are few groups within the United Nations which are less united and disciplined. The lack of cohesion in the group is a fact which should dispel some of the exaggerated fears of the Europeans.

The patterns within the group continue to shift, and often in the right direction. Provided groups do not become hard and inflexible blocs they can be a good thing rather than a bad thing for an Assembly which faces, perhaps a greater threat from anarchy than from bloc voting.

The aim of the West, therefore, should be not to oppose the development of an African-Asian group, with results that would certainly be negative, but to show a friendly interest in its workings and maintain the most co-operative relations possible with its members, very very few of whom want to team up with the Communists against the West; at the United Nations or elsewhere.

These African-Asian Governments, let us not forget, represent one of the most important forces of today; the surge of awakening millions of a long submerged world to political freedom, with a passionate determination to secure a better life than they have known in the past. Their emergence on the world scene, it is true, presents us with new problems. But these are the product of inevitable historical processes, not of the United Nations: The United Nations provides, in fact, a framework within which this evolution of international society which is going on can take place with the most peace and the least pain. Mankind marches on and we of the West must march with it, while trying to play our part in directing the march to a good goal. If we do not, there will be far more trouble even than we have today.

FRAMEWORK FOR DIPLOMACY

The detractors of the United Nations, ignoring realities, see it merely as some extra-plan tary body with a life of its own, independent of national states, but with a tendency to interfere with relations between those states and as a body over which right-thinking nations who should continue to run the world have no influence at all. That, as I have tried to point out, is not an accurate picture.

Some supporters of the United Nations, on the other hand, tend to regard it as a body on which they can cast their burdens and thereby simplify - and even evade - problems of national policy and national responsibilities. This can do the United Nations as much harm, perhaps, as open opposition to it. The United Nations is no substitute for wise national policies, and it is wrong and even dangerous to give the impression that it is. But it can and should supplement those policies by providing an international framework within which we can pursue an active and realistic diplomacy for the solution of problems.