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In Defense of Nation-Building

BY ROBERT J. SILVERMAN

n one of my favorite Bill Murray movies, he plays a local television weatherman sent to cover the annual Groundhog Day festivities in Punxsutawney, Pa. Murray openly despises the assignment. Forced by bad weather to stay in the small town overnight, he continually awakens the following mornings to find himself reliving Groundhog Day in the same place. He is only able to break the time loop when he learns how to handle the people and the assignment well.

Is the United States stuck in a similar time loop when it comes to the nation-building assignment?

Of course there are real reasons to question the whole enterprise. To begin with, nation-building is a paternalistic term—it sounds like we are building someone else’s national institutions. In fact, what is usually meant is a mix of capacity building, development and reconstruction aid, often focused at the local and provincial levels, in conflict, post-conflict and crisis countries.

Rick Barton, assistant secretary of State for conflict and stabilization operations, uses the much better term “jump-starting,” which implies correctly that this enterprise doesn’t work unless the local people take ownership of it early on.

There are other reasons for a lack of enthusiasm for nation-building in the United States. It has cultural connotations of the colonial enterprise; it can become overly dependent on the U.S. military (see under Iraq); and it certainly is not the kind of international relations traditionally associated with diplomacy (see under Henry Kissinger, A World Restored).

Most importantly, it is often seen as just plain not feasible, an amorphous task without clear criteria for success at best and a waste of money at worst. State’s Office of the Inspector General reflects this skepticism in its March 2014 report on the Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations.

So, given all this skepticism, why do we continue to get stuck in Groundhog Day?

The circumstances are different each time, but I count Vietnam, Bosnia, Iraq, Afghanistan and Syria as Groundhog Day—and one could add others.

Nation-building, or nation jump-starting, will remain a key part of our overseas mission as long as we are the pre-eminent democracy, and we should plan for it better. Here are three suggestions.

First, it is time to revise the prescriptions in the 2010 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, which spoke repeatedly of a “whole of government” approach. That is a nice slogan; but if it means a laundry list from the Washington interagency for what the United States should do in conducting these difficult assignments, it is absolutely wrong.

Instead, we should have two or three clearly defined priorities adopted by a unified U.S. government at the outset of each such assignment, and that mission should be delegated to the chief of mission to implement on the ground.

Second, the U.S. government should realize that the State Department is the natural leader of this enterprise. True, USAID has critical expertise in certain sectors; Treasury plays an important role, especially in liaising with the international financial institutions. And the military has the lead in security assistance and the resources to play a greater role in key infrastructure protection, while the intelligence community is focused on the very different counterterrorism mission.

State has the people who know the region and its leadership structures, who are able to integrate the various interagency resources to best achieve mission priorities in a specific place. We sometimes come to this realization after the mission has started (see under Iraq).

Third, given its natural leadership role, State should invest more in equipping our people to be successful in carrying out the mission. To me that means more language training, more and longer interagency leadership education and more priority given to those with multiple tours in troubled regions. I believe Robert Ford’s record of effectiveness as ambassador to the Syrian opposition has something to do with his three tours in postwar Iraq.

In short, let’s embrace the nation-building enterprise and prepare for the next mission to Punxsutawney.

Be well, stay safe and keep in touch,
Bob
Silverman@afsa.org

Robert J. Silverman is the president of the American Foreign Service Association.
Remembering Our History

BY SHAWN DORMAN

This year marks nine decades of the Foreign Service and AFSA. On May 24, 1924, President Calvin Coolidge signed the Rogers Act into law, establishing the modern Foreign Service. The history of the Foreign Service and AFSA is our focus in this anniversary month.

And speaking of birthdays, The Foreign Service Journal is actually 95 this year! The American Consular Association published the first issue of our precursor, the eight-page American Consular Bulletin, in March 1919. That organization was expanded into the American Foreign Service Association after the Rogers Act was passed, and the magazine was renamed, as well.

The new publication began with bold ambitions, which have stood the test of time: “This first printed bulletin of the American Consular Association is the result of a feeling on the part of many consular officers that there should be some organ by which information of interest to the Service might be disseminated—an organ which would provide a medium for the exchange of ideas looking to the improvement of the service as well as news of the activities of particular officers.”

Fittingly, it was during that birthday month that we took the Journal and other AFSA materials to the International Studies Association convention in Toronto. The ISA was established in 1959 to promote research and education in international affairs and to be the premier organization for connecting scholars and practitioners in the field of international studies.

I made the trip to Toronto, along with retired FSO Robert Dry, a member of AFSA’s Professionalism and Ethics Committee, to represent AFSA and the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training.

Our goal was to make connections in the academic world and share the practitioners’ perspectives through AFSA and ADST materials (The Foreign Service Journal, the Inside a U.S. Embassy book and the ADST oral histories, which were conveniently featured in our March issue).

The divide between the study of international relations and the practice of diplomacy that I saw firsthand in Toronto was striking, indeed, and begs to be addressed. Happily, in this month’s feature, “The American Way of Diplomacy,” Robert Hutchings does just that, offering a reality check and ideas for elevating diplomacy as a subject for serious study.

To illuminate AFSA’s own 90-year history, this fall AFSA’s Foreign Service Books imprint will publish a new book, The Voice of the Foreign Service: A History of AFSA. It’s author, former FSO Harry Kopp, has been poring over archival documents and old FSJs, interviewing, researching and writing for the last 18 months, and the book is close to completion. Look for it before the end of our anniversary year.

For this issue, in “Foreign Service, Civil Service: How We Got to Where We Are,” Mr. Kopp looks at the sensitive and sometimes contentious Foreign Service-Civil Service relationship over time, including the controversial 1950s Wristonization program and its impact on the present state of FS-CS relations.

Then we take a close look at how the Rogers Act came to be with “In the Beginning: The Rogers Act of 1924,” written by two retired FSOs, AFSA Vice President for Retirees Larry Cohen and James Lamont—who may just be the only person to have written his Ph.D. thesis on the Rogers Act. Everyone concerned with the Foreign Service should be familiar with this act, so here is your primer.

To conclude our focus, we offer a selection of vignettes from AFSA members, active-duty and retired, on some of their best moments in the Foreign Service, followed by a condensed AFSA History Timeline.

Elsewhere in this month’s issue, Ambassador Robert Hunter calls for “Getting State and the FS Back in the Game” (Speaking Out). And you’ll find a fascinating account of Ambassador Charles Yost’s tenure in Cold War Morocco, written by his daughter, in FS Heritage.

We welcome your feedback on this issue and encourage you to think about submitting a letter or a full article for a future issue. Author guidelines can be found on the FSJ page of the AFSA website. If you’re keen to share but not to write, send us a favorite recent photo from an interesting place for Local Lens.

Next month, look for perspectives on the diplomatic corps of other countries, written by practitioners.

Shawn Dorman is the editor of The Foreign Service Journal.
Promoting FS Health

I am writing in response to the Speaking Out column in your November 2013 issue (“Keeping Faith with State’s Wounded Warriors,” by Juliet Wurr) and to the two letters to the editor in the January-February 2014 issue involving a workers’ compensation claim.

Although the State Department cannot comment on medical and confidential information on specific employees, the department shares the concerns about the health risks that many of our Foreign and Civil Service employees face when posted abroad. We have taken appropriate and effective action to address them.

The State Department provides support to its employees in filing claims for workers’ compensation benefits under the Federal Employees’ Compensation Act, a program administered by the U.S. Department of Labor’s Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs. Although OWCP is responsible for adjudicating claims for workers’ compensation, the department works closely with OWCP and its employees to assist them if an employee believes that he or she contracted a disease or other injury causally related to his or her employment.

The department also consults regularly with OWCP regarding the supporting documentation and standards it applies in evaluating claims, including the required demonstration by an employee that a disease was contracted in the performance of duty. The department strongly believes that Foreign Service employees, as well as all other federal government employees posted abroad, who contract an infectious disease endemic to their country of assignment should be eligible for workers’ compensation benefits under FECA.

The department has engaged in numerous discussions with OWCP regarding this issue, and we understand that OWCP shares this view. We continue to work with OWCP to clarify the standards it applies to the adjudication of such cases.

In addition to its work with OWCP, the department is committed to enhancing its efforts to inform Foreign Service and other U.S. government civilian employees posted abroad regarding the health risks they face in their countries of assignment, and to provide them the necessary resources and direction to mitigate these risks.

The Department of State’s Office of Medical Services strives to safeguard and promote the health and well-being of America’s diplomatic community. Overseas, MED provides primary care and mental health services, manages hospitalizations and medical evacuations, and assesses local health threats and medical resources for more than 50,000 employees and their eligible family members serving under chief-of-mission authority.

MED staff members promote wellness through health promotion, education, immunizations and attention to health maintenance. They provide occupational and travel medical services to maintain a safe workplace and healthy workforce worldwide.

They also prepare for medical responses to pandemics, disasters and terrorist attacks by emergency planning, staff training and stockpiling of emergency drugs, medical supplies and personal protective equipment. And they support deployments to zones of armed conflict by psychologically preparing, screening and treating employees for post-traumatic stress disorders or other related mental health conditions.

Hans G. Klemm
Acting Director General for the Foreign Service and Director of Human Resources
Washington, D.C.

A ClarificationRegarding Workers’ Comp

The AFSA News article “Claiming Workers’ Compensation” in your January-February issue states: “The cost of long-term treatment of all civilian federal government employees—including members of the Foreign Service—who are injured in the line of duty, or suffer from a medical or psychiatric condition that can be attributed to government service domestically or overseas, is reimbursed through the Office of Workers’ Compensation in the Department of Labor, and not through the foreign affairs agencies.”

While it is correct that the Department of Labor adjudicates claims, pays claim-related medical bills and pays monetary, wage-loss compensation for those who are unable to work or who have incurred permanent impairments, all these related expenses are actually charged back to the employing agency at the end of the year.

Of primary importance, however, is not which agency covers such expenses, but seeing that all claims are handled fairly and in a timely manner by OWCP. That is our goal.

Judy Goodman Ikels
Chief, Work/Life Division
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C.
The Young African Leaders Initiative

I’d like to highlight the Young African Leaders Initiative for Foreign Service Journal readers. This noble endeavor by the United States is a signature effort to invest in the next generation of African leaders. Nearly one in three Africans are between the ages of 10 and 24, and approximately 60 percent of Africa’s total population is below the age of 35.

President Obama launched YALI in 2010 to support young African leaders as they spur growth and prosperity, strengthen democratic governance, and enhance peace and security across the continent.

Since 2010, the State Department has held 15 exchanges for young African leaders and sponsored 1,283 sub-Saharan scholars through its educational and cultural affairs programs. U.S. embassies have awarded small grants totaling $750,000 to YALI alumni groups supporting youth development in Africa.

The YALI programs could be emulated across the globe, especially in places where there is a lack of understanding of basic governance and the rule of law. The Middle East would be a great place to start a similar program for emerging leaders in the areas of civic engagement, government and business.

As a reader for the YALI program, I have seen many talented individuals who aspired to become leaders within their chosen fields. Sadly, however, due to a lack of resources and opportunities within their respective environments, they were unable to develop their true potential. So it is truly an honor to be part of the State Department’s innovative, creative efforts to address this problem.

Programs like YALI are an investment in the future of those nations, and they promote the values that we hold dear in our own nation and those of us in the Foreign Service strive to impart in the regions in which we work: democracy, human rights and the rule of law.

Krishna Das
Foreign Service Specialist
Embassy Baghdad

Correcting Tydings

“Telling Our Stories: The Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection,” as featured in the March issue of The Foreign Service Journal, was an excellent way to mark AFSA’s 90th anniversary. The excerpts from the ADST interviews with six diplomats who carried out their assignments with distinction, meeting many challenges from the 1940s through the 1990s, offer unique insights into the professional and personal aspects of serving our country abroad.

These well-selected excerpts will surely encourage many readers to consult the website of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training in search of “the rest of the story.” The ADST oral history interviews are a valuable historical resource—and often a great read, too.

Regarding the interview of FSO John S. Service, however, I would note that the chairman of the Tydings Committee (formally called the Subcommittee on the Investigation of Loyalty of State Department Employees), which in 1950 summoned Mr. Service and others to testify, was U.S. Senator Millard E. Tydings, D-Md.—not Joseph Tydings, as indicated in the excerpt.

Millard Tydings served in the Senate from 1927 until 1951, following his defeat in the bitter 1950 campaign. His colleague on the committee, Sen. Joseph McCarthy, R-Wis., became involved in the Maryland election and was alleged to have engaged in unfair and deceptive campaign practices. That election itself became the subject of a Senate investigation in 1951, but the results were ultimately allowed to stand. Joseph D. Tydings, Millard’s son, represented Maryland in the U.S. Senate from 1965 to 1971.

Michael D. Orlansky
FSO, retired
Burlington, Vt.

Recalling Anson Burlingame

In reference to the March AFSA News article, “AFSA Memorial Plaque: The Forgotten, Found,” I believe that one other exceptional American diplomat omitted from the list should be honored and remembered: Anson Burlingame, Abraham Lincoln’s first envoy to Imperial China (Qing Dynasty).

While serving in Beijing (1861-1867), Burlingame often spoke up for ordinary Chinese whose voices were rarely heard. He articulated the issues of unfairness perpetuated by foreign powers seeking special privileges, extraterritoriality, access to commerce in coastal ports and other demands.

