

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1235th
MEETING

Friday, 9 February 1962,
at 11 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 (continued)

Page

393

Chairman: Mr. Mario AMADEO (Argentina).

AGENDA ITEM 78

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

1. Mr. SCHWEITZER (Chile) said that in the opinion of his delegation there was no evidence to substantiate the Cuban complaint, and Chile did not consider that there was any foundation for the allegations and apprehensions of the Cuban representative. It did not agree with the arguments and conclusions put forward by the Soviet Union, Romania, Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian SSR. Consequently, it would vote against the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia and Romania (A/C.1/L.309).

2. The United States had publicly, emphatically and repeatedly stated that it had no plans for aggression against Cuba. The sincerity of that attitude had been proved by the presence of the United States at the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States, held at Punta del Este in January 1962, and by its decision to deal with the Cuban problem through collective rather than unilateral action. Chile did not doubt the intention of the United States to fulfil its obligation, as a member of the Organization of American States, to refrain from intervening, militarily or otherwise, in the internal affairs of Cuba. Consequently, the strong attacks directed against the United States in the course of the debate was unwarranted. While the United Nations was a forum for the expression of all political opinions and ideas, it should not be used as a platform for propaganda and "cold war" tactics, which could certainly not contribute to international understanding or help to restore stability in the Caribbean area.

3. The meeting at Punta del Este had not been convened as a result of pressure from a great Power. Nor had it attempted to conceal the differences of opinion

which inevitably arose in any community of free peoples. However, the countries assembled at Punta del Este had agreed on certain basic principles—on the need to strengthen the effectiveness of the democratic system and to make it immune to penetration by totalitarian ideologies, by dealing with economic and social realities on a basis of justice and by directing efforts towards improving the lot of the common man in America, especially in the continent's under-developed areas. Chile still hoped that Cuba would revert to partnership in the inter-American system, with all the rights and responsibilities inherent in that partnership. But it should be remembered that the OAS was a legal and political body whose members were required to observe certain principles and practices based on its charter, the resolutions of its conferences, and the relevant treaties and conventions. Membership involved a pledge that the political organization of each State would be based on the effective exercise of representative democracy, the peaceful settlement of disputes, the observance of human rights, the promotion of economic progress and the preservation of the hemisphere's security.

4. The Cuban revolution was not a superficial phenomenon, but a phenomenon of substance, having very extensive repercussions. It would be futile to underestimate its historical significance or to denigrate it solely because of its ideological orientation or its close association with a particular bloc of Powers. While Chile did not approve of many aspects of the Cuban revolution, that did not prevent it from recognizing its importance and from seeking to learn from it those lessons which might be applicable to Latin America and the under-developed areas of the world. The factors which had caused the Cuban revolution would subsist so long as there was exploitation, poverty and ignorance in Latin America. As the Chilean Minister for Foreign Affairs had said at Punta del Este, the urgency of satisfying the Latin American peoples' need for a decent standard of life could not be ignored, but it was not necessary to pay for their prosperity by abandoning freedom. The anti-democratic influences being brought to bear on Latin America could not be fought by coercive or isolationist measures; they could be counteracted only by accelerating the process of structural change in the Latin American economic and social systems, so as to prevent the undermining of the structure by unrest resulting from impatience and distress. The threat to America's democratic institutions, and its countries' concern at subversion and at attempted interference by extra-continental Powers, were due not only to the Cuban revolution but to the basic conditions prevailing in the countries of the continent. The resolution entitled "Alliance for Progress" adopted at Punta del Este (resolution V) clearly stated that the accelerated economic and social development of the American republics was an essential condition for the preservation of their democratic institutions.

5. With the Alliance for Progress, the United States had inaugurated a new policy towards Latin America. The programme it proposed required structural changes, like land reform, together with a series of radical measures of an economic and social nature which would help to eliminate class privileges and to lead the continent out of semi-feudal backwardness. The United States was stimulating those changes.

