

The Third World: What is in a Name?

*Iheanyi N. Osondu

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ujah.v12i2.1>

Introduction

The origin of the term “Third World” has been variously debated by Wolf-Philips (1979), with critical responses from Worsley (1979); Mini (1979); Love (1980) and McCall (1980). While these debates and others that followed did not take away the authorship from Alfred Sauvy (1952), a French economic historian and demographer, his original use and application of the term “third world” has completely changed or been eroded in the later part of the twentieth century and now the twenty-first century. According to Worsley (1979), the existence of the neutralist “Third Force” mostly the independent French left in 1949 inevitably led to the coining of the “Third World”. Although Worsely (1979) initially contested this origin, in his later articles, he did not broach the subject again especially when Wolf-Philips (1967) pointed out that it seemed Claude Bourdet had used the term as early as April 1949 while referring to the writing of Marcus (1958), but did not pointedly say that Bourdet originated the term. Even Muni (1979) did not contest the attribution of the origin of the “Third World” to Sauvy (1952) in his contribution to the debate. Hence, the source of the origin was traced to a three volume writings of Sauvy and his colleagues at the *Institut National des Etudes Demographiques* in 1956 – *Le Tiers Monde: Sous-developpement et developpment* that firmly credits Sauvy with the introduction of the “Third World”.

It should, however, be noted that Sauvys’ (1952) usage of *Tiers Etat* alluded to the 1789 oratory of the *Abbe*

Sieyes- ‘What is the Third Estate? Everything. What has it been till now in the political order? Nothing. What does it want to be? Something. (Wolf-Phillips (1987). According to Love (1980) the use of *Tiers Monde* in this context was more of an expression of neglect, exploitation and revolutionary potential. Safire (1972), further argued that *tiers monde*, was originally popularized in France between 1947 and 1949 and was used to describe parties that pitched their political tent between the Gaullist *Rassemblement du peuple Francais* and the regime of the Fourth French Republic (1946 – 5). According to Safire (1972) President Charles de Gaulle, had also used the phrase *tiers monde* to describe the role of France, independent of United States foreign policy alliances. Safire (ibid, 1972) further offered a working definition of *tiers monde* or third force as a weight added at the fulcrum of the balance of power; a group of nations or an ideology that lies between the communist world and the western capitalist camps Wolf-Phillips (1987). In this instance, the term third force or precisely third world was used in a political not economic sense. It is critical to note that today the so called second world or the communist Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are aggressively pursuing a free market economy. Therefore any numerical first, second and third worlds is obsolete and should be confined to the heaps of ancient history, since you can not have a first and a third in a numerical or arithmetical numbering, without having a second.

Furthermore, Love (1980) referred to a possible earlier version he assumed was ignored by Worsley (1979) as Juan Peron’s “third Position”. Love (ibid, 1980) argued that Worsley (1979) should have credited Peron’s Argentina along with India, Yugoslavia and Egypt as one of the early champions of neutralism. According to Love (1980), Peron was possibly the first to use the term; *faute de mieux* that

could be interpreted to mean “thirdness”. Love (ibid, 1980) emphasized that Peron’s connection with the Axis made him a political pariah with the United States State Department between 1945 and 1946, hence, he was advocating the “third Position” no later than 1949. Although Love (ibid 1980) asserted that “thirdness” was closely related to some notion of neutrality in the emerging cold war, he did acknowledge that “third force” and “third position” were still not the “third World”.

The third world, meanwhile, became popularized during the first Non Aligned Movement conference held in Bandung (Indonesia) in 1955. At this conference, representatives of 29 newly decolonized or independent countries used it as a way of identifying with, or stating their desire to pursue neutral unaligned foreign policy vis-a vis the capitalist economy of Western Europe and North America (Euro-America), and the countries with centrally planned economies of Eastern Europe and the Soviet union (Porter and Sheppard, 1989). The term “third world” as used here was political not economic in application and is a product of the cold war between the capitalist countries of Western Europe and North America (Euro-American) and the centrally planned countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. These two ideological divides were later termed the First and second worlds. It should be noted that the leading participants in 1955 Bandung Conference called the Non aligned Movement included notable politicians like Kusno Sosrodiha Surkarno (Indonesia), Chou En-Lia (Peoples Republic of China), Gamal Abdul Nasser (Egypt), and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru (India). The decolonized countries of South America were not invited to this conference, may be, because it was assumed that their economies were closely tied to that of United States for them to follow an unaligned foreign policy (Porter, et .al. ibid 1989). The non aligned conference

later reconvened in 1961 in Belgrade under the chairmanship of Marshall Tito of Yugoslavia. This time, Latin American Countries were invited and participated very actively. This meeting was under the auspices of the United Nations and led to the creation of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

