'The Third World' is a much used term these days. It has no precise universally accepted definition as yet. It has become a convenient omnibus term that embraces a third element in the world power structure. The term was first coined and used to indicate some politically non-aligned countries. Since then the term has acquired new dimensions. Political, Economic, Geographical and other allied criteria have come in to create further confusion. Nevertheless the term today is understood ordinarily to mean politically non-aligned and economically undeveloped, underdeveloped or developing countries. Let us make an analysis in detail of the concept to ascertain what meaning we would attach to the term for our purpose.

The Third World, so-called, is a place of vast variety. Originally, and rather vaguely, it meant the countries that were not Communist or clearly anti-Communist, which were neutralist in foreign policy, with a general implication that they were also underdeveloped economically and usually not of the white race. Some countries like India and Indonesia clearly belonged to it and others like Norway and Australia are undoubtedly out. Poverty, hunger and illiteracy have become the sine qua non for the Third World countries.

Girdling the world at its equatorial bulge is a belt of hunger. (1) Above it live 1.4 billion inhabitants of northern developed nations whose advanced industry and agriculture permit them the luxury of worrying about reducing diets instead of diet deficiency. Below it are the potentially prosperous lands of the Southern Hemisphere's temperate zone. Along the belt live many of the 2.5 billion citizens of the underdeveloped world, nearly all of them are ill-fed; at least 60% are malnourished, and 20% more are starving... (2)

---

(1) The F.A.O. indicates that areas of greatest dietary deficiency include the "Andean countries, the semi-arid stretches of Africa & the Near East and some densely populated countries of Asia."

(2) Time - May 13, 1974
The conflict between the two worlds - one "rich" one "poor" - is developing and the battlefield is the globe itself. On one side are 2 dozens or so industrialised non-communist states whose 750 million citizens consume most of the world's resources, produce most of its manufactured goods and enjoy history's highest standard of living. Demanding an ever larger share of that wealth are about a little over 100 underdeveloped poor states with 2 billion people - millions of whom exist in the shadow of death by starvation or disease. So far the conflict has been limited to economic pressures and proposals, and speeches in international forums. But the needs of the underprivileged nations are so pressing that some Western politicians described them as "time bomb for the human race."

The have-nots are often described as the South (in contrast to the industrialized North), the LDCs (less developed countries) or the Third World (in comparison with the First World of the industrialized West and the Second World of Communism). The Third World does not in fact include almost all the truly free societies of the world, and it includes only a few that are not. But it is not a monolithic bloc in itself.

In fact, in the process of change and growth, in addition to the term 'The Third World' new terms like 'The Fourth World' and 'The Fifth World' have come into use... The Split in the world took place in the wake of "King Faisal's tax" when oil prices ballooned skyhigh. The energy poor LDCs nosedived and became known as Fourth and Fifth worlds. Let us analyse the meaning of all these terms to get at some precision in the meaning of the term 'The Third World'.

The First World includes the advanced industrial nations of Europe, North America and Asia that accept a more or less capitalist, market-oriented economy. The U.S., Canada, Japan, most of the nations of Western Europe, New Zealand and Australia clearly qualify. South Africa, Portugal, Greece, Spain and Argentina are borderline cases.
The Second World includes the 1.3 billion people of the world’s centrally planned Communist-run nations, the so-called "command" economies with the exception of Yugoslavia, which has a somewhat mixed economy. In UNCTAD, Socialist countries are divided into three groups. The first includes Yugoslavia, Rumania, Cuba, North Korea, Vietnam - countries that belong to Group of 77. The second group consists of China. While not part of 77 it extends unqualified support to integrated programme and the Common Fund. The Third (Group D in U.N. parlance) includes USSR, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Hungary, Mongolia and Poland.

The Third World with 620 million inhabitants, is made up of a large body of still poor states that need time and technology, rather than massive foreign aid, to build modern, developed economies. The nations in this category include the revenue-rich members of OPEC (Organization of Oil Exporting Countries), as well as states whose development may be guaranteed by other key natural resources: Zaire and Zambia (copper), Morocco (phosphates), Malaysia (tin, rubber and timber). Into this group also fall nations like Taiwan, Singapore, South Korea, Mexico and Brazil, which are developed enough to attract foreign investment and borrow on commercial terms. Oil has transformed nations like Iran, Venezuela, Nigeria and Arab sheikdoms into a kind of plutocracy of the poor.

