CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION AND THE FINDINGS

We started the first chapter with the definition of the term, "Third World", its meaning and significance. In the General Assembly debates it was first used by Mali on 12.10.60 to denote the undeveloped, underdeveloped and developing countries of the Free World. Originally it meant non-aligned less developed countries. The First World countries are the industrial countries of the of the North and Second World is the world of Communism. In the wake of the last Arab-Israeli round the Third World was further divided into the Fourth and the Fifth. Countries with little resources and small infrastructures depending on imported technology and foreign aid came to be branded as belonging to the Fourth World while the Fifth World countries are the planet's basket cases seemed to thrive on permanent dole. The Fourth and the Fifth World can not borrow on commercial terms - mostly the non-oil possessing poor countries.

On the other hand, according to Red China's analysis, the world is divided into three political segments. The first world comprises the Super Powers, the USA and the USSR. The developed countries of Europe and Japan constitute the Second World while China and other developing countries have formed the Third World. In our dissertation we took the traditional division and it covers the so-called Fourth and the Fifth Worlds. Thus the Third World comprises underdeveloped, economically backward with high incidence of illiteracy, non-communist, anti-colonial, aid and investment seeker emergent states of Asia, Africa, and Latin America - the so-called "Free World" states. Like 19th Century Poland - which was said to be a state of mind - these poor nations are united more perhaps by attitude than by geography.
There is a kind of tug of war going on between the North and the South over the finite resources of the spaceship called earth. Industrial countries enjoy the highest standard of living while the underfed denizens of the Third World are reared in poverty, squalor and disease. Each one blames the other for its own undoing. The rich nations are accused of plundering the poor ones by framing a favourable economic structure that tilts on the former's side. As colonial blimps they exploited them and in the decolonization era rigged the international trade in order to keep the poor dependent on them. The New International Economic Order was conceived to change the ground rules of international trade.

The basic problems afflicting the poor nations are that most of them rely on primary products, supplying raw materials to the industries of the Northern Countries. These basic commodities face severe price fluctuations owing to recession in the developed countries and competition with the synthetic products etc. There remains also a big difference between the primary products and manufactured goods. In order to stabilize the prices of raw materials and to strike, a reasonable balance of prices between the manufactured and primary goods, the common Fund and Price indexation are thought to be the panaceas. To bridge the gap of low internal capital formation, 0.7% of g.n.p. transfer has been envisaged. All these claims have been incorporated in the NIEO.

The First World countries point out that the basic ills lie with the LDCs themselves. Food production in the underdeveloped region went up in recent years thanks to the much haunted Green Revolution. But everything there has been eaten up by the population explosion. According to the First World think tanks, unless the stork farmer race is checked, no amount of industrial or agricultural production can feed the 2,00,000 new mouths everyday. While the advanced countries are drawing gradually close to the Zero Population Growth,
the poor ones do not face the demographic monster with a political will. The electorate in the First World have also grown weary of the penury of the forgotten world and do not want to see their money spent on the development of the LDCs.

Thus there seems to be a communication gap between the two - to the rich, much of the Third World misery is its own creation while to the poor it is the duty to pay for the sins once committed by the colonial explorers and perpetuated by the ill-contrived international trade pattern. Since the gap between the poor and the rich is widening steadily some western politicians called the poverty of the Third World as a time bomb for the human race. The bitter animosity inside the General Assembly was ridiculed by the outspoken Daniel P. Moynihan as "politics of resentment and economics of envy."

Having discussed the recent allegations and counter allegations we tried to conclude that confrontation does not pay. Only a dialogue can help remove the economic imbalances and lay the foundation of peace.

After noting the problem in several aspects, we have pointed out that 'Third World' is used in the thesis in a comprehensive sense covering both the Fourth World and the Fifth World. This Third World through Interest aggregation and Interest Articulation can generate demand inputs for future positive peace and these demand inputs, if converted into outputs through the UN System, may prepare the ground for stable peace and one world of peace, prosperity, and understanding.

Chapter two deals with Uniting for Peace Plan, Domestic Jurisdiction Clause, Asian representation in UN bodies, Recognition by the UN of the representation of a Member State, Red China's membership and non-self Governing Territories. Aggregative interests of the Third World found meaningful articulation so long as they did not collide with the vital interests of the Big Powers, we concluded so by analysing those topics.
Uniting for Peace:

Uniting for Peace resolution might not be the whole book but a promising first chapter. The Third World was taken for a ride by the US. In their efforts to raise the G.A. at par with the S.C., they all backed it. They were also sore at the S.C.'s performance. Hamstrung as it was by Big Power rivalry, the S.C. was not in a position to deliver the goods. Centre of gravity shifted from the elite Council to the Assembly of commons. Without the solid support of the Third World nations, the plan would never have seen the light of the day. Here there was aggregation of Third World States' interest with which was mingled the interest of one Big Power; the USA. With the uniting for Peace Resolution the centre of gravity was shifted from the SC to the GA - there was something like a partially changed Paradigm of the UN and in the change the Third World had a contribution.

