

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1105th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 20 February 1962,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

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 (concluded)
Report of the First Committee (part II) . . . 1357

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

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 (concluded)

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (PART II)
[A/5090]

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the First Committee.

1. Mr. ENCKELL (Finland), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to submit for the consideration of the General Assembly part II of the report of the First Committee [A/5090] on item 78 of the agenda, entitled "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".

2. The General Assembly took note of part I of this report [A/5072] on 20 December 1961 and of the statement made therein that the First Committee had not discussed the item for lack of time. The item remained on the agenda of the resumed session.

3. In the course of the consideration of this item, which took place between 5 and 15 February 1962, different views were expressed as to the impact of the developments during recent years on the relationship between the two Member States already mentioned, as well as between them and the other American Member States.

4. Divergent views were also expressed by a number of delegations on the recent decisions taken by the Organization of American States.

5. Considerable attention was given by a number of speakers to the events which had been put before the General Assembly at its resumed fifteenth session,

and to the question of their impact on the present situation. Despite other differences of opinion expressed during the debate concerning, among other things, the urgency of the question and the wording of the item as inscribed on the agenda, a broad consensus may be said to have emerged in the Committee indicating the wish that the development of the relations between the Member States mainly concerned would take place in strict adherence to the relevant principles of the Charter.

6. A number of speakers took favourable note in this respect of the assurances given in the debate and expressed the hope that the fears and suspicions voiced in the course of the same debate would thus be allayed. No proposal, however, was submitted which would have embodied these views in a manner which the majority of the members of the Committee would have found acceptable.

7. The Committee had before it a draft resolution [see A/5090, para. 3] submitted by the delegations of Czechoslovakia and Romania, but, since both the operative paragraphs of that draft resolution were rejected in separate votes, I have no recommendation to present to the General Assembly on behalf of the Committee.

8. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Assembly has been informed that the report of the First Committee contains no recommendation. A draft resolution [A/L.385/Rev.1] has however been submitted by Mongolia. I call upon the representative of that country, who has asked for the floor to introduce the draft resolution.

9. Mr. JARGALSAIKHAN (Mongolian People's Republic) (translated from Russian): As you know, this item, which was included in the agenda of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly at the request of the Government of Cuba [A/4832 and Add.1], has already been discussed in the First Committee. The positions of all countries were explained at sufficient length during the discussion of this item in that Committee, and the Mongolian delegation does not consider it necessary to restate its views, since they were also made known in the First Committee.

10. The General Assembly now has before it the report of the First Committee [A/5090], which clearly describes the discussion on the item and its result. This report, as well as the entire course of the discussion in the First Committee, shows that a great many countries felt it necessary, in connexion with the consideration of the item submitted by Cuba, to recall the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, such as the development of friendly relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and non-interference in the internal affairs of any State.

11. No one took exception to this in the First Committee. The same was true of the voting in which no

disapproval was expressed of these principles. Not a single vote was cast against them and forty-one delegations voted in favour of them.

12. The Mongolian delegation regards this as a favourable sign, since it means that unanimity can be reached on this item in the General Assembly.

13. The Mongolian People's Republic is accordingly submitting a draft resolution [A/L.385/Rev.1], which takes account of the position of countries, as stated in the First Committee. This draft resolution reads as follows:

"Report of the First Committee on agenda item 78

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the report of the First Committee on agenda item 78 (A/5090),

"Recalls that it is a permanent aim of the United Nations to develop friendly relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and non-interference in the internal affairs of any State."

14. The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic, a small Asian country which is interested in the maintenance of world peace, considers that, since not a single State opposed the principles mentioned in our draft resolution in the vote in the First Committee, there should be no objection to the endorsement of the draft resolution at this meeting of the General Assembly. It is quite probable therefore that no formal vote on the proposal will be necessary at this meeting.

15. The adoption of this draft resolution by the General Assembly would contribute to the peaceful settlement of the question under consideration and would have a calming effect, because it would clearly show that the principles mentioned in the draft resolution will be strictly observed in relations between the States concerned.

16. The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic co-operated with a large number of other countries in drafting a resolution on a very important question on the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly—the question of Angola—and, as you know, showed its good will in seeking a mutually acceptable solution to this question. We hope that the countries with which we have collaborated in the past will support the step that the Mongolian People's Republic has now taken in the interests of the maintenance and strengthening of world peace.

17. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I would remind you that, in view of the procedural decision taken by the Assembly, statements must be confined to explanations of vote.

18. I shall give the floor to representatives who wish to explain their votes.

19. Mr. ZEA (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): I am not really going to give an explanation of vote at this time. I only wanted my name to appear on the list of speakers so that I might ask the Assembly for a separate vote on the proposal in draft resolution A/L.385/Rev.1. There should be a vote on each part of the proposal and then on the whole.

20. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of Colombia has asked for a separate vote on each part of draft resolution A/L.385/Rev.1 and then on the draft resolution as a whole. I shall

put that proposal to the General Assembly before we start voting on the draft resolution.

21. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): I would like to point out, by way of an introductory remark, that the title of this item has not been changed. It will be remembered that the title reads: "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".

22. The sponsor of draft resolution A/L.385/Rev.1, now before us, seems to be trying, by that document, to create the impression that the title of the item has been changed, obviously because the deliberately biased form of the title of the item clearly reveals its cold war propaganda purpose. However, the title of the item has not been changed. The original document itself referred three times to item 78—in the upper left hand corner, in the heading and in the first preambular paragraph—and item 78 still reads just the way it always has. The substitution in the revised text of the draft resolution [A/L.385/Rev.1] of the title "Report of the First Committee on agenda item 78" for the title of the agenda item is itself nothing but another parliamentary manoeuvre to obscure the fact that the draft resolution is still a draft resolution against the background and in the context of the completely unproved Cuban charges as set forth in the cold war title of the item.