The Fourth World contains the LDCs that have some raw materials, some modern economic infrastructure and some trained technocrats and administrators and thus could eventually achieve self-sustaining economic growth. But unlike Third World countries they need significant financial help and special treatment by the industrial powers to spur exports of their goods and imports of technology. This group, with a population of 930 million, includes Peru, the Dominican Republic, Liberia, Jordan, Egypt, Thailand and Guinea-Bissau.

The Fifth World countries, comprising 175 million inhabitants, are the globe’s true basket cases, perhaps doomed to remain on a permanent dole. They have few, if any, easily exploitable resources to sell abroad, and most are seemingly unable to grow.
enough food to feed themselves. The most notable catastrophe countries are Mali, Chad, Ethiopia, Somalia, Rwanda and Bangladesh. They are the absolute poor, living in an environment of squalor, hunger and hopelessness, "situations so depraved as to be below any rational definition of human decency" to quote World Bank President Robert McNamara.

In Beijing's analysis, the world is divided into three political segments. The first world is made up of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. - "the biggest international exploiters, oppressors, and aggressors and the common enemies of the peoples of the World. The developed countries of Europe and Japan constitute the Second World, which although "controlled and bullied by the Super Powers" is still a major force. China and the developing countries comprise the Third World. The Third World must "win over and unite with the Second World" in the struggle against the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union.

As late as 1960, Mali used the expression Third World to describe underdeveloped countries of the world and reiterated that the stability and chances of peace rested on freeing the 'Third World' from hunger... It was against any assistance in the form of charity which undermined dignity of the respectable. Laos also in the 94th plenary meeting of the General Assembly dated 13.10.60 used to claim to belong to the Third World, whose millions of inhabitants were living at a subsistence level and were in danger of being swamped by despair. It also urged the more fortunate people of the developed countries to pay more attention to the less favoured.

Too often LDCs are lumped together in order to satisfy this or that economic development. But each less developed State has its own personality and its own peculiar problems.

Like 19th Century Poland - which was said to be not so much a country as a state of mind - the poor nations are united more perhaps by attitude than by geography. Underlying that unity

(1) General Assembly 901st Plenary Meeting dated 12-10-1960, Page : 658
are a gnawing sense of anger against the West and a common feeling that their fate is not in their own hands. The leaders of the poor include such articulate spokesmen as Algeria's Houari Boumedienne, Tanzania's Julius Nyerere, Jamaica's Michael Manley and Mexico's Louis Echeverria who recite a familiar litany of sins that they believe are being committed by the First World against them: imperialism, unjust exploitation of resources, arrogance, waste and neocolonialism. Recently, in November 1975 Nyerere told a meeting of the Commonwealth Society in London "I am saying that it is not right that the vast majority of the world's people should be forced into the position of beggars without dignity. We demand change, and the only question whether it comes by dialogue or confrontation." (1)

The basic cause of the First World - LDCs confrontation is not in dispute. The glaring contrast lies between the opulent life of the industrialized nations and the poverty, misery and despair that blankets half the world's inhabitants. An estimated 1 billion of them suffer in some degree from malnutrition, perhaps half a million die of starvation annually. Famine was rampant in Ethiopia, the African nations of the Sahel (Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Upper Volta), Gambia and in areas of Tanzania and Kenya. Near famine also plagues Bolivia, Syria, Yemen and Nigeria. One poor harvest could bring massive hunger to India, the Sudan, Guyana, Somalia, Guinea and Zaire. In two dozen other nations, the populace faces chronic food shortages, among them: Bangladesh, Iran, Indonesia, Philippines and Haiti. Shantytown refugee camps have risen like festering sores throughout the region, providing the barest relief to half a million people. Their individual monthly ration is only 26 lbs of flour and 4.4 lbs. of dried milk, the nutritional equivalent of about one-third of average American's diet.

