

Before embarking on a study of possible changes in diplomatic practice and organization, it would appear desirable to take a brief look at some of the symptoms of change in the international environment. Our task is going to be more difficult if, as suggested above, the course of history is moving out of a period of transition and into an essentially new and different phase. Without attempting to forecast the shape of things to come, we may nevertheless try to indicate some of the differentiating features which separate the new period from the old and show how some of the primary concerns of the future are likely to differ from those which occupied our attention in the not very distant past.

To begin with the framework or terms of reference through which we consider our international relations are in process of change. One reason is that whereas modern history was essentially European history or history seen from a European perspective, contemporary history is essentially world history. It has been suggested that more clues to the future may be found in Nkrumah's autobiography than in Eden's memoirs and more points of contact exist in the world of Mao and Nehru than in that of Coolidge and Baldwin. According to a significant body of opinion, an assessment or outlook which concentrates on the European predicament, while correct within its own limits, may be misleading in balance and perspective. The course of events in Europe itself may be understood differently when viewed against the world-wide process of change.*

* Barraclough writes: "The European conflicts of the first half of the 20th century were more than a continuation of earlier European conflicts. From the end of the 19th century Europe was involved simultaneously in the problems inherited from its own past and in a process of adoption to a new world situation, and both aspects of its history must be taken into account. It is easy to place disproportionate emphasis on the unsolved