



C O N T E N T S

Agenda item 90:

Complaint by the Revolutionary Government of Cuba regarding the various plans of aggression and acts of intervention being executed by the Government of the United States of America against the Republic of Cuba, constituting a manifest violation of its territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence, and a clear threat to international peace and security (continued) 93

Chairman: Mr. Karel KURKA (Czechoslovakia).

AGENDA ITEM 90

Complaint by the Revolutionary Government of Cuba regarding the various plans of aggression and acts of intervention being executed by the Government of the United States of America against the Republic of Cuba, constituting a manifest violation of its territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence, and a clear threat to international peace and security (A/4537, A/4543, A/4581, A/4631, A/4701, A/4708, A/4710, A/4716, A/4725; A/C.1/839, A/C.1/840, A/C.1/841; A/C.1/L.274, A/C.1/L.275, A/C.1/L.276, A/C.1/L.277) (continued)

1. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that he had been glad to hear previous speakers clearly show the connexion between the competence of the United Nations and that of regional agencies such as the Organization of American States. The two spheres of competence, far from being incompatible, were complementary. To be convinced on that point, it sufficed to read Article 52 of the United Nations Charter, article 20 of the charter of the Organization of American States (OAS)¹ and article 2 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.² The regional agencies, which were better acquainted with the circumstances of each problem arising in the particular region and strong in their common culture and interests, had a better chance of success in any attempt at conciliation or mediation. There was nothing narrow about that regionalism, which was imbued with a spirit of universality and inspired by two fundamental principles of American law—the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination, which was enshrined in the United Nations Charter and the charter of the Organization of American States, and the principle of non-intervention first proclaimed at the Congress of Panama in 1826 and confirmed in the Convention on Rights and Duties of States adopted by the Seventh International Conference of American States at Montevideo in 1933.³ His delegation's vote on the various proposals before the Committee would be based on those considerations.

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 119 (1952), No. 1609.

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 21 (1948), No. 324 (a).

³ League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CLXV (1936), No. 3802.

2. He approved of the draft resolution submitted by seven Latin American countries (A/C.1/L.276), which recognized the competence of the United Nations, contained an appeal for assistance to the OAS and would prevent any pressure, ideological or other, which might aggravate existing tensions. His delegation would accordingly vote for that text.

3. The Mexican draft resolution (A/C.1/L.275) had the disadvantage of omitting any reference to regional jurisdiction, although the function of the OAS had in effect been recognized in the United Nations Charter itself. The Peruvian delegation would therefore be unable to vote for that draft resolution.

4. An entirely different spirit and legal approach marked the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.277) and the Romanian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.274), particularly as regards the role of the United Nations. That role should be primarily to attempt reconciliation in a constructive spirit and not to engage in polemics. In any case, prudence and juridical considerations required that it should never condemn or even accuse without adequate proof.

5. Two diametrically opposed schools of thought were at present struggling for the upper hand in Cuba. According to one of them, all social reform should be achieved in freedom and for freedom; according to the other, the achievement of economic equality was paramount, even at the cost of subordinating all liberties to the authority of an all-powerful State. If social reform was to be achieved in freedom, the United Nations should never become the scene of discord, but should make every effort to restore harmony and optimism.

6. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) expressed sympathy, on behalf of the Government and people of El Salvador, for the people of Cuba, which they soon hoped to see free from the horrors of civil war. Judging by its origins and subsequent development, the increasingly bitter dispute between the Government of the United States and the revolutionary régime in Cuba was a further manifestation of the struggle being waged by a system that was completely alien to the spirit and true wishes of the American community against all nations where Western culture and Christian civilization prevailed.

7. El Salvador had fought hard for the definition and observance of the principle of non-intervention. Its efforts and those of some other Latin American countries had resulted in 1933 in the adoption of article 8 of the Convention on Rights and Duties of States. The principle had been embodied in all subsequent instruments adopted by the American community and particularly in article 15 of the charter of the Organization of American States. At the Ninth International Conference of American States, held at Bogotá in 1948, at which that Charter had been adopted, the American States had also condemned any system that would

endanger political and civil rights and freedoms, and particularly the activities of international communism and any other form of totalitarianism. They had undertaken to adopt the necessary measures, in keeping with their respective constitutions, to prevent any activities instigated from abroad and designed to overthrow their institutions, disrupt the political life of their nations or impair the right of peoples to govern themselves in accordance with their democratic aspirations. Consequently, the inter-American legal and political system comprised not only the principles of non-intervention and self-determination, but also the principle that the political organization of all States in the hemisphere should be based on the effective exercise of representative democracy. That latter principle was one of the corner-stones of American regional organization. Moreover, some of the provisions of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, entitled "Regional arrangements", had their origin in the Act of Chapultepec, which had been adopted unanimously in 1945 by the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace.