Domestic Jurisdiction:

Incorporation of Art.2(7) meant an acceptance of the principle of non-intervention. The Third World nations tried to use domestic jurisdiction clause as a shield against arbitrary or unjust intervention. But domestic jurisdiction was not all that sacrosanct. Human rights transcend domestic jurisdiction. The Charter, being basically a multilateral treaty, upholds all fundamental human rights. When India pointed an accusing finger at S. Africa for its policy of apartheid against people of Indian origin, S. Africa sought refuge in Art. 2 (7). Colombia held the brief for the delinquent International pariah by saying that the racial conflict was essentially a national problem. Although it was more or less accepted that the domestic jurisdiction clause should be put in the cold storage where human rights are involved, a balance of harmony between the two has not yet been struck. Here Third World could not achieve much.
Asian Representation:

One of the seven deadly sins of the Charter framers was the under representation of Asia and Africa. With the gradual decolonization of Asia and Africa, the Charter looked like an anachronism, a kind of hangover of the colonial past. It did not fit in the new set up. The Third World with its innate clairvoyance tried to obliterate the colonial scar. Its absurdities were pointed out and because of relentless insistence of the Third World the Charter was amended in 1955 to make room for the new aspirants. More people from Asia and Africa were inducted into the World body. Here the interest aggregation of the Third World States became effective as the Big Powers did not and could not stand in the way.

Recognition of a member State:

Cuba sparked off lengthy controversial debates in the 10th meeting of the Ad Hoc Political committee in 1950s by laying down a string of conditions which made a state eligible for recognition. They were (i) Govt's effective authority over national territory; (ii) general consent of the people; (iii) Govt's ability and willingness to abide by the UN's code of conduct; (iv) respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms. In the debates that followed Uruguay observed that with the help from abroad, a govt. could effectively wield its authority but it should not be accepted by the UN as it defiled the doctrine of self-determination. India opined that the Govt. of a state seeking admission to the UN should be sufficiently stable, should exercise effective control over the territory and be obeyed by the majority of the population. To India stability appealed more than
anything else which was denounced by Costa Rica. Because of foreign support, people might be unable to revolt as they were in Manchuko. The Govt, of that country exercised effective authority only by violating the provisions of the League Covenant. Thus according to Costa Rica, physical control of the territory alone without any principles of justice and of legitimacy of the Govt. and of the effective participation of the people in the administration of their territory was not enough. The debates centred round these points and did not end with any consensus. The only principle usually followed by member states in extending admission to the UN in those days was the principle of expediency and convenience. In the 1970s of course when the cold war tension eased, recognition became a matter of routine.

Red China's admission:

As for Red China's membership battle lines were drawn between Nepal, Ceylon, Burma, Sudan and India on the pro-admission side and Iraq, El-Salvador, Philippines, Colombia, Guatemala, Thailand, Laos, Costa Rica, Rwanda, Gabon, Central African Republic, Cameroon on the other side opposing it. The former held that People's Republic was a reality. To deny it would be ostrich like ignorance, while the latter insisted China mend its ways and habits.

N.S.G.T.:

In the debates on NSGT The Third World nations held unanimously that it was the UN in general and the General Assembly in particular that should judge whether an administered country became eligible to govern itself, that the Administering countries should supply all information to the General Assembly as per Art. 77 of the Charter, that the metropolitan power should not impose their alien culture and education to the innocent native population. The Third World prescription was the result of the individual experience under the colonial rule. But their mere interest aggregation and articulation
was not enough. When Namibia was ready for independence, the Administering Power, S. Africa, balked. It successfully flouted economic sanctions and condemnation of the General Assembly. At the same time third World rhetoric and interest aggregation ushered in Decolonization. That was a very significant achievement in the field of international law and relations for which the contribution of the Third World and its interest-aggregation will always be remembered.

In Chapter three we discussed and analyzed the attitude of the Third World nations toward intervention. We picked up cases of intervention in Greece, Korea, Hungary, Jordan, and Lebanon in the first half of the chapter. Basically their concern centered round the withdrawal of foreign troops as the presence of them constituted a threat to peace and sovereignty of the hapless state.

**Greek Question:**

Egypt demanded withdrawal of foreign troops in order to safeguard the independence of the Balkan states. To Costa Rica existence of civil conflict did not justify the intervention of the three governments - Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Paraguay while condemning foreign intervention conceded that the Greek Govt. was entitled to have powerful allies. Cuba saw in the Greek Question a growing antagonism between the US and the USSR. It urged that the decision of the GA members on this score should be based on their conscience and not by voting in blocs. While agreeing on the formation of a commission to probe into the Greek imbroglio, Colombia demanded that none of the permanent members of the S.C. should be included in the proposed commission because they never were unanimous in their decision. From the debates we inferred that the small nations were against any kind of foreign interference in the domestic affairs of a state and were aware of the Big Power rivalry. They also censured neighbouring help that was extended by Albania,
Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. If there were to be any intervention to restore peace and order, let the UN do it. There was a kind of born distrust against the Big Powers who incidentally had behind them an unclean slate. The Third World supports UN intervention only. If past is prologue the law should develop along that line.

Korean Issue:

Most of the third World nations felt that an aggression had taken place in South Korea and that sentiment legitimized the UN action through the historic Uniting for Peace resolution. Even in the generalized consent there was skepticism as to the solution of the problem militarily. India laid stress on cosmetic concessions like free general election with adult suffrage and secret ballot and the formation of a national govt. It also demanded a definite time limit for the withdrawl of occupation of troops. Some Latin American countries became vituperative on the statement of Nehru in connexion with a political conference on Korea in which there was no Asian participation. India in those days believed that the siding of the Chinese troops in Korea was due not to its aggressive design but to the fears of the Peoples Republic that its political integrity might be affected. But some other third World countries did not toe the Indian line and they resolutely objected to Red China's admission to the UN because of its aggressive adventurism first surfaced in Korea and then in the rape of Tibet and finally in the Sino-Indian border skirmishes in 1962. In short, the Third World because of its numerical inferiority and non-cohesive nature did not have any effective say. The US had a field day.