23. The Cuban charges of intervention and plans of aggression have been with us now for six months. My delegation voted long ago, in September 1961, in favour of including this item on the agenda, because of our commitment to the principle that any complaint, no matter how groundless, should receive a hearing in our Organization. The First Committee dealt with this complaint and with the Czechoslovak-Romanian resolution [see A/5090, para. 3].

24. It is instructive to review briefly the fate of this communist cold war effort. Not one representative—I repeat, not one representative—outside of the eleven communist representatives, supported the unfounded accusation of United States interference in Cuban affairs. A clear majority of the First Committee also rebuffed an apparently harmless reference to peaceful settlement of international disputes because they recognized that in the context of the Cuban charges, such an affirmation of a general principle would dignify and give substance to charges that were in fact crude, defamatory and false.

25. The First Committee also witnessed a striking demonstration of vigour and solidarity among the nations that make up our Organization of American States. We voted as one in defence of our common cause. It is this fact, more than any words I can say, that testifies to the worthlessness of the Cuban charges.

26. Over this weekend we were greeted by a new exercise in parliamentary legerdemain. This will, I am confident, be equally repudiated by this Assembly. Having failed to obtain any support for the baseless charges levelled against the United States in the First Committee and having failed to enlist the backing of a single one of the ninety-three non-communist Members of this body for its complaint of United States interference, the communist bloc is now trying to bring in through the back door what was thrown out

at the front. That well-known authority on Caribbean affairs, that long-time friend and next-door neighbour of Cuba, the Republic of Outer Mongolia, has now appeared from Central Asia and placed before us a draft resolution which purports innocently to reaffirm the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and of non-interference in the internal affairs of any State.

27. In voting on this parliamentary manoeuvre, the United States will take the following course.

28. First, we will vote for the preambular reference to the report of the First Committee [A/5090]. We welcome that report as demonstrating the fact that, after a fair hearing and thorough airing of the Cuban complaint, it was overwhelmingly rejected. We find it proper for the General Assembly to take note of this report.

29. Second, on the operative paragraph, which is substantially a repetition of the second preambular paragraph of the Czechoslovak-Romanian draft resolution introduced in the First Committee, we shall again abstain. The obvious manoeuvre of Mongolia on behalf of the communist bloc is to force other Members of the Assembly into the apparent dilemma of either voting against self-determination or of adopting a resolution with an unintended effect. There is no reason to fall for this trick. The United States, of course, subscribes to these principles. The United States reaffirms principles which were first set forth in our Declaration of Independence and in our Constitution as well as in the conventions and agreements of the inter-American system and the United Nations Charter. In a separate vote on the operative paragraph we will, therefore, not vote, but will abstain, in the light of the context of this paragraph under the unproved Cuban allegations which are still in the title of the item.

30. We shall, however, vote against the draft resolution as a whole and we hope that the Assembly will do likewise. There is no reason to dignify the unproved charges presented by the communist bloc by enveloping them in noble and historic principles of the Charter. A vote against the draft resolution as a whole will properly repudiate this transparent parliamentary manoeuvre. If such principles are to be reaffirmed, they should be proclaimed in the context of calling on the Cuban régime to stop intervening in the affairs of other American States. They should call on this régime to grant the Cuban people the right to choose freely their own form of government and to give them the right of self-determination. Those principles should voice the appeal of the free peoples of the world for restoration to the Cuban people of those equal rights spelled out so clearly in the Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations Charter and the charter of the Organization of American States.

31. When this item was inscribed on the agenda in August 1961, we recognize the competence of the General Assembly to concern itself with such grave charges. We welcomed the airing of those charges, the discussion of those charges. We were gratified by the display of hemispheric unity and the support of other Members who repudiated those charges. We were gratified that not one of the ninety-three non-communist Members of this body voted with the communist bloc to validate those charges. We trust that this Assembly will act with the same sense of responsibility and will not be trapped by a transparent

manoeuvre such as the one we now have before us and will vote against this draft resolution as a whole.

32. Mr. MALALASEKERA (Ceylon): The delegation of Ceylon wishes to explain its vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.385/Rev.1, if indeed it is at all necessary to explain a vote for a draft resolution invoking a paramount principle of the Charter.

33. We shall vote for the draft resolution because we have already cast our vote for a paragraph of similar substance in the First Committee, a paragraph which, we were happy to note, was adopted without opposition. We shall vote for the draft resolution also because a situation does exist—a fact vigorously confirmed by both sides. We shall vote for the draft resolution because it invokes a harmonizing principle, at least as far as we are concerned, with no judgement of any of the parties concerned. We feel that if we keep on reiterating the principles of the Charter on every possible occasion, it can do nothing but good, because thereby the time might ultimately come when nations will in fact act according to these principles and not be satisfied with merely paying lip-service to them.

34. In substance we think that this draft resolution is only a formalization of principles to which both parties have committed themselves in the course of the debate in the Committee. Furthermore, we feel that on an issue involving as much tension as we have undoubtedly seen in this, it is the duty of this Assembly to declare itself in some minimum degree. We hold that a "do nothing" Assembly would be even less tolerable than an Assembly which, some allege, does too much.

35. Mr. Henry Ford COOPER (Liberia): My delegation will ask for a division and a separate vote on the operative paragraph of resolution A/L.385/Rev.1, on the report of the First Committee on agenda item 78—entitled "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"—beginning with the words "and non-interference in the internal affairs of any State". While it is impossible and unrealistic for my delegation to vote against this paragraph of the draft resolution, which is taken from the Charter of the United Nations, yet my delegation has never been able to accept the argument that non-interference in the internal affairs of any State applies to colonies and dependent territories, or to any State claiming equal rights and self-determination of its people, where a small minority, especially when that minority is of an alien race and culture, seeks to impose its will upon a people or to rule against the express will of the great majority of that people of different background, culture and religion, by sheer force or by pressure and exploitation.