At the end of his China tour, the Qing Imperial Court asked him to serve as its envoy to help renegotiate the many unequal treaties Western powers had imposed following the Opium Wars of 1839-1842. The State Department authorized him to do so. (For the full story, see www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2011/0912/ca/jue_burlingame).

As part of his mission to help China, the envoy drafted eight articles to supplement the 1858 Treaty of Tientsin. These formed the Burlingame Treaty of 1868,
also known as the Seward-Burlingame Treaty. This new treaty accorded equality, fairness and reciprocity to China.

Regrettably, the national mood in the United States at that time was highly xenophobic, and Congress tried to abrogate the treaty by legislation. President Rutherford Hayes vetoed that bill, citing the constitutional principle of separation of powers, but the treaty was later nullified by the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.

En route to Europe, Burlingame and his large Chinese delegation stopped in London, Paris, Stockholm, Copenhagen, Berlin and St. Petersburg, and were warmly received at each stop by heads of state. Sadly, the Russian winter was too severe for Burlingame, who died there of pneumonia on Feb. 23, 1870.

He was buried in a cemetery in Cambridge, Mass., with both American and Chinese flags draped over the coffin. In honor of his diplomatic service, the Qing Court conferred a posthumous Civil Service title of the first rank on him and set up a pension of $10,000 for his family. The city of Burlingame outside San Francisco International Airport was also named after him.

In retrospect, perhaps Mark Twain’s words in his tribute to Burlingame expressed it best: “For he had outgrown the narrow citizenship of a state and became a citizen of the world, and his charity was large enough and his great heart warm enough to feel for all its races and to labor for them. ... In greatness, ability, grandeur of character and achievement, he stood head and shoulders above all the Americans of today. ... He was a good man and a very, very great man. America lost a son, and all the world a servant, when he died.”

Stanton Jue
FSO, retired
Arlington, Va.
Sending Their Best to Washington

As AFSA delves ever deeper into the issue of political ambassadors, we have often made the case that our counterparts around the world do not contend with the same level of political patronage when it comes to the selection of ambassadors—and particularly those being dispatched to the capitals of important allies. But would the actual statistics bear out the anecdotal evidence supporting that conclusion?

After researching every ambassador currently stationed in Washington (167 in all) and scrutinizing their biographies, it turns out we were even more right than we knew.

To aid in our analysis, we divided these officials into three categories: career members of their country’s Foreign Service; highly experienced former government members; and political appointees. The chart shown here tells the story vividly. Only 13 of the 167 could be categorized as political appointees—just 7.8 percent. In comparison, 37 percent of America’s ambassadors stationed overseas were political appointees as of April 1.

As we broke the data down even further, we discovered that not a single member of NATO, the Group of 20 or the Association of Southeast Asian Nations has a politically appointed ambassador representing it in Washington. The only nations with such political appointees in Washington are Haiti, Jamaica, Kenya, Kosovo, Lesotho, Mauritania, Moldova, Panama, Rwanda, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Trinidad & Tobago and Zambia.

Clearly, almost every country in the world believes that its bilateral relationship with the United States is so important that only highly qualified and experienced diplomats or government ministers are entrusted with conducting it.

We invite you to investigate the list by visiting www.afsa.org/foreignambs. (Note that the data there is accurate as of March 18; subsequent personnel changes may affect the accuracy of the data.) AFSA’s document, Guidelines for Successful Performance as a Chief of Mission, is available online at www.afsa.org/chiefsofmission.

—Ásgeir Sigfússon,
AFSA Director of New Media

Addition by Subtraction?

In a March 24 statement known as the Hague Declaration, the United States and its closest allies formally suspended Russia from membership in the “Group of 8” industrialized democracies.

As a result, the body will now revert to its Group of 7 structure, which dates back to 1976 and brings together finance ministers and central bank governors from Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The Hague Declaration reads, in part: “This Group came together because of shared beliefs and shared responsibilities. Russia’s actions in recent weeks are not consistent with them. Under these circumstances, we will not participate in the planned Sochi Summit.

“We will suspend our participation in the Group of 8 until Russia changes course and the environment comes back to where the G-8 is able to have a meaningful discussion, and will meet again in G-7 format at the same time as planned, in June 2014, in Brussels, to discuss the broad agenda we have together.

“We have also advised our foreign ministers not...
The University of Southern California’s Center on Public Diplomacy was established in 2003 as a partnership between the Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism and the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California. In 2008, USC received the Benjamin Franklin Award for Public Diplomacy from the U.S. State Department in recognition of its work to “advance and enrich the study and practice of public diplomacy through its research, professional education and public engagement.”

To enhance its ability to carry out that mission, CPD has redesigned its website to connect PD professionals to colleagues around the world, help them dig deeper into its original analysis and curated content, and share their work with the global PD community. The new and improved site offers access to daily news, blogs, interviews and multimedia content, as well as the largest free collection of public diplomacy resources anywhere.

—Steven Alan Honley, Contributing Editor

SITE OF THE MONTH: http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org

Welcome Home, Public Diplomacy.

Your all-new website for PD is finally here.

MTV Fights Trafficking

Remember the old days when MTV just showed music videos? Today the pioneering network harnesses the power of its world-famous brand to support social action campaigns.

One such campaign is MTV EXIT (End Exploitation and Trafficking), which works in partnership with USAID and Australian Aid. MTV EXIT seeks to help end human trafficking and exploitation “by raising awareness, promoting positive behavior change and driving social action.”

Based in Thailand, MTV EXIT works with “influencers” around the world, including international and local celebrities, anti-trafficking and youth organizations, government agencies and young people, primarily in the Asia Pacific region.

So far, the campaign has put on 38 large concerts, including a Jason Mraz appearance in Myanmar and concerts in Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia and even Timor-Leste, featuring many of the most popular Southeast Asian artists.

Through films, TV shows, music videos, concerts, public service announce-
The people at the Journal office have been somewhat surprised, and a little miffed, at the lack of reader comment on the changes in the magazine’s appearance in the last couple of issues. Hasn’t anybody noticed? When the Saturday Evening Post underwent a radical face-lifting operation a few years ago, the reaction, pro and con, was convulsive. We wouldn’t like people writing in to cancel their subscriptions, as some SEP readers did, but we expected at least a few oral or epistolary twitches. …

So far (at this writing) nobody has pointed out that the eagle on our title page is looking the wrong way: anyway, in the wrong direction from the eagle on the United States Seal. No insubordination or heresy intended: his pose does not indicate an ideological shift to the left. The artist insisted he had to face that way, outward toward the magazine title rather than inward away from it.

We choose to believe that the absence of protests means that Journal readers are, as a group, open-minded, receptive to change and experiment. Not just unobservant.


50 Years Ago

The people at the Journal office have been somewhat surprised, and a little miffed, at the lack of reader comment on the changes in the magazine’s appearance in the last couple of issues. Hasn’t anybody noticed? When the Saturday Evening Post underwent a radical face-lifting operation a few years ago, the reaction, pro and con, was convulsive. We wouldn’t like people writing in to cancel their subscriptions, as some SEP readers did, but we expected at least a few oral or epistolary twitches. …

So far (at this writing) nobody has pointed out that the eagle on our title page is looking the wrong way: anyway, in the wrong direction from the eagle on the United States Seal. No insubordination or heresy intended: his pose does not indicate an ideological shift to the left. The artist insisted he had to face that way, outward toward the magazine title rather than inward away from it.

We choose to believe that the absence of protests means that Journal readers are, as a group, open-minded, receptive to change and experiment. Not just unobservant.

Contemporary Quote

I feel privileged... If I were outside government now I’d be writing editorials, seeking meetings with the U.N. ambassador [and] seeking meetings with the Secretary of State. Instead I get to work with the Secretary every day who’s as committed as I am to dealing with the problem. I get to talk to the president about it, who has dedicated $100 million to get African forces in there in as timely a fashion as possible in tough budget times.

So I’m in a much better position now to affect both the pace and the scope of our response, and we’ve come a long way. But... neither the new Samantha Power nor the old Samantha Power can be satisfied when you still have Muslim and Christian civilians who are living in great fear.


Shooting the Messenger

Stung by online political attacks, Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan banned access to the social media platform Twitter on March 21, just ahead of local elections. At this writing, the issue is in the courts.

Erdogan has made similar threats to ban Facebook and YouTube, but has not yet acted on those.

The Turkish telecommunications regulator BTK defended the ban as intended to prevent the possible “victimization of citizens,” citing legal complaints from users who asserted the site had violated their privacy.

But the English-language Turkish newspaper Hürriyet Daily News reports that the Istanbul Heavy Penal Court told the Union of Turkish Bar Associations that Twitter had been blocked as a result of an “executive decision, not a judicial verdict.” TBB has filed a petition with the court requesting the ban be lifted, the report said.

The Committee to Protect Journalists commented that “Prime Minister Erdogan can keep stepping up his attacks on social media, but they only serve to show that he is afraid of the message and desperate to shoot the messenger.”

Twitter is a popular platform for Turkish whistleblowers, who in recent months have shared recordings—allegedly of Erdogan and his aides—that implicate top-ranking authorities in corruption, abuse of power and other wrongdoing.

Anonymous tweets promising to release even more sensitive recordings via Twitter on March 25, a few days before the elections, presumably goaded Erdogan to issue his edict.

Many Turkish Twitter users have sidestepped the ban, including Turkish President Abdullah Gül, who tweeted: “There is no way that closing down social media platforms can be approved.” The hashtag #TwitterIsBlockedInTurkey began trending from within the country a few hours after the ban was announced.

Neelie Kroes, vice president of the European Commission who is also in charge of the European Union’s digital agenda, called Turkey’s ban “groundless, pointless, cowardly.”

—Steven Alan Honley, Contributing Editor
Getting State and the Foreign Service Back in the Game

This is not just about diplomacy, either narrowly or broadly defined, but about analyzing and integrating all instruments of power and influence—political, diplomatic, economic and military.

By Robert Hunter

For some time, there has been a spate of articles and other commentary (I might even say hand-wringing) about the diminished role that the State Department is playing in the overall “making” of U.S. foreign policy, as opposed to “carrying out” at least the non-military elements of it. (Witness Vali Nasr’s pointed analysis in The Dispensable Nation: American Foreign Policy in Retreat, Anchor, 2014.)

Though I have never served in the U.S. Foreign Service, I would like to draw on my experience as a former ambassador to NATO and National Security Council staffer, and a current member of State’s International Security Advisory Board, to offer the following suggestions for getting State and the Foreign Service fully back in the game, where they belong.

Strengthening the Foreign Service is essential in its own right, but I believe it is also critical to focus on the role that the State Department must play in the interagency process, as well as in developing (and implementing) overall strategies for the United States in the world.

This is not just about diplomacy, either narrowly or broadly defined, but about analyzing and integrating all instruments of power and influence—political, diplomatic, economic and military. (And also cultural: I still bemoan one of the worst decisions affecting U.S. interests abroad in the last two decades, the elimination of the U.S. Information Agency, for which I spoke over many years and which should be promptly revived.)

The Paradigm Gap

This mission has become even more urgent since the end of the Cold War, with the collapse of a relatively simple unifying foreign policy paradigm. Indeed, there is now a “paradigm gap” that—absent a unifying “threat” from, say, China—will not be closed, given the nature of today’s diffuse international system and the likely systems of tomorrow.

This reality is reinforced by the sheer scope of U.S. interaction with the outside world, encompassed (for want of a better term) by the concept “globalization.” Ironically, we face fewer direct threats to the homeland than we did during the Cold War, but are perforce far more engaged in the outside world than ever before, and must therefore be both smarter and more creative.

Among other things, radical expansion of the term “foreign policy” means that there are a lot more players than ever before in U.S. policy formulation and engagement (not all of whom are in Washington), including the public and private sectors and nongovernmental organizations. These players all have an instantaneous capacity to interact and communicate that defies centralization under the authority of anyone, certainly including the Secretary of State—let alone any U.S. chief of mission abroad.

The country teams in many embassies are already too huge to manage, forcing the front office to spend more and more time gathering intelligence on what is being done in the name of the U.S. by so many different actors—including combatant commands that bear no allegiance to the chief of mission.

Back in Washington, State has often been sidelined since the end of the Cold War—not just because the White House has been drawing power to itself, but also because State has not sufficiently cultivated Foreign and Civil Service staff with the talents and skills to play effective roles in strategic thinking and policy integration. These are not, alas, generally requirements for promotion.

Killing off the mind-expanding Senior...
Seminar, on the specious grounds that senior people could not be spared for several months, is just one example of the problem. The same goes for the tendency often to send FSOs judged to be “unpromotable” at State to be political advisers at military commands, even when they are “square pegs” who lack the regional or functional expertise to be effective there. This robs the commands of solid diplomatic advice, deprives State of a source of seasoned intelligence on the U.S. military and reduces the chances of integrating different aspects of policy. This robs the commands of solid diplomatic advice, deprives State of a source of seasoned intelligence on the U.S. military in action, and reduces the chances of integrating different aspects of policy.

Left on the Margins

While State continues to do its job well enough, often superbly, in terms of day-to-day activities (frequently under difficult circumstances), it has become steadily more marginal in the formulation of policy at the high end of the spectrum. This has been true of at least the last three administrations, and the resulting gap—though only in part State’s “fault”—has been largely filled by other entities. In particular, the National Security Council staff has grown exponentially since the end of the Cold War, even though they, too, have often shown little penchant for “strategic thinking.” This is due in large part to the fact that every president after George H.W. Bush has seemed to believe, erroneously, that America’s role in the world is easier to manage in an era of reduced direct threats to the nation. (Also, the larger the NSC staff grows, the more it “crowds out” more experienced and expert people in the agencies.)

