

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/4537
13 October 1960

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifteenth session

LETTER DATED 12 OCTOBER 1960 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS
ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

On 26 September 1960, the Prime Minister of Cuba, while addressing the General Assembly, made many untrue and distorted allegations against the United States which could not be allowed to stand unanswered. In my brief reply before the Assembly on the following day I stated that the United States would shortly make available a document dealing fully with the issues involved.

On the instructions of the United States Government, therefore, I have the honour to request that the enclosed document, entitled "Facts concerning relations between Cuba and the United States: a reply to allegations against the United States by Prime Minister Fidel Castro of Cuba", be circulated to all Members of the United Nations for their information.

The United States Government, which together with the people of the United States entertains feelings of the warmest friendship and goodwill toward Cuba and her people, deeply regrets that such unfounded and hostile statements should have been made and that it should be necessary to correct the record by means of this reply.

(Signed) James J. WADSWORTH

FACTS CONCERNING RELATIONS BETWEEN CUBA
AND THE UNITED STATES

A REPLY TO ALLEGATIONS MADE IN THE UNITED NATIONS
AGAINST THE UNITED STATES
BY PRIME MINISTER FIDEL CASTRO OF CUBA

INTRODUCTION

On 26 September 1960, the Prime Minister of Cuba, Mr. Fidel Castro, addressed the General Assembly at considerable length on the relations between the present Cuban regime and the United States. His speech contained many unfounded accusations, half-truths, malicious innuendoes and distortions of history - all aimed against the historic friendship between Cuba and the United States, a friendship which he seems anxious to destroy.

The most important charges against the United States which Prime Minister Castro made in this address had already been considered and rejected in two meetings of the Organization of American States, consisting of twenty-one Republics of the Western Hemisphere, before he made them in the General Assembly. The Foreign Ministers of the OAS heard and rejected them at their meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica, in August. The delegates to the OAS economic conference in Bogota, Colombia, in September heard essentially the same charges from the representative of Cuba and again rejected them. Now, in view of the repetition of these and other unfounded charges before the General Assembly, and out of respect for the opinions of the entire membership of the United Nations, the United States feels compelled once again to set the record straight.

* * * * *

CONTENTS

Page

1. Cuban-United States relations since 1898	6
2. The United States, alleged ally of monopoly and reaction	7
3. The U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo	8
4. The United States attitude toward the Batista Government	9
5. U.S. military aid to Cuba	10
6. Cuba's balance of payments: "monopolies ... sucking its blood"	11
7. Terms of payment for seized lands in Cuba	13
8. Cuban sugar exports to the United States	14
9. Presence of anti-Castro Cubans in the United States	18
10. Explosion of the munitions ship La Coubre	19
11. Charges of aerial bombing of Cuba from U.S. territory	20
12. Alleged propaganda and subversion on Swan Island	23
13. Alleged "red smear" against the Government of Prime Minister Castro	23
14. Guantanamo: alleged "pretext" for aggression on Cuba	24
15. United States policy concerning Puerto Rico	25
16. Confinement of Cuban delegation to Manhattan	27
17. Cuban difficulties in New York hotels	27
18. Death of Magdalena Urdaneta	28
19. Alleged refusal of the United States to renegotiate with Cuba	29
Conclusion	32

1. Cuban-United States relations since 1898

The charge: That in times past "Cuba was virtually a colony of the United States;" ... "the apple was ripe and the United States Government held out its open hands." That the Platt Amendment, granting the United States the right to intervene and to lease naval bases in Cuba, was "imposed by force" on Cuba. That the "colonization" of Cuba then began with "the acquisition of the best land by United States firms, concessions of Cuban natural resources and mines, concessions of public services for purposes of exploitation, commercial concessions, concessions of all types." That "a greater part of the sugar production, the lion's share of the arable land of Cuba and the most important industries ... belonged to North American companies."

The facts: When the people of Cuba sought independence from Spain toward the end of the 19th century, the American people overwhelmingly sympathized with them. In 1898 the United States became the active ally of the newly independent Cuba. American soldiers fought side by side with Cuban patriots in the war for Cuban independence.

In the years after Cuba became independent the new nation stood in obvious need of political and economic stability and of investment capital. The Platt Amendment, which governed United States relations with Cuba after the withdrawal of United States troops from the island, helped to assure these conditions.

Prime Minister Castro did not mention the fact that the Platt Amendment was abrogated in 1934 - twenty-six years ago - by agreement between the two Governments. This step was taken during the Presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt, author of the "Good Neighbor" policy, a policy which has remained in effect ever since.

The Prime Minister also neglected to mention that in empowering the use of military forces to assist in the liberation of Cuba the Congress of the United States in 1898 adopted a joint resolution, signed by the President the next day, explicitly disclaiming any intention of the United States to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over Cuba as an aftermath of this assistance and endorsing the right of Cuba to be free and independent and under the control of its own people.

As regards United States interests in Cuban sugar, it is probably true that at one time American-owned firms owned or leased most of the sugar lands and produced most of the Cuban sugar crop. However, long before Prime Minister Castro came to power United States citizens were reducing their sugar holdings. By 1959 they had an interest in no more than one-third of the sugar lands of Cuba, about 1,210,000 acres on which about one-third of the Cuban sugar crop was produced.

Sugar production accounted for only a minor part of United States investment in Cuba. Only 25 per cent of United States investments were devoted to agriculture, and of that more than half represented sugar mills, not the growing cane. The remaining 75 per cent were such as to promote not a one-crop economy but a highly diversified economy, with emphasis on industry and manufacturing. The major portion was invested in public utilities - electricity and telephones - both indispensable to industrial growth and diversification and both regulated by the Cuban Government. As a result Cuba had the fifth highest rate of electrical consumption in Latin America. In addition, 10 per cent of United States investments were directly in manufacturing industries.

2. The United States, alleged ally of monopoly and reaction

The charge: "Why does the United States Government not want to speak of development? ... Because the Government of the United States does not want to quarrel with the monopolies, and the monopolies need natural resources ... The Government of the United States cannot propose a plan for public investment, because this would divorce it from the very raison d'être of the United States Government, which is the United States monopolies. That is the true reason why no true program of economic development is planned: to preserve the land of Latin America, of Africa and of Asia, to keep it the private domain of those who wish to invest their surplus capital." The United States has betrayed its revolutionary origin and has "become today the ally of all the reactionaries of the world, the ally of all the gangsters in the world, the ally of the landowners, the monopolists, the militarists and the fascists of the world, the ally of the most retrograde and reactionary groups of the world."

