

areas" are then said to be concerned with internal government structure and process. With the exception of very specific and directed thrusts, it therefore seems to us virtually impossible to address directly the consequences of Departmental activities in society at large. Accordingly it is not surprising that the most useful areas for evaluative work are seen to lie, generally, within the governmental sphere of activity.

- B. Foreign policy, when considered for evaluation purposes (from an internal government perspective), appears to exist on two planes; the very general and the very specific, with not too much of use in between. On the general plane, issues have proved too nebulous and complex to come to grips with; on the specific plane, issues become so specific as to take on the dimensions of individual projects (an internal audit concern).
- C. Much descriptive material concerning foreign policy activities is in current circulation, to which stockpile the Team has now made its own contribution. What is missing, (with respect to the gap between the general and the specific referred to in para. 2 above) is an explanation of these activities in terms useful to evaluation and other management endeavours. Are there patterns or regularities in foreign policy practice that might prove useful in understanding the discipline? Can it be explained to practitioners and outsiders alike in terms of general principle, or will we be obliged to rely on descriptions of events, procedures and structures? We predictably discovered no general principles or laws governing foreign policy practice, but we think it will be necessary to go beyond description alone, at some time or other, in order to address meaningfully the results of Departmental efforts. In this respect, the report sets out the Team's view concerning how foreign policy accomplishments might be approached in terms of basic causal connections between the various activities, their raisons d'être, and their end results.
- D. With respect to the consideration of the end results of the Department's activities, upper limits may be said to exist concerning:
  - (a) the Department's ability to develop and implement coherent foreign policy, and
  - (b) the degree to which it can be held accountable for the achievement of national foreign policy objectives.

Concerning the former, it seems evident that the Department cannot present a clearer picture of foreign policy than that which is held by the government of the day (however useful its advice may be at the margin). Concerning the latter, the Department exercises national prestige and influence, and contributes to their enhancement, but it does not possess these qualities in its own right.