The drop in the number of FSOs in senior-level positions at State—50 percent is the common assessment—is a further problem, not just for the department but also for policy-formulation overall. The intrusion of political appointees many layers deep into the bureaucracy, even down to the working level—lots of whom, let’s be candid, are not up to the job—only exacerbates the loss of Foreign Service expertise.

This might have happened anyway, given the growth of patronage politics in recent decades. But it has not been helped by the relative lack of hard analyses and useful policy suggestions flowing from State to the White House, which could signal to the president that too much patronage politics at State could kill off a valuable goose and its golden eggs. And if the NSC staff itself proves to be inadequate in strategic thinking, the president does not benefit if the pros at State don’t fill the gap.

The Ideas Gap

All too often, today’s Foreign Service does not encourage (or promote) members well-versed in strategic thought, broad-scale analysis and integration across regions and functions to present for presidential-level decision the perspectives and potentialities for U.S. effectiveness in the world. Too often, insight and initiative are stifled in the lower and middle grades; cutting-edge analysis is heavily sandpapered on the sixth and seventh floors, before smooth but uninspiring “consensus”—i.e., “fully cleared”—recommendations pass to the White House.

Thus, expertise at State has made less of a dent in the interagency process and has been less on the “front lines” of ideas than should be expected. These lacunae in State’s policy leadership notably include, for instance, fashioning a new Transatlantic Compact embracing NATO and the critical Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership—on which Treasury and USTR have marginalized State; most areas of Middle East policy (including the necessary integration and trade-offs of contending aspects of U.S. interests and policies); charting courses to deal with the consequences of U.S. disentangling from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; and providing context and political content for the “rebalancing” to Asia.

Another area, evident recently, in which the White House came up short and State did not fill the void, concerns NATO, Central Europe and Russia. Had circumstances been properly understood and policies well-formulated and executed, clear-sightedness just might have headed off the recent crisis over Ukraine.

It has been years, if not decades, since State’s Policy Planning staff has played the creative role for which it was designed. Too often, its director has lacked the skills, experience and stature to provide the necessary leadership in choosing and motivating staff and assuring that S/P’s products meet the needs of the Secretary of State. (To be fair, though, the Secretary has often failed to use S/P effectively or demand that it be “brought up to snuff.”)

At the same time, many regional bureau assistant secretaries—even when Foreign Service and not political—are selected for their capacity to “manage” a bureau—which, of course, is important—but not to produce (or draw out from their teams) the perspectives needed for State to play a critical role in the formulation of policy. The under secretary for political affairs has often been top-class in this regard, but recent incumbents have rarely been chosen for their capacity for strategic thinking.

Of course, there are pockets within the department that traditionally have played an effective “strategic” role and some continue to do so, notably, in my judgment, current Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security Rose Gottemoeller and her able team. This is
one area where State’s leadership role has long been acknowledged throughout the government.

Filling the Leadership Vacuum

Part of the problem is also insufficient leadership at the top of the department. To be blunt, several Secretaries of State in the past two decades never understood that their real influence derived from their ability to bring ideas to the table, not just success at implementing policy or sitting at the president’s right hand in the Cabinet or situation rooms.

They compounded that mistake by defining success in terms of the narrow instrumentality summarized as “diplomacy”—even when expertly carried out—without reference to strategic thinking, analysis, planning and presentation of policy alternatives.

There has also been weakness at the top at the State Department in terms of fighting for money, including failure to enlist presidents in that cause. The first Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review four years ago was a noble venture in essaying a counterpart to the Defense Department’s Quadrennial Defense Review, thus opening the door to challenging DoD’s 13-to-1 share of the national security budget pie.

But aside from some increase in the number of Foreign Service positions, what did the QDDR accomplish? The creation of three new bureaus just added to bureaucracy without enhancing State’s “clout”—whether in diplomacy and development or, more importantly, in strategy.

Cast a Wide Net

What is to be done? Addressing the problems and possibilities of the Foreign Service and of the State Department requires taking a broad look at the role of State in an age when more factors than ever before must be integrated to enable the United States to be effective in the world.

It means placing added emphasis on developing people with the capacity for strategic thinking; and it means reforming the selection, promotion, organization and management processes within State, especially to emphasize and reward the skills and perspectives that produce ideas that can truly add value not just to the “interagency process” but also to securing U.S. interests and values abroad.

Each Secretary of State needs to make building an effective, top-class, “strategically-oriented” team his or her first order of business before plunging into diplomacy. Otherwise, State’s role will continue to be depreciated, and the Foreign Service will increasingly be seen not as a policy development instrument but as a team of negotiators—however able.

It follows, too, that strengthening State’s role in foreign policy and national security must include not just Foreign Service officers and others whose experience is largely limited to the department, but their colleagues from other agencies, the private sector, NGOs and non-FSO “policymakers”—where strategic thinking and integration of different perspectives and instruments of policy and action will also be in critical demand.

Of course, all of this must be directed from the top, by U.S. presidents who understand the need for a first-class team in foreign policy and national security, structure and organization to enable them to be effective and his or her commitment to lead. This, too, is needed for State and the Foreign Service to get back in the game.
The burden of two very different personnel systems, and a large and growing cohort of appointees exempt from the disciplines of either, is taking a real toll on the Department of State—and the Foreign Service.

BY HARRY KOPP

The U.S. Department of State is one of the few agencies—the Department of Defense is another—with large numbers of employees in different personnel systems. The two systems, Civil Service and Foreign Service, have different employee benefits, protections, rights and obligations.

Conflicts between the systems have long been evident. From the 1940s into the 1970s, a series of commissions, committees and panels of experts urged the department to move to a single structure. The department’s leadership agreed with these recommendations, but time and again found reasons to delay or avoid acting on them.

State eventually abandoned the effort to integrate the two services, but not the search for ways to strengthen a sense of teamwork and unity of purpose. The dual system, with its administrative complexities and inevitable inequities, continues to burden the department’s managers.

The Roots of a Dual System

The roots of the dual system reach to the 18th century, when Thomas Jefferson, the first Secretary of State, created different services to perform different functions: a diplomatic service to
In 1900 the U.S. had 41 diplomatic missions and 318 consular establishments—and just 91 domestic employees, including the Secretary of State.

The Foreign Service Act of 1924, generally known as the Rogers Act, passed after three years of debate, combining the two services into a single Foreign Service of the United States, with entry by competitive examination, promotion by merit, mandatory retirement, a pension system and other features that remain in place today (see p. 26).

Personnel Structure under the Rogers Act

The personnel structure of the Foreign Service as conceived in the 1924 Act was a flow-through system, bringing new members in at the bottom and moving them through ranks that emptied with promotions or retirements, by reason of age or time in grade. The system was rotational, with members expected to move periodically from station to station. Officers in the Foreign Service would compete against each other, with the top performers advancing and the worst performers facing possible dismissal.

By contrast, the Civil Service system, introduced to the Department of State in the early 20th century through a series of executive orders, was static. Members did not necessarily enter at the bottom, and they advanced in grade only by moving to more highly rated—more challenging and more responsible—positions. They had a high degree of job security and were not expected to move periodically from one assignment to another.

The principal difference, however, was that members of the Foreign Service expected to spend roughly 90 percent of their time overseas. Members of the Civil Service, with a few exceptions, worked only in the United States.

The exceptions were outside the State Department. Congress established a Foreign Commerce Service in the Commerce Department (1927-1939) and a Foreign Agricultural Service in the Department of Agriculture (1930-1939), and provided overseas postings for employees of the Interior Department’s Bureau of Mines (1935-1943). Employees of all three agencies remained in the Civil Service when sent abroad. When austerity and war later shut both organizations down, their members were reassigned to the Department of State and welcomed into the Foreign Service. Congress revived the FAS in 1954 and the FCS in 1980, and both services adopted the Foreign Service system.
Despite repeated calls to move to a unitary personnel structure, like most other federal agencies, the State Department has refused to act.

Broken by War

World War II broke the Foreign Service, as it broke so many institutions. Recruitment was halted to avoid interference with the military draft, leading the increasingly short-handed department to implore its senior officers to stay on the job as long as possible. Under the Rogers Act, the percentage of officers in each of the top six (of nine) ranks was strictly limited: no more than 6 percent, for example, could be in Class 1, the highest rank, and no more than 14 percent in Class 6. The percentage caps, lifted finally in 1945, effectively blocked promotions. As officers grew frustrated, many resigned to join the armed forces.

In 1941 Congress addressed the shortage by authorizing the department to form a Foreign Service Auxiliary of people hired outside the examination process, to serve for the duration of the war. Auxiliary personnel were paid according to their civilian experience and sometimes outearned regular Foreign Service officers doing similar work. Many had skills in economics and finance that regular FSOs often disparaged as technical or "specialized."

By 1943 planning for a postwar world was already underway. The department's top administrative official, a career member of the Foreign Service named G. Howland Shaw, saw a need to retain the skills that the Auxiliary had brought into the service. Regular career FSOs feared that an influx of Auxiliary personnel into the career would inhibit their own advancement. A December 1943 Foreign Service Journal editorial defended the "versatility and adaptability" of the "trained Foreign Service officer" who is "better fitted to handle the coming postwar duties than any group of specialists or technicians recruited from civil life."

But the hiring freeze in the career service had made that thinking irrelevant. In January 1946, the 976 officers in the Auxiliary outnumbered the 820 officers of the regular career corps. Under the Manpower Act of 1946, the department held examinations that brought 360 new officers into the career service at all but the most senior grades. The new officers came from the Auxiliary, the military and the Civil Service, or had been clerks and vice consuls in the non-career Foreign Service.

A July 1945 Washington Post editorial called for "a complete overhaul and radical expansion of the State Department," including "democratization of the Foreign Service." The Bureau of the Budget urged Secretary of State James F. Byrnes to place the department’s Foreign Service and Civil Service employees in a single system. Foreign Service personnel, said the BOB, would benefit from more time in the department, and Civil Service personnel would gain from tours abroad.

The bureau also recommended recruitment and hiring into the middle and upper grades of the Foreign Service, to break down its closed, elite structure. It argued, as well, for more attention to building leadership, supervisory and administrative skills through systematic training for all of the department’s employees.

Seldin Chapin and the 1946 Act

Seldin Chapin, head of the department’s Office of Foreign Service (a position roughly equivalent to today’s director general of the Foreign Service), led a study group that proposed a 10-year transition to a consolidated service whose members would all serve at home and abroad. But consolidation, even over a decade, would surely have met resistance from the career Foreign Service, and likely from the home service as well.

State management did not want to deal with such friction, and turned aside Chapin’s recommendation. Instead, it directed him to work on legislation to preserve a separate Foreign Service.

The Foreign Service Act of 1946 evolved from Chapin’s efforts. It created a service that included an officer corps, a staff officer corps (providing a career for the non-career clerks) and a reserve. Reserve officers held commissions for up to five years and were often chosen for their specialized skills and knowledge.

Staff, reserve and regular officers were all on the same pay scale and received similar benefits. The foreign and home services remained separate, but members of the home service, the staff officer corps and the reserve corps with at least four years of experience (or three years for those over the age of 31) could seek lateral entry into any but the highest level of the Foreign Service.

Chapin, a career FSO, was a graduate of the Naval Academy. His legislative draft introduced several features of the Navy’s personnel system to the Foreign Service, notably "promotion up or selection out"—mandatory retirement of regular (but not staff or reserve) officers repeatedly passed over for promotion or repeatedly ranked at the bottom of their class.
The 1946 Foreign Service Act created a service of great flexibility, able (at least on paper) to add and subtract personnel as needs changed. But the legislation left untouched the managerial complexity of a Department of State with two personnel systems, and failed to provide overseas exposure for the home service or Washington assignments for the Foreign Service. Its passage turned out to be just the beginning, not the end, of a long period of organizational flux and debate.

**Curing a “Cancerous Cleavage”: Hoover to Wriston**

A series of blue-ribbon panels, beginning with the Hoover Commission of 1947-1949 (chaired by former President Herbert Hoover) urged the department to restructure itself. Citing “a cancerous cleavage” between the Foreign Service and the Civil Service in the department, the commission’s recommended solution was clear: “The personnel in the permanent State Department establishment in Washington and the personnel of the Foreign Service above certain levels should be amalgamated over a short period of years into a single foreign affairs service obligated to serve at home or overseas and constituting a safeguarded career group administered separately from the general Civil Service” [emphasis in original].

Dean Acheson, the former under secretary and future Secretary of State, was a member of the commission and “heartily concurred” with this view. But when he became Secretary of State in 1949, he fudged by appointing New Deal lawyer James H. Rowe to head a new commission to study the report of the old one. Rowe’s report reached his desk in 1951 with another recommendation for merging the Civil and Foreign Services. It cited a survey that found 81 percent of the department’s civil servants and 59 percent of its Foreign Service officers supported an integrated service—albeit with caveats. Members of the home service wanted assurances they would not be penalized if they chose not to go abroad; FSOs feared loss of pension and retirement benefits and worried about a decline in standards.

Secretary Acheson was even more reluctant to act in 1951 than he had been in 1949. Senator Joseph McCarthy’s witch hunt was in full cry, and the department was in turmoil. Acheson (referring to himself in the third person) later wrote: “It would seem understandable that the Secretary regarded a far-reaching and basic reorganization of the status of every person in the Department [of State] as General Grant might have regarded a similar proposal for the Army of the Potomac between the Wilderness and Appomattox.” So, as had happened under Secretary Byrnes, the moment for uniting the services passed again.