The facts: The United States does speak of economic development of under-developed countries, and not only speaks of it but contributes increasing

sums of money and energy to it, both through the United Nations and through other agencies, including the inter-American system.

In fact, the United States Government contributes more to economic development of other countries than any other Government in the world. Still larger is the outflow of United States private investment - which we believe, as do most other nations, makes a major favourable impact on the economic growth of under-developed countries and on the well-being of their peoples.

As for "monopolies", United States industries are forbidden by law from engaging in monopolistic practices - by the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890 and the Clayton Anti-Trust Act of 1913, both of which are actively enforced by the United States Government. The Marxist idea of "monopolies", applied to the United States, is a hundred years out of date.

The picture of the United States as the ally of "gangsters ... landowners ... monopolists ... militarists ... fascists" is straight out of the mythology of Soviet communism - as are the economic theories quoted above.

The raison d'être of the United States Government is not "monopolies". It is, in the words of the United States Constitution, "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity."

3. The U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo

The charge: That "because of the Platt Amendment, imposed by force on our people, the Government of the United States took upon itself the right to establish naval bases on our territory, a right that it imposed on us by force and which it has maintained by the same means."

The facts: The United States never "took upon itself" or "imposed by force" any right respecting Guantanamo. Nor do United States rights in Guantanamo arise from the now-defunct Platt Amendment.

In 1902 and 1903 the United States conducted diplomatic negotiations with the Republic of Cuba for the purpose of acquiring the right to establish coaling and naval stations on Cuban territory. As a result of these negotiations, two

executive agreements were signed in 1903. The first provided for the lease to the United States of certain designated territory at Guantanamo Bay. The second agreement spelled out the terms of the lease.

The validity of these agreements was reaffirmed by Article III of the 1934 Treaty of Relations between the United States and Cuba, which is still in effect and which provides:

"Until the two contracting parties agree to the modification or abrogation of the stipulations of the agreement in regard to the lease to the United States of America of lands in Cuba for coaling and naval stations signed by the President of the Republic of Cuba on February 16, 1903, and by the President of the United States of America on the 23rd day of the same month and year, the stipulations of that agreement with regard to the naval station of Guantanamo shall continue in effect. The supplementary agreement in regard to naval or coaling stations signed between the two governments on July 2, 1903, also shall continue in effect in the same form and on the same conditions with respect to the naval station at Guantanamo."

These instruments were not imposed by force. They were negotiated between sovereign Governments. It is particularly necessary to recall their provisions because Prime Minister Castro has raised a current question concerning Guantanamo (see item 14 below).

4. The United States attitude toward the Batista Government

The charge: That "the military group that tyrannized over our country ... was based upon the foreign interests that dominated the economy of the country" - meaning those of the United States - because it was "the type of government that was chosen and preferred by the monopolists."

The facts: The type of government existing in Cuba is the affair of the Cuban people. Since World War II the United States has maintained normal relations with Cuban Governments of varying political tendencies: Colonel Batista in 1940; Dr. Ramón Grau San Martín in 1944, who promoted social reforms against opposition from both right and left wings, including the Communists; Dr. Carlos Prío Socarras in 1948, who won out over both Communist and Batista forces and sought economic progress for his country; beginning in 1952, the second Batista Government; and,

until frustrated by systematic hostility, the present Cuban Government. The idea that leaders of such varying persuasions could have been imposed on the Cuban people by United States "monopolists" is ridiculous, and is an insult to the capacity of the Cuban people to govern themselves.

The United States has a firm policy of non-intervention in Latin American affairs, stemming from the "Good Neighbour" policy of 1934 and in harmony with the United Nations Charter and the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro. The United States regards the principle of non-intervention as one of the cornerstones of the inter-American system.

5. U.S. military aid to Cuba

The charge: That "the Batista regime stayed in power with the assistance of tanks, planes and weapons supplied by the Government of the United States;" that the officers of the army under Batista "were instructed and trained by a military mission of the United States;" and the use of this U.S. materiel and training "to fight the Cuban revolutionaries ... had received the previous agreement of the Government of the United States."

The facts: The United States military missions in Cuba were established in 1950 and 1951, pursuant to mission agreements between Cuba and the United States. This took place during the Presidency of Dr. Carlos Prío Socarras, not of Colonel Batista. These agreements, like similar agreements with most of the other American Republics, had as their sole purpose co-operation in the military defence of the Western Hemisphere and, in this case, specifically of Cuba and the United States. The function of the missions was to give technical advice, arrange for the admission of Cubans to United States military schools and academies, and to help in the procurement of military equipment and arms needed for the common defence.

Equipment was provided to the Cuban Government under a military assistance agreement for hemisphere defence negotiated with and signed by the Prío Government, prior to the advent of President Batista.

Any use made by the Batista Government of this equipment, or of military training provided by the United States, in order to combat Cuban revolutionaries,

was done without the consent of the United States authorities and in disregard of the agreement. The missions had no contact whatever with any military operations against the revolutionaries, trained no personnel for this purpose, and were not present at any time in the zones of operation.

When it became evident that Cuba was undergoing a revolution which had the support of a large part of the Cuban population, the United States showed its determination to stay out of Cuba's internal conflict by suspending all sales and shipments of combat arms to the Batista Government. This suspension was publicly announced in March 1958, ten months before the Castro forces took power. After March 1958 the United States did not make any combat arms available to the Batista Government, either directly or through third countries or in any other way.

6. Cuba's balance of payments: "monopolies ... sucking its blood"

The charge: That "the balance of payments in the last ten years, from 1950 to 1960, has been favourable for the United States vis-à-vis Cuba to the extent of \$1 billion." Thus, that Cuba, "a poor and under-developed country ... was contributing to the economic development of the most highly industrialized country in the world." That the President of the United States did not want this situation changed but rather wanted the new Government to be "true to the monopolies that were exploiting Cuba and sucking its blood."

The facts: These assertions are factually incorrect and the inferences drawn from them are illogical and untrue.

In the decade 1949-1958, the latest for which reliable figures are available, Cuba's exports to the United States earned \$4,405,000,000. (This includes \$756 million of premium payments for Cuban sugar sold in the U.S. market, over and above world sugar prices.) In the same decade Cuba imported from the United States goods worth \$4,676,000,000. Thus Cuba's adverse trade balance toward the United States was not \$1 billion in this decade, but about \$271,000,000.

But even this figure does not truly describe Cuba's international trading position. During the same decade Cuba's imports from all countries amounted to \$6,319,000,000, while her exports to all countries totalled \$6,835,000,000 - a

favourable over-all balance of \$516,000,000 for the decade, indicating a healthy trading position.

