

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Page 2 of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

enthusiasm for the appeal for world government with which he concluded, or simply a warm farewell to an old favorite who announced during his speech that he may soon retire from the IPU.)

In eight of nine roll-call votes in the IPU Council and on the floor of the Conference, the Soviet Bloc delegations were on the losing side, and in the sole victory, the vote was on an amendment to a resolution which was voted down, so that in a real sense it can be said that they won no roll-call votes.

The Fifty-First Conference brought together in Brasilia delegations representing 45 of the 64 members of IPU, an observation delegation from Colombia (which is not a member), the Greek Ambassador as an observer (Greece was one of the 19 members which did not send a delegation this year), and observers from four international bodies (the ILO, FAO, UN, and OAS). The Conference had been scheduled for Buenos Aires, but had to be held outside of Argentina because of the Argentine crisis and the attendant dissolution of the Argentine parliament. When plans for Buenos Aires were cancelled, the IPU secretariat canvassed other South American governments, since the Union wished to hold the Fifty-First Conference in South America. As a result of the Secretariat's inquiry, Brazil offered Brasilia's facilities. Ranieri Mazzili, President of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies was elected President of the IPU Council to succeed G. CodacciPisanelli of Italy, who had held the office for the last five years.

The Fifty-First Conference was the first attended by three new IPU members, Ethiopia, the Central African Republic, and Mongolia.

The Conference agenda contained four substantive items. These were international trade as a factor in economic development (Agenda Item 3), speculation (Agenda Item 4), disarmament (Agenda Item 5, with three major subdivisions), and acceleration of independence of colonies (Agenda Item 6). As has been noted above, the Cuban and Sino-Indian crises were in effect a fifth major substantive agenda item.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155

uneppe1

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Page 3 of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

CUBAN AND SINO-INDIAN CRISES

Although not on the formal agenda of the conference, the Cuban crisis was uppermost in the minds of all delegates as the conference convened, and President of Brazil Joao Goulart, in the opening address on October 24, made a clear allusion to it in an appeal for efforts "to avoid the catastrophe of a war which, with the employment of nuclear weapons, would have neither vanquished nor victors".

During the general debates on October 24 and the morning of October 25, Cuba was at first brought up only by the Bloc speakers, the other speakers having prepared talks addressed to questions already on the agenda. The first Bloc speaker, and the first to mention Cuba, was J. K. Wende, of the Polish delegation, who argued that the U.S. blockade of Cuba declared on October 22 had been undertaken because the Cuban way of life did not please the United States. He said that the argument that Cuba represented a military threat was not convincing. He urged peaceful negotiation.

I. V. Spiridonov, the leader of the Russian delegation, also maintained that the real motivation behind the blockade order was U. S. dissatisfaction with the way of life of Cuba. Speaking at 12:44 P.M. on October 24, he maintained that there was no Soviet base in Cuba. The blockade, he said, was military action, and a step toward war.

The Czech speaker, V. Skoda, in the afternoon mentioned Cuba only in passing, condemning U. S. action there. A Bulgarian speaker, P. Kostourkov, said of the U. S. action that it was deliberate interference in the internal affairs of Cuba and contained a threat of universal catastrophe.

The first non-Communist speaker to mention the subject was the chairman of the U. S. delegation, Senator A. Willis Robertson, Democrat of Virginia. The U. S. delegation had anticipated that the Communist speakers, who had inscribed their names on the order of speakers early, would speak of Cuba, and Senator Robertson's address had been planned as a reply. Senator

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Page 4 of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

