There is a similar and equally unfounded apprehension that the consolidation of the Foreign Service under the Department of State may result in information reaching business interests in this country more slowly from the field. This is a recurrence of an old symptom. It has become a sort of fetish among certain people when they discuss this furnishing of information from the field to speak of the services rendered by the officers of Commerce as being made with an extraordinary rapidity and those coming from officers of the Department of State as coming with an extraordinary slowness. There is no ground for either statement. Both the officers of the Department of State and of Commerce are conscientious people who have no desire other than to do their duty and to serve American business interests promptly and adequately. Examination of the records will show that the replies made by Foreign Service officers of State are made as promptly as those from Foreign Commerce officers, and I believe the reverse is also true. The Department of State has exercised for years control over not only the quality but the promptness of the replies made by its officers to inquiries from the Department of State, from other departments, and from business. There is nothing in the record to indicate dilatoriness. We do not claim that every officer of our Service is as good as he should be, and we do have men who at times are slow and even negligent. All that it is necessary to note here, and that should be noted emphatically, is that the level of performance in one branch of the Service is as good as in the other, and that there is absolutely no basis for this so-often heard statement that consolidation would
would result in slowing up the preparation of reports and their receipt by interested persons and departments. As a matter of fact the direct contrary would probably be the result of consolidation - that is, that a slight speeding up of the already very good service could be accomplished.

Another misapprehension which exists is that the transmitting of certain material from the foreign services through the Department of State involves a certain delay in the material reaching the ultimately interested department or business man. There may have been a time when in the Department of State and in other departments there was a certain slowness in the administrative staff in handling the material received from the field. I can assure you that so far as the Department of State is concerned material which reaches it before twelve o'clock of any given day leaves again for its further destination the same day. There is never more than a twelve and at the most a twenty-four hour delay in any material of this kind being passed through the Department of State. No reasonable person can speak of this as a delay and I am sure that the appropriate departments of our Government and responsible business interests who are using the services of our officers abroad would be the first to give testimony to the promptness of the furnishing of the material.

There exists continued objection to certain material from the foreign field passing through the Department of State and not being transmitted directly from the field to the interested departments or firms. It should not be necessary to emphasize to any person having a knowledge of the conduct of our foreign relations how important it is that certain information which may be very important and valuable
valuable should not be generally published as it may destroy all the sources which the officer in the field has to draw upon. There is certain information which is obviously of a non-confidential nature and which can be given publicity in the form in which it is received. There is further certain information which comes in from the field a part of which may be given publicity and a part of which can be given only restricted circulation within the government departments and agencies interested. There are again further reports of so highly confidential a character that they cannot be given any publicity whatever. There has to be therefore a certain control over material from the field if we are to maintain our relations with other states and with firms and organizations and individuals in foreign countries on a friendly and mutually satisfactory basis. This control has always been exercised in all the departments concerned with the thought that the most liberal attitude must be taken in the furnishing of information to interested persons and firms. There is no government in the world today which is giving to its business men and to its people in general such a valuable and broad service as that which is being rendered by our Government. It is believed that if there is a consolidated Foreign Service arrangements may appropriately be made through which trade letters can go directly to the inquirer, through which non-confidential reports may be sent directly from the foreign establishment or agency concerned, but always keeping in mind that reports of a confidential or semi-confidential character should be directed to the Department of State. It would indeed take an unreasonable person who would assume that it will not be the practice of that Department to transmit and to make available for other departments and agencies
agencies and for business in this country as much of
this information as may be in the public interest.

There is one very serious misapprehension which, however,
we may happily note exists only among certain restricted
groups in this country, and that is that the agents of the
Department of Commerce or some other departments of our
government abroad might be able to perform services for
business which an agent of the Department of State cannot
perform. The performance of services must be on a reciprocal
basis between countries and we cannot ask other governments
to permit our officers to perform services within their
territory which we would not be prepared to have officers
of those governments perform in our own country. The thought
therefore that in some mysterious way officers of departments
other than State can perform services which officers of State
cannot perform is without any foundation for this would
involve a unilateral conception in foreign relationships
which has no basis in fact. The thought has even been
advanced that agents of other departments than State can
perform under cover and direct services and interests in
this country which officers of State could not perform.
We can be sure that any officer who would perform such
services would rapidly become persona non grata and that
it would be decidedly detrimental to the interests of our
country as a whole. It has also been advanced that agents
of other departments of our Government that that of State
can, as more directly business representatives, perform
certain services which officers of State could not properly
perform. The answer to this is very simple. There is no
service which any officer of our Government abroad can
properly perform which is not now being performed by our
consuls.
consuls and our chiefs of mission in the some 314 establishments we have throughout the world. On the contrary, as the officer of the Department of State is a representative of our Government and recognized under international law and practice, he has a standing which no legislation in this country can give to officers of other departments. He is therefore in a position to have contacts in government, in business, and in wide circles abroad which are not open in the same degree to an officer of another department. It is therefore obvious that the officers of the Department of State are in a far better position to perform all proper services for our government and for business and our interests in general than an officer of any other department. This is inherent in the very nature of international relationships.

