

## CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CUBA, INC.

Suite 301 Langford Building, 121 S. E. 1st Street • Miami, Florida 33131 • Phone 373-0631

January 31, 1966

RECEIVED  
FEB 17 1966  
BOB DOLE

### EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

PAUL D. BETHEL

### MEMBERS

MARIADA ARENSBERG  
HENRY W. BALGOOYEN  
JEAN P. J. BALTZELL  
WILLIAM BARLOW  
MURRAY BARON  
JOSEPH BEIRNE  
NICHOLAS DUKE BIDDLE  
AMB. SPRUILLE BRADEN  
KARL BRANDT  
RALF BRENT  
IRVING BROWN  
ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE (Ret.)  
COLEMAN BURKE  
DICKY CHAPELLE  
LEO CHERNE  
ERNEST CUNEO  
CHRISTOPHER EMMET  
JOHN FISHER  
DR. RUSSELL H. FITZGIBBON  
DR. HARRY GIDEONSE  
HAL HENDRIX  
SAL B. HOFFMANN  
DR. SIDNEY HOOK  
DR. HARRY KANTOR  
KEVIN CORRIGAN  
CLARE BOOTHE LUCE  
EUGENE LYONS  
BRIG. GEN. S. L. A. MARSHALL (Ret.)  
HENRY MAYERS  
ARTHUR G. McDOWELL  
BENJAMIN F. McLAURIN  
DR. HANS. J. MORGENTHAU  
EDGAR ANSEL MOWRER  
JOHN O'ROURKE  
BONARO OVERSTREET  
BISHOP JAMES A. PIKE  
VIRGINIA PREWETT  
VICTOR RIESEL  
DR. ROBERT STRAUZ-HUPE  
EDWARD TELLER  
VICE ADM. CHARLES WELLBORN, JR. (Ret.)  
DR. ARTHUR P. WHITAKER  
PRESTON G. WOOLF  
(incomplete)

My Dear Congressman:

I am writing you regarding U.S. funds slated to be used in a United Nations project for Communist Cuba. Such a project works directly at cross-purposes to stated U.S. foreign policy objectives.

The essential elements in the case are revealed in the attached story which appeared in "The St. Louis Globe Democrat."

It seems to me, and to the group of prominent American citizens whom I represent, that the United States should resort to every legal measure possible to thwart the UN project.

I need only mention the tri-continental conference on subversion which just terminated in Havana last January 17. The purpose of that conference is to enlarge Russia's Cuban base of subversion so as to place the continents of Asia, Africa, and South America under direct attack by Cuban-trained guerrillas and terrorists.

We can further ask: "How can our allies take the so-called economic blockade of Cuba seriously when the United States itself contributes to the re-building of Castro's economy and his military machine?"

The United States voluntarily provides 40% of the funds for the UN Development Program -- money which comes from American taxpayers. We have, as you know, had a tremendous strain placed on the Federal budget this year due to the Viet Nam war and domestic programs.

I am sure you will agree that it is inconceivable that this country voluntarily give funds to an international base of subversion which is located just 90 miles off our shores. I hope that you will do everything in your power to obtain a reconsideration of the United States' position with regard to use of UN Development Fund money for Communist Cuba.

Sincerely yours,

January 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

851

AMERICAN AID

(Mr. FINDLEY was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read in today's St. Louis Globe-Democrat a report by Mr. Edward O'Brien, chief of the newspaper's Washington bureau, announcing a United Nations grant to support a technological institute in Cuba, with 40 percent of the money coming from the U.S. Treasury. Only Communist Party members and members of the militia, according to the report, are permitted to attend the institute.

This means that more than \$1 million in U.S. tax dollars will go to support what may well be a principal Communist training school for revolution.

The news report indicates that the United States will not attempt to block approval of the project or withdraw the U.S. contribution.

Perhaps the United States has obligations through the U.N. treaty which it cannot duck, but the language of this news report suggests otherwise. Certainly the project deserves thorough congressional examination.

On the face of it, the United States seems to be in the ridiculous position of throwing bullets at the Communists on one front and throwing dollars at them on another.

Has the Monroe Doctrine sunk to such low ebb that the United States now feels obliged to help support the Communist military establishment 90 miles off our shores, an establishment which quite clearly continues to be the focal point for Communist activity throughout Latin America?

