
Pro Rege

Volume 10 | Number 4

Article 4

June 1982

Who is My Neighbor? Politics and Justice in the Global Economy

James W. Skillen

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), and the [International Relations Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Skillen, James W. (1982) "Who is My Neighbor? Politics and Justice in the Global Economy," *Pro Rege*: Vol. 10: No. 4, 17 - 25.

Available at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol10/iss4/4

This Feature Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at Digital Collections @ Dordt. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pro Rege by an authorized administrator of Digital Collections @ Dordt. For more information, please contact ingrid.mulder@dordt.edu.

Who is My Neighbor? Politics and Justice in the Global Economy

James Skillen
Adjunct Professor of Political Science
and Executive Director of the
Association for Public Justice



Dr. James Skillen became a member of Dordt's faculty in 1978, having taught previously at Messiah College and Gordon College. Dr. Skillen received his Ph.D. in political science from Duke University. Since 1979 he has also served as a member of the Dordt College Studies Institute. He is now taking up new duties as the full-time Executive Director of the Association for Public Justice in Washington, D.C.

To speak of the "North-South" dialogue or relationship is to speak of something with much less identity in people's minds than the East-West relationship. At least that is true of North Americans. Whatever the "North-South dialogue" refers to, it certainly seems rather distant to most of us—something of secondary importance on the world scene.

Increasingly, however, I am impressed with a similarity between the global North-South situation and an earlier North-South relationship that is much more familiar to us—the one between northern and southern states in the U.S. in the first half of the nineteenth century. I'm thinking here not of comparable conditions of the economies, but of the fact that most Northerners and Southerners in the U.S. probably did not know enough about the circumstances that

would lead to the stormy conflict in the decades ahead. Only gradually did the tensions mount, and finally it was too late to settle the serious problems without war.

Now I am not predicting war in the near future between the global "North" and "South." What I'm trying to suggest is that the problems represented in the North-South relationship are of such a serious nature and are so little appreciated by most of us, that we had better begin to understand and address them or we should not be surprised to find ourselves overwhelmed by them in the decades ahead. I am not talking about North-South problems isolated from East-West or other global problems, for all of them are quite closely intertwined. But while we concentrate on certain dimensions of the East-West relationship, we may fail to see the

presence of a growing North-South conflict.

For those who have not been initiated into the shorthand symbolic language being used here, the "North-South" relationship or dialogue refers both to a general global relationship of rich (or "developed") countries and poor (or "underdeveloped") countries as well as to a specific set of negotiating sessions that have occurred between North and South with regard to possible changes in the structure of the international economic order. The geographical references are quite inexact, but the rich countries are generally situated North of almost all the poor countries, thus the symbolic expression.

Earlier this year the United States decided not to participate in further *multilateral* talks (talks among many countries at the same time) toward the restructuring of the international economic order. In October, 1981, in Cancun, Mexico, President Reagan had suggested that his administration did not look favorably on multilateral negotiations, but he agreed that U.S. representatives would at least begin to participate in them. By February of this year, however, the U.S. was dropping out. As one reporter put it:

The US and to a lesser extent its industrial partners (Japan, Canada, France, Britain, and West Germany) want to protect the integrity of such specialized agencies as General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, where they are in a controlling position. They want to make sure their policies will not be determined by a UN conference where they would be hopelessly outvoted.¹

But in addition to the general attitude of protectionism on the part of the North, the Reagan administration "believes that the developing nations should mostly learn how to help themselves and pull themselves up by their bootstraps."²

Other participants in the dialogue from both North and South believe that such an

approach on the part of the wealthy North is a mistake. One European ambassador argues that the South cannot simply be put aside to fend for itself. "The growing imbalance between the wealth of a few countries and the poverty, the lack of infrastructure, of food, of education of much of the third world is a time bomb."³

Is the North-South relation a "time bomb" or a secondary issue to be left alone for a while? If it is a time bomb, why do many of us not recognize it as such? If it is of minor importance, what is all the talk about? Why does the North-South relation seem so far off for most of us, and what are the problems involved? Let me mention just four factors at this point.