6. For Chile, as for the other American countries, there could be no dilemma: it was not a matter of choosing between freedom and social justice, for they were not incompatible; they could go hand in hand. The nations of the American continent adhered to the principles of representative democracy, free elections, individual freedom, freedom of information and freedom of political self-determination. They regretted that the Cuban revolution had not been oriented towards observance of those principles; that it had not been a wholly indigenous product, but had been influenced by Powers and doctrines which had no part in the Latin American make-up. The danger presented to Latin America by extra-continental interference and communist penetration was a real one. However, while the Punta del Este meeting had issued a warning against that danger, it had, in resolution I, entitled "Communist offensive in America", rejected the idea of using it as a pretext for strengthening reactionary doctrines and methods which attempted to repress ideas of social progress. Chile was much concerned about how the Caribbean problem would be solved; but it was convinced that democratic government, peaceful coexistence and continental solidarity must be preserved in the Caribbean area, in accordance with the principles of the charter and resolutions of the Organization of American States and the Charter of the United Nations. The countries of the American continent were now determined to build a democracy that was truer and more just, and the United Nations would surely assist them in that endeavour.

7. Mr. ASTAPENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that it had become clear to everyone, since the invasion of Cuba in April 1961, that the United States had trained, armed and directed the participants in that undertaking. No attempt was any longer made to conceal the role played by the United States Central Intelligence Agency. Furthermore, the United States Government, which had not been brought to its senses by the failure of its 1961 intervention against Cuba, was preparing to carry out new armed aggression and was organizing acts of sabotage and diversion against that country. Neither the representative of the United States nor the representatives of its allies, including in particular Guatemala, had denied those facts.

8. The United States was arrogating to itself the right to decide what government the Cuban people and the peoples of other countries in the Western hemisphere and elsewhere should have, with whom they should maintain diplomatic relations, and with whom they should trade. The policy of the United States towards Cuba was one of the most vivid examples of an imperialist policy which threatened international peace and security.

9. The present policy of the United States towards Cuba was in keeping with its past policy of using marines in Latin America to defend the profits of the United States monopolies. According to The New York Times of 15 November 1961, Smedley Butler, a retired United States general, had asserted in his memoirs

that his mission in such Latin American countries as Mexico, Haiti, Cuba and Honduras had been to defend United States business interests. According to the 1 May 1961 issue of the magazine U.S. News & World Report, United States troops had between 1900 and 1934 intervened in Latin America thirty-one times for the purpose of defending the lives and property of United States citizens. The United States was attempting to justify its present actions in terms of the need to defend "democracy" and to combat the "communist menace". No one denied the right of the United States to adhere to the capitalist system. The question was whether it had the right to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries which did not share its ideological views. Such a policy was in clear conflict with the United Nations Charter, with international law and with the principles of peaceful coexistence.

10. The President of the United States himself had assumed full personal responsibility for the 1961 attack on Cuba. Furthermore, Mr. Nixon, the former Vice-President of the United States, had just said that he had been unable to discuss the Cuban situation freely during the 1960 Presidential campaign because he had known that the United States was preparing for an invasion of Cuba. Those facts were in striking contrast with the frequent appeals by United States representatives for the creation of a new world in which law and justice would prevail. In carrying out aggressive acts against Cuba, the United States was guided not by the United Nations Charter but by the interests of the United States monopolies; the latter, during the period 1950-1958 alone, had extracted from Cuba \$1,100 million in profits which could have been used for the construction of houses, schools and hospitals in that country. An article in the July 1961 issue of the quarterly review Foreign Affairs had described the extent to which the United States had controlled Cuba in past years.

11. The Cuban people had now thrown off the oppressive rule of the United States monopolies and their henchman Batista, and had become the masters of their own country. They had carried out a programme of agrarian reform and had assumed ownership of the basic means of production. Cuba's gross national product would be 60 per cent greater by the end of 1962 than it had been in 1958, while unemployment would be less than one-third as great as it had been at the end of the Batista régime. New houses and schools were being built, and illiteracy had been virtually wiped out in the single year of 1961. The present Cuban Government was strongly supported by the people and would not be replaced by one acceptable to the United States monopolies.