Intervention in Hungary:

Although we reproduced the views of Iraq, Columbia, Peru, Venezuela, Argentina, Nepal, Bolivia, India, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, Lebanon, Guataemala and Cuba - all told fourteen
states - the entire Third World condemned the Soviet Union for its brash and unabashed crackdown in Hungary. In spite of the aggregative stand of the Third World the Soviet Union did not blink and Moscow's East European client, got a good thrashing for its delinquency. The Third World was not effective vis-a-vis direct Super Power interests. They paid scant regard to the Third World counsel.

Intervention in Jordan and Lebanon:

Intervention in these two Middle Eastern countries was supported by monarchical Iran and Ethiopia and aligned Turkey and Pakistan. They believed in the inherent right of any independent sovereign country to request and receive assistance of its allies and friends for its self-defence. They were the status-quo forces determined to fight Arab radicalism championed in those days by President Nasser. To India intervention beyond the pale of Chapter VII of the charter was incongruous and counterproductive. To Yemen presence of foreign troops impaired the sovereignty of those two states and posed a real threat to the peace of the area. Ghana did not question the legitimacy of intervention but construed it as an attempt at the preservation of a Govt. having not the support of the majority of its people. Interesting to note the stance of Cuba which in those days was not "Exporting revolution". It sided with the status-quo forces. Cuba also supported France in Algerian Question. The British and the American forces were withdrawn quickly. Whether the withdrawal was the result of Third World's verbal bombardment was another point. But on this issue the Third World chorus was discordant. In the second half of the chapter we discussed Suez, Algeria, West Irian, Palestinian partition and the Congo crisis.

Suez, Algeria and West Irian:

Everybody disapproved of the Suez intervention including the Big Powers. Egypt lost the war but gained a martyr in President Nasser. Because of pressure from every side the
Anglo French Israeli joint venture did not pay dividends, Similarly, the Metropolitan Powers, France in Algeria, Holland in West Irian were left in the lurch. Short of sending troops, the Third World nations fought like eunuchs in a seraglio. The Third World as a cohesive body lent its support against those incorrigible colonialists who tried desperately to hold back their erstwhile possessions.

**Partition of Palestine :-**

The Third World was divided on Palestinian partition. Some Latin American countries like Brazil, Peru, Guatemala and Uruguay spoke for partition presumably because of the guilt complex shared by every Caucasian white man - a reparation owed to Semitic people. Also because they did not have those disruptive forces of race, language and religion - the forces that usually call for the birth of a new nation. Barring a few Latin American countries, the entire Third World opposed the sinister plan of partition. Here too its aggregative stand had to bow down to super Power machinations. To find a berth for the Jewish state by partitioning Palestine was legally wrong and politically unwise - that was the sentiment held by most of the Third World countries. Braving the Third World hostility the new state of Israel was foisted on Arab land and it sowed the seeds of perennial fratricidal friction. In the chapter we reproduced the volte face of Chile, Haiti and Philippines from pro to abstention when the issue was voted in the General Assembly. The same partition could not have been sold to a General Assembly in the 1970s.

**Congo Crisis :-**

The bloody birth of a nation in 1960 posed a great problem to the UN which tried to hold the ring against intervention by rival Super Powers by resorting to what was known as 'preventive diplomacy'. Congo crisis had many facets. The independence
of the nation was threatened by the secession of Katanga - the financial hub of the new nation. Ghana pointed out that at the time of independence the new nation inherited a public debt of roughly £350 million sterling against assets worth £240 million sterling. Most of the assets - the copper mines - were located in Katanga and they accounted for 60 percent of the national revenue. By the time of independence, all control over the Congo Central Bank had passed to the Belgian National Bank. In the months before independence, the Belgian Govt. allowed an unprecedented flight of capital from the Congo to take place. To bail out the national Govt. from the deepening financial crisis, the Belgian National Bank, according to Ghana, put forward two strings - first the Central Congo Bank's total Gold and currency reserves were to be ferried to Belgium. Secondly, the monetary policy of the Central Bank was to be okayed by the Belgian National Bank. That was a kind of financial strangulation in which the Govt. of Patrice Lumumba was gasping. In this concealed colonialism the gap between revenue and the expenditure was widened by the rebellion of Force publique - the notorious king Leopold's soldiers, some of whom comprised the private armies of Tshombe, Mobutu, and Kalonji. Mobutu's engineered rebellion succeeded largely because the Lumumba regime could not pay the soldiers or meet other expenditure. The situation grew worse with the shipment of outside arms from Brussels to Katanga. Belgium being a NATO member quickly sought the help from other constituents of the Atlantic Pact - notably the US, France, and Britain - the same countries who at the 1885 Berlin Congress presided over the division and spoliation of Africa among themselves. Congo as a part of king Leopold's System had a large number of civilian authorities, mostly Belgians, who encouraged separatist movement in Katanga while the Belgian Govt. tried to foist a kind of federation by partitioning the country into small units.
As a matter of fact, all eyes were set on Katanga - the mineral rich province of the new nation in which the erstwhile colonialists had invested heavily.

The UN forces landed in the Congo at the request of the legitimate govt. of Patrice Lumumba. Ghana's bitterest criticism came when the same forces, supposed to be neutral, prevented Lumumba from using the Leopoldville radio station. Oddly enough, he was forcibly prevented by none other than the Ghanian troops under UN command. The action of the UN was a most improper interference in the internal affairs of the Congo and an abuse of the powers granted to the UN forces by the Security Council. The same Ghanian troops were forbidden to intervene in the arrest of Lumumba by the goons of Force publique. The UN forces did not act, noted Ghana, to seize the military aircraft delivered to Tshombe by a US Globemaster. The supply of arms to one side was bound up with the failure of the UN to exercise control over the financial dealings of Katanga and Belgium. In order to plug the loopholes Ghana demanded that the UN command in the Congo must maintain law and order by enforcing the constitution and the Congolese laws. The UN civil and military command should be reorganized for a solution that comes from the African states with military support from the uncommitted nations of Asia and elsewhere. All initiative and aid from powers outside Africa, particularly from the aligned ones should cease in order that the crisis should not escalate into a Spanish Civil War type imbroglio. With the stabilization of the crisis, the Congolese Parliament should meet under UN protection in accordance with the constitution.