36. We are of the opinion that the Article concerning non-interference in the internal affairs of States is a part of the Charter which at times is used to cover up or maintain colonial rule or possession, or to impose the will of a tiny minority upon an overwhelming majority. It is this section of the Charter that is often used to suit particular purposes and peculiar circumstances entirely divorced from the merits of the case. In short, it has become a whipping-boy of the United Nations.

37. While my Government fully supports the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of any State wherever such a case is sincere and genuine it cannot support any use of this Article for the purpose of maintaining colonial possession or of exploitation, by a tiny minority of the population, of the majority in any country against their will or wishes or of domination of a people for self-aggrandizement.

38. It will be peculiar as well as interesting to observe how those countries, and particularly those colonial Powers, which have been the champions of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, now vote on this part of the paragraph.

39. My delegation will support the first part of the operative paragraph, beginning with the words "Recalls that it is a permanent aim of the United Nations", and we shall abstain on that part of the paragraph beginning with the words, "non-interference in the internal affairs of any State". We shall abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

40. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): The Polish delegation had an opportunity to explain quite fully its position on the complaint of Cuba during the debate in the First Committee. Within the past two weeks we have listened attentively to the views and opinions expressed in the First Committee by representatives of countries in various regions of the world. In the course of that debate we also heard categorical assurances from the representatives of the United States, who solemnly declared that the United States was "not ... planning the slightest armed attack on Cuba",^{1/} and that the United States was not preparing any aggression against Cuba.

41. These declarations led the representative of India to express the hope, in the First Committee, that:

"Faithfully translated in practice, these assurances should help in allaying fears and in creating a better international atmosphere between Cuba and the United States, as indeed in the Western hemisphere in general."^{2/}

42. The first test for determining what was really behind those assurances came sooner than everyone probably expected. It came during our present proceedings in the General Assembly. The delegation of Mongolia submitted a draft resolution [A/C.385] prepared in a most careful way, seeking to avoid hurting anybody's feelings and taking into consideration the position of many non-aligned delegations. The authors of this draft resolution, in that spirit of compromise even went so far as to change the title of the document [see A/C.385/Rev.1], something which, according to my recollection of United Nations records, seems an unprecedented conciliatory gesture. It should be noted, further, that the only operative paragraph of this draft resolution contains a provision based directly on the text of the United Nations Charter. This paragraph was adopted only a few days ago, in the First Committee, by forty-one votes in favour, without any objections and the delegation of the United States itself abstained on it.

^{1/} This statement was made at the 1233rd meeting of the First Committee, the official record of which was published only in summary form.

^{2/} This statement was made at the 1240th meeting of the First Committee, the official record of which was published only in summary form.

43. Taking into account these circumstances and the assurances only recently presented by the United States representative, it would be most logical to expect the United States to welcome all those conciliatory efforts on the part of other delegations, and at least not to oppose the adoption of the Mongolian draft resolution. But unfortunately, it became clear once again how well-founded were, and are, our doubts and suspicions concerning all the solemn assurances expressed by the United States delegation. The real value of these assurances cannot be measured otherwise than by the deeds of those who pronounce them. Unfortunately, the way in which the United States delegation acts and behaves in this debate contradicts entirely their own words. We heard an example of this just a little while ago. The representative of the United States, in explaining his vote, presented us with a most unusual position which completely contradicts all logic and is inconsistent with the votes taken in the United Nations before. The United States representative, explaining his vote, announced that he will support the first paragraph of the draft resolution before us, and that he will then abstain on the second paragraph and then vote against the draft resolution as a whole. Now, is this not a most unusual way of voting on a draft resolution? If each of the paragraphs receives the support of the United States delegation or is of such a nature that the United States delegation cannot vote against it, why then, I ask, do they vote against the whole draft resolution?

44. And at the same time, the United States delegation did a most unusual thing by pressing, from this rostrum, all other delegations to vote in a similar way, and threatening them with the statement that voting in a different way would be voting with the socialist States, in one bloc, and would not be to the liking of the United States delegation. This is a most unusual thing from the parliamentary point of view, and from the political point of view as well.

45. Moreover, if this draft resolution is rejected, we think that not only the Cubans but all others, both in the Western Hemisphere and also all round the world, would have justified fears that once again the United States delegation did not wish to give a complete assurance, in the form of a United Nations resolution, of peaceful endeavours for the solution of the existing problems and conflicts between the United States and Cuba. This refusal to support the draft resolution which proposes that the principles of the Charter be taken into consideration, certainly strengthens our fears and should certainly make every delegation here more vigilant in regard to future events in the Caribbean area.

46. Mr. GARCIA INCHAUSTEGUI (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): We wish to say that we favour and will vote for the draft resolution submitted by the People's Republic of Mongolia [A/L.385/Rev.1], because the Revolutionary Government of Cuba carries out the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, and considers that faithful observance of these principles is the only guarantee that States will live together in a civilizing manner.

47. We wish to draw attention to the contrast between our attitude and that of the aggressive United States Government. That Government, because it opposes the principles of the Charter, has obstructed and tries to obstruct, through the votes of its military allies, the passage of every resolution enshrining

those principles. It would seem, that, from the colonialist point of view whenever one party to a conflict is the United States and the other a small State Member of the United Nations, all peaceful solutions are excluded.

48. This attitude of the United States Government is the best proof of its aggressions, and of its interventionist acts and statements. Obeying pressure from that Government, some Latin-American countries and the United States Government itself have said to the countries of the world: do not join in Cuba's complaint, do not present draft resolutions; this is an American regional affair. Yet they exclude Cuba from the regional body and deprive it of its legitimate rights in the Organization of American States. Their purpose is clearly to make a small State helpless by employing in this world Organization the same tactics of isolation and discrimination that they employ in the regional military alliance.