It was after this meeting that the phrase “third world” assumed a life of its own and led to the countries within this group negotiating for such things as prices of commodities they produced; reduction in trade barriers and the provision for more capital investment. What started life as a political phrase assumed a very broad meaning and interpretation depending who is using it. Today, its application goes beyond its humble beginning as a political jargon and is differently used to refer to various stage of economic advancement by development theorist. It must be noted here that any discussion on development must acknowledge that development as being applied by the development theory was largely based in economic language, institutions and rules. Development theories only recognize activities that command price, or generate cash, counts overwhelmingly, despite a range of other valued cultural practices that reproduce social and ecological relations, for which money is meaningless or less important (Philip 2008). In addition, the development paradigm favors monetary relations and measures which in most cases is at cross roads with cost of non-monetary resources and at the same time encourages the conversion of resources like water (in bottles), air (tradable pollution permits), survival networks of the poor (micro-credit informal institutions such as **isusu**), and even love into commodities (Davis, 2001).

In addition, other terms such as “undeveloped,” “developing,” “less developed,” “nonindustrialized”, “have-nots” and “south” have been used as alternatives, based on

Western economic models and the concentration of wealthier countries in the middle latitudes and the Northern Hemisphere.

Geographical Application of Third World Regions

In contrast to its earlier references, the third world was later used geographically to refer to areas of the world confined to the tropics and subtropics or within latitudes 35° (degree) North and South of the Equator. These are areas dominated by the inter-tropical convergence Zone (ITCZ). Areas within this latitude that is not entirely affected or directly influenced by the Inter-tropical convergence zone (ITCZ) due to their geographic position are Northern China, Mongolia, Korea, and southern parts of Argentina and Chile (Porter and Sheppard, 1998).

However, this area contains 60% of the ecumene – the livable part of the earth or approximately, 60% of the earth's surface. According to Porter and Sheppard (ibid 1998), if 35° degrees latitude is taken as the standard dividing line between the tropic and sub tropical areas of the world and the middle and high latitudes, approximately 86% of the third world lies within the tropics and subtropics while only 18% of land designated first and second world lies within the tropical and subtropical zones which cover most of the Australian desert and the southern part of the United States.

Within this area geographically defined as third world, there is a great diversity regarding development. For example, this area includes the fast developing or industrializing countries of Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and South Korea or the so called "Asian Tigers." What is funny about this arbitrary division of the world by development theorist is that while the "Asian Tigers" are fast catching up with the first world development, others are being demoted by some other theorist to fourth and even fifth

world status (Porter and Sheppard, 1998; Philip, 2008). If taken geographically, the third World region is very diverse politically, geographically and economically that there is so much crammed into it. Since a region simply put is any area of the Earth, with a distinctive or unifying physical or cultural characteristics that set it apart and make it substantially different from surrounding areas. In addition, a region may be defined on the basis of its homogeneity or its functionality (Fellmann, at.al, 2005; 2010). In this case there is no definitive general characteristic one can identify as unifying except the arbitrary imposition of the name “third World.” Moreover, there is no significant element of internal similarity or a coherent spatial similarity. According to Hobbs, (2010), regions are human constructs not facts on the ground. Hence, people create and draw boundaries around regions in an effort to define distributions of relatively homogeneous characteristics, and none exists here. Therefore, developing world or third World is a catch all phrase that lacks precision and explanatory power (Griffiths, 2010). It is important to note that the lumping together of about 120 – plus nations that make up the developing world obscures the disparities in size, population, distribution of wealth, ethnicity and a host of other indicators that makes it difficult to categorize and generalize about this large, diverse group of countries (Griffiths, 2010).