1.) First, the North, and perhaps especially the western North, has not yet adjusted to the fact that about 100 new states have entered "our world" since World War II. The world most of us still live in, consciously, is the world defined by a North Atlantic economic and political reality facing a threatening ideological and military enemy farther "East." The crisis in Poland not only stirs us easily, but we can "place" Poland in the context of that northern framework of West-East problems. We even think we know who the enemy is in that situation. But even though we were involved for a decade in Southeast Asia, most of us still can't comprehend what the problems were there or what mistakes we made. After 1973, news about Vietnam and Cambodia has been limited and discussed very little among us. Few of us can name many of the African states, or if we can, we would probably have difficulty identifying the former British and the former French colonies, or knowing which of the tribal groups are divided among how many of the new states.

That world of the South is largely out of sight for most of us unless a major disaster or war occurs. "Our world" is still the world of western explorers "opening up" China, or going to the "heart of Africa," or inspiring the "independence" movements in Latin America. Western colonies around the world

could fit into that "small" world of ours, but 150 independent states can hardly be grasped in such a picture. Even a "world war" can be understood if we view it from the standpoint of our "North Atlantic" interests. But the fact that the world has a different appearance from the viewpoint of newly independent Zimbabweans, or from the viewpoint of newly self-governing Nicaraguans, is a fact at the periphery of our world, or so it seems. A global village that is no longer directed from London and Paris, or from London, Paris, and Washington is a globe that is still unfamiliar to us.

2.) In the second place, the ruling assumptions in the North about global development have not yet been adjusted to fit the population explosion and the finitude of resources available to that population. Oh, yes, I know, we have all heard plenty about the growing world population, and we have become familiar with OPEC and its role in the energy crisis. But I'm not talking about a mere acquaintance with new "furniture" in the world; I'm referring to a real adjustment to the circumstances of that world. Sticking to the "furniture" analogy, I'm referring to a family's understanding of its home after it has been using the new sofa for a year and has finally found the right place for it in the living room, or its adjustment to the new fuel-efficient car after a year of withdrawal from the larger, more comfortable gas-guzzler. Thus far in the new world, the North has only begun to make minor pragmatic adjustments to OPEC and to others who put pressure on it. But by and large the North is still making those minor adjustments with the hope that it can soon return to another, earlier, more wide-open world of technological expansion and resource development that will allow as much consumption and national independence as anyone wants.

3.) The third factor in our perception of the world that keeps the North-South problems at a distance is a product of the first two. For most of us in the North, the South comes into view only as places and peoples who are

either a threat to us or who are undergoing crises of their own. Saharan Africa never enters our consciousness until we hear about a tremendous famine there. Iran or Nigeria represents nothing in our daily experience until we hear of a revolution that encompasses our embassy or a civil war that pits tribe against tribe. Few Americans are directly involved, it seems, so the problems must be unrelated to our world and our responsibilities.

But the natural consequence of this attitude is our inability to grasp the anti-Americanism that overflows from Iran or Nicaragua or elsewhere in the "Third World." Those countries and peoples, we imagine, should be happy to be entering "our world" where freedom and prosperity might someday come their way. If they could only appreciate the meaning of "our world" from "our" point of view, then they would not so easily be duped by communist propaganda. And if something like communism seems to be influential here or there in the South, it only proves that the Soviet Union is successfully hoodwinking unsuspecting people. In other words, our thinking process only brings us back to the world as *we* see it from an old North Atlantic viewpoint where the world can be saved by us and our methods and institutions if we can just stay ahead of the enemy of the East. We know as little about the Middle East or Africa or Latin America after hearing about the famine, or war, or government coup as we did before that "crisis" was drawn to our attention.

4.) Fourth, and finally, most of us find it hard to think about or to comprehend the *structures* of the international economic and political order. This is due in part to our American experience based largely on conservative/liberal assumptions about society. Structures in the forms of economic and political rules or institutions do not figure very prominently in our daily thinking. We believe that government should do a minimum job of allowing the free exchange of goods and information among citizens. In

our homes or jobs or businesses we quickly adjust to the rules by which we play the game, and then go on to "do our thing." The global village, for most of us, is just an open field of interacting states and peoples who are arranging airline schedules, making a few commercial deals here and there, organizing conferences, and doing all kinds of other things they choose to do. We assume, of course, that some health codes may be important and that somehow exchange rates for different monies have to be worked out. But the meaning and authority of the World Health Organization or the power and rights of major Banks have little place in our consciousness.