Cuba indicted the UN for allowing the so-called "Third man", Mobutu, to emerge. To support its contention it reproduced press reports from the Time magazine - a defender of monopolies. After a conference in September 1960, Mobutu used the same radio station which had eluded Lumumba. The UAR regretted
that even in the presence of UN forces, the legitimate national govt. of the Congo could not function. Mali too noted with regrets that the blue helmets who were supposed to protect and defend the Prime Minister simply handed him over to Mobutu — the UN’s poisoned gift to Lumumba. Morocco castigated the UN for its weakness for Tshombe. It was paradoxical to see an international organization making contact with the governor of a province. What neo colonialism disliked most was Lumumba’s pure, unpurged nationalism. The bitterest criticism of UN came mostly from the African contingent of the Third World. Countries like Nepal, Pakistan, and India commended the mediatory role of the UN. Saudi Arabia even demanded UN Africanise the Congo. But instead of UN being omnipresent, Belgium became omnipresent and the UN was "omni-absent" from the Katanga province. Interesting to note in this connexion was the fact that while Ghana and others accused Belgium of splitting the Congo into small parts for its own sinister motives Niger found in the birth of little provinces a new Congolese structure on which imposition of solutions would create new difficulties. Having scanned the economic and military background we concluded by saying that without UN intervention Congo would have slipped into the morass of international power politics. The Third World, though criticized its performance, welcomed UN intervention.

In Chapter 4, after dredging the GA debates in the years 1952 to 1965 we found that the economic picture of the world did not change materially. The Third World was as poor as it is now while the affluence of the First skyrocketed. The gap between the rich and the poor widened. The Third World, dependent basically on primary goods, clamoured for price indexation or pegging in order to neutralize the imported inflation. The international trade structure was built in the favour of the industrial nations. Not only there was no parity of prices of raw materials and the finished goods, many First World Countries put up tariff barriers against imports from the Third World countries. The GATT
stood helpless. In addition, the Third World had to face stiff competition from the synthetic substitutes of their raw materials. All those factors accounted for their gradual slide on the economic scale.

Twenty two countries were scoured. Others also held similar sentiments. Their common stance was to rationalize the trade pattern so that the poor nations could live on justice and not on charity. Because of low capital formation at home, aid was needed to keep the economy buoyant. But aid should be without strings. In order to stabilize prices of raw materials, the Third World demanded, through UNCTAD, the Common Fund in which seventeen primary products were listed. They rich nations found in the Common Fund (a $ 3 billion kitty) - a ploy to use the resources pooled by the First World at their exclusion from the Fund Committee - a fund of the poor, for the poor with the capital contributed by the First World. Similarly, a flat debt rescheduling programme was opposed by the First World. It favoured a case by case plan instead.

Transfer of .7% g.n.p. from the rich to the poor was not responded adequately specially by the US, West Germany and Japan although the smaller Scandinavian countries lived up to the quota.

In order to correct the economic imbalances and also to change the ground rules the NIEO (New International Economic Order) was conceived. Surprisingly it was conceived by a body where there are three distinct pressure groups - Group A, that is, the so-called Group of 77 (whose membership is roughly 100 or so); Group B represents developed Western countries and Group D means the Communist Block. In the Group of 77, there is a further division between the less and the least developed countries—meaning thereby twenty five especially poor countries, the so-called basket cases of Henry Kissinger. They are Afghanistan, Botswana, Bhutan, Burundi, Chad, Dahomcy, Ethiopia, Guinea, Haiti, Laos, Lesotho, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Nepal,
Niger, Rwanda, Sikkim, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, Tanzania, Upper Volta, Western Samoa and Yemen. A demand for special consideration for the least developed was opposed on the ground that this would reduce the bargaining power of the Group as a whole.

In 1962, ECOSOC, at the instigation of the LDCs decided to hold a UN conference on Trade and Development in Geneva in 1964. The DCs were against the holding of such a conference at all. Once held, they sought to avoid the establishment of a permanent organization. The DCs also sought to ensure that the new body so set up should be directly under the supervision of ECOSOC while the LDCs wanted it to stay under the control of the GA where their voting power was stronger. The DCs wanted all decisions to be by two thirds majority, with a separate majority of the twelve major trading nations (all industrial countries). But the LDCs preferred simple majorities. Ultimately a compromise was struck - voting substantive decisions by two thirds majority in the conference and a simple majority elsewhere; in case of deadlock a conciliation mechanism would operate before any final decision came into effect...

Designed to develop fairer trade, UNCTAD considered shipping, insurance, commodities, excise taxes, quotas and other matters of special concern to poor countries. In 1970, after protracted negotiations, there was provisional agreement on a generalized system of preference (GSP). Even then the existing preference areas were not absorbed. The EEC, for instance, gives special benefits to some African, Caribbean and Pacific countries but not to others...
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In a world where the rich countries, with less than a third of population, have 81 per cent of world exports, the poor ones with more than two thirds of the population, have only 19 per cent. Moreover, the volume of trade by LDCs continued to decline from 22 per cent in 1960 to 17 per cent in 1975. 