The Third World and Theories of Development

Development theorists are of the opinion that development means making a better life for everybody. Just like all other ideologies that have been espoused before, Development promises a comprehensive final answer to all societies’ problems, from poverty and illiteracy to violence and despotic rulers. Development bears one ideological characteristics of suggesting there is only one correct answer

and it tolerates little dissent (Easterly, 2010). Development theorists believe that every problem in every part of the earth can be solved using technology. In so doing, they forget that there are problems that bedevil some parts of the earth such as political, economic and sociological that cannot be solved solely with technology. According to Easterly (2010) Development has its own intelligentsia, comprised of experts at the International Monetary Fund (IMF) the World Bank and the United Nations. Some of these development theorists are the key adviser who devised the structural adjustment programs where loans were “given” to struggling economies. Such loans never solved the problems but worsened the economies they were meant to help. For example, in the former Soviet Union - a second World, the failure of development theorists led to their application of “shock therapy” which rather than help their economy created nostalgia for communism. Development theorists made up of hundreds of experts sought to solve every problem of the poor, from green manure, breast feeding education and bicycles to solar energy systems, school uniforms for aid or orphans and wind mills (Easterly, 2010). In other words, they have “a one size fit all” solution for all the world’s problems no matter where and in which culture and society such problems may exist. Adopting and implementing the experts’ strategy reform is like tying a person’s hand to his or her back and challenging him/her to a boxing tournament.

According to Peet et. al (2009) development is a founding belief of modernity and modernity is that time in Western history when rationality supposed it could change the world for better. For Easterly (2010), the ideology of Development is not only about having experts design your free market for you; it is about having the experts design a comprehensive, technical plan to solve all the problems of the poor. In addition, these experts see poverty as a purely

technological problem, to be solved by engineering and natural sciences, ignoring messy social sciences such as economics, politics and sociology. Moreover, Development theory, stresses world goals over the autonomy of societies to choose their own path. On the other hand, theories of development reach deeply into culture, and in most cases, western culture, for explanatory and persuasive power, while the end product of such deep thinking, together with the dedicated practices of millions of well meaning people, and are political tools, with mass appeal (Peet at. al. (2009). It must be pointed out that there is no single universally acceptable standard for measuring wealth and poverty on the global scale (Hobbs, 20010/2007). There is no doubt that development per se is important because it produces an economy, and more broadly a society and culture, that determines how people live and in terms of income, services, life chances, education and so on and so forth (Peet, et. al. 2009). Thus, development is conventionally a measure of economic growth, with level of development seen in terms of the size of the economy (Peet at. al. ibid, 2009). It is, therefore not surprising, that one of the factors used by development theorist and the United Nations especially, the World Bank, to measure development include Gross National Income (GNI) – which is basically what everyone (in a country) earns and Gross National Product (GNP) which is the total value of final goods and services produced in a year by a country’s residents including profits from capital held abroad. These and many others are derived from official (formal) data or statistics which in many cases are often deficient. According to Peet at. al. (2009) not only do these data vary greatly in reliability from country to country but also characteristics such as production, income, or education are, in reality, culturally specific rather than universal. Although national and international agencies such the World

Bank and International Monetary Fund, report only data which can be measured using conventional accounting procedures, it should be noted that there are great difference in the way national records are collected in culturally different environments.

Furthermore, the procedures used in collecting these data, raises some pertinent questions. For example, whose conventions are used? It is definitely those of the first World, made up of Western Europe and Euro-America. Therefore the use of Gross Domestic Product- (GDP) which is the total output of goods and services that a country produces for home use in a year is not in the real sense universally applicable and or comparable, since they are produced in a different cultural environment. When divided by the country's population, the resulting figure of per capita GDP is another of the most commonly used measures of economic well-being (Hobbs, 2010).

Hence, using GNP which is based on western economic model and culture to assess other cultures and economic systems begs the question. It should be noted that even within the same country, there is great inequality in the distribution of wealth. It is also important to note that GDP measures only that part of production that is sold for a price in a formal market, and does not include products that are consumed within the family, or services that are exchanged informally or gifts. Therefore, a large portion of economic activities in third World countries are either ignored completely or merely estimated.

