Subject: "The Reorganization of the Department of State and the Consolidation of the Foreign Services of the other departments into that of the Department of State"

I had hardly been able to settle down to my duties in the Department when I was confronted with the problems of reorganization in the Department and the consolidation of the foreign services of the other departments of our Government which did work abroad into the Foreign Service. The Secretary and Under-Secretary Wells informed me of the necessity of my undertaking immediately a study of the Department in its order to determine what should be done in order to reorganize/services on a basis that these services could be, not only more effective for the conduct of the work and to meet the new conditions and work which the Department had been facing and would have to face, but also to permit the rapid expansion of various sections of the Department which might be necessary, not only with the increasing scope of our relationships but in case we might become involved in conflict. At the outset I should state that when we thought in terms of the possibility of future conflict, it was not, as some men have suggested, who have written on developing events in our own country in those days and in the Department, that we were of the opinion that that conflict was inevitable. The President and the Secretary, I would like to state most emphatically, while they were of the opinion that the way things had been developing in Europe and the way things had not been done, it was increasingly inevitable that war would come and that if it came that we would be involved. As wise and prudent men this was the only attitude which they could take. On the other hand, every action they took, and I can say this from first-hand knowledge during the three years that I was in the Department, they did everything that was humanly within their power in order to avoid this conflict. One of the most unjust things which I think has been said, particularly of President Roosevelt, is that he
deliberately shaped certain events in order to precipitate this conflict and to bring us in it. There is nothing further from the truth. The President and Secretary Hull were wise and prudent men. They were men of unusual vision. They were both realists while at the same time being idealists; they kept their feet on the ground.

We had the same problem in the Foreign Service, although in a different way, that we had in the Department of State. We had succeeded in building up, through the wise action of our Presidents in the more recent years and through the wise actions of our Secretaries of State, in building up a Foreign Service for which there was no equal in any other country. There is no doubt, I think, that for many years Great Britain had the most capable foreign service. The method of selection, however, of the officers for service abroad in the British Service was such that the field upon which they could draw for new blood was relatively limited. The British Foreign service instead of increasing in efficiency had been gradually decreasing in efficiency; ours had been steadily going forward, and at the time that I came to the Department we had, without any question, the best equipped foreign service of any government. The Department had been in the field in its embassies, legations, and consular establishments, upon whose loyalty, capacity, understanding, and industry it could depend.

With the growth, however, of our Nation and the increasing scope of our interest in what was happening in every part of the world, various departments of our Government had established foreign services of their own. There was, for example, the foreign service of the Department of Commerce. The increasing industrial development of our country had naturally made us more interested in foreign markets, and there had
been set up in the Department of Commerce a Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Our consular officers, ever since the beginning of the Foreign Service in the administration of President Washington, had been rendering reports on economic and financial and social conditions in the countries and places where they were stationed, just as they rendered political reports. The Department of Commerce, some years before, had come to the conclusion that it needed direct representatives of its own and through an act of Congress the so called Foreign Service of the Department of Commerce was established. These men were stationed in the embassies and legations abroad and were known as Commercial Attachés, Assistant Commercial Attachés, and by various other titles. They were not only stationed in our embassies and legations abroad but they were supposed to be under the direct control of the chief of the diplomatic mission, and to collaborate in the closest possible way with consular officers in the respective countries, and they had instructions not to duplicate each other's reporting and activities. As was inevitable, however, in such an organization, for any number of reasons frictions began to arise between the consular officers stationed in various countries and the commercial attachés and his assistants in the Capitol. There grew up not only great duplication in reporting on economic and commercial affairs and on financial matters, but there was a dual approach to the various governments in which these men were stationed. An officer of the State Department of the embassy staff or the legation staff would go to officers of the government to which accredited in order to discuss a certain matter; the commercial attaché quite independently might do the same thing. Commercial interests in the countries were just as much puzzled by this dual approach as were government officials. It
was causing increasing confusion and increasing harm to our interests. It was natural also that personal rivalries should develop which were completely unnecessary but in the nature of the organization were inevitable.

