

themselves at the expense of the developing countries. Now they are playing demagogic number games to show how much development aid they have given; in reality it is a matter of their hanging on to their sources of profit ...

Third World

Mexico

El Sol, May 31 — The approval of the basis for creation of a new world economic order and a political defeat of the United States were the most salient facts of the fourth UNCTAD session, which ended today.... The resolution also asked the Secretary General of UNCTAD to call for a special intergovernmental group of experts meeting to study the problem of debt and payments negotiations.... The United States whose Secretary of State Henry Kissinger presented a project at the conference for the creation of an International Resources Bank, did not fare well at this international forum. His project was rejected....

The road has not been cleared yet, however, for a new international order, more just and equitable, desired by the Third World countries.

In reality, this fourth UNCTAD set the basis for its creation. On the other hand the Third World will have to eliminate the reservations stated tonight by countries like the U.S. and Great Britain, both of which decided to resist....

India

National Herald, June 1 — (editorial) — The achievements at Nairobi are not spectacular but they represent a substantial

advance for the developing nations....The prophets of doom were loud in their denunciations toward the end of the conference but compromise was reached at the end...One of the surprises of the conference was the seemingly passive role of the Eastern European bloc throughout the proceedings. India was forced to hold back the hawks among the developing nations, particularly Africans bent on a showdown. But why for example did India abstain on the western sponsored resolution commending the IRB. On the face of it the motion which was narrowly defeated was intended to confuse the issues of the conference....

Patriot, June 1 — The task of the non-aligned group today is serious. It is economic and political. It is the fight for a just new world order. Detente has lifted the threat of insecurity and conflict in some ares of the world but western capitalist nations are more aggressively determined that this historic change in international climate not be utilized to right economic injustice on a world scale. Non-alignment is no longer regarded with derision as it once fashionably used to be in Washington and London, but with fierce hostility. Dr. Kissinger has attacked non-alignment recently ... for seeking international economic cooperation on fair terms. The U.S. Secretary of State's writ does not run throughout the western world but reflects the interminable wrangle at Nairobi, on the question of commodities and debt relief. The non-aligned nations have now to explore ways to develop the necessary sanctions behind these demands with the complete assurance of continued support from the socialist world for a new world economic order.

Echeverria's Speech at the Habitat Conference

June 5 (NSIPS) — The following is an excerpted text of Mexican President Luis Echeverria's speech at the May 31 session of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements in Vancouver, Canada.

In attending this forum, Mexico reaffirms that the existence and strengthening of the United Nations is absolutely essential for carrying out the priority tasks of our times, and that if true, rather than imposed, peace is to come about, it will be achieved through the United Nations and by no other means.

Achieving this goal presupposes an intense effort to assume a historical responsibility we can no longer put off to the future — the responsibility of confronting the deep-rooted causes of the accumulation of problems that is shaking the foundations of human civilization. It presupposes a thorough knowledge of contemporary reality, the development of self-critical thinking and a systematic search for viable alternatives...

There are two basic obstacles to any transformation of the terms of our coexistence: the conspiracy of powerful interests and the persistent tendency of many men to believe that the rules and patterns of their own times are immutable constituents of human nature.

Nothing is further from the truth. History shows that the essential characteristic of mankind is evolution, the ability to find new answers and to set new courses.

Twenty-eight years ago, the General Assembly approved and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which established the right of all persons to an adequate standard of living that would assure the health and well-being of both themselves and their families, particularly as regards food, clothing, housing, medical attention and all necessary social services.

The information gathered for the study of the delegates shows how far we still are from making that goal a reality.

This Conference provides a fitting opportunity to undertake a more far-reaching analysis of current conditions that will help to establish the true causes of this delay, and to discuss the strategy to be followed in achieving effective results. . . .

Once again, we must insist on a fundamental fact: the urban problem, like so many others, will never be solved if we think of it as something autonomous, as a specific and isolated element. It is simply another link, and not even the most weighty or most explicit link, in a whole chain of material circumstances that go to make up the reality of our times and are reflected in our "lost cities" and slums. How can it be dealt with as something separate from unemployment, ignorance, unsanitary conditions, the population explosion, and the inadequate diet or outright hunger of the great majority of the world's population?

An effort must be made to develop an integrated approach. A constructive, sincere effort to accept the fact that the urban problem is, in itself, not a cause but a result; not the origin of the crisis, but its consequence; not its substantive foundation, but simply an effect. In other words, there can be no positive solution unless the problem is dealt with as a whole.

