

**UNITED NATIONS**



# **SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS**

**TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR**

**1696<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 15 MARCH 1973

**PANAMA CITY**

---

## **CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1696) . . . . .	1
Statement by the President . . . . .	1
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1
Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America in conformity with the provisions and principles of the Charter . . . . .	1

## NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIXTH MEETING

Held in the Legislative Palace, Panama City, on Thursday, 15 March 1973, at 4 p.m.

**President:** Mr. Juan Antonio TACK (Panama)  
later: Mr. Aquilino E. BOYD (Panama).

**Present:** The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, China, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1696)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America in conformity with the provisions and principles of the Charter.

*The meeting was called to order at 5.40 p.m.*

### Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): May I take this opportunity, first, on behalf of the Security Council to extend a warm welcome to the new Permanent Representative of the United States of America, Ambassador John Scali, and, secondly, on behalf of my delegation to tell him of our whole-hearted hopes that we shall be able to enjoy with him the same close and helpful co-operation and collaboration we had with his illustrious predecessor. That is our sincere desire.

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

**Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America in conformity with the provisions and principles of the Charter**

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received from a number of representatives of Members of the United Nations letters in which they ask to be allowed to participate without the right to vote in the consideration of the question on our agenda, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter. The States concerned are the following: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Mauritania, Mexico, Uruguay, Venezuela and Zaire.

3. In accordance with the established practice of the Council, and there being no objection, I shall invite the representatives of these States to take the places reserved for them in the Council chamber so that they may participate, without vote, in the Council's consideration of the question on the agenda, it being understood that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when they wish to make a statement.

*At the invitation of the President, the representatives of Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Mauritania, Mexico, Uruguay, Venezuela and Zaire took the places reserved for them.*

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As members will recall, in a letter to the President of the Council on 28 February 1973 [S/10892], the acting representatives of Panama and Peru asked the Council to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to the Secretary-General of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL) and to the delegation accompanying him.

5. I understand the Council has decided to extend an invitation to the Secretary-General of OPANAL and the delegation accompanying him to participate in the meetings of the Council. At the appropriate time, and with the consent of the Council, I shall invite the Secretary-General of OPANAL to address the Council.

*It was so decided.*

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Council will now continue its consideration of the question on its agenda.

7. General DE LA FLOR VALLE (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, as Minister for External Relations and representative of Peru in the Security Council I am doubly honoured and pleased to find myself in the capital of this noble nation and under the enlightened leadership of you, Sir, the young and brilliant leader of the Panamanian revolution.

8. The deep ties of history and affection existing between Peru and Panama were born in the heroic days of the discovery of America, when the men that linked us to Western civilization set out from this land, and those ties continued in their eloquent interweaving with the feats of the group of Panamanian soldiers who in 1824 helped to strengthen our own independence and that of all America

at the well-known battle of Ayacucho. Those among many other events have dictated an unalterable friendship between Peru and Panama, which today reaches culmination in the wholehearted support of Peru for this valiant republic in a claim in which its Government and people are indissolubly linked and are bending all their efforts.

9. Mr. President, I trust that under your wise and prudent leadership this first series of meetings of the Security Council in Latin America will achieve results in keeping with the hopes of our peoples.

10. The Security Council is once again assembled outside the usual place of its meetings; first it met in Addis Ababa and now, secondly, it is meeting in Panama. But these choices are not haphazard. They prove clearly how international peace and security are intimately linked to the problems confronted by the third world. Asia, Africa and Latin America stand as marginal zones around the main centres of power which, in the last 25 years of international history, have been the arena of conflicts that have pitted not only small countries against one another but, primarily, the great Powers. The horror and fear of nuclear war allowed the two greatest Powers in the world to establish a balance which thus avoided a frontal confrontation but shifted it to other regions of the world, in this case the third world, where there was gradually awakened a united awareness and an understanding that true liberation is not solely political but also economic and cultural.

11. Latin America was born to life politically independent, as a result of the military struggle against the colonial Power; but immediately thereupon a new economic dependence was created owing to the interpenetration and domination of the area by the capitalist industrial system. This gave rise, firstly, to the establishment of primary production in the region, and, secondly, through dependence, to a transfer of capital to the dominant industrial centres. Thus, on the one hand, development began and, on the other, under-development.

12. As a consequence of this the under-development of the nations of the third world cannot be explained away as a stage in the national economies of those countries when comparing them to those of the industrialized nations, but rather is the result of a process of their dependence on the others. But that historical domination alienated our peoples and undermined their identity, which even led to an alienation of the individual, that being another type of violence and, without any doubt, the most profound damage caused by such dependence.

13. The history of the peoples of Latin America has been marked by the similarity of the structures of dependence and by the lack of union among them, encouraged by the dominating Powers. But fortunately today in our region there is emerging a new and clear awareness of its political, economic and social reality and of the need for revolutionary changes.

14. Social upheaval, the product of misery, hunger, disease and ignorance, is now becoming a positive and creative force which will repel any type of domestic or external oppression. Thus we are now entering upon a qualitative

change in the history of mankind and thereby of international relations.

15. Peace has been spoken of in Latin America, but peace understood as the lack of warlike violence. However, that systematic violence that constantly attacks human life is not always approached in the right way—a violence that exists on the social level and grows in the injustice of economic imbalance, a violence born of social and economic discrimination. You cannot build true peace on it, much less can you build justice with it, for peace cannot rest on daily coercion and pressure which are the seeds of conflicts. And thus it is indisputable for us that the terms security and development are the crux of a single unit. Security cannot naturally exist where difference and discrimination are the order of the day, where injustice has become a rule of life and is used as an instrument for social and political disputes. This clear and firm conviction has led my Government to place the problem of security within the framework of development, and it is this concept that leads us today here to ask that the problems touching the security of the continent and the prevention of conflicts should be approached also from this same standpoint. The Council, the supreme body for international security, whose mission is to deal with situations that threaten international peace and security, cannot—in the preventive functions that fall to it—turn a deaf ear to the existence of these situations where to a large extent, as a profound and well-defined motivation, lie social and economic frustration

16. At present in Latin America we could not truly speak of warlike conflicts that fall within the purview of the classic definition of aggression. But there is a structural situation that generates a rising process of frustration, which becomes more acute daily and, if not solved, can result in situations that will lead to breaches of international peace and security.

17. In the consideration of the situations included in the subject on our agenda: "Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America in conformity with the provisions and principles of the Charter", we must draw the attention of all to certain specific facts where, because of non-application of the purposes and principles of the Charter, international peace and security are endangered. The Council must deal with these situations in order to prevent future conflicts which today can be envisaged.

18. First of all, I would refer to the problem of the so-called "Canal Zone" which the Republic of Panama has been confronting since its independence was achieved and which is a shattering example of an unjust relationship between sovereign States. The situation of the Canal cannot be legally defined otherwise than as a colonial enclave. This was very simply, humanely, patriotically and revolutionarily defined for us this morning [1695th meeting] by General Omar Torrijos, the head of Government, in the statement which he made at the opening of these meetings of the Council. I am sincerely grateful to him for having made special mention of my own country, Peru.

19. Peru, because of our close fraternal links with the Republic of Panama as well as our nationalist and Ameri-

canist convictions, which have repeatedly been affirmed by the indisputable chief of the Peruvian revolution, General Juan Velasco Alvarado, feels in duty bound to state that the solution of this threatening problem of the Canal Zone, which has been weighing for 70 years on the dignity of a people of Latin America, must be solved within the framework of justice. We believe an agreement should be arrived at that will unequivocally establish the full sovereignty and unhampered jurisdiction of Panama over its entire territory, and enable Panama to have full responsibility for the functioning of the inter-oceanic Canal, allowing it freely to dispose of its natural resources and to enjoy just participation in the economic benefits derived from it. The solution to this unjust relationship must also guarantee a true peaceful use of this waterway to the benefit of the international community, through neutralization of the Canal as a major contribution to international peace and security.

20. The persistence of colonial situations in Latin America constitutes a further, permanent threat to the maintenance of peace and security in the region. Despite the fact that on our continent the shattering of the colonial and political shackles of dependence took place in the majority of cases at the beginning of the last century, there still exist in America territories under colonial domination, and an end must finally be put to this. We therefore believe it imperative that the principles of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly be fully implemented.

21. When we speak of critical situations in Latin America we must perforce refer to all those forms of coercion resorted to by imperialism in order to maintain internal and external dominion over our countries. Among these are all those economic and political measures that some Latin American nations have lately defined as economic aggression designed to bend the will of those countries that follow independent lines for their development, thereby affecting the interests of the large enterprises.

22. The existence and application of the amendments known as Pelly, González, Hickenlooper and others are open proof of the policy followed by the United States in open contradiction with the most elementary principles of international coexistence because they hinder the progress of the developing countries. In the defence of its natural resources Peru has taken a position of open denunciation of the existence of those amendments as well as of the so-called transnational enterprises that use such forms of coercion to protect their illegitimate interests.

23. In the exercise of our sovereignty and marine jurisdiction over the 200 miles of sea adjacent to our coasts, we constantly confront problems because of the predatory attitude of private enterprises encouraged by States that on this matter follow a policy that is at variance with the elementary principles of international co-operation and friendship, creating situations of conflict that might affect the peace and security of the continent. Peru contends and will continue to contend that its oft-defined marine right is just. It is based on legitimate geographical, geological, economic and social reasons, and the threat of the

application of coercive measures cannot intimidate us in the exercise of our sovereign right.

24. In international relations, the transnational character of great enterprises is at present very often defined as a characteristic of the world of today. These enterprises maintain a network of operations that go beyond their own States and, without being subjects of international law, adopt their own decisions and exert coercion in order to control our wealth as well as our economic and financial lives.

25. The countries of Latin America which, like Peru, are devoting themselves to the transformation of their socio-economic structures find in certain of these transnational enterprises one of their main obstacles because in many cases they bring about coercive measures that affect international co-operation when they create virtual economic or financial blockades against us in the international sources of credit and even interfere in international trade itself.

26. Thus we should mention that the measures I have just referred to constitute violations of the Charter, as recognized in a series of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

27. Furthermore, we consider that the alienation of one of the members of the inter-American community and the blockade imposed upon it are not precisely measures that are likely to lead to peace and security in the continent. Rather, they encourage friction and division among peoples that have a common origin. The isolation of the sister republic of Cuba is at variance with the principles set forth in the Charter. We believe that Latin America, a multiple reality that does not contradict the basic unity of its peoples, needs for the normal regulation of its international life the recognition of the full play of political and ideological pluralism which, furthermore, would be more in keeping with the period of understanding upon which the international community has embarked.

28. Peru, which has encouraged and advocated the Treaty of Tlatelolco,<sup>1</sup> calls for the great Powers that have not already done so to adhere to it and repeats here the danger inherent in the continuation of nuclear tests, particularly those being carried out in the South Pacific, which are a threat and a risk for the human environment and are not in keeping with the present moment of détente which the world is enjoying.

29. I have ventured to stress some of the most flagrant cases which threaten international peace and security in Latin America. The Council now knows the situation; its duty is to co-operate in solving these problems.

30. We know that it will not be very easy to take the first steps to start our search for a solution. However, I consider that the indispensable measure to strengthen and maintain international peace and security in our region is to start truly and effectively to implement the principles and

<sup>1</sup> Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, p. 326).

provisions of the Charter. I do not believe that there is a single State member of this Council that could deny this appeal. Furthermore, Peru feels that all the members of this principal organ of the United Nations should arrive at a consensus which, declared by the President, will take up those cases that have been raised and express the existence of goodwill in the consideration and solution of these problems. Thus the Council would have fulfilled in Panama one of its noble and important tasks and would have given the peoples and Governments of the region renewed faith in the United Nations.

31. Peru wholeheartedly supports the Panamanian position. We do so with determination not only because of the justice it bespeaks, which constitutes a true claim felt by all Latin America, but also because it is fully in keeping with our own foreign policy which we have manifested in a series of specific acts in the last few years. The Canal Zone, which geographically, politically, economically and socially belongs to the Republic of Panama, is an indissoluble part of its national territory and its restoration is one of the inevitable and fundamental factors in the development of the Panamanian nation and in the elimination of a focus of permanent tension in America.

32. We sincerely believe that in the just solution of this substantive problem of America the United States is being offered a decisive chance to draw a fine line between a past of misunderstanding regarding Latin America and a future of constructive participation in true and reciprocal respect, laying the groundwork for friendship and co-operation which we shall not reject.

33. Drawing inspiration from its humanistic, just and libertarian revolutionary process, Peru will continue to contribute to the building of an era of international peace and security in Latin America and in the world as a whole.

34. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I invite the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guyana, Mr. Shridath Ramphal, to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

35. Mr. RAMPHAL (Guyana): Mr. President, allow me first of all to record my thanks for being permitted to address the Security Council on this important occasion in the international life of Latin America and, if I may say so, in the life of the Council also. Permit me also to extend my congratulations to you on your accession to the office of President of the Council. It is, of course, a double honour that during the month of Panama's presidency the Council is holding for the first time a series of meetings on the soil of a Latin American country and in this your own beautiful capital city. As a sister Latin American State, we share the pride which you, the Government and the people of Panama must feel at this distinction. We convey through you to your Government our thanks and congratulations on the generosity and excellence of the arrangements that have been made.

36. I do not know if this second occasion of an "away" fixture—to use the language of the national sport of Latin America—suffices to make what was a precedent at Addis Ababa a practice of the Council. Whether or not it does, my

Government wishes to go on record as giving its support in full measure to the holding of meetings of the Council from time to time outside its Headquarters in New York, and especially in the developing regions of the world.

37. One of the burdens under which the United Nations labours is that for all too many of the world's people its workings seem to be unrelated to and entirely remote from their personal lives and the well-being of their societies. The very nature of international diplomacy accounts in part for this involvement gap; but there are other factors which contribute as well, and one at least is the concentration of activity in New York and in the great cities of the developed world which house the headquarters of the specialized agencies.

38. We cannot make the Security Council itinerant; but these occasional series of meetings in regions of the world for whose security and development the United Nations carries so major a responsibility, and whose Governments are foremost among its champions when internationalism is at stake, are of immeasurable value. They greatly, I suggest, enhance the prospect of making the proceedings of the United Nations a genuine dialogue of mankind.

39. My presence is a token of our support for such a series of meetings; but it is an earnest also of the importance we attach as a hemispheric State to the character of the Council's deliberations at these meetings at Panama City—to its wide-ranging: "Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America in conformity with the provisions and principles of the Charter".

40. It is one of the deficiencies of our organizational arrangements at the international level that the Security Council spends most of its time occupied with specific threats and actual breaches of world peace and security. All too little time is set aside for the essential tasks of review and appraisal of the prospects for a durable peace and for meaningful security in world-wide terms, or even in terms of the world's regions. This functional imbalance has produced serious practical difficulties for the discharge by the Council of its primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security under the Charter. Hurdled into session, nearly always too late to save innocent lives and to prevent social and economic dislocation, invariably after one or more of the permanent members has become involved in or in some way identified with the conflict, paralysed by the potential of the veto, the Council more often than not stages a contest in semantics and propaganda while the conflict rages.

41. Until it is accepted that the ultimate interests of all States are not served by a system which reduces this Council to impotence at the moment when the peace and security of the world most demand its vigorous and effective intervention, until the necessary steps are taken more truly to democratize international relations, there is little prospect indeed of dramatic improvement in this area of the Council's activity. But it is the clear duty of the Council continuously to explore new ways of discharging its responsibilities; and one of these must surely be the elaboration and development of that preventive diplomacy

which has already begun to evolve out of the experience of the Council, and which was in the beginning conceived as United Nations intervention in areas of conflict outside of, or perhaps marginal to, the spheres dominated by cold-war struggles.

42. Save for the crisis in 1962—a crisis which in an important sense marked the beginning of the end of the cold war—Latin America has been a region free of cold-war conflicts. What better theatre than for the practice of preventive diplomacy than these lands of Central and South America and of the Caribbean. The Treaty of Tlatelolco, once given the dimension of universality, can provide a back-drop for such diplomacy, and this series of meetings, in its function as a kind of diagnostic instrument, can provide the Council with the cases in Latin America to which initiatives should be directed. But we are of course now entering a period when such a diplomacy can have a wider reach. In this time of détente, of negotiation and consultation, of cautious withdrawal and disengagement, is there not room for the effective practice, even within the former theatres of conflict, of preventive diplomacy?

43. The perception that Article 34 of the Charter provides a rich source of constitutional authority has already done much to strengthen the Council's effectiveness and to develop the Organization's peace-keeping role. It is unquestionably the case that acts of aggression have been discouraged through United Nations presences appointed to observe, to report and to publicize activities in troubled areas of the world. The most recent mission sent by the Council to Zambia<sup>2</sup> is very much a case in point. Meetings of the Security Council outside its New York Headquarters may have much the same therapeutic effect for an entire region that a United Nations presence has been shown to have for specific trouble areas.

44. But preventive diplomacy, like preventive medicine, should not await the manifestation of ill health. The investigative jurisdiction conferred by Article 34 is not restricted to specific disputes brought to the Council on the basis of adversary proceedings. It can and should be invoked by the Council itself responsive to its obligations for maintaining peace and security in all the regions of the world. And what better way of doing so than by institutionalizing a system of periodic checks through discriminate use of the power conferred by Article 28, paragraph 3, of the Charter?

45. And when it is urged, as it has been urged, that meetings of the Security Council such as these in Panama provide a forum for deliberations more properly within the competence of regional organizations, let it be remembered that regional organizations, quite apart from the implications of selective membership, are susceptible to misuse for the silencing of debate and the avoidance of settlement rather than for effective dialogue upon vital issues. Let us acknowledge that regional institutions have on occasions been so misused.

46. Meeting from time to time in different regions of the world to inquire into their state of health in terms of the

<sup>2</sup> Security Council Special Mission established under resolution 326 (1973).

maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security, the Security Council can greatly assist in advancing respect for the Charter, in discouraging and deterring policies, programmes and campaigns violative of its provisions and, generally, in maintaining and strengthening peace and security in the area. I venture to suggest, with all humility, that through a system such as this, a system of periodic regional meetings, the Security Council may have within its grasp more effective machinery for the discharge of its primary responsibilities than we have hitherto believed to exist.

47. As one of the States of the Latin American region we are, of course, especially pleased that the opportunity has been provided to focus attention upon the problems of this region. It is indicative of the reality of the role which the States of Latin America are now playing in the world community that this is the fourth time within the last few years that a major international conference has been convened within the region.

48. In Lima, Peru, in November 1971, 96 countries of the Group of Seventy-Seven met to consider a common strategy for developing countries. In April 1972, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at its third session brought together at Santiago, Chile, 141 countries of the developed and developing world on the specialized issue of the international development strategy. Later that year, when the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries convened in Georgetown, Guyana, the representatives of 70 countries of the third world united in their resolve to secure the reality of political and economic independence. Today, the Security Council meets in Central America in this dynamic and courageous Republic of Panama.

49. On all four occasions the issues under deliberation were and are of international significance; but their Latin American locale is symbolic of the reality of concern for change in the hemisphere, of identification with those beyond the hemisphere who share similar problems, of an acknowledgement that solutions lie not in hemispheric arrangements alone, but in a widening of the bases of unity and of joint effort founded upon it.

50. Latin America is no longer an enclave of the western hemisphere pursuing a destiny determined by intra-hemispheric relationships and speaking with a muted voice on issues of wider import. Throughout Central and South America and the Caribbean region there is a stirring that rejects a closed identity. There is a perception of global involvement that inspires contribution to an international effort acknowledging no regional frontiers. The meetings of the Security Council here in Panama City with an agenda devoted to the problems of the hemisphere reflect the understanding of Latin America that its problems are legitimately the concern of the international community no less than that in the resolution of the problems of that wider community the States of Latin America have contributions to make and obligations to fulfil.

51. For some of us in the hemisphere there are additional reasons for welcoming an international forum that focuses attention on the problems of Latin America since the

Institutions of Latin America do not speak for us all, or permit us all to speak within them. Each year, for example, the Foreign Ministers of Latin America meet in the General Assembly of the Organization of American States. Guyana has no voice within those councils. Almost the youngest of the American States, we have been rendered ineligible for membership of the hemisphere's principal regional organization on the basis of quarrels not with us but with our erstwhile colonial masters.

52. I say this not in anger but in sadness; for what is diminished thereby is not Guyana or Guyana's sovereignty or Guyana's integrity—territorial or political—nor, of course, Guyana's resolve to protect and defend them all. What is diminished is the organization itself. What is blunted is the cutting edge of the hemisphere's solidarity; what is lost is the moral strength of an appeal in the name of justice and right on other issues when appeals in their name go unheeded within the hemisphere itself. This series of meetings of the Security Council helps in significant measure to fulfil one of the primary functions of the United Nations, namely, to redress at the international level imbalance, injustice and inequities created, sustained and allowed to go unrequited at the level of region.

53. Let me now turn to the more substantive issues within the ambit of the Council's agenda. As I do so, I remind myself of the need for frank exchanges, for eschewing pretensions and for avoiding a vanity that buries beneath a mountain of self-adulation the wrongs and deficiencies of which the region rightly is not proud. Let us not indulge the conceit of believing it to be in the interest of Latin America to present a fantasy of an untroubled region in which a régime of peace, justice and progress prevails. It would be a false conceit; for, as the Minister for External Relations of Peru has just so vividly depicted, such is not the scene in Latin America today.

54. The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America—the Treaty of Tlatelolco—presents a good example of these dangers of falsification. My Government has acknowledged before, indeed within the General Assembly itself, the great achievement of this self-imposed régime of restraint. It is an achievement worthy, in the main, of the approbation of this Council as a practical step at the regional level towards the maintenance of international peace and security. It is an example which, in most respects, should inspire the emulation of other regions of the world so that ultimately at the international level we may move from the stage of non-proliferation to total prohibition of nuclear weapons. My Government has always, both within the United Nations and outside it, identified itself in a wholehearted way with the objectives of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

55. But Guyana is not a signatory to this Treaty—and Guyana is not a signatory for the very practical reason that we are said to be excluded by its provisions from accepting its obligations. Members of the Council may find it especially surprising that this violation of the principle of universality should be perpetrated in a Treaty whose objectives can be effectively fulfilled only if its obligations are imposed in a comprehensive manner. The absurdity of the exclusion is further compounded by the irrelevance of

the consideration upon which it is founded, namely, in the language of article 25 of the Treaty, the existence "prior to the date when this Treaty is opened for signature, of a dispute or claim between an extra-continental country and one or more Latin American States".

56. A curious logic seems to have guided the framers of the Treaty in thus tainting its otherwise estimable provisions with this exclusionary doctrine taken from article 8 of the Charter of the Organization of American States. It is a curious logic because that article was designed as an instrument of pressure on young developing States either to purchase their independence at the price of their patrimony or to surrender it thereafter as a ticket of admission to the OAS. It is bad enough that these conceptions should have informed the framers of the Charter provision. It is difficult to understand by what processes they could have carried over into a treaty intended to establish a nuclear free zone in Latin America.

57. It was natural, therefore, that when the Treaty of Tlatelolco engaged the attention of the General Assembly at its twenty-second session this provision should have aroused the active concern of many delegations. That concern found expression in the sixth preambular paragraph of resolution 2286 (XXII), by which the General Assembly, though welcoming the Treaty with special satisfaction, noted that "it is the intent of the signatory States that all existing States within the zone defined in the Treaty may become parties to the Treaty without restriction". That notation of the intention of the signatory States was based on understandings reached after intensive consultations preceding the vote on resolution 2286 (XXII). It was an understanding expressly recorded in the statements of many of the delegations that spoke during the debate on that resolution.

58. To date, that understanding has not been respected and that expectation has not been fulfilled. Just under five years ago, on 23 April 1968, the Government of Guyana formally indicated to the depositary Government its intention to sign the Treaty and to accept its obligations. It is our understanding that the machinery established to examine the matter consequent upon that request has not yet made it possible for a definitive reply to be sent; although, let me make it quite clear, for this result we lay no blame at the door of the depositary Government.

59. Meanwhile the situation has grown even more anomalous for under Additional Protocols I and II to the Treaty certain extracontinental States exercising a metropolitan presence in the Caribbean have now become signatories to the Treaty, including States with which there exist those quarrels which have been made the occasion for Guyana's exclusion.

60. Once more, as with article 8 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, while Guyana may be sinned against by this unwarranted deviation from the principle of universality, it is the régime of denuclearization which the Treaty seeks to establish that really suffers. For, let me repeat, so long as a single State in Latin America is placed under disability in accepting the obligations of the Treaty its operation will be impaired and the full attain-



ment of its objectives frustrated. And, of course, beyond the Treaty and its objectives, these exclusionary arrangements damage the fabric of Latin American co-operation through their discrimination against member States of the region.

61. I have mentioned this matter at some length because at these meetings the Council ought unquestionably to mark the contribution of the Treaty to international peace and security in Latin America and, as it does so, the Council should be as aware of its inequities as it is of its potential. But I mention it also because this conscious breach of the principle of universality epitomizes attitudes carrying over from an earlier period that can have an important bearing on the prospects for peace and security in the region and, therefore, on the Council's examination of means for their maintenance and strengthening.