There is the further misapprehension that the officers of the Department of State are not as interested in extending aid to business as the officers of other departments who may be in the field. This is making an invidious distinction between officers of our Government which I believe cannot be seriously advanced but which nevertheless is constantly heard. In this connection it may be pointed out that the officers of the Department of State have had it their tradition to serve our Government and all sections of our people including our commercial interests for almost a century and a half. Since the consolidation of the diplomatic and consular branches of the Foreign Service of the Department of State the attitude which a number of our diplomatic officers had and which unquestionably was unfortunate has disappeared. Those officers who had this attitude towards certain services rendered by our Government have long since disappeared from the picture, and there is not...
not a single officer of the Foreign Service of the Department of State who in capacity and usefulness and who in willingness to serve is not on the same level as any officers of any other department.

There has been seriously advanced the thought, and it requires careful consideration, that in the question of assignments the business and agricultural interests in this country would wish to be assured that there will be at strategic points in the foreign field men who are specially qualified to carry through the services which are needed. In this connection it should be brought out that the assignment of officers to posts in the Foreign Service of State today is made by a board known as the Board of Foreign Service Personnel composed of two Assistant Secretaries of State and the Chief of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel. It is obvious that in view of the varied needs at practically every post the greatest care has to be exercised in determining what officer shall be assigned to a particular post. It is not only a question of language and qualifications, but of personality, background, and experience. I doubt whether there is any important business firm in this country today which uses greater care and objectivity in determining who shall be assigned to a particular duty than is being done in the Department of State by the Personnel Board in assigning the officers and personnel in our establishments in the field. Every single transfer and assignment is carefully considered by this Board. It is the thought that if there is a consolidated foreign service there shall sit on the Board of Foreign Service Personnel whenever certain assignments of interest to those departments may be considered an Assistant Secretary.
Secretary of Commerce or an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. This should provide adequate safeguards as far as questions of assignment are concerned. They are now being made on a purely non-political basis and one of pure aptitude. There is no reason to believe that under a consolidated foreign service any other procedure should be followed as the practice now being followed is a definite tradition.

Another matter which very properly concerns those in this country interested in the conduct of our foreign relations and particularly the departments most concerned is the question of specialization. While it is obvious that any officer of our government, irrespective of what department he is serving, should have a very broad general background, there are special capacities and experience which are needed for special service at particular posts at given times. A Foreign Service officer of the consolidated service who is assigned as commercial attaché or agricultural attaché at a given post should obviously have the background and experience to assure adequate performance of his task, particularly as under such a consolidated service the responsibilities of the attaché would be wider and heavier and his opportunities for service correspondingly greater. As it is difficult to conceive of any consolidation of the foreign services under the Department of State which would not involve the incorporation into this unified service of the existing career personnel of the foreign service of Commerce and Agriculture, there would be available for assignment to such posts as agricultural and commercial attachés the same officers who are now serving in these capacities. There are in these services junior officers
officers who already have specialized and who would be brought into the consolidated service and who in due course would become available for superior assignments. In addition to this there is the great reservoir of the already existing Foreign Service of the Department of State from which unquestionably any well informed person will realize that adequate qualified personnel can be drawn.

