What happened at the UNGA?

By: Francisco Delgado Rodríguez
31/10/2025


It’s challenging to find the best adjective to describe what is clearly an extraordinary victory for Cuba in the recent debate held at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) regarding Resolution 79/7, "Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial blockade imposed by the United States of America against Cuba."

It’s also difficult to formulate a comprehensive analysis immediately after the vote, especially since certain aspects and information are not usually public, because that’s precisely one of the peculiarities of the diplomatic world, the arena of this victory.

Some wonder why the Cuban government typically gives such high priority to this debate and to the approval of the resolution condemning the blockade, not only by Cuba and its allies, but by the majority of countries.

Its relevance stems from several factors, including the venue where it was approved: the UN General Assembly, the most representative body in the world. This, among other things, makes it impossible for the enemy of the Cuban nation to obscure or cover up what was approved there with its powerful media machine.

With 165 votes in favor, the clear majority of the world's governments represented at the UN acknowledge that the blockade imposed by the US is a crime, and therefore recognize the existence of this criminal policy, contrary to the position and narrative of that country and its allies.

The 12 abstentions should also be considered, in several cases, as a stance, albeit a shameful one, against the US. The votes against totaled 7.

One could perform a simplistic math alluding to the difference in votes in favor of Cuba, compared to previous years; even Mr. Rubio can boast that his  desperate and crude pressure tactics, deployed mercilessly in every corner of the world, yielded results, where there wasn't even a noticeable effort to persuade with any argument.

However, that same basic addition/subtraction reveals the obvious: the votes in favor of Resolution 79/7 are 23

times more than the 7 that voted against Cuba, not counting those who abstained. This suggests that they don't support the resolution, but neither do they support the US, which demanded without reservation that the existence of the embargo not even be mentioned.

A first look at the countries in these two small groups reveals that, in general, ideological affinities with the far-right paraphernalia prevail. These are the cases of Argentina (against), Paraguay (against), Ecuador (abstained), and Costa Rica (abstained) in Latin America. Israel isn't even worth discussing.

Reviewing how some of the states bordering or very close to Russia voted, it's also evident that their votes were linked to the conflict surrounding the war in Ukraine, a country that voted against Cuba, seeking solidarity for its own needs from Washington, with whom it maintains a complicated relationship. Romania, Poland, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Estonia, Lithuania, Moldova, and Poland all abstained.

It shouldn't be forgotten that, as part of Mr. Rubio's intense efforts, one of them was to spread the supposed claim of massive support; they even spoke of 20,000 soldiers sent by Cuba to back Russia. They couldn't have come up with a bigger absurdity, but it obviously had some impact. History or future revelations will shed more light on this.

Each country involved deserves its own particular analysis. Their foreign ministries would present, with varying degrees of credibility, the reasons for not supporting the resolution, but the rather basic argument is that, in general, they don’t do so because they are unaware of the existence of the blockade, the core issue of the resolution. In fact, many of these governments, some already in power, supported the corresponding resolution in 2024, essentially the same one as now, only updated.

As has been duly denounced by the Cuban Foreign Ministry and authorities, the level of pressure and blackmail reached an unusual dimension. This has its peculiar explanation.

When Mr. Rubio was a senator, it was common to hear his complaints and denunciations about the supposed lack of interest or effectiveness of the State Department in preventing the world's traditional support for the resolution against the blockade.

Given that attacking Cuba is his priority, especially since he had the means to implement that objective as Secretary of State, Mr. Rubio was obliged to change the direction of the vote, and the goal was to prevent the resolution from being approved, something he considered a foregone conclusion. Some of the Miami spokespeople even declared premature victory, once again making fools of themselves, from which it's difficult to recover.

Returning to the pressures, it was... I can mention a concrete example, based on the strenuous digital social media activity of the State Department's Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, that is, the department that "handles" Cuban issues.

Well, it turns out that in the 15 days leading up to the vote, this Bureau announced that it had to minimize its activity on social media, due, as we know, to the "hardships" caused to these institutions by the federal government shutdown. With an effort that could have been better used, they issued 23 posts or messages, 21 of them against the resolution proposed by Cuba. This operation could be described as free, without money, but obsessed. Behind it all, naturally, was Mr. Rubio.

Another unique aspect of this battle in 2025, against the empire on the UN stage, was the participation of the US ambassador in the debate. It should be noted that usually, the one who participates in the debate is a lower-ranking diplomat, since US policy has been to downplay the event, ultimately to disregard the resolution.

But Mr. Rubio's position is already known. He instructed his ambassador to expose himself by uttering the lies he did, which aren't even worth commenting on. It would suffice to read the tedious barrage of false arguments issued by the Office of Western Hemisphere Affairs in the 21 messages mentioned.

In this story, there’s one specific episode that deserves highlighting: the very brief intervention, in the form of an authorized interruption, by the Cuban Minister of Foreign Affairs, Bruno Rodríguez Parrilla. In minutes, with a very short text, the Foreign Minister, representing all of Cuba, ridiculed the ambassador, who looked at him perplexed as he listened, unaccustomed to "such insolence toward a representative of the world's largest and most important country," he surely thought.

Incidentally, the Cuban Foreign Minister also alluded to the unfortunate role that the current ambassador, Mike Waltz, played as a member of the House of Representatives, recalling his past in the service of the Cuban-American mafia in Florida.

Bruno also cast a shadow on the Signal chat service, a kind of WhatsApp used by high-ranking officials in the US government, where top-secret state information is shared, and which occasionally appears in the press—something that has become part of the folklore of the current Trump administration.

Discussing the indisputable veracity of Resolution 79/7 is beyond the scope of this article. In any case, it's unnecessary because it's not only the Cuban government that believes there is a brutal economic war being waged against the island; it's the whole world, including the people of the countries whose governments have now betrayed the truth and the most cherished principles of universal humanism.

Finally, it should be noted that Mr. Rubio clearly did not achieve his objectives, and it's not worth paying attention to what he says now; it's all just justifications for lying to President Trump in order to remain in the federal government a little longer.

In any case, as Cuban Vice Foreign Minister Carlos F. de Cossio said, referring minutes later to the vote in favor of Cuba: “In any game or dispute, this is a knockout.” See you next year, for the next victory.

**Translated by Amilkal Labañino / CubaSí Translation Staff**