The industrial world's way of eating is an extremely inefficient use of resources. For every pound of beef consumed, a steer has gobbled up 20 lbs. of grain. While meat is an important source

(1) Time - December 22, 1975

Note: Source
of protein, many in the industrial west eat much more meat than is nutritionally necessary. Harvard Nutritionist Jean Mayer notes that "the same amount of food i.e. feeding 210 million Americans would feed 1.5 billion Chinese on an average Chinese diet." (1) Ten thousand of them die of starvation in each week in Africa, Asia and Latin America. There is a kind of vicious circle: ill health = reduced working capacity = low productivity = poverty = undernourishment = ill health (2)

It is true that since 1950 developing countries have expanded their farm lands by 35% and their yields per acre by roughly the same percentage. Their total grain production soared 78% compared with 64% in the industrial nations. Much of the gain came in the late 1960s through the planting of new, high yield strains of wheat and rice. The hybrids produced more grain per plant, and their short stalks made them far less vulnerable to wind damage. The development of these seeds was hailed as the Green Revolution. Within a few years, one third of the wheat area and one fifth of the rice area in non-Communist Asia were planted with the miracle seeds. (3)

Then bad weather started to plague world's crop land. Fertilizer was in short-supply and its price started to climb. Then came the devastating impact of the quadrupling of the market price of petroleum by the OPEC cartel. Higher oil prices meant added costs for the farmer: pesticides, herbicides and nitrogen-based fertilizers are derived from petroleum, while the manufacture of all fertilizers requires much energy. These price-increases critically undermined Green Revolution. The hybrid seeds need greater amounts of water, fertilizer and pesticide. If any of the three are missing, yields plunge, often below what traditional seeds would produce.

Although the Third World's population is literally exploding - there are 2,00,000 new mouths to feed everyday - the land

2. The Third World, Problems and Perspectives - Edited by Alan B. Mountjoy Page 17
available for growing food is diminishing. In the underdeveloped areas of Asia and Africa which include more than half of the world's people, the population is increasing by 2.3% a year, far faster than food supplies (1) - a serious situation that has been severely aggravated by drought in parts of Africa and India.

It should be noted that there were about 500 million people on earth in 1650; 1000 million in 1850; 2000 million in 1930 and 3000 million in 1960 and 4000 million in 1975. Quality of data is, however, suspect owing to illiteracy, insufficient infrastructures, suspicion of enumeration and high costs. Several LDCs like the Somali Republic, Republic of Yemen, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Afghanistan and Vietnam did never have a national census. Red China never had a census since 1953. In the World Population Year (1974) the UN assisted 30 LDCs to take census - 20 of them for the first time. By A.D. 2000 the population of the Third World alone could be as many as 5000 million. Birth rate in excess of 40 per 1000 are common in the LDCs. Until a few years ago fertility was a useful distinguishing criterion between the D.C. (Developed Countries) and the LDCs. But some of the small countries like Puerto Rico, Trinidad, Malaysia, Cyprus, Sri Lanka, Singapore, Hongkong, Taiwan, S. Korea, Mauritius, Costa Rica registered a fertility decline. Progress in family planning is much more limited in Africa and Latin America than it is in Asia. The only major progress in mainland Africa has been made in Tunisia in conjunction with a number of social measures. The influence of Roman Catholic Church impeded the spread of family programmes in the whole of Latin America. Prestige of male and virility, the so-called "macho spirit" was another impediment there (2)

In sharp contrast the birth rate in the developed countries like Austria, Belgium, E. Germany and W. Germany, U.K./and Luxemburg is moving towards the much debated state of zero

1. Time - September 16, 1974
population growth or natural decrease - the theoretical point at which birth balances deaths. Unless the present rate is checked, this planet's 3.9 billion inhabitants will double in number within 35 years. Ridicule is heaped upon proposals from the developed countries that call for setting up Family Planning Programmes in underdeveloped nations and reducing the world's birth rate from 2% now to 1.7% by 1985. Latin American delegates at the world population conference in Bucharest in August 1974 claimed that over-population was a myth invented by the rich to exploit the poor. China's representative, Huang Shu-Tse declared: "the large population of the Third World is an important condition for the fight against imperialism." (1) No wonder that one delegate from a sparsely populated nation muttered that the conference was "more demagoguery than demography". Noble Laureate Borlaug complained that the higher yields of the miracle seeds were meant to give the underdeveloped nations some time to reduce their population growth and begin upgrading their citizens' nutrition. Instead, he said, "our efforts to buy time have been frittered away because political leaders in developing nations have refused to come to grips with the population monster."