Recent studies have shown that women in the informal sector in developing countries contribute a lot to the family income. For example, Rogers (1980) showed that women produce between 60% and 80% of food in the informal sector. Also, Snyder (1995) revealed that about 70% of entrepreneurs are women. Furthermore, Osondu

(1992) showed that the informal sector not only fund but also supplied over 80% of urban housing in Enugu, Nigeria, a third world country. It is important to note here that health of the housing market in first world economies to a large extent is a mirror of their economy. For example, the type of housing finance, interest rates, number of housing starts, houses sold, or repossessed is a strong indicator of the health of the national economy. But in most developing countries, informal housing finance institutions are not easily understood by development theorist as many house owners even in urban areas, finance their houses through personal savings, and informal housing finance methods, whilst houses are completed by instalmental construction methods. Housing sales are informally transacted even when these are large blocks of flats or bungalow that meets any standard anywhere in the world (Osondu, 1992). Since they are informal or non convectional, their statistics do not make it the formal data table or the country's GNP statistics. It is therefore odd that all these informal housing activities including finance and construction, which contribute greatly to the housing market, literally do not count when measuring the economy in third world countries.

Consequently, if using GNP as a measure of development, which hides the disparity in wealth ownership within a country, how much more among countries. For instance, according Peet (2009) the World Bank in 2005 published economic statistics in which it divided the world into three groups, according to their income level. Namely: low- income; middle- income; and higher- income. The data showed that in 2005, world population stood at 6.5 billion with a total income of 4 trillion dollars and an average per capita income of \$7,000 a year. A break down of this data shows that a little over 1 billion people live in high income countries where the total GNP was \$35.5 trillion and a GNI

per capita averages \$35,131 a year. According to Peet et al (2009) approximately 15.7% of the world population who live in high income countries, and get about 80% of global income. A good knowledge of the economic patterns in many third world countries is very important in evaluating data collected by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). For example, farmers in developing countries are in the informal sector. Many produce food first for family consumption, before selling the excess. There are those who give away some of their products to family and friends. Therefore it is not possible to calculate their income, since most of their products are not “sold” formally in the market. In addition, artisans like carpenters, auto mechanics, road side traders and market women are never truly assessed for tax purposes. Most of them only pay the standard tax that is imposed on all adults. No body can successfully asses their income and they may not be willing to disclose such information.

On the other hand, about 2.4 billion people who inhabit low –income countries have only \$1.36 trillion in total income or an average GNI of \$580 a year. This means that about 37% of the world’s population that live in very poor countries get just 3% of global income Peet, at al. (2009). It is important then, to note, that global inequality is even increasing more with globalization, a theme that is encouraging the haves to have more and the have nots are consigned to the heap of history. For example, in 1960, 20% of world population living in the world’s richest countries had 30 times the income of the 20% of world population living in the poorest countries. However, in 1972, the figures changed to 44 to 1 and in 1997, the ratio was 74 to 1 (United Nations Development program, 1999). Inequality is on the increase no matter what investment theorists enunciate regarding the redistribution of wealth. According to

Milanovic (2007), there is more disparity than previously thought. For example, national poverty rates in low income countries lie in the range of 45% – 70 % of the population, while the percentage of those living on less that \$2.00 a day varies from 50% to 90% depending on the country.

Human Development Index

The Human development index (HDI) is a different conception developed by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) to measure development in different parts of the world using different indices such as access to knowledge; nutrition and health services, security; leisure, political and cultural freedoms. In addition, the HDI measures development in terms of longevity (life expectancy at birth), knowledge (adult literacy of western education); mean year of schooling; income sufficiency. Income sufficiency, in this case, defines the proportion of people with sufficient resources for a decent life. Based on this index, the UNDP ranked Western industrialized countries with 0.9 out of 1.00 at the top while countries that scored below 0.5 represents low development. It is instructive to note that 29 of the 31 countries in the low development category are found in the African continent. Others include Haiti and Yemen. Most of these countries historically were colonized. In some of these countries you will only get age estimates as most date of births are not written out in mostly rural communities.

It could be seen from the foregoing discussion, that using a western developed economic tool like GNP does not do any justice in dividing the world into development classes. Moreover as Osondu (1992) noted, using economic tools developed in one culture to measure other cultures is just inappropriate. For example one of the most significant ways in which economic development becomes tangible to people is housing. In any meaningful measurement of western

