

agreement never will be possible. The reaction to this may become, in its turn, unnecessarily despairing and pessimistic. Consequently, there is the strong temptation to conceal or deny the fact of disagreement or to concentrate on blaming the other person or persons for it. In this latter technique the Communists are past masters. Their participation at international conferences is, in fact, often for propaganda purposes only. Their tactics to this end are worked out long before the conference opens, and their exploitation of failure by attributing it to others, continues long after the conference ends.

One reason why there is a reluctance to revert more often to normal methods of diplomacy, using what we call "official channels" rather than political conferences, is that diplomacy as a profession still has a somewhat dubious reputation. This is a 'hang-over' from the days when professional diplomats were the agents of autocratic rulers, in carrying out policies that had little or nothing to do with the welfare of people, or little concern for their interests.

In its origin and in its practice until recent years diplomacy has tended to remain aloof and exclusive. Its spirit and its appeal has often been more dynastic than democratic.

With a faint aura of wickedness still about it, this calling is considered by many to be full of trickery and skull-duggery, practiced by sinister, if distinguished looking gentlemen, who have replaced the knee breeches of the 18th century by the striped pants of today.

This is, of course, unwarranted and unfair. No doubt it could be corrected if a good public relations firm was retained to convince the public that the striped pants are really overalls. Striped pants, in any event, are not a garment but a state of mind. That state of mind, I hope and believe, does not exist in the Canadian External Affairs Department or in its Foreign Service. Striped pants and bow ties do not go well together!

Unfortunately, also, the failures of diplomacy have often been charged with responsibility for resulting wars which men have had to fight long after the diplomat has asked for his passports. Diplomatic failures - as is the case with other failures - linger in memory and persist in history long after successes and achievements are forgotten.

In the past diplomacy has suffered from bad public relations - or - even worse, you will admit - from no public relations at all. It is important to alter this in the future because the public relations aspect of international politics, and hence diplomacy, is now so important as at times to be decisive. The main reason for this is, of course, the inescapable necessity, in a democracy of basing foreign policy, and its conduct, on public opinion, which is now determined by all, not merely a few of the citizens. It is essential, therefore, that public opinion should be kept fully and honestly informed; not, as I have argued, of every step in negotiation, but of every principle of policy, which is something different. Public opinion must, however, be convinced that, even if its representatives in