62. We are satisfied that no good cause is served—certainly not now served—by policies of isolation, of exclusion, of discrimination, directed against any member of the family of American States. In those cases in which we are the victims of such policies we shall continue to speak out in the name of principle. In those that involve other States, such as the Republic of Cuba, we have already taken those steps within our own power to pursue policies, and to develop relationships founded upon them, that justice and principle dictate.

63. However, peace and security in the hemisphere do not end with the prohibition of nuclear weapons. It is relatively easy for Latin America to eschew the use of that which it does not possess. What is needed if international peace and security in Latin America is to be maintained and strengthened in conformity with the provisions and principles of the Charter is for all States within the region, and for all States in the hemisphere and beyond in their relations with Latin America, to elevate the principles of respect for the sovereignty of other States, for their territorial integrity, for the security of their boundaries settled on the basis of treaties solemnly concluded, for their right to determine and pursue the patterns of their social, political and economic systems; for freedom from interference through intervention, pressure or intrigue—to elevate these principles to the level of a national ethos—to move them from the level of public asseverations to that of guiding rules of national conduct.

64. Such a move from precept to practice is a prerequisite to peace and security, for the history of man is littered with discarded principles as each offender contrives his own justification for the course on which ambition, bigotry or hatred sets him. Throughout the world, the racist masquerades his evil, the expansionist his greed, the interventionist his obsession to control, always with the righteousness of national cause. Principles by which States have lived and in whose name they continue to appeal for right and justice in other issues are rationalized away with spurious but implacable argument.

65. In Latin America we can help to minimize these dangers by avoiding the temptation of complacency; by refusing to accept every protestation as a promise or every undertaking as a guarantee; by maintaining a vigilant watch

over those principles which have long been the creed of Latin America; by ensuring through their preservation and practical observance that Latin America makes to the world community the contribution to international peace and security for which it is almost uniquely qualified; and by demanding that all other States make their contributions in like manner to the peace and security of Latin America.

66. However, no measure of conformity to the principles of the Charter will guarantee an effective and durable régime of peace and security in the hemisphere unless it is matched by a complementary effort at all appropriate levels both within and outside the hemisphere to create conditions of economic security. My Government shares with the Government of our great neighbour, Brazil, the firm conviction that a concept of collective economic security must underlie and, where necessary, reorient international efforts in the developmental field.

67. We believe, moreover, that the elaboration of this concept lies within the mandate of the Security Council to preserve international peace and security. Unless and until new institutions arise or existing institutions, such as the Economic and Social Council, enlarge their scope of concern and initiative to encompass this responsibility, we consider it to be essential that the Security Council should acknowledge the legitimacy of these considerations in the fulfilment of its traditional role.

68. It is pertinent, therefore, in the context of the Council's examination of means for securing the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America, that account be taken of the economic condition of the region. The realities of that condition are startling in the extreme. The international statistic that for two-thirds of the world's population the human environment is dominated by poverty, malnutrition, illiteracy and misery is fully reflective of the state of the human environment in Latin America. The region itself is acutely conscious of these deficiencies generated by conditions of underdevelopment as well as by the maldistribution of such meagre gains of development as have arisen.

69. Out of this acknowledgement there has come from Latin American States initiatives over a wide spectrum of economic activity. Of these, none are more significant than those which are responsive to the urge of peoples throughout the region to take control over their economic destinies despite the hazards and impediments posed by the international economic system. Among the developing countries, the Latin American region has been playing a prominent if not, indeed, a leadership role in this new thrust for economic security.

70. Certain principles, in particular, have informed these efforts: respect for the permanent sovereignty of all States over their natural resources, whether of the land or of the seas and submarine areas adjacent and subjacent to their coasts; respect for and active support of the right of all States to carry out such collective and structural changes as they deem indispensable to their social and economic progress; the necessity for effective dialogue with the dominant economic Powers and, more especially, with the dominant economic Power within the hemisphere itself, so

that economic relations may more closely reflect the declared objectives of the international development strategy; and beyond relations between States, a determined effort to grapple with the many-sided problems arising from the economic power complexes for which the multinational corporations have been responsible.

71. These efforts, founded on the concept of self-reliance, need and deserve the positive support of the Council as Latin America enters a crucial period of change. Let the Council set its face against all efforts to stifle the legitimate endeavours of the developing States of Latin America as they seek to harness their own resources for the betterment of the lives of their people. Let the Council acknowledge that economic, no less than military, aggression is a violation of the Charter, constituting not merely a threat to, but an assault upon, the peace and security of the area. And let the Council come to grips with the phenomenon of the multinational corporation and devise mechanisms for ensuring that its non-governmental character does not place it beyond the reach of the Council's authority. Unless ways are found of thus promoting and strengthening the economic security of Latin America, we shall labour in vain, and the Council shall labour also with futility in endeavours to maintain and strengthen international peace and security in Latin America.

72. Fortunately, Latin America is not alone in its struggle for economic security, for that effort is part of the world-wide struggle of the developing States to secure maximum solidarity. Within recent times, the non-aligned countries, which number more than half of the world's developing States, have embarked on practical steps towards this end, and the Action Programme for Economic Co-operation among the Non-Aligned Countries, which opens up far-reaching possibilities for redressing developmental imbalances through collective effort, has begun to unfold in practical and resolute ways.

73. The Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, which was held in Georgetown, Guyana, in August 1972—and which promulgated the Action Programme—paid special attention to the needs of and the pressures upon Latin American States. It is perhaps right that I, as the Chairman of that Conference, should read into the records of this meeting of the Council the statement from the report of the Conference which reflects the unanimous feeling of its many participants:

"The Conference examined the situation in Latin America and expressed full support of the Chilean Government of People's Unity bent upon consolidating their national independence and building a new society; of the nationalist measures taken by the Peruvian Government and its efforts to safeguard the nation's sovereignty and to promote social progress; and also of the efforts of the people and Government of Panama to consolidate their territorial integrity. The participants welcomed the growth of the efforts being made by the Latin American peoples to recover their natural resources, reassert their sovereignty and defend the interests of their countries. The members agreed that the realization of Latin America's full and true independence is an essential element in the general emancipation process of the

developing countries and in the strengthening of international peace and security."

74. I venture to suggest that the events of this very month, indeed of the last few days, in Latin America are eloquent testimony to the fact that those sentiments reflected the authentic voice of the people of Latin America to the advancement of whose interests all our efforts are surely directed. But if these efforts are to be successful within the Latin American region there are anomalies and inequities that we must correct and redress from within the region.

75. In the economic as in the political field, the solidarity of Latin America is impaired by considerations that increasingly have relevance only for a passing era. Institutions like the Special Committee on Latin American Co-ordination, which have a vital role to play in the region's effort to achieve collective economic security, must ensure that all the States of Latin America may contribute to that achievement. Institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank, so totally committed to the pursuit of economic objectives, cannot close their doors to developing States like my own within the region primarily in response to political considerations. And we are not alone in standing without.

76. Recognizing thus the necessity for freer access to the economic organs of co-operation, the eighth Annual Meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, recently concluded at Bogotá, Colombia, has called for more just arrangements. In its draft report the conference frankly states:

"With respect to the problems of multilateralism, it is important to emphasize that the exercise of the rights and obligations of countries that provide and receive external financing should be independent of other than strictly technical considerations, especially in view of the fact that the countries of the region have adopted various political systems and developmental models. In this regard, bilateral problems that may exist among member countries must be kept from affecting the multilateral nature of the decisions of the international or regional lending agencies."

On the capacity of Latin America to effect these changes and to bring about those institutional reforms that must be the handmaiden of collective effort within the hemisphere, no less than upon the responses of the developed world to those aspirations of our region that cry out for fulfilment, will depend the prospects for the effective economic security of Latin America.

77. Let me turn, however briefly, to the question of colonialism in Latin America. The Republic of Guyana has too recently emerged from its own colonial experience to have anything but the most positive position on the end of all colonial relationships within Latin America. Our own independence just seven years ago, coming as it did in the context of the independence of our sister West Indian States of Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and Barbados, marked an important point in the emergence of a new multiracial, multilingual and, in every respect, pluralistic Latin American region. But it did not mark the end of

colonial relationships or of metropolitan presences. Indeed, for too long since then there has been a constitutional standstill in the movement of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories of the Caribbean towards full independence.

78. We greatly welcome the arrangements recently concluded for the attainment of independence by the Bahamas in June of this very year. With the other English-speaking States of the Caribbean they are members of our community of countries working assiduously towards the development of ever closer relationships among ourselves and the building of bridges of understanding, friendship and co-operation with the older Latin American States.

79. Among the remaining English-speaking territories of the region not yet independent the inhibitions on progress are not now the traditional ones of a reluctant withdrawal of the metropolitan Power; although let it be said, had the present readiness to withdraw been manifested at an earlier stage, it might indeed have provided that basis for regional unity on which we believe the political future of the smaller territories must ultimately rest.

80. In the eastern Caribbean, the associated State of Grenada has now reached an understanding with the United Kingdom on the attainment of independence in 1974. The Government of Guyana will give its support to all such efforts designed to bring an end to the British metropolitan presence in the Caribbean; but it is an objective that must be obtained in a manner determined by the people of the territories themselves and their views must determine the character no less than the timing of the withdrawal of the metropolitan Power. In this context, let it be known that throughout these islands there is a widespread political awareness and an effective participation by the people in all the processes of government. There can be no question of the right of these States to play anything but a full and equal role in both the hemispheric and the global systems.

81. The political awareness of the Commonwealth Caribbean subregion—including the already independent States—has already found expression in programmes of social and economic transformation, in experiments with techniques and ways of living, in vital forms of the creative arts and in the movement of regional integration which will shortly culminate in the establishment of a Caribbean community. These developments at home and a willingness to play a modest role in the international community have greatly enhanced the capacity with which history has endowed the English-speaking States of the region to act as an interpreter and as a bridge of understanding between Latin America and the States of Africa and Asia.

82. But there is one of the non-self-governing English-speaking States for which the impediment to independence is of a different kind. I refer to the State of Belize on this Central American mainland. Today, Belize, itself a member of the family of Commonwealth Caribbean States and an active participant in the Caribbean Free Trade Area, is being denied independence not through the unwillingness of the colonial Power to withdraw or through its own lack of enthusiasm for self-determination, but because of the

threat it faces from a neighbour which asserts a claim to all its territory.

83. For Belize the prospect of independence is clouded over by the danger of total absorption. What should be the exhilaration of freedom could well become a smothering at birth. We cannot speak of colonialism in Latin America and rightly call for its extirpation while shutting our eyes to this cruel reality that serves mainly to perpetuate it. This is obviously not the time for detailed analyses of claim and rejoinder. Suffice it to say that the Government of Guyana stands full square behind the right of Belize to self-determination—to separate existence as an independent State guaranteed of its sovereignty and its territorial integrity.

84. In this context, and in order that the Council's examination may be fully informed by the views of all areas within Latin America, no less than by an appreciation of the great potential of this region for contributing to the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security, let me read into the record of the Council's proceedings the Declaration of the Prime Ministers of the four States of Barbados, Guyana, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago at the conclusion of the Seventh Conference of Heads of Government of Commonwealth Caribbean countries held in Chaguaramas, Trinidad, in October 1972. I quote from that Declaration:

"The Prime Ministers of Barbados, Guyana, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago meeting together during the Heads of Government Conference at Chaguaramas have considered the role of the English-speaking Commonwealth Caribbean countries in the Organisations and Agencies of the western hemisphere and have agreed upon the following—

"(a) The existing exclusion of certain Commonwealth Caribbean countries from membership in the Organization of American States on the ground of controversies between members of the Organization and a European Power, represents an attack on the anti-colonial movement in the English-speaking Caribbean. It constitutes a rejection of the fundamental objectives of the Inter-American System and the frustration of the lofty aims of the great Liberator Simón Bolívar to create a community of independent and peace-loving nations in the whole western hemisphere. This is so whether the exclusion is directed against an independent State or against an internally self-governing country seeking to achieve full freedom and independence.

"(b) The exclusion is particularly offensive to the Governments and people of the English-speaking Caribbean countries since it applies only to countries within this group, and as such imports into relations between American States a connotation of an indefensible discrimination.

"(c) The countries discriminated against, as western hemisphere countries, have an undeniable right of access to the financial and technical resources of the Inter-American Development Bank. The refusal of access to these resources impedes their economic and social development and jeopardizes their aspiration to economic independence.

"The Governments of Barbados, Guyana, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago will therefore adopt all necessary measures in order to bring this exclusion of Commonwealth Caribbean countries from the Inter-American System to an end."

85. The interests of international peace and security in Latin America require that this Council should lend its positive support to the dismantling of these and other exclusionary arrangements.