There were attempts to establish maximum and minimum prices and limit production for rubber, tin, tea, copper, nitrates, diamonds, sugar and wheat. But most of them broke down for one reason or another, usually because some producers refused to join or sought to exceed their production quota. Although a number of new commodity schemes were introduced - The International Tin Agreement, 1956, The International Sugar Agreement, 1953 which broke down in 1962 but finally revived in 1968, The International Coffee Agreement, 1962 - the obvious difficulties over any commodity agreements are (i) the absence of agreement among producers about the volume and allocation of production and the price level to aim at and (ii) the reasonable price is not secured between the producers and consumers and (iii) innumerable difficulties as a result of changes in price levels, the size of harvests, the competition of other products or new substitutes...

The UNCTAD Committee on commodities concluded that there was urgent need for new agreements for copper, cotton, iron-ore, rubber, rice and other products. The IMF in June 1969 introduced a facility to help finance buffer stocks in addition to its long term "supplementary financing" scheme to stabilize earnings from declining or unstable commodities. Under "compensatory finance", special assistance is given to meet short-term balance of payments difficulties, arising from falls in primary product prices. These are all extensions of the GATT which did not tackle the trade barriers, agricultural protection and quota restrictions on simple manufactures. As a matter of fact, there are some products, like textiles, which are of greatest interest to LDCs, whereas there has been least liberalization. Since the bargaining power of the poor is limited, trade among rich countries grow faster than that of
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the poor. UNCTAD has four main committees - one on Commodities, one on Manufactures, one on Invisibles and Trade Financing and one Shipping - to heal the cancerous growth pattern in the international trade. Since development is a long drawn, a self-winding process the Third World has to do the following home-work - stress agricultural development, limit population growth, reform education, encourage entrepreneurs, reject prestige projects and encourage foreign investment - so as to make up for the losses and to catch up with the First World as well.

Third World has then to reorganize its own economic policy if it wants to catch up with the First World in economic matter. Economic bankruptcy of the Third World is a chronic weakness. Poverty, squalor, distress, imbalance, hindered growth - all follow from economic constraints. Third World Interest Aggregation in the economic field can achieve a lot. Being mostly raw materials producers the Third World Countries, if they can achieve some economically balanced growth, can have greater bargaining strength with the First World and can then reorient the world economy to their favour. They must have free sovereignty over their resources: they must not allow unjust exploitation of these resources by the First World: they must improve their terms of trade: they must be economically self-reliant. Their interest aggregation in the economic field has led to the birth of the NIEO. That is an important achievement. The Third World by sticking to the stand that economic development of the underdeveloped countries in the key to World economic stability - can surely force the First World to see reason and to mend its economic policies to the mutual advantage of both First World or Third World.

Interest Aggregation of the Third World in economic matter has achieved much: it is yet to achieve a lot. Economic stability and equality in the world is a positive peace concept. Third World by demanding economic equity and working for economic stability is laying the foundation of a stable positive peace. The UN paradigm of positive Peace through the GA is thus being strengthened by the Third World.
In Chapter Five we tried to reflect the attitude of Third World nations toward Colonialism, neo-colonialism and Zionism on the one hand and non-alignment and peaceful co-existence on the other. Today's Third World is a product or a child of colonialism. Every country threw verbal punches against their colonial masters for the ills bequeathed at the time of independence. Since the Latin American nations are ethnic cousins of the white Europeans, the Latin section of the Third World always exert a moderating influence on the Afro-Asian radicals in drafting any anti-colonial resolution or imposing any economic sanction against the traditionally recalcitrant S. Africa. We presented the views of India, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Ghana, Ethiopia, Mali, Tanganyika and Senegal to show how deep was the colonial wound while the Brazilian stand on economic sanctions against S. Africa smacked of moderation. As a corollary to gradual decolonization, the Third World was anxious about the majority rule in S. Africa where till today a kind of obnoxious racism known as apartheid is practiced. Because of total interest aggregation among the Third World nations, the GA Resolution 1514(XV) Declaration on the Granting of Independence to colonial countries and people was passed by eighty nine votes in favour, with none against and nine abstentions. Of those abstaining, the U.S. the UK and France earned the unflattering S. Arabian sobriquet, "the three Musketeers" of the free world. According to Iraq, west was caught on the wrong side of a social and political revolution called decolonization. After the Second World War it was the greatest single event that took place almost peacefully and helped proliferation of UN membership.

Although colonialism withered gradually, neo colonialism posed the greatest threat to the toddling nations. By neo-colonialism we meant any manifestation of a return to power by the former colonial masters. The departing colonial powers left few institutions upon which the new leaders could build viable nations. It is no accident that the Congo collapsed literally
days after the Belgians packed and left. Portugal pulled out of Angola with little by way of an administrative structure to show for its nearly five centuries of colonial rule. It was as if the colonial powers were arranging things to ensure their return once things had fallen apart. This is more so in the case of Africa where the enduring problem is that of a continent unable to govern its own affairs. For that the former colonial powers have long maintained a web of cultural, economic and occasionally military relationships with their former colonies as well as several other African states. As a matter of fact greatest external influence on the Third World events continued to come from Western Europe, especially from former colonial powers. The dominance of Europe - in the economies of Third World nations, the prominence of European advisors or experts, the continued strong trade links, supply of cheap and abundant raw materials for the European factories, the European life styles of the ruling elites of most of the Third World countries - all are taken as evidence of a new form of European colonial influence in the Third World. The deeprooted cultural commitment by the new elite to European values can be construed as a failure of many Third World nations to develop along truly independent lines. There is little that the colonial powers can do about the past; they should have prepared their subjects adequately for independence which they did not. The main question now is to find out areas of co-operation between their erstwhile masters and the new decolonized nations of the Third World in which their long-term interests coincide. Economic destinies of Europe and its former colonies are inextricably linked. Europe lacks adequate natural resources to survive, the former colonies are the obvious source. But the European nations must stay out of basically Third World issues and do whatever possible to help in the economic development of the LDCs. As for the majority rule in S. Africa we conclude by saying that the obduracy of the settler regime was holding the inevitable and would inevitably sour the relations once the struggle is over.
Zionism:

Although the history of Zionism dates back to 1878 with the founding of Petach Tivka, to Third World it was an extension of colonial design in the 20th Century cleverly orchestrated by the UK and the US. The Jews, the Christians and the Moslems are called "people of the Book". But Zionism is distinctly different from Judaism in its form and content. Zionism is more militant and a lever for US diplomacy in the Middle East. The Arabs are the greatest sufferer of this sinister design. As fellow Moslems, all other Islamic countries back up the Arab stance. The residue countries of the Third World oppose the aggressive Zionist expansionism. Gradually, the once radical sentiments of pushing the Jewish state to the sea has been mellowed down and a kind of adversary partnership is being forged after the Yom Kippur War when the dependence of the US and its allies on Middle East Oil became pronounced. Saudi Arabia as an economic superpower has been acting as a balancer between the Arab extremists and the hard-headed Jewery. In matters of voting against Zionism which also is equated with racism, the Third World stands more or less united in the GA.

Non-alignment and Peaceful Co-existence

Basically non-alignment means political free-wheeling. To a certain extent the unaligned nations were floating free while the aligned ones kept their eyes peeled for the Super Powers in a strait-laced era like the one that followed the Second World War. So long the US sees and seeks as "containment" of Soviet Power, Moscow sees and fears as "encirclement" the Spenglerian apprehension that the lights were about to go out existed. It was a counter to alignment when the cold war rivalry among the Big powers enmeshed the world with military alliances, a handful of weaker nations forged a group and not a bloc in order not to get involved in the proxy wars of the military leviathans. That the regional pacts were not the answer to solve the earthly problems militarily was evident from the cracks and leaks often surfaced even in the hard-boiled North Atlantic alliance (cod war between Iceland and Britain, war between Turkey and Greece over Cyprus.)
The doctrine of peaceful co-existence, the basic tenet of non-alignment, was the driving force of non-alignment. The five principles as enumerated by Indonesia were - i) belief in God ii) humanity iii) nationalism iv) democracy and v) social justice. These were successfully sold at the first non-aligned summit at Bandung. With the overkill proportions of the bulging arsenals, even the superpowers felt the usefulness of cocktail existence. It was no longer an exercise in futility but a battle-tested formula that preempted the SALT blueprint for survival between the superpowers. Most of the Third World countries are unaligned who provided some safety markings on the global minefield, if not defused it.

For years, the catchall international slogan of non-alignment often meant maligning the West and lining up behind Moscow. Many Third World members of the global Non-Aligned Movement seemed to have specialized in denouncing US imperialism and promoting anti colonial national and liberation struggles. At the last Non-aligned summit at Belgrade in August, 1978, there was a split between pro-Moscow "progressives" and Western oriented "conservatives". Moscow-Havana mischief in Africa, said Egypt's Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Boutros Gali, threatened to bring the cold war to the heart of the African continent and transform our movement into a new arena for ideological conflicts..."(1) Non-alignment movement seemed to have assumed a new meaning and purpose in the face of recent Soviet encroachments in Africa and elsewhere along with the Cuban expeditionary forces. A surprising number of Third World states singled them out as the new enemies of non-alignment. But the Quintessence of the doctrine was voiced by a moderate delegate at Belgrade. We criticized the US adventurism in Vietnam in its day - now we criticize Soviet adventurism in Africa. (2)*

1. Time, 14th Aug. '78
* Because of the perceptable tilt of the Non-aligned bandwagon towards the Socialist Camp, a disillusioned Burma parted company of the group. Even then it is a formidable force in world politics.

2. Ibid
We started the Disarmament Chapter 6 with a Churchillian simile that summed up the innate human nature of arming—that is the fear syndrome and mutual distrust. We tried to explain the various related problems of disarmament, the powerful lobby of the death merchants and the unholy alliance of the military establishment with the political elite. Also the problems of unemployment and recession were discussed in the light of disarmament. Salient features of the disarmament problems are that the Super Powers are the greatest arms peddlers.

For most of the industrial countries, arms sales became primarily a welcome means of improving the chronic balance of payments deficits they suffered since the astronomic jump in oil prices. Another major reward for arms sales is the diplomatic leverage on the recipient. At a time of uncomfortably high and persistent unemployment arms exports create badly needed jobs at home. Selling weapons abroad also enables producer countries to regain part of their steep research and development costs and benefits from the economics of large scale output. France's aviation industry, for example, could not afford to design and manufacture new advanced combat aircraft for the French air force unless it could count on sales to foreigners. As a matter of fact, Paris has its eyes on the greatest untapped arms market of all—communist China.

Arms deals are galore. No Arms producing country shows any intention of braking its sales drive. The French stage an extravagant biennial "arms supermarket" at camp Satory, near Versailles while the equally innovative British have converted two ships into floating exhibit halls that cruise from nation to nation, offering military hardware. Paris also maintains an elaborate sales apparatus that has been organized into several separate agencies, in order to avoid political problems in providing weapons to both sides of a conflict. Thus one French agency can sell arms to S. Africa and Israel, while another can show the latest military gadgery to black Africans.
and Arabs. In short the Big Four producers account for about 90% of World's arms trade.\(^1\)

Cast against this backdrop, Third World's moral disarmament fell on deaf ears. In the chapter we quoted twenty six countries - all of whom spoke in favour of disarmament. While favouring disarmament, many of them supplied the sinews of armament by purchasing those marketed monstrosities from the industrial nations. Third World's interest aggregation was confined to the extent that resources otherwise squandered on lethal weapons should profitably be used to alleviate their poverty. Many of them also supported the US spawned international inspection and control of atomic weapons. Philippines even went to the extent of dreaming a World govt., a supranational authority, with powers to dispose of nuclear weapons. No real progress could be made unless states were prepared to cede a certain portion of their Sovereignty. Unlike the super Powers, small nations had nothing to hide or share. So the idea of control and inspection was readily sold to them. We also referred to the Assembly Resolution 3093 which recommended the use of resources released from Production of arms for development purposes. The Resolution was a signal evidence of Third World interest aggregation and interest articulation.