The Department of Agriculture also had an increasing interest in agricultural developments in other countries, and some time after the establishment of the Foreign Commerce Service, there was established by act of Congress the Foreign Agricultural Service, and agricultural attachés were attached to many of our embassies and legations abroad. These agricultural attachés, like the commerce attachés, were under the direct control and supervision of the chief of the diplomatic mission, and they were supposed to collaborate closely with the consular officers in the country and not to duplicate the activities and reporting. The duplication of activities and approach on the part of agricultural attachés was not as great as that which was caused by the presence of the commercial attachés, but this was due probably to the more limited field in which they operated. The dual approach to governments was equally undesirable and disadvantageous to the best conduct of our relations.

The Treasury Department had a number of Treasury Attachés in some of the leading capitals of the world. These had even more limited duties than the attachés of the Department of Commerce and of the Department of Agriculture. Their work was of a very specialized character and did not conflict with the work of the diplomatic missions and of the consular service.

There was, therefore, a double problem which confronted me. The President and the Secretary, Mr. Hull, gave me specific instructions to proceed with the study of the organization of the Department and they
gave me very general indications as to the character of the reorganiza-
tion; they gave me really only indications as to what they had in mind
was to be the purpose of the reorganization rather than any details.
As I had long been in the Foreign Service and as I had been one of those
foreign service officers who spent a good deal of time at home, not only
in the Department but in other departments of our Government/which I
remained in close touch as I found this necessary from for my work,
but I'd also been in touch with business, financial and agricultural
interests throughout our country. I, therefore, knew the broad outlines
of the problem. The President and the Secretary also indicated to me
that they wished me to go ahead with plans for the consolidation of the
foreign services of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Treasury
into that of the Department of State. The President indicated that
several reorganizations acts were to be submitted to the Congress affect­
ing various departments and activities of the Government. It was his
intention that this consolidation of the foreign services into one,
that is, that of the Department of State, should be brought about through
one of these reorganization acts and he preferred it to be, if possible,
in the first reorganization act to be submitted to the Congress.

I had to work on both these problems simultaneously but I shall
recount first what I did in the matter of the reorganization of the De-
partment of State.

It was obvious that that I would need to supervise the reorga-
nization of the Department of State a number of men who would be of real
help to me and who knew the work of the Department thoroughly as well
as the work of the field, the work of the Department and of the field
were so closely related to each. I found that the same people who could
work with me in the reorganization of the Department could also work
most effectively in the matter of the consolidation of the services. I began to look around the field and I wish here to pay a tribute to those who were the greatest assistance in carrying through this task and without whose assistance I would not have been able to carry it through. Charles Hosmer was an experienced foreign service officer who knew the Department and the field, and he was a man of great practical common sense and of good judgment. Fletcher Warren was a younger foreign service officer who had real knowledge of these administrative problems and had his feet always completely on the ground. I was fortunate at the time there was in the Department Nathaniel Davis, a most conscientious and capable foreign service officer. These men formed the intimate team who worked with me and who under my direction were able to do the ground work which was necessary. We made a complete study of the work of the Department and of the existing organization. We found that there were many changes which had to be made so far as the actual administrative set-up in the Department was concerned. I do not think this is the place to go into the details of this reorganization. It is sufficient to say that we had to eliminate many of the existing bureaus and sections of the Department and to create a number of new ones. We changed the administrative set-up in these divisions, old and new. We had to make many shifts of personnel. The basic idea that we had in mind was always that the work of the Department was increasing not only in scope but in volume, and that the new set-up would have to be such that it could be expanded as conditions required it. This reorganization within the Department did not require any legislative action. It was entirely an administrative and executive matter under existing law. The reorganization was gradually put into effect and the results thereof began to be felt not only the work of the Department
itself but in the relations of the Department with the field. Everything went smoother and as the increasing burden of work developed, it was found that very few new divisions, and we had foreseen most of them, had to be added and that the additional work could be taken care of through the expansion of the personnel in the existing new divisions. The reorganization, however, was probably the most thoroughgoing that the Department had undergone for many years; it was overdue for many years. Even at that, and that this reorganization was overdue for many years, the Department was probably the most efficiently functioning department in Washington at the time that this reorganization took place in 1937, 1938 and 1939. I do not make this statement with regard to the Department as my personal opinion but it was the consensus of opinion of those in Washington and in our country who at that time had to deal with the Federal Government. There has been so much unjustified criticism of the Department that I think it is quite desirable to emphasize that at the time that this reorganization was made in 1937 to 1939, inclusive, the Department already was really the best organized department of our Government in Washington and the most smoothly and efficiently working one.