economy, housing is an important factor. According to Bourne (1991) housing is a compound of many things: a physical entity, a social artifact, an economic good, a capital stock, a social symbol and at times a political “hot potato”. Housing construction, sale and purchase is very much used as measure of the economic health of many western countries. In contrast, this is not true of countries classified as less developed or developing. Yet, housing construction, supply and demand varies from country to country. Moreover, as Osondu (1992) noted, the private sector provided about 80% of urban housing in Nigeria and most of these are through unconventional methods of finance and construction, which involved informal sources of finance and instalmental construction. These informal housing mechanisms do not make it into formal government data base and therefore are not included while calculating GNP. According to Halparin, (1986) one widely held view is that an economy comprises of separate sphere of instruments or practical actions and that economic analysis requires a unique set of conceptual tools which when modified can be used to analyze patterns of livelihood everywhere. This is not so, hence, Gudeman (1986) asserted that economics and economic theories are social constructions and that the central process of making a livelihood is culturally modeled. In addition, Fanon (2004) argued that values are in fact irreversibly poised and infected as soon as they came into contact with the colonizers, because they never tried to understand the culture and traditional value system of the people they colonized. Hence, it must be remembered that the gulf between cultures is too great to be easily bridged and too great at times even for mutual comprehension (Worsely, 1964). Moreover, the customs of the colonized especially their myths are assumed by the colonizers as the very mark of their indulgence and innate depravity. It is no wonder that the

same imperialist or colonial policy makers, more recently nicknamed development theorists in the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, does not understand the contributions of the informal sector in many a developing nations because they are based on non monetary values and customs of the practitioners.

As already noted, informal housing institutions in developing countries provides almost 80% of housing finance (Osondu, 1992) and are very rarely included while calculating the GNP. Care must therefore be taken in using western economic models in measuring, for example, the success of informal institutions and development. This is why Ekins (1986) had argued that the process of applying inappropriate western values in developing countries had wiped out traditional economic activities and at times disrupt the economics of a whole region. This is exactly what imperialism; an early version of colonialism did to the colonized world. For example, Osondu (2008) noted that while western economic systems expect individuals to borrow and pay by using of credit cards in order to determine their credit worthiness, informal institutions, such as, isusu groups, existing in the so called underdeveloped or developing countries of Africa, expect individuals to save before buying. In these two culturally different scenarios, the individual whose consumer pattern is determined by how much credit he/she obtains in other words owes contributes to the GNP while the other who save before purchase does not. One question that immediately comes to mind is the relationship between development and colonization. What has colonization got to do with development?

Colonization and Development

Historically, the theory of development was laid and hatched during the period of colonization. According to Fowale

(2009), imperialism and colonialism are concepts used in describing the state of relations between Africa in particular, plus other non European world and Europe from their first period of contact till the end of Second World War. At the core of imperialism is the uncontrollable urge to spread beyond one's own geographical border with the sole purpose of gaining prestige, power and control through the appropriation of other people's, resource and land. In addition, colonialism is the domination by one country of the political, economic and cultural life of another country or region. Moreover, it is, through the acquisition of these goods that a country gains more economic standing that gives it a superiority complex to teach and impose its culture like language, religion and well as political beliefs on others. This is further described by Middleton (1997) as the exercise of power by a state beyond its borders, which is what major Europeans powers did during the scramble and later colonization of Africa (1884-1885). It is instructive to note that after over more that five centuries of contact with Africa, European powers laid claim to almost all parts of Africa. The scramble for Africa, following the Berlin conference of 1884-1885 was a smoke screen for the scramble for Africa's' natural resource and as market for European countries whose resources and market base was dwindling following the industrial revolution. In fact as de Blij et al. (2004) succinctly put is the Berlin Conference was Africa's undoing. Its legacy is the African geopolitical geography that is a permanent liability after 3 three months of ignorance, greed acquisition at a time when Europe's search for minerals and markets had become insatiable (de Blij et. al. 2004).

It should be noted also that European countries had lost their oversea territories before scrambling for Africa territories. For Example, Britain had lost her 13 American colonies, while Spain and Portugal were struggling in South

America. Therefore, the scramble for Africa became the new form of imperialism. Nothing changed except in name since the Berlin conference (1884-1885) formalized the colonization of Africa. Or put in another way European countries met and legally broke up African territories and ethnic groups occupying them. Without paying attention to the existing ethnic groups, European imperial lords carved up African territories, ignoring ethnic boundaries, linguistic and cultural values, and in so doing contributed to many of the ongoing ethnic and tribal clashes in the continent. Moreover, European occupation of Africa eroded many traditional African values while destroying existing social relations.