With the detonation of an atomic device by India, a Third World Nation, the thinking reverted back to non-proliferation. But the energy crisis after the Arab - Israeli round in 1973 pushed many countries to the brink of energy as well as economic bankruptcy. The lust for economic growth made nuclear power an unavoidable necessity. But the trouble is that a nation that has a fast breeder reactor can eventually have a bomb. There was strange interest aggregation between some First World Countries (France and Germany eager to sell nuclear technology) and some Third World nations (Brazil, Argentina, Pakistan equally eager to buy it). Chances of its being misused are always there and some international control seems desirable in order to allay the "atom angst". While at the same time nuclear fission is the

\(^1\) Time February, 1978.
answer to the energy problem. Connected problems of storage of nuclear wastes, pollution etc were also discussed. In short, what is needed to face the hydra-headed monster called, disarmament, is a moral and political will. Third World today has a majority in the GA. Through interest aggregation they can ask for a special meeting of the GA on Disarmament and by majority got a Resolution adopted on Disarmament. That will have a weight and value which the armament producing and armament exporting states cannot ignore.

After disarmament, we discussed Human Rights and Fundamental freedoms in Chapter seven. Human Rights are the 20th Century label of earlier natural rights. The UN charter incorporated Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms for the first time as their inclusion in the League Covenant was restricted to the workers only. The Commission on Human Rights was constituted in 1946 to draft an Intl. Bill of Rights which would have three parts - a declaration, a covenant and measures of implementation. A declaration on Human Rights with thirty articles was adopted in December 1948.

Since by that time there emerged a clear division of traditional rights like freedom from arbitrary arrest, the right to a fair trial, habeus Corpus, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly on the one hand and those of cultural, economic and social rights like right to work, to health, to social security, to adequate standard of living on the other - the debates in the GA in the 1950s veered round whether one covenant or two would be adopted.

Most of the Third World states that participated in the debates favoured one covenant. Thus Mexico, Chile, Philippines, Pakistan, S. Arabia, Iran, Afghanistan favoured one covenant while India fell in line with most of the First World countries who wanted dual covenants. The countries that laid more stress on methods of implementation than the adoption of single or dual covenants were Cuba and Venezuela while Ethiopia saw
interdependence between the two types of freedoms. Finally
the idea of one covenant was rejected by the narrow majority
of four and the two covenants were adopted by the GA in 1966.
Disunity in the Third World was the cause for such a debacle.
But the Third World threw its weight on the inclusion of the
colonial clause in the Covenant.

With regard to the provisions of implementation, the Third
World countries professed to set up an international agency
to look after the violation, if any, of human rights in the
countries administered by metropolitan powers. Some of them
even argued for the right to petition. Syria spoke of the
right to Self-determination. The Third World also welcomed
the resolution on genocide. But then in the 1960s, Burma,
Indonesia, Mauritania, Iraq, Guine, Congo, Guatemala pointed
to the acts of genocide perpetrated by Portugal with the tacit
approval of some of the First world countries in Angola.

Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms are lofty ideals but their
observance is a tricky affair. Generalized murder for reasons
of state is perpetrated by leaders, who like actors in a Kabuki
drama, wear masks of ideology and expediency to suit the moment.
Violation of Human Rights is everybody's monopoly. As a matter
of fact there are very few countries in the world where Human
Rights seem to be alive and well. The basic trouble is that
sovereign states can not allow themselves to be pushed around.
We quoted a state Dept. statistics to show that only a handful
of countries were above board. As a matter of fact according
to Amnesty International, the Nobel Prize winning Organization
that takes periodical stock of Human Right violation throughout
the world, there are more per capita political prisoners
gaoled in Third World jails who are denied a fair trial. To
quote Alexander Solznystyn in another flourish, the Third
World is, so to say, no better than the Gulag archipelago.

Had there been perfect and complete interest aggregation and
interest articulation, among the Third World States on the issues,
the achievements would have been more spectacular and far-
reaching. In fact Third World today is having significant
say in many matters and through GA resolutions is making its impact felt in the process of policy formulation and decision making. The UN Paradigm is thus in a slow process of change on account of Third World Interest aggregation in the GA.

That the Third World needs the UN more than anyone else was discussed in the penultimate chapter of the dissertation. It needs UN protection in moments of crisis as well as in matters of economic development. In the beginning, when the entity of the small nations was being forged, the US coaxed them, cajoled them in order to match the Soviet tactics in the UN. Gradually, the US alienated itself primarily because of its unflinching support for the incorrigible colonial allies with whom it had ethnic, economic, military and cultural ties. It also abstained from voting in the historic Decolonization resolution.