The problems on which world attention has focused in recent years, such as preservation of the environment, the high rate of population growth, unemployment, food scarcities and the condition of women, are all closely linked to the social programs of the different nations. . . .

It is no coincidence that our country has been taking a more active part in international gatherings ever since setting in motion at home the changes that were indispensable for dealing with problems that, at the world level, are a source of great concern to our organization. . . .

Recently, the Mexican Congress approved various amendments to our Political Constitution and passed a new law that specifies the terms under which our nation is to exercise its responsibilities in regulating human settlements. . . .

The new Law will make it possible to give added impetus to democratic planning aimed at promoting a more rational and just development of our cities. Thus, for example, we are promoting the creation of autonomous development poles in our country in which there is to be a coordinated establishment of industrial centers and agricultural production centers that will ensure higher employment levels and living standards in rural areas, avoid migration from the provinces, and aid in preserving the environment.

Despite the fact that our country, like other Third World nations, has applied itself to this aim with firm decision, our achievements and our real prospects still fall far short of fulfilling our aspirations. This is so because under present-day circumstances national efforts alone cannot correct phenomena whose structural origin lies beyond our borders.

There can be no substantial answers to these questions if we remain subject to the irrational system prevailing in international relations. It is imperative, therefore, that we forge ahead in our efforts to shape a new order founded on solidarity and cooperation.

Although the phenomenon of human settlements is the concern of all, it must be recognized that there are differences between their structure, origin, dimensions and consequences in wealthy nations and in poor nations.

The urbanization of the industrialized countries is the result of productive forces that led to abundance within a context of colonial wars and imperialistic expansion, whereas in the underdeveloped countries it is the product of poverty and despair, of the flight from impoverished rural areas and of migration in search of an ultimate vital alternative.

By the time population levels in the leading nations of the developed world passed the one million mark, those nations already had several decades of industrial revolution behind them. The rural masses that arrived at the gates of the European cities as labor reserves and made the accumulation of capital possible because of their low wages are not the same masses that are flooding into the cities of the

underdeveloped countries only to enter the ranks of the marginalized, a situation that not only betokens injustice but also throws economic models based on internal exploitation and dependency abroad into an insurmountable crisis. Explosive urban growth in the Third World is the result of an arousal of false expectations, not of social or economic change.

In poor countries, just as the population explosion came as the result of lowering death rates without taking into account the expansion of the forces of production, urban growth has been the result of the absence of a sound economic and social infrastructure. . . .

In the past, access to urban life meant a step upward to greater freedom, more security, and a better existence. Today, in marginalized countries, to move from the country to the city, to that degraded existence in "lost cities" and slums, frequently implies not self-improvement but regression, and is simply further proof of the fact that the present world economic system is incapable of resolving the imbalances of our times.

The desperate migration of rural masses in search of a better life, which confronts our cities with the accusing presence of a social crisis in the form of unemployment, exploitation, and a shortage of basic services such as water, housing and schools, has been called urbanism in the Third World.

The disruption of life in human settlements in peripheral areas has been caused by a system of domination that operates in a manner of which the peoples are unaware. Massive resources and surplus value are transferred on the national level, from some regions of the country to others, and on the international level, from poor nations to rich ones, in exchange for unilaterally fixed and unfair remuneration.

In industrialized countries the tertiary sector, services, has reached a new stage of economic development based on mass consumption and provides employment for skilled workers in the more modern technological and administrative systems. In cities in underdeveloped countries, on the other hand, those activities conceal a structure of unemployment and underemployment. Under such conditions, the so-called services are not those actually needed by society, and those who provide them attain only minimum levels of economic reward and stability. Such countries are accumulating a dangerously high degree of inefficiency and frustration that may explode at any moment.

The literature of multinational power tries to hide the true causes of human overcrowding in poor countries by making it appear that those countries are inhabited by hopelessly dull and lethargic men and women, or, at best, by beings abandoned by fortune. The truth is, and it bears repeating, that it is internal colonialism and unfair international economic relations that condemn these peoples to unemployment and marginalization.

How could the human tide that is moving to the cities actually be kept in the rural areas with a decent standard of living when the prices of food and raw materials are at the mercy of mercantile monopolization and iniquitous international speculation? How could productive efficiency be increased in the primary sectors when under such circumstances acquiring tools and technology implies an enormous drain on our economies?