49. Nevertheless, the so-called Cuban problem is a problem also of America, Africa and Asia. It is the problem of all peoples struggling for their development, political and economic independence and national liberation. It is the conflict of all who struggle against colonialism and racial discrimination. It was not for nothing that the colonial allies of the United States joined it in voting against Cuba in the First Committee. This is perfectly clear to us and so is the fact that the struggle of peoples for their independence, and against foreign military bases and the policy of apartheid, is also our struggle, because everything that contributes to the independence of a small State is good for Cuba. We understand that and, although the representatives of some small States do not, their peoples understand it. In defending our own rights we have been defending the rights of those peoples.

50. Nevertheless, you may be assured of one thing: the powerful companies will not return to Cuba to exploit our people; racial discrimination widely practised by the United States Government throughout its territory, will not return to Cuba; illiteracy will not return to Cuba; unemployment and the administrative immorality put in power by the Americans will not return to Cuba. None of these atrocious signs of United States neo-colonialism will return to Cuba; they will not return because our people are resolved to prevent it, because they have prevented it.

51. In a press interview given last Saturday, 17 February, a well-known Central-American "democrat" called Somoza asserted that Cuba was outside the inter-American system and was therefore not protected by the international conventions, so that aid to any force invading our country was legitimate. The newspapers of Sunday, 18 February—and I can show you their headlines here—report that the United States Government has changed the second chief of its shadowy Central Intelligence Agency because he took part in directing the aggressive plans against Cuba carried out in April 1961. Also in that Sunday's newspapers, Mr. McNamara, Secretary of Defence of the United States, publicly approved the interventionist policy of his country's armed forces against all national liberation movements, and his Government's willingness to wage colonial wars to put them down. The newspapers of yesterday, 19 February, gave news of the pressure exerted by the United States Government on its NATO allies to co-operate

in the economic blockade against Cuba. This is only to cite what has been published in the United States Press itself during the past few days.

52. We have proved here—and proved it by documentary evidence, whatever the Assembly's vote may be and the First Committee's vote may have been—that the United States Government, by its permanent representative here and by its President, has lied to this great world Assembly.

53. We reaffirm our position that we have no aggressive designs on any neighbouring country. That would not only be contrary to our convictions; it would be a mistake we shall never commit, however much our enemies may want us to. We reaffirm that we have come here to defend the principles of international law, the principles of the Charter, and the right of our people and all peoples to adopt the social system they desire without suffering interference or aggression as a result. We will defend our independence and our sovereignty with Cubans in Cuba.

54. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We shall now proceed to vote on the draft resolution [A/L.385/Rev.1] submitted by Mongolia. I would remind the Assembly that we have before us, first, a request by the Colombian representative for a separate vote on each part, and then on the whole of the draft resolution. Now we have just had another request, from the representative of Liberia, for a separate vote on the phrase "and non-interference in the internal affairs of any State" in the operative part of the draft resolution.

55. If there is no objection to these motions for division, I shall consider that the Assembly has adopted them.

The motions for division were adopted.

56. I now put to the vote the preamble to the draft resolution. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Haiti, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Mauritania, Togo, Gabon.

The preamble was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

57. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put to the vote the phrase "and non-interference in the internal affairs of any State" in the operative part of the draft resolution. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Central African Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, 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.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada.

The phrase was adopted by 36 votes to none, with 64 abstentions.

58. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put to the vote the operative paragraph as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Central African Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ceylon, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, 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.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and North-

ern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada.

The operative paragraph was adopted by 39 votes to none, with 61 abstentions.

59. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Iceland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, 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, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary.

Against: Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, 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.

Abstaining: Ivory Coast, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Niger, Pakistan, Senegal, Sweden, Togo, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Finland, Gabon.

The draft resolution was rejected by 45 votes to 37, with 18 abstentions.

60. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have now completed the vote. I shall call upon those representatives who want to explain their votes.

61. Mr. MALHOTRA (Nepal): My delegation, in its statement in the general debate on item 78 in the First Committee [1241st meeting] made it clear, I hope, that we did not want to take any sides on the issue. Inasmuch as mutual distrust of one another on the part of the parties concerned lay at the root of the item on the agenda my delegation felt that the best possible course would be for those parties to take positive steps to remove the causes of mutual distrust and suspicion of each other's intentions. To that end my delegation had expressed satisfaction at the assurances given by the representatives of Cuba and of the United States in the First Committee. Nevertheless, since the matter had been brought to the notice of the United Nations and had been discussed on several occasions before, also in the various organs of the United Nations, my delegation thought fit to reiterate its conviction on the basic principles of non-intervention in the internal affairs of any State—the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

62. In consonance with our consistent stand on the item, when the only draft resolution before the First Committee [see A/5090, para. 3] was put to the vote,

my delegation voted for the second paragraph of the preamble, which recalled the principles referred to earlier by me. We also voted for operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution which asked for mutual negotiations between the parties concerned.

63. The draft resolution before the General Assembly had only one substantive paragraph, which also formed its only operative paragraph. The paragraph recalled the principles contained in Article 1, paragraph 2 and Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter; and in its wording it was exactly similar to the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution which had been considered in the First Committee. That particular paragraph, this Assembly may recall, was adopted unanimously by the First Committee without a single vote against it. Having already voted for the paragraph in the First Committee, we, in consistency with our stand, voted for it here.

64. We also voted for the draft resolution as a whole, because the adoption of such a resolution, in our view, would not have condemned any party and would only have reiterated the Assembly's faith in the basic principles of the Charter.

65. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): My delegation's vote on this item was consistent with our vote in the First Committee, and I would say consistent with the draft resolution which was before the First Committee [see A/5090, para. 3]. We voted for the preambular paragraph. We also voted for the operative paragraph. We abstained on the separate vote on the sentence containing the phrase "non-interference in the internal affairs of any State". And as this had been incorporated in the whole draft, we had to abstain on the whole draft.

66. Why did we abstain on the "non-interference in the internal affairs of any State"? We did so for two reasons, one specific and the other general. The specific reason is that in the case of the draft resolution before the First Committee, the first operative paragraph of that draft resolution, under which the General Assembly would have made an urgent appeal to the Government of the United States to put an end to the interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cuba, was rejected. It was rejected on the grounds that there was not a particle of evidence of such intention of interference by the United States, and that on the contrary, there was evidence of intention not to interfere at all.

67. So, having that in mind—and that was the decision of the Committee—if this phrase, "non-interference in the internal affairs of any State", was intended to imply that the United States had any intention of interfering, that implication would be contrary to what was decided in the First Committee. Therefore, for this specific reason, we abstained from voting on that sentence.

68. The general reason for which we abstained was that this operative paragraph which recalls the permanent aim of the United Nations, when it speaks about respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, is quoting exactly from Article 1, paragraph 2 of the Charter. When it speaks of non-interference in the internal affairs of any State, it is not quoting exactly but is referring to Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. That is an Article which is the subject of very great controversy. My delegation is one of those which believe that the intention of that Article—I have had the

opportunity to expound this theory on the question of South Africa, and probably that is why South Africa has voted for this paragraph—was that the object of the United Nations should be to develop more and more power in preventing situations where there is flagrant violation of human rights. That idea as I explained, was put forward by the original drafters—I quoted exactly, and I shall not do it now—when they said in effect, "We had to draft this in this way for the time being, but we consider that this will evolve into greater and greater power for the United Nations". And that was put forward by the United States representative at the San Francisco Conference. The same attitude was adopted also by the representative of Australia among the drafters, who was one of those in favour of inserting paragraph 7 in Article 2.

69. Therefore, the theory that that paragraph of Article 2, when it refers to general interference in the internal affairs of any State, implies that any State is a castle and that nobody can look into it—not even the United Nations—is one which we are against. We believe that the United Nations is humanity's only hope of progress towards universal peace based on universal freedom, and that the United Nations should not be curtailed in its power to intervene in the interests of peace and freedom.

70. So, for this general reason also, we abstained on this sentence and on the draft resolution as a whole.

71. Mr. KIZYA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): During the discussion of the question of non-interference in the affairs of Cuba, a sovereign State pursuing an independent policy and a Member of the United Nations, we saw for ourselves that the United States was exerting the most blatant pressure on the delegations of many countries. We witnessed undisguised hypocrisy and crude dictation, infringements of rules of procedure and violations of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter.

72. Statements by many representatives contained clear evidence of preparations for further aggression against the freedom of the Cuban people. Proof was given that gangs are being trained for the invasion of Cuba in the United States and at that country's many bases in the Caribbean. In today's editions, which have only just come out, the New York daily newspapers report that preparations for a new invasion of Cuba are being made in Guatemala; even the name of the commander of this bandit army—General Cabrera—is mentioned. Mr. Stevenson, the representative of the United States, notwithstanding these facts which he did not refute, made an unsubstantiated statement that the United States is not preparing any new aggression [1231st meeting of the First Committee]. Since, as I have already said, these facts have not been refuted, we must sound a warning against believing Mr. Stevenson. Our conviction on this point is well founded, for it was none other than Mr. Stevenson who attempted to mislead us last April. We do not believe the representative of the United States for the further reason that he has not only not refuted the telling facts that have been adduced, but has not replied to any of the direct questions put to him by Mr. Zorin, the representative of the Soviet Union. No one, including the representative of Guatemala, has refuted the direct statement of President Ydigoras Fuentes who, in a New Year speech, admitted that a new act of aggression was being prepared.

73. The United States delegation has sought to ensure that the United Nations—all of us who represent the countries of the entire world—should silently, I repeat, silently, condone and virtually sanction open acts of banditry by the United States Government, to begin with, against Cuba; this so-called experience would then be used against other Latin American countries which do not choose to obey the dictates of the United States monopolies.

74. It should be clear therefore why the delegation of the United States, in the First Committee and here in plenary, gave instructions to those delegations that are dependent upon it to ignore any draft resolution whatsoever. It is no coincidence that the representative of Peru, who is usually an eloquent and lengthy speaker, limited himself to a few words only when he spoke in the First Committee on 13 February 1962 [1239th meeting]. You will recall that he said Peru would not vote for the draft resolution of Romania and Czechoslovakia. It is true that he added: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman". And that was the end of his speech.

75. You may ask why this was so. It was because, as the representative of the Soviet Union so graphically put it, many delegations were gagged. They were given direct instructions to remain silent and to vote against any draft resolution whatever.

76. It may well be asked what there was in the Czechoslovak-Romanian draft resolution [see A/5090, para. 3] that was unacceptable to the Western Powers. The representatives of Israel and Cyprus have already given us the answer to this question. Speaking in explanation of their vote, they stated that they did not like the title of the draft resolution. Mr. Plimpton has just told us the same thing.

77. But, what was it which they did not like in the draft resolution of the Mongolian People's Republic and which caused them to vote against it? The draft resolution does not have the title that the United States delegation did not like and its contents repeat word for word—one of the most fundamental provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, a provision which has already been referred to in this Assembly by the representative of Liberia. The logical conclusion, therefore, is that you do not like the Charter of the United Nations, which you yourselves signed. You are brazenly flouting the most sacred document of our Organization—its Charter. You are flagrantly violating the rules of international law. Once upon this road, however, you may go so far that there is no returning.