Robertson's address, unlike the preceding non-Communist addresses, made no effort to skirt the Cuban issue, and indeed, was devoted entirely to the subject, which he described as "the gravest threat of nuclear war since the Communist invasion of the free Republic of Korea". He noted that there was no Cuban parliament to be represented at the Conference, in spite of Castro's early promises, and denounced the installation of offensive rockets capable of reaching from Canada to Brazil, a fact which he assured the Conference the U. S. Government had incontrovertible proof. He said "we hear it said... that what the Soviet Union is doing in Cuba is no different from what the United States is doing in Turkey and in other free countries on the periphery of the Soviet block. This is silly". He quoted from the President's October 22 speech, to the effect that the secret and swift build-up in Cuba was designed to upset the status quo, and as such, could not be accepted by the United States. If a parallel existed at all, Senator Robertson continued, it was between Cuba and a member of the Warsaw Pact, such as Poland: "If the government of Poland were to undergo a change, and if Western nuclear missiles were to be installed on Polish territory, that would represent a change in the deployment of such weapons comparable to what has occurred in Cuba. It would, I think, be a provocative change, and it would obviously heighten world tensions." Turkey, as an ally of the United States, was not in the same category, and could not be compared with Cuba. Senator Robertson's speech was well applauded.

After Senator Robertson spoke, a Hungarian delegate, Molnar, said at 4:47 P.M. that Russia had no need of rockets in Cuba, since she already has rockets on her own territory capable of reaching anywhere on earth. The U. S. blockade was an act of war (it will be noted that the Soviet speaker earlier in the day had been more cautious, terming a step toward war) which could have incalculable consequences.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Page 5 of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

Perhaps significantly, the first non-Communist speaker after Senator Robertson to mention the Cuban situation and the first to mention the Sino-Indian crisis was an Indian representative, Hanumanthayya, who said that there had been accusations against the United States because of her actions towards Cuba, but these were merely a symptom of the greater malady which had existed over the last decade between the two great blocs. There was a connection between Hungary and Cuba; apparently America feared that Cuba might become a base for Soviet operations and Russia feared that Hungary might become a base of operations against her. India, Hanumanthayya said, was being attacked by China, which had become so expansionist and intolerant ideologically that she was attacking even the Soviet Union ideologically. It was time that those who believed in true peaceful coexistence told China un-animously that she must behave. He was convinced that the American and Soviet leaders desired peace and said that the ideal was to work for world government.

On the following morning, October 25, another Polish delegate, S. Zolkiewski, said that the action of the United States was a manifestation of colonialism. He said that according to Senator Robertson's "strange thesis", American missiles based in Turkey no longer constituted a danger to the Soviet Union precisely because they were based in a country which was a friend of the United States. That was not true; the missiles were extremely dangerous. Cuba had never been a threat to the United States.

These debates culminated with the presentation of a draft resolution by the Yugoslavs enclosed on the morning of October 25, which said that the Conference, "Deeply disturbed by the sudden increase in international tension and by the dangerous consequences which the blockade of Cuba entails for world peace, ...Appeals urgently to the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union to avoid any action which might lead to catastrophe and a general conflict ...". Since the subject was not on the agenda, it was necessary to call a meeting of the IPU Council to consider it, and a

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Page 6 of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

meeting was called for that afternoon. In the Council the British member, Mallalieu, urged that the resolution be reworded to contain reference to the Sino-India crisis. He was followed by Jan Karol, the Polish delegate, and then by Krishnamoorthy Rao, the Indian, a sequence which perhaps contributed to mouse-trapping the bloc spokesman, who argued against the British proposal. This set him up for Rao, and the verbal manhandling of the bloc seems to have continued from this point to the end of the conference: Rao observed that Europeans feel that whatever happens in Asia and Africa is less important, a state of mind which should not continue. India and China represent about half of the population of the earth, he said, and Indian and Chinese lives are important, too. Therefore IPU concern with prevention of war should extend to Indian and Chinese difficulties. Clumsily, one bloc speaker after another tried to argue against this, while the Western speakers fairly rode to hounds on it. When the issue was put to the vote, the Anglo-Indian position carried the day by 64 to 17, with six abstentions. The 17 votes opposing the addition of India and China to the resolution were all from the Bloc, with the exception of one Communist Chilean parliamentarian. Abstentions came from Finland, one of the two Venezuelan representatives, and Nigeria. The resolution was then submitted to a three-man drafting committee consisting of a Yugoslav, a Brazilian, and a British delegate. The drafting committee, under British guidance, changed the language so that the resolution referred to "the events in the region of" rather than "the Blockade of" Cuba as being the cause of the Caribbean difficulties, thus placing the onus partly on the Russians and the Cubans rather than entirely on the U. S. blockade order.