President Dwight Eisenhower’s Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, had far fewer qualms about disrupting the department. In 1954 he appointed a committee of eight under Chairman Henry Wriston, president of Brown University, to review past reports and recommend action that would be swift and decisive. Just five months after the committee’s first meeting, its work was done, and Secretary Dulles accepted its main recommendations.

The Wriston Committee called for the integration of the Foreign Service and the home service “where their functions and responsibilities converge.” Implementation would entail making some 1,450 home-service positions in Washington available to members of the Foreign Service, and admitting a like number of home officers from the Civil Service to the Foreign Service, along with a large number of new recruits. The Foreign Service officer corps was to grow from around 1,300 to nearly 4,000. Congress passed the necessary legislation in August 1954, and enacted related reforms the following April.

Although in surveys FSOs claimed to favor integration of the Civil and Foreign Services, in practice many objected to bringing in new officers at any but the lowest grades. And many considered members of the Civil Service unworthy of joining their ranks.

The country’s most famous Foreign Service officer, George F. Kennan, certainly held that view. Writing in Foreign Affairs in high patrician style, Kennan, then on extended leave from the department, referred to himself as “an antiquated spirit” who would prefer “25 really superior officers to 2,500 mediocre ones.” He dismissed the Wriston Report as “a pamphlet.”

**Last Gasp of the Single-Service Impulse**

Wristonization, as the process was soon universally known within State, was completed in just four years’ time, but few found the result satisfactory. The incoming Kennedy administration found a State Department that still contained two personnel systems. An outside committee on foreign affairs personnel under former Secretary of State Christian Herter produced a report that Secretary Dean Rusk approvingly sent to the president. “Especially welcome,” he wrote, “is the proposal for a single foreign affairs personnel system, instead of the dual Foreign Service and
Civil Service system with which we now work."

Secretary Rusk’s top management official, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration Bill Crockett, followed his chief’s lead. Crockett, a lateral entry into the Foreign Service, was tireless and optimistic. "I was the Foreign Service’s Don Quixote," he later said in an oral history interview. "I saw windmills to combat, and I never contemplated failure. I was naïve or inordinately optimistic about what we could accomplish."

Crockett enlisted the support of Representative Wayne Hays, D-Ohio, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. In 1965 Hays produced a bill that would have placed nearly all employees in State, the Agency for International Development and the U.S. Information Agency in a unitary Foreign Service. The bill would have added to the regular, staff and reserve officers a new category, foreign affairs officers, comprising professionals who would serve primarily, but not exclusively, in the United States.

His bill passed the House but died in committee in the Senate. Hays blamed Senator Claiborne Pell, D-R.I., a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and a former FSO. Pell, said Hays, "didn’t like the selecting-out thing." Crockett blamed the often-reported animosity between Senate Committee Chairman J. William Fulbright, D-Ark., and his erratic House counterpart.

Whatever the reasons, the legislative path to integration had reached its end.

William Macomber, a political appointee, took Bill Crockett’s job as State’s under secretary for management in 1969. Nominally a Republican, he had already been Kennedy’s ambassador to Jordan and had served as Dean Rusk’s assistant secretary for legislative affairs in the late 1960s.

Macomber used administrative measures to create a new Foreign Service personnel category, the foreign affairs specialist, to which members of the Civil Service and the Foreign Service staff corps could convert. The FAS corps was a hybrid, taking rank-in-person, selection-out and mandatory retirement from the Foreign Service system, but without a requirement for worldwide availability. Foreign affairs specialists were expected to serve primarily in the United States.

The FAS program was short-lived. Federal courts accepted the position of the American Federation of Government Employees that the program had no basis in law and shut it down in 1973. Still, it had been popular. Hundreds of civil servants, especially in the U.S. Information Agency, had converted to FAS before the court decision, and many, including the head of AFGE’s USIA local, chose to remain foreign affairs specialists to the end of their careers.
The FAS corps was effectively the last time the single-service impulse took tangible form in the Department of State. (The National Performance Review, a study prepared in 1993 under the leadership of Vice President Al Gore, urged USAID to bring its Civil Service and Foreign Service employees into a single personnel system modeled on the Central Intelligence Agency, but that idea was not pursued.) In 1975, Foreign Service Director General Carol Laise told Secretary of State Henry Kissinger that the drive toward a single-system model had failed and should be abandoned. Soon after, yet another blue-ribbon commission, this one convoked by Congress and headed by retired Ambassador Robert Murphy, came down in favor of a dual-service system, a position endorsed by Deputy Under Secretary for Management Larry Eagleburger.

**Vive la Difference**

When the Carter administration and Congress wrote the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 and the Foreign Service Act of 1980, a merger of the two systems was never seriously discussed. (Creation of a single senior service, instead of the separate Senior Foreign Service and Senior Executive Service that emerged, was briefly under consideration, however.)

The American Foreign Service Association had favored a single-service system in the 1950s, but after the reformers known as the Young Turks took control in 1968, AFSA argued in favor of a “clear division” between the home (Civil Service) and Foreign Service. AFSA praised the Foreign Service Act of 1980 for its “reaffirmation of the distinction between the Foreign Service and the Civil Service.” (The distinction was blurred for the director general of the Foreign Service, who under the legislation became responsible for all of the department’s human resources, including its Civil Service employees, but had little to do with Foreign Service personnel in agencies other than State.)

The years since passage of the 1980 Act have not been kind to the position of the Foreign Service within the Department of State. In 1988, the department had 9,232 full-time employees in the Foreign Service and 4,677 in the Civil Service, a ratio of 2 to 1. By 1998, the department had cut its Foreign Service staff by 16 percent, to 7,724. The number of civil servants, however, had increased by more than 6 percent, to 4,977, so the ratio had fallen to 1.6 to 1.

To repair the damage to the Foreign Service, Secretaries of State Colin Powell and Hillary Rodham Clinton undertook programs—the Diplomatic Readiness Initiative and Diplomacy 3.0, respectively—that secured congressional support for increased funding and additional positions for Foreign Service and Civil Service employees in the Department of State. Under these programs, the Foreign Service grew more rapidly than the Civil Service, but overall personnel data tell a different story. By 2009, State employed 12,018 members of the Foreign Service and 9,487 members of the Civil Service, a ratio of just 1.3 to 1.

Throughout this period, the emphasis that AFSA and other foreign affairs organizations placed on the unique characteristics of the Foreign Service clashed repeatedly with the emphasis of the department’s leadership on teamwork and unity of purpose. AFSA and other organizations were quick to criticize Secretary Powell when he changed the annual Foreign Service Day celebration to a more inclusive Foreign Affairs Day in 2001 and renamed the Foreign Service Lounge the Employee Service Center.

More seriously, AFSA fought a long and litigious campaign to block certain high-profile assignments of Civil Service employees to Foreign Service positions overseas, and to inhibit such assignments generally. These and other efforts to defend the distinction of the Foreign Service did not reverse the Service’s diminishing prominence in the Department of State and in the conduct of the country’s foreign relations. Nor did such efforts sit well with the department’s management, which tried under successive secretaries to make (in Secretary John Kerry’s words) “each component of our workforce … work together as one cohesive and vibrant team.”

The Foreign Service Act of 1980 is now 34 years old, the age of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 when it was replaced. The drafters of the 1980 legislation had no great admiration for the dual-service system, but like Secretaries Byrnes, Acheson and Rusk, they concluded that keeping it was preferable to attempting change.

With two very different personnel systems—not to mention a large and growing cohort of appointees exempt from the disciplines of either—the Department of State lacks the cohesion and vibrancy Sec. Kerry has called for. The department’s managers, its Foreign Service and Civil Service employees, and its congressional committees of jurisdiction should start now to look for ways to harmonize the systems, with renewed dedication to merit principles, equal opportunity, and a fair balance of rights and obligations. Only fundamental change can give the Secretary what he wants and deserves.
Stay tuned for information on the numerous special programs and activities that will commemorate the 90th anniversary of AFSA and the Foreign Service in 2014.

www.afsa.org/90
Jim Lamont, a Foreign Service officer from 1965 to 1991, wrote about the Rogers Act for his doctoral dissertation, which he completed 50 years ago. In studying the legislation, he became curious about what happened to the Foreign Service after its enactment, so he took the Foreign Service exam to find out.

Larry Cohen, a Foreign Service officer from 1980 to 2007, is currently AFSA’s vice president for retirees. He and Jim Lamont served together in the economic section of Embassy Tegucigalpa from 1983 to 1985.

The need for such sweeping reform had been evident many years before Representative John Jacob Rogers, R-Mass., introduced his first Foreign Service reform bill in 1919. A decade earlier President Theodore Roosevelt had declared: “The spoils system of making appointments to and removals from office is so wholly and unmixedly evil, is so emphatically un-American and undemocratic, and is so potent a force for degradation in our public life, that it is difficult to believe that any intelligent man of ordinary decency who has looked into the matter can be its advocate. As a matter of fact, the arguments in favor of the merit system against the spoils system are not only convincing: they are absolutely unanswerable.”

The status quo was also inefficient. Although the Consular Service was in dire need of modernization, it was widely seen as business-oriented and was the more respected of the two divisions. The Diplomatic Service lacked many attributes for an effective professional career and was perceived by the public as elitist and snobby. Little interaction occurred between the two divisions, whose members followed unrelated career paths. Both suffered from a dearth of essential benefits. Salaries were discouragingly low for consuls and ridiculously low for diplomats.

The leading internal catalyst for reform at State during the early years of the 20th century was Wilbur John Carr. Born in Ohio in 1870, Carr entered the State Department as a shorthand
clerk in 1892. Through talent and hard work, he rose to become chief of the Consular Bureau in 1902; seven years later, he became director of the Consular Service. Under his leadership, the Consular Service became better organized and more effectively managed than its stodgy diplomatic counterpart.

Carr’s forward-looking ideas about administration and management caught the attention of Elihu Root, President Theodore Roosevelt’s Secretary of State. In 1906 Secretary Root worked with Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, R-Mass., to pass the first bill to restructure the Consular Service along merit-based lines. Drafted almost entirely by Carr, the Act of April 5, 1906, reorganized the Consular Service in almost every way. Among other things, it classified officers by salary, increased the overall pay scale, and provided for the creation of a corps of consular inspectors who were to report on the operation of each consular post at least once every two years.

These reforms did not address State’s larger structural problems, however. The Diplomatic Service was clearly not equipped to meet its growing responsibilities in the post-World War I world. No inspection system supervised diplomatic posts. The State Department lacked the authority to support disabled officers, fund sick or home leave, provide for a retirement system with benefits or allow officers to serve in positions outside of their specialty. And neither service possessed legal authority for officer training; post, representational or cost-of-living allowances; or the dismissal or retirement of ineffective officers.

While executive orders promulgated by Presidents Grover Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft had introduced some merit principles to both services, leading Progressives realized that effective reform required comprehensive legislation. But how could an increasingly isolationist and economy-minded Congress enact such legislation?


Enter John Jacob Rogers

Born in 1881 in Lowell, Mass., Rogers graduated from Harvard University and Harvard Law School. In 1912 he was elected as a Republican to the House of Representatives for the state’s Fifth Congressional District. A fervent supporter of institutional reform, Rogers well deserved his eventual nickname, “the father of the Foreign Service.”

With Wilbur Carr as his legislative ghostwriter, Rogers introduced a series of reform bills beginning in 1919. Generally, changes were made to the bills either when Rogers and Carr wanted to incorporate improvements, or when a new Congress required a new bill to replace one that had died with the previous session. Despite occasional variations in content and language, all were precursors to the Foreign Service Act of 1924. Carr also ensured that the consuls maintained a united front in support of passage of the bills.

The Diplomatic Service was another story. William Castle,
chief of the Bureau of Western European Affairs, exemplified the resistance to some to Carr’s efforts. Castle remarked that he did not regard an increase in diplomatic salaries as wise. “No man ... not possessed of a large income” should be admitted to the Diplomatic Service, Castle sniffed.

Another critic of the Rogers bills was Joseph C. Grew. Like Rogers, he was a Massachusetts native and Harvard man. A Boston Brahmin, Grew began his government career in 1904 as a consular clerk at the U.S. consulate in Cairo, but soon entered the Diplomatic Service and rose swiftly through the ranks. During the early 1920s he served first as minister to Denmark, then Switzerland. In March 1924, he was made under secretary of State.

Unlike Castle and his ilk, Grew and his colleagues were not motivated by snobbery or a desire to protect privilege or patronage. They also shared the desire of Carr, Rogers and others to enhance the department’s professionalism and its ability to conduct diplomacy. In fact, they opposed union with the consuls precisely because they considered unity an obstacle to achieving those goals. Only diplomats, Grew believed, possessed the specialized experience and ability required for such important work. Interservice union, he argued, would seriously harm their esprit de corps.

Still, Grew and his supporters knew they held a weak hand. It was true that the Diplomatic Service occupied the most senior positions and exercised greater influence within the department. But it also suffered from a reputation as a haven for political-patronage appointees. One of Rogers’ strongest diplomatic supporters, Minister Hugh Gibson, played on this stereotype at a congressional hearing by deploring “the boys in the white spats, the tea drinkers, the cookie pushers ... the specimens who have become poor imitations of foreigners.”