78. We have completed the discussion of a very important question on the agenda of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly. Those who still harboured any doubts have received an excellent object-lesson in United States diplomacy—the art of arm-twisting and skull-cracking.

79. Attempts were made to convince us that the Cuban delegation had submitted this question unjustifiably, thereby intensifying the cold war, and that no one is threatening Cuba. Unfortunately, there were many "doubting Thomases" in the Assembly who, sincerely or erroneously, or possibly insincerely cast doubt on the existence of a threat to the freedom of the Cuban people. Time will be the arbiter.

80. So far as my delegation is concerned it, like all those to whom freedom and honour are dear, would be glad if the United States—not in word but in deed—

stopped brandishing its weapons and left Cuba in peace.

81. We would counsel the enemies of Cuba to heed the strong and sober words of the Soviet Government's statement 18 February 1962 [A/5093]:

"Cuba is not alone. It has many friends, not only in Latin America, but throughout the world, and among them is the Soviet Union. The Republic of Cuba, as has been clearly stated by the Head of the Soviet Government, N. S. Khrushchev, can always rely on the aid and support of the Soviet people. The Soviet Government's public warnings to the enemies of democratic Cuba remain in force today."

82. Mr. ILBOUDO (Upper Volta) (translated from French): In our anxiety not to be swayed by any bloc, we decided to repeat the vote we cast in the First Committee, in order to remain consistent with ourselves, although the draft resolution was submitted by a country whose allegiance to one of the blocs is perfectly obvious. In so doing we merely reaffirmed our adherence to the United Nations Charter, since some of the provisions of the Charter are reproduced in the resolution and since the principles thus invoked, particularly the principle of non-interference, are those which we firmly uphold. Thus we have voted against no one, just as we have voted for no one. We simply voted for the principles which we consider to be just and good.

83. Mr. MATSCH (Austria): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolution presented by Mongolia. I need not emphasize that Austria has always been in favour, and will always be in favour, of developing friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights, as well as for the principle of self-determination of peoples, and particularly for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of any State.

84. These principles, embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, have always guided the Austrian Government and will do so in the future. Nevertheless, a recalling of these principles or particular reference to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States in connexion with a complaint of "plans of aggression and acts of intervention" allegedly being executed by one Government against another Government would necessarily lead to the conclusion that such a complaint was justified and that the principles enumerated in the draft resolution were jeopardized or interfered with.

85. However, my delegation, after having listened carefully to the debate and to all the evidence submitted to the General Assembly and the First Committee, does not feel that such conclusions were justified. My delegation has noted with great interest and with much satisfaction that the representative of the United States of America declared twice, and formally, during the debate in the First Committee that:

"The United States had not been and is not preparing any aggression against Cuba."^{3/}

86. The discussion of this item has not produced, in the opinion of my delegation, evidence which would lead to doubts on this statement, nor has the debate

^{3/} This statement was made at the 1231st meeting of the First Committee, the official record of which, was published only in summary form.

convinced us that the principles of equal rights, of self-determination for all peoples and of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, were endangered.

87. For these reasons, my delegation was unable to support the Mongolian draft resolution.

88. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The position of the Soviet delegation was set out sufficiently clearly and fully during the discussion of this item. However, in view of the result of the vote, I too should like to explain my delegation's position and to make a number of comments on that vote.

89. The extensive discussion which has taken place during the last two weeks of this session of the General Assembly concerning the item submitted by the Revolutionary Government of Cuba has shown the great importance of this question for peace and the independence of States. During the general discussion in the First Committee, statements were made by representatives of thirty-eight States despite the obvious pressure exerted by the United States with a view to preventing an extensive discussion. In addition, the representatives of another ten States spoke on the draft resolution which was submitted to the Committee [see A/5090, para. 3] so that the total number of States Members of the United Nations which have given their views on this agenda item is now approximately half the membership of the Organization.

90. As you know, during the discussion in the First Committee of the question of aggressive actions by the United States against the Republic of Cuba, the representatives of twelve Latin American countries made statements. It will be recalled that not all of them took an independent stand, since their hands were tied as a result of obvious pressure exerted by the United States both at the current session of the General Assembly and outside the United Nations. Furthermore, a number of Latin American countries, which had refused to support the illegal decisions imposed by the United States against Cuba at Punta del Este,⁴ were compelled to remain silent in the United Nations because of further direct pressure by the United States. Nevertheless, even in such circumstances, during the debate in the First Committee, the representatives of two large Latin American countries—Brazil and Chile—took a position of their own differing from that of the United States, which was essentially defending its right to engage in blatant interference in the domestic affairs of Cuba.

91. It is also important to note that even the representatives of those Latin American States which have generally followed United States policy with respect to Cuba were almost all obliged at least to pay lip-service to the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States as such. The socialist countries took a resolute stand in the debate on the side of heroic Cuba and declared their full support for the just struggle that the Cuban people are waging for the freedom and independence of their homeland, the building of a new life, against interference by the United States in their domestic affairs, and against the new intervention being planned by the Government of the United States.

92. A large group of Asian and African countries took an active part in the discussion of the complaint by the Revolutionary Government of Cuba against the aggressive acts of the United States, which is eloquent proof of the concern caused throughout the world by the tense situation obtaining in the Caribbean through the fault of the United States Government. The seventeen African-Asian countries expressing their views on this question included influential Asian and African countries such as India, Indonesia, Ceylon, the United Arab Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Iraq, Morocco, Nigeria and others. As you know, not one of these countries, which do not belong to any military pacts or blocs, rose to the defence of the United States position or supported the United States either in its statements or in the voting.

93. During the voting, many other Asian and African countries, for instance, Afghanistan, Burma, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Upper Volta and several others, confirmed their *de facto* agreement with the position taken by those African-Asian countries. Although they did not participate in the debate, their votes clearly demonstrated their attitude towards the United States position.