8. Thus, if there was no doubt concerning the General Assembly's competence in the matter the OAS, to which both contending States belonged, was the agency which under Article 52 of the United Nations Charter should consider the dispute with a view to finding a peaceful settlement before referring it to the Security Council or the General Assembly. An *Ad Hoc* Good Offices Committee had, in fact, been established at the Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, but the two parties had not availed themselves of it and the situation had steadily deteriorated.

9. Viewing the matter with complete objectivity and being anxious to contribute to a solution of the problem without impairing recognized principles and rules, his delegation would vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.276), which was well balanced and appropriate to the occasion. It would have to vote against the other three draft resolutions, which did not mention the inter-American system and did not call for recourse to the peaceful means and agencies provided by that system.

10. In view of the seriousness of the problem, the United Nations should remain calm and act with the utmost caution to prevent the explosive situation from becoming catastrophic.

11. Mr. ORTONA (Italy) considered that, no matter how serious, the Cuban crisis was the concern of the American hemisphere and should not be made part of the cold war. The United Nations certainly had the right and the duty to do everything in its power to improve the situation, but it was for the Cubans themselves to solve their problems and for the American States to deal with questions affecting their hemisphere. The Italian delegation therefore viewed with concern any attempts at outside intervention which might endanger the principles dear to the Americas—non-intervention by non-American States in the affairs of the American continent and respect of each other's sovereign rights by the countries of the hemisphere. The OAS was not an empty formula; it was the forum chosen by the American Republics themselves to deal with their problems.

12. As regards the charges made against the United States, he recalled that President Kennedy had categorically stated that there was no question of United

States intervention in Cuba. It was not an overstatement to say that if the landing and ensuing operations in Cuba had been organized by the United States Government with a view to overthrowing the Cuban Government, the combat on the beaches of Cuba would have taken a different turn. The course of events showed that the United States has scrupulously refrained from interfering. That restraint was all the more remarkable since the United States made no secret of its moral and political support for those now fighting against the Havana Government. That attitude was in striking contrast to that taken in the past, in respect of other revolutionary uprisings, by countries which were now profuse in sanctimonious statements. The attitude of the United States, which was dictated by the principles of pan-Americanism and non-intervention, left the door open to a solution within the framework of hemispheric solidarity, and one which would not affect the rights of the Cuban people.

13. The Italian Government supported the appeal voiced by the seven Latin American sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.276. It would co-operate in any action that the United Nations might decide on with a view to ending the Cuban crisis. On the other hand, the Romanian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.274) and the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.277) would have the effect of impeding the desired solution and would imply an unwarranted condemnation. The Italian delegation would also be unable to vote in favour of the Mexican draft resolution (A/C.1/L.275).

14. Mr. HASAN (Pakistan) thought it unhelpful to concentrate entirely on present events in Cuba, however unfortunate they were. First, the Committee was in no position to investigate the truth of the charges levelled against the United States; it was therefore natural to consider them unsubstantiated. Secondly, the item had been placed on the agenda before the happenings of the past few days; it would therefore be unreasonable if members of the Committee were to let their view of those happenings influence their attitude towards any draft resolution on that item. They should rather seek the root causes of the problem and try to find in which direction a solution seemed possible.

15. The Cuban representative had said that the present situation was the result of the monopolies which United States citizens had acquired in Cuba. He had added that total United States investment in his country was \$1,000 million. That figure, which seemed probable, was insignificant in relation to the budget and gross national product of the United States. The question of full compensation for expropriation could not explain the present crisis. His delegation was inclined to think that the revolutionary leaders of Cuba had misjudged the intentions of their rich and powerful neighbour toward their social and economic reforms, which, however important they might be to Cuba, were little compared with all the other international problems with which the United States was concerned. Contemporary history showed that revolutions engendered a psychology of resentment, often without an object.