86. Has not the time come, and is not the occasion of these meetings of the Security Council in Panama the propitious moment, for Latin American States to close the book of colonial history; to acknowledge that over the long march of history save for the indigenous people of Latin America we are all late comers; to abandon the posture of colonial Powers arguing about boundaries as if they had no bearing on the peoples to whom they relate; to admit that there is no juridical basis on which the claims of one colonialism may be preferred above another; to accept the realities of settled communities and settled States and to recognize that the interests of peace and security in the hemisphere depend as much on our capacity to show justice and understanding to each other as it does on our securing justice and understanding from the States beyond the region?

87. But the problems of peace and security in Latin America go beyond those created by or residual to a formal colonialism. When in January of this year the Security Council gave consideration to the holding of a series of meetings here the Permanent Representative of Panama to the United Nations stated that it was the desire of Panama to have discussed the question of the Canal of Panama. One does not have to be long in this vibrant and friendly community to recognize, or to pay more than a fleeting visit to the Zone to understand, the intensity of feeling which surrounds this issue and this Council cannot, whether it meets in Panama or elsewhere, embark on an examination of means for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America without bringing within the ambit of its deliberations those issues which now agitate relations between Panama and the United States of America. It is to the credit of both Governments that they have embarked upon processes of bilateral dialogue and negotiation that have as their agreed objective the establishment of new arrangements for the operation of this important waterway for the world's shipping. It is the duty of the Council to give its full support and its every assistance to all such efforts for peaceful and effective resolution. But these sentiments and exhortations would be mere rhetoric unless underwritten on all sides by a resolve to reach just solutions.

88. In the search for those solutions a special responsibility devolves on the United States to understand and be responsive to the imperatives of national dignity and self-respect that inform the case of Panama—imperatives that not only have so richly conditioned the national growth and development of the United States itself but have in the past evoked its championship of causes far beyond the hemisphere.

89. And to those in the councils of the United States, if indeed there be any, who urge that strategic interests should prevail over those principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity which are now part of the heritage of this hemisphere, let it be recalled that no way has ever yet been held—be it overland route or mountain pass or navigable straits—in defiance of the will of those who dwell around it. Let history and reason combine to convince that such strategic interests can never be served in any durable way save on a basis of consensus—a consensus founded, in this case, upon the acceptability of the arrangements for the operation of this great international waterway to the mass of the people whose territory it bisects.

90. Similar considerations must inform decisions on the future of all foreign military presences in the hemisphere. Both the precepts of the United Nations' Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and their practical character as incubators of confrontation and conflict constitute a mandate for their disbandment.

91. In so urging, I am conscious out of the experience of my own State that a response by a larger and more powerful neighbour to these imperatives that look beyond the confrontations of today to the inevitable friendships of the long tomorrow can be more richly rewarding in terms of ultimate values than the transient returns of imposed solutions. The Protocol of Port of Spain concluded between Guyana and Venezuela in 1970 is, I venture to suggest, a contemporary example of what can be achieved in the resolution of conflict when solutions are sought by consensus rather than by power and when understanding and vision take the place of hostility and limited perceptions. The mechanisms of quietus which that Protocol devised and the sincerity of purpose that has since characterized their application constitutes a practical contribution to the maintenance and strengthening of peace and security in the hemisphere. Together they represent the positive application at a bilateral level of that preventive diplomacy which these meetings of the Council in Panama may help to develop and consolidate.

92. As the Security Council approaches its task at these important meetings, let the spirit of détente now at large among the major Powers find a habitation and a home within this hemisphere; and let the Council, mindful of the opportunities at hand, translate that spirit into practical courses of action so that its deliberations may fulfil the promise which its presence in Panama holds out to all the peoples of Latin America.

93. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I invite Mr. Emilio Rabasa, the Secretary for External Relations of Mexico, to take a place at the Council table.

94. Mr. RABASA (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is a matter of deep satisfaction for me to attend this extraordinary series of meetings of the Security Council, the second to be held away from Headquarters under Article 28, paragraph 3, of the United Nations Charter.

95. From the outset, with enthusiasm and no reservations whatsoever, Mexico supported the initiative of the Government of Panama in offering this its capital to serve as the

venue for the series of meetings. We believe that both historically—it was not without reason that Bolívar chose it as the venue of the first Congress in 1826—and geographically—it is the isthmus linking the entire continent—not to mention other reasons characteristic of it, Panama's proposal is fully warranted, a proposal which, it is worth while to recall immediately won expressions of sympathy and solidarity from the Latin American Group in the United Nations.

96. It is also a matter of special satisfaction for us that the Council reached a consensus both in accepting the invitation extended and in approving the agenda item, "Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America in conformity with the provisions and principles of the Charter".

97. The Council deserves to be congratulated for meeting away from Headquarters since, in addition to considering that item, it will establish direct and human contacts and can really get the feel of the varied and complex problems Latin America now faces.

98. We are convinced that, as was so rightly said by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Panama, my colleague and friend Juan Antonio Tack, in transmitting to the President of the Council in January 1973 his Government's invitation, these meetings will make "a positive contribution to the search for solutions to the problems of Latin America, which are linked to the strengthening of international peace and security and the promotion of international co-operation" [see S/10858].

99. Naturally, this conviction is based on our confidence that the Council, given the nature of the present meetings, will strive harder than ever to adjust its conduct to the principles of the Charter, which is the highest standard of conduct for all organs of the Organization and all its Member States.

100. The significance and scope of those principles have been defined in several General Assembly declarations, some of which hold a place of honour—for example, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which were unanimously adopted in 1970, at the commemorative session for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Organization [resolutions 2625 (XXV) and 2734 (XXV)].

101. In these Declarations the Assembly emphatically reaffirmed the sovereignty of States and the right of peoples to determine their own destiny without intervention, coercion or pressure from outside, especially such as involves the threat or the use of force, whether open or concealed, as well as the duty of States to abstain from any attempt that would in part or in whole break the national unity and the territorial integrity of any other State or country. The fully representative organ of the United Nations also expressed, with particular firmness, its belief that there is a close interrelationship between the strengthening of international security, disarmament and the economic development of countries, so that whatever

progress is achieved towards the attainment of any of these objectives will constitute progress towards the attainment of all of them.

102. In these two spheres, disarmament and economic development, so rightly emphasized by the General Assembly, the Latin American States represented here can doubtless bring to these extraordinary meetings of the Security Council a not negligible contribution, even if it be only by reporting on our achievements, claims and plans for the future.

103. In regard to disarmament, our region can be proud of having given the world an example, the significance of which it seems to me to be difficult to exaggerate. It has established the first—and so far the only—zone covered by a statute for the complete absence of nuclear weapons over densely populated territories.

104. I am particularly satisfied that those who have preceded me, the Foreign Ministers of Peru and Guyana, have expressly referred to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which is also known as the Treaty of Tlatelolco, thus giving it the name of the historic site in Mexico City where it was opened for signature. Allow me to recall in this connexion that, when in February of 1967 this Treaty was unanimously adopted, U Thant, who was then Secretary-General of the United Nations, affirmed:

"The nations of Latin America can, with ample justification, take pride in what they have wrought by their own initiative and through their own efforts".

It is also relevant to recall that the General Assembly, when the Treaty was presented to it in October 1967, proclaimed, in its resolution 2286 (XXII), which was adopted without a single vote against it, that this Latin American instrument:

"constitutes an event of historic significance in the efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to promote international peace and security".

The States Parties to the Treaty, among them the one which is our host, already number 18, so that the Latin American zone already covers an area of more than 8 million square kilometres and a population greater than 140 million.

105. OPANAL, which, as is known, has its headquarters in the capital of my country, has been functioning since September 1969, and its principal organ, the General Conference, has already held three sessions. Its first Secretary-General, the representative of Ecuador to the United Nations, Ambassador Leopoldo Benítez Vinuesa, is today among us, as is the present Secretary-General, the representative of Uruguay, Mr. Hector Gros Espiell, who has been especially invited by the Security Council.

106. We believe that the Council the organ which, under the Charter, has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace, would do well to add its voice, its powerful voice, to the voices of the General Assembly and the

Secretary-General of the United Nations, in order on this occasion to urge States which can become parties to the Treaty, as well as those for whom the two Additional Protocols are intended, to endeavour to take all the measures which depend on them so that the Treaty will rapidly be in force for the largest number of countries and be most effective. In this connexion, it is not superfluous to recall that the General Assembly, in no less than five successive resolutions, urgently called upon the nuclear Powers which had still not done so to sign and ratify Additional Protocol II of the Treaty, whereby those Powers would commit themselves as early as possible principally not to use, or to threaten to use, nuclear weapons against the States parties to that instrument.

107. Concerning economic development, I think it should be emphasized that the growing gap between the industrialized countries and the developing countries constitutes, in our opinion, one of the most serious threats to the peace of the world. That is precisely why the President of Mexico, Mr. Luis Echeverría, proposed at the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which was held in Santiago, Chile, nearly a year ago, in April 1972, the drafting of a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. As is well known, the Conference endorsed the initiative of the head of State of Mexico. The Working Group which the Conference established under resolution 45 (III) has just held its first session in Geneva, and I would not hesitate to call the results encouraging.

108. It is indispensable that a new era of genuine international economic co-operation should come into being and that this co-operation should cease to be a privileged matter of whim or goodwill, and become a practice in law.

109. The right of countries fully to dispose of their natural resources in order to ensure higher standards of living for their populations is intimately connected with the foregoing—and this is gaining ground in the international conscience.

110. To build a just and equitable international economic order where the rights of all countries are defined and protected, and particularly the rights of the developing countries, is, at this time, a primary duty of the international community. We trust that the coming into force of the Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States, which we hope will occur in the not-too-distant future, will represent an invaluable contribution for the fulfilment of this primary duty. The Charter will then make specific, without any rigidity and with the flexibility which the laws and even the constitutions allow for in the internal order of each country, a series of legal standards of mandatory compliance which will be a guarantee of justice and equity for all peoples in regard to their economic and social situation, establishing a minimum of international stability in these fields. We feel certain that economic co-operation among nations within this framework will constitute one of the most effective means to consolidate peace.

111. To achieve more and better co-operation I repeat, co-operation—in the political, economic, scientific and

cultural fields, the President of Mexico will shortly visit six countries with different economic structures and various ideological conformation. This will once again reiterate one of the essential characteristics of the foreign policy of President Echeverría, namely, to have a frank and direct dialogue with heads of State or Government, whatever their political organization, so as to assert the position of Mexico on various problems while underlining the autonomy and lasting character of the principles which my country has traditionally maintained. Since the head of State of Mexico shares and adheres to many of the concerns and promptings of the third world, he will avail himself of the opportunity of the tour to reiterate them to the highest authorities in these developed countries.

112. The Government of Panama in various forums and on various occasions has expressed its wish, which we find completely warranted, that these extraordinary meetings of the Council, for the preparation and organization of which it has spared no efforts, might contribute to a just and equitable solution to the question of the Canal, which, as is very understandable, has for more than half a century been the fundamental concern of its foreign policy.

113. We consider that if the two parties directly involved in this problem—and it is obvious that the problem also has aspects which interest the entire international community—strive to adjust their respective positions to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which I have already had occasion to mention, it will not be difficult to arrive at a mutually and generally acceptable agreement.

114. Even though, as everybody knows, the basis of the problem is derived from the application of a bilateral treaty and, therefore, its solution concerns only the signatory parties, nevertheless, because of its political, economic and even moral aspects, all America is awaiting the outcome and is alerted to it. On this I would venture to comment that in our times, in this hour of history, it is difficult to conceive of a treaty in perpetuity being still in force, especially when all—or almost all—the burdens are imposed on one party whereas the other enjoys all—or almost all—the prerogatives.

115. In expressing my hope that these meetings will be truly fruitful, I should like, in conclusion, to communicate to the Government and people of Panama our profound gratitude for their cordial and generous hospitality.

116. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I invite the Minister for External Relations of the Republic of Colombia, Mr. Alfredo Vásquez Carrizosa, to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

117. Mr. VASQUEZ CARRIZOSA (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This series of meetings of the Security Council is not a ceremonial act nor is it routine; and it is no less than a recognition of the personality of Latin America, which has played such a significant role in the development of international law. At the same time, it constitutes an invitation to this hemisphere to assert its views on peace and security.

118. Colombia wished to be present in order to express its thoughts on the subject on the agenda of these meetings, and we are present as observers, in a spirit of forthright friendship towards the countries represented here. We are Members of the United Nations and as such are linked to whatever will be to the benefit of our peoples. Our international policy has always been governed by international law. We adhered to the San Francisco Charter and, despite the difficulties created by a world in evolution, we find in it a programme of co-operation for peace which must be unreservedly supported by all nations.