One of the happiest features of the reorganization plan was that it was acceptable to the departamental staff. They appreciated the new working conditions; they found their tasks, although more responsible, in many respects being easier. For some reason which I cannot explain and which no one could ever explain to me, the Department personnel in Washington had not received much recognition in the way of salary increases during the years. Of all the departments of the Government in Washington it perhaps had had less attention in this respect than any other. There was a feeling in the Department personnel which
I found to be quite justified, that while very proper attention had been given to the increasing of the salaries and the bettering of the working conditions and the general situation of foreign service officers and personnel in the field, that they in the Department had been neglected. This was not only very unfair but it was bad for morale, and it was possible for us, in connection with the reorganization plan of the Department, to bring about promotions, increases in salary, transfers, and other administrative action which greatly benefited the morale of the Department personnel which, I should add, in so many respects was just as capable and just as efficient in its work at home in the Department as the foreign service personnel was in the field. This happily proved to be the beginning of more attention to departmental personnel in Washington, and in the following years it was a great pleasure for me to note that the Department personnel was getting increasing recognition of the situation. In the years that followed and even after I had retired, it was a source of great satisfaction when I came to the Department, to find so-called old timers greeting me with a smile wherever I went. Many of these people I did not know because the Department personnel, even when I was stationed there, was fairly large. It was a pleasant experience, even up to now it is a pleasant experience, when I visit the Department to find a familiar face approaching me and saying: "We shall never forget what you did for us when you were working here in the Department. It was the beginning of better times for all of us."

In this connection, while it is interesting to note that while a number of books have been written on the organization and the work of the Department of State, perhaps the best book which has been published so far is that of Graham H. Stuart. He is, I believe, still a professor at Stanford University. The book which he has written is entitled
\[\text{The Department of State, A History of its Organization, Procedure and Personnel}.\] It is an excellent book and anyone interested in this reorganization will find it adequately covered therein as well as reference to previous organizations of the Department.

Anyone who works hard and who really takes an interest in his work has a right to certain satisfactions. Sometimes these do not always come, but in connection with this reorganization of the Department of State, which was carried through during the period that I was Assistant Secretary, from 1938 to 1940, inclusive, I believe it will be found that those who have commented on the Department will say, or have said, that it was the most effective of the various reorganizations through which the Department has gone through during its long life. Since the reorganization just under reference was carried out, there have been many others and, in fact, too many. The more recent reorganizations have had the effect of complicating the situation rather than simplifying it. The reorganization of 1937 to 1940 is almost invariably referred to as the most effective one and the most practical one which had been carried through up to now in the history of the Department. It would not have been possible without the loyal, effective collaboration of the men whom I have mentioned in this memorandum and many others in the Department and in the Foreign Service. My part was to direct and lead.

The consolidation of the foreign services of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture and Treasury into the Foreign Service of the Department of State was a far more difficult problem. The reorganization of the Department of State had been an internal matter of the Department and, in what was done, those of us who were carrying it through had the wholehearted support of the President and of the Secretary
of State, and of the Under-Secretary. It was a difficult task but in no sense as difficult as that of the consolidation of these foreign services of other departments into that of State, as this involved other departments of our Government as well as interest outside of the Department. This consolidation had long been a dream of mine. I had realized that sound administrative practice and the best conduct, the most effective conduct, of our foreign relations required such consolidation and a singular approach to other governments. I had seen first-hand the duplication in Washington as well as in the field that came out of these different foreign services. I had seen the confusion that there was growing increasingly out of our approach on the same matter to other governments. It was really an imperative measure. The President and Secretary Hull were convinced that it was an imperative measure. The President told me at the outset that he was determined that it would be carried through. I told him how difficult it would be as I was sure that the Secretaries of Commerce, Agriculture and Treasury would be so definitely opposed to it. I told him that commercial and agricultural interests in the country in some cases would be opposed to it through a lack of understanding of the problem and how the dual approaches were injuring their interests rather than furthering them. The President said that it was up to me to make all these people involved understand the importance of the whole matter. He wished it to be done through the reorganization plan, either the first or second, so the time element was important and the task was one which seemed almost too difficult and complicated to carry through in the short time available.

