

of authority, as well as attitudes, quirks and foibles. The Division made a good try at reconciling the Department to the unfamiliar C.I.S. animal with which it had been placed in harness. This was an uphill and not quite successful effort. Departmental officers were concerned at the broad-brush approach taken by C.I.S. in writing material on foreign policy questions--and with considerable justice--because C.I.S. writers were not foreign policy specialists and not sufficiently nuancé to do justice to this subject. C.I.S. prose, also, was not greatly admired by the Department as it tended to be journalistic and jaunty rather than academic and delicately balanced as was departmental style of that day (i.e., before general use of the telex for communication had diminished the departmental capacity for "literary" writing). Moreover, the C.I.S. people had come from a different sort of professional background and experience from that of most officers of the growing Department of External Affairs. If, on the one hand, departmental officers tended to be haughty, C.I.S. officers were apt to be contemptuous of what they considered wilful ignorance and unwillingness in the Department to learn about the functions, purposes and modes of public communication. However, above and beyond these reciprocally negative attitudes, there was a more fundamental problem which could not be blinked, and that was the question of authority, of responsibility