119. For my country it is a matter of special satisfaction that these meetings are being held in the Republic of Panama, which has so many ties of brotherhood with the Republic of Colombia and in whose capital a new international law came into being at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Since then we have formed the oldest and best-constructed regional organization for its time, within legal standards intended to guarantee respect for the territorial sovereignty and political independence of States. Here in 1826 a Congress was convened by Simón Bolívar as President of Colombia and here too a treaty was signed the same year which laid down as a precept the collective defence of sovereignties.

120. While in Europe there was talk of interventions, protectorates, tutelages and military alliances, in Latin America the thinking was of legal acts, boundaries of law and elimination of the right of conquest. There could not have been a greater contrast than that between the two Congresses: the one in Vienna in 1815 and the one in Panama in 1826. These were two political hemispheres leaning towards different goals. Europe conceived its international life on the basis of hegemony by a few Powers and in terms of power. Simón Bolívar believed in the unity of Latin America as a sound instrument to safeguard sovereignty and strengthen the democratic conquests in this part of the world.

121. After its first years of independent life, Latin America had to face the problem of intervention. It also suffered the effects of an era of colonialism and of penetrations from distant Powers on its coasts. Because of the effect of this situation, sovereignty was relegated internationally to a precarious title, and intervention became the greatest international problem of this hemisphere and the principal reason for its urgent concern. Not having the military power to repulse intervention, the peoples who were the victims of intervention have had recourse at times to improvised resistance, sometimes to silent protest. At any rate, Latin America made the intellectual and diplomatic effort of its major doctrines to declare the interventions impossible and illegal.

122. The Drago Doctrine on the forced payment of public debts appeared after the European fleets came to our coasts to enforce payment of these debts, and the Calvo Doctrine emerged as an antidote against diplomatic intervention for the benefit of foreign companies and concessionnaires. The Estrada Doctrine also tried to prevent intervention by withholding recognition of a new government, and that set of legal doctrines came to a culmination in 1933 in the

Convention on Rights and Duties of States,<sup>3</sup> article 8 of which reads: "No State has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another".

123. Latin America has professed a true faith in international law. We believe that any difference between nations in this hemisphere can be solved by legal channels through direct arrangement, mediation, arbitration or legal settlement. We have perfected a series of specific treaties on these subjects, which are applied within the regional system. Yet, it is indispensable to state that none of these regional solutions prevent us from participating in the United Nations or establishing ties of friendship and solidarity with countries of other continents.

124. It becomes more obvious daily that there is no regional problem which is not tied to a universal interest. The concept of international solidarity encompasses the planet. The Viet-Nam war has proved that there are no local conflicts, that every conflict has repercussions in other parts of the world. The same occurs with questions of peace, currency devaluations, trade barriers, the ecology of continents, questions of labour, or the collective petition of the developing countries to dispose of their natural resources on land as in the sea. The universality of contemporary problems leads us to believe that peace like war in the world is already indivisible.

125. That is why Latin America, outside its region, is part of a group of proletarian or developing countries which have been called "the third world" and which have, in unison, sought a greater participation of the poorer countries in the benefits of progress to which they have contributed with their labour and with their imports from the rich countries. The circle of international action of Latin America, because of economic necessities, has expanded, and its thinking has become sharper on the general problems of peace.

126. Above all, Latin America claims equality of rights for its peoples and a broad and recognized capacity of its Governments to participate in any international decision which, in the economic and financial fields as well as in the political field, may affect the conditions of life or of labour in the countries in this part of the world. The United Nations, as an international organization, would have no purpose were there not the purpose of achieving the ideals of international solidarity.

127. As Latin America sees it, it is proper for a sovereign and independent State to have the right to exploit the natural resources on its territory, and foreign capital must be invested in our region with a view to a genuine participation in the economic and social development of our countries and not for speculative purposes. Foreign capital can give considerable assistance to development if it helps, instead of hindering, the prosperity and advancement of our national industry with real technological contributions.

128. The system of international loans must be adjusted to the conditions of development and the availability of

<sup>3</sup> League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CLXV, p. 19.



internal resources to reach them. The price policies for commodities, at the same time, have a fundamental part in the strategy for prosperity of the United Nations. The opening up of markets for our processed goods is essential within the plans intended to overcome the colonial pattern of trade which imposed an exchange of industrial goods from a few privileged countries for raw materials from the poorer countries.

129. Latin America claims the just treatment which corresponds to its capacity to work in international exchanges. The lengthy delayed process of discussions held since 1964 at sessions of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development have not made it possible to bring about the disappearance of a lesser participation of this region in trade in world markets. If one sincerely seeks peace and security, it will be indispensable to give priority to the economic conditions of the countries of the third world, among them Latin America.

130. In recent years the monetary system has undergone profound changes and grave disturbances which have totally altered the assumptions on currency stability which were considered to be lasting in the Bretton Woods Agreements in 1945. Times have changed. It will be necessary to re-evaluate the international financial and monetary situation, and in order to achieve broad world consensus no State can be deprived of the right to be consulted. International solidarity cannot be the result of the dictates of a group of countries over another, but must be the result of complete and total understanding.

131. At present Latin America is carrying out some experiments designed to give our development problems Latin American solutions. The idea is gaining ground of continental nationalism and of self-help. In this connexion Colombia is associated with five countries of the area of the Andes. We have been joined by Venezuela to constitute a special zone of development and harmonization of economic policies which already has a market capacity of 60 million inhabitants and a total gross product of \$22,000 million.

132. In the political as well as in the economic field Latin America is a continent which is becoming aware of its own personality and will project it in the service of peace and security--and these are not for us a mere absence of warlike operations or a recess between conflicts. Peace and security for us mean all the rights of peoples to lead a life of dignity with guarantees for human life. Peace and security mean the legal order of nations built on freedom and justice, with the elimination of any violence as an instrument of coercion in international relations.

133. The principles of international co-operation are enshrined in the very Charter of the United Nations and in the very recent Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, adopted in 1970 by the General Assembly [resolution 2625 (XXV)]. The problem of peace is not one of a lack of principles, because there are many, and very relevant ones and very lofty ones. It is a problem of good faith and the simple application of an international law conceived of for our times. The liquidation of the cold war

enables us to hope that there will be greater understanding among nations, which is so vehemently pressed for by the peoples who must for ever bear the rigours of violence or war.

134. It is necessary to indicate that two of the principles of that Declaration are intimately connected: the duty not to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any State and the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples. Very emphatically, Colombia believes that international co-operation depends on these foundations. The old and even new forms of intervention have become anachronistic, as has the so-called doctrine of "special interests" which the great Powers have claimed on certain continents.

135. The ideological plurality of States is an incontestable reality and it corresponds to a time such as ours of the complete emancipation of peoples. Colombia for its part maintains universality in its relations and we see this as a corollary of international solidarity and of the undeniable fact that diplomatic relations entail no recognition of other ideologies. But this broad policy of co-operation requires the most complete respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of States. Intervention and territorial occupations are remnants of colonialism or super-seeded methods of the cold war.

136. Although the need for disarmament is primarily the responsibility of the great Powers, Colombia has also believed it desirable to eliminate unnecessary or sophisticated armaments in Latin America as one means to contribute to universal disarmament and to increase investments for economic and social development. The Treaty of Tlatelolco also is a statute indispensable to preventing Latin America from becoming a storage depot for nuclear weapons or an atomic testing ground.

137. We have defended new ideas on the law of the sea. It is necessary to incorporate in international law the doctrine of the sovereignty of coastal States over the natural and living resources of the sea adjacent to their coasts, which we have called the patrimonial sea and which adequately covers the need to preserve these resources for the benefit of those States and to accept freedom of navigation and overflight. With the Secretary of External Relations of Mexico, Mr. Rabasa, I had the honour on 28 January of this year to sign a declaration recommending the consideration of an economic zone in the future law of the sea as a minimum request of Latin America.

138. Finally, at these meetings the problem of the Panama Canal will be discussed. Doubtless it is a bilateral question between the Republic of Panama and the United States, which will have to be mainly responsible for the revision of the Hay-Bunau Varilla Convention of 18 November 1903.<sup>4</sup> We know that the two States concerned have undertaken direct negotiations which we are watching with our best wishes that they may lead to a solution. Colombia and Panama had a common history and we have sealed any

<sup>4</sup> Isthmian Canal Convention. For the text, see *Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States of America, 1776-1949*, vol. 10, Department of State publication 8642 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 663.



differences for ever with friendship. The prosperity and integrity of this Republic are of great concern to us.

139. But we could not, of course, remain indifferent to a question which is of concern to all America and, although it is bilateral in nature, has undoubted repercussions on hemispheric relations. It seems to me that under international law any independent State has among its fundamental attributes that of territorial sovereignty, and it is quite obvious that this must be understood as a clear sovereign power within the territory marked out by national frontiers. The contrary would be tantamount to maintaining in perpetuity situations of colonial domination and being left behind by history.

140. Under treaties in force, Colombia on the other hand enjoys special transit rights through the Panama Canal, and it is only natural that on behalf of the Republic of Colombia I should deem it fitting to recall this circumstance which has enabled us to know each other better and to create closer ties of friendship between Panamanians and Colombians with the incessant passage of ships and the movement of masses of people through this corridor of America. There is at any rate a continental interest, which is only too understandable, in free transit for all nations. This interoceanic course constitutes one of the most important maritime routes for the world, and free transit through the Panama Canal is essential for international trade and communications.

141. To sum up, we must assess the present situation. In Africa and Asia, as in Latin America, there is an irrevocable movement for the recovery of all the rights of statehood. The United Nations has in full measure been the great forum for ideas on the legal equality of peoples, and this world Organization has made possible the necessary readjustment of old situations inherited from the past century. To ignore this is no longer possible. History is taking large strides forward and what was feasible for power politics in the nineteenth century and at the beginning of this one is now contrary to the Charter and to the feeling of international solidarity. Perhaps between the smoke of wars and the crossroads of conflicts we are approaching a time of settlement of difficulties and a new international order based on certain irrevocable postulates: the strategy of peace to intensify social and economic development; total sovereignty of the independent State; recovery by the State of its natural resources; the self-determination of peoples; co-operation and solidarity among nations.

142. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now invite the next speaker, the Minister for External Relations of the Republic of Cuba, Mr. Raúl Roa, to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

143. Mr. ROA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I wish to thank you very much for allowing me to make a statement on behalf of my Government before the Security Council.

144. It is not appropriate to indulge in ritual courtesies or courtly obsequiousness when speaking among peoples which, although they constitute a congeries of blood, languages, cultures, traditions, customs, styles of life and

different degrees of development, still hold within themselves the centripetal forces that inexorably tend to unite them from the Río Bravo to Patagonia. Simón Bolívar stated: "The homeland should be one", "Our America": that is how José Martí defined it. Benito Juárez said, "Respect for the rights of others is peace." "We belong to Latin America", reaffirmed Fidel Castro. It must be one and ours because of the geosocial surface that we cover, because of the problems which are the same, because we fight the same fight, because we have a common history and destiny, one that we have possessed since the European empires carried out their rapines and their devastations in the Antilles and at the same time the resistance of the natives, the creoles, the blacks and the mestizos started to rise against the insatiable and despotic intruders, eventually replaced in the twentieth century by the North American neo-empire—an empire that wanted to convert the Caribbean sea into a private lake and to extend the frontiers of its own domain to Cape Horn.

145. To encourage dissension, to isolate and to cause animosity among our peoples was one of the tactical means; it used in its policies of expansion and hegemony, but the cohesion, the closeness, the meeting and the rebellion have been reborn with proud impetuosity and what was termed a dream in Bolívar and Martí is today a true process under way. The peoples of our under-developed America, exploited and dependent as they are, rise ever more united and tightly knit and through different roads are now channelling their high spirits towards the same goal.

146. Neither with the peoples of our America nor with any people do we speak as lord to servant or as servant to lord. We speak as brother to brother. It is for that reason that a fraternal feeling of solidarity towards the heroic Panamanian people and firm support for the Government that is led by General Omar Torrijos, which today stands for national dignity and claims full exercise of sovereignty over the territory that has been taken from it on the isthmus is the message that I bring from the Revolutionary Government of Cuba and that I pronounce from this rostrum.

147. To paraphrase Martí, we have judged it imperative that it should be for Panama, which suffers, which struggles, which urges, which advances and does not measure the risks or the sacrifices, that the first Cuban words at this meeting of the Security Council are spoken. In a word, I bring the tribute of Cuba to the indefatigable fighters of yesteryear and today that did not yield and will not yield their noble undertaking of regaining their mutilated national rights, reintegrating the colonial enclave called the Canal Zone into their homeland and turning the transoceanic waterway into an open road, open to all the peoples of the world under the flag, the sovereignty, the jurisdiction and the administration of Panama. The dearest aspiration of the Panamanian people was always to have a canal for all mankind and not a water monopoly, a canal surrounded by shipyards and factories and not by military bases and the factories of the green berets, a canal for peaceful transit and not a canal for war planes and warships.