Businessmen in the United States had come to look upon the commercial attachés of the Department of Commerce and its foreign service as being their direct instrument. For decades they had depended upon
the consular service; they were really still depending upon the foreign service of the Department of State for the furthering and the protection of their interests. The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, however, of the Department of Commerce had known effectively how to make it appear that the Commerce service was really doing the work for the businessmen. It is not an exaggeration to say that nine-tenths of the services performed for foreign businessmen were being performed by the Foreign Service officers of the Department of State. Notwithstanding this, businessmen began increasingly to think in terms of the Foreign Service officers of Commerce doing all the work. It could not be expected that the average businessman, with all the problems he had to look after in his business, would look too closely into this; what he was interested in was service and he thought he was getting it from the Foreign Commerce Service. It was too much to expect that the average businessman would appreciate the fact that the approaches to foreign governments had to be made through the Department of State, which is the organ for the conduct of our foreign relations and recognized as such in our Constitution and in our laws.

So far as the foreign service of Agriculture was concerned, it was not as large as that of the Department of Commerce, as it was the practice of the Department of Agriculture to station agricultural attachés and much smaller staffs abroad than the Department of Commerce. The problem, however, in one respect was just as real in that the agricultural interests were naturally pleased to think that our Government had a special group of agricultural attachés abroad directly responsible to the Department of Commerce and independent of any other service.

So far as the Treasury attachés were concerned, as I have already said, their duties were more restricted. They had very little contact
with the public as compared with the other foreign services and their duties were particularly for the Treasury Department. There was not much duplication of efforts so far as the Treasury attachés were concerned, nor was there much duality of approach to other governments. Then too, there was always closer collaboration between the Treasury officers abroad and the officers of the Department of State. This was probably because there was less conflict of interests and less pressure from the respective Departments at home to undertake certain activities.

I realized from the outset that the most difficult task would be, not to convince the businessmen and the agricultural interests of our country that the consolidation was of advantage, but that there would be this difficulty in getting the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce to agree. The preliminary conversations which I had with Secretary of Commerce Roper and Secretary of Agriculture Wallace indicated that there would be this difficulty; in fact, it seemed at the outset almost unsurmountable. So far as the Secretary of Treasury was concerned, Mr. Morgenthau, he did not even wish to discuss the matter, and he put it on the basis that their work was of such a special character that it was done not so much for the general public as for the Treasury Department itself, and that the field of activities of the Treasury attachés was exceedingly limited. I could not but agree with him that in many respects his position was correct although basically there was no reason why the Treasury representatives should not also be foreign service officers. I came however, early to the conclusion that the consolidation would be effective and attain the objectives that we were after if it only included the foreign services of Commerce and of Agriculture. I, therefore, concentrated my efforts on the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce, realizing that in case we
found in the end that the consolidation of the Treasury representatives into the Department of State was necessary, that the President would be able to see that it was done.

Secretary of Commerce Roper, who was familiarly known as "Uncle Dan", was a very charming and amiable gentleman. The Department of Commerce, however, through the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which was headed by Dr. Julius Klein, was irrevocably opposed to a consolidation of the Commerce service into that of State. On the contrary, it had very definite plans for wide expansion of the Foreign Commerce Service and these expansion plans involved encroaching on the existing duties of foreign service officers of the Department of State to a degree that there would be a conflict of law as well as of practice. The fact that this situation existed made it only more necessary that the consolidation be carried through. I had long conversations with Secretary Roper; they were of little avail. There was not much purpose to be served by conversations with the officers of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce because their path was so clearly set and their objectives so clearly defined that it was really useless to discuss the details with them; it was a case in which the word would have to come from above.

Secretary of Agriculture Wallace was much more understanding of the matter. He stated from the outset that so far as he was concerned he realized that the consolidation had advantages for the Department of Agriculture rather than disadvantages. The only thing which he feared in connection with the matter was that the agricultural interests throughout the country would not understand the change and would hold him responsible for it. It was clear, however, that he was willing to face this responsibility. He was convinced of the advantages of the
consolidation and, in fact, of its necessity. Almost from the beginning therefore, I had the full support of Secretary Wallace. I think that the conversations which Secretary Wallace had with Leslie Wheeler, who was one of the most capable agricultural attachés which the Department of Agriculture had, were very helpful. Wheeler was a very understanding man and realized the advantages of the consolidation for the agricultural interests of our country and for the Department of Agriculture. He also realized that it was necessary for administrative purposes and to avoid dual approaches to foreign officials and to facilitate the work abroad.

