On the last day of last February I retired from the foreign service of the United States after 44 years of service including over 29 years as Chief of Espionage. I was Ambassador at a variety of Posts. Since that time I have had time and opportunity to consider how the practice of diplomacy has had to adjust itself to many changes in an ever-changing world.

1911 might be described as the horse Thoroughbred, 1955 as the jet plane age. When I was in Colombia in 1926, mail from the Department reached us in about a month. Mail from Washington to Bogota now arrives in a matter of hours. At Paris could get Washington on the telephone in a few minutes. At Cairo it takes longer, but only minutes longer. Now-a-days we have to move faster than we have to move fast, sometimes too fast.

There are some unchanging principles in the practice of diplomacy, telling the truth is one. That does not mean telling all a man knows but when he makes a statement he should tell the truth, aside from the moral of the matter in the long run truth-telling pays dividends. Further more the longer you live the more convinced are of the providence of God in human affairs.

That's exactly the opposite of what the partisans of the Iron Curtain think today also. To them a statement is true if it is useful. There is no other value. That there is no place for God or Providence.

45 years ago the interest of the American Press
The American Government in foreign affairs was not very great. We didn’t have to care. We were getting along very well; we were prosperous, we were happy. We didn’t expect very much of it. We didn’t have to expect very much. Over the course of the years, all that has changed. Change, gradually. It is true that our foreign relations do not vary large—indeed, for instance, if we don’t expect our standard of living will inevitably go down. We need friends. We need all the friends we can make. This is especially true in the face of the Iron Curtain.

415 years ago the interest of the American people in foreign affairs was less than that of the government or of the people. Only a few men and women had an interest in what was going on beyond our own shores. Now the interest of the majority is enormous. I have recently had occasion to travel considerably around the United States, making commencement addresses and other speeches to various groups. I came into contact with large bodies of great women. I was struck by their enlightened awareness of our foreign relations. Even ten years ago this was not so. Fifty years ago the interest was only a beginning; thirty years ago hardly a beginning.

This state of affairs brings responsibilities to our government. It is in the interest of our government to let the people know as clearly about our foreign activities as can be done without giving counter to the enemy.
at the point where it gives comfort to our foes. After
some experience in international conferences, I
advisedly state that a one-time adage "corporals openly
arrived at" I literally carried out would do the course
of peace in the world which harm. Also we must bear
in mind that a promise means something to us but
means nothing to the countries of the Iron Curtain
unless it is useful.

The United States at this juncture is the most powerful
country on earth. That brings more responsibilities.
We must be sure what we want, sure what we need,
sure what our duties are, where our interests lie but
above all we must try to be sure that our direction
is in God's way. We cannot stand aloof from the
challenge that the Iron Curtain poses to the very
fundamentals in which we believe. We have no
denunciation on earth from this conflict. The battle
must be won in places near-by as well as far-
off places where millions of men have no livelihood
of democratic experience - and in the final
analysis it must be won here at home.

That is why I am more than deadly serious when
I bring to your attention the problem of how we are
to survive.

Since the last war the Communist empire has
brought about 100,000,000 people under police
state control. Since the last war the free world
has brought political independence to about the same
number. But in those countries most of which
previously were under control and have had little
experience in self-government, danger exists. The disappearance of absolute monarchs or colonial administrations in many such nations has left a vacuum. Millions of the people are illiterate and are living on a level of bare existence. Their newly-won independence in itself is a good omen. But it comes at a time in history when a great evil, based on slavery, is trying to spread like the whole world and that is what makes the danger. In our own self-interest we cannot afford to see the Communist-Imperialists take over these vulnerable nations one by one.

The conflict in which we are engaged is to preserve our freedom to do that. The first priority to prevent the loss of vulnerable Asia—Asia and Africa, as well as all-important Europe and South America. The goal is clear. The means are more difficult. Regardless of our power, the enemy has not been willing to risk an all-out military struggle. It may well be that the fact of our power has been the most important contribution to the preservation of freedom and independence of some of the fledglings which need time before they will be able to stand solidly on their own feet. If we know this, we cannot necessarily expect all of the other nations to benefit to believe it. And so there are political leaders in some countries and people who advocate avoidance of trouble until their heads in the sand. The trouble is that while their heads are buried they can be devoured. Among these
areas of the world there are also people who believe that we Americans want to dominate them.

Therefore the course we are pursuing is a delicate one in which we must make every possible effort to rally the free nations to dedicate themselves to the preservation of freedom and the dignity of man. It is necessary for all to make the issues clear. But we cannot try to dictate nor to dominate.

In America there may be an inclination to think that we have been of good to another nation: "We have helped them; why then they do what we want especially since it is in their own interest also." But newly-independent peoples are inclined not to do what we want them to do; they have the idea that it is a favor to us in return for help we have given them. The problem is to show that the goal is a common one and that what they need to do is in their own interest — for their own sake, not for ours.

Despite the misfortunes along the way the delicacy required in rallying free peoples of the world for an effective fight for freedom and indirectly to safeguard my opinion which is that we have made progress. Some of the very difficult problems which were repressed to free nations have in the past opened the door wide for Communist intrigue. This has been solved. It is not within my province to discuss all these matters.

I was concerned with a very serious dispute between Egypt, our ally, Great Britain...
While the dispute was between these two nations, there were far reaching overtones. The situation caused serious instability which became very dangerous for the Near East. Our interest obviously was to see a peaceful and honourable settlement.