Rogers himself characterized the diplomats as “men to whom social opportunities strongly appeal,” and expressed the hope of eliminating from the Service “the idle rich young man who thinks in terms of silk hats, spats and afternoon teas.” Another witness from the Diplomatic Service, Hugh Wilson, attempted to defend his peers by declaring that diplomats were “more spat upon than spatted.” This was decidedly a minority view, however.

In the end, career diplomats sensitive to their service’s negative reputation and desirous of its professionalization had to go along with Rogers and Carr.

**A Hard Slog**

Rogers’ legislation eventually gained the endorsement of Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes, who wryly remarked, “It is a poor patriot who would sink his ships and his diplomats at the same time.” Presidents Warren Harding and Calvin Coolidge also supported the measure.

Since the president, the secretary of State, and both houses of the Republican-controlled Congress favored the legislation—with the Senate minority leader lending his backing—opposition was
not substantial. Yet final passage was not smooth. Congressional indifference and a lack of political attention at key points in time delayed action. In the House of Representatives, vocal partisan attacks came in early 1923 from four Texas Democrats who challenged almost every aspect of the bill, its sponsors and the means by which it had progressed in Congress. Rogers himself and the Republican Party were specifically assailed.

In March 1923, the House of Representatives passed Rogers’ bill. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved it. Congress was about to adjourn, and unanimous consent was required to bring the bill to the Senate floor for debate. As Carr waited anxiously in the gallery, no motion came to allow debate, so the bill died.

The problem was unanimous consent. Senator Thomas Sterling, R-S.D., was seen as likely to block the bill from coming to the floor because of concerns about its retirement feature. Lodge told Carr that he could do nothing with Sterling. Carr asked Secretary Hughes to write to President Harding, who wrote to Sterling. But the senator remained unconvinced.

Carr suspected that Lodge was not being sufficiently active, but hesitated to “nag” him. One of the leading consuls, Tracy Lay, thought that Lodge had not pushed the bill strongly enough, possibly because he was jealous of Rogers and did not want him to get credit for it.

Carr himself was less harsh toward Lodge: “I am disposed to think … that if Lodge did refrain purposely from pressing the bill, it was because he was loaded up with distasteful administration measures at the last moment … and became tired and displeased and unwilling to fight for anything anymore. It may be, on the other hand, that he had learned that Sterling would continue his opposition, and that there was no use trying to pass the bill by unanimous consent.” He added: “A mere onlooker cannot judge without being put in possession of all the facts.”

If not for the adjournment of Congress, the bill would likely have passed easily in 1923.

In 1924 such opposition as existed was again politically pow-
erless to stop it. On May 1, the House of Representatives passed the bill for a second time. Two weeks later, Sen. Lodge called the bill up. With the addition of four amendments, it passed the full Senate with little floor debate and no real opposition.

The amendments were not minor. They provided that officers could accept any position in the government without giving up their right to reinstatement in the Service; that officers on special duty or duty as inspectors should receive per diem instead of subsistence pay; that officers retiring before reaching 65 should receive 75 percent rather than 50 percent of their contributions to the retirement and disability fund; and that Carr’s position as director of the Consular Service be abolished and a new assistant secretary job created. The House quickly concurred with the bill as amended.

President Calvin Coolidge signed it into law on May 24, 1924.

The Act’s Main Provisions

The legislation addressed several long-standing goals of Carr and his allies:

- First, it established a new entity, “The Foreign Service of the United States.” Its members were called “Foreign Service officers,” were promontable on merit and subject to assignment in either the consular or diplomatic branch of the Service.

- The Rogers Act created a class structure for FSOs (Class 9 through Class 1) with specified pay scales. Officers were to be appointed as diplomatic secretaries, consular officers or both. Entrants would not be commissioned to a specific post; rather they would be placed within an officer class. All applicants had to pass an examination and spend five years in probationary status in an “unclassified” (but salaried) group before entering Class 9.

- For the first time, representational allowances were to be provided to diplomatic and consular missions. Home leave travel and subsistence expenses would be paid to FSOs who served overseas for at least three years. Officers acting as chargés d’affaires or assuming temporary charge of a consulate would receive additional compensation. The Rogers Act also ordered the creation of a list of unhealthful posts; a year at any of them would count as 1½ years for purposes of calculating length of service.

- FSOs could be assigned to the Department of State for a period of three years. If the “public interests” demanded further service, a tour could be extended by up to another year.

- The Rogers Act created a Foreign Service retirement and disability system. FSOs age 65 or older with at least 15 years of service were now eligible for full retirement. Officers who became disabled (provided it was not because of “vicious habits, intemperance or willful misconduct”) were entitled to similar benefits. Retirement annuities, however, were subject to reduction by whatever income an annuitant earned from other sources.

Easier Said than Done

After the act’s passage, messages of appreciation poured in to those most responsible for the outcome: Rep. Rogers and Wilbur Carr. The latter received extensive expressions of congratulation.
including the pen Pres. Coolidge had used to sign the bill into law. In public Carr maintained his customary modesty. But in his personal diary, he confided: “It was I ... who drafted the legislation and who carried through most that we have that is valuable.”

While the Foreign Service Act specified what was to be done and set in place the framework for the modern Foreign Service, it required executive orders and administrative regulations to come to life. Accordingly, Executive Order 4022 of June 7, 1924, established the Foreign Service Personnel Board and named the under secretary of State as its chairman. Other board members included the assistant secretary for consular affairs—Carr—and an assistant secretary from the diplomatic branch so that both former services would be represented. The order also provided for the creation of a Board of Examiners and a Foreign Service School.

Now that the institution’s basic structure was defined, the Personnel Board went to work. In its first major action, it retired older officers and jettisoned other “dead wood” in the united officer corps, clearing the way for more meritorious officers to rise through the ranks.

The board acted with remarkable unanimity on a multitude of matters, following a tacit understanding that consular members would generally leave final decisions on diplomatic questions to their diplomatic colleagues and vice versa. It established standards for entry tests and efficiency reports, assigned members to promotion review boards and clarified the requirements for entrance to the Foreign Service. Of particular note, it opened up the institution to women and African-Americans.

The first woman to enter the Foreign Service after passage of the Rogers Act was Pattie H. Field, who was sworn in on April 20, 1925, and served as a vice consul in Amsterdam. However, Field was not the first woman in the United States Foreign Service. That honor belongs to Lucile Atcherson, who was appointed to the Diplomatic Service in 1922. (See “Lucile Atcherson Curtis: The First Female American Diplomat,” by Molly W. Wood, in the July-August 2013 Foreign Service Journal.)

According to the State Department’s Office of the Historian, the first African-American to join the U.S. Foreign Service following passage of the Rogers Act was Clifton R. Wharton, whose diplomatic career spanned nearly 40 years. Before 1924, some African-Americans had been admitted, but were assigned only to a handful of countries in Africa and the Caribbean, such as Haiti and Liberia. Now assignments of African-American FSOs were to be made worldwide—at least in theory. (See “African-American Consuls Abroad, 1897-1909,” by Benjamin R. Justesen, in the September 2004 Foreign Service Journal.)

To the continuing concern of Grew and his fellow diplomats, some issues were left unresolved. But as Carr commented, “The law is only the instrument which we are authorized to employ to the end we wish to obtain. We shall have only the kind of Service we are willing to make.”

Unfortunately, a rocky road lay ahead for the system, due in large measure to the State Department’s failure to aggressively pursue congressional funding for training, allowances and other requirements. Congress even cut previously granted post allowances. This timidity seriously debilitated the Foreign Service, both in terms of efficiency and morale. One story that made the rounds told of a London bobby who encounters a solitary man sitting on a curb. The bobby asks him, “Gov’nor, why don’t you go ‘ome?” The man replies, “I have no home. I am the American ambassador!”

Ironically, interchangeability between the services, a key sticking point prior to passage of the legislation, proved almost totally non-controversial. Just before its May 1924 passage, Grew wrote in a letter to a fellow diplomat that Carr “realizes ... the branches must represent two separate professions” and there must be “no weaving back and forth” between them. His judgment about Carr’s views was essentially correct. The Personnel Board subsequently made clear that “indiscriminate transfers from one branch to the other clearly would not be in the interest of the government or of the officers themselves.” Carr had to agree.

Foreign Service officers “particularly adapted” to one branch were expected to serve in it permanently, while officers with equal talents in both fields would be given their choice. However, Grew and his fellow diplomats also recognized that there had to be some exceptions. As an indication of its acceptance of interchangeability, the Personnel Board decided that most For-
The Promotion-Equity Crisis

During the transition to a merit-based promotion system, a serious problem emerged. For the consuls, an officer list drawn up in order of excellence was no problem. But personnel records for their diplomatic colleagues were woefully inadequate. The Personnel Board felt constrained under the circumstances to use separate lists on a purely “temporary basis” until standards became more uniform. Carr had to concur. As a result, equal numbers of officers in each specialty were promoted during the first year of the new system. But this failed to take into consideration the greater number of consuls (375 to 117), their longer average time-in-class and Service seniority.

The issue came to a head in October 1925. Robert Skinner, an influential, high-ranking consular officer who had been actively involved in the Rogers reform effort, complained to Grew that half-measures and grudging concessions regarding Foreign Service unity did not fulfill the spirit of the Rogers Act. Most significantly, he provided figures that proved promotions favored diplomats. The Personnel Board researched the numbers and found, to its surprise and chagrin, that Skinner was right. But it took no action to remedy the situation.

By mid-1926 Congress got wind of the dispute. With pressure mounting, the board asked the State Department’s solicitor to rule on the legality of maintaining separate promotion lists. Instructed that such a practice was illegal, the board belatedly unified its two lists, and followed this action in 1927 with a proposal for 44 additional consular officers to be granted immediate “reparation” promotions.

That response failed to resolve the flap, however. Grew saw the writing on the wall, remarking: “We seem to have our hands particularly full of wildcats.” He was right. House and Senate resolutions called for a full investigation, and in April 1927, Secretary of State Frank Kellogg, upset by the whole situation, sought a shakeup of the Personnel Board. He proposed to President Coolidge that Grew be nominated as ambassador to Turkey, and that two other board members be nominated for ministerial positions overseas.

Although the three nominees were eventually confirmed, the department’s clumsy handling only reinforced the growing belief that reform of the Foreign Service was incomplete.

The Moses-Linthicum Act

Accordingly, Congress held hearings in 1928 with an eye to rewriting the Rogers Act. A bill strongly influenced by the consuls was introduced that year and served as a template for similar bills introduced over the next three years. In 1931, Senator George H. Moses, R-N.H., and Representative John C. Linthicum, D-Md., introduced a bill that passed and was signed into law by President Herbert Hoover. Carr called it “one of the most important measures, and perhaps the most important, for the future welfare of the Foreign Service that has yet been enacted.”

The Moses-Linthicum Act ordered a reorganization of the department’s personnel system, establishing a Division of Personnel led by an assistant secretary to handle efficiency records and personnel led by an assistant secretary to handle efficiency records and their evaluation. This official, together with two other assistant secretaries, would form a personnel board with the sole duty of recommending officers for promotion, demotion, transfer or separation. FSOs who were board members were made ineligible for promotion to minister or ambassador until three years after serving on the board.

The act also set more liberal compensation rates and leave-of-absence rules and instituted optional retirement after 30 years of service, retroactive credit for service at unhealthful posts, more equitable representation, post allowances, within-class salary increases and other benefits. Further, it spelled out more stringent examination and appointment rules, and created new opportunities for clerks to advance into the Service.

The new act’s most important result, however, was psychological. It served to reassure all FSOs that there would be no recurrence of the administrative stumbles that had led to the crisis of 1926-1927.

A Great Legacy

Nearly a century later, the Rogers Act, buttressed by the Moses-Linthicum Act, still serves as the foundation of the current Foreign Service. Of course, in hindsight it suffered from weaknesses that somewhat limited the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy.

Nevertheless, to a very large degree it accomplished the goals Rogers and his fellow reformers envisioned. Not until 1946, 22 years after its passage, was any noteworthy change to the Foreign Service’s structure deemed necessary. And even then, the Foreign Service Act of 1946 was, in essence, only an updated expression of the ideas Rogers had promulgated in 1924. His vision—and Wilbur Carr’s—still determine to a large degree the conditions under which today’s Foreign Service personnel work and live.

Sadly, neither Sen. Lodge nor Rep. Rogers lived long beyond the act’s passage. Lodge suffered a fatal stroke in November 1924, less than six months after its enactment, while Rogers died at the age of 43 in Washington, D.C., on March 28, 1925.
FOREIGN SERVICE STORIES

What Makes Us Proud

Members of the U.S. Foreign Service share moments from their careers.

In commemoration of the 90th anniversary of the modern Foreign Service, AFSA has redoubled its efforts to deepen public understanding of diplomacy, development and foreign affairs, and to celebrate the accomplishments of the men and women from all corners of America who serve—and have served—in U.S. foreign affairs agencies.

There’s no better way to do this than sharing the stories of the Foreign Service. And there is no one better able to tell those stories than our members, both active-duty and retired.

AFSA asked members to send brief notes, 100 words or so, about the time when they were most proud to be part of the U.S. Foreign Service. Please enjoy this sampling of the great variety of stories we have received.

—Shawn Dorman, Editor

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

“At An Angel from the Embassy”

By Corinna Ybarra Arnold

Hometown: Brownsville, Texas

In January 2010, I was in the Dominican Republic when the earthquake occurred in Haiti. Once we heard that people were going to be evacuated to Santo Domingo, my colleagues and I were deployed to an airport hangar to work with the military on a welcoming center for them. We worked all day to make the space comfortable and to get the evacuees essential items for their stay. I could not have been prouder to be a part of the Foreign Service when the first plane full of survivors came in late that evening.