Realizing the opposition of the Department of Commerce to the consolidation and that steps would have to be taken eventually by the President, I left this part of the matter for the moment and concentrated efforts on getting the principal trade organizations in the United States to study the matter. I was in touch with the principal officers of the Foreign Trade Council with headquarters in New York, with the Manufacturers Association of the United States and of the United States Chamber of Commerce in Washington. The officers of these organizations were for the most part friends of mine and men whom I'd known for many years. I had seen them on many occasions in connection with their business abroad while I was on my trips to the United States, which usually took place every year. I had seen many of them when they were attending meetings of the International Chamber of Commerce abroad or when they were travelling abroad on their business. Most of the officers of these organizations were familiar with the work of our services abroad and realized that this duplication in work was increasing and was not to their advantage. They realized that the dual approach in so many capitals had already done a good deal of harm. The difficulty experienced was not in convincing the officers of these organizations, which were the
principal organizations representing American business, especially that sector interested in foreign trade, in their convincing their members. It would be a long story indeed, to set forth the efforts which my associates in the Department, who were working with me on this matter, and I made in seeing people all over the country. I made frequent trips to New York and to Boston, and to Providence, and to Philadelphia, and to Cleveland, and other cities where I met with trade groups in order to explain to them the purpose of the consolidation. Within some months it was obvious that the time had arrived when we could depend upon sufficient support from these organizations and their members so as to make possible the reorganization, or rather, to assure that there would not be any opposition by them of an active character to the consolidation.

It was then that I was able to go to the Secretary and to the President to explain to them the status of the matter. I said that Mr. Roper was irrevocably opposed and that this was due to the attitude of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. I said that Mr. Wallace, the Secretary of Agriculture, was prepared to go ahead. I set forth the reasons why Secretary Morgenthau did not think it was necessary that the Treasury officers abroad, who were so limited in number and so restricted in duties, should be included in the consolidation. I explained to the President and to Secretary Hull that the trade organizations, in my opinion, in the United States would not offer any serious objection to the consolidation, and that, in fact, the leaders of these organizations already realized the advantages therein and the necessity thereof.

I had done everything that I could; the point had now been reached where the President and Secretary Hull would have to give me their assistance. The one obstacle was really Secretary Roper and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.
The first step that the President took to settle this matter was to appoint Mr. Richard Patterson as Under-Secretary of Commerce. He felt that, as a practical businessman, Mr. Patterson would understand the situation and as Under-Secretary of Commerce would be able to get the opposition of Secretary Roper and of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce eliminated. I carried on many conversations with Mr. Patterson; I think he was convinced not only of the desirability but of the necessity of the consolidation, but he was not able to convince Secretary Roper. The only solution, therefore, left was for the Secretary of Commerce to be changed. This was not a simple matter, for President Roosevelt was very fond personally of Mr. Roper. He talked with Roper about the matter, but Roper expressed his opposition. He indicated that he would rather leave the Department of Commerce than consolidate. Anyone who knew President Roosevelt well realized the reluctance he had to ask any member of the Cabinet to resign no matter what the reasons might be for such desire to have his resignation. Secretary Roper was offered several diplomatic posts which he declined. The President finally decided to offer him the post as Minister to Canada. I do not wish to speculate as to what the reasons were for Secretary Roper agreeing to this change, but he did offer his resignation as Secretary of Commerce and was appointed Minister to Canada.

The President appointed Mr. Harry Hopkins as Secretary of Commerce. The close relationship between President Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins is so well known that it is not necessary to make any reference to it here. Harry Hopkins and I were very close friends; we had first known each other in Vienna when I was Minister there. From that time on he had always shown a friendly attitude towards me. He and I were not in accord on many matters and on matters of internal policy in the
United States we were certainly in complete discord. He, however, took
a very active interest in foreign affairs and, in most aspects of our
foreign problems, we were really in complete accord. In any event, I
had great respect for him and he, I think, returned this in a measure.
The President told me that immediately after the appointment of Hopkins
that he had discussed this matter of the consolidation with Hopkins,
and that Hopkins would go along. I was to speak to Hopkins about it
and get the matter out of the way so that it could go to Congress. So
far as the foreign service, or rather, the foreign representations of
the Treasury Department were concerned, it was not necessary to carry
them into the consolidation as the number of people they had abroad was
so small and it was really not necessary; they were not complicating
the situation in any way. I reluctantly agreed and Secretary Hull
agreed.