It is this over-all trading balance that is most significant. Normally a free-trading nation does not seek a bilateral trade balance with each and every trading partner, but rather an over-all balance of payments with all countries. Attempts to balance trade bilaterally, as on the barter principle, restrict trade unnecessarily and impede economic growth and the improvement of living standards. Thus, for example, the United States has a favourable balance of trade with some of the American Republics, whereas in others the balance is adverse to the United States by ratios as high as two to one. This principle of balancing trade multilaterally is one of the cornerstones of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, of which both Cuba and the United States are members.

The advantage of this multilateral trading system to Cuba is easily shown. The dollars which Cuba earned for goods sold to the United States could be used freely to import other goods into Cuba from anywhere in the world. The fact that Cubans actually bought from the United States slightly more than they sold to the United States did not result from any artificial barter or quota requirement and was not "blood sucking". It was purely the result of competitive forces and of the free choices of Cuban traders.

Under the present Government, Cuba has artificially reduced imports from the United States by more than one half. There was no economic necessity for this. In the years before Prime Minister Castro came to power Cuban foreign exchange reserves, averaging \$270,000,000, were sufficient to cover temporary fluctuations in Cuba's balance of payments. The only possible conclusion is that the reduction of trade with the United States was artificial and politically motivated.

In exchange for its former dollar earnings, and its freedom to seek the greatest advantage for Cuban traders and consumers in the markets of the world, Cuba has been developing a new system of barter transactions with the Soviet Union. In those transactions Cuba will have no choice as to the country to which it will sell or from which it will buy. It will have no chance to benefit from competition in price, quality or style among various potential trading partners. Its

transactions, instead of earning hundreds of millions of dollars a year which can be spent anywhere in the world, will yield only fractional amounts of free currency for Cuba's use in world trade.

7. Terms of payment for seized lands in Cuba

The charge: That the United States, in demanding "speedy, efficient, and just" payment for United States-owned lands seized by the Castro regime, was in effect telling Cuba: "Pay now, cash on the spot, and what we ask for our lands" - thus forcing Cuba "to choose between an agrarian reform and nothing".

The facts: The United States never made such a demand. Several times, it is true, the United States has asked the Cuban Government to make "prompt, adequate and effective compensation" to American citizens whose lands had been taken under the agrarian reform law. But the United States never demanded payment "now, cash on the spot, and what we ask", or attempted to impose any other fixed or rigid terms. We sought only to bring about negotiation of the question of compensation, in accordance with accepted principles of international law.

This was the least that could be asked. The laws prevailing in Cuba in the years when the seized lands were originally bought by United States citizens all contained provisions for prior compensation in case of expropriation. Yet, over one year after the Cuban agrarian reform law was passed, not one American owner has received compensation for lands taken under this law. In his United Nations speech, in fact, Prime Minister Castro asserted an alleged right to seize such properties "without indemnity" - a notion which directly flouts international law.

The United States has a long record of co-operation with countries seeking to carry out sound land reform programmes. On 11 June and 12 October 1959, the United States expressed to the Cuban Government its full support for soundly conceived programmes of rural betterment - including badly needed land reform. The implication that the United States sought to interfere with the Cuban land reform programme, either by making unreasonable demands for compensation or in any other way, is groundless.

8. Cuban sugar exports to the United States

The charge: That the United States, by reducing in 1960 the quota of Cuban sugar annually imported into the United States at premium prices, committed "economic aggression" against Cuba.

The facts: This charge is absurd. It was Cuba under Prime Minister Castro, not the United States, which first caused drastic reductions in Cuban-United States trade. In the sugar trade alone, months before the United States reduced Cuba's sugar quota, Cuba made firm agreements to export a large part of its present and future sugar crops to the Soviet Union and Communist China. In the interest of its own economy the United States could not remain tied to a source of supply burdened with this new obligation and with many other new uncertainties.

These facts deserve to be set forth in more detail.

In January 1960, seven months before the United States Congress acted to reduce the Cuban sugar quota, the present Cuban Government began a series of steps to obstruct trade with the United States. These steps included:

- New import licensing requirements contrary to Cuba's obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.
- Threats and pressures on traditional Cuban customers of the United States to divert their orders to suppliers in other countries.
- Reduction of the import quota on United States rice by more than 25 per cent; severe limits on dollar exchange allowed by the Government for rice imports from the United States; imposition of a new "contribution" (i.e. duty) on all rice imported from the United States; and, meanwhile, duty-free importation of at least 16,500,000 pounds of rice from a third country under a new bilateral trade agreement.
- New surcharges, ranging from 30 per cent to 100 per cent, on remittances of dollar exchange needed by Cuban importers to pay for certain kinds of commodities normally imported from the United States.
- A new order that all Cuban exporters and other Cubans who earn dollars or other foreign exchange in their business must surrender all this foreign exchange to the Government.
- Refusal to lend money to United States-owned banks in Cuba, forcing them to bring in funds from abroad to meet normal business requirements.

If the aim of these steps has been to reduce Cuban imports from the United States, they have succeeded. There is now an estimated backlog of over \$150,000,000 owed to United States citizens for goods shipped to Cuba and for services and earnings. During the first four months of 1960 Cuban imports from the United States were 50 per cent below those in the same four months of 1958 and 75 per cent below those in the same four months of 1959.

Meanwhile Cuba's export trade to the United States continued to flourish. Cuban exports to the United States in the first four months in 1960 were only slightly below those for the same part of 1958 and well above the figure for the same part of 1959.

Then in 1960 the Cuban Government concluded barter agreements with the Soviet Union and Communist China involving the export of a very large part of its annual sugar crop. The agreements provided for payment not at premium prices, as had been true of Cuban sugar exports to the United States, but at prices at or even below the world market level. Moreover, only a minor portion of the payment was to be in convertible currencies, whereas the entire payment for Cuban sugar imported into the United States has been in dollars which Cuba could spend anywhere in the world.

The present leaders in Cuba have often referred to the sugar quota arrangement with the United States, by which Cuba earned convertible dollars at preferential prices, as a form of "bondage" or "slavery". For instance, on 2 March 1960, Dr. Ernesto Guevara, the president of the National Bank of Cuba and a ranking official of the regime, said of the United States citizens concerned: "They have never stopped to analyze what amount of slavery the three million tons of our sugar which we customarily sell at supposedly preferential prices to the giant of the north has meant and means to the people of Cuba." When the United States Government queried the Cuban Government about these remarks, there was no reply. The inference was left that the Cuban rulers regarded the sugar quota as a form of slavery imposed by the United States on the Cuban people.