Before the Cuban and Sino-Indian crises resolution (enclosed) came to the floor on the morning of October 26, however, the issue began to be aired in the general debate by non-Communists, perhaps gaining momentum as events in the outside world moved forward. On the evening of October 25, the Guatemalan representative, Foreign Relations Com-

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Page 7 of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

mittee Chairman, Abraham Cabrera Cruz, made what was perhaps the hardest anti-Communist speech on the Cuban issue of the conference. After describing the plight of Cuba in vivid terms, he urged that the Yugoslav resolution be amended so as to address an appeal to the United Nations to establish in Cuba an administrative council which would protect the people and supervise elections, thus enabling the Cuban people to exercise their sovereignty and elect a representative assembly. On the following morning, during the discussion of the Yugoslav resolution, Cruz tried to introduce such a counter-resolution, but was unable to get the floor. During the discussions of the amended Yugoslav resolution on the morning of October 26, the Czechs sought to restore the language blaming the crisis on the blockade rather than on "the events in the region of Cuba". The Czech proposal was voted down in a roll-call by 361 to 92, with 45 abstentions. Favoring the Czech amendment were the Bloc, Yugoslavia, and Communists from the Chilean and Finnish delegations. The abstainers were Ceylon, Ghana, Nigeria and Tunisia. After this last skirmish, the resolution was accepted unanimously, and was transmitted to the governments of the United States, the Soviet Union, India, and Communist China. On the final day of the Conference, the Embassy was able to transmit to President Codacci-Pisanelli, President Kennedy's reply (enclosed), none of the other three governments having as yet reacted. In his reply, the President noted that he shared the feeling of the IPU about the risks of nuclear war, and that the United States and other Western hemisphere governments had sought to bring an end to the threat to peace created by the introduction of offensive nuclear weapons into Cuba. He said that the OAS governments are gratified that Chairman Khrushchev has agreed to withdraw these weapons. He deplored the aggression by Communist China.

The letter was read to the Conference by Codacci-Pisanelli during the final session, and was applauded by the delegates. In a final address, Sir Herbert Butcher, the chief of the British delegation, speaking as the representative of one of the two founders of the IPU, said that he was happy to note President Kennedy's firm determination

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority ND 53155

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Page 8 of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

that there be no nuclear weapons in the Western Hemisphere, and applauded the Soviet decision to withdraw them.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND THE PROGRESS OF
DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Agenda Item 3 was entitled "The Role of International Trade in promoting Blanced Economic and Social Progress in Developing Countries". In the debates on this subject, a definite consensus among the Latin American, African, Asian, and Communist Bloc speakers emerged. The basic tenets of this consensus were as follows:

I. Prices of manufactured goods are rising, while those of the raw materials on which the developing countries' economies are based are declining. Developing countries are thus not obtaining a "just" price for their products, and their development is hindered, since the total aid received from the "highly industrialized countries" (or, when the speaker was a Communist, the "highly industrialized capitalist countries") is more than counter-balanced by the widening gap arising from this unfavorable balance of trade. The gap is the fault of the industrialized countries, since they set prices, not only for their own manufactured goods, but also for the raw materials they buy. Ranieri Mazzili, the Brazilian president of the Conference and newly elected president of the IPU Council, spoke of the prices for the commodities exported by the developing countries as being "manipulated by powerful financial groups", a phrase closely akin to the frequently-heard "economic groups" or "powerful economic groups" used throughout Latin America and constantly by the Communists. It is evident that the plot theory of economics has wide acceptance among the politicians of the underdeveloped countries as well as among Communists. Mazzili, for instance, is a member of the Vargas-founded PSD, not generally thought of as a pre-Communist party. Similar views are widespread in the (also Vargas-founded) PTB of Brazil. According to the Communist explanation freely offered at the Conference, the capitalist countries are manipulating the markets deliberately

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

9

Page 28 of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

to continue their economic domination of the underdeveloped countries, and Mazzili himself, as the president of the Conference at the closing ceremony, reiterated this idea, indicating that the carefully reasoned explanations of the American and other Western speakers on this point had made no impression.