How can we demand persistent and continued planning efforts from our countries when many of them are weighed down by poverty, when their national priorities are obstructed from abroad, when the availability of resources of all kinds is dependent on arbitrary, uncertain and burdensome transfer by the centers of power, and when decisions are taken on the basis of information which presents a false vision of the country and the world that favors the interests of the strongest powers? . . .

It would be most unfortunate if this meeting were to be turned into a mere forum for accusations and lamentations that serve no constructive purpose; it would be an even more serious matter, however, to seek to impose answers that are foreign to the real needs of the greater part of mankind.

If this Conference is to produce valid options they will have to be detached from metropolitan ethnocentrism and be formulated from democratic viewpoints capable of promoting projects of true priority to nations, of financing them without ties of any kind and of fostering human dignity based on justice and freedom. We therefore reject all would-be cooperation that tends to reproduce patterns that are foreign to our aspirations, since such patterns are basically vehicles for economic and cultural penetration, for hegemony and dependency, which for that very reason do not solve our problems but only make them more acute. . . .

For that very reason this Conference is part of the great theme of our times, the division of the world into a bloc of abundance and an enormous archipelago of poverty.

The attitude which the industrial States have recently adopted in economic matters reveals the extent to which their real dispute is waged not in the sphere of worldwide ideological conflict but rather in that of specific economic interests, and how easy it is for powerful minorities to reach circumstantial agreement when the majorities make specific demands and organize for action. When matters come to a head, however, questions of profit and loss have always proved more powerful than the standards of freedom, democracy, justice and solidarity.

This situation also reveals a further harsh truth: any other contradiction between peoples is outweighed by the contradiction between rich and poor nations. The former struggle to expand their power, and the latter simply to preserve their fundamental right to survival.

Monetary disorder, generalized unemployment in large areas of the world, the renewed and growing deterioration in the terms of trade faced by developing countries and the increasing gravity of the problems deriving from the foreign debt have accentuated the structural distortions that neo-colonialism imposed on our economic and social systems. They have made the expression "developing countries" paradoxical, since in many of those countries what has actually occurred has been a clear-cut involution towards poverty and dependence, an involution of the terms of international relations that results in greater impoverishment, direct and indirect aggression, and in political and economic pressures that frustrate the hopes of many nations.

In spite of the gravity of these problems, the Fourth UNCTAD in Nairobi showed that possibilities for any concerted world action between the powerful countries and the

Third World nations to jointly implant a new international economic order are becoming dangerously remote.

Up to now, the developed countries have had the power to profit from circumstantial crisis by subjecting the great masses of the world's people to even more rigorous conditions of poverty.

This has created the false illusion that contemporary imbalances can even be good business for those who for centuries have systematically administered in their own favor the injustice that has prevailed in the world.

For that reason, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and more recently the initiative to establish the Common Fund for the Financing of Stabilizing Reserves of Basic Commodities and the proposals contained in the Manila Declaration presented by the Third World countries at the Fourth UNCTAD with a view to establishing a more rational and equitable organization of financial and commercial relations, the transfer of technology and economic cooperation for development, have all been received by the centers of world power with deep mistrust, as if they were part of some arbitrary attitude on the part of the underdeveloped world.

This is the persistent reaction of power in the face of demands for justice, and in this case, in the face of a solid alternative for survival that the Third World has proposed under the sign of reason and the desire for concord.

This attitude may constitute a grave historical error. To meet demands for equity that have their basis in the fact of our mutual interdependence with absolute rejection, a categorical *no* or indifference is tantamount to refusing to realize that affairs have reached a limit difficult to sustain.

The accumulation of poverty is leading to a dead end from which escape is possible only by means of qualitative change. If we do not make these changes through negotiation and understanding, we shall inevitably be led to violence.

To further increase the numbers of the marginalized masses and to manipulate the agony of peoples in order to finance the economic recovery of countries that have for so long lived in abundance shows a lack of foresight that can only lead to the gravest consequences.

We must face the present situation with a cold eye. The rules of present-day international life cannot be sustained; they carry within them the seeds of international instability, and their contradictions lead to permanent and numerous points of conflict. The subsistence of this state of affairs endangers peace, and is destined to end in violence that will bring about an era of authoritarianism and repression that is sure to thwart the development of the most lofty potentialities of the human spirit.

