

division constitutes a new and terrifying, and sometimes seemingly impossible, chasm for traditional diplomatic procedures to bridge. This difficulty with which diplomacy is now faced has been well expressed at the beginning of chapter seven of Henry Kissinger's "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy" published in 1957, which has stimulated a great deal of new thinking, and has, therefore, and naturally, aroused also a great deal of controversy. Mr. Kissinger writes:

"It may seem like a paradox to ask diplomacy that it rescue mankind from the horrors of a thermonuclear holocaust by devising a framework of war limitation. How can there be an agreement on the limitation of war when all negotiations with the Kremlin have proved that the two sides have rarely been able to agree even on what constitutes a reasonable demand?"

A little later in his book, Mr. Kissinger points out that no state is prepared to negotiate about its own survival, and that no nation is prepared to abandon safeguards which it considers essential to its own survival, merely for the sake of maintaining an uneasy harmony in international affairs.

To quote further from another of my principal authorities (I am now, of course, referring to a statement I myself made during the disarmament debate at the United Nations a year ago):

".... our debate in this Assembly is not merely about disarmament, but about human survival. We have yet to prove that we are capable of the radical adjustment in our thinking which the modern age demands. We are still using the outworn vocabulary of international rivalry in the age of intercontinental missiles and the beginning of venture into outer space."

I have attempted to illustrate the sweeping changes which have taken place in the climate which colours contemporary international relations. I have also mentioned the fact that these changes, because they affect the assumptions on which a foreign policy is based, have necessitated some far-reaching revisions in the classical conceptions of diplomatic procedure. Nowhere are these specific changes more evident than in the position and functions of ambassadors, the professional practitioners of the diplomatic craft.

In the halcyon days of diplomacy, before the advent of the vast changes which I have described, an Ambassador abroad was entrusted with what seems to us now an extraordinary freedom of action and power of negotiation. His reports or requests for instructions to his Foreign Office at home were thoughtfully drafted and beautifully written in the sure knowledge that he would receive no reply, if he ever did get one, for many weeks to come. Nowadays, of course, this has