United States and Cuban representatives, the United Nations should refrain from dwelling on the past and look hopefully to the future. His delegation had voted for the second preambular paragraph and for operative paragraph 2 in order to reaffirm the fundamental principles of the Charter without pronouncing judgement on Cuba's complaint. It would have preferred the adoption of a constructive resolution which cast no reflection on anyone.

25. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that two positions had emerged in the voting on the draft resolution. Forty-one States had voted for the second preambular paragraph, thus supporting the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter; fifty-nine States, including the United States, the United Kingdom, France and other members of the military blocs led by the United States, had abstained, thus throwing those principles open to question. Similarly, thirty-nine States, including the socialist countries, Cuba and the principal countries of Asia and Africa, had voted for operative paragraph 2, thus supporting a peaceful settlement of the present dispute; the United States and the NATO bloc had voted against the paragraph, thus opposing a peaceful settlement. The results of the vote showed clearly which States were in favour of peace and friendly co-operation between peoples and which favoured the use of force for the purpose of imposing their will on other countries.

26. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that his delegation had voted against operative paragraph 1, which was the essential part of the draft resolution, because it was satisfied that the United States had no intention of committing aggression against Cuba. His delegation had abstained on the first preambular paragraph

because it was not convinced that a tense situation existed in the Caribbean area. It had voted for the second preambular paragraph in order to indicate support of the fundamental principle stated therein, without regard to the item under consideration. Although it favoured the peaceful settlement of disputes, it had abstained on operative paragraph 2 because the wording of the item suggested that the present dispute was the result of plans of aggression and acts of intervention by the United States.

27. Mr. BORJA (Philippines) said that his delegation had voted against the two operative paragraphs because the implications contained in them required proof. It had abstained on the second preambular paragraph in the belief that, as the Peruvian representative had pointed out, the paragraph in question had nothing to do with the substance of the item.

28. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America), replying to the observations of the Soviet representative, noted that all the American republics had

abstained on the second preambular paragraph. They had done so, even though they supported the principle stated therein, because, in the context of the charges made against the United States in the title of the item, the paragraph implied that the United States did not support that principle. Similarly, they had voted against operative paragraph 2, even though they favoured the settlement of differences by peaceful means, because the present dispute was one between the communist Government of Cuba and the democratic Governments of all the American republics rather than one between Cuba and the United States, as suggested by the wording of the item.

Completion of the Committee's work

29. The CHAIRMAN said that with the conclusion of its consideration of agenda item 78 the Committee had completed its work at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.