

the resources of the professions to deal more effectively with larger and more complex problems for social purposes. There is no evidence to support the view that management and professional practice are necessarily mutually exclusive...

"... the challenge is clear and the stakes are high. Without some such fundamental and far-reaching effort, the public will not be as well served as it could be, the FSO corps will become a declining professional group, and the Department of State will come more and more to resemble the Ottoman Empire of the Federal Government."*

The advantages to be gained from holding Heads of Post responsible, as managers, for all operations in their country (or countries) of accreditation have been apparent for some time. In May 1961, President Kennedy wrote to all U.S. ambassadors and heads of mission giving them sweeping authority and responsibility for supervision:

"You are in charge of the entire United States Diplomatic Mission, and I shall expect you to supervise all of its operations. The Mission includes not only the personnel of the Department of State and the Foreign Service, but also the representatives of all other United States agencies..."**

According to McGeorge Bundy, Kennedy thereby deliberately sought to rub out the distinction between policy and operations, to reverse the "policy-operations dichotomy" in which a long line of Secretaries of State had sought refuge:

"Secretaries of State saw their main role as advising the President on foreign policy matters, and the career diplomats were concerned with the classic functions of diplomacy - observing, reporting, negotiating... though keeping the new functions at arm's length, State Department people thought

* The Professional Diplomat by John E. Harr, 1969, pp. 325-349

** The full text of Kennedy's letter is contained in The Professional Diplomat, pp. 356-360