12. The peoples of all nations rejoiced at the achievements of the Cubans, but from Washington came hysterical cries about the threat to the security of the Western hemisphere. It was obvious that Cuba, a small peace-loving nation, was not going to use its armed forces in order to attack the United States or any other country. The charge made in the document entitled "The Castro régime in Cuba", issued by the United States Department of State, that the Cuban Government had armed a high percentage of the people, was mere hypocrisy; those who had organized the invasion of April 1961 would naturally wish to see Cuba weak and defenceless. Only a Government which enjoyed the support of its people would dare to arm them. The real basis for the charges was the fear of the United States that Cuba's success would inspire other countries to follow its example. United States monopolists had a

vested interest in maintaining the existing system which enabled them to draw about \$1,000 million from the Latin American countries every year in profits.

13. As for the charge that human rights were being violated in Cuba, it was hardly appropriate for such accusations to be made by the country which protected Franco and Salazar, the Hitlerite generals Heusinger and Speidel, and puppet régimes in Taiwan, South Korea and South Viet-Nam—not to mention Katanga. The United States remained silent while its friends, after the fashion of Batista, indulged in appalling cruelties, provided that it could maintain its foreign bases and continue to draw profits for its monopolies. In the United States itself, the Negro and Puerto Rican minorities were subjected to racial discrimination and people were imprisoned for their convictions. Finally, the United States had itself trained criminals to spill the blood of Cubans.

14. The policy of the United States had the twin aims of re-establishing the dominant position of its monopolies in Cuba and of frightening the other Latin American countries into submission. In the New York Herald Tribune of 24 April 1961, a columnist, David Lawrence, had actually called for direct intervention in Cuba, as a lesson to the other countries of the Western hemisphere. Those countries also were under heavy economic pressure: the United States Secretary of State, speaking in Uruguay on 21 and 25 January 1962, had made it quite clear that the successful implementation of the "Alliance for Progress" programme would depend on the adoption of collective measures against Cuba. The United States Press had made no secret of the fact that the moderate position taken by certain countries at the Punta del Este meeting would affect allocations under that programme—a programme which was designed, not to promote the independent industrial development of Latin America, but to preserve for the United States its sources of raw materials in the Latin American countries and to further its foreign policy aims. Nevertheless, a number of countries had, at Punta del Este, refused to give their support to aggression against Cuba.

15. The United States preparations for such aggression placed an absolute obligation on the United Nations to defend Cuba and thereby preserve international

peace and security. In that connexion, he drew attention to Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Charter and to that part of the Preamble which expressed the determination of the peoples of the United Nations to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours. Those provisions were being grossly violated by the United States, which by its recent actions had demonstrated its clear opposition to the principles of non-intervention and self-determination. It obviously intended to keep the whole Western hemisphere as its private preserve. At Punta del Este it had forced through a decision to exclude Cuba from the OAS, despite the fact that Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and Mexico, representing 140 million people, had refused to support it. Several speakers in the Committee, including the representative of Brazil, had shown that there was no legal basis for such a decision. On the pretext of combating an "alien ideology", the United States was trying to turn the OAS into a new Holy Alliance in order to suppress national liberation movements in Latin America. But times had changed since the Holy Alliance, and nothing could thwart the aspirations of the Latin American peoples to genuine independence, freedom and prosperity. Like Cuba, the Soviet Union had suffered military intervention and an economic blockade by the imperialists because it had placed power in the hands of the workers and peasants. But the efforts of the United States would fail against Cuba, as they had failed against the Soviet Union. The United Nations must come to the aid of Cuba, a small Member State which was seeking its support against intervention and aggression carried out in disregard of the recognized principles of international law, the United Nations Charter and other international agreements.

16. For those reasons, his delegation would support the draft resolution submitted by Romania and Czechoslovakia (A/C.1/L.309), which represented the minimum action that the situation required, and any country believing in the principles of equality, self-determination and non-intervention should support it. The Byelorussian SSR, like all peace-loving nations, stood at the side of the Cubans in their struggle and would give them all necessary aid.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.