Perhaps at this point it is advisable to enter briefly into the degree to which specialization has already become necessary in the Foreign Service of the Department of State. There was a time when the Foreign Service was relatively smaller and when every Foreign Service officer had to be a jack of all trades. In this lay and lies still to a considerable degree the strength of the Foreign Service and our officers are chosen at the outset because they have shown a special adaptability for the work and then at their posts and at the various posts where they serve they acquire a wide background and experience in conditions and in the work of the service which greatly increase their usefulness. As time has gone on, however, it has become increasingly necessary for some of the officers to specialize in certain lines. Some are more particularly adapted for political reporting and negotiating, some for press work, some for consular functions, some for major economic or financial reporting, and some for commercial reporting. The service is so large, the work at the different posts so varied, and the demands upon the service so wide that there is ample opportunity for an officer to specialize without becoming penalized in the way of promotion and assignment. In making assignments, therefore, the Foreign Service Personal Board already finds that the reservoir of the foreign service is adequate to
to enable it to draw upon it for any kind of service which
our Government has so far needed abroad except certain highly
technical service to which reference will be made later.

A striking example of the way in which the Foreign
Service can meet any of the needs which arise within
government and business has been shown by the recent
development in the need for highly specialized economic
and financial reporting in view of the disordered conditions
of exchanges and of exchange controls which have been
established. The Treasury Department has needed to have
day to day information of a very important and vital character
with regard to developments in foreign money markets and
in financial conditions in practically every part of the
world. When this need arose it was first thought that the
Treasury would have to go out into private business and secure
the services of very highly trained specialists for the
purpose. In order not to complicate the machinery of our
foreign representation by the introduction of a further
special type of representative it was determined that an
effort should be made to find these men within the foreign
service of State. We have now a foreign service officer in
our embassies in Berlin, Paris, London, and foreign service
officers in other establishments in different parts of the
world who are constantly reporting to the Treasury on these
matters and as effectively as any persons who could have been
drawn from private business. This is as convincing an answer
as can be given to those who fear that if there is established
a consolidated service there will not be available the men
with
with the special qualifications necessary for special tasks. It is time that we get away in this country from the idea that the foreign service of the Department of State is made up of bespatted individuals who have no interest in business. It is a service made up of the best that we can draw upon in this country and which has so far shown itself up to every emergency which has arisen and there is no reason to believe that it is not in a position to continue to meet such conditions as they arise.

The Congress has recognized the desirability of permitting the Department to enable certain of its officers to specialize by putting an item into our annual appropriation act for sending certain officers of the Foreign Service to business schools in our leading colleges and universities. This program has already been in effect for a number of years and has fully demonstrated its wisdom. The young officers who have been given this training have shown that in their further performance this experience has been a most useful one.

It should be observed in this connection that any officer of our government who serves in a diplomatic or consular capacity abroad or as commercial or agricultural attache should be an officer who has that wide general background and experience which we expect from the officers of the foreign service of State today. The thought that these officers must of necessity have had long business experience in actual business in this country or that they must be unified persons is hardly in line with the actual situation which these officers have to meet in the field. Unless our officers, irrespective of the particular services which they are rendering, are men of culture, good personality, wide background, and with a broad knowledge and experience in the foreign
foreign field, they are not in a position to perform the really effective service which we expect from the chief of a diplomatic or consular establishment or from a commercial or agricultural attache. The purely specialist is not in a position to render the service which our government and the respective departments expect.

This leads to the consideration of a very important factor, and that is that there are times when the Department of State and the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture and other Departments of our government may need abroad for temporary periods specialists to perform a particular task. Occasions arise when there may be necessity for our government or perhaps certain interests in this country to have a report or reports on a condition which can only be prepared by a person with highly specialized training or experience in that particular field. We cannot expect to have such men in any foreign service of our government even though we should maintain separate foreign services for different departments. The very fact that there were such specialists would not make them really effective members of such a foreign service. These specialists very properly are found in the departments in Washington or can be drawn upon as occasion may demand from business. When future need for them arises in the field there is no reason why they should not be assigned temporary from the respective department or agency in Washington to one of our establishments in the field, or why a properly qualified person should not be drawn from business temporarily into the government service and given such assignment. This does not mean that he must necessarily
necessarily be a member of the Foreign Service. His duty at a foreign post would only be incidental to his regular career. Such persons can as occasion demands be sent abroad through arrangement with the Department of State and a temporary commission would be given them as a foreign service officer for the period of the assignment. The giving of this commission for the period of assignment would, without making them a permanent member of the unified foreign service, give these persons that status before other governments and in our own establishments abroad during the tour of duty which will facilitate their official task.