148. The Cuban delegation wishes also to state that we are extremely grateful for the generous hospitality and the

great deference that has been shown us by the Panamanian authorities. We have been able to find once again that we are doing what Martí urged us to do in a letter that he wrote to the Dominican hero, Federico Henríquez Carvajal, "across the sea, through love and blood, what under the sea is done by the Andean fires".

149. The meetings of the Security Council in the capital of Panama, with an agenda that calls for an examination of problems dealing with international peace and security in this hemisphere, is of such importance that it cannot be gainsaid. It is obviously a political and moral victory chalked up by the Government of Panama. Pressures, artifices and threats all failed. The majority which at one time mechanically obeyed orders in the Security Council and the General Assembly has been shattered—an unmistakable sign of a change in the international play of forces and the growing influence of the new currents of history. But that is not all. For the first time the principles of the Charter have prevailed over the traditional subterfuges of the Organization of American States, the so-called regional dependency of the United Nations—very clever in taking from the competence of the Security Council, usually under orders, the consideration of problems or ratifying facts accomplished, however reprehensible according to its own precepts.

150. Suffice it to recall still recent events: the overthrow of the constitutional Arbenz Government in Guatemala; the mercenary invasion of Cuba that was smashed at Playa Girón; and the condonation of the brutal aggression against the Dominican Republic, met by the courageous unarmed people and a group of patriotic soldiers led by Colonel Francisco Caamaño, who assumed heroic stature in the second battle for the independence of Latin America against North American imperialism and the oligarchies at its service. Dead or alive, Cuba pays him tribute with respect and admiration. Alive or dead, he is and will continue to be a shining symbol of the revolutionary conscience of the Dominican people.

151. Furthermore, we must stress the fact that this meeting is taking place in a country which, despite its peculiar geographical configuration, despite the fact that it possesses a long coastline on the Pacific, and despite its ancient ties with Peru and New Granada, is nevertheless—because of its demographic composition, its tropical idiosyncracies and its culture with strong Antillean imprints—a parcel of our own Caribbean America, with features of national entity that it assumed long before it declared its independence from Spain. If on one side of the isthmus the serene waters discovered by Vasco Núñez de Balboa come in, on the other side the spume-covered waves of the Caribbean break on the New World constantly shaken by cyclones and at one time, as indeed now, travelled by *conquistadores*, adventurers, pirates, self-seekers, fishermen, admirals, outlaws, smugglers, traffickers and liberators.

152. A nation that has suffered the upheavals of the political tidal waves unleashed by outmoded empires and Yankee neo-colonialism, the spinal column of Panama, is in an area where have taken place the most dramatic international tensions that our continent has ever seen and the most profound transformations in imperial power relations

that have grown up during the past 50 years. If, when overthrowing imperialist domination and choosing the socialist way of development, the Cuban revolution did start a new era in the history of the Caribbean, a part of those pages is being written by the unshakable will of the Panamanian people, the gesture of the Puerto Rican people for independence and the unshakable courage of the Dominican people, as well as the creation of new States, such as Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana and Barbados, which also struggle to consolidate their emancipation through the regaining of their natural resources and wealth, confronted as they are by severe difficulties and stubborn resistance. However, there can be no doubt that it is in Panama that those tensions caused by North American imperialism today have reached their highest point, and peace and security in America is seriously endangered. If this becomes obvious to us, it is no less obvious that this danger threatens our entire continent, north to south, and therefore the entire continent must face it. It would seem useless to add that the Panamanian problem forms part of that context.

153. If the supreme organ of the United Nations proposes to study in Panama measures to preserve and strengthen international peace and security in the hemisphere, then we must put before it for its consideration, even if briefly, but openly and without circumlocution, the complex and burning realities that conspire against both peace and security. At this time priority must be given to the question of the Canal as far as Latin America is concerned, and therefore we must give first attention to it.

154. During the last few years, poverty has crossed Latin America in seven-league boots. This shaking reality is the sum and substance of the realities that form the profound network from which it is born, and which hinders the preservation and strengthening of peace and security in our continent. Although we might generalize our analysis and our conclusions and include Africa and Asia, obviously I prefer to limit myself to Latin America. Nor would this involve any loss; for when all is said and done, Latin America, Africa and Asia are today one and the same, facing one and the same common enemy which stands in the way of their liberation and development, and again one and the same in the irrevocable decision of their peoples to choose and shape their own futures. The millions of human beings who rise daily with the sun and who go to bed hungry each night in those three continents have resolved now to remain awake and alert until that dawn breaks.

155. A mere glance at the hemisphere shows us immediately the growing gap between development and underdevelopment in Latin America and the growing development of the Power which, in an unholy alliance with the native oligarchies extracts the wealth of those countries, takes over their natural resources, forces labour conditions down, exploits investments, forcing financial dependence upon them, blocking and breaking off scientific exchange through the transmission of obsolete technology; and engages in ideological penetration and political dominion, as well as diplomatic and military usurpation. That Power, the most aggressive, ambitious and wealthy of our day, is—need I say?—the United States of America. What people of Asia or Africa is unaware of its appetites, of its perfidy

and its claws? Which of its allies in Europe, however unconditionally allied, has been unaware of its impostures, thefts and arrogance? Here, there and everywhere, is there anyone who is unaware of its pretentious role as world policeman for the forces of reaction, or has not suffered its intimidations and harassments—not to mention its depredations everywhere, its military bases in all continents, its policy of atomic blackmail, its machinations against the socialist countries, its open or covert attacks of all sorts against the small countries that break away from its stranglehold, as did Cuba, or refuse to bow their heads, as did Viet-Nam; its diplomatic intrigues, either in the shadows or in the open; or the crimes and acts of subversion and sabotage perpetrated by the Central Intelligence Agency? Who, in short, can doubt that threats and danger to international peace and security will come from the United States as long as its imperialist organization of power subsists?

156. Study of the relationships and structures of dependence which give rise to stagnation and the distortion of the economic, political, social and cultural lives of our peoples has been approached from different standpoints and has been the subject of different interpretations. There is a copious bibliography on the subject in many languages, and one of the most common errors is, through incompetence or deliberately, to confuse development with growth; hence the erupting volcanoes and the clay-footed giants, who mask certain statistics with glaring fallacies.

157. But the fundamental conclusion to be derived from theoretical study and concrete experience has already been clearly established and cannot be challenged. The phenomenon of under-development is the consequence of capitalistic expansion in its successive phases of development: colonialism, imperialism and neo-colonialism. Therefore, it is the result of a long process which is characterized by the complex relationship of political, economic, social and cultural dependence. The type of domination going along with this dependence has persisted in the countries that have emancipated themselves only formally from their one-time metropolitan masters. The external political changes have left the structures of domination intact and, therefore, have not altered their adaptation to the requirements of the developed capitalist countries that created and imposed them. It is too obvious that the methods used by neo-colonialism are more subtle and clever than those of the one-time colonial régime; they have changed their shape, but the substance and the spirit have not in any way varied.

158. The reactionary violence that has accumulated in those deformed institutional formations must ineluctably give rise to the revolutionary violence of the people, and to imperialist aggression in defence of its spoils, privileges and impositions and of the dominant classes tied to its interests. That is one of the obvious realities that conspire against peace and security in Latin America.

159. We cannot overlook the fact that the phenomenon of under-development and dependence today falls within the context of a historic moment of transition, when, in addition to the fundamental contradiction between the capitalist and socialist systems, there are the contradictions

arising from the national liberation movement in the under-developed countries and the growth of the labour movement in the capitalist countries. We are living in a world where antagonisms and disparities are multiplying and spreading.

160. The doctrine of multipolarity of powers that has been adduced by so many and elaborated by the *éminence grise* of President Nixon is only a curtain of rhetorical soot to cover up the basic antagonism between capitalism and socialism, the general crisis of the capitalist system and the anti-colonial revolution that is trying to dominate a vast area of the world, in which the imperialist Powers are desperately trying to retain the fruits of their villainous pillages that have given them the possession, use and utilization of 80 per cent of the natural resources and basic wealth of mankind.

161. Of the present population of the world, only about 25 per cent has access to the material goods and cultural values born of their gigantic and explosive exploitation. And, although within the ambit of scientific and technological progress the developed capitalist countries are already on the threshold of the twenty-first century, the majority of under-developed countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia are still lagging behind on the very edges of the present century, and some have only just crossed the frontiers of contemporary civilization itself.

162. The under-developed countries, as part of their struggle for liberation and development, have pressed international organizations to help them to solve this problem. Yet the initiatives for development that have been promoted and encouraged by the United Nations beginning in the 1960s and that were renewed in 1970, as we have already heard stated at the conferences of the Economic Commission for Latin America as well as at the meetings of the Group of Seventy-Seven and of the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development show that the result has been a great number of failures and frustrations. Under-development and dependence in Latin America has grown; and, therefore, the threat to peace and security, likewise.

163. I do not have to stress the fact that the painful deterioration of Latin American economies has become even more acute with the second devaluation of the North American monetary unit. The vertical fall of the dollar, an obvious example of the pathological upheavals that beset the capitalistic system, has for Latin America and the countries of the third world spelt a reduction of almost \$1,000 million of their dollar reserves; and if we want to assess the pathetic picture, we need only add to the present grave situation the foreign debt of those countries, which rose in the 1970s to nearly \$70 thousand million. Significantly, in 1971, as a counterpart of that further deterioration in the Latin American economies, and as a consequence of the intercapitalistic contradictions, trade, economic, financial and technical assistance relations between Latin America and the European Common Market, Japan and the socialist countries showed a relative improvement.

164. But those sporadic changes do not and cannot change the nature of the tragedy. In Latin America, at this very

time, more than 80 million persons are living in the dark miasma of illiteracy; 15 per cent of their active labour force are unemployed; 30 per cent are underemployed; mortality and morbidity are at terrifying rates; under-consumption and under-nourishment prevail; wealth, natural resources, industries, banks, transportation and the mass means of communication are largely in the hands of foreigners. The North American capitalists have extracted millions of dollars from their original investments—at the rate of 3 to 1. Monopolies have not only bled white the soil and subsoil of our countries, but in many cases they are also the true owners of the centres of decision in essential questions. They are at the very crux of the relations and structures that their domination has established. Latin America has been one of the juiciest places for experimentation by the financial pyramids which are the hallmark of the contemporary monopolistic capitalist system.

165. From want, hunger, ignorance, oppression and the destruction of marginal and over-exploited social classes arise, dripping with the blood and sweat of others, the ease and privileges of those circles that base themselves on under-development and dependency.

166. This series of undeniable truths is the result of a definite strategy and is protected by the political, juridical and military machinery owned by the United States but placed under different headings, which form a complete gamut ranging from the consultative meetings to the Inter-America Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, through the preventive interventions and the South Pacific Command illegally located on the Panama Canal. The ideological background of this policy of expansion and hegemony dates back to many years prior to the unilateral proclamation of the invalid Monroe Doctrine. Today it is reinforced by its military bases and its launching pads of nuclear rockets.

167. Many countries of Latin America have expressed their hopes of avoiding the catastrophic perspectives of an atomic aggression by turning our continent into a nuclear free zone. That was doubtless a laudable initiative of Mexico. In 1967 after laborious negotiations, the Treaty Prohibiting Nuclear Weapons in Latin America was approved in that country. Apart from motivations resulting from its own concrete situation and constituting a basis of its foreign policy, Cuba has refrained from subscribing to that Treaty, since we believe that the noble aims of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, as it is usually called, will be a pure pipe dream until it covers also the denuclearization of the only nuclear Power in the hemisphere. We are not attacking the Treaty; we abstained.

168. I shall not speak of the harassments, the pressures, the infiltrations of counter-revolutionaries, the acts of sabotage, piracy and aggression of various types that we have suffered in Cuba, including the real threat of a nuclear hecatomb. Nor shall I speak of the economic blockade and the trade embargo imposed on us with the connivance of those who at that time acted as the Cains of Latin America. I shall not speak of that living, fresh and enlightening history, because it is shameful and it would take me too long. But I will say that that was the high price the Cuban people had to pay definitively to break away from North

American imperialism and the oligarchies and with incredible will, awareness, courage and abnegation, to set up the conditions for its independent, revolutionary and socialist development, with the unchanging support and fraternal help, on all levels, of the socialist community of countries and, primarily, of the Soviet Union. But the peoples that are not ready to pay that price must know that they will never emerge from under-development and dependence.