Neither unprecedented generosity by the wealthy nations, nor maximum exploitation of known farming techniques, nor anticipated scientific breakthroughs can win what Rural Economics Expert de Vries called the "stork-farmer race", or in the words of U.S. Economist Rawley Farley "the anxious race between demography and development." (2) In many parts of the developing world, valuable farm acreage has been abandoned because of urban sprawl, soil erosion and desert encroachment. As life in the countryside becomes too wretched to endure, millions of peasants abandon their farms and head for the slums of the

developing world's cities, vainly seeking jobs that do not exist. Whether they are called favelas (Brazil), ranchos (Venezuela), bustees (India), barriadas or bidonvilles (Algeria), there is a tragic sameness about these hovels where millions live and die: the fragile shacks made of cardboard or rusting corrugated sheet metal, the famished children's distended bellies, the inescapable stench of human beings packed tightly together without ready access to water or toilets. In the decade of 1960-70 the total real national product in the developing world increased at a faster rate than that of the developed world. Because of population growth, increase per head was less. People in the Third World were promised great gains upon independence from colonialism and yet they still find their lives and societies in a mess. Historically, such unfulfilled expectations prepare the ground for revolution.

Increasing urbanization, the sign of growth and economic progress is now occurring throughout the developing world at a pace far in excess of economic advances. In the advanced countries during their main period of urban growth alternative employment grew up and agricultural efficiency increased. Urban mortality levels remained higher than those of the countryside. The vast movement from the land there was spread over a greater period of time and was not focused solely on towns. The rate of urban demographic bulge in recent years for the world has been calculated at @ 3.2 percent while the developing world's figure is over 5 percent and the annual growth rate for larger cities is even higher: Lusaka for example grew at an annual rate of almost 12 percent between 1963 and 1968: the population doubled within seven years. By 1980 it is expected that eighteen cities in Latin America will have become "million" cities. The economic and social attractions of the towns proved alluring to the people suffering from chronic rural poverty and gasping in the stagnating countryside. Subsistence agriculture proved inefficient. (1)

1. Alan B. Mountjoy - Third World Problems & Perspective (Macmillan 1978) P. 105-6
Added to this was a freakish succession of excess spring rains, summer drought and early fall frost. Climate runs in roughly 200 year-long cycles, and the earth is now entering one of its chilly phases - what some scientists call the "little ice age" that cooled Europe from the 16th through 19th centuries. During those years Greenland's once lush fields vanished, England's productive vineyards withered, and agricultural disasters like Ireland's great potato famine came to be accepted as a natural feature of life. Since the 1940s, the mean global surface temperature has fallen only about 1°F. But even this small drop has trimmed a week to ten days from the growing season in the middle latitudes that are the earth's breadbasket. Continued cooling could lead to agricultural disasters. The vaunted (miracle) wheat and rice of the Green Revolution were specifically created by plant geneticists to thrive under the optimum growing conditions of recent years. They are particularly vulnerable to vagaries of weather. A decline in moisture can significantly reduce their yields; they can also become susceptible to blights and pests. But a flood of observations by weather satellites and other new instruments show its major effect: a gradual expansion in recent years of the so-called circumpolar vortex - the great icy winds that whip around the top and bottom of the world. Those winds move generally from west to east, but the outer edge of the vortex twists and bends, like the bottom of a large, swirling skirt. As the edge of the great wind system reaches closer to the planet's midriff, it has blocked moisture-laden equatorial winds. No longer have they been able to bring needed rain to such diverse areas as India, parts of Central America and West Africa's Sahel. Already suffering from years of overgrazing, the Sahel has dried up so badly that the Niger River can be forded by foot for the first time in centuries. In effect, the Sahara has edged southward.
Widespread poverty is the main problem that afflicts all underdeveloped countries. This deteriorating situation poses a dilemma for the wealthy, food-surfeited citizen of the developed world. He must decide whether he has moral obligation to feed those who are starving even if the food shortage in the poorest countries could have been prevented by population control. Morels aside, out of sheer self-interest he must ponder whether the hungry half-billion will allow him to live peacefully, enjoying his wealth. He must realise that there is the chance that the impoverished might resort to war to take his wealth and food. Western man must decide whether his own sense of human dignity— which is the basis for democratic institutions—can survive as he witnesses so many people starving around the globe. As a matter of fact concerted movement of the richer countries of the World to help their poorer neighbours has continued for more than two decades. During the Second World War hundreds of thousands of servicemen from the richer countries saw for themselves for the first time the poverty and backwardness of many alien lands, particularly of people belonging to low latitudes. This first-hand knowledge of poverty helped to strip the blinkers from the eyes of the people in rich countries.