When one man I visited in the hospital after 2 a.m. said it was his wedding anniversary, I told him he should call his wife. He called and told her, “I am in the Dominican Republic, and an angel from the embassy just handed me her personal phone to call you.” It was an amazing moment. I will never forget that day and those we served.
LAOS

The Thank You Card

By Joseph De Maria
Hometown: Lakewood, N.J.

I was the sole consular officer in Vientiane in the late 1990s. At the time, Laotians who had been admitted to the United States as refugees in the 1970s and 1980s had established themselves there and were petitioning for relatives, often elderly parents, to immigrate. I adjudicated hundreds of such cases.

One day, when I opened my mail at the office, there was a “thank you” card with about 10 signatures, some of adults and some of young children. It simply said, “Thank you for sending us our grandparents.”

MEXICO

Three Generations

By Manav Jain, Consular Officer
Hometown: Villa Park, Calif.

During my first tour, at Embassy Mexico City in 2003, a Filipino man came in to notarize his recently departed father’s military service documents, which indicated that he had fought on the U.S. side during World War II. In reviewing the paperwork, I realized that his father was potentially a U.S. citizen. Congress had granted U.S. citizenship to certain Filipinos who fought alongside the United States in World War II.

On confirming the regulations and qualifications, we posthumously made his father a U.S. citizen. Because the father spent time in the U.S. after the war, the man himself became a U.S. citizen from birth, which in turn granted his own son U.S. citizenship.

We created three generations of Americans that day.

GHANA

Accra’s Infrastructure Upgrade

By Heather Byrnes
Hometown: Anchorage, Alaska

Among my best Foreign Service memories is the day I heard that a U.S. company had been awarded the tender for a $595 million project to revamp the water and sanitation infrastructure in Ghana’s capital, Accra. This would boost U.S. exports, lead to about 3,000 American jobs and provide a much-needed fix to Accra’s annual flooding and resulting cholera outbreaks.

I served for four years in Ghana as commercial counselor, accompanied by my husband and three children. Although we loved the country, it wasn’t an easy tour: I contracted typhoid and encephalitis. But it was all worth it when I heard the news of the water project.

BELGIUM

The Secretary’s Entourage

By Ted Wilkinson
Hometown: Washington, D.C.

In June 1973, Secretary of State William Rogers visited Copenhagen, and then continued on to Brussels to attend a NATO ministerial meeting. He and his Washington entourage occupied most of the 20-odd seats for the U.S. delegation at the NATO meeting. I was in the last seat, as a very junior notetaker, when Rogers passed a note to Ambassador Rumsfeld, seated next to him. The note travelled with puzzled glances all the way down the 20 seats to me. It read: “What did the Dane say yesterday?”

I did the obvious—called Embassy Copenhagen for a reply, and then sent a follow-up cable query. The reply came in the next morning, with all the possible answers the embassy could come up with.

What I relished was the slug line on the cable: “For Secretary Rogers and Ted Wilkinson.”

UZBEKISTAN

Teaching English

By George Wilcox
Hometown: Tucson, Ariz.

In 1996, working at Embassy Tashkent as the first United States Information Agency Regional English Language Officer for Central Asia and the Caucasus, I organized a national English teachers’ conference for Uzbekistan, focusing on business applications. During the conference I told everyone our office was too small to organize more conferences; but we could help them, if they wanted to form a national association and organize such conferences themselves.

Within six months, with our office serving as the primary catalyst, they had formed their
association. Over the following years, it held many conferences and continued to grow. Several years ago, they informed me I'd been formally recognized as "the Father of UZTEA!"

**BURKINA FASO**

**A Sister Schools Project**  
*By David Patterson  
*Hometown: Evansville, Ind.*

In 1998, when I was serving in Ouagadougou as the information programs officer, Ambassador Sharon Wilkinson asked me to go “up country” to a small village an hour’s drive from the capital to be the U.S. embassy representative at the dedication of a new schoolhouse built by USAID. Though USAID had officially shut down operations in Burkina Faso in 1996, the school was one of its last projects.

The headmaster at the school pointed out that the 30-odd students did not have even basic supplies such as pencils or paper. As a result, he had to write the lessons on the chalkboard, and the children had to memorize everything. He asked me to please have the embassy supply these items, and I told him I’d see what I could do.

Back at the embassy, I was told we could not do that. So I contacted Highland Elementary School in my hometown of Evansville, Ind., to see if they could possibly help. The fourth-grade class went into action, and within a month I had more than 30 kits. Each was a large, two-gallon Ziploc bag filled with notebooks, crayons, pencils, pens, scissors, water color paints and a ruler.

I soon made another trip to the village. What joy on the children’s faces as each was presented with a bag full of school supplies! I truly felt proud to represent America. Later, while on home leave, I visited the Highland Elementary class to thank them and give them photos of the event at the village school.

Last time I checked, the fourth-grade classes of the two schools were still corresponding—by mail. Highland had asked for their sister school’s email address. They were shocked when I explained that there was no electricity in this village, let alone computers! It gave the kids a new perspective on life.

**GEORGIA**

**Untangling an Adoption Crisis**  
*By Robin Busse  
*Hometown: Charlottesville, Va.*

I was proudest of being in the Foreign Service when I helped untangle an adoption crisis in Georgia. In September 2003, Georgia changed its adoption law virtually overnight and without notice, shutting down the process. There were six American families whose cases had started under the old code but had not yet made their way to conclusion.

After intense behind-the-scenes work, “my” six cases were eventually released. One child was so ill that I held the immigrant visa interview with his adoptive parents in his hospital room in a rundown, Soviet-era clinic.

Another couple was briefly detained and had to leave their baby in foster care. After the adoption was approved, I escorted this family to the airport because they were so scared they might be arrested again.

We walked through immigration where, as expected, they were carefully scrutinized as the first foreign adoptive parents allowed to take a Georgian out of the country under the new laws.

**MEXICO**

**A Poignant Introduction**  
*By Javier Alfredo Araujo  
*Hometown: El Paso, Texas*

One of my proudest moments in the Foreign Service was during the summer of 2013, when the U.S. consul general in Ciudad Juarez invited me to share the podium to launch “100,000 Strong in the Americas.” More than 500 students from northern Mexico came to learn about President Obama’s initiative to increase educational exchanges between the United States and Latin America and the Caribbean. The goal is 100,000 exchanges annually in each direction.

The consul general introduced me as a diplomatic colleague who, 35 years earlier, had sat in the very same room awaiting a student visa!

**AFGHANISTAN**

**Women's Basketball in Kabul**  
*By Rose Naputi  
*Hometown: Merizo, Guam*

On March 7, 2012, in Kabul, during turbulent and troubled times in a country devastated by war, I had an awesome opportunity to celebrate International Women’s Day in a friendly basketball competition between a U.S. team made up of embassy and International Security Assistance Force women, and the Afghan Women’s Olympic basketball team.

This event brought together women of all ages and cultures from our military fighting forces, our embassy staff and, most
importantly, our Afghan partners. During practices and on game day, I played small forward and in the final seconds, I made the last basket of the game—which to me symbolized the success that all women can achieve.

In Kabul and other major cities in Afghanistan, enormous progress has been made in women’s rights since the 2001 U.S.-led invasion brought down the Taliban regime that banned girls from going to school and women from working. This event, which received worldwide news coverage from CNN, Reuters and the New York Times, was a show of support for women throughout Afghanistan, and it was an honor to participate.

**India**

**Heading to the Embassy in a Nice Suit and Tie**

By Justin Davis  
Hometown: Atlanta, Ga.

Returning to the office from a meeting in New Delhi, I hailed a taxi, jumped inside and asked the driver to take me to the American embassy. Before putting the car in drive, he took another moment to watch me as I scrambled to fasten my seatbelt and catch my breath. He could tell I was somewhat disheveled and in a hurry.

As he pulled away, amidst the cacophony of horns behind us, he asked where I was from. “The United States,” I told him. His eyes grew round in surprise. Seeming not to believe me, he asked, “Why are you heading to the embassy in such a nice suit and tie?”

I told him I was a U.S. diplomat posted there. He seemed puzzled, and confessed that he had never seen or heard of a black American diplomat. I smiled, “We come in all colors.”

After a hearty guffaw, he, too, smiled, and responded in broken English: “I see. I enjoy America’s diversity, happy to get you where you need to go.” He sped up the car and helped me get safely to my destination.

It’s times like that when I am proud to call myself a U.S. diplomat.

**Washington, D.C.**

**A Hero’s Welcome**

By Vella G. Mbenza  
Hometown: Midway, Ga.

As an information management specialist, I did a hometown diplomat stint at an elementary school in Midway in 2013. Nervous as heck, I was greeted with a hero’s welcome by administrators, teachers and the nicest fifth-graders I have ever met. I had donned one of my African dresses and had set up a table filled with African and South American relics and fabrics on display. After my presentation, I spent another hour and a half speaking with the adults at the school about the Foreign Service and how to apply.

I left the classroom extremely proud to be a part of this organization that others in my small town were so interested in.

**Mongolia**

**The Land of Genghis Khan Revisited**

By Joseph E. Zadrozny  
Hometown: Houston, Texas

Mongolia still has the ring of the remote and exotic, the land of Genghis Khan. It certainly did in 1992, when I first stepped off the plane, only five years after the United States and Mongolia had established diplomatic relations. I was part of the second group of Peace Corps Volunteers in the country, and the first group to be assigned outside of the capital.

Twenty years later, I found myself back in Mongolia, this time as a diplomat. My proudest moment was meeting a former student, who is now a teacher herself, teaching English. Mongolia will always hold a special place in my heart.

**Mauritania**

**Sheltering Local Employees in a Crisis**

By Gregory McLerran  

It was 2 a.m. when the phone rang in my home on the compound of Embassy Nouakchott. One of the Foreign Service
Nationals, calling from the General Services Office compound, was screaming into the phone. “The police have come to take us away,” he shouted, referring to more than 100 local staff and their families from Senegal and Mali for whom we had arranged a place of safety there.

This was in 1989, during a period of unrest in Mauritania when foreign nationals from Black Africa were hunted down and deported or killed. I immediately woke Communicator Cookie Rodríguez, who was staying with me during the crisis, and then Ambassador William Twadell and Deputy Chief of Mission John Vincent. The ambassador called the foreign minister to request assistance.

When help was slow in coming, Amb. Twadell elected to go to the compound himself—despite the curfew enforced by nervous Mauritanian army troops and the danger such a trip entailed. Ms. Rodríguez volunteered to drive his limo and, with flags flying, they headed out. On the way, they met the foreign minister, and the ambassador joined him. The two officials reached the compound in time to stop the police from taking away our FSNs.

The courage shown by Amb. Twadell and Communicator Rodríguez was exemplary. The following day, accompanied by American members of the embassy staff, the FSNs were taken to the airport, where Algerian and French aircraft flew them to safety.

The entire embassy staff showed great empathy and courage in sheltering our colleagues from Mali and Senegal, and it made me proud to be a member of the Foreign Service.

**T O G O**

*It All Started at the American Embassy Library*

*By Azizou Atté-Oudeyi*

*Hometown: Springfield, Mass.*

My journey started when I visited the American embassy library in Lomé for the first time at the age of 13.

I was born in Togo, a small country located on the west coast of Africa, and immigrated to the United States through the diversity visa program. I became a U.S. citizen in 2005. While working for the U.S. Postal Service, I began pursuing a career as a Foreign Service officer. My dream became true in October 2013, when I took the oath of service before Secretary of State John Kerry.

I was most proud of being part of the Foreign Service when my colleagues honored me with the Glenn Munro Award for Outstanding Potential and Leadership during the A-100 orientation session.

**S O M A L I A**

*A Roadmap in Somalia*

*By Brandi James*

*Hometown: Augusta, Georgia*

As the principal reporting officer for Embassy Nairobi’s Somalia Affairs Unit from July 2011 to June 2013, and one of the first State Department officials to work inside Somalia after the infamous Battle of Mogadishu (Black Hawk Down) in October 1993, I had an extraordinary opportunity to live and breathe expeditionary diplomacy.

I reported on Somali and international community efforts under the United Nations-backed roadmap process to end the transitional period of governance within a one-year timeframe. During that period, Somali stakeholders drafted a provisional constitution that protects fundamental human rights, which was adopted by a representative constituent assembly.

Traditional elders selected educated and civic-minded Somalis to a new 275-member federal parliament. On Sept. 10, 2012, that new parliament held an historic indirect presidential election, which ushered in a new hope for Somalia and a peaceful transition to the first president democratically elected inside Somalia since 1967.

I have never felt as proud of being a part of the U.S. Foreign Service as I did on Jan. 17, 2013, when Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton officially recognized the new Somali government, the first time the United States had done so since 1991. My long days traveling inside Somalia on rickety planes under insecure conditions and long nights sleeping in makeshift containers or hooches had paid off. I could finally see how my work—however trivial and distant from the radar of Washington policymakers it may sometimes seem—could help make a difference.
An AFSA Timeline

Editor’s Note: As AFSA and the Foreign Service both celebrate their 90th anniversaries, here are some of the events that have shaped both institutions. As with any timeline, there are many other important developments we could cite, but we believe these represent a good beginning.

You will find an expanded version of this document at www.afsa.org/timeline.