Here is the text of Mr. O'Brien's article:

AMERICAN AID TO TOTAL \$1.2 MILLION—ROOSEVELT PUTS TENTATIVE OK ON PROJECT

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—A United Nations agency which receives 40 percent of its money from

the U.S. Treasury is planning to give \$3,100,000 to Cuba, with more than half of the aid funds allocated to strengthen the University of Havana's technological faculty.

The United States, through Ambassador James Roosevelt, has informed the U.N. agency it will not demand rejection of the project, nor will the United States withhold its \$1,240,000 share of the cost.

TRAINS ENGINEERS

The university's technological branch trains engineers and others and is headed by Russian and Cuban military personnel. Only Communist Party and militia members are permitted to attend.

"Cuban technology is specifically oriented toward training in computers, electronics, and other areas of endeavor which Fidel Castro has stated are related to the military potential of Cuba and particularly to radar and military communications," according to the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba Inc., an anti-Castro organization of prominent Americans.

In 1963, the U.N. special fund headed by Paul G. Hoffman, proposed an aid project for Castro's Cuba but dropped it after an angry outcry in Congress and State Department opposition.

Last Tuesday, Ambassador Roosevelt, who represents the United States on the U.N. development program governing council that passes on special fund projects, said this Government's opposition in 1963 was "a gimmick" and "didn't mean a thing in the whole concept of the fund."

PUBLIC RECORD

Mr. Roosevelt said he will "place on the public record the Government's objection in principle" to the new project but will do nothing else to block the project or cut off the customary 40 percent contribution by Washington.

U.S. payments to the U.N. special fund are voluntary. The fund will spend over \$150 million this year.

Mr. Roosevelt said the U.S. nominal opposition to the Cuban project is not based on the Castro regime's communism but on the theory that Cuba's shortage of technical experts was caused by the Castro regime itself, which has caused thousands of Cubans to flee.

The new aid project was proposed by Mr. Hoffman, who maintained that U.S. support "must be kept free of ideological and political considerations."



# Cuba to Get U.S. Funds From UN Agency

## American Aid to Total \$1.2 Million

By EDWARD W. O'BRIEN  
Chief of The Globe-Democrat  
Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON—United Nations agency which receives 40 per cent of its money from the United States Treasury is planning to give \$3,100,000 to Cuba, with more than half of the aid funds allocated to strengthen the University of Havana's technological faculty.

The United States, through Ambassador James Roosevelt, has informed the UN agency it will not demand rejection of the project, nor will the United States withhold its \$1,240,000 share of the cost.

### TRAINS ENGINEERS

The university's technological branch trains engineers and others and is headed by Russian and Cuban military personnel. Only Communist Party and militia members are permitted to attend.

"Cuban technology is specifically oriented toward training in computers, electronics, and other areas of endeavor which Fidel Castro has stated are related to the military potential of Cuba and particularly to radar and military communications," according to the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba Inc., an anti-Castro organization of prominent Americans.

In 1963, the UN special fund headed by Paul G. Hoffman, proposed an aid project for Castro's Cuba but dropped it after an angry outcry in Congress and State Department opposition.

Last Tuesday, Ambassador Roosevelt, who represents the United States on the UN de-

## Cuba To Receive Funds From U.S.

Continued from Page 1A

velopment program governing council that passes on special fund projects, said this government's opposition in 1963 was "a gimmick" and "didn't mean a thing in the whole concept of the fund."

### PUBLIC RECORD

Mr. Roosevelt said he will "place on the public record the government's objection in principle" to the new project but will do nothing else to block the project or cut off the customary 40 per cent contribution by Washington.

United States payments to the UN special fund are voluntary. The fund will spend over \$150,000,000 this year.

Mr. Roosevelt said the United States' nominal opposition to the Cuban project is not based on the Castro regime's Communism but on the theory that Cuba's shortage of technical experts was caused by the Castro regime itself, which has caused thousands of Cubans to flee.

The new aid project was proposed by Mr. Hoffman, who maintained that United States support "must be kept free of ideological and political considerations."

Of the \$3,100,000 total, \$2,000,000 will go to the university and \$1,100,000 for an agricultural research station near Havana.

### ULTIMATE TOTAL

An ultimate total of \$25,000,000 in UN aid to Cuba is being discussed. Whether it materializes will probably depend largely on congressional and public reaction to the first portion.

Brazil and Paraguay strongly objected to helping Castro through the UN. Both countries are among the principle targets of Communist subversion directed from Cuba.

A Communist tri-continental congress of subversion, which brought together top ranking Reds from many countries, ended in Havana less than two weeks ago. At the congress, Cuba