It is hard to understand how a traditional pattern of Cuban sugar exports paid for in dollars, at prices above the world market, the proceeds of which Cuba was able to use to purchase goods anywhere in the world, can be described as "slavery" - whereas new barter agreements at lower prices, agreements which tie

the Cuban economy to the Sino-Soviet bloc and infringe on Cuba's right to choose the origin, cost and quality of its imports, can somehow be portrayed as "economic freedom".

At all events, it became apparent that the present rulers of Cuba were forcing a radical change in Cuba's entire foreign trade system, and that the motives in their minds in doing this were not economic or commercial but political. This was confirmed when the Foreign Minister of Cuba, Dr. Raul Roa, said in Montevideo, on 10 June 1960, that Cuba had decided "to break the structure of its commercial relations with the United States".

It was against this background that the United States Congress and the President of the United States acted in the summer of 1960 to reduce the preferential quota for imports of Cuban sugar. Despite the vindictive attitude of the Cuban leaders over many months, this act by the United States was not an act of retaliation or revenge. Indeed, it would have been strange to take revenge by reducing a quota which Cuban leaders themselves had condemned as a form of bondage. Rather, the reduction in the quota was necessary in defence of the United States economy, which has for many years depended heavily on Cuba as a source of sugar.

Cuba normally has supplied about 71 per cent of the sugar import requirements of the United States. In the years 1931-1958 the United States imported from Cuba an average of 2,580,000 tons of sugar - all at preferential prices. Cuba's dollar earnings from this trade rose from a low of \$39,000,000 in the depression years of the early 1930's to \$100,000,000 in 1936 and \$400,000,000 in 1947. In 1959 the earnings were \$350,000,000.

Cuba's preferential position in the United States sugar market goes back to 1902. It was made more secure in 1934 by a quota system which gave Cuba a more stable United States market at the higher United States domestic price and in addition a 20 per cent tariff preference as compared with other foreign producers. This arrangement was a matter of mutual advantage. It helped the Cuban economy by providing a most important source of dollar exchange to pay for imports from all parts of the world. It helped the United States economy by providing a reliable source of needed sugar imports at all times, including times

of war and crisis. Thus during both the Korean war and the Suez crisis, when world markets were disturbed, the Cuban sugar industry maintained large stocks which were made available to the United States at fair prices.

This arrangement could last only as long as both parties wanted it to last. The events of early 1960 in Cuba made it doubtful that the Cuban Government was either able or willing to continue it. The highest officials of the Cuban Government made repeated statements describing the supposed political and commercial advantages of selling Cuban sugar elsewhere. On 13 August 1960, the Minister of Finance, Raul Cepero Bonilla, said: "For the next year, it would be much more advantageous to Cuba if the United States did not buy a single grain of sugar." Meanwhile agreements were made committing Cuba to sell a major part of her sugar crop to the Sino-Soviet bloc, and indications appeared that that bloc was prepared to import even larger quantities of Cuban sugar by purchase or barter. Finally, it appears that these new obligations must be met out of a smaller Cuban sugar crop. United States experts estimate that the 1961 Cuban sugar crop may fall as low as 4,900,000 Spanish long tons - as compared with 5,700,000 Spanish long tons in 1960.

For all those reasons the United States was forced, slowly and reluctantly, to conclude that Cuba is no longer a reliable source of supply for vital United States sugar requirements. This was the reason why the United States reduced the Cuban sugar quota and thus freed itself to turn to other sources of sugar supply.

The conditions leading to this decision were created by the present authorities in Cuba. Their right as a sovereign nation to order their foreign trade as they wish is not in dispute, except when in so doing they violate their agreements. But if they claim that right for themselves, they cannot deny it to others.

There are ample grounds for the belief that the present Government of Cuba set out deliberately to provoke, by its own action and threats, a United States action - unavoidable as a matter of economic self-defence - which it could then picture in its propaganda as "economic aggression". Now that it has achieved this dubious success, at a very considerable economic cost to the Cuban people, the cry of "economic aggression" against the United States sounds utterly hollow.

9. Presence of anti-Castro Cubans in the United States

The charge: "The first unfriendly act perpetrated by the Government of the United States was to throw open its doors to a gang of murderers, bloodthirsty criminals who had murdered hundreds of defenseless peasants, who had never tired of torturing prisoners for many, many years, who had killed right and left".

The facts: The number of people who have fled Cuba and have taken refuge in the United States since the Castro Government came to power does indeed run into the hundreds. In view of the fact that the Castro Government has effectively banned all political opposition or public criticism as "counter-revolutionary", and has sought to brand those who dissent from its policies as "war criminals" and adherents of the deposed Batista regime, it is not surprising that many Cubans who value freedom have gone into exile - some of them in the United States. Here they enjoy the traditional right of political asylum. They do not enjoy protection against criminal charges of murder or any other extraditable crime.

In all cases where the Cuban Government sought extradition of Cuban refugees on criminal charges, the United States Government has given the fullest possible co-operation consistent with its traditional legal safeguards and with the very limited co-operation of the Cuban Government itself.

The provisions for extradition of persons from the United States to Cuba are set forth in the United States-Cuban Extradition Treaty and in United States statutes. Cuba can file extradition proceedings in United States courts without even notifying the executive branch of the United States Government.

All this was explained to the new Cuban authorities when, in January 1959, they raised the question of the return to Cuba of certain Cubans who had taken refuge in the United States. Yet to the best of the knowledge of the Department of State, from that day to this the Cuban Government has never requested extradition for a single one of those persons commonly defined by the Government of Cuba as war criminals from the Batista regime.

In fact, the only extradition case which the Cuban Government has followed through to conclusion is that of Major Pedro Diaz Lanz, a former member of the Castro revolutionary group and chief of the Cuban air force after the Castro Government came to power in 1959. In the case of Major Diaz Lanz a United States

District Court denied extradition on the ground that the Cuban authorities had given insufficient evidence of his alleged "crimes".*

In some cases the United States Embassy in Havana has certified extradition papers against certain Cuban refugees, but the Cuban Government has failed to follow up this step. In still other cases Cuban authorities have asked that the United States exercise its "good offices" to detain certain Cubans, but have not taken any step to have them extradited or even indicated the offences with which they were charged in Cuba.

This record strongly suggests that the Cuban Government has no serious desire to obtain extradition of those whom it has branded as "war criminals", preferring to keep the issue alive as one item in its campaign of anti-United States propaganda.