94. The position of the neutral countries of Asia and Africa on the question under discussion, as set out in the statements of the representatives of those countries, was clear and unambiguous. They expressed themselves in favour of respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, of all countries practising tolerance and living together in peace as good neighbours, and of the maintenance of peace and international security; they expressed themselves against interference in the domestic affairs of States and against the threat or use of force in international relations. In short, in discussing the question of aggressive acts by the United States against Cuba the neutral countries of Asia and Africa, although there were some differences in their positions, spoke as a whole in favour of respect for the fundamental provisions of the United Nations Charter. This is the first conclusion to be drawn from the discussion in the First Committee.

95. The attempts by the United States to uphold its so-called right to interfere in the domestic affairs of another State found no support from the large Latin American countries or from the major Asian and African countries or from the socialist countries. The United States did not wish to see that result confirmed here, and organized manoeuvres designed to prevent the General Assembly from taking any decision whatsoever on this question.

96. Furthermore, in the discussion in the First Committee, the point was very clearly made that the acts which the United States is now committing against Cuba are completely contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter and also to the charter of a regional agency, the Organization of American States. Reaffirming their loyalty to the fundamental provisions of the United Nations Charter which prohibit interference in the domestic affairs of States and the threat or use of force in international relations, the representatives of a large number of States Members of the United Nations also expressed their disapproval of the attempts by the United States to subvert the Charter of the United Nations not only by its own aggressive acts against Cuba, but also by what might be called back stair manoeuvres.

⁴ Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, held at Punta del Este, 23-31 January 1962.

97. As you are aware, serious concern has been caused throughout the world, a concern also reflected in the discussion in the First Committee, by the fact that for the purpose of preparing further aggression against Cuba, the United States is making use of a regional agency, the Organization of American States, upon which it has imposed illegal decisions against Cuba. Although this represents an outflanking manoeuvre, it is all the more alarming in that, like the preparations for aggression against Cuba by the United States itself, it directly raises the issue of the fundamental principles of our Organization's Charter.

98. In their statements in the First Committee many Asian and African countries rightly made the valid point that the decisions taken at Punta del Este were not in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter and were in fact in direct conflict with them. As we all know and as was rightly emphasized by a number of representatives from these countries, no regional agency may take any enforcement action without the authorization of the Security Council. In point of fact, the contradiction between the decisions taken by the OAS at Punta del Este under United States pressure and the United Nations Charter is so obvious that even those Latin American countries which supported the United States position did not deny it. They merely attempted to find some means of justifying this patent contradiction.

99. Thus, another undeniably important conclusion to be drawn from the discussion in the First Committee is that the activities now being undertaken against Cuba by the United States of America and, under its pressure, by the Organization of American States are contrary both to the Charter of the United Nations and to the charter of the OAS. The fact that the United States today opposed a decision endorsing the principles of the United Nations Charter which were mentioned in the draft resolution submitted by the Mongolian People's Republic merely confirms that the actions it is already taking and those it is planning to take against Cuba are indeed in direct opposition to the Charter of the United Nations.

100. The acrobatics in which the United States engaged today in explaining its vote—a matter which has already been discussed in some detail by the representative of Poland—only shows how the United States is obliged to shift its ground in order to find some way of justifying the irrational position it took in this vote. It is regrettable that the independent countries of Western Europe and other continents which are military allies of the United States were compelled, because of their obligations as allies, to support this irrational position.

101. A further important conclusion to be drawn from the discussion in the First Committee is that the United States was politically isolated from its own allies. As you know, not a single ally of the United States in NATO, SEATO, or CENTO spoke in the First Committee in defence of that country's aggressive policy, not one of its allies came to this rostrum to defend this aggressive policy which finds no support anywhere in the world. In other words, while all the allies of the United States in military blocs not linked with it by a community of interests and, because of their position as allies, are compelled to vote with the United States even for non-sensical resolutions, they cannot openly defend such a position before world public opinion, for they realize that it would be condemned in their own countries.

This is significant, for an unjust cause cannot be defended.

102. The discussion at this session of the item submitted by the Republic of Cuba has clearly confirmed the incontrovertible fact that the overwhelming majority of peoples and Governments are alarmed by the present aggressive acts of the United States against Cuba, that they plainly warn the United States to refrain from any military adventures and fully reaffirm their loyalty to the principles of the United Nations Charter such as the maintenance of international peace and security, respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, non-interference in the domestic affairs of States, the unconditional renunciation of the threat or the use of force in international relations and the practice of tolerance by all peoples and countries, which should live together in peace as good neighbours.

103. The fact that in the voting here thirty-seven States voted openly in favour of this position, despite the pressure of the United States and its allies in military blocs, and that eighteen countries abstained and so did not associate themselves with the position of the United States, is a serious warning to the United States, because it signifies that the greatest countries of Asia and Africa, together with the socialist countries, amounting altogether to more than half of mankind oppose the United States position in this question.

104. If the United States, as Mr. Stevenson said in the First Committee on 14 February [1241st meeting], really believes in the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, it is completely incomprehensible why it voted against the Mongolian draft resolution. The explanations which the esteemed representative of the United States, Mr. Plimpton, attempted to give here cannot, of course, convince or satisfy anyone. After all, what did this draft resolution do? It simply recalled and reaffirmed well-known provisions of the United Nations Charter. And in the First Committee, as is known, forty-one delegations voted in favour of this, while not one delegation, including the delegation of the United States and those of the Latin American countries, voted against it.