The global village, for most of us, is just an open field of interacting states and peoples who are arranging airline schedules, making a few commercial deals here and there, organizing conferences, and doing all kinds of other things they choose to do.

But if we step back for a moment to look at the rules that structure the world economy—the rules that are being debated in the U.N., in the conference on the international law of the sea, in the World Bank, and in countless other low and high places—we can see many aspects of those rules and structures that are unjust from a global viewpoint.

You might object, immediately, that there is no way to talk about justice on a global scale. Other countries won't look out for us, so how does one imagine that we can look out for them. Since there is no world government (and God forbid that such an institution should ever arise), it is not possible to act on the assumption that global justice can be achieved. Realism requires self-interested toughness.

The objection about the "how" of global justice is important, but it sidesteps the point I'm driving at. The point is not *how* can we

achieve global justice, but rather, is it possible to gain some clarity from a transnational perspective on what justice demands of us. And if Christians can't ask this question, then nobody can. If Christians, who confess the Lordship of Christ over the whole world, who read of God's demands for justice among all peoples, can't ask about the meaning of global justice, then there is little point in going on to ask about peace or prosperity or anything else in the world.⁴

In order to try to bring the North-South relationship a little closer to home, and in order to clarify one or two of the points I want to emphasize, I would like to tell a short story which is, as far as I know, entirely hypothetical.

A young couple has its first child who displays musical genius at a very early age. Before she reaches the age of five, there is no longer any doubt; she is a genius. A second child, a son, is born and joins the happy family, but before too long one can see that the sense of responsibility for the first child overshadows the parents' care for the second child. Musical training for the daughter begins close to home, but eventually the parents are driven to ever-increasing expense and ever-increasing distances, to keep up with their daughter's development.

Everything is gradual in this case. No sudden, earthshaking event occurs. But with each passing month, the parents make one crucial decision after another about the investment of their time and income. With increasing difficulty, and often with a sense of tension, they find themselves doing everything possible for the musical advancement of their daughter. They buy no new clothing for themselves or their son; they reduce food intake at home; they put off entirely all improvements for the upkeep of their house. With each step taken, it is harder to think of turning back and going in a different direction. Rationalizations about future rewards from the daughter's successful career that can help to feed and clothe the rest of the family provide the rationale to continue along the route now chosen.

Eventually the parents become so weak and unkempt that they are unable to follow the older child on her concert tours and travels for further study. One day, in fact, the son dies from complications due to malnutrition. The financial rewards that still might come in from the daughter's success did not arrive soon enough. A musical genius has been sent on her way, but the family has disintegrated.

Now, what would you say about such a family? I hope you can see the ambiguity of the situation. The broken and distorted family is a tragedy, to be sure, but isn't the courage and dedication of those parents remarkable? Something precious has been lost, but hasn't something priceless been brought to light? After all, is genius and creativity ever developed without tremendous sacrifice?

The story, I hope, will shed some light on this matter of a North-South relationship. Different regions of the world are like different children in a family. Different talents and creative achievements come to light in different places and at different times. The momentum of industrial development seems to progress at its own pace. The inner momentum of one industry or another, one art form or another, can be almost autonomous. Each step of musical progress, just as each new technological discovery, should lead to the next step. That is not unnatural or unjust in itself.

The most natural development in the production of deodorant, for example, is to keep working to produce a better, cheaper, fresher, more powerful product even if dozens of brands already exist. The chemists are already on the payroll; the capital is already invested; the advertising momentum is already rolling. A deodorant factory cannot be redirected overnight into the production of clothing or food or fertilizer.

But at the same time, we know that this world is not just an odd collection of autonomous talents and discoveries, each with its own momentum, subject to nothing but its own will and progressive drive. God

created us with many talents to be developed for His glory and for our fulfillment. Any particular talent, or institution, or community, or region of the world is only one part of creation's fullness; it is only one dimension of human responsibility before the face of God. And it is improper, unjust, and illegitimate to absolutize one talent or one kind of human institution to the point where it distorts or destroys the fullness of life. A child's musical genius is beautiful, and it should be developed. But musical genius of a child does not exist in a vacuum. It exists in a particular child in a particular family at a particular time in history. Parents of such a child are responsible for more than the musical talents of one child. They are responsible for the loving community of all family members—physical, psychological, social, musical, and the rest. A family, we would say, simply cannot be reduced to the musical development of one of its members.

