

## Editorial

This is the last number of the *Review* to be published under my editorship and by Butterworths. The January number will appear under Richard Little's editorship and with Cambridge University Press. I wish Dr Little well for his term as editor and hope and expect that he too will benefit as I have from the support of the Editorial Committee, the officers of the Association, the executive and the membership. The sometimes tiresome task of refereeing articles for the *Review* has been undertaken with considerable constructiveness and patience by a large proportion of the members of the Association.

In this number I have taken advantage of the anniversary year 1989 to commission three articles on the significance and endurance of three great years for our subject, 1789, 1919 and 1939; and each of our authors finds a liberal landmark in them. James Mayall writes about the uniqueness of the French Revolution as the birthplace of modernity and as something which has both shaped and been accommodated by international relations ever since. Christopher Seton-Watson shows how the settlement of 1919 is not only still with us, but also only now beginning to yield its fruit in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union itself. And Christopher Hill shows how 1939 foreshadowed the continuation of the liberal dispensation in world politics and not merely the rediscovery of Realism which our subject made with such zest after the Second World War.

These commissioned articles, and the Special Issue on the Balance of Power which appeared in April with Moorhead Wright as guest editor, are not part of the normal service the *Review* seeks to give and which is represented by the rest of the articles in this number. The normal service derives from the vision of the journal I received from the founding editor, Jack Spence, and his successor, Roy E. Jones, and it is this that I have sought to consolidate, namely, a review of international studies, seeking to carry forward the debate about International Relations, to be sure, but having a wider concern with the whole field of international studies from international law to international history. It is a constant challenge to keep alive this general view of our subject matter, and it is one that I am sure Richard Little will take up with his characteristic enthusiasm and eclecticism.

R. J. VINCENT