105. The fact that now, in plenary meeting of the General Assembly, the United States has not wished to confirm openly, with its vote, those provisions of the Charter to which it did not object in the First Committee, merely displays its hypocrisy in defending the position which it adopted in that Committee. It is characteristic that the United States cannot bring itself to speak out openly against reaffirmation of the well-known provisions of the Charter and at first does not vote against those provisions, but subsequently votes against the resolution as a whole. What an absurd position!

106. At the root of the present manoeuvres of the United States, as of all its previous manoeuvres in the United Nations, lies the same unchanging motive: the United States does not wish to cease continuing its aggressive activities against Cuba, interfering further in its internal affairs, and preparing fresh military intervention against it. This is the most alarming thing, and it is to this that the attention of the whole world must be directed. The United States is simply exposing itself once more as an advocate of direct interference in the internal affairs of other States, as an advocate of the use of brute force in international relations.

107. It should be borne in mind, however, that we no longer live in a period when any State could with impunity resort to the use of force against another State. The Soviet Government's statement of 18 February [A/5093] has already been mentioned here. I should like to call attention to it once more. "Cuba is not alone", it says; and it is a fact that a majority of countries, representing the greater part of humanity, voted with Cuba—this is a fact which no one can deny.

"Cuba is not alone. It has many friends, not only in Latin America, but throughout the world, and among them is the Soviet Union. The Republic of Cuba, as has been clearly stated by the Head of the Soviet Government, N. S. Khrushchev, can always rely on the aid and support of the Soviet people. The Soviet Government's public warnings to the enemies of democratic Cuba remain in force today."

108. Only the members of the military blocs voted with the United States. But it is quite incomprehensible how neutral Austria crept into this company; we greatly regret that this should have happened, and the explanations given here by the esteemed Mr. Matsch convinced none of us. Austria in fact voted with the NATO, SEATO and CENTO military blocs. This is an actual fact, from which conclusions must be drawn. No explanations will help here, because such explanations explain nothing. They explain only that Austria, for some reason, voted with the NATO, CENTO and SEATO military blocs. That is the real fact which has to be considered and from which conclusions have to be drawn.

109. That only members of the military blocs voted with the United States indicates that only the United States and its allies in the military blocs are embarking on this dangerous road of preparations for military adventures, the use of force, and interference in the internal affairs of other States. The circumstance that the chief countries of Asia and Africa and the socialist countries, making up the greater part of mankind, voted for reaffirmation of the principles of the United Nations, for the protection of Cuba against interference in its internal affairs; is the most important political result of this debate, which should serve as a clear warning to the United States and those that follow in its footsteps.

110. Mr. JARGALSAIKHAN (Mongolian People's Republic) (translated from Russian): It is perfectly clear to us why some delegations did not wish to vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by our delegation. Our draft resolution simply reaffirmed the generally accepted fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, which should be observed by every member of our Organization.

111. When our delegation submitted this draft resolution, it was convinced that the draft would be adopted by the General Assembly, for in the First Committee no one objected to what was stated in that draft. Indeed, a simple recalling of the basic provisions of the United Nations Charter could have met with no objection from those who are really interested in conforming with the principles of equal rights, the self-determination of peoples and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

112. Reaffirmation of these lofty principles could be unwelcome only to those who have not yet abandoned the policy of force and are trying to impose their will on others. Apparently, much that was said in the

First Committee was not to the liking of some who still wish to see free and independent Cuba as their colony, as a source of wealth to them. One cannot be put off by a simple denial of the serious charges against the United States brought forward by many delegations on the basis of convincing facts. A most glaring example of the aggressive intentions of the United States was the recent conference at Punta del Este. All this bears eloquent witness to the gross interference by this great State in the internal affairs of little Cuba. The facts speak for themselves. The United States perpetrated aggression against Cuba in the recent past, and facts show that it is making preparations for fresh aggression.

113. On the other hand, the peace-loving policy of Cuba is well known to us. The Revolutionary Government of Cuba is following a consistent policy of peace and friendship between peoples on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence between States with different social and economic systems. We can therefore clearly see who it is that is threatening the security of the Caribbean area and who it is that is supporting the preservation and strengthening of peace in this part of the world.

114. The adoption of our draft resolution by the General Assembly could have made a clear contribution to a peaceful solution of these problems. We should not evade questions whose solution would help to restore calm in this region. Our delegation, as the sponsor of this draft resolution, accordingly considers that its rejection is not in keeping with the purposes of the United Nations.

115. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I give the floor to the representative of the United States, who has asked to exercise his right of reply.

116. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): I am sorry that, under the guise of explaining his vote, the representative of the Soviet Union has chosen to prolong so angrily and so threateningly his present futile offensive in the continued communist cold war against the free world. I am afraid that what we like to think of as his customary equilibrium has again been upset by the decisive defeat by the General Assembly of the transparent parliamentary manoeuvre which has just failed and by the unanimous—and I say "unanimous"—way in which all the American Republics voted together in the First Committee to reject the Cuban charges, and this morning in the Assembly to reject the propagandist manoeuvre brought in at the last moment by Mongolia on behalf of the Communist bloc.

117. The representative of the Soviet Union also seems to have forgotten that the Cuban charges, despite the desperate pressure by the Soviet delegation and its allies, received only eleven votes in the First Committee—not a single vote from any non-communist delegation. All the shrill and angry speeches in the world by communist orators cannot change that simple fact—the fact that the irresponsible Cuban charges were completely rejected by the First Committee and received nothing but communist votes in support.

118. The representative of the Soviet Union knows perfectly well, just as the General Assembly knows perfectly well, that the United States is firmly and completely devoted to all the principles of the United Nations Charter—the Charter which the United States took such a leading part in drafting and which it hopes

always to take a leading part in defending. But the representative of the Soviet Union must realize that neither the United States nor the majority of the Members of the General Assembly could be tricked

into supporting the transparent cold war propaganda resolution which has just been so decisively rejected.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.