Harry Hopkins at the time was not well and had not been well
for some time. At the time that he assumed his duties as Secretary of
Commerce he was confined in a good deal to his home in Georgetown sick.
His home was very close to mine. I went to see him after this last
mentioned conversation with the President and told Harry about it. He
said, "George, I can't do this. If I agree to this consolidation every-
body will think that the President just appointed me as Secretary of
Commerce as a yes man to carry this thing through." It was difficult
to argue with him as he was really a sick man, but I had to tell him
that the matter was a pressing one and could not await delay and that
certainly the President had not appointed him as Secretary of Commerce
merely because of this consolidation. I said the President, as he knew
so much better than I and as others knew so much better than I, had
appointed him for many other reasons. I said that I was sure the Pre-
sident, in appointing him, had kept in mind, or rather had in mind, that he, Harry, would not offer any difficulties in the way of something which was so important and, in fact, imperative. I thought, therefore, that he was laying too much stress on this aspect of the matter; at the same time I could understand the feelings which Harry Hopkins had. I told him about the attitude of the principal trade organizations in the country and that they would not oppose the measure and understood the desirability of it. I felt, however, that the best thing to do was to go back to the President rather than to prolong the conversation too much.

When I saw the President a few days afterwards and told him about my conversation with Hopkins, he laughed and he said that he could not understand why Harry had these fears about public opinion. He had certainly not appointed him just for that reason; he certainly did expect him to take this action with regard to consolidation. Harry had not feared public opinion before about anything, why should he fear it over a matter of this kind, the reasons for which were so obvious. He told me to go back to see Harry again. I said to the President that I thought really the point had been reached where it would be desirable for him to speak to Harry himself. The President looked at me for a moment and then he said, "George, you go and see Harry and lock the door and throw the key out of the window, and don't come out of the room until the matter is settled". I had nothing else to do but to undertake this task again. I went to see him the next day at his home; he was in bed and I took up the matter with a good deal of hesitation. I asked him if he preferred me to come back another day as I had a matter of business to take up. He said, "Why not take it up now? It's the same matter of consolidation". I told him it was. I told him what the President had said. Hopkins smiled and said, "It's all right, George, you
go ahead, I go along. You can tell the President and the Secretary that I go along."

I reported to the President and to the Secretary the result of the work which had been done on the consolidation. I was instructed to proceed on the basis of the consolidation of the foreign services of Commerce and Agriculture into that of State and to leave the Treasury matter aside. I do not recall who it was who was in charge at the time of the preparation of the reorganization bill to go to Congress and which was to include this matter. I had the whole plan drawn up, including the appropriate wording of some of the legislation. I had to go over the whole matter because this particular officer of the Government who had been charged with the preparation of the reorganization act and some of his principle associates naturally wanted to know all about it and the reasons for it, etc., and this was another laborious task of several weeks before the matter was in final shape.

When the reorganization bill reached Congress, there were several members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives who were very much interested in individual officers of the Department of Commerce and of the Department of Agriculture, but more particularly of the Department of Commerce. Some of these members of Congress were very powerful people and, in fact, two of them occupied very key posts in the Congress who could make difficulties for the whole reorganization bill, which covered many measures other than the consolidation of the foreign services. Some of the officers of the Foreign Commerce Service and of the Foreign Agricultural Service and, again I repeat, more particularly of the Foreign Commerce Service, were afraid that in any consolidation they would not be brought into the service of the Department of State. They feared that for some reason or other their record would
not be adequate or there might be prejudices against them or for some reason they would lose their posts. I then had the task of convincing these members of Congress who had a special interest in certain individuals, that the reorganization act would not affect their status but, in fact, in many ways improve it. The Department of State had by that time a retirement plan. The officers of the Department of Commerce and of the Department of Agriculture in the foreign field had nothing but the Civil Service plan. It fortunately so happened that the officers in whom these particular Congressmen were interested were officers who would be absorbed in the foreign service of State; in other words, that they were men of performance and capacity and as such as could properly be taken into the Department of State service. What would have happened if some of these men had been men not apt to be absorbed in the consolidated service, I do not know. Certainly the Department of State would not have agreed to absorb men from the Foreign Commerce Service nor the Agricultural Service who would not make proper officers of the Department of State. In addition to the conversations which I had to have with these members of Congress with their special interests in individuals, I naturally had to appear before the appropriate Senate and House committees which had to deal with these aspects of the reorganization bill. It was not a difficult task to convince them of the desirability of the consolidation.