10. Explosion of the munitions ship "La Coubre"

The charge: That "a mysterious explosion - an explosion that was too mysterious - took place in the harbor of Havana, an explosion of a ship carrying Belgian weapons to our country, after many efforts made by the United States Government to prevent the Belgian Government from selling weapons to us" - in other words, by clear implication, that the United States Government caused the explosion.

The facts: The explosion of the French vessel La Coubre in Havana harbour on 4 March 1960, while it was discharging ammunition purchased by the Castro Government, resulted in many deaths and injuries and wide-spread damage. The United States Government promptly expressed its condolences to the Government of Cuba over this tragic disaster, the cause of which is unknown to this day.

Within a few hours of the disaster, before any investigation could be carried out, the propaganda agencies of the Cuban Government, including the controlled press and radio, implied that the United States had caused the explosion. No evidence whatever was adduced to support this charge. The following day, 5 March, at the public funeral of the victims, Prime Minister Castro directly accused the United States of the responsibility - while in the same breath admitting "we do not have conclusive evidence". The same charge, only thinly

* Major Diaz Lanz is referred to in item 11 below.

veiled and again completely unsubstantiated, was repeated in a pamphlet entitled Patria o Muerte (Fatherland or Death) issued by the Department of Public Relations of the Cuban foreign ministry. This pamphlet was widely disseminated in Latin America and was distributed by the Cuban representative on the Council of the Organization of American States to all his diplomatic colleagues. Despite repeated United States protests and denials, the charge has now been repeated by the Cuban Prime Minister before the United Nations.

To this day not one piece of evidence, conclusive or otherwise, has been divulged by the Cuban authorities to support this extremely serious charge against the United States. The only possible conclusion is that there is no such evidence, and that the Cuban Government is cynically using this disaster to add fuel to the fire of its propaganda against the United States.

11. Charges of aerial bombing of Cuba from U.S. territory

The charge: "A plane manufactured in the United States ... flew over Havana, our capital, dropping pamphlets and a few hand grenades ... The result was more than forty victims, between the grenades dropped and the anti-aircraft fire Pirate planes continued to fly over our territory dropping incendiary bombs. Millions upon millions of pesos were lost in the burning fields of sugar cane The American Government was an accomplice in these aerial incursions."

The facts: The United States Government, in endeavoring to prevent unauthorized flights of aircraft from United States soil in the Caribbean area, has imposed upon such flights the most vigorous and elaborate system of controls in its peacetime history. Since there are 75,000 private aircraft in the United States, and 200 airports in Florida alone, the prevention of unauthorized flights is not easy - as Prime Minister Castro and his associates must know very well, having been political exiles in the United States before they came to power in Cuba.

There have been only five unauthorized flights over Cuba concerning which the United States Government possesses any substantial evidence. The Cuban Government has been asked repeatedly to give evidence of other flights so that United States authorities may investigate - but no such evidence has been furnished.

In one of the five known flights, in March 1960, the pilot William Shergalis was, by his own admission, an agent of Fidel Castro - directed to make the flight in order to fabricate evidence of an alleged "United States provocation". Shergalis is now under indictment in the United States District Court of the Southern District of Florida for violating the United States laws applying to agents of a foreign principal and for making an illegal flight.

Another flight, that of Rafael del Pino, on 25 July 1960, is surrounded by circumstances similarly suspicious. Del Pino flew to Cuba in a light, unarmed airplane which he had rented from a private company in Florida. After landing in Cuba, he was attempting to take off when a force of Cuban police opened fire and shot the plane down, wounding Del Pino in the process. The firing took place from ambush and without warning, in circumstances such that the police could not have known the purpose of the flight or the identity of the pilot unless by prior arrangement. The suspicion of prior arrangement is heightened by the fact that Del Pino was a long-time friend of Fidel Castro, knew him at the University of Havana, participated with him in the Bogota riots of 1948, and was with him in Mexico in 1956. Moreover, it is known that Del Pino had been in communication with a member of the Castro family shortly before the flight.

Of the three remaining known flights, the best known is that of Major Pedro Diaz Lanz.

Major Diaz Lanz had fought in the mountains with the Castro revolutionary forces. He had been chief of the Cuban air force under Prime Minister Castro. On 30 June 1959, he broke with the Government of Prime Minister Castro, stating that the Government was under Communist influence and that Communist pressure had forced him out. He thereupon left Cuba.

On 21 October 1959, Major Diaz Lanz eluded the surveillance of United States authorities and made an illegal flight from United States territory over Havana, the Cuban capital. When the United States Government determined the facts on this flight it expressed its regrets and apologies to the Cuban Government. It was in this flight that Prime Minister Castro told the General Assembly that hand grenades were dropped on Havana. The Cuban Government had earlier charged, both in the Security Council and in a pamphlet which was widely distributed, that this plane had dropped bombs and strafed. This charge was false, as the

United States demonstrated in the Security Council in July. The converted bomber making this flight had a permanent luggage rack in its bomb bay and had completely sealed gun positions, as revealed by an investigation by United States authorities after it returned to a United States airport. Perhaps this is why the renewed charge, as stated by Prime Minister Castro in his speech to the General Assembly in September, was that the plane had dropped "grenades", not bombs.

In its efforts to establish the facts about the Diaz Lanz flight, the United States Government has had no help from the Cuban Government which has submitted no official information on the subject. The United States possesses no evidence that the plane dropped hand grenades on Havana. A report by the Cuban Government's own police at the time, moreover, attributed the injuries during the incident either to anti-aircraft fire or to grenades or bombs thrown from automobiles by terrorists, not to bombs, strafing or any other objects coming from an airplane.

The foregoing accounts for three of the five known illegal flights.

A fourth illegal flight took place on 18 February 1960. Its apparent purpose was to bomb a sugar mill. The flight failed when the bomb exploded in mid-air, destroying the airplane and killing its occupants. In the case of this flight also, the United States Government offered its regrets and apologies to the Cuban Government - for which it has received no acknowledgement.

The fifth flight, in May 1960, is still under investigation. The United States has asked the Cuban authorities for help in this investigation but has received no reply.

The stream of unsubstantiated charges on this subject by the Cuban authorities caused the United States to propose, at the Seventh Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the American Republics in San José in August 1960, that a special committee be created to clarify the facts. The Foreign Ministers approved this proposal but the Government of Cuba has shown no sign of willingness to co-operate with such a committee.

The conclusion is inescapable that the Cuban Government is less interested in preventing these unauthorized flights than it is in keeping the charges alive as a part of its campaign against the United States.