It is the same European imperialistic goals that were later given a new name in post independent Africa as development theory. In other words, imperialism and colonialism were the hand of Esau while the new Development theory becomes the voice of Jacob.

All this was based on the experience of nineteenth 19th century Europe and what Europeans come to regard as a universal concept and philosophy necessary for the improvement of mankind (McMichael, 2008). Expressed in another way, development was practically interpreted by European elites as a type of social engineering of emerging “African” societies. It was seen as necessary in formulating government policy that is the key in controlling social transformation fundamental to the rise of capitalism and industrial technologies. In fact, development was identified with the post industrial revolutions era in Europe and with the regulation of its disruptive social effects. It is therefore not surprising that almost all former European colonies are today designated as third world countries based on perceived European standards and concepts of development.

This social engineering was the bases of European colonization of non European world (Michael, 2008). In

addition, the extraction of colonial resources not only aided European industrialization, but also, revealed how colonial administration managed the colonial population as they in turn experienced their own type of wrenching transformation (McMichael, *ibid*, 2008). For example, Davis (2001) had argued that the system developed by the British colonial power during the famines of 1876-77 and 1896-1902 enabled them to manipulate their colonies especially India to their own economic advantage. In addition, Davis (2001 *ibid*) discussed how the British colonial government in India, exploited the natives by creating more misery and poverty, whilst bolstering the British economy out of the misery of the indigenous people. Davis (2001 *ibid*) further examined how subsistence driven market forces, the consequences of colonial revenue settlement and the imposition of a “new Gold “ standard coupled with a decline in indigenous irrigation and the informal colonialism in Brazil created famine, poverty, death and ultimately the third world.

It is, under these circumstances, that the European Colonizers assumed that the nature of the colonized territories as “Backward” to Europeans. Hence development assumed an additional burden and source of the proverbial “the white mans burden”.

The European colonizers, from their experience in Europe projected development as an extension of modern social engineering to the colonies as they were incorporated into the European world. Citizens of the colonies were subjected to many new disciplines including forced labor (King Leopold of Belgium in the Congo), schooling, and segregation in native quarters. Segregation into native quarters was a feature of many colonial administrative centers known as “government Reservation Areas or GRA’S” in British colonies and is at the root cause of the popular and widely known apartheid segregation in South Africa.

Different forms of colonial subordination differed across time and space all with one aim to either adapt or marginalize colonial subjects to the European presence. However, all European colonial powers shared one main objective in their quest for African colonies then and now, which was and is still exploitation to farther European desire for materialism and development.

Simply put development became a power relationship (Michael, 2008). Any form of native opposition to the strange and imposed European style form of government was dealt with heavy hands. For example, in 1929, a new form of British direct taxation and the introduction of warrant chiefs contrary to the cultural traditions of the indigenous people of the South East Nigeria, sparked off the “Aba women’s” riot or rebellion. Moreover, the colonizers imposed a new and inhuman work ethics. Colonial subjects who did not accept such conditions were severely dealt with, and any opposition was regarded as insubordination that attracts summary punishment. According to Fanon (2004), Colonialism became a one-armed bandit. In the colonized region, the proximity and frequent direct intervention by the police and the military ensure the colonized are kept under close scrutiny and contained by rifle butts and napalm. The shooting or summary execution, of 21 miners and injuring of 51 others in Enugu, South East Nigeria, by November 18, 1949 by British military officers, for merely opposing poor working conditions in the Iva Valley mine is an example of the kind of high handedness that European colonizers employed in subjugating their colonies.

In the Former Belgian Congo, King Leopold embarked on a ruthless campaign of suppression and exploitation. For example, for failing to meet a production quota, entire communities were massacred (de Blij, (2003). It has been estimated that during King Leopold’s ruthless reign in the

Congo, more than 10 million indigenous people were murdered. In the light of today's international intervention and law, he should have been tried for genocide.

Those non European cultures were forcibly and irrevocably changed through colonization and in post colonial context founded on inequality and exploitation. Thus, setting the stage for unequal international framework by which political leaders of newly emerging independent countries had to negotiate in an unequal international framework that is not of their own making, through which, however, their governments may acquire political legitimacy.