Washington also championed the cause of Zionism and apartheid much to the chagrin of the Third World. It is the avantgarde of the Colonial spirit that is the most unsettling to the Third World nations. There they see an ugly triumph of a miscreant system. The underfed denizens of the Third World have become more alert to the possible mischief of institutional America. The Group of 77, the ever watchful godfather of the poor countries, never missed a shuffle of the diplomatic poker game to fling digs at the US. Their idea of the adrenal new world runs counter to the terms of the US and its cohorts. Ensconced in a highly bastardized form of an economic as well as political nihilism, the Third World has become virtually a wasteland of agitprop. From a political necromancer to a pariah the slide is indeed massive for the US and we tried to account for those factors that settled the country into an apathetic limbo for sometime. A maddening amalgam of imperiousness, hot-headedness, condescension, a kind of "caste mentality" wiped out the initial popularity of the US.
Then we passed over to the different voting blocs inside the GA and their mode of voting. Principally there are four main groups - the Soviet Bloc, the Afro-Asians, the Latin Americans and finally West European and others. Their behavioral pattern on different issues was discussed. With twenty Latin American votes, this bloc far outweighs any other regional group on substantive issues. Because the Latin American countries were not grilled in the colonial process in the way the Afro-Asians were, they wield a moderating influence on their hard-core brethren in other two continents. Their anti US stand stems from their geographical proximity to the Colossus of the North as well as the occupation of the Panama Canal by the US. Economically, they groan under the US conglomerates. As a kind of political godfather the Soviet Union milked the situation. Russia operates in the world with an ideology with grim and slogging coherence. It whipped up the anti-colonial fever of the emergent states and played them off in the G.A. with the result the US started complaining against the "tyranny of the majority".

There was a vast change in the geo-political equation in the 1970s. While the Soviets started adventuring in many of the poor countries, the US too softened its attitude towards the Arabs. The unequivocal yankee support for Israel was moderated in the aftermath of the Arab oil embargo in 1973. It traded Arab Oil for Israeli defence. No longer could America afford to let its Atalantic allies go down the gutter in the event of another Arab oil embargo. The sinews of West European development are provided by the middle Eastern fossil fuel. One embargo in 1973 bled them white. So the new economic Super Power Saudi Arabia, has emerged on the distant horizon. Gone are the days when American troops were kept in combat readiness once the Sabertooth was flashed in West Asia. As for the Saudis, the broad terms of the job are as familiar to them as the keys on a typewriter-peace in the area is essential so that they could sell plenty of oil and with those petrodollars the tide of communism could be stalled. Since the Saudis bankroll all the
frontline states as well as the moderate Palestinians, their voice carries more weight than anyone else. Saudi Arabia has not only burrowed into the inner circles of fellow Arab states, it has had tremendous financial lever in Washington. If the Arabs decide to withdraw their petro-wealth from the Western and American banks, the economic system of the capitalist world wobble on the verge of a disaster. The declining dollar would receive a severe jolt once the OPEC abandon its price quoting in the green backs.

In an obsequious return gesture, the Carter Administration announced a "package" proposal for the sale of aircraft to Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Israel. Saudi Arabia was allowed to buy 60 of one of the most sophisticated fighters, the fabled F-15. Thus there was a shift of the traditional US policy which only ensured the survival of the fortress state. The US started pursuing a more even handed Middle East Policy that protects Israel's security and supports its moderate Arab neighbours as well. Thus oil became the obvious and overwhelming example of the new power relationships, contrary to the King Faisal's aphorism that "oil and politics do not mix". The US has edge over the USSR in the Arab World. To most of the Moslem countries the Soviets are considered as godless interlopers. With the resurgence of Islamic Fundamentalism in Iran in the aftermath of the 1979 Revolution, room for atheistic communism became more difficult in the entire Arab belt.

Though the oil price hike taught the industrial nations a lesson or two, it siphoned off almost all the resources of non oil rich LDCs. Since many of them needed financial crutches, an emergency pool known as "Witteveen facility" with a $10 billion kitty was created to bail those economically strapped countries. The price spiral widened the gap between the rich and the poor countries more than ever. Process of industrialization has not ushered in the capital intensity of
of manufacturing, it has brought about ecological imbalances. Pollution is the end result of industrial growth. In fact, desertification is the result of prolonged aggression and plunder by imperialism and colonialism. The tide of ecological refugees would swell the rolls of the unemployed and destitute in the growing slums of Third World's towns and cities. They would create a tinderbox for social unrest. In order to remove the abysmal poverty of the poor nations a two-pronged attack, has to be mounted. One is the changing of the ground rules, now embodied in the NIEO and the other a string of prescriptions generally aired at international debates and forums. The usual remedy is suggested for the incongruous future of the Third World states. They are: more stress on agricultural development, limitation of population growth, educational reformation, entrepreneurial encouragement, rejection of prestige projects, invitation to foreign investment. Side by side externally, trade liberalization and improvement in the terms of trade between the DCs and LDCs, in favour of the latter, transfer of technology to the LDCs, removal of tariff barriers are the steps towards economic self-sufficiency. Economic well-being is never achieved through tongue-lashing and mud-slinging. It remains to be seen how long the industrial nations which long for economic growth and prosperity will be able to stand all the growth and prosperity they are likely to get during the last quarter of this industrial century. In a world which is getting interdependent everyday, poverty and affluence beyond a discreet degree can not get along well.

Third World is now conscious. Interest aggregation in the Third World is now a positive force. There has been a qualitative and quantitative change in Third World Stand on many issues - economic, non-economic and politico-economic matters. Their slumbering years of mute suffering are over.
They must have their due share in the wealth of the globe. If Third World can achieve interest aggregation, the future must be for the Third World. The UN Paradigm has not changed as yet on account of the resurgence of the Third World in the GA and the UN - but old rigidity of the UN Paradigm with supremacy of the SC in all the matters of vital importance has to some extent been modified. Third World through interest aggregation, wherever possible, has initiated a slow process of change in the Paradigm which may earn momentum in the years that lie ahead.