

on foreign policy, to the people and the country because it is important that they should know what we are trying to do. We have more active debates on foreign policy in the House of Commons now than we used to have. There is a good deal more discussion of it. There is more information given and there is more advice received, and that is all to the good. Personally I have been criticized from both extremes, and no one should complain about that. I was criticized in a newspaper the other day for talking too much, and a few days later I read a newspaper which criticized me because I did not say enough about the principles underlying our foreign policy.

One of the difficulties that confronts a Foreign Minister in a democratic country these days is that so much of diplomacy is now conducted in public; so much of it is now conducted by the political representatives of the government instead of the professional diplomatic representative, as used to be the case fifty or one hundred years ago. While I believe in the maximum amount of information in diplomacy for those who are bound to feel the results of failure or success in diplomacy, and while I think the people of a democratic country should know all about the principles and policies under which their government are operating in this field, I still believe, probably more so now than when I first took on this job, that very often the most constructive negotiations could be done better in private than in public.

I think the people should know all about our policies and principles, but I must say that I get a little worried at times about the modern tendency actually to negotiate difficult and complicated problems between states in public. We get some very dramatic examples of the value, if you like, but also of the weaknesses of that kind of diplomacy at the United Nations. Too much of the time diplomatic negotiations in the United Nations resemble working in a goldfish bowl with a microphone and a television camera in the middle of it. Very often diplomacy in camera is more successful than diplomacy before the camera! However, I do not suppose we can do very much about that, about returning to the old state of affairs when things were done quietly. As I get older in this game, however, I must say I appreciate more and more the value of diplomacy by quiet negotiation between experts in contrast to diplomacy by noisy discussion between politicians.

Lord Strang, this is the man I quoted a few moments ago, had something to say about this in the same book. He said -- and he was a professional diplomat -- that those of us who have spent a good part of our lives drafting instructions for ambassadors know how severe a test of policy that is. It is small wonder then that in the climate of today, a minister may sometimes be tempted to take an easier way - to jump into an aircraft with only a general idea of his policy, with no precisely defined formulation of it, and go and talk around a table with his opposite number in the hope that by a kind of joint improvisation something useful may come out of the meeting. The temptation is