169. But I shall speak of Cuba, to stress the pre-conditions that we consider to be indispensable in order to go beyond under-development and dependence. It would be unforgivably naive to depend on the international co-operation of imperialism to shatter the vicious circle of relations between the developed capitalist countries and the dependent and under-developed nations, since the present structures were created by the very foreign centres of power that gobble up their resources and wealth. As a corollary, I can say that there is no liberation and development and there cannot be any without a change in the economic and social structures that will make basic changes in the control of the means of production, such as agrarian reform and the nationalization of the key sectors of the economy. Reform and development with populist attractions only tend to increase stagnation and dependence. We have to shake up and radically change the relations and the structures of internal and external domination. In other words, the pre-condition for development and liberation is revolutionary change.

170. We in Cuba obtained full liberation and the objective possibility of developing along the socialist road through the revolutionary armed struggle of our people. But the road of access to power can vary and always depends on specific circumstances. What is important is the nature of the change and that the people participate in it.

171. Thus, Chile has now started, under the direction of the Government of Popular Unity and President Salvador Allende, to regain its basic wealth and natural resources within the constitutional framework and is carrying out the process resolutely in the face of the threats, aggression and plots of North American imperialism. The Revolutionary Government of the Armed Forces of Peru, under its President, General Juan Velasco Alvarado, has already, and also in accordance with its own conceptions and circumstances, undertaken a series of economic and social structural changes with the declared purpose of freeing itself from under-development and dependence. Both those movements are characterized, furthermore, by the objectives which they have set for themselves, namely, to benefit the working population and the needy masses. The sacrifices and devotion called for can be accepted and carried out by peoples only if they work for themselves and if they take part in the endeavours. Cuba, through its achievements, shows that the work can be done.

172. Cuba, Chile and Peru are the first exponents of the new revolutionary situation that has gained ground in Latin America as a response and a challenge to the onerous conditions under which we exist. But in the present circumstances of Latin America and the rest of the world, freedom and development can be fully achieved only through the effective and militant union of our peoples. As

the Prime Minister of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba, Major Fidel Castro, said, that union will not occur in one day and at a specifically defined time. It will be a historical process as awareness of the phenomenon gains ground, as peoples liberate themselves and as they understand that for each and every one of our peoples there can be only one truth--there is a future only in union, there is a salvation only in union. It will be a long historical process of partial economic integration, until one day--and this is the law of history--we shall belong to an economic and political union of the peoples of Latin America. On that day the threats to peace and security in our hemisphere will also be wiped away.

173. The direction of history is also changing in Latin America. The peoples are not only getting closer together and trying to obtain their rights again; in other fields--and at other levels, some countries have begun to exercise their sovereign right, in accordance with their laws and needs, to benefit from their basic resources and natural wealth, whether they be on land or in the sea, despite measures of pressure which, because they violate the principles of self-determination of peoples and those of non-intervention set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, constitute a threat to international peace and security.

174. The total breakdown of the Alliance for Progress, the key crisis through which the Organization of American States is going, and the measures of self-defence adopted in the Andean Pact; the entry of Venezuela in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, and of Chile and Peru in the Organization of Copper Exporting Countries; the progressive statements of the Charter of Lima; the timid aspirations of the Special Commission of Latin American Co-ordination; and the recent agreements arrived at in Bogotá at the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meetings, where the United States was practically isolated and silent, are clear indications of the growing awareness that the development of our continent is incompatible with neo-colonial dependence on the United States. While that dependence exists, we can state axiomatically that peace and security are being threatened.

175. It is within this context, of which it is a part, that we must study the main item on our agenda: the threats to peace and security in the hemisphere that lie in the neo-colonial relations imposed by the United States on Panama in the so-called Canal Zone and in the transoceanic waterway itself and that emanate from a treaty which violates the most elementary norms of international law. It was signed under threats and with an imperialist pen on behalf of a "Messianic civilizing mission" and to benefit the territorial, economic, commercial, financial, political and military expansion of the United States at the expense of Panama and Latin America. This most shameful history of piracy is recounted in hundreds of books, and the chief robber himself proclaimed it in a famous, cynical and true statement when he said, "I took Panama".

176. If we truly want to understand the significance and meaning of the burning situation that flowed from this neo-colonial enclave we must study it within the framework of the very process of the formation of the Panamanian people. No disloyal secession from Colombia, no republic

invented by North American imperialism, was or is Panama. By virtue of its territorial unity, the political, economic and social factors that conditioned its evolution, and its history and culture, Panama was and is a nation possessing all a nation's attributes, powers and jurisdictions. And, like all nations, it has the inalienable right to exercise them. The Panamanian people has strengthened with ideas, corroborated with facts and washed with blood its indomitable will to be free, independent and sovereign. This small country, arbitrarily divided and amputated, belongs to the over-all nation we see in the offing--the great Latin American union that will one day take shape.

177. If we look back to the seventeenth century and particularly the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the Panamanian isthmus had become a bridge of dry land between the two oceans, we shall see that its settlers, a growing mixture of Spaniards, Indians and blacks, were becoming increasingly aware of the role as a bridge which geography and economy had given the provinces of Panama and Veragua. The heavy flow of intercontinental trade that started in Portobelo on the Caribbean and Panama on the Pacific led even at that time to thought of the need for some ditch to bring the two oceans together. The idea of a canal across the isthmus dates back to that time.

178. The movement, progress and prosperity that colonial trade had created in Panama shrank during the second half of the eighteenth century, when the majority of trade was directed south through the Strait of Magellan, causing social and economic suffering. But during these periods Panamanian nationality jelled, and it became even more singular. As César A. de León stated, "It was more pronounced than that of other regions that later became independent States". The rest of our continent and Cuba have followed the same process. The gestation of nationality in the Spanish colonies was a phenomenon very similar in all countries and ran parallel in them.

179. At the dawn of the nineteenth century Panama was, as we have said, already an entity perfectly differentiated from all the rest. There are highly significant events to prove it. Panama continued under Spanish domination after Colombia had broken loose. It was still linked to Spain after Central America had broken away. Panamanian contingents participated in the battles of the Liberator, and the province broke away from the Spanish crown on 28 November 1821. Simón Bolívar greeted that event with exultant words:

"I cannot express the feeling of joy and admiration that invaded me when I heard that Panama, the centre of the universe, had regenerated itself and freed itself of its own will. The act of independence of Panama is the most glorious monument any American province can offer history. Everything has been covered: justice, generosity, policies and national interest."

180. In 1826 the Liberator selected the Isthmus as the centre of the frustrated meeting of our peoples to unite, to repel by force the reconquest set up by the Holy Alliance and to start a common policy. One of the cardinal purposes in Bolívar's mind was to help in the independence of Cuba, which was already hungered for by the United States under

Jefferson's presidency as a strategic base for its future policy in the Caribbean. The pincers of the Monroe Doctrine, the false analogy of the ripe fruit, the Machiavellism of patient waiting and the crude expression of "manifest destiny" were hanging over our own country's future. The Liberator had been careful not to invite the United States. He could not do so when he himself had said, "the United States, ... destined by Providence to plague America with torments in the name of freedom".

181. The wide-scale conception of Bolívar, that, in order to strengthen their independence, guarantee their security and speed up their political, economic, social and cultural development, the only alternative for countries that had liberated themselves from Spain was to constitute a federation of peoples, was welcomed by Panama with such warm enthusiasm that its first act of sovereignty and self-determination was to unite with Greater Colombia—a fruitful germ of the continental union the promoter had in mind. This courageous decision, different from that of many other countries, led Panama into great difficulties when, in 1830, Greater Colombia broke apart and Colombia was unfortunately plunged into chaos with Panama remaining linked to it, against the wishes of most of the Panamanian people, during the tormented period of wars between factions. During that period the Panamanian people remained true to its unshakable determination to constitute itself as a free and independent nation. Despite repeated defeats of its attempts in 1841 it became fleetingly independent and was recognized as a sovereign State by a number of countries. But in that same year, when the United States was usurping the most fertile land from Mexico—land which added to the annexation of Texas what are today the states of California, New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Colorado and Wyoming—the Mallarino-Bidlack agreement was signed, giving the nascent Power rights, privileges and immunities in matters of navigation and free transit across the isthmus. Also, that nation promised to ensure the neutrality of the territory and the rights of sovereignty and property of New Granada. In the light of that agreement, the United States did not take too long to obtain the economic and strategic privilege of building the railway from one ocean to the other. From that moment on, North American interference and the struggle between the usurpers and the victims followed close on one another. As an illustration, let us look at the famous "slice of the watermelon" and the intrusions carried out either because of the imperialists' desire to do so or because of the demands of others, in 1860, 1861, 1862, 1865 and 1886, when Panama lost its autonomy and was reduced to a mere province.

182. The Panamanian professor Nils Castro very pertinently recalls the vibrant accusation made 122 years ago by the outstanding Panamanian thinker Justo Arosemena: "The Yankees have caused all sorts of trouble. They have shown an insolent contempt for institutions, customs, authority and the national race itself." That was the time when the California gold rush poured thousands of adventurers across the isthmus leaving in their wake humiliation and hatred.

183. The disguised policy of "patient waiting" was now followed by the impatience of "Monroesism" and "big-

stick" action, England, which tried to stop North American expansion by opening a waterway across Nicaragua, but had to abandon that idea because of the complex situation in Europe and the prime need to protect its own immense colonial empire, was not in the way of its partner the United States in the growth of this Yankee imperialism. During Cleveland's presidency, Secretary of State Olney sent a very crude message to Lord Salisbury, the head of the British Government, in which he said: "Practically speaking, the United States are today sovereigns in America, and their decision is law in matters in which they participate." That shows the reason for the very speedy abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and the speedy negotiation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, which was rejected by the United States Senate because it did not authorize the United States to fortify the Canal, and another treaty that did so was immediately approved. The main obstacle for over 50 years to the progress of the "do-gooders" and of "manifest destiny" towards Central America and the Far East had disappeared, and now the road was open to obtain the Zone and start the Canal.

184. But the United States intervention that was going to disfigure and distort the constant struggle of the Panamanian people for independence was that of 1902. The Thousand Day War, which started in Colombia, because of rivalries of power between liberals and conservatives, left more than 50,000 dead and caused enormous damage and tensions in Panama, which until that time had managed to remain outside the upheavals. But this time the repercussions of the struggle had unleashed a social war in the isthmus led by Victoriano Lorenzo. The United States intervened as a settler of squabbles between the liberals and the conservatives. The peace was signed on the battleship *Wisconsin*. But the promise to respect the lives and property of the liberals of the "other war" was violated in Panama, where Victoriano Lorenzo was shot and the liberal leaders were outlawed. And yet the Herrán-Hay Treaty for the construction of the Canal was signed, a Canal in which too much hope of economic improvement had been placed by the Panamanian people. But the terms of the agreement were so lenient that the Colombian Congress refused to ratify it. President Theodore Roosevelt then decided to tear up the Mallarino-Bidlack Treaty and turn to force.

185. On 20 May 1902, in Cuba, the first neo-colonial experiment of the continent was starting. On the very threshold of the popular victory, the result of 30 years of struggle, and despite the warnings of José Martí, it was a republic that had been distorted with a constitutional appendix which stipulated the right of the United States to intervene in its domestic affairs and opened the sluice gates of its basic resources and natural wealth to the voracity of American bankers, merchants and capitalists. Perhaps it was the most dramatic phase of the process that was beginning in the Caribbean then.

186. On 3 November 1903 something very similar took place in Panama. Already possessing Puerto Rico, the Philippines and Hawaii, and having imposed the Platt Amendment on Cuba and established a naval base at Guantánamo—a strategic infrastructure that was necessary to protect the interoceanic Canal—the Roosevelt Government decided to give economic and military help to the

most reactionary sectors of Panamanian separatism, which were conditioned to a recognition of its plans and privileges; and, with the adventurer Philippe Bunau Varilla, the prime mover in the French company that succeeded the one which had failed to build the Canal, hatched an uprising against the central Government of Colombia, with the naive co-operation of the Panamanian people, which did not know of their designs and plans. United States troops landed in the city of Panama on the day set for the uprising and United States ships repelled the Colombian ships, attempting to suppress the rebellion. That day Panama broke its dependence on Colombia to fall under the neo-colonial domination of the United States. But that manoeuvre was to destroy a constant hope of the Panamanian people. If Cuba had broken away from Spain and Panama from Colombia, they had not done so from the United States—that was the double task that was imposed upon them at that time.

187. José Martí had seen before, during and after, as well as around the events. Before he fell so radiantly on the battlefield, the apostle of freedom told his Mexican friend, Manuel Mercado:

"I am in danger of giving my life for my country and for my duty every day—because I know it and I know how to do it—I think I can in time, with the independence of Cuba, stop the United States from spreading over the West Indies and thus falling more heavily on our lands of America. Whatever I have done thus far, whatever I do, is for that end."

And that is what he did and would do:

"to avoid the road being opened up in Cuba that will be fed with our blood and lead to the annexation of our countries by the brutal North Americans that despise us.

