

constraints so powerful that even the strongest of its member governments are required to yield. According to what James Eayrs has called the "paradox of power", it is the Great Powers which seem to be experiencing the greatest difficulty in achieving their respective national goals. Contests involving these powers, e.g. the U.S. and North Vietnam, USSR and Czechoslovakia, or USSR and China continue with results which are far from clear-cut. According to Eayrs, there are three likely reasons for this: the dread of the Great Powers of thermonuclear war; the fact that they are only free to engage in guerilla-type war, which for them is extremely frustrating^{*}; and the heightened constraint of public opinion, assisted by modern communications.^{**} In contrast to the Great Powers, the smaller countries have come into their own like never before, thereby enhancing the variety and complexity of international life. Especially in the UN General Assembly where "the mighty are put down from their seats and those of low degree exalted" the small states frequently have seen themselves as the custodians of international morality. Many significant initiatives have in fact originated with the smaller states. Moreover it is suggested that since they have few if any vested interests in the international system as it is, the smaller states continue to have a role to play as innovators.

^{*} Aurelio Peccei sees the "once triumphant, sharp logic of war (as) all but sealed in Vietnam.... to all practical ends, its objective - victory - is now foreclosed ... This is a total reversal of past situations, opening up unlimited perspectives, and bound to generate new trends in man's thinking, new approaches to the world's problems." The Chasm Ahead p.xv

^{**} Fate and Will in Foreign Policy by James Eayrs