Thus colonialism which is the root cause of inequality in the world today is fundamental in any discussion of development - the bases of the arbitrary division into first, second and third worlds. In a nut shell, colonialism is the subjugation by physical and psychological force of one culture by another. Hence, the colonizing power through military conquest of territory and stereotyping the relation between the two cultures dominates the lives of the colonized people. Colonialism created the perception among Europeans that non-European natives of their colonies were "backward", seen to be trapped in stifling cultural traditions (McMichael, 2008). For example, to emphasize European superiority, and the inferiority of the natives, many ethnic nationalities from different colonized part of the world such as the Samoa, Sani, Nubians, Tuaregs, and the Galibis were taken away from their native lands and displayed for scientific and leisure purposes in many a European zoos as human exhibits, in cities like, London, Milan, Warsaw, Hamburg, Antwerp, Barcelona and New York. In New York especially, Madison Grant, head of the New York Zoological Society Displayed a pygmy Ota Benga in a cage in the Bronx zoo along side a chimpanzee in order to demonstrate how closer the Africans and the pygmies were to a chimp.

Colonial rule encourage this superior – inferior imagery as European and non-European cultures were compared within a relationship in which Europe had a powerful socio-psychological advantage rooted in its missionary and military-industrial apparatus. The assumption in this comparison or interpretation is that of European cultural superiority and historical accounts abound showing how such powerful misinterpretations and the devaluing of other cultures was demonstrated in different parts of the world that experienced colonization. In some parts of the world where European colonizers settled, it is reflected in the assumption made between settlers about indigenous people they encountered. In almost all cases, the colonist is not content with stating that the colonized world has lost its values or worse never possessed any. According to Fanon (1965) the colonist viewed the colonized as absolute evil, corrosive elements, destroying everything which involves aesthetics or morals.

It must be recalled that when the early European traders travelled along the coast of Africa to others parts of the world to trade in fur, silk, precious metals, tea, spices, tobacco, sugar and cotton, their merchant companies exchanged such manufactured goods such as cloths, guns with people in coastal regions. In the process, it extended to slaves and eventually the conference in which they sat down in Europe and subdivide Africa during the scramble for Africa.

Conclusion

Many examples of European cruelty in Africa clearly showed that the aim behind colonialism was exploitation of African resources and an obvious display of European ego of superiority. Since the scramble for Africa was a precursor for colonialism born out of development theory of superiority, it

is no wonder that western democracies and media have maintained what Adichie (2009) called “the danger of a single story” which robs people of their dignity and emphasizes how we are different rather than how we are similar. It is the ill conceived belief that European culture is superior that gave rise to the arbitrary division of the world into first, second and third worlds.

References

- Adichie, Chimamanda (2009) The danger of a single story: Africa unchained. TED, Ideas worth Spreading.
<http://www.ted.com>
- Brenner Nail and Theodore Nick (2002) Cities and Geographies of “Actually Existing Neoliberalism” *Antipode*, Vol. 34, Issue 3, Pages 349-373.
- Davis Mike (2000) The origin of the Third World. *Antipode*, Vol. 32, Issue 1 page 48.
- Davis Mike (2002) Late Victoria Holocausts: El Nino Famines and the making of the Third World. London, Verso
- Di Blij H.J and Muller Peter, O. (2003) Geography, Regions and Concepts. 11th. Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Easterly, Williams (2007) The Ideology of Development. Foreign Policy July/August *Reprinted in Developing Worlds 10/11 Twentieth Edition By McGraw Hill 2010*
- Edgerton B. Robert (2002) The Troubled Heart of Africa: A History of the Congo, St. Martin's Press; 1st edition (December 1, 2002)
- Ekins, Paul eds. (1986) The living Economy: A new economics in the making. Routledge and Kegan Paul London.

- Escobar, Arturo (1995) *Encountering Development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fanon, Frantz (1963) *The Wretched of the earth*, New York, Grove Press.
- Fanon Frantz, et. al. (2004) *The wretched of the earth*. New York, Grove Press
- Fellmann, Jerome D; Getis, Arthur, Getis, Judith (2005) *Human Geography: landscapes of Human Activities* 8th. Edition. McGraw Hill, Higher Education, New York, New York.
- Fellmann, Jerome D, Bjelland Mark D; Getis, Arthur, Getis, Judith (2010) *Human Geography: landscapes of Human Activities*. 11th. Edition McGraw Hill,, Higher Education, New York, New York.
- Fowale, Joseph Tongkeh 2009 *Colonialism And Imperialism, Africa's Twin Woes in The twilight of African Development and Civilization*.
- French Howard, (2004) *A continent for the Taking: The Tragedy and Hope of Africa*. New York, Knopf.
- Goldsmith, James (1994) *The Trap*. New York: Carroll and Graf.
- Griffiths, Robert, J. (2010) *Understanding the developing World: Developing World Annual Edition # 10/11*, McGraw Hill Contemporary learning series Dubuque.
- Gudeman, S. (1986) *Economics as culture – models and metaphor of livelihood*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Harvey, D. (2005b), *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford, Uk: Oxford University Press.
- Hobbs Joseph J. (2001/2007), *Fundamentals of World Regional Geography*. Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning United States.

