

House Republican Policy Committee
1040 New House Office Building
Capitol 4-3121 Extension 6168

June 20, 1963

Cuba file

TEXT OF RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY POLICY COMMITTEE TODAY

Joint Resolution Expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere.

President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared that the United States would consider any attempt on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety".

In pursuance of this application of the Monroe Doctrine, the United States protested against the movement of Spanish troops into Santo Domingo in 1861 and demanded the withdrawal of French military forces from Mexico in 1866.

The Government of the United States warned in 1940 that assumption of control of any part of the American continents by Axis Powers would violate the Monroe Doctrine.

The American States agreed at Caracas May 28, 1954, that "the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international communist movement, extending to this Hemisphere the political system of any extra-continental power would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America".

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles asserted June 30, 1954, that "the intrusion of Soviet despotism /in Guatemala/ was a direct challenge to our Monroe Doctrine, the first and most fundamental of our foreign policies," and with the assistance of the United States, loyal Guatemalans removed their Communist rulers forthwith.

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter declared on August 24, 1960, at San Jose "any Communist regime established in any one of the American Republics would in effect constitute foreign intervention in the Americas."

The foreign ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January 1962 declared: "The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extra-continental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union".

The international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic, and military sphere of influence.

In light of the foregoing facts, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

- a. That the United States regards the Monroe Doctrine as continuing to be fundamental to its foreign policies;
- b. That the United States regards the existence of a military base in Cuba supported by Soviet equipment and Soviet personnel as a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine;
- c. That the objectives of the policy of the United States with relation to Cuba must be:
 1. Termination of Soviet intervention;
 2. Establishment of conditions under which the Cuban people may freely exercise their right of self-determination;
 3. An end to Communist subversion, sabotage, and guerilla warfare against the people of the Western Hemisphere.

From: Subcommittee on Special Projects FOR RELEASE SUNDAY AMB
House Republican Policy Committee June 16, 1963
Room 1040 New House Office Building
Capitol 4-3121 Extension 6168
Press Contact - Phil Brennan

RECEIVED
JUN 21 1963
BOB DOLE

REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON CUBA TO PUSH FOR
NEW CUBA RESOLUTION

Rep. James Battin (R-Mont) Chairman of the task force on Cuba and Subversion in the Western Hemisphere of the House Republican Policy Committee's Subcommittee on Special Projects today released a six-page review of the history and implications of the Monroe Doctrine in which an immediate return to that Doctrine was advocated.

In releasing the study Rep. Battin said that his group is preparing a new resolution calling for implimentation of the Monroe Doctrine by the Congress and the Administration. The resolution, he said, "states clearly the goal of U.S. Policy toward Cuba."

Rep. Battin cited "substantial Soviet communist gains in Latin America being achieved through subversion and terror launched and directed from the Soviet base in Cuba" as evidence of the need for a Cuba policy based upon the Monroe Doctrine. "The situation in all of Latin America is just this side of desperate" he warned, "and we can no longer afford to continue the policy of 'wait and see' and hope as the Administration has been doing. It is time now to act before it is too late and all of Latin America has been engulfed by Soviet Communism. The resolution now in preparation will point up this fact."

The Montana Republican said that the resolution would be taken up with the House Republican Policy Committee in an effort to secure that group's support for the move. "We expect overwhelming Republican backing for this resolution," he declared.

The six-page study released by the Battin group attacked the theme of President Kennedy's foreign policy address at American University last week saying that the President is "completely wrong" in believing that the attituded of the American public toward the Soviet Union is a major cause of the nation's conflict with communism and that Khrushchev's heart can be melted if this nation adopts a more cordial attitude toward him."

In outlining the purpose of the new Cuba resolution the Task Force report said that "this nation has a historic policy opposing intervention in this hemisphere by despotism based in other parts of the world--a policy laid down on December 2, 1823 by James Monroe."

Rep. Battin said that the text of the resolution would be made public "sometime next week."