Another misapprehension which should be cleared up is that the field of activity of commercial and agricultural attaches might be narrowed through this unification of the foreign services and that their usefulness correspondingly would be decreased. As a matter of fact the direct contrary would be the case for the field of activity and usefulness of such attaches if they were members of a unified foreign service under the Department of State would be greatly widened.

As it is now must remain the attaches under international practice cannot have representative status and therefore their contacts with foreign governments must be limited. It is true that under the present arrangements the foreign service officers of Commerce and Agriculture are being assigned through the Department of State to our missions abroad and are given diplomatic status. This status, however, is more useful from a personal than an official point of view because we cannot legislate for them or give them an representative capacity. The activities of these officers are
are limited, therefore, to reporting on conditions in their respective fields and to their giving advices and counsel to our chiefs of mission and to the foreign service officers of State. If there is consolidation of the foreign services under the Department of State then the commercial and agricultural attaches will be fully foreign service officers of our government and it will be possible for the foreign service officers designated as commercial or agricultural attaches to have a fully representative capacity and to have contacts with all governmental departments and agencies abroad under the direction of the chief of the mission. It will be possible to take a step which is highly desirable in the public interest and that is to put the commercial and economic reporting activities of all of our foreign service officers in a particular country under the supervision and control of the officer designated as commercial attache, and similarly to place all agricultural reporting under the supervision and control of the foreign service officer designated as agricultural attache. In other words, the consolidation of the foreign services instead of in any way decreasing the influence of their respective departments upon the reporting in the field and upon the flow of information, will give them a much more important part therein than they are now able to play. It is obviously impossible under existing conditions for the Department of State to permit the commercial attache, as the officer of another department, to exercise control in a given country over the officers of the Department of State therein in matters of commercial and economic reporting. Under a unified foreign service this desirable end will be gained and they will all be members of one foreign service.
An objection has been raised to the consolidation of the foreign services under the Department of State on the ground that although this would be highly desirable and feasible under the present Secretary of State it would be an unsafe thing to do as a matter of continued practice. Those who raise this objection agree in principle that it would be desirable to have a consolidated foreign service under the Department of State, but they fear that another Secretary of State would not give the Department and the Foreign Service that businesslike administration which characterizes its present great incumbent. It is really rather difficult to treat such an observation seriously for an examination of the record over many decades will show that succeeding Presidents have recognized that the person at the head of the premier Department of our Government, which is the Department of State, must be a man of the highest qualifications. I think that any unprejudiced and objective observer will have to agree that for many decades the incumbent of the office of Secretary of State has been on a level of capacity and sagacity at least of that of other members of the Cabinet. This argument, therefore, carries no weight and in itself carries its own nullification. Comparisons are invidious and none will be made in this memorandum, but the facts can be read in the record and there is nothing in the record which can give us in this country the slightest ground to have any fears that the person who will head the Department of State will not be one who will have as definitely at heart all the interests of our country as much as the head of any executive department.

There remains the thought which is at times advanced
that the Foreign Service officers of the Department of State may not be capable of performing certain services for business as well as they are now being performed by officers of other departments. There will be general agreement that any officer who is capable of negotiating a treaty, of representing the interests of our government, of acting in behalf of our government and interests in the protection of vital principles, and who is capable of doing the wide range of reporting which our foreign service officers are now called upon to do does not also have the capacity to perform the services which we would ordinarily expect from a commercial and agricultural attache.

Perhaps it is interesting to observe here that one of the further reasons why it is not generally understood to what degree the Department of State and its officers have been aiding business in so many ways, as well as in the reporting on financial, commercial, and industrial conditions, is that in the very nature of its work the Department of State cannot advertise. The conduct of our foreign relations with other states must be carried through with a certain reserve. It frequently happens that the Department of State may be actively engaged in prosecuting a certain matter on which it has to keep silence and therefore suffer criticism from interested groups in this country on the ground that it is doing nothing. It nevertheless must and does meet this criticism in silence for if there is to be any hope for a successful outcome it must be silent. If every time we make a move we were to speak of it, it would only have the result of making it impossible for the country to
to which these representations have been made to give a favorable response. Other countries have their public opinion to which they are responsible just as we have ourselves, and in the relations between states the same principles prevail as between persons and firms in this country.