1789 ■ The Department of State becomes the first Cabinet agency to be created.
1791 ■ Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson establishes separate diplomatic and consular services.
1856 ■ The Organic Act regulates diplomatic and consular posts and sets a salary cap of $17,500, which stays in place for the next 90 years.
1895 ■ President Grover Cleveland places most consular positions within the merit system.
1909 ■ President William Howard Taft extends the merit system to all diplomatic positions below ministerial rank and prohibits consideration of candidates’ political affiliation.
1918 ■ The American Consular Association is formed.
1919 ■ The American Consular Bulletin begins publication.
1924 ■ The Foreign Service Act of 1924, known as the Rogers Act, unifies the diplomatic and consular services to create the Foreign Service of the United States.
1924 ■ The American Consular Association reconstitutes itself as the American Foreign Service Association “for the purpose of fostering an esprit de corps” among Foreign Service employees, and the American Consular Bulletin becomes the American Foreign Service Journal.
1929 ■ Elizabeth Harriman gives AFSA $25,000 to establish a scholarship fund in honor of her late son Oliver, a Foreign Service officer.
1929 ■ Foreign Service clerks and non-career vice consuls at Embassy Paris form Local 349 of the National Federation of Federal Employees, called the Foreign Service Local.
1931 ■ The Moses-Linthicum Act regulates Foreign Service ranks and retirement.
1933 ■ Secretary of State Cordell Hull unveils AFSA’s Roll of Honor, a memorial plaque honoring “those in the American Foreign Service who ... have died under tragic or heroic circumstances.”
1933 ■ AFSA confers its first scholarship.
1946 ■ A new Foreign Service Act replaces the Rogers Act, creating Foreign Service Staff officers and Foreign Service Reserve officers. AFSA admits members of both groups to active membership.
1947 ■ The Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch recommends merging the Foreign Service and Civil Service within the State Department. No action is taken.
1950-1953 ■ State fires more than 500 employees as “security risks” during the McCarthy era.
1951 ■ The American Foreign Service Journal is renamed the Foreign Service Journal.
1951 ■ AFSA replaces its executive committee with a board of directors, chosen annually by an electoral college of 18 members. AFSA has about 2,000 active-duty and 500 associate members out of a pool of 12,000 eligibles.
1954 ■ In what becomes known as “Wristonization,” State opens the Foreign Service to about 1,500 Civil Service employees, and makes a similar number of domestic positions available to FSOs.
1956 ■ Junior FSOs at State form the Junior Foreign Service Officers Club.

SELECTED HIGHLIGHTS

FOCUS 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF AFSA AND THE FOREIGN SERVICE
1962 ■ President John F. Kennedy signs Executive Order 10988, authorizing federal employees to unionize.

1964 ■ AFSA forms a Committee on Career Principles.

1965 ■ AFSA, DACOR, and the State Department organize the first Foreign Service Day, to promote exchanges among career diplomats, academicians, journalists and businesspeople.

1967 ■ AFSA elections give the reformist “Young Turks,” led by Lannon Walker and Charlie Bray, all 18 seats in the electoral college.

1967-1968 ■ AFSA establishes awards for constructive dissent, funded by donations from the Harriman, Herter and Rivkin families and named for the donors.

1968 ■ AFSA publishes Toward a Modern Diplomacy, a 185-page manifesto based on the report of Committee on Career Principles. It calls for a unified Foreign Service combining State, USIA, USAID, Commerce and Labor under an independent director general.

1969 ■ President Richard Nixon signs Executive Order 11491, setting new rules for labor-management relations within the federal government.

1971 ■ Following issuance of Executive Order 11636, setting labor-management rules for the Foreign Service, AFSA moves to seek recognition as a Foreign Service union.

1972 ■ Bill Harrop and Tom Boyatt lead AFSA in a contest with the American Federation of Government Employees for representation that centers on the legal issue of who is labor and who is management.

1973 ■ AFSA is certified as the winner in State, USIA and USAID representation elections. New AFSA bylaws replace the association’s chairman and directors with a president and governing board, effective the next year.

1976 ■ AFSA’s membership votes to recall John Hemenway after nine months in office. The Governing Board chooses Pat Woodring, AFSA’s first female president, to complete his term.

1976 ■ AFSA and State reach agreement on regulations to implement grievance legislation.

1976 ■ USIA rejects AFSA in favor of AFGE in a second representation election.

1980 ■ A new Foreign Service Act, the first in 34 years, is passed with substantial AFSA input. Among many other provisions, it establishes the Senior Foreign Service.

1982 ■ The Mary Harriman Foundation funds a new, annual Avis Bohlen Award honoring the Foreign Service family member who has done most to advance U.S. interests overseas.

1983 ■ The Department of State funds the AFSA presidency as a full-time position.

1985 ■ AFSA establishes a Legislative Action Fund.

1988 ■ New bylaws provide for an AFSA vice president to represent each constituency.

1989 ■ AFSA establishes a program of conferences with Senior Foreign Service officers, intended to attract international businesses as “International Associates.”

1992 ■ AFSA wins election challenging AFGE’s representation of the USIA Foreign Service.


1995 ■ AFSA joins AFGE in a State-USAID-USIA rally protesting government shutdown and furlough.


1999 ■ AFSA conducts its first annual high school essay contest.

1999 ■ An act of Congress closes USIA and transfers its personnel and functions to the Department of State. The Broadcasting Board of Governors remains outside State, and its FS employees keep AFSA representation.

1999 ■ AFSA engages in a high-profile fight against assignment of State Department Civil Service employee to a deputy chief-of-mission position on which qualified Foreign Service officers had bid. The Foreign Service Grievance Board sides with AFSA, but Secretary of State Madeleine Albright overrules it, citing national security grounds.

2000 ■ The Delavan Foundation funds the Tex Harris Award honoring specialists for constructive dissent.

2001 ■ AFSA objects as Secretary Powell changes Foreign Service Day to Foreign Affairs Day, renames the Foreign Service Lounge as the Employee Service Center, and changes the Foreign Service Star to the Thomas Jefferson Star for Foreign Service.

2002 ■ Governing Board approves creation of a political action committee, AFSA-PAC.

2003 ■ AFSA publishes an all-new edition of Inside a U.S. Embassy. A revised version follows two years later.

2007-2008 ■ AFSA renovates its headquarters for the first time in 40 years.

2009 ■ AFSA establishes the Foreign Service Books imprint.


2013 ■ AFSA wins an uncontested election to represent Foreign Service employees of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service at the Department of Agriculture.
How do we rescue U.S. foreign policy from creeping militarization? How can we resurrect diplomacy from the musty archives of the past? A diplomatic practitioner offers some answers.

BY ROBERT HUTCHINGS

Two decades ago, the late historian Ernest May imagined a visitor from a foreign land coming to Washington, D.C., and being shown the West Wing of the White House, with its Situation Room in round-the-clock operation, and next door, the Old Executive Office Building housing the ever-expanding National Security Council staff.

"Across the Potomac, [the] visitor sees the Pentagon. With a daytime population of 25,000, it is the crest of a mountainous defense establishment, which employs almost two-thirds of the nearly five million persons who work for the U.S. government. Farther out in Virginia, at Langley, the Central Intelligence Agency has more office acreage than the Pentagon. At Fort Meade in Maryland sits the even larger, more mysterious, and more expensive National Security Agency," wrote May.

The visitor might return from his visit, May concluded, to describe the nation’s capital this way: “Yes, a city. But, at heart, a military headquarters, like the Rome of the Flavians or the Berlin of the Hohenzollerns.”

Twenty years later, the city is much the same. As J. Anthony Holmes, a former ambassador and AFSA president from 2005 to 2007, observed in *Foreign Affairs* a few years ago, the defense budget is roughly 20 times as great as the combined budgets of the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development. There are more lawyers in the Pentagon than diplomats in the State Department.

Defense Secretary Robert Gates warned in 2008 that the United States risks the “creeping militarization” of its foreign policy by giving such overwhelming priority to our military services and paying so little attention to the diplomats who work to advance American interests through non-military means.

Gates reminded Americans that current and future wars are likely to be “fundamentally political in nature” and that military means always need to be harnessed to political ends.
The American Way of War

Except in the early days of the republic, “the American Way of War” has centered on achieving a “crushing” military victory over an adversary, the distinguished military historian Russell Weigley argued 40 years ago. He noted the paradox that although Americans generally view themselves as peace-loving, they have been capable of engaging in the most devastating kind of warfare, aimed at total victory and the complete elimination of enemy threats—or even the enemies themselves. Rather than seeing war as part of an ongoing political and diplomatic process, as Carl von Clausewitz counseled, Americans have tended to see war as an alternative to diplomacy.

So instead of waging war until we have achieved certain limited ends and then negotiating a peace, which is the way most wars have been waged historically, the United States insists on unconditional surrender, regime change and the total defeat of the adversary—not only Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan, but far lesser threats like Serbia, Iraq, Libya and Syria.

In addition, the Cold War produced some lingering bad habits. Because that long conflict had such a substantial military component, and because countries on both sides of the East-West divide built up a substantial military arsenal as a result, it became tempting to view every strategic challenge, then and now, through that same strategic lens. As the saying goes, “If the only tool you have is a hammer, you tend to see every problem as a nail.”

We instinctively look to our military to address global problems, whether or not the military hammer is the appropriate tool for the task. Our soldiers constitute one of the best-trained fighting forces the world has ever seen, but they are asked to do too much. Our diplomats, in contrast, struggle to find adequate resources. Our soldiers are stretched too far; our diplomats are too few and too poorly prepared for the challenges we face.

Now, as U.S. forces return home from two of our country’s longest wars, in Iraq and Afghanistan, there is an urgent need to reassess strategic priorities and capabilities. What international role should the United States play in the 21st century? How, and with what tools, should we engage the rest of the world?

What role does America’s still-unrivaled military power play, and how can U.S. leaders better use the formidable non-military elements of American power and influence? And how can we resurrect diplomacy from the musty archives of the past and make it more relevant to the present and future?

International diplomacy remains one of the least studied and most misunderstood elements of foreign policy. Scholars and practitioners have produced a substantial body of literature on international economics and military strategy, but they have not done the same for diplomacy and statecraft.

The Learning/Practice Gap

Even at the professional level, diplomacy is undervalued, underanalyzed and under-resourced. Although diplomatic training occurs at the Foreign Service Institute and in diplomatic academies around the world, this is mostly confined to foreign language and area studies with a thin veneer of “how-to” instruction for junior diplomats.

Few American diplomats have ever enrolled in a course on diplomacy, either before or after entering the Foreign Service. Even as they rise to the highest levels, they are expected to learn “on the job” rather than as part of a rigorous program of professional preparation. Contrast this with the professional training their military counterparts receive all the way through their careers.

The problem is not all with government: the academy deserves blame, too. There is growing concern among scholars about what has been called the “cult of irrelevancy”: the reality that academic research is too often abstract and theoretical, written by academics for other academics. To illustrate the gulf that has developed between the worlds of learning and policy, a recent poll showed that of the 25 international relations scholars who produced the most important scholarship over the past five years, only three had ever held policy positions in the U.S. government.

Reinventing Diplomacy

To address these shortcomings and begin bridging the gap between policymakers and academics, the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas has launched a major new global initiative called “Reinventing Diplomacy”—one
of several similar undertakings around the country. This program includes new curricula at the undergraduate and graduate levels, public outreach events so that our citizens are better educated about foreign policy issues and a new effort to elevate diplomacy as a subject for serious academic inquiry.

We also aim to “internationalize” the study and practice of statecraft so that American and Chinese diplomats, for example, will have been trained in similar, or at least mutually comprehensible, ways. Such a synthesis occurs in the academic study of international relations, but not in strategy and statecraft. It is a strange irony that international relations scholars from around the world speak a common professional language, read the same books and debate the same theories—but their statesmen and diplomats do not.

Last spring we convened a major international meeting of scholars and practitioners to investigate the key elements of successful diplomacy. We all know what failure looks like, but we also need to recognize success. When have diplomats worked effectively to influence international outcomes? How can current diplomats learn from past experiences?

The discussions produced a series of historical case studies examining the evolution of successful diplomatic efforts in diverse settings, including the U.S. opening to China, the negotiation of the Camp David Accords in the Middle East, the management of Germany’s reunification at the end of the Cold War and completion of the North American Free Trade Agreement, among other topics. We have worked to consolidate “lessons learned” from these cases that diplomats can use when they approach current opportunities and challenges.

**A Call for Imagination**

Much work remains to be done: to train the next generation of diplomats and better equip those currently serving, to produce a body of policy-relevant research on diplomacy, to reach
out to the wider public and to catalyze a global dialogue among students, scholars and practitioners of diplomacy. Beyond the curricular and research agendas we are already pursuing on our campus, there are several avenues of potential collaboration.

We could, for example, form a consortium of top-tier public policy schools, which would offer serious academic training in diplomacy and statecraft. This could be done under contract to the U.S. Foreign Service Institute and listed as an FSI course—perhaps through its existing National Security Executive Leadership Seminar. The goal would not be to duplicate the FSI curriculum, but rather to focus on areas where public policy schools have a comparative advantage.

A more ambitious model might “go global,” by partnering with leading public policy and international relations schools around the world so that American diplomats (and other foreign policy professionals) could study alongside their counterparts from Europe, Asia and other parts of the world, in seminars and workshops taught by an international faculty.

There are, of course, obstacles to be overcome. But as the creator of the State Department’s yearlong master’s program for mid-career Foreign Service officers at Princeton University, a program that has been running successfully for 15 years now, I know that such obstacles can be overcome—as long as there are willing partners with sufficient imagination on both sides.

