

other areas of world order than in the maintenance of peace and security. The West's Achilles' heel is also exposed to the dominant concerns of the "non-European" states, and their peoples. The lingering legacy of colonialism, the manifest disparities and discriminatory character of current bargaining power, and the stark inequities of human welfare and opportunity, frequently lead to the complex realities of North-South relations being crystallized in an over-simplified, but powerful, claim of systematic injustice.

It is difficult to envisage, for example, how a liberal free-market policy, or a belief in interdependence, can indefinitely survive the discriminatory exclusion or restriction of developing countries' products in Western markets. What are the prospects for the survival of fragile democratic systems, or for the respect for human rights, in societies that are unable to provide for the basic human needs of their populations, let alone the spiralling expectations spurred by their citizens' vicarious exposure to the affluence of the North? How can humanity hope to mobilize all its nations in such urgent common enterprises as the preservation of the environment and human life-support systems when the minority, which so far has done most to cause the problems, monopolizes the potential means to their solution, such as money and environmentally-sound technologies, and further adds insult to injury by exacting the crippling repayment of bad loans which would long since have been written off by the good capitalist rules prevailing within any of the creditor economies. It is also worth remembering that increases in oil prices as a result of the crisis in the Gulf impact disproportionately on the already fragile economies of the South.

Even such a thoughtful commentator as Claude Julien of *Le Monde Diplomatique* has been induced by the disparities of power and in the conditions of *human* order between North and South to question the profound legitimacy of the current effort in the Persian Gulf to maintain and reinforce international order. While recognizing that this international response could provide foundations for a better military order, limiting the risks of armed conflict, he fears that this system may stop only at protecting the "*désordre établi sur la planète*" at the human level. Is this to be another double standard, undermining the moral claims of the new campaign for order?

It seems clear that there is room, and urgent need, to secure universal confidence in some of the *world order* values that have gained a tenuous toe-hold far beyond the "European" community of states. The West will have to pay a price to demonstrate the consistency of those