

What can be achieved by the developing countries through a "New International Economic Order" is very limited if they themselves are not prepared to undertake discipline and reform, and adopt change with regard to both production and birth control. Nor is there any guarantee that a greater say in international economic affairs will lead to a reasonable distribution of income between the different developing countries and to a higher standard of living for the poorest within the individual developing country.

Since the countries of the world are highly interdependent, the timing of requests by developing countries is most important. It would also be wise to concentrate demands on fewer items instead of exerting pressure on all sorts of questions. It cannot be in the interest of developing countries to have the passage to a new economic order take place in such an abrupt way that it results in disturbances of the international economy, which would also hurt them.

It may be argued that the Western market system and Western political ideology are on trial in a considerable part of the world. Communism appeals to a human being who is starving and looking for a place to sleep. In this situation it is not appropriate to talk about political democracy. Without great difficulty, a parallel can be made between the Marxist class struggle and the efforts of the poorer populations to increase their material well-being. Thus poverty is explained as a result of the exploitation by the imperialistic powers and the inequalities of capitalism. The poorer peoples thereby are given priority in the class struggle and are motivated to improve their conditions, developments that are welcomed by the Communists and understandable to the poor.

There is certainly a valid point here, but I do not find the arguments convincing. When the developing countries, in the context of the North-South dialogue, e.g. in UNCTAD, attack the West in particular, the main reason is that they are dependent on trade with the Western world, and on its growth, to a much larger degree than on trade with the East. The newly-independent countries in Africa want to be themselves without interference and without involvement in the ideological fight between East and West. They do not want to have their material well-being effaced in this way. To a certain degree a differentiation is taking place in the dialogues or competition between East and West and North and South. Apart from food, the developing countries want advanced

technology and capital. I should not be surprised if many of their leaders, after contact with the Eastern system, come to the conclusion that only the Western industrialized countries are able to fulfil their wishes.

But the Western world will have to widen its own values, especially that of equality, to include the position between East and West and North and South. Apart from food, the developing countries want advanced technology and capital. I should not be surprised if many of their leaders, after contact with the Eastern system, come to the developing countries. Otherwise, the discussions in the UN and its Specialized Agencies will be futile.

If it is found undesirable to have poorer populations tempted – at least in the short run – by a Communistic *cul-de-sac*, it may also be necessary for the Western industrialized world to set a desirable example, putting its own house in order through national and international efforts. It does not inspire the wholehearted confidence of the Third World to find that, simultaneously with the increasing international co-operation in trade and currencies, individual Western countries are trying to solve their own economic problems on the basis of theories that were formulated for a society that was entirely different from today's. Nor does it inspire confidence to see these attempted solutions, in spite of economic summit meetings, being applied more or less in isolation.

In order to improve the market system and stabilize democracy – which, in practice, have proved more effective than any other approach – it has become a social necessity to introduce a balancing factor in Western societies. Personally, I believe that an incomes policy in one form or another is indispensable; but an incomes policy will in the long run hardly be possible without a new line of thinking that gives wage-earners a more active role. It goes without saying that the Communists will be in opposition to such a policy, because it tends to avoid a polarization of wage-earners and business and because its purpose is to stabilize Western development and to improve the conditions of employees. But, in their own interest, the defenders of democracy ought to realize the importance of wage-earners' obtaining more participation in decision-making, a larger degree of involvement and responsibility, and co-ownership. Perhaps the internal threat to democracy is the most serious, and it may be rewarding to make our societies and manner of life more worthy of defence and security.