The same can be said, it seems to me, about global development. It is illegitimate for us to try to look at the world only from the viewpoint of its potential industrial development, or chiefly from the viewpoint of its potential democratic or socialistic maturation. The world is not just an economy or a set of political arrangements and conflicts. It is wrong to think about the world by rationalizing the future in terms of some progress that might emerge from one or another of its present components. It is unjust to argue that eventually some of the wealth from the North will trickle down to the South and that then those countries can live as we live. It is unjust to rationalize that the military security of the United States is the preeminent issue of global security, and that from that center point all other benefits to the world will trickle down. All of these rationalizations (and many more) start with an approval of some region or aspect of global life as it now exists (even if it is structured unjustly) and then move to an idea of development and change which "wishes" or "hopes" for improvement in others by means of the inner momentum of the region or

aspect under question.

What do we see in the global village today? Do we see a healthy, multifaceted family growing in many interrelated directions at once with each member a participant in the justice of the whole? No, we see the inner dynamic of scientific, technological, and other achievements unfolding in some sectors of life in some societies to a very high degree—microchip computers, space shots, genetic engineering, and more. Yet at the same time, we see millions of people dying from malnutrition, millions of illiterate, homeless, jobless, people who have little hope for the development of their lives and talents. Whether or not we can see it—we who have relatively well-developed lives—there is something radically wrong and unjust about such a world. There is something awfully strange about a culture that produces dozens of varieties of deodorants, with billions of dollars invested in deodorant production, while millions of people are dying from hunger, loneliness, joblessness, and illiteracy. Whether or not we can figure out *what* to do about this predicament, anyone who cannot see the injustice of it is blind or hard of heart.

Take the simple case of U.S. participation in the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), one of the most popular recent efforts at global cooperation to combat hunger in the poorest countries. The western OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) in which the U.S. participates, contributed happily to IFAD especially after it saw OPEC begin to support it. The U.S. participated cooperatively for more than four years. But earlier this year the U.S. began to complain that it could not contribute as much as promised, and asked that IFAD cut back its staff while demanding more funding from OPEC.

Both Congress and the Reagan administration can be faulted. But the action can only lead others to conclude that this is one more instance of U.S. distrust of, or lack of interest in, international organizations

and its short-range preoccupation with its own economy. At the very time when the U.S. reduced its pledge from \$200 million to \$180 million, OPEC was increasing its pledge from \$443 million to \$450 million. Is the U.S. responding justly in this situation? Is this an instance of wise and just balancing of global care for the world's hungry, or is it a manifestation of U.S. unwillingness to promote a more just international framework of cooperation?

Or take the more complex problem of Third World development. In a recent paper on the problem of development in the Caribbean, Theodore Malloch gives an example of the bind in which small countries and former colonies find themselves. Roughly 70 percent of the products in the Caribbean region are exported. Multinational companies are the primary agents of trade, many putting their money into short-term projects with high economic gains. The Caribbean plantation economy has not changed much since the days of sugar; most of today's raw materials and semi-processed goods are exported to the industrialized consumers of the North.

According to Malloch, an export-oriented agricultural economy means that the best agricultural land is given over to "cash crop" production (sugar cane, bananas, coffee, citrus). Basic domestic food needs are then met, in large part, by high-cost imports. The negative cycle continues with further indebtedness, over-exploitation of the soil and forests, higher unemployment, greater poverty, growth of crime, and so forth.

Puerto Rico brings the Caribbean closer to us than we might wish. In a recent article, Anthony Stevens-Arroyo points to signs that "the island is on the brink of total collapse," with unemployment above 50 percent, housing problems mounting, and both crime and police brutality increasing. Stevens-Arroyo quotes a Puerto Rican University professor: "There is no Puerto Rican economy any longer. The island government simply has no way to control the exchange of goods and labor."⁶

Please understand that I am not trying to idealize another world. I am not asking you to forget the reality before us, or to pick on the rich countries simply for being rich. What I'm trying to do is to direct our thinking toward a normative point of departure. The great treasure that Christians can carry into this area of international relations is the treasure of God's revelation which calls for justice to be done to every neighbor as an expression of the lordship of Jesus Christ who is not a family deity or a national god or an avenger of natural fates, but the Lord of the whole world—the one who allows us to step up to His view of the world. And His viewpoint transcends all one-dimensional angles of vision, all regional or national parochialisms. Christians can and must ask what justice demands of us in response to contemporary global injustice. Only by asking the normative question, by which we can get directional clarity, will we be able to ask the "how to" questions.