Subcommittee on Special Projects, House Republican Policy Committee
1040 New House Office Building
Ca. 4-3121, x. 6168
Press Contact: Phil Brennan

FOR RELEASE
Sunday A.M., June 16, 1963

SECOND INTERIM REPORT OF THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CUBA AND SUBVERSION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE
A Task Force of the Republican Policy Committee,
Subcommittee on Special Projects

PREAMBLE

Within the past week the President of the United States has made a foreign policy address calling for a re-examination of the attitude of Americans toward the Soviet Union. The theme of this address was that the Soviet Union could be led to adopt "a more enlightened attitude" if the United States changed its attitude toward peace and put aside its belief that the Russian people are "lacking in virtue".

It must be presumed that the purpose of the President in making his remarks of June 10 was to indicate the direction of American foreign policy. We believe that the President is completely wrong in believing that the attitude of the American public toward the Soviet Union is a major cause of the nation's conflict with Communism and that Khrushchev's heart can be melted if this nation adopts a more cordial attitude toward him.

It seems to us tragically irrelevant for the President to urge upon the nation a deeper admiration of the Soviet Union for such attributes as courage and industry at a time when the ink is hardly dry on an OAS report declaring "intervention by Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere, by way of Cuba, has increased considerably during the past year".

The report which follows is offered in the hope that it will direct attention back to the type of basic decision that must be made by the leaders of this nation in order to win the cold war.

SECOND INTERIM REPORT

The nation needs a Cuban policy. It has no Cuban policy primarily because the President and the Democratic Congress have failed to make up their minds about the nation's goal.

To a President who is fond of nautical metaphors, we say that a course cannot be charted until the port which we want to reach has been determined. Until the destination has been firmly fixed, the nation will continue to drift.

The statements so far issued by Administration leaders to define the goal of Cuban policy have been ambiguous, inconsistent, and incomplete. The Joint Congressional Resolution signed by the President on October 3, 1962 -- perhaps the most authoritative statement of the national policy goal -- is deficient in clarity, in comprehensiveness, and in courage.

Consequently, the Congress should adopt, and the President should sign, a new joint resolution stating the goal of the policy of the United States toward Communist Cuba.

THE AMBIGUITY OF THE GOAL OF CUBAN POLICY

The Joint Congressional Resolution, like the President's statements of September 4 and 13, 1962, expresses opposition to the establishment in Cuba of an offensive military capability which threatens the security of the United States or of other nations in the Hemisphere. It expresses opposition to the export of Communism to other Latin American nations by force or the threat of force.

It is silent, however, on the attitude of the United States toward a Soviet military presence in Cuba which is "defensive" in character or which does not immediately threaten the security of the United States or of other American nations. It is silent on the attitude of the United States toward Communist subversion carried on by means other than the use or threat of force.

Many of the statements that relate to our nation's goals are open to the interpretation that this nation is ready to co-exist with a Communist Cuba if it or Cuba does not seek to impose Communism on other nations.¹ They suggest that

a Soviet presence in Cuba which does not involve offensive weapons, though "abnormal", is something which our nation can live with.

Confusion about the objective of our national policy is reflected in the utterance of the President as well as in those of lesser leaders of the Administration. The President has refrained from reaffirming or repudiating the Monroe Doctrine but has offered a truncated version of the Doctrine, which one Administration lieutenant called the Kennedy Doctrine.^{2/} The President spoke boldly before the released Cuban prisoners about the return of their flag to a free Havana in Miami in December 1962. But, less than three months later, at San Jose he omitted from his remarks the statements in his prepared text calling for a restoration of freedom to Cuba. The Vice President said, "We want to get rid of Castro," only to have this declaration revised by McGeorge Bundy to read "we cannot sympathize" with Castro's "course of policy" and "we must range ourselves" against it.^{3/}

From time to time the Administration has given the impression that the presence of Soviet troops and military equipment in Cuba produces important advantages for the United States. Sometimes it is said that the Soviet presence makes Cuba "a showcase of Communist failure" and turns the people of other Latin American states away from Communists. Sometimes it is said that the maintenance of Soviet forces in Cuba imposes an economic strain on the Communist world. Sometimes it is said that the Soviets exercise a restraining influence on the volatile Cuban Government.

