

Nonaligned Summit Meeting Nears End

Cuba Prevails in Denunciation of U.S.

9/17/79
By Karen DeYoung
Washington Post Foreign Service

HAVANA, Sept. 8 — After nearly 20 years of pushing, prodding, cajoling and begging the Western powers to take notice of them, the nonaligned countries representing most of the Third World have finally announced that they have had it.

Under the leadership of Cuba, host of the sixth nonaligned summit ending today, the movement's 94 members have produced their harshest condemnation of the West since the organization was founded—as a coalition of states fighting for independence in the cold war in 1961.

For some delegations, the new posi-

tion implies a tilt toward the Soviet Union. Others caution that, rather than an east-west competition for influence, they see as a north-south battle in which their principal enemy is the United States — by virtue of its dominant world position and its failure, despite repeated warnings, to accommodate Third World needs.

Neither the condemnation of the United States nor the implied shift to the East has pleased all the countries represented here. Yugoslavia, Singapore, Malaysia, Senegal and a dozen more have been dragged along kicking and screaming.

Others, including the Arab majority, have given their silent approval to

the pro-Soviets by virtue of their desire to be as strongly anti-West as possible.

Still others, such as President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania and a few other African states, have placed themselves above the fray and warned that disunity could lead to disaster.

But for the United States, which had expressed concern and lobbied hard from outside the movement for moderation, the summit is seen as a disaster.

The conference produced strident calls for U.S. troop withdrawal from South Korea, denunciation of Washington's Middle East diplomacy, inde-

See NONALIGNED, A20, Col. 1

pendence for Puerto Rico, evacuation of the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba and others around the world, and the legitimization of armed rebellion in southern Africa.

Perhaps even more significantly for the future, the delegates declared the key to solving the energy problem, which has destroyed some of their fragile economies while ballooning others, is within the movement itself.

While the oil producers swallowed hard at Third World consumers' calls for price concessions, raw material barter agreements and the investment of petrodollars in development projects rather than American banks, the producers listened.

Whether the movement's new political militancy will be demonstrated in deeds remains to be seen. The first test will come almost immediately when the U.N. General Assembly meets later this month. The moderates continue to maintain that the meeting's chairman, Cuban President Fidel Castro, has gone too far, that a rising tide of resentment is growing within the silent majority and will eventually make itself felt.

Regardless of Cuba's claims of independence from the Soviets, they say, coincidence with Soviet policy will push off members of the movement to return to the original middle course between the superpowers.

But for now, what has emerged from this six-day meeting is a policy against the United States on every world issue—and a leader in Castro.

By skilful use of the chairmanship, by audacity and personal charisma, Castro directed an organization of states that are well aware of their traditional ineffectiveness. Guyana's Prime Minister Forbes Burnham last week called it the fight between "the

big boys and the little boys."

Castro addressed the issue of Soviet dominance over Cuba in his speech inaugurating the summit. "Throughout our revolutionary life, no one has ever tried to tell us what to do," he maintained. "No one has ever tried to tell us what role we should play in the movement of nonaligned countries."

While the question of Soviet influence greatly concerned the more vocal moderate delegations, particularly those in Southeast Asia who fear Soviet dominance through Vietnam, a silent majority of nations tended to follow the leader who offered them action.

"For the little countries that basically lean toward the West and have most of their ties there, but are looking out for themselves," one observer noted, "a hard-line movement policy puts them in a better future negotiating position with the United States."

The silent majority sees in Castro, a Cuban delegate maintained, someone who can both stand up to the United States for them, and talk to the Soviets for them.

Those who outspokenly disagreed with Castro's characterization of the battle as first and foremost against the United States were left behind in a tidal wave of stirring rhetoric that promised to have some teeth behind it.

Unfortunately for the United States, its friends in the movement tend to be those who put their faith in protocols and politeness rather than in audacity.

Thus, when Yugoslavia objected to the way Castro handled the meeting, Cuban officials knowingly pointed out in private that it was "well known" that Yugoslav policy usually coincided with U.S. policy.

When Singapore objected to Cuba's

muscling out the Cambodian delegation representing the Pol Pot regime in favor of the government installed last winter by Vietnam, Castro called the Singapore delegation "imperialist stooges."

Aside from their essential grayness, as opposed to the flashiness of the militants, the moderates now admit they chose the wrong issues to fight over.

Their battle on the Cambodian issue was essentially a point of order, and they exhausted enormous energy only to end up looking as though they were defending what all agreed was the indefensible Pol Pot government.

"The Yugoslavs," one Western diplomat observed, "have been defending the Maginot line," by talking about "founding principles" and "rules" while the Cubans were calling for action against problems that threaten many members' existence at home.

Thus, while Yugoslavia won some toned-down wording in the Cuban-written summit declaration that provided the basis for discussions here, the substance of the document remains largely intact.

"The larger question is what it all means beyond the summit," the diplomat said, "when everybody goes home and takes a cold shower. Most immediately, the resolutions passed here are usually nonaligned gospel at the United Nations.

"But the effects of this meeting could be even larger on the overall North-South dialogue. Clearly, the effects are likely to be poor" for the West.

On an economic level, the nonaligned countries feel little progress has been made since the 1976 U.N. special session when they first joined in protest.

"Nothing has happened," the diplomat said, except that trade barriers have risen against their exports. The Tokyo trade negotiations just ended have been a disappointment and the price of energy is killing them.

Despite the harsh arguments over the wording of political resolutions, there was virtually no disagreement over Cuba's tough economic denunciation of the West.

For the first time, what Western trade officials call "the OPECs and the non-OPECs" talked about how to join forces against the West for their mutual advantage—a subject that used to be avoided as a threat to the tenuous unity of the organization.