Bob Goudzwaard, a Dutch economist, has contributed considerably to my understanding of a normative approach in international politics and economics. "From the perspective of the Christian conviction," Goudzwaard argues, "this world, as created world, is intended for listening to norms as the core of its responsibility."⁷

Only in and through the response of justice, of love for the neighbor, of caring for nature entrusted to us does this created world reach its destination. When these norms are negated—which means that power, technology, prosperity do not "open up" to the service of God and the fellow man, but are given an independent existence as supposedly meaningful in themselves—this created world is bound to react adversely. Societal-distorting phenomena, such as the pollution of the environment, malnutrition, loneliness, and long-term unemployment, ought therefore not to be interpreted in terms of fate that has struck, but

in terms of failing human responsibility. They are signs on the walls of this creation that we ourselves have been weighed in the balances and found wanting. That implies at the same time the possibility of an appeal to ourselves and others. There are norms, and they are valid for everyone—for all men and for all cultures and societies. "Culture is response". . . . The awareness of evil in the world can be misshapen and distorted, but where it exists it points to the validity of norms which cannot and may not with impunity be transgressed, for people and their societies.⁸

Goudzwaard tries to show in his writings that good economics should mean good stewardship of people and resources, not a narrow, short-term efficiency that makes a profit now but leads to costly distortions later. And at the very least, stewardship means conservation, avoidance of waste, and urgency.

Conservation—the care for this creation and its fruit-bearing potential for this and for future generations. The "robbing" of a world, its total exploitation for one's own good, clashes with the norm of stewardship.

Avoidance of waste—the avoidance of the senseless loss of possibilities for use. This normative element is misused by making it independent and reducing it to (mere) monetary "efficiency," but at its core it remains a legitimate element of our economic mandate. Whatever is of value or has been obtained by labor may not be lost by spendthrift recklessness or lack of insight.

Urgency—giving preference to those forms of use which are the most urgent in the totality of the fulfillment of man's challenge. Here ideology has

also had its influence: Western individualism speaks of the order of priority, of human needs as a purely individual concern, in which everyone autonomously or sovereignly may go to work for himself. But this is a dangerous bypassing of the recognition that the fruits of the world, God's creation, are intended for *all* mankind (Calvin); man as steward is here replaced by "man as owner."⁹

The point of my earlier story about the musically gifted child was not simply to point to the communal character of human responsibility, it was also to point to the need for a comprehension of *public justice* whether at the state level or at the international level. It is not enough to ask the farmer, merchant, and family to be good stewards of the resources and persons closest to them; we must also ask about the justice of the whole. How can music, education, farming, deodorant production, and every other kind of human enterprise unfold in such a way that wise conservation and avoidance of waste is joined with urgency?

This is where I am convinced the unique purpose of governments, international governmental organizations, international law, and other public legal entities, shows itself. That purpose is to see that *justice* is done to every human talent and need, and since so much of what is needed in the global community cannot be dealt with justly by isolated, autonomous, self-interested states, justice increasingly demands international legal responsibility. As regards the role of the state in the international economic order, Goudzwaard says, "it is best to speak of a duty to act in accordance with the norm of *public justice*. . . ."¹⁰ Such a duty may directly induce the state to participate in international agreements and to build international and supranational institutions.

After all, it is clearly observable that precisely in the area of international economic relations there are large gaps

in the formation and administration of justice. Whereas within the Western national states the expansion urge of big corporations has in the course of years been curtailed and limited and given a place within a balanced whole of social legislation, environmental legislation, the right of competition, and the like, outside the national territory the right of the strongest is still often determinative. . . . In important respects, the market economy of the 19th century is still dominant in the world economy of the 20th century. It is precisely for the countries of the Third World that this is the most damaging to both culture and nature."¹¹

Justice does not mean allowing the underdogs to try to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps if they can. It means seeking a structure, internationally, where genuine responsibility can unfold in all parts of the world.