16. There was an astonishing misunderstanding about United States policy. It should not be imagined that that country, whose economic system reflected a considerable degree of social justice, regulated by the Government, was opposed to any egalitarian and socializing measures abroad. The people of the United States knew well that their economic experience could not be repeated everywhere else in the world. Lastly, it should

be noted that the present policy of the United States was not to ally itself with régimes which were reactionary and opposed to the creative and revolutionary urges of other countries. The tragedy of Cuba seemed the result of a serious error of judgement about the United States intentions, rather than of a conflict of economic interests between the United States and Cuba. The present leaders of Cuba had uncritically accepted the assumption that the United States would oppose their revolution and their reforms. That had led to increased psychological tension between the two countries. Yet Cuba and the United States were bound to remain attached to the inter-American system, which was an effective guarantee of peace and security in the Western hemisphere. The good-neighbourly relations between the two countries had not been damaged beyond repair by recent events. In the interests both of Cuba and of the world community, a way must be found to improve the present situation through the good offices of neighbours and friends of both countries. Although that method could not be laid down as an absolute rule, the present dispute was one of those in which the principle of regional peaceful settlement could prove most constructive. Whatever changes may take place in their ideologies, alliances and ways of life, the United States and Cuba would have to live as neighbours.

17. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) said he had been impressed by the common ground covered in the statements of Latin American representatives, who had given a good picture of the development of the OAS, what it was, what it did and what it was inspired by. The Latin American countries had also made a notable contribution to the whole conception of the United Nations. Dealing with the problems which necessarily arose among twenty-one countries, one of which was a great Power, they had worked out the principle of non-intervention, not in the abstract but in an attempt to apply it to particular problems, including the problem under discussion.

18. The problem of Cuba should not be isolated, but should be viewed on the regional level, within the framework of the OAS.

19. In answer to the charges against their country, the United States representative and President Kennedy had said clearly that it had never been the intention of the United States to wage a war of aggression against Cuba. At its beginning the Cuban revolution had met with wide sympathy in the United States and Latin America, since it had been believed that it was trying to carry out the necessary reforms and since it had taken the place of a hateful Government. The good neighbour policy of the United States had also meant that Cuba could have counted on greater co-operation and economic aid. Cuba had met that early sympathy with rebuffs and violent speeches, and had tried to stir up trouble in sister republics. The Cuban Government had encouraged a political and military power repugnant to countries of the Western hemisphere to intervene within that hemisphere. It had refused to avail itself of the resources of the OAS, preferring the propaganda possibilities provided by the rostrum of the United Nations.

20. One of the two draft resolutions submitted by Latin American countries, that of Mexico, had the disadvantage of containing no mention of the OAS. For that reason, and since only one resolution should be adopted, the Australian delegation preferred the seven-Power draft, which was intended to give effect

to the principle of non-intervention and the principles of the Charter, and to make possible the economic, social and political progress of all States Members of the United Nations. His delegation would therefore vote for the seven-Power draft resolution.

21. Mr. NONG KIMNY (Cambodia) recalled that, when the General Assembly had resumed its work at the beginning of March, most delegations had agreed, after long talks between the great Powers, not to place on the agenda questions likely to revive the cold war; his delegation had welcomed that agreement. Unfortunately the question of Cuba had exacerbated the international situation. It was true that the disaster which that country had suffered was a threat to peace, and that the whole world was concerned about it. Cambodia had subscribed to the principles of peaceful coexistence which had been proclaimed at the Asian-African Conference held at Bandung in 1955, and had always taken a position of strict neutrality in international conflicts. It did not intervene in other States' domestic affairs, whatever their system of government. Only by pursuing such a policy could small countries, faced with the various conflicting ideologies in the world, keep their freedom and independence and devote all their efforts to their own economic development. It had been said that democracy and communism could not be reconciled and that it was necessary to choose between them. Yet the question could be considered from another point of view, on the principle of "live and let live". The first concern of small countries was to live beside powerful neighbours without anxiety. That was why they put all their hopes in the United Nations. Nevertheless, the great Powers should set an example by fulfilling their obligations under the Charter.

22. If the question of Cuba was to be solved, the first principle to be observed was that of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States. An appeal should therefore be made to all countries to abstain from helping in the invasion of Cuban territory. Those were the views on which his delegation would base its decision when the voting began. It wished to avoid condemning anyone, especially since it had not yet been possible to establish from where the invasion had been launched. The representatives of the United States and Guatemala, in answer to the charges made against their countries, had said that their Governments had given no aid to the Cuban refugees; the Cambodian delegation noted those remarks, and was pleased by President Kennedy's statement that the United States had not intervened and would not intervene in the domestic affairs of Cuba. Cambodia would vote for a just proposal that would serve the cause of peace, in keeping with the United Nations Charter.

23. Mr. JIMENEZ (Panama) said that a group of Latin American countries had been trying for several days to find a solution to the grave problem occasioned by the present situation in Cuba. His delegation had taken part in those efforts, which had resulted in the formulation of a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.276). The Government and people of Panama were fully conscious of the seriousness of the situation, which endangered world peace. It was the duty of all countries to ensure that the problem was settled in conformity with the United Nations Charter and the charter of the Organization of American States, having regard specifically to the peaceful means recommended at the Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States. The seven-Power draft resolution offered exactly that kind of solution, particularly

as it was the work of a group of countries which very clearly understood the fears and aspirations of the Cuban people. It would enable a constructive solution to the Cuban problem to be achieved, and it did not ignore the competence of either the United Nations or the OAS. In the present circumstances, all selfish interests should be set aside and a just solution should be found which would enable nations to live in peace.

