

In the U.S. diplomatic service, the very top posts have rarely, if ever, been held by career men. That, I think, is not good for the morale of the service. On the other hand, the British diplomatic service is sometimes criticized as too much of a closed corporation of officials recruited from a limited class of persons. I think that the Canadian service, even in its brief existence, has given evidence that it will avoid these extremes. This will mean rejecting the view, on the one hand, that a man who has successfully manufactured safety pins can be equally successful in conducting delicate and complicated negotiations between governments; and, on the other, avoiding the equally dangerous delusion that because a man has not passed a Foreign Office examination and learned how to sign his letters, "I have the honour to be, Sir, with all truth and respect, your Lordship's humble obedient servant", he is therefore not qualified to manage an Embassy.

In some ways diplomacy is now more difficult and complicated; in others, easier and simpler than it used to be. A hundred years ago, an Ambassador in some posts was three months away from his foreign office and often had to make his own decisions on the spot. If wrong he could be fired, but not for three months! A Lord Stratford de Redcliffe at Constantinople, for instance in the middle of the last century, practically determined what British policy towards Turkey would be and advised his government accordingly. In this mechanically marvelous age, however, an Ambassador is never more than a few minutes away from his instructions and his instructors. It can be argued that he is merely the other end of a telephone wire; that all he has to do is to read and deliver a message: act as a Western Union boy running telegrams between governments. Not so. Whereas government a hundred years ago was a simple, one-cylinder science, an affair between monarchs and a handful of rulers, where issues were few, and developments slow, now government has become a hideous, complicated, swiftly moving mechanism, delicately poised on the base of a public opinion which a thousand different forces are trying to shift every hour.

This means that the policy making agencies of government, the repositories of the people's power and the people's will, with a dozen major problems facing them every hour, can determine policy only in broad outline, and their servants, the officials, are left to fill in details within the policies laid down, as well as to execute the decisions reached.

This development is seen in diplomacy and foreign affairs, as in other forms of government. It leaves ample room for the exercise of discretion and judgment (at least in democracies). At home, it imposes on the permanent Foreign Office official the duty of giving advice on a variety of difficult, complicated matters that affect the relations between governments. At the diplomatic mission abroad, there is the duty of interpreting and carrying out the instructions which in these busy days, have often, unavoidably, been decided and drafted in a hurry.

There are, of course, tricks to be learned in executing your instructions so that you may get the maximum result with the minimum of effort. I have been stationed both in London and in Washington, and a Canadian diplomat can attend no better school than our offices in those capitals. I must not give away trade secrets, but I hope I will not be misunderstood if I say that the methods which may be successful in Whitehall do not always work so well on Pennsylvania Avenue. The appeal to the mind, after a good luncheon at the Athenaeum Club, often makes the maximum impression in London where they have been exposed to the wiles of diplomats for a long time. In Washington, an appeal to the heart of an American official, after watching, together, a ball game, won by the home team, is sometimes effective in removing an obstacle to agreement. Not that the British are hard-hearted and the Americans soft-