12. Alleged propaganda and subversion on Swan Island

The charge: That the United States has "taken over" Swan Island, "which belongs to Honduras"; that "There are now American infantrymen there"; that the United States "has set up a very powerful broadcasting station" on the island "which it has placed at the disposal of war criminals... and maneuvers and training are being carried out on that island to promote subversion in Cuba and to promote the landing of armed forces in our islands".

The facts: The two Swan Islands have been under United States control for almost 100 years. The United States has offered to discuss with Honduras, at an early date, the latter's claim to the islands.

There is a private commercial broadcasting station on the islands, operated by the Gibraltar Steamship Company. The United States Government understands that this station carries programs in Spanish which are heard in Cuba, and that some of its broadcast time has been purchased by Cuban political refugees.

The assertion that manoeuvres and training are being carried out in the Swan Islands with a view to subversion or the landing of armed forces in Cuba is totally false.

13. Alleged "red smear" against the Government of Prime Minister Castro

The charge: That United States news agencies told the world that "Cuba was already a communist government, a red peril ninety miles from the United States, with a government dominated by communists" at a time when the present Cuban Government "had not even had the opportunity of establishing diplomatic and commercial relations with the Soviet Union".

The facts: Unlike the press of a totalitarian country, the press and news services of the United States are free to write and interpret the facts as they see them, without governmental guidance or restraint. It is true that many American newspapermen, even during the early months after the present Government came to power in 1959, reported what they regarded as clear signs of communist influence in the new Government. Far from seeking to "smear" the new Government, however, the Government of the United States -- which alone can speak officially for the American people in international affairs -- exercised great restraint in commenting publicly on political trends in Cuba.

/...

In fact, on 26 January 1960, over a year after Prime Minister Castro came to power and long after the press reports referred to above, President Eisenhower issued a major restatement of United States policy toward Cuba. In it he reaffirmed the adherence of the United States Government to the policy of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries, including Cuba; he explicitly recognized the right of the Cuban Government and people, in the exercise of their national sovereignty, "to undertake those social, economic and political reforms which, with due regard for their obligations under international law, they may think desirable"; and he expressed the sympathy of the American people for the aspirations of the Cuban people.

Had the United States Government not followed such a policy of restraint, it could have mentioned various developments: the silencing of almost all the anti-Communist forces in Cuba; the consequent flight into exile of many of the leading editors and commentators of the nation; the emergence of the Communist party newspaper Hoy and the increasing influence of its editor, Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, in the governmental machinery of censorship; and the fact that the only political party permitted to function in Cuba is the Communist party.

It is quite true that these developments took place, and were discovered and reported through the free press, long before Prime Minister Castro established formal diplomatic and commercial relations with the Soviet Union. But the point is irrelevant. Diplomatic and commercial relations are not the only means by which outside influence may be exerted.

14. Guantanamo: alleged "pretext" for aggression on Cuba*

The charge: That the United States is using the naval base at Guantanamo, Cuba, "as a means of promoting self-aggression, to justify an attack on our country"; that various speculations in the United States about a possible Cuban attack on Guantanamo are published in order "to set the stage for aggression"; that Guantanamo is "pointed at the heart of Cuba and pointed at the heart of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba, in the hands of those who declare themselves enemies of our country, of our revolution and of our people".

* For discussion of Guantanamo base agreement see item 5 above.

The facts: It is not the United States but the Government of Cuba whose responsible officials appear intent on provoking an incident concerning the base at Guantanamo. Prime Minister Castro and his brother Raul Castro have both issued frequent hints and warnings about the possibility that the Cuban Government might reclaim the United States naval base -- notwithstanding the legal and binding international agreements which cannot be abrogated except by the mutual consent of both parties.

The idea of a United States threat of aggression against Cuba, whether because of Guantanamo or for any other cause, is a figment of the imaginations of the leaders of the Cuban Government and cannot be substantiated by any action or any statement by the responsible spokesmen of United States foreign policy.

The war of nerves launched against Guantanamo by the Cuban leaders can have no result but to incite Cuban citizens against the United States and against the naval base itself. The personnel and authorities of this base have always enjoyed the best relations with the Cuban people; the base has contributed substantially to the economy of the nation; and it is an important factor in the military security of all the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

The assertion by Prime Minister Castro that the United States authorities who control the Guantanamo base "declare themselves enemies of our country, of our revolution and of our people" is totally false. The command of the Guantanamo naval base has always been, and is still, under orders to stay out of the internal affairs of Cuba. It has done so and will continue to do so. The base is in the hands of the United States, whose Government and people are friends of Cuba, of the Cuban people, and of their just aspirations.

15. United States policy concerning Puerto Rico

The charge: That the United States "has destroyed the Puerto Rican nationality"; is destroying Puerto Rico's "national spirit"; has been destroying Puerto Rico's nationality "for fifty years".

The facts: These assertions can best be answered by quoting two statements. The first statement was made in the General Assembly on 27 November 1953, by the United States Representative, Mr. Lodge, at the time when the United States ceased to report to the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories concerning Puerto Rico, which had now attained complete self-government and commonwealth status. It reads:

"I am authorized to say, on behalf of the President, that if at any time the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico adopts a resolution in favor of more complete or even absolute independence he will immediately thereafter recommend to Congress that such independence be granted. The President also wishes me to say that in this event he would welcome Puerto Rico's adherence to the Rio Pact and the United Nations Charter."

The second statement is a message by Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, to the President of the General Assembly, dated 27 September 1960, which reads:

"In view of the charges of United States colonialism against Puerto Rico, raised at the General Assembly of the United Nations by the Soviet and Cuban delegations, I have the honor of bringing to your attention the following views of the Commonwealth Government:

"The people of Puerto Rico strongly adhere to the democratic way of life, based on the respect of minority rights, the protection and furtherance of individual freedoms, and the effective exercise of the right to vote in free, unhindered elections. There can be no genuine self-determination unless these conditions are met.

"Puerto Rico has truly and effectively met them and it has freely chosen its present relationship with the United States. The people of Puerto Rico are a self-governing people freely associated to the United States of America on the basis of mutual consent and respect. The policies regarding the cultural and economic development of Puerto Rico are in the hands of the people of Puerto Rico themselves for them to determine according to their best interests.

"The United Nations General Assembly, by Resolution of November 1953, has solemnly recognized that the people of Puerto Rico effectively exercised their right to self-determination in establishing the Commonwealth as an autonomous political entity on a mutually agreed association with the United States. In further regard to the principle of self-determination, the Commonwealth Legislative Assembly has approved this very year a law authorizing another vote on Puerto Rico's status whenever 10 per cent of the electors request it.