The inadequacies of statements of policy would be less important if the actions of the Administration revealed a consistent and purposeful movement toward a clearly recognized objective. But the actions of the Administration have been as inconsistent as its words.

The Attorney General, who said in April 1961, "The neutrality laws were never designed to prevent individuals from leaving the United States to fight for a cause in which they believe" has confined a score of Cuban exile leaders to the Miami areas. He has shown great vigor in providing immunity from exile attack to Cuba and to Cuban shipping. The President, who declared that the quarantine of last October would be maintained until United Nations inspection of the withdrawal of Soviet missiles was obtained, ended the quarantine without securing on-site inspection to verify the removal of the missiles.

There can be no doubt that the Administration would prefer that the Soviet Union pull out of Cuba and that it hopes that Castro will disappear. This wishful thinking, however, does not constitute a policy goal. There is a world of difference between a wish that the existing situation change and a determination to do all within our power to bring about a change.

A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW CUBAN RESOLUTION

This nation has a historic policy opposing intervention in this hemisphere by despotism based in other parts of the world -- a policy laid down on December 2, 1823 by James Monroe.

President Monroe asserted that "we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing" Latin American states "or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any light, than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States". He warned that "we should consider any attempt" on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this Hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety".

The Monroe Doctrine barred any further "interposition" by European powers to extend their system or exercise control in this hemisphere. It said simply, "Hands off". It made no distinction between offensive and defensive weapons or between forcible and pacific means of intervention.

The purpose of the Monroe Doctrine, as Elihu Root once explained, was to prevent the development of a situation that could endanger hemispheric security. The Kennedy Doctrine, by contrast, appears to permit intervention by non-American states in this hemisphere up to the point at which a danger to security has reached an acute stage. The difference between the Monroe Doctrine and the Kennedy Doctrine is the difference between preventative medical care and treatment which begins after the development of a high fever.

In earlier periods of our history the Government of the United States asserted that the Monroe Doctrine barred the presence of Spanish troops in Santo Domingo and the establishment of a French puppet emperor in Mexico. In 1940 Secretary of

State Cordell Hull served notice that the Monroe Doctrine prohibited the exercise of any authority by Axis Powers over any part of the hemisphere.^{4/} In 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt extended the Monroe Doctrine to Greenland and sent American troops to that island to forestall Nazi occupation.

In 1912, when Mexico proposed leasing to a Japanese fishing company, a port area in Lower California, the United States Senate, relying on the Monroe Doctrine, asserted, "... when any harbor or other place in the American continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another Government, not American, as to give that Government practical power of control for national purposes."

In 1954 Secretary of State John Foster Dulles declared that "the intrusion of Soviet despotism (in Guatemala) was a direct challenge to our Monroe Doctrine, the first and most fundamental of our foreign policies". With the assistance of the United States, loyal Guatemalans removed their Communist rulers forthwith.

Along with the United States, the other nations of the hemisphere have used the language of Monroe to serve notice that trespassing is forbidden to Communism. The Ninth Inter-American Conference at Bogota in 1948 condemned "interference by any foreign power, or by any political organization serving the interest of a foreign power, in the public life of the nations of the American continent". The Tenth Inter-American Conference at Caracas in 1954 declared that "the domination of control of the political institutions of any American State by the international communist movement, extending to this Hemisphere the political system of any extra-continental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America".

Three years ago Khrushchev told the world that the Monroe Doctrine was dead, saying "the remains of this doctrine should be buried as every dead body is, so that it does not poison the air by its decay". The Eisenhower Administration replied, "... the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the Doctrine was proclaimed". The Kennedy Administration has so far failed to contradict Khrushchev either by word or by deed.