It is a strange irony that international relations scholars from around the world speak a common professional language—but their statesmen and diplomats do not.
Charles W. Yost
Our Man in Morocco

This account of Ambassador Charles Yost’s tenure in Morocco during the Cold War offers a window into his remarkable career and the texture of postwar diplomacy.

By Felicity O. Yost

When World War II ended in 1945, three years after “Operation Torch,” the Allied invasion of North Africa, U.S. soldiers remained in Morocco. They were still there 13 years later—and for Moroccans, this was a problem.

In 1958, in the midst of the Cold War, Charles W. Yost became part of the solution. On a hot, muggy Sunday in July, he walked out onto the tarmac of Washington’s National Airport. The State Department had booked him on a four prop-driven, dolphin-shaped Lockheed Constellation—the luxurious “Paris Sky Chief.” Two days later, after stops in Newfoundland, Ireland and France, the plane landed in Rabat.

A week after his arrival, photographers recorded the new U.S. ambassador, his top hat sitting at a rakish angle on his slender frame, arriving at the royal palace in a convertible, followed closely by a mounted military escort. Ushered into the throne room, he presented his credentials to King Mohammed V—a man he referred to as “a wise and courteous scion of an old dynasty.”

A slight man with a kindly face, the king was delighted to discover that his exchanges with the American ambassador could be conducted in French, and thus in private.

Over the coming years, the two would form a personal bond based on trust and respect—a bond that would ease them, and their countries, through the national and international problems they confronted.

Chaos Brewing

Within days of his arrival, the country team gave Ambassador Yost a sobering view of the current political situation. In a nutshell, the stability of the newly independent Moroccan government, and U.S. objectives there, were under serious threat.

A faltering economy, rising unemployment, and an uneducated and impoverished lower class were all creating a fertile recruiting ground for extremists. As Amb. Yost well knew, Morocco had a rich but turbulent history, and had regained its independence from Spain and France only in 1956.

The most problematic issue concerned the four American military bases built in Morocco during World War II. At the end of the war, the French had taken over the bases; but in 1950, they reverted to the United States under the aegis of NATO. There the 316th Air Division housed American nuclear-armed B-47 bombers, with their capability to strike the Soviet Union. They were a

Felicity O. Yost, the daughter of Ambassador Charles W. Yost, retired recently after 37 years as a graphic designer and election monitor at the United Nations. She is now writing a biography of her father, tentatively titled Charles W. Yost and the Golden Age of U.S. Diplomacy, from which this account of his tenure as ambassador in Morocco is drawn.
crucial weapon in the U.S. air defense arsenal in the days before American intercontinental ballistic missiles became operational.

But for Moroccans, the presence of foreign troops provoked deep resentment. Moroccan anger was also fueled by the behavior of the bases’ American civilian staff. Some of them “got drunk on the plane [from New York],” recalled an American vice consul, “stayed drunk on the plane, arrived in Paris drunk, were transferred to another plane, arrived drunk in Casablanca. Three days later, they were sent home, drunk.”

As American and Moroccan officials argued over the status of the bases, nerves on both sides of the Atlantic were wearing thin despite efforts to relieve tensions. Amb. Yost soon realized that unless a solution could be arrived at, the continued American military presence would complicate—or worse, derail—an otherwise good relationship with Morocco, which had been the first nation to recognize the United States, in 1777.

The Crisis Deepens

Throughout the 1950s, political protests had torn at the fabric of Moroccan society. The Union des Travailleurs du Maroc (Moroccan Workers’ Union), the Parti Istiqlal (the major political party) and student organizations were all impatient with Morocco’s lack of progress in surmounting its social and economic problems. And all three, Yost informed Washington, were using the American bases as convenient political targets at which to vent their anger.

In his early cables, the ambassador also alerted the State Department to the Moroccan left wing’s attempt to remove the army and police from the palace’s purview, a move that would severely undermine the king’s ability to govern. The king’s strategy, Yost reported, was to detach the moderate party members from the far left by conferring government posts on them. If the moderates could work with the conservatives, a coalition government might function; or so the king hoped. Yost concluded that Mohammed V was the main force keeping the country from exploding—a weighty responsibility for the 49-year-old monarch.

In 1958, the UMT called for a general strike in Rabat. It soon spread across the country, and by year’s end, the nation was imploding. Early the following year, the tenuous equilibrium...
began to unravel, and Amb. Yost warned Washington that the king “wondered whether Moroccans would soon be slitting each other’s throats.”

Yost added that though the king was under tremendous pressure to close the bases, Mohammed V was trying to put his critics off. He urged Washington to meet the king halfway on the base question, or risk inciting opposition forces that, once unleashed, might be impossible to control. U.S. security interests in North Africa and the Middle East were then, as now, a critical issue.

**Negotiating with the Brass**

The Pentagon recognized the gravity of the situation but objected, in no uncertain terms, to the idea of closing the facilities. During consultations in Washington in June 1959, General Nathan Twining (chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) and Admiral Arleigh Burke (chief of naval operations) told Yost they saw no reason to soften the U.S. negotiating stance.

The endless discussions with the Pentagon caused Yost to doubt that soldiers, who “perceive the components of foreign affairs through the prism of what they believe to be overriding military necessities, were psychologically best fitted to define and judge national security in its broadest sense.”

**It would be best, Yost felt, if the U.S. trod as lightly as possible on Moroccan sensibilities.**

As the situation became more urgent, he warned that if Washington took no steps to defuse tensions over the bases, the likelihood that the king would be assassinated would increase. And that outcome would put the hard-line, unpopular and volatile Prince Hassan on the throne.

It would be best, he felt, if the U.S. trod as lightly as possible on Moroccan sensibilities, keeping a minor breach in relations at a manageable level. “I suggest,” Yost wrote, “that what we need is not more crisis management but more crisis neglect. Small ills, like pimples, are more likely to be inflamed than cured by scratching.”

Yost knew that if he succeeded in convincing the Pentagon to agree to close the bases at some future date, both Rabat and Washington could pull back from the brink of a major military and diplomatic confrontation. If he failed, the consequences for his career and the U.S.-Moroccan relationship could be momentous.

**A “Triumph for Royal Diplomacy”**

In his initial conversation with Amb. Yost, General Curtis LeMay (Air Force vice chief of staff) assumed that he was dealing with a lightweight. As Yost wrote: “LeMay gagged at giving up those [bases] in Morocco and spoke grimly of ‘bombing them into the Stone Age’ if the Moroccans should use force.”

Yost’s reserved manner fooled many, friend and foe alike, who faced him across the negotiating table. But he did not hesitate to remind LeMay that the Moroccans could simply deprive the bases of access to drinking water. He also reminded the general of the larger implications for American alliances if the
free world's champion bombed a friend and ally.

In the end, with perseverance and wise counsel, Yost won the support of Gen. Twining. His success was an example, as he later recounted, of how facts could persuade an intelligent person despite his core beliefs.

On a crisp morning just three days before Christmas 1959, Amb. Yost walked up to the stairs of Air Force One at Nouasseur Air Force Base in Casablanca. He and the king had come to greet President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who had commanded "Operation Torch" 17 years earlier and was now returning to sign a joint communiqué ending the crisis.

U.S. military forces would be withdrawn over the next four years. As the New York Times reported it, the accord "concluded by the United States Ambassador, Charles Woodruff Yost, and King Mohammed, was something of a triumph for royal diplomacy."

A Tragedy and New Challenges

The night of Feb. 29, 1960, the second day of the holy month of Ramadan, was clear in the seaside town of Agadir, 342 miles south of the capital. But as families who had broken their fast at sunset greeted friends in the streets, they began noticing the animals' odd behavior: a cat who yowled so loudly she drowned out a radio; donkeys whose withers started shivering nonstop; and the echo of countless dogs howling across the starlit night.

At 11:40 p.m. the town suffered a magnitude 5.7 earthquake. The ground shook for just 15 seconds, followed by a massive tidal wave, but that was all it took for fire and brimstone to consume the town. Due to poor design and use of shoddy materials, many areas were completely obliterated. Some 15,000 people died, and twice that many were injured.

A phone call alerted Amb. Yost to the disaster, and he immediately launched a massive American relief effort. The official residence became a hub for U.S. and other assistance, and soon filled up with any container that could hold clothes, blankets, canned goods, bandages, water jugs or cooking utensils. Even chickens were deposited on the doorstep.

Less than 12 hours after the quake, a Navy transport aircraft, with Yost aboard, led a convoy of UF-1 Albatrosses (amphibious search-and-rescue flying boats) to the site. Even from a distance they could see the havoc wreaked on the seaside community, the enormous fissures in the earth into which whole city blocks, entire families, and herds of camels and donkeys had simply vanished.
At the end of the harrowing visit, Amb. Yost visited a curbside medical facility. There a photographer captured a heart-wrenching image of him sitting at the bedside of a patient, his head bowed, weeping as he gently held the survivor’s fingers—the only unbandaged part of the man’s body.

In mid-November 1960, a new challenge arose when the Soviet Union offered to sell two nuclear-capable Ilyushin bombers and 12 MIG fighters to Morocco. For the Americans, Soviet nuclear bombs and jet fighters within easy striking distance of U.S. bases were simply unacceptable.

In December, back in the States on home leave, Amb. Yost met with officials at State and at the Pentagon. He emphasized foreign policy, he did not mind being surprised with a ‘fait accompli.’ Furthermore, the Yost-Dulles connection was one that went back many decades.

Dulles, the nephew of Secretary of State Lansing, had also grown up in Watertown; in 1902 Dulles’ father, a Presbyterian minister, had married my father’s parents. That connection may explain why the ultraconservative Dulles became a loyal supporter of my liberal father.

That support proved crucial in the 1950s, during the investigations of my father by the FBI and the Truman Loyalty Board. Those investigations ruined the lives and careers of many State Department colleagues, and took their toll on both of my parents.

In 1961, my father began his first assignment at the United Nations, as the deputy to Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. After Stevenson’s death in 1965, he stayed on as deputy to Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, and was promoted to the rank of career ambassador, the highest professional Foreign Service level.

The turbulent 1960s presented upheavals around the globe—most significantly in the Congo, Kashmir, Cyprus and the Middle East—that challenged the United Nations and American diplomacy. My father’s habit of “suspecting that there is some right on both sides of most questions,” as he wrote, helped him face those challenges.

In 1966 he resigned from the Foreign Service to begin his career as a writer at the Council on Foreign Relations and as a teacher at Columbia University, but was called out of retirement by President Richard Nixon in 1969 to become the permanent United States representative to the United Nations, a position he held until 1971.

At his 1981 memorial service, historian Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. reflected: “Charles Yost’s life presents the gallant spectacle of a supremely rational man trying to make sense of a supremely irrational age.”

—Felicity O. Yost

Charles W. Yost (1907–1981)

Born in 1907 in Watertown, N.Y., my father joined the Foreign Service in 1929 at the suggestion of Secretary of State Robert Lansing, a family friend. Forty years later, his last assignment was as the first career diplomat to be appointed permanent U.S. representative to the United Nations.

His early assignments to the U.S. consulates in Egypt and Poland proved frustrating. When the ambassadors to those countries saw promise in him, and requested his transfer to their staff, the State Department refused on the grounds that his apprenticeship had been too short. As a result, when he rose to supervisory positions, he went out of his way, as Ambassador John Gunther Dean later recalled, to always be “helpful and supportive of his younger colleagues starting in their career.”

In 1944 my father returned to Washington, where he worked on postwar planning before being assigned to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference as a member of the committee that drafted chapters VI and VII of the United Nations Charter—the provisions regularly cited in times of crisis. Following service as an assistant to Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius during the United Nations’ 1945 founding conference in San Francisco, and later as secretary-general of the U.S. delegation to the Potsdam Conference, my father served in Asia, including as the first U.S. ambassador to Laos, and in posts in Europe.

In 1958, after the abrupt termination of his assignment to Syria when the country broke off relations with the U.S., he was adrift. It was my Polish mother, Irena, who was responsible for his next assignment; she mentioned to the wife of Deputy Under Secretary of State Loy Henderson my father’s strong desire for a new posting.

When Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was informed that Henderson had slated my father for Morocco, Dulles was not put out. Because Dulles considered my father a subtle and reliable implementer of American
that it would be in the interest of the U.S. to respond positively to Morocco’s request for military support. By supplying its army, which tended to be loyal to the king, with updated weapons, Washington could help solidify the king’s position and make the Soviet overture less attractive.

In a cable to the Secretary of State, Yost “urgently requested standby authority to make such an offer.” After the Pentagon’s objections were appeased, the White House signed off on an offer of F-86s.

Changing of the Guard

On Feb. 21, 1961, Yost met with the king and presented a letter from the new U.S. president, John F. Kennedy. In subsequent meetings with the monarch, he pursued the issue of Soviet jets and technicians stationed in the country. At the conclusion of the second meeting, on Feb. 25, Mohammed casually mentioned that he was scheduled for minor surgery later that evening; so minor, in fact, that the procedure would be done in the palace and certainly would not interfere with their meeting the following morning.

The next morning, however, the Moroccan press reported that the king had died during the night. When the American ambassador received a phone call during breakfast, he remarked to his wife: “I would venture to bet Prince Hassan was involved.” It was an opinion shared by many.

In one of his last acts as U.S. ambassador to Morocco, Yost urged President Kennedy to send a high-profile representative to the funeral. Ambassador at Large Averell Harriman, a Yost family friend, turned out to be the perfect choice. The night before the funeral, Yost and