But it is not likely that wealthy nations will reduce their living standards to help LDCs. If the world’s food supply were evenly divided among the planet’s inhabitants, hunger might be curbed for several decades. But the Americans will not eagerly reduce the 1.3 million tons of fertilizer they spread each year on lawns, golf courses and cemeteries; that amount would produce enough extra grain in the LDCs to feed about 65 million people. American consumer Advocate Esther Peterson already questioned the wisdom of providing food for hungry countries when the U.S. cost of living continued to climb. (1)

The diplomatic vehicle often used by the poor nations is the so-called group of 77, a consortium of developing countries (actually, there are now 110) within the United Nations. In the U.N. General Assembly, where they now constitute a solid and virtually unbeatable voting bloc on any given issue, the developing states have approved resolutions that demand a "new international economic order." In attacking the First World's complacency, the developing nations made four main charges:

(1) Colonial exploitation raped defenseless societies, depriving them of their natural resources and destroying traditional social relationships. As proof, spokesmen for developing nations frequently point to Egypt; industries founded there in the early 19th Century, when the country was autonomous although under loose Turkish sovereignty, were dismantled by the British after they occupied the country in 1882.

(2) In the post-colonial period, the First World has rigged the international economic system to keep the poor dependent. First World has favoured imports of LDC commodities rather than manufactured products. This may have discouraged the growth of industry in some of the developing nations and hindered economic diversification. The reliance on a single crop or mineral for export earnings painfully exposes many poor countries to erratic swings in the price of raw materials.

(3) Foreign aid has done little to help the poor, but has instead created enclaves of privileged elites addicted to First World luxuries and living standards. (1) Imported technology almost inevitably brings along elements of the civilization that

---

1. There is a gibe that foreign aid is a process by which poor people in rich countries help rich people in poor countries. As a matter of fact aid as instrument prolongs and strengthens the richer nations' influence and power over the poorer ones. More often than not foreign aid is taken as a kind of reparations fund for offenses past and future.
created it, such as high consumption patterns. The benefits of growth do not reach all segments of a developing country's population. Hyper-inflated bureaucracies and corrupt officials in a poor state, for instance, claim a large share of their nation's output, while widespread illiteracy limits access to new jobs stimulated by the economic development. Foreign investors may bring capital-intensive, labour-saving equipment into a country where there is massive unemployment. The UNCTAD demanded an annual transfer of .7% g.n.p. of the First World's states to developing nations in the form of grant of low interest loan. This was accepted by the First World countries but not honoured by most of them.

(4) Through aid programs, investments and exportation of culture, the First World has undermined the dignity and self-sufficiency of the underdeveloped states.