"More than 13,000 visitors and trainees from all over the world, including thousands from the new states in Africa and Asia now represented at the United Nations, have seen with their own eyes the social and economic achievements of the Commonwealth under free, democratic institutions. As an example of Puerto Rico's great forward strides as a Commonwealth, the rate of growth of the net Commonwealth income in 1959 was 9.4 per cent, one of the highest in the entire world.

"The People of Puerto Rico fully support the United Nations as a symbol of a world order, ruled by law and the principle of self-determination,

and hope that through the United Nations a militant campaign for peace is developed that would avoid the nuclear extinction of our civilization."

16. Confinement of Cuban delegation to Manhattan

The charge: That the Cuban delegation to the General Assembly was "singled out for... confinement to the island of Manhattan"... and was subjected to "hostility under the pretext of security."

The facts: As host country to the United Nations, the United States is obligated to afford to accredited delegates "any necessary protection to such persons while in transit to or from the Headquarters District". In the case of Prime Minister Castro and his delegation, the United States made extraordinary efforts to fulfil this obligation - efforts made necessary by the fact that the conduct of Prime Minister Castro and his associates, both before and during their visit to New York, created extraordinary difficulties.

For more than a year and a half Prime Minister Castro and his Government have carried on a systematic campaign of defamation against the United States Government in terms which were contrary to known fact and offensive to the American people. In addition, hundreds of Cubans who fled Cuba since the coming to power of Prime Minister Castro have taken up residence in the United States rather than live under the present Cuban Government. Thus, in the interest of Prime Minister Castro's personal safety, and given the heavy demands upon United States security personnel because of the large number of Prime Ministers in the United States, it was necessary to confine his movements to Manhattan. The same decision was made concerning the delegations of the Soviet Union, Hungary, and Albania.

17. Cuban difficulties in New York hotels

The charge: That notice was given by unnamed persons, presumably United States officials, "to all hotels not to rent rooms to us"; and that, when the Hotel Theresa in Harlem offered to rent rooms to Prime Minister Castro's party, "an official of the State Department did all in his power to try to stop us from being given rooms in the hotel".

The facts: The United States Government never gave, or caused to be given, notice to any hotel "not to rent rooms" to the Cuban delegation. This is the very reverse of the truth. When the management of the Hotel Shelburne in New York asked the State Department whether he should accept an application for rooms for the Cuban delegation, the Department of State informed him that it hoped he would "accept the request of the Cuban Consul General of New York for accommodations for the Cuban Delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations". As a result, the management of the Hotel Shelburne agreed to accommodate the Cuban delegation.

Nor was there any attempt by any United States official to prevent the Cuban delegation from moving to the Hotel Theresa. The remoteness of that hotel from the United Nations headquarters placed a greater burden on the already overburdened police whose duty it was to assure the safety of Prime Minister Castro. Nevertheless, to assist Prime Minister Castro, who was at this point at United Nations Headquarters, an immediate security check was undertaken. By 10.30 p.m., 19 September, the United States Mission to the United Nations informed Prime Minister Castro that his party could proceed to the Hotel Theresa. Simultaneously Prime Minister Castro had instructed his own security officers to check the hotel. This investigation was not completed until midnight. The Prime Minister then proceeded under police escort to his new accommodations.

It is also true that a private citizen offered to house the Prime Minister and his party at the Hotel Commodore, only a few blocks from the United Nations, free of charge - an offer which the Cuban delegation rejected.

18. Death of Magdalena Urdaneta

The charge: That the shooting and subsequent death of a nine-year-old Venezuelan girl, Magdalena Urdaneta, in New York during the Castro visit was "provoked by those who receive support from the systematic campaigns against Cuba and with the connivance of the authorities"; and that "a spokesman from the White House" in an act of "hypocrisy" made a statement "fixing the guilt on the Cuban delegation".

The facts: On 21 September a large group of Castro supporters assaulted members of a small anti-Castro group while the latter was patronizing a New York

City restaurant. During the mêlée, several shots were fired by a pro-Castro combatant, one of which struck Magdalena Urdaneta, a nine-year-old Venezuelan girl, as she sat with her parents having dinner. Miss Urdaneta died shortly afterward.

The following day, the Department of State (not White House) press officer stated that this Venezuelan girl was the innocent victim of an aggressive attack by adherents of the present Cuban Government and that the Department of State wished to express to the parents of Magdalena Urdaneta its deep sympathy and regret over her untimely death.

Francisco Molina, a Cuban national known as "Fancho the Hook", has been identified by a witness as the assailant who fired the shot which took the life of Magdalena Urdaneta. Molina lost his right hand in an industrial accident several years ago and in its place alternately wears a metal hook or flesh colored artificial hand. Molina is known to anti-Castro forces in the New York City area as the head of a group of Castro followers intimidating anti-Castro people.

Assistance was requested of the Federal Bureau of Investigation when it appeared that Molina had fled the State of New York to avoid prosecution for the murder of the Venezuelan girl. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has distributed 140,000 "wanted" flyers on Molina.

19. Alleged refusal of the United States to renegotiate with Cuba

The charge: That "the Government of Cuba has always been ready to discuss its problems with the Government of the United States, but the Government of the United States has not been ready to discuss these problems with Cuba"; that "the Government of the United States does not deign to discuss matters with the small country of Cuba on the Cuban problems".

The facts: Since the advent of the Government of Prime Minister Castro on 1 January 1959 the United States has officially expressed a willingness to negotiate matters at issue between Cuba and the United States on more than twenty-five separate occasions.

This is the fourth time that the present Government of Cuba has alleged to a responsible international body that the Government of the United States

refused to negotiate with the Government of Cuba. Prime Minister Castro's reference to the Cuban Government's willingness to negotiate presumably relates to the proposal of the Government of Cuba last February to name a commission to conduct negotiations in Washington. Secretary Herter described the actual circumstances of this case at the meeting of Foreign Ministers at San José, Costa Rica on 26 August 1960 in the following words:

"The Cuban Foreign Minister has asserted that the United States Government refused to negotiate with the revolutionary Government of Cuba when, last February, it decided to name a commission to conduct negotiations in Washington. I need not point out that the Government of Cuba, in its proposal, suggested that the Government of the United States should bind both the executive and the Congress to refrain from any action whatever which the Government of Cuba might consider to affect its interests while leaving the Government of Cuba free to negotiate or procrastinate as it chose. It is appropriate to ask, however, why the Government of Cuba deliberately refrained from quoting my government's reply in its entirety. I say deliberately refrained because, Mr. Chairman, this is the third time that the Government of Cuba has trumpeted this note before responsible international bodies to serve its own purpose in completely distorting the position of the U.S. Government in this matter. The fact is that the part of the United States note which Minister Roa has again deleted from his presentation to this body went on to affirm the friendship between the Cuban and American peoples and to welcome any proposals which the Cuban Government might wish to make, the subjects which might be discussed, as well as the manner and the place in which negotiations might be conducted. It may be well to recall to the Foreign Minister of Cuba the full text of the closing paragraph of the note sent on February 29, 1960, by the U.S. Ambassador in Cuba which he has again found it so convenient to omit:

"The Government of the United States for its part firmly intends to continue by its conduct and through its utterances to reaffirm the spirit of fraternal friendship which, as Your Excellency so well stated, has bound and does bind our two peoples, and which the United States Government believes is earnestly cherished by them. Prior to the initiation of negotiations and through normal diplomatic channels the United States Government would wish to explore with the Government of Cuba the subjects to be discussed and the manner and place in which negotiations might be conducted. Accordingly, I would welcome, for transmittal to my government, any proposals which Your Excellency might care to submit in these respects."