"I lived in the monster and I know his entrails; and my sling is that of David."

188. Appointing himself Special Envoy and Minister Plenipotentiary, the freebooter Bunau Varilla went to Washington. On 13 November he presented credentials and on 18 November he signed the Isthmian Canal Convention, together with Secretary of State Hay. He did not even wait for the Commission's arrival to negotiate formally. Lacking powers and rights, Bunau Varilla turned Panama into a Yankee protectorate. The symbolism of the policies of the "big stick" and "dollar diplomacy", parts of the planned United States neo-colonialism, was thus starting simultaneously in the Greater Antilles and in the Isthmus on the mainland.

189. In the history of international relations, the Isthmian Canal Convention is the most expressive proof of unscrupulousness, contempt for principle, open rapacity and contempt for a people. The majority of writers have demonstrated its absolute juridical invalidity and, therefore, the fact that it does not truly exist in the light of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Among the authorities on the matter there are many Americans who share this view. But it is the patiotic writers—like Julio Yau, Jorge Turner and Jorge E. Illueca

—and the nationalist fighters of Panama that have uncovered the background of neo-colonialism and have fought to ensure the abrogation of the Convention and suffered persecutions and massacres. We can still remember the days of January 1964, when 21 teen-age students gave their lives and more than 300 persons were wounded in the legitimate effort to raise the Panamanian flag next to the United States flag, in accordance with the views of President Kennedy, at the secondary school in Balboa.

190. This ferocious aggression of United States troops, which gave rise to vociferous indignation among the Panamanian people, led to the breaking of diplomatic relations with the United States and the convening of the Security Council and of the Organ of Consultation of the Organization of American States, to examine the causes of the conflict between the two countries that was endangering hemispheric peace and security and establish conditions for negotiating a new convention that would remove those causes, making it possible to establish on a new basis the relations arising from the construction and use of the Canal.

191. The negotiations which were started, in the light of the Joint Declaration of Panama and the United States of 3 April 1964,<sup>5</sup> culminated in 1967 in three drafts: the Panama Canal treaty, the treaty for the building of a sea-level canal by Panama, and the treaty for the defence and neutrality of the Panama Canal. Feeling that these instruments "did not meet the objective of bringing about the prompt elimination of the causes of conflict between the two countries", the present Government of Panama rejected them and negotiations were broken off.

192. On 29 June 1971, Panama renewed the dialogue with the United States, clearly defining its position and setting forth its guidelines, through its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Juan Antonio Tack, and issued the following basic documents: protest of the Revolutionary Government to the Government of the United States (26 June 1970), statement at the headquarters of the Organization of American States (26 June 1970), rejection by the Revolutionary Government of the three draft treaties of 1967 (20 August 1970), statement in the American Society in Panama (15 December 1970), statement at the First Regular General Assembly of the Organization of American States, in San José, Costa Rica (15 April 1971), and letter to the Secretary-General, U Thant, (4 October 1971).<sup>6</sup>

193. The causes of the conflict between the two countries were listed by the Panamanian Government: perpetuity, political jurisdiction and administrative authority, the carrying out of unauthorized civilian works, protection of the Canal and the insufficiency of direct and indirect benefits to Panama.

194. Article II of the Isthmian Canal Convention states that

"The Republic of Panama grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation and control of a zone of

<sup>5</sup> See *The Department of State Bulletin*, vol. L, No. 1296 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 656.

<sup>6</sup> This communication was sent to Member States by a note verbale dated 7 October 1971.



land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of said Canal."

It is furthermore granted perpetual right over various islands in the Bay of Panama and to

"the use, occupation and control of any other lands and waters outside of the zone above-described which may be necessary and convenient".

195. In the Arias-Roosevelt Treaty of 2 March 1936,<sup>7</sup> the United States yielded the right to use, occupy and control any other lands but retained the perpetuity of the concession of the Canal Zone. In 1967, in the above-mentioned draft treaties, it proposed the maintenance of the validity of the Zone to the year 2067.

196. Cuba considers that the perpetuity of those neo-colonial agreements should be abrogated as well as their concessions. It must be borne in mind that they are null and void: the representative of one of the parties did not have full powers, and there was no free consent. The will of the United States was imposed without the Panamanian people's approval. The Convention of 1903 is intended precisely to legitimize a situation which is contrary to law.

197. The United States has even gone beyond the Draconian terms of the Convention. It is there set forth that the political jurisdiction and administrative authority were limited exclusively to "the . . . maintenance, operation sanitation and protection of the Canal". But the United States Government has arrogated to itself the full right of exercise of the vaunted jurisdiction and authority in the Canal Zone.

198. Cuba considers that the neo-colonial enclave is affecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Panama and we feel that full enjoyment of the inherent powers over the entire territory of the isthmus must be returned to Panama.

199. When the Treaty of 1936 limited the powers of the United States to "the maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the Canal", it was obvious that the word "construction" had been dropped, and, therefore, that prior agreement should be obtained before any civilian construction was carried out. The United States has carried out such construction without respecting either the letter of the agreement or the authority of the Panamanian Government. Cuba considers that an immediate end must be put to this inadmissible abuse of power.

200. The Panama Canal Zone has become a powder keg to the peace and security of the hemisphere. Article X of the 1936 Treaty, prepared in the light of the foreseeable imminence of the Second World War, literally states:

"In case of an international conflagration or the existence of any threat of aggression which would endanger the security of the Republic of Panama or the neutrality or security of the Panama Canal, the Govern-

ments of the United States of America and the Republic of Panama will take such measures of prevention and defense as they may consider necessary for the protection of their common interests. Any measures, in safeguarding such interests, which it shall appear essential to one Government to take, and which may affect the territory under the jurisdiction of the other Government, will be the subject of consultation between the two Governments."

It is provided in article XXIII of the Convention of 1903:

"If it should become necessary at any time to employ armed forces for the safety or protection of the Canal, or of the ships that make use of the same, or the railways and auxiliary works, the United States shall have the right, at all times and in its discretion, to use its police and its land and naval forces or to establish fortifications for these purposes."

201. Cuba considers that neither of those articles authorizes the United States to transform the Canal Zone into part of its world-wide system of military bases for aggressive purposes or to guarantee the security of its continental territory; nor to utilize the territory of the Canal Zone as a training ground for its armed forces; nor to train special and conventional forces of the Latin American armies; nor to send expeditions of rangers or camouflaged planes to Latin American countries struggling for their liberation and development; nor to use the Zone as a headquarters for its Southern Command, a regional branch of the American Army; nor to turn the Zone into a centre for subversion and a base for interference in the domestic affairs of the countries of Latin America. The armed attack against the Dominican Republic, organized in the Canal Zone, constituted one of the gravest threats to security in Latin America and proves the fiction of the peace structures when they are left in the hands of aggressive criminals of this type.

202. The all-encompassing powers assumed by North American imperialism in Panama constitute the greatest threat to security and peace in our continent, involuntarily exposed as we are to the incalculable consequences of its aggressive policies and military adventures.

203. Cuba considers that it is imperative to dismantle the military bases and neutralize the Canal and that Panama has the right and duty to defend its own territory, which has not suffered any threats, aggressions or damage except from the United States.

204. As for the direct benefits derived from the Canal and the railway across the isthmus by the Panamanian people, they are laughable: it is not worth mentioning the mere pittance given Panama for their use, control and utilization. The present Panamanian Government has refused to accept it.

205. Deprived of its own considerable resources, or even possessing them, the main resource of Panama is its geographical location. The isthmus does not exist because of the Canal; the Canal exists because of the isthmus. The earnings derived from its use should be the basis for its

<sup>7</sup> League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CC, p. 17.



Independence and the prime mover behind its national development. But thus far they have constrained its independence, undermined its sovereignty, perpetuated its under-development, hindered its international trade, discriminated against its population by the occupiers of the Zone and insulted its national honour. Cuba regards as an inalienable and imprescriptible right of Panama, and one that must be immediately exercised, the nationalization of this natural resource for the benefit of its people and the elimination of the structures and relations of domination that stand in the way of its development.

206. If peace and security are desired in Latin America, the rights to full independence, sovereignty and self-determination must be respected, and, therefore, the power and right of all States to carry out structural changes and select their roads to development without foreign interference, whether these be called economic blockade, trade embargo, coercive action in the international credit organizations, diplomatic pressures, direct or indirect reprisals, ideological frontiers, the Hickenlooper Amendment or open or veiled aggression, of the kind that has occurred and is occurring in so many different modalities.

207. The hour has already struck when all forms and manifestations of colonialism and neo-colonialism in Latin America must be wiped out, including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the seditious activities of transnational enterprises and the naval base at Guantánamo, an area which is part of our national territory and which was taken over against the express will of the people of Cuba and used after the triumph of our revolution as a nest of counter-revolutionaries and spies. We most energetically protest against this arbitrary imposition and we reiterate our sovereign right to restore to our homeland that portion of our country illegally torn from it by United States imperialism. Nor should any of those forms and manifestations of colonialism and neo-colonialism be allowed to persist in Africa or Asia.

208. That, in short, is the position of Cuba on the problems submitted for the Council's consideration.

209. Cuba has always shared the age-old desire of all peoples for peace and security and, therefore, we support the measures adopted by the United Nations for the granting of independence to colonial or dependent peoples, for general and complete disarmament, for the total destruction of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, for the abolition of existing arsenals and for the cessation of their manufacture and testing. When supporting these moves, however, Cuba has also stressed that these undertakings will meet massive obstacles while the imperialist policies of aggression and exploitation exist.

210. The efforts of the United Nations to that end will give positive results only when the security, independence and territorial integrity of all States, large and small, are guaranteed, and this can be feasible only through the overthrow of the aggressive purposes of imperialism. In the Middle East there is still grave danger to the independence of the Arab peoples and to world peace, because of the territories usurped by Israel with imperialist assistance and its stubborn refusal to give them back unconditionally.

Imperialism still prolongs Portuguese domination in Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique and backs the warlike racist régimes in the southern part of that continent. The United States still refuses truly to carry out the peace agreements signed after the victorious resistance of Viet-Nam and the peoples of Indo-China.

211. It is imperative that we state categorically that no country of Latin America can or could, even if it were proposed to it, for obvious reasons, allow the existence of situations that affect international peace and security. The constant responsibility for having provoked these must always fall on the shoulders of the only imperialist Power of this hemisphere.

212. It is now for the Security Council to set the political and juridical framework that will guarantee recognition, obedience and respect for the sovereign rights of Panama in its negotiations with the United States on the Canal Zone. The alternative is clear-cut and final: either the Canal and the Canal Zone are made Panamanian and Latin America is allowed to be free and developed, or peace and security will be increasingly endangered in this part of the world.

213. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

214. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): In exercising my right of reply, I reject without qualification the falsehoods, the page after page of calumny which have just been directed against my country. I reject without qualification the counsels of hate and the voice of venom that, for page after page, have poisoned the atmosphere of this chamber, of this body dedicated to friendship and concord. The accusations against my country are so wild, so reckless, so far removed from the truth, that they are unworthy of a detailed reply at a time when the winds of peace and hope are stirring around the world.

215. There are many differences, many issues, that must be patiently resolved by the process of diplomacy in this hemisphere and in the world. The approach we have just heard from the self-appointed spokesman of a people whose present condition must arouse the compassion of us all is not the way to achieve the high purposes of this body, nor to fulfil our hopes for the Security Council and the United Nations.

216. But I have neither the time nor the inclination to refute in detail all of these accusations. This meeting is being held to contribute to the maintenance of peace and security in this hemisphere. The statements of the representative of Cuba do nothing to advance us toward the noble goal which has brought us to this table.

*Mr. Boyd (Panama) took the Chair.*

217. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform members of the Council that Her Excellency Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, has sent the following message to the President of the Council:

"The meeting of the Security Council in Addis Ababa last year was an historic event. It provided an opportunity

to the international community to focus attention on the pressing problems of that Continent. I am glad that the Council is meeting in Panama City this year. The nations of Latin America have been enriched by the mingling of modern scientific and cultural values with ancient civilizations. Man's spirit of adventure has been matched by his indomitable courage to shape great destinies. With its vast potential of human and material resources this continent has an important role to play in the community of nations. The subject of discussion at the Security Council meetings is of interest to the entire world community as no economic and social progress is possible unless the

world feels assured of permanent peace and international cooperation. Latin American countries have a great deal to contribute to the realization of international peace, security and progress. I hope the meeting will prove constructive and will lead to a real strengthening of peace and cooperation in the world and will give an impetus to our joint efforts in that direction. Please accept my greetings and best wishes to you and to the members of the Security Council for the success of your deliberations."

*The meeting rose at 8.55 p.m.*

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

#### 如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

#### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

#### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

#### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Извещайте справки об изданиях в нашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

#### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.