- Halperin, R H. (1986) *Economics across Cultures: Towards a comparative Science of the economy*. The Macmillian Press Ltd. London.
- Hochschild , Adam (1999) *King Leopold's Ghost* Mariner Books (October, 1999) .
- Horowitz Irving Louise (1966), *Three Worlds of Development. The Theory and Practice of International Stratification*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Lall Sanjaya (1979) *Transnationals and the third world: The R & D factor*. *Third World Quarterly*, Volume 1, Issue 3, July 1979 pages 112-118.
- Lancaster, Carol (2010) *The New face of development in Developing Worlds Annual Editions # 10/11 Twentieth Edition*. McGraw Hill, Dubuque.
- Leslie Wolf-Phillips (1987) *Why Third World? Origin, Definition, and Usage*. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 9, Issue 4, October. Pages 1311-1327.
- Love Joseph I. (1980) "Third World" A Response to Professor Worsley. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No 2, (April, 1980) pages 315-317.
- Marcus, T. John (1958) *Neutralism and nationalism in France*. New York Bookman Associates P33.
- McCall Grant (1980) *Four World of experience and action third World Quarterly 2 (3) October*.
- McMichael Philip (2008) *Development and Social Change: A global Perspective*. Pine Forge Press, 4th Edition.
- Milanovic, B. (2007) *An Even Higher Global Inequality Than Previously Thought*. World Development Discussion Paper. Available on line at siteresources.world-bank.org/INTDECINEQ/ReourcesGlobalinequality.pdf

- Muni S.D. (1979) The third world: Concept and controversy. *Third World Quarterly* 1360 – 2241, Volume 1, Issue 3, pages 119-121.
- Ngugi, wa Thiongo (1989) *Decolonizing the Mind*. London, Heinemann.
- Osondu I.N. (2008) *Migration Trends: A comparative analysis of African Traditional Economic Systems in comparative Western Culture* *International Journal of Migration.*
- Osondu, I.N. (1992). *Housing Finance in Urban Nigeria: A case study of Enugu, Nigeria*. PhD Thesis, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Scotland UK.
- Pakenham T (1992) *The Scramble for Africa: White Man's Conquest of the Dark Continent from 1876-1912* Avon Books; 1st. Printing edition (December, 1992)
- Peet, Richard and Hartwick Elaine (2009). *Theories of Development: Contentions, Arguments, Alternatives*. The Guildford Press 72 Spring Street, New York, NY 19912.
- Perkins John (2005) *Confessions of an Economic hit man*. Berrett – Koehler, Publishers Inc. San Francisco.
- Porter, Philip W and Sheppard Eric, S. (1979) *A world of difference: Society, Nature Development*. The Guilford Press 72 Spring Street, New York, NY 10012.
- Rodney, Walter (1982) *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, Washington DC. Howard University Press.
- Roger, B. (1980). *The Domestication in Development Societies*. London: Tavistock.
- Sheppard, Eric, et. Al. (2009). *A World of Difference: Encountering and Contesting Development*. The Guilford Press, New York, London. 2nd. Edition.
- Snyder, M. (1995). *Transforming Development: Women, Poverty and Politics*. London Intermediate Technology Publications.

Worsly, Peter. (1970) *The Third World: A Vital New Force in International Affairs*. The University of Chicago Press.

Worsely, Peter(1964) *The Nature of Human Society: The Third World*. The University of Chicago Press.

United Nations Development Program (1999) *Human Development Report* New York: United Nations development Program.

Prof. Iheanyi N. Osondu is of the Department of History, Geography, Political Science and Criminal Justice, Fort Valley State University.