"To this date, despite the several subsequent efforts to elicit a reply from the Government of Cuba, none has been forthcoming. When, shortly after the note referred to above was delivered, the revolutionary

Government of Cuba designated Dr. José Miró Cardona, who preceded Dr. Castro as Prime Minister of the revolutionary Government, as its Ambassador to Washington, there was high expectation that he would carry forward the negotiations. He never arrived. After months of waiting, he was forced to seek asylum in the Argentine Embassy in Havana after protesting the increasing role of communism in Cuba."

Dr. José Miró Cardona, incidentally, is still in the Argentine Embassy in Havana.

CONCLUSION

The relationship between Cuba and the United States is no mere accident of geography and trade. It is part of our mutual history. Tear the history of either country from that of the other, and there would be a gap making much of the rest inexplicable. It is our belief that such a wrench will never come. Neither the people of the United States nor - we are convinced - the Cuban people would consider it.

Like all the other American Republics, Cuba and the United States began as colonies. Our first English settlement was in Virginia in 1607 and our independence came 169 years later in 1776. Cuba, discovered by Columbus on his second voyage and settled approximately 100 years before Jamestown, was a colony from 1510 to 1898, a period of 388 years.

Both Cuba and the United States were born of revolutions dedicated to the common purpose of independence and freedom. In the United States we are proud to remember that the heart of our people went out to Cuba in the Cuban struggle for liberty. Although we are a peaceful people, we declared war in Cuba's behalf, and the blood of our young men was shed with that of Cuban patriots for Cuban independence.

The great apostle of American liberty was Thomas Jefferson. The great Cuban apostle of liberty was José Martí, a man whose name and ideals are respected in the United States.

On the centenary of Martí's birth the Soviet Union tried to indicate some spiritual tie between Martí and communism. No such tie exists, nor could exist. Martí's opinion of Marxism was expressed in his famous letter to Fermin Valdez Domingues. The Marxian concept has two basic dangers, he said: "that of extraneous, confused, and incomplete interpretations, and that of the pride and dissimulated violence of ambitious men, who in order to raise themselves in the world begin by pretending - in order to have shoulders of other men on which to stand - to be impassioned defenders of the helpless."

Martí perceived correctly the dangers of communist imperialism under a pretense of defending and succouring the oppressed. He perceived correctly that the strength of the Western Hemisphere depends on the fraternal unity of its

peoples. He perceived correctly that the true goal and glory of mankind is brotherhood, peace, dignity; and that unity is the key to strength and progress.

Prime Minister Castro has accused the United States of holding back Cuban development as a free nation. The facts are to the contrary. Cuba has not only consistently received higher prices from the United States for sugar than any other supplier but has also been a partner with the United States in a mutually preferential tariff with special low import duty rates. In per capita gross national product Cuba ranks third in Latin America. It is quite true that in the Republic of Cuba these developments were not matched, as the United States hoped they would be, by corresponding progress in eliminating corruption in public life, and achieving greater social justice and a more equitable distribution of the national income, in guaranteeing free elections, and ensuring government of, by, and for the people - progress which only the Cuban people could make for themselves.

When Prime Minister Castro came to power in January 1959, with promises to his people seemingly made in all sincerity, the United States hoped he would perfect the revolution by needed internal reforms. The United States tried to show its understanding and sympathy for his stated aims: honest and efficient government, the perfection of democratic processes, and economic development leading to higher living standards and to full employment. On 11 June and 12 October 1959, we expressed officially to the Cuban Government our full support for soundly conceived programmes for rural development. We particularly endorsed its stated desire to do something for land reform.

Not even the shock of the many executions in the first month following the establishment of the revolutionary government, nor the sharp attacks on the United States Government by high officials, could dampen the friendly feeling with which Prime Minister Castro was greeted when he came to the United States in April of 1959. There was a genuine reluctance to believe that Cuba, a country for which the people of the United States have long had a special affection, could be embarked on an unfriendly course.

On 26 January 1960, President Eisenhower issued a major restatement of American policy toward Cuba, reaffirming the adherence of the United States Government to a policy of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other

countries, including Cuba, and explicitly recognizing the right of the Cuban Government and people, in the exercise of their national sovereignty, "to undertake those social, economic and political reforms which, with due regard to their obligations under international law, they may think desirable", and expressing sympathy for the aspirations of the Cuban people.

Unfortunately, these policies of the United States were not reciprocated. The present Government of Cuba has deliberately and consciously sought to exacerbate relations with the United States. For openly announced political reasons Cuba's imports from the United States have been reduced to less than one-half of the level of two years ago. Property is not expropriated, but confiscated without payment, to serve political rather than social ends.

Growing intervention in Cuban affairs by the Soviet Union and Communist China is welcomed by the Government of Cuba. The present Cuban Government itself seeks to intervene in internal affairs of other American States and to undermine the inter-American system.

The present Cuban Government claims to speak for the Cuban people but denies them the right to choose their own spokesmen in free elections. It claims to believe in democracy, yet only the Communist party is permitted to function. It speaks of the rights of man, but Cuban jails are crowded with thousands of political prisoners.

It boasts of freedom of expression in Cuba, yet the editors of the great Cuban papers are all in exile while every expression of opposition to the policies of the Government, or to communism, is suppressed as counter-revolutionary. It interferes with the free exercise of religion. It affirms the independence of the judiciary but the right of a fair and impartial trial is denied those who differ with the government in power.

We regret that these things are true, but they are true. The people and Government of the United States, who are friends of the Republic of Cuba, still look to see it again become what its great son Marti declared he would have it be: "A democratic and cultured people zealously aware of her own rights and the rights of others."