What is needed is the positive policy of the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine is being violated by the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba -- whatever their strength, whatever the nature of their equipment.

The Doctrine is being violated as long as there is any type of Soviet intervention in Cuba.

The removal of Soviet troops and the elimination of other types of Soviet intervention in Cuba is an urgent policy objective.

The ultimate objective of United States policy must be the elimination of the Communist regime in Cuba and its replacement by a government freely chosen by the Cuban people.

Let the President and the Congress act!

####

Footnotes

1/ The uncertainty about the nation's objectives is evidenced in a recent report from Freedom House entitled "What Can We Do About Cuba?" The report, stating the consensus of the deliberations of 25 experts on Cuba in late April 1963, declares that the following are "troubling questions": "Is American Cuban policy geared to a negotiated 'accord' with Khrushchev on the kind of Cuba with which the United States could 'co-exist'? Is the Administration 'looking toward some kind of reconciliation, perhaps on the basis of a Tito-type arrangement for Cuba?"

2/ "The President has been careful not to declare openly that the Monroe Doctrine either does not apply in the Cuban case at this particular time or that it is an obsolete political concept in terms of present-day realities.

"But the Administration spokesmen have made it fairly clear that the President does not believe that the Monroe Doctrine is really applicable under the present circumstances."

Ted Szule, New York Times, Sept. 23, 1962.

3/ "Issues and Answers" ABC-TV October 14, 1962

4/ It is interesting to note that the argument used by Hitler's government and rejected by Hull in 1940, contending that United States participation in the affairs of Europe made the Monroe Doctrine obsolete, was adopted by Senator John Sparkman.

"... the non-intervention in the affairs of the American Continent by European nations which is demanded by the Monroe Doctrine can in principle be legally valid only on condition that the American nations for their part do not interfere in the affairs of the European Continent." von Ribbentrop, July 1, 1940.

" This change has greatly altered the conditions governing our implementation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was based in part on the assumption that the nations of the Western Hemisphere would remain uninvolved in the conflicts of Europe." Senator John Sparkman, Sept. 20, 1962.

APPENDIX I

ATTITUDES ON THE SCOPE AND STATUS OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE BY RESPONSIBLE SPOKESMEN OF THE LAST FOUR ADMINISTRATIONS

Franklin D. Roosevelt (1933-45)

Cordell Hull, July 5, 1940:

"The Monroe Doctrine is solely a policy of self-defense, which is intended to preserve the independence and integrity of the Americas. It was, and is, designed to prevent aggression in this hemisphere on the part of any non-American power, and likewise to make impossible any further extension to this hemisphere of any non-American system of government imposed from without. ... It made clear that the future transfer of existing possessions to another non-American state would be regarded as inimical to the interests of this hemisphere. This has become a basic policy of the Government of the United States."

Cordell Hull, April 12, 1940:

"There is an express application of the Monroe Doctrine by the United States regarding Greenland. There appears to be no serious question about Greenland forming part of this hemisphere as contradistinguished from the European side of the Atlantic. ... The German forces occupying Denmark could easily cause the Government of Denmark to issue orders about Greenland, as they could about Danish shipping throughout the world. For this reason it's important that Greenland should receive our attention under the Monroe Doctrine."

Public Law 32, 77th Congress, Approved April 19, 1941

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (1) That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power."

Harry S. Truman (1945-53)

President Truman, December 27, 1945:

"We believe that the sovereign states of the Western Hemisphere, without interference from outside the Western Hemisphere, must work together as good neighbors in the solution of their common problems."

President Truman, April 5, 1947

"When we hear the cry of freedom arising from the shores beyond our own, we can take heart from the words of Thomas Jefferson. In his letter to President Monroe, urging the adoption of what we now know as the Monroe Doctrine, he wrote:

'Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another.'

"We, like Jefferson, have witnessed atrocious violations of the rights of nations.

"We, too, have regarded them as occasions not to be slighted.