The struggle has been defined variously as rich vs. poor, Southern Hemisphere vs. Northern Hemisphere, developed countries vs. underdeveloped countries. The protagonists are the advanced industrial nations (Western Europe, North America and Japan) vs. the nations of the Third World (Latin America, Africa and Asia), an extraordinarily diverse group that, for the moment at least, has achieved solidarity for what it seems as its common purpose. So one-sided have the Assembly's actions become that the U.S. has denounced them as "a tyranny of the majority". Outspoken U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Daniel P. Moynihan has characterized them as "the politics of resentment and the economics of envy." One reason for this unity is that the vast majority of the developing states share one overriding experience: they emerged in the past two or three decades from long periods of colonial domination by the West. Out of the 11 empires of 6 countries came the new nations and 126 members to the U.N. - in 24 years 75 states have been added to that roll.\(^1\) Although the Soviet Union occupies more Asian real estate than any other political unit on the continent

---

1. George Thompson - *New World of Asia - Foreign Affairs - October 1969.*
the Third World is not violent in its attack towards Russia, because it does not have a colonial past. As independent states they all seem to feel that their problems are mainly due to their having been plundered by the imperialists. Whatever their differences, and they are great, all now seem to be caught up in the exhilaration of the counterattack against their former colonial masters.

Two recent related events galvanized them into a cohesive bloc: the 1973 decision by the ministers of OPEC to quadruple the price of oil, which had been $2 per bbl., and the Arab nations' imposition of an oil embargo at the time of Yom Kippur War. The LDCs - even those not directly involved in oil exports or the Middle East conflict - were exhilarated. They saw both actions as proof that the industrialized West was vulnerable to collective pressures from the poor nations. "For the first time since the rise of Western Capitalism, a decision affecting the world economy was taken outside the West", said Ismail Sabry Abdullah, director of Egypt's Institute of National Planning. (1) The symptomatic first objections to the 1973 oil price hike came from one of the poorest countries in The Third World - Tanzania.

Historians of the future will probably see this counter-attack as one of the major events of the 20th Century. In 1961 the first conference of non-aligned nations was held in Belgrade under the sponsorship of Yugoslavia's Tito, Egypt's Nasser and India's Nehru. The 1970s saw a rapid growth in their power and sense of purpose as well as in their tendency, encouraged by the Soviet Union and other Communist countries, to blame the industrialized West for many of the world's problems. The U.N. conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm in 1972, was marred by Third World claims that the rich nations, having gained their wealth by polluting the environment, now wanted to curb pollution and thus

keep the non-aligned poor. In 1974's World Population Conference in Bucharest China lectured on the draining away of the world's resources into the hands of a minority of industrial, consumer-oriented countries. It was also in April and May, 1975 at the U.N. Special Session on Raw Materials and Development, that the non-aligned nations formulated a comprehensive economic programme. Dominated by Third World figures such as Algeria's President Houari Boumedienne, the special session endorsed two resolutions. One was a Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic order; the second was a Programme of Action designed to bring about the new order. (1)

Though the U.S., Japan and West Germany voiced strong objections to the resolution, the General Assembly in December, 1975 adopted the Third World's position by passing a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. The main points of the three resolutions are an accurate guide to what the Third World wants:

(1) "Full, permanent sovereignty of every state over its natural resources and all economic activities." This includes tighter regulation of multinational corporations and the unrestricted right to nationalize foreign holdings - and to pay compensation according to national law, regardless of international law governing such situations.

(2) Dependent largely on raw materials exports the Third World countries want world-wide commodity agreements that would assure them stable markets and prices. These in turn would be indexed to the cost of their industrial imports from the First World countries. Producer cartels, little OPECs, in effect, "would be internationally sanctioned as a means of "accelerating development" of the poorer nations.

1. Time - September 8, 1975.
Outright "transfer of resources" - redistribution of the wealth - from rich to poor, it wants it faster than ever. During the period of colonialism and in the two decades that followed World War II, the industrialized West did import Third World products at very low prices; foreign companies made huge profits, and comparatively little was poured back into the producing areas. But at the same time it is also true that the countries that clamour for an international redistribution of wealth are plagued by their own severe imbalances between wealthy minorities and impoverished majorities.

