pollution and to preserve the physical environment, despite the costs involved. A serious social pollution created by the irrational way in which international trade operates is strangling millions of human beings, and yet public opinion remains insensitive to it. We are still far from an interdependent economy on this small planet of ours.

The third UNCTAD has eloquently proved that the world is not a community, that the "have" countries' assistance to the development of the Third World is too marginal, that "free" international trade is a myth that profits the developed countries at the expense of the Third World. Nations are not agreed on the worldwide development objectives to be achieved; as a result the discussions on the means to be adopted for reaching them were unproductive. The third UNCTAD should serve at least as a warning to public opinion. World survival is at stake and everyone — rich and poor — depends on it.

Lester B. Pearson said in his address at the Conference on International Economic Development, Columbia University, New York, that no planet could survive half enslaved, half free, half engulfed in poverty, half on the way to the anticipated joys of limitless consumption, the result of unprecedented production, and that neither our ecology nor our morality could survive such a contrast. What is going to happen when that minority majority, the Group of 77, becomes aware that there is strength in numbers?

The widening gap . . .

Two recent statistical reports indicate that the gap between the have and have-not nations is widening despite the flow of development assistance from the industrialized states.

According to the *United Nations Statistical Yearbook,* the total *per capita* output — industrial and agricultural — of the developed countries increased by 43 per cent from 1960 to 1970, while the per capital increase in the developed countries in the same span was only 27 per cent. Moreover, the less-developed nations start from a much lower *per capita* base.

In terms of consumption of energy, the developing countries in 1970, with a population more than twice as large as that of the developed countries, consumed only a little more than one-seventh of the total energy produced.

In terms of caloric food intake per person, Ireland stood first with an average daily consumption of 3,450 calories following by New Zealand with 3,320; the United States, 3,290; France, 3,270; and Britain, 3,180. At the other end of the scale, the intake per person in Indonesia was listed at 1,750 calories; in Bolivia, 1,760; Somalia, 1,770; Ecuador, 1,850; and Algeria, 1,890 calories.

In terms of adequacy of housing, the 1971 *UN Yearbook* shows that in Britain there is a density of only .6 persons per room; the United States achieved the same percentage. In Switzerland it was .7 persons per room. In contrast, the Central African Republic had an average of 3.4 persons per room; Pakistan, 3.1; and India, 2.6 persons per room.

The growth of population in the underdeveloped nations is much higher than that in the developed countries despite much lower life expectancies and much higher infant mortality.

The World Bank, in its annual report issued in September, said that, despite impressive economic growth in the poorer nations, "it is probably true that the world's burden of poverty is increasing rather than declining".

The Bank's report, prepared for the annual meeting of this UN specialized agency and the International Monetary Fund, attributed the increase in poverty in part to rising population. But it added: "Statistics conceal the gravity of the underlying economic and social problems, which are typified by severely skewed income distribution, excessive levels of unemployment, high rates of infant mortality, low rates of literacy, serious malnutrition and widespread ill health."

The Bank report said the total debt and the annual cost of debt service of the poorer countries had continued to increase.

The report said, however, there had been progress toward development and it stressed that generalizations about developing countries — their prospects for growth, their potential for expanding trade, their ability to carry debt burdens — were hazardous. (*New York Times* summaries, July 10 and September 18, 1972).