Our generation has reached a crossroads, leading either to a substantive regression of human coexistence or to the preservation of the creative possibilities of our species.

This is no exaggeration. We are not indulging in alarmist tactics that draw attention from the essence of the question. Statistics and quantified surveys of the immediate future illustrate more eloquently than words the gravity of this dilemma. . . .

To sit here as has been done in recent international conferences with decisions taken beforehand, with instructions to give in on minor points and not to give an inch with regard to

the advantages and gains that have been accumulated, is equivalent to assuming the great responsibility of relegating millions of human beings who live in subhuman conditions to a situation that leaves them no alternatives. Such obstinacy and short-sightedness are nothing new, but are rather a part of the same panorama that has in the past preceded all social upheavals and all wars.

The new international economic order is based on the assumption that the powerful are essentially willing to renounce excess and surfeit for the sake of peace.

Together, as protagonists and spectators of history, we have all reached the moment for far-reaching decisions. It is absurd for immense financial resources to be lost in rearmament, destroyed by the waste of the consumer society, and eroded by inappropriate use of the patrimony of humanity.

The time has come to develop a rational project that defines the use of energy and natural resources as elements of social change that serve man, and sees the use of technological innovations and economic resources not as power serving the interests of the strongest, but as the result of the collective creation of all human beings.

This program can be carried out. Its historical viability cannot be impugned. Nevertheless, its implementation implies abandoning rhetoric and moralizing attitudes in order to find practical approaches and take definite steps.

Despite the delay tactics and obstinacy of the power centers, today we reiterate our willingness to aid in keeping the dialogue alive.

We have always believed in negotiation as a means of finding areas of understanding between different ideologies and conflicting interests, as well as in the possibility of devising mechanisms of cooperation that offer legitimate advantages to all peoples.

In Nairobi, the Third World once again proved, in spite of obstacles and a lack of comprehension, that it has a civilizing project based on moderation, strict historical objectivity, and an authentic spirit of conciliation.

We Third World countries must accompany our determined pursuit of joint and harmonious world efforts with immediate progress in our own coordinated and unified relations. Our political organization must be carried a step further, to a new stage of economic organization.

Next September, a meeting of the member nations of the Group of 77 will be held in Mexico, for the purpose of developing a program of cooperation among our countries. The fundamental obligation of all Third World governments today is to begin the task of organizational, analytical, and creative transformation.

Unless we establish solid, efficient, and modern states, we will not be able to combat internal distortions in our own societies. Unless we are willing to establish, among ourselves and for ourselves, definite instruments, devices, and mechanisms for achieving solidarity in technological, financial, industrial, and commercial matters we will make no progress toward our more ambitious goals of reforming the world order. . . .

The United Nations continues to be the best forum for bringing about the understanding among peoples that the changing conditions of international coexistence demand. . . .

There are two basic choices open to our organization: to see its role as that of a mere administrator of an antiquated system that has been outstripped by events and by the new composition of the majority of its members, or to recognize its obligation to change its ways. Only the second alternative can lead to peace. . . .

Exclusive

Wills' Speech at Algiers Meeting of Non-Aligned Steering Committee

June 4 (NSIPS) — The following speech by Fred Wills, Foreign Minister of Guyana, was delivered as the keynote to the meeting of the Steering Committee of the Group of 77 Non-Aligned Nations in Algiers on May 30, 1976. The Group of 77's Steering Committee may be considered the officially constituted leadership of the entire Third World.

I take it as a great honor to speak here in the magnificent city of Algiers, a city of historic and strategic significance dominating the communication systems that link the two greatest expanses of water on the globe. Above all, the city of Algiers has become symbolic in respect of the recent struggles of the disadvantaged majority of the globe for freedom and self-determination. We in the developing world are conscious of the debt we owe to your illustrious President

(Boumediene — ed.) for his leadership of our Movement and for the added vitality he has injected into the contemporary international system. It was on the initiative of President Boumediene that our Movement took the steps which led to the adoption by the international community of a blueprint for a new international economic order — a blueprint which we are confident will survive the temporary setback at Nairobi. When the long view of history settles on this period during which your great President led our Movement, it will immediately be seen as that which increased the solidarity and the effectiveness of the Movement.

This development is closely reflected in the ever-increasing threat to Non-alignment in Latin America. I am pleased at the great honor which has been bestowed on my