It was, however, with a great relief that I got word that the bill had been passed both the Senate and the House, and that the consolidation was a reality. There then came the task of bringing these officers into the Foreign Service of State. This involved the examination of the records of all the foreign service officers in the employ of the Department of Commerce and of the Department of Agriculture. As
was quite natural, in view of the more recent organization of the foreign
services of these two Departments, they had not kept efficiency records
except in a most casual way. They did not have an inspection corps to
keep track of the officers in their service abroad. It would have been
a blow to morale of the foreign service of the Department of State to
bring in officers of Agriculture and of Commerce who were obviously not
fitted for the work of the foreign service of the State Department.
This meant that we had to go painstakingly into each individual case,
that is, into the case of each person from Agriculture or commercial
attaché on down in the foreign service of the two departments under
reference before a decision could be reached as to, first, whether they
should be absorbed into the foreign service of State and, second, in
what grade and category they were to be placed in the foreign service
of State.

It was quite obvious that once these men who had formerly been
officers of the Department of Commerce and of Agriculture exclusively,
when absorbed into the foreign service of the State Department would
continue, at least for the time being, to be used in positions such as
commercial and agricultural attachés. On the other hand, every consider­
ation of personnel and morale required that if any of these men so ab­
sorbed from Commerce or Agriculture should show aptitude for other
assignments in the work of the Department abroad, that they should have
the same treatment as other foreign service officers. This had been
made a condition of the reorganization and it was carried through faith­
fully by the Department of State. As a matter of fact, the officers of
the foreign service of the State Department who were somewhat disturbed
about the bringing in of a considerable number of men from these
other two Departments on the grounds that it might interfere somewhat
with their rate of promotion were so happy that the consolidation had been effected, that they put these other considerations into second place. All officers of the Department of State had suffered too much from this duality of representation and work; they knew that the operation of our services abroad and our representation abroad would be so tremendously facilitated that other considerations of a personal character became secondary. So far as the officers of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce and were concerned, without exception they were very happy that the consolidation went through. They realized that they had greater opportunities for the exercise of any capacities they had; they knew that they would be used principally in agricultural and commercial matters from the outset, but that if they showed an aptitude for other branches of the work of the Department, that there would be no discriminations shown. These officers of the other two Departments also were pleased with the consolidation because they felt that they benefited by the retirement plan and by greater security in office; they were protected by the same law which protected the foreign service officer of the Department of State. Many of the foreign service officers of the other two Departments were pleased with the consolidation on less meritorious grounds. They realized that as officers of the Department of State they would have more standing in the field, in the local community where they served, as well as with the Government with which they had to deal. As a matter of fact, it was this inferiority complex from which some of the officers of Agriculture and Commerce abroad suffered, which led to so many of the difficulties in Washington between the departments there and which accentuated the duplication of work in the field and the duality of approach to other governments in the field. The responsibility for the difficulties the three systems
could not be laid to the attitude of the Departments in Washington alone, it was due as much and, perhaps in the final analysis, even more to the attitude of some of the officers of these services of Commerce and Agriculture abroad.

In any event, the enormous task of consolidating the foreign services of Commerce and Agriculture into that of State was carried through. Again I must pay tribute to the men like Charlie Hosmer, Nathaniel Davis, and Fletcher Warren, who aided in this matter. I must repeat again that without them and their loyalty, their capacity and their wide knowledge, the thing could not have been done in the effective and smooth way in which it was done. The trade organizations in the United States were satisfied; they soon learned that they were getting better service, they had in fact known it all the time, but certain very vocal and interested individuals in these organizations had made majority of the more noise than the wise men in them.

With the many changes which followed the advent of Secretary Stettinius to the Department and certain disorganization in departmental practices, some difficulties began to arise in the application of the consolidation, and I understand that about a year ago, through an act of Congress, the Department of Agriculture has again set up its own agricultural service. This is a step backward. The White House and the Department of State and the Congress should never have permitted this to happen. Had the matter been adequately presented to the Congress by the Department of State, the Congress would never have taken this action in re-establishing the agricultural service abroad. It will only be a matter of time, I believe, before the Agricultural service will again be re-absorbed into that of the Department of State, and that is the way it should be.