Justice does not mean allowing the underdogs to try to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps if they can. It means seeking a structure, internationally, where genuine responsibility can unfold in all parts of the world. Justice, in the Bible, is not simply relief of the oppressed, but reconciliation that allows the poor or even the prisoner to build a new life. "Justice implies that the other (human being, nation) is restored to *his* rightful place to resume and independently fulfill again his own calling."¹²

As Goudzwaard puts it:

Justice in the Biblical sense is not in the first place a choice for or against cer-

tain forms of possessions, but it concerns whether the available property is open or closed to the other. Justice in ancient Israel demanded of every farmer that he would not harvest his entire land, but leave something for all who would pass by, and also that he would deposit in the gate one-tenth of his yield for those who might need it.¹³

Certain kinds of development aid from the North to the South might indeed be unhelpful and unjust in the long run. I am not calling simply for more handouts and redistribution that only create further dependencies. But justice demands something in the relation between rich and poor countries that concerns more than relief aid and handouts. Not only do the rich countries typically look to the needs of their own citizens first, but the kind of aid they give frequently, if not usually, is designed with their own development interests in mind rather than the real development needs of the poor countries. And although the rich countries of the North (both East and West) do not want the countries of the South to place any demands on their possessions, they do want to exercise claims, sometimes exclusive claims, to the raw materials outside their borders in the heart of those countries with the greatest needs of their own.¹⁴

Who is my neighbor? Anyone who is in need. Who are the neighbors of countries such as the U.S. and Canada? Countries of the South as well as those of the North. There will be no short-term, easy solution to the injustices of the present global economy. And the U.S. is not solely to blame for global injustice. Multilateral repentance is required just as much as multilateral redressing of grievances. Christians have one of the greatest challenges before them that they have ever faced. While not ignoring the evils of communism, militarism, fascism, and nationalism coming from sources all over the world, and without disowning or merely criticizing their own states,

Christians at this point in history will be distinguished, if at all, by the degree and extent of their efforts to show that they serve the King of all kingdoms, the Lord of global justice, and not homemade gods attached to this nation or that, to this ideology or that—gods who will suffer the same fate as all other idols human beings have constructed, the fate of destruction at the hands of the living Lord, Jesus Christ.

Notes

¹Louis Wiznitzer, *Christian Science Monitor* (February 5, 1982).

²Wiznitzer.

³Wiznitzer. See my editorial on the North-South Dialogue in *The Public Justice Report* (November, 1981).

⁴For more on the general background of a Christian approach, see my *International Politics and the Demand for Global Justice* (Sioux Center, IA: The Dordt College Press, 1981).

⁵See the report on the IFAD by Richard M. Harley, *Christian Science Monitor* (January 26, 1982).

⁶Anthony Stevens—Arroyo, "Will Puerto Rico Become a Caribbean Version of Poland?" *Des Moines Register* (January 28, 1982). For a broad assessment of economic development in the West, see Bob Goudzwaard, *Capitalism and Progress: A Diagnosis of Western Society* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1979).

⁷Bob Goudzwaard (with John van Baars), "Norms for the International Economic Order," in *Justice in the International Economic Order*, Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Reformed Institutions for Christian Higher Education (Grand Rapids, MI: Calvin College, 1980), p. 231.

⁸Goudzwaard, p. 231.

⁹Goudzwaard, p. 233. Especially helpful along these lines are the essays in Goudzwaard's *Aid for the Overdeveloped West* (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1975).

¹⁰Goudzwaard, "Norms for the International Economic Order," p. 238.

¹¹Goudzwaard, "Norms for the International Economic Order," p. 238.

¹²Goudzwaard, "Norms for the International Economic Order," p. 235. An excellent exposition of some biblical passages on justice can be found in Sidney Rooy's "Righteousness and Justice," in *Justice in the International Economic Order*, pp. 1-16.

¹³Goudzwaard, "Norms for the International Economic Order," p. 235.

¹⁴Goudzwaard, "Norms for the International Economic Order," pp. 244ff.