After the revolution which brought a young group of officers to power in Egypt, the problems were dealt with realistically. First, the disputed Sudan was given the right of self-determination. This agreement among the British, Egyptians, and the Sudanese opened the way for a solution of the next problem - the Suez Canal Base. Negotiations on this were tough and took a long time, and all made a very busy time. In the final discussions with the British and the Egyptians, established the kind of satisfactory terms. Under these terms, the Base prevents it to Egypt, but can be used by the British in case of all attacks on the whole States of Turkey within ten years after the evacuation of the British troops is completed.

The problem was not simply an international one. It had delayed for many years the very large efforts required. It took years to develop the economy into a manner needed to assure a stable government. Now that the Sudan-France disputes are settled, the Egyptian Government can turn its attention to the task of enabling the people to make a better living. In Egypt, this means saving more water from the Nile to put more land under
cultivation. As I left Egypt, the job was being
undertaken vigorously. We are giving some assistance
Tite Egypt at an expensive $1. Egypt can progress
sufficiently in enabling its people to make a
better living. Egypt can remain a free nation
without the enslaving ideology. It is in our
interest to see this happen. Indeed, in many
other countries in similar circumstances
Immediately following the signing of the
and Sudan agreements the British and the
Egyptians were astonished at the rapidity of the change in
attitude of
Egyptians in particular. The Arabs in general,
to the British. The attitude changed quickly and
all time how to one that could be trusted friendly
if an agreement had been reached on the Suez
issues. Serious trouble would have broken
out which might have spread over all the
Middle East with disastrous consequences for all
our interests especially for our all-important
petroleum real capabilities.
It is my opinion that if the free nature endures in
Middle East, human nature is such
that men on the other side of the Iron Curtain
 sooner or later will break out of their bounds
there is an indomitable nature in man which
demands freedom. It may be suppressed for
generations but it is inevitable that the chains
some day will be broken. And that is our hope -
Having as recently left the Foreign Service want to say that we citizens must rely heavily on the men and women who serve us abroad to help keep other nations on the side of freedom. Again 45 years ago it was not very important whether we had a first-class foreign service. Now if we don't have a top-flight group of men and women who give us abroad, this dictators will come to all we hold dear.

Often I have been asked what career I might choose if I had my life to live over. My answer has always been the same -- the Foreign Service. At various times over the years there have been reforms of the foreign service and counter reforms and time and again the men in this field have been depressed and discouraged. We can admit that some of these personal policies have given cause for depression and discouragement. I was Assistant Secretary of State some 22 years ago and one of my jobs had to do with personnel and I know how hard it is to be objective. There is one thing I can say that is that, in spite of difficulties and even inequities, the good man nearly always comes to the top.

In the old days diplomacy was a matter of kings and princes and courts. It was much of a family affair even if its operations were occasionally complicated by murder and intrigue. It had to do above all with the fate of dynasties.
was much a do about marriages and dowries and the like. To-day it does nothing of the sort. Diplomacy to-day has to do with politics of disguise as it always did but just as important now are economic forces and labour and culture. We must take into account specific matters such as agriculture and petrolium and industry and education. We must have men who are specialists in these fields and men who talk difficult languages. Diplomacy grows more complicated everyday.

Formally public opinion didn't count very much (as it doesn't count to-day in the Soviet realms), if the rulers didn't give it much consideration (as they don't in the Soviet realms) to-day in the free world public opinion is king. Our government can go only as far as public opinion will let it. On the one hand our government must keep the public informed on the other hand it is equally important for the government to know what the people think.

It has been said that the personal element in diplomacy is not as important as it used to be. As the stakes are higher now and more and greater interests are involved the personal element never loomed so large. Time and time again it is one man in Washington or in the field who by his prestige or his wisdom or just his personality makes or unmake or re-makes history for good or for bad. To the advantage or the detriment of his country and eventually...
the world. I know because I have done it many a time. No amount of despatches - writing or telegraphing or lecturing or newspaper interviews - can do that.

Man cannot live alone; nor can nations. In isolation no people will thrive. Nations need to trade if they are to live abundantly. They need cultural interchanges, exchanges on adviser, scientific cooperation, news exchanges, educational exchanges. Diplomacy is needed to change all that.

Diplomacy cannot be complacent. It involves drive, determination, sacrifice, wisdom, intelligence, skill, tact, and not only in effect means nothing but discipline. Tact. There is a hierarchy in all of nature which derives from the natural law.

We are often asked what are the primary personal requisites for a good diplomat. They are always the same: intelligence, wisdom, voice, self-confidence, common sense. And above all a conviction that he knows what he is doing and that his cause is a good one.

Honesty, integrity.

Diplomacy is also a challenge - a continuous challenge. There are few dull or unoccupied moments for a diplomat at an important post. Official business is only a part of the real world while achievements elsewhere in the field of diplomacy are achieved out of the office, at lunch or dinner, or in the street.
hunches or over drinks or riding horse backs at tennis or golf or following talking at walls or on archaeological expeditions. In other words, diplomacy is an all-time engrossing career. There is no place for the sluggard or the laggard in modern day diplomacy.

As I have remarked before, modern diplomacy has to do with many things besides political relations and political rivalries. It has to do with oil, for instance. The nation which controls no oil is a very sorry nation indeed while the nation which controls huge oil reserves counts itself as happily fortunate. Diplomacy is often involved in ways and means of acquiring and conserving the required oil rights and oil concessions.

Perhaps all this calls for a final definition of diplomacy as simply the intelligent and honest practical way of protecting and advancing a nation's interest by conducting its foreign relations to that nation's honor and prosperity for the good of the world and finally to Hile Glory of God.