Generally, the non-Communist holders of these beliefs are of the opinion that the solution lies in the adoption by the industrial countries of a "fair price" policy, coupled with price stabilization measures. The Communists, of course, argued that the situation was irremediable without the abolition of capitalism. The conclusion of the underdeveloped countries at the conference was that a world economic conference should be called, at which time they would hope to pressure the industrial countries into acceptance of "fair price" policies and price stabilization measures. There was a hint at one point from one speaker that one way a "fair price" policy could be put into effect might be through a sort of international commodity support price system, although for most of the underdeveloped countries' politicians, the concept is probably too complex. They seem to feel that pricing is an ethical, rather than an economic, process, and they are deeply suspicious of the industrial countries' laws of economics. One gets the impression that the ethical value of a price is determined by the degree of profit allowed the producer.

II. In addition to paying unfair prices and manipulating prices, the industrial countries have erected tariff barriers and are combining in restraint of the export trade of the underdeveloped countries. This conception, like the other, receives much encouragement from the Communists, of course, an extension of this line of thought is that the European Common Market (particularly) and other regional economic groupings are designed to help their members by excluding outsiders. Communist speakers made a particularly heavy attack on the European Common Market as a plot to enslave the Africans and bankrupt the Latin Americans. A Ghanaian speaker carried his argument to the point of condemning the Common Market for its evil ways and saying that Ghana's policy was to organize an

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

10

Page ~~11~~ of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

African trading bloc and military alliance, so Africa could have a common foreign policy.

Although statements made in the debates were often quite extreme, as noted above, the resolution (enclosed) which came out of this was relatively mild, although individual points might seem objectionable. The most significant point was a recommendation that the governments of the countries represented at the conference be urged to give "the fullest support to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development". Although few industrialized countries had any great enthusiasm for the resolution, none felt it politic to fight it, and it was finally adopted without discussion or opposition.

PECULATION

Agenda Item 4 was entitled "Draft Convention on Measures to be taken in the International Field against those Guilty, in the Exercise of Public Office, of Fraudulent Enrichment Prejudicial to the Public Interest". This measure, moved by Venezuela, had appeal primarily to the Latin Americans. The Venezuelans had in mind the national treasure they believe former dictator Perez Jimenez absconded with when he went into exile. It was noted during the debates that recovery of such funds has been difficult or impossible because most international legal measures to date have involved extradition cases, and few countries have been willing to extradite political exiles. Delegates from the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Australia felt that the proposed convention had many faults, and proposed further consideration. Some felt that it should be a resolution rather than a convention on the grounds that it was inappropriate for legislators to be drafting conventions. However, as in the case of the Trade and Development resolution, none felt it politic to insist, and in the end the resolution (enclosed) was carried by unanimous consent.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

11
Page ~~12~~ of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia, Office

Agenda Item 5 was entitled "Methods and Prerequisites for General Disarmament", and had three major subdivisions: a) "Measures for lessening International Tension", b) "The Constitution of an International Force to meet Immediate Needs", and c) "General Acceptance of Compulsory Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the Settlement of Disputes between States".

The rapporteur on "Measures for lessening International Tension" (attached) was J. K. Wende of Poland, and his draft resolution contains references to the "de-nuclearized" zones of the Rapacki and other similar plans. The operative paragraph, however, was relatively innocuous, recommending to "all the Parliaments of the world that they support all measures for lessening international tension, the implementation of which would promote the solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament under effective international inspection and control, accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and by the creation of international armed forces in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter."

Little came out of the debate on this resolution which has not already been said elsewhere, the Bloc speakers insisting, for instance, that on-site inspection of underground nuclear explosions is not necessary, etc., etc. The resolution was carried by unanimous consent, with the abstention of the Swiss.