24. Mr. LY (Mali) said that, in a message which he had just sent to the Head of the Cuban Government, the President of the Republic of Mali, Mr. Modibo Keita, conveyed the indignation of the Government and people of Mali at the aggression which Cuba was suffering from counter-revolutionaries who had powerful assistance; he expressed his full sympathy and solidarity with the Cuban people and said that Cuba's heroic struggle commanded the admiration of all the young anti-imperialist States, for the fight against colonialism was one and indivisible. The wording of that message was in conformity with Mali's policy of giving support to all peoples struggling for their independence. President Modibo Keita had confirmed it again recently during a meeting with President Tito of Yugoslavia.

25. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) deplored the events which had led to tension between two neighbouring countries, Members of the United Nations. It was encouraging for the smaller countries to note that all Member States were deeply concerned at the situation in Cuba. However, the United Nations should take prompt and effective measures to put an end to the situation to the satisfaction of the Cuban people. Admittedly, full information was not available, but several facts were known: an armed attack had been made from outside against the Republic of Cuba; there had been interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign State; and peace had been disturbed in Cuban territory. Member States must do everything in their power to settle the conflict peacefully, in accordance with the Charter. An end should, therefore, be put immediately to any activity that might result in further bloodshed, and any assistance to those carrying out the armed attack should be stopped.

26. His delegation had no objection to the Romanian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.274), but would abstain in the vote on that text because it thought that the Mexican draft resolution (A/C.1/L.275) contained the most constructive provisions. It would, therefore, vote in favour of the latter text. However, he felt that the word "cause" or "foment" should be substituted for the word "promote" in operative paragraph 1.

27. While he had no objection to the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.276), he made one reservation on principle. While the matter was the concern of the United Nations as a world organization—and it was before the United Nations—his delegation would not like the question to be confined to a regional arrangement only. The provisions of the joint draft resolution could be implemented by the American countries themselves, without having been adopted by the United Nations. His delegation saw no reason, therefore, why the United Nations should give its support to that text and would accordingly abstain when it was put to the vote.

28. As regards the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.277), some of its provisions already appeared in other draft resolutions; furthermore, he could not support the condemnation it contained because sufficient information on the situation was not yet available. His delegation would, therefore, abstain on that text also.

29. Mr. ALEJOS (Guatemala) observed that in the course of the debate many delegations had endeavoured to find a way to settle the Cuban problem, but that the communist countries had sought to complicate the situation by resorting to insults and slander and claiming that the invasion forces had set out from Guatemalan territory. It was well known that the *de facto* Government of Cuba had financed conspiracies and provoked strikes and disorders in Guatemala, which had been compelled to break off diplomatic relations with the Republic of Cuba. Yet the communist countries had not said a word in defence of the rights of the Guatemalan people. But they were now accusing the United States of having trained and transported the troops that had invaded Cuban territory, an allegation which had been formally denied by the highest United States officials. Moreover, the communist countries were calling for intervention in Cuba. The fact of the matter was that they had already intervened themselves in Cuba by giving instruction in the handling of aircraft and tanks of Russian manufacture supplied to Castro. Guatemala was accordingly ready to ask for a commission to be sent to Cuba to verify those facts. It was intolerable for Cuban territory to be occupied by foreign troops because such a situation was a serious threat to the American continent.

30. His delegation would vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.276), which was in conformity with the ideals of the American States.

31. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) felt that the Afghan representative had somewhat misunderstood the true scope of the seven-Power draft resolution when he had given his view that United Nations competence in the matter should not be completely disregarded by referring the Cuban question to the OAS. The sponsors of the draft resolution had no intention of ignoring the United Nations. They considered it preferable to solve the problem within a regional framework, but each one of them reserved the right to appeal directly to the United Nations, for the two bodies, far from being mutually exclusive, were complementary. Under operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, Member States belonging to the Organization of American States were requested to lend their assistance with a view to achieving a settlement by peaceful means in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter and of the charter of the Organization of American States. That paragraph was addressed to the American countries; but all Member States of the United Nations were referred to in operative paragraph 2, which read: "*Exhorts* all Member States to abstain from any action which may aggravate existing tensions". That was a decision which could be taken only by the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.