

This is the big problem facing us.

And, gentlemen, it is not only our problem, a problem for the countries victimized by underdevelopment and insufficient development; it is a problem for the international community as a whole.

On more than one occasion, it has been said that we were forced into underdevelopment by colonization and imperialist neocolonization. Therefore, the task of helping us to emerge from underdevelopment is, first of all, a historic and moral obligation of those who benefited from the plunder of our wealth and the exploitation of our men and women for decades and for centuries. But, at the same time, it is the task of mankind as a whole, as the Sixth Summit Conference has declared.

The socialist countries did not participate in the plunder of the world, and they are not responsible for the phenomenon of underdevelopment. But, even so, because of the nature of their social system, in which international solidarity is a premise, they understand and assume the obligation of helping to overcome it.

Likewise, when the world expects the producing developing countries to contribute to the universal flow of external financing for development, it does so because of a hope and duty of solidarity among underdeveloped countries, not because of obligations and duties which no one could hope to impose. The big exporting countries should be aware of their responsibilities.

Cuban contribution

Even those developing countries that are relatively more advanced should make their contributions. Cuba—which is not speaking here on behalf of its own interests and is not defending a national objective—in accordance with its means, is willing to contribute thousands, tens of thousands of technicians: doctors, teachers, agronomists, hydraulic engineers, mechanical engineers, middle-level technicians, skilled workers, etc.

The time has therefore come for all of us to join in the task of pulling entire peoples, hundreds of millions of human beings out of the backwardness, poverty, malnutrition, illness and illiteracy that keep them from having full human dignity and pride.

We should, therefore, mobilize resources for development, and this is our joint obligation.

Mr. Chairman, there are so many special, multilateral, public and private funds whose purpose is to contribute to some aspect of development—agricultural, industrial, the meeting of balance of payments deficits or whatever—that it is not easy for me, on presenting the economic problems discussed by the Sixth Summit Conference to the 34th Assembly, to formulate a concrete proposal for the establishment of a new fund.

Undoubtedly, however, the problem of financing

should be discussed deeply and fully in order to find a solution. In addition to the resources that have already been mobilized by various banking channels, loan organizations, international bodies, and private finance agencies, we must discuss and determine a strategy for the next development decade, which should include an additional contribution of no less than \$300 billion (1977 real values), to be invested in the underdeveloped countries and to be made in yearly installments of at least \$25 billion right from the beginning. This should be in the form of donations and longterm, low-interest soft credits.

It is absolutely necessary to mobilize these additional funds as a contribution of the developed world during the next ten years. If we want peace, these resources will be required. If there are no resources for development, there will be no peace.

Some may think this is asking too much, but I think it is a modest figure. According to statistical data, as

First reactions to a call for cooperation

Le Monde, editorial, Oct. 15, "The Open Hand of Fidel":

To help the Third World countries so as to help oneself while recession again threatens in the richer nations, that theme is reappearing in a few official milieus. ... The scandal is permanent but one needs spectacular tragedies like that of Cambodia to awaken public opinion. ... In the face of such a dark reality, Castro did not have to exaggerate to shake his audience last Friday at the United Nations. No one ignores the oratorical talents of the Cuban head of state, but he did not lack cleverness either. It is through a certain moderation, unusual for him, that he reached his aim. Presenting himself less as a Cuban revolutionary than as the leader of a universal movement, which he could legitimately do as acting president of the nonaligned movement, presenting an extended hand instead of a clenched fist, he won over an audience which was less complacent than at the beginning of his speech.

We will see what remains after the emotion has subsided. Adversaries and proponents of Fidel Castro will be counted in two weeks when Cuba will present itself to the suffrage of the United Nations to get itself elected at the Security Council. After which one will have to get to the business of talking big money. But why couldn't we for once escape the classical dilemma; bread for those deprived of it necessarily means sacrifices for those who already

I stated in the inaugural session of the Sixth Summit Conference of Nonaligned Countries, world military expenditures amount to more than \$300 billion a year. This sum could build 600,000 schools, with a capacity for 400 million children; or 60 million comfortable homes, for 300 million people; or 30,000 hospitals, with 18 million beds; or 20,000 factories, with jobs for more than 20 million workers; or an irrigation system for 150 million hectares of land—that, with the application of technology, could feed a billion people. Mankind wastes this much every year on military spending. Moreover, consider the enormous quantities of young human resources, technicians, fuel, raw materials, and other items. This is the fabulous price of preventing a true climate of confidence and peace from existing in the world.

The United States alone will spend six times this much on military activities in the 1980s.

For ten years of development, we are requesting less

than what is spent in a single year by the Ministries of War and much less than a tenth of what will be spent for military purposes in ten years.

Some may consider our demand irrational, but the truly irrational thing is the world's madness in our era and the perils that threaten mankind.

The tremendous responsibility of studying, mobilizing, and distributing the flow of these resources should be entrusted to the United Nations. The funds should be administered by the international community itself, in conditions of absolute equality for all countries, whether contributors or beneficiaries, without any political strings attached and without the amount of the donations having anything to do with voting power in deciding when loans are to be granted and to whom.

Even though the flow of resources should be measured in financial terms, it should not consist only of money. It may also be made up of equipment, fertilizers, raw materials, fuel and turn-key factories, valued in the

have it. The North-South collaboration formulas of Fidel Castro, after many others, don't they open a new way, advantageous to all? Why don't we tell him we take up the challenge?

Les Echos, Oct. 15:

Newly promoted leader of the nonaligned, while remaining the constant spokesman for a certain idea of socialism, Soviet-style, Fidel Castro came to the United Nations at the same time to settle accounts and to propose a compromise. The message he issued in front of the 152 members of the Assembly is double-edged. He was the apostle of peace and cooperation between people so as to eliminate the unjust disparity between rich and poor, while warning the UN Assembly that the world was on the verge of apocalypse. At the same time, he reiterated his attacks against the capitalist countries, and more especially the United States, which he did not hesitate to accuse of attempting to assassinate him. The fact remains that beyond his outrageous style—notably the demand for a \$300 billion fund for developing countries—Castro proposed for the first time the opening of a dialogue with the West. It remains to be seen on what terms. The calls and diatribes of the new "prophet" of the Nonaligned Movement provoked the enthusiasm of the majority of the members of the Assembly, with the notable exception of the United States and China. The speech is made, now Castro must build his credibility.

Washington Post, Oct. 16:

The Castro truculence has a life of its own ... It

can keep the Third World from taking full advantage of the limited but still valuable steps the United States is prepared to take on global development now....

Joseph Kraft, syndicated columnist, U.S., Oct. 15:

The United States' main problem is to break up the coming-together of the Soviet bloc and the Third World in a massive front of anti-American unity. The start of a solution is to kick Castro.... By kicking hard at Castro, by challenging him rhetorically and harassing him in practice, the United States underlines the role of the Cuban regime as the lynchpin in the projected alliance between the Soviet bloc and the Third World. Many countries with doubts about that grouping will have more reason to hang back—especially those that are jumping in only because they think Washington doesn't care.

The Carter administration has consistently favored a policy of accommodation to the demands of the Third World. The Andrew Young approach has been a complete bust ... Pakistan, Mexico, and Spain, to cite three recent examples, have all recently associated themselves with Third World criticism of the United States.

Castro comes nicely to hand as the head of a regime and a country who can be pushed around with only minimal costs.

William McHenry, United Nations Ambassador for the United States:

Do you think we can give them funds after they insult us?