As was said at the outset of this memorandum, there is every reason to believe therefore that the time has arrived when in the interests of efficiency and of good governmental practice the foreign services of our government should be consolidated into one under the control of the Department of State. The conduct of our foreign relations cannot be vested in any other department, nor can this responsibility be split up without serious damage to our vital interests. What is at issue is the interests of our people as a whole, our prestige, and the protection of our major interests, and not the interests of an individual firm, person, or department. We must look at this problem of the organization of the machinery for the conduct of our foreign relations and of our activities abroad from the sole point of view of the national interest. It is the only sound way of viewing the problem and under the circumstances which we have to face today and in the future the only way.

There is a very important aspect of this problem which should be covered in this point. While the Department of State is charged with the conduct of our foreign policy for the President, it has, as has already been pointed out in this memorandum, never taken the attitude that it is the only department interested in foreign policy. It has taken the attitude that it is its duty to formulate our foreign policy in conjunction with the President and to serve as the instrument
instrument of our country for carrying it through. It recognizes at the same time in the making of policy all the departments and agencies of our government, representing as they do every branch and phase of our national life or interest. For this reason the Department of State has cultivated increasing contact with other departments and agencies of our government on matters of policy so that all national policy which forms the basis of our foreign policy may represent a coordinated opinion of our government as a whole. For this reason observers who believe that we should without delay take steps to unite our existing statutory foreign services under one single foreign service under the control of the Department of State are of the opinion that it will be highly desirable that there should be established either by law or by executive order a committee known as an Interdepartmental Committee on Commercial Policy which may be composed of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce. This committee, which should meet at fixed periods, would discuss all major questions of policy and the members thereof would designate alternates who would sit for them when the detailed discussions were in progress on any particular phase of policy.

There is further reason to believe that in order to establish more adequate liaison between the various interests of our country and the departments concerned there should be set up by executive order an advisory committee on commercial policy composed of an outstanding representative of our commercial, industrial, exporting, importing, banking, agricultural, social welfare, and cultural interests. Such
Such a committee to be effective should be small and it would serve as the effective liaison between the trade organizations and other groups in this country interested in information from the field and between the departments having competence in these fields and therefore with the foreign service of the Department of State which would serve as their common agent.

There has been a great deal said from time to time in the past concerning the need of American industry and agriculture and other phases of our national life to have direct agents abroad in the employ of our government who are technicians and specialists. In other words, there has been advocated a practice which would lead to practically every department and agency of our government having its specialists and technicians in every part of the world, and this of course would lead to the absurd and utterly impossible conclusion that every trade, every industry, should have its own representative in one form or another. Aside from this being impracticable from the point of view of other governments because as we know such an army of agents of our government would not be received by other governments, it would, if carried to its logical end and in order to do justice to every element of our population be necessary for every department and agency to have officers abroad regularly assigned for reporting or other purposes. The present organization which we have has already aroused a certain amount of suspicion and concern on the part of a number of governments who do not understand our hydra-headed organization. Any further expansion of our present system is impossible if only from the point of view of the attitude of
of other governments, and even though we might find a receptive attitude here and there we must remember that all international representation is on a reciprocal basis and that if we sent agents of a certain kind to other governments we must be prepared to receive theirs. With the new ideas that have been developed in certain parts of the world and with the new conditions which have arisen we are already in a difficult position so far as the reception of certain types of agents from abroad is concerned whom we may be asked to receive. By bringing about this consolidation of our existing services into one we will not only put ourselves in a stronger position abroad but we will put ourselves in a stronger position at home to resist the reception of certain agents of other governments on an official status whose activities we would have to view with concern.

Aside from all the administrative and other advantages which will result from the consolidation of the foreign services, there is the definite advantage which will be gained in more economic administration. There was a time when we had in every capital a diplomatic and consular establishment, usually housed in separate quarters and with completely separate and independent overhead charges. With the amalgamation of the diplomatic and consular branches of the foreign service of the Department of State into one foreign service we are now able to consolidate the establishments of State in capitals and have made very rapid progress in that direction. We already have in a good many capitals only one establishment of State instead of the two which we formerly had. We are making very rapid progress in extending this system every year. What it means in the way of more efficient
efficient practice and for service to our government is so obvious that it need not be gone into here. That it means a good deal in the way of economy is equally clear. That it means a great deal to the American traveling and business public which instead of running from one establishment to another can now do all its business under one roof goes without comment. If we are further able now, through the consolidation of the foreign services into one, to carry this forward similar advantages, all of which are in the public and private interest, will follow.