Debate on the need for an international force led to presentation of a draft resolution (b in the enclosure) which was unacceptable to the Bloc. In the roll-call vote on the issue, the Bloc received a drubbing; the vote was 303 to 118, with 25 abstentions. The only opposition was on the part of Communists, including the Yugoslavs. Switzer and again abstained, as did parts of the delegations of Finland, Israel and Venezuela.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

12
Page ~~12~~ of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

Similarly, the bloc resisted the strengthening of the resolution adopted under international institutions implicit in c) "General Acceptance of Compulsory Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice..." Here the Bloc argued that the arbitrary acceptance of Court decisions would run counter to the principal of unanimity contained in the UN Charter, by which the great powers have the veto. The vote went against them by 348 to 100, with 30 abstentions. The abstainers were Ethiopia, part of the Finnish delegation and Yugoslavia. Only Communists voted against the measure.

INDEPENDENCE FOR COLONIES

Agenda Item 6, entitled "Principles and Methods to be followed for accelerating the Implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples", led to a certain amount of heat and little light in the discussions. Debating on this also led to a certain amount of scoring on the Bloc, especially by the Irish and Germans, on the issue of "neo-colonialism" in Eastern Europe. One Irish speaker, T. O'Higgins, nearly broke up the meeting on October 31 by converting a quiet rambling discussion into a savage denunciation of Soviet colonialism in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and by referring to the Soviet denial of the right of self-determination in Hungary and East Germany. He was well applauded as he ended in a confusion of applause, the ringing of the time bell, and attempts to continue his speech.

Africans and Asians, however, concentrated on European colonialism in those continents, arguing that the colonial territories not liberated by the end of the year should be subjected to UN supervision or even, as one speaker suggested, direct UN government. These speakers argued against European speakers' position that the colonies were being liberated just as fast as they became ready for self-government by charging that the reason that the colonies were not ready

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Page 13 of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

was that the colonial governments had not made them ready, and that their lack of readiness was actually an argument against the continuation of the colonial governments' control. The Australians became quite involved, since they felt that New Guinea is far from ready for self-government. Early in the debates an Australian speaker explained that the Australian government has not yet established contact with a number of tribes in New Guinea, and later, when argument became more heated, he said that certain tribes "kill, cook, and eat members of their own and other tribes, as well as domestic cats and dogs". Discussion of the draft resolution under this item (enclosed) degenerated into a complex paragraph by paragraph amendment battle, at the close of which each side had so amended the resolution as to make it unacceptable to the otherside. The final vote was to reject the whole resolution, 144 to 61, with 284 abstentions. Favoring the resolution, in the end, were only Germany (presumably with East Germany in mind), the Central African Republic, half the Danish delegation, Guatemala (thinking of British Honduras), Panama, the Netherlands and the Philippines. Opposed were the United States (supporting Australia), the old Commonwealth, Chile, Spain, half the Israeli delegation, Italy, Nigeria, Tunisia and Yugoslavia. The Bloc, the remaining African and Asian powers, Belgium, Brazil, the other half of the Danish delegation, Finland, 6 of the 17 UK delegates, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland abstained. The Bloc abstained out of unwillingness to vote against a measure advocating rapid liberation, and out of unwillingness to vote for a measure authorizing (paragraph 7) military bases for security purposes.

For the Ambassador:

John Keppel
Counselor of Embassy
for Political Affairs

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Page 14 of 14 Pages
A-531, Nov. 9, 1962
Brasilia Office

Enclosures:

1) Draft resolutions on:

- a) Cuba (the Yugoslav resolution)
- b) Cuba (Drafting Committee)
- c) International Trade
- d) Peculation
- e) Disarmament
- f) Independence of Colonies

2.a) Letter from President of the Interparliamentary Council to President Kennedy (original)

b) President Kennedy's reply (copy)

3) Agenda and Summary records of the Conference (English)

DISTRIBUTION: POL Rio (5); POL II; Labor; CF (3)

Department pass copy to Dr. George B. Galloway,
Executive Secretary, U.S. Group, Interparliamentary Union, Library of Congress, Washington D.C.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 53155