"We, too, have declared our protest.

"We must make that protest effective by aiding those peoples whose freedoms are endangered by foreign pressures.

"We must take a positive stand. It is no longer enough merely to say, 'We don't want war'. We must act in time - ahead of time - to stamp out the smoldering beginnings of any conflict that may threaten to spread over the world ..."

Dwight D. Eisenhower (1953 -61)

John Foster Dulles, June 30, 1954:

"This intrusion of Soviet despotism [in Guatemala] was, of course, a direct challenge to our Monroe Doctrine, the first and most fundamental of our foreign policies."

John Foster Dulles, June 30, 1954:

"If world communism captures any American State, however small, a new and perilous front is established which will increase the danger to the entire free world and require even greater sacrifices from the American people."

John Foster Dulles, March 4, 1954:

"... it is time to make it clear with finality that we see that alien (i.e., Communist) despotism is hostile to our ideals, that we unitedly deny it the right of prey upon our hemisphere and that if it does not heed our warning and keep away we shall deal with it as a situation that might endanger the peace of America ... There is no place here for political institutions which serve alien masters."

Henry Cabot Lodge, June 20, 1954:

"I say to you, representative of the Soviet Union, stay out of this hemisphere and don't try to start your plans and your conspiracies over here."

Department of State, July 14, 1960:

"... the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the Doctrine was proclaimed."

John F. Kennedy (1961-date)

John F. Kennedy, Sept. 13, 1962:

"Q. Will it require force to contravene the Monroe Doctrine or does the presence of a foreign power in any force, but not using that force in this hemisphere, amount to contravention of the Doctrine?"

"THE PRESIDENT: Well, I have indicated that if Cuba should possess a capacity to carry out offensive action against the United States, that the United States would act. I have also indicated that the United States would not permit Cuba to export its power by force in the hemisphere."

Congressman Wayne Hays (D-Ohio), September 26, 1962

" . . . I think if a determination is made that the buildup in Cuba reaches a point where it is a threat to the United States, then it is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine."

Senator John Sparkman (D- Ala.), September 20, 1962:

"This change has greatly altered the conditions governing our implementation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was based in part on the assumption that the nations of the Western Hemisphere would remain uninvolved in the conflicts of Europe. But in discharging our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine, we must act with full regard for the fact that the problem of Cuba and of Communist designs in the Western Hemisphere is not an isolated one but part of our worldwide struggle against Communist imperialism."

Senator Dennis Chavez (D- New Mexico), September 20, 1962:

" . . . how can we justify saying we object to the Russians being in Cuba when we have a base within 60 miles of the Russian border in Turkey? I have been at our airbase in Turkey, 60 miles from Russia. How can we justify that and at the same time object to the Russians being in Cuba?"

Senator Stephen Young (D- Ohio), September 20, 1962:

" . . . the Monroe Doctrine has been altered because we have foreign commitments and responsibilities.

"I submit, therefore, that we can neither morally nor realistically take action which would jeopardize the security and independence of our allies.

" . . . it is not the same Monroe Doctrine as that of 1823; and our historians have been reporting that fact to us for some decades. They are correct."

Congressman Cornelius Gallagher (D-N.J.), September 26, 1962:

" . . . the Monroe Doctrine of 150 years ago has been amended by the necessity of a Kennedy doctrine which recognizes that a few sailing ships and men armed with muskets differs critically from a thoughtless armed action which can escalate into a nuclear holocaust and incinerate the Western Hemisphere."

Congressman Elmer J. Holland (D- Pa.), September 28, 1962:

Mr. Holland inserted in the Congressional Record an editorial which was entitled, "Monroe: Obsolete Doctrine." The editorial said, "The Monroe Doctrine is dead." Congressman Holland called it (p. A-7178): "An excellent editorial on the present 'hot' cold-war situation It is good to know that we have responsible and level-headed publishers and editors throughout the Nation who are dedicated to reporting the facts."