Most of the poor nations are burdened with a tropical climate, which lowers both soil fertility and levels of human exertion. Many also lack the cultural milieu to reinforce individual initiative and social concern for progress. There is widespread fatalism and torpor and preference for a contemplative life. For many traditional African societies, work is considered only a means of survival rather than a way to improve one's living standard. West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt in a New York speech declared "We warn those who today demand a fast redistribution of wealth not to be impatient. In Europe, the process of industrialization has so far lasted about 200 years." Modern Methods of agriculture, in fact, advanced through Europe in the 19th Century at the snail's pace of only a few miles yearly. As a matter of fact conversion of Europe and North America from subsistence agricultural economics to the highly advanced industrial nations of today was spread over a century of trial and error, of discovery of new materials, of new technologies, of the creation of new organs of finance, of new commercial relationships, of changing social and political environments. 

There is much the world's developing states can learn from the First World. Their experiences, achievements and knowledge are readily available. But this will require a dialogue rather than the hostility of

the past few years. "It would go back to the jungle, it is a toss up whether the developing countries opt for economic progress or instead, for winning symbolic points by twitting the industrial states" - warned a Harvard Political Scientist. \(^{(1)}\)

The world is spending an estimated $365 billion annually on arms; theoretically, that money could finance agricultural development programs. It is not likely, however, that nations are ready to start disarming. Even if they did, politicians would soon find their constituents clamouring that almost all the money saved on weapons be spent at home rather than abroad to help poor nations feed themselves. But at the same time it is true that poverty breeds dangers. The 1970 Nobel Peace Prize Winner Norman Borlaug warned "you cannot have political stability based on empty stomach and poverty." "When I see food lines in developing countries, I know that those governments are under pressure and are in danger of falling". Shortages or high prices of food have already contributed to the toppling of governments in Ethiopia, Niger and Thailand. \(^{(2)}\)

Development, according to Alan B. Mountjoy, implies more than economic growth; it means fundamental changes in society, in ways of life, in political and institutional patterns and the grasping of new concepts and new sets of values. The modernisation of economics encourages and in turn depends upon changes in social attitudes such as to the mobility of labour, the prestige of land and animal ownership, relations between landlord and tenant, the desirability of education, of birth control, the status of women, identification with the nation rather than the tribe. Development, in short, is no simple, straightforward process of economics but strikes at the very roots of social and institutional patterns.

So, in a comprehensive sense, the Third World comprises underdeveloped, economically backward with high incidence of illiteracy, non-communist, anti-colonial, aid and investment seeker new states of Asia, Africa and Latin America - so-called "free world" states most of which were born after the 2nd World War, spanning the continents of Asia, Africa and South America. Although most of the countries are proverbially poor, some of the oil rich countries of the Middle East enjoy the highest per capita g.n.p. - Kuwait's $ 8450 is greater than that of U.S.'s $ 6200. (1) Most of them are non-aligned but countries like Philippines, Turkey and Pakistan are partners in defence in military organizations like NATO, SEATO and CENTO. Israel, although geographically non-European and militarily unstrung - there is no military pact between Israel and U.S. or for that matter between Israel and any other countries in the World - does not belong to this burgeoning group of Third World. Similarly union of South Africa though perched on the African continent does not belong to the Third World Fraternity.

For our purpose in this dissertation we would use the term "Third World" in a comprehensive sense - combining the criteria of political, economic and geographical definitions. Our "Third World" concept accordingly would cover the two other worlds also - "The Fourth World" and "The Fifth World" as understood and analysed in this chapter. We are living in a queer world - which is physically one, ideologically two and nationally many. Out of the nationally many worlds has been born the "Third World" first and thereafter come the "Fourth World" and the "Fifth World". We group the three "Worlds" - Third, Fourth and Fifth - into one "The Third World": This "Third World", weak and insignificant at the initial stage, has now gathered new strength specially in the U.N. General Assembly on account of sheer increase in their number and in voting strength. This "Third World" by their

attitude to world issues can play an effective and determining role in world peace. The General Assembly becomes the arena where the Third World can think of interest aggregation and interest articulation. There in the General Assembly they can generate demand inputs for 'future' peace on the international political system. These demand inputs, when directed towards genuine 'positive' world peace, cannot be ignored. The international political system is to convert these demand inputs into outputs if it is to survive. Hence the Third World today, by defining their attitude to world issues and by creating demand inputs along that line, can play a decisive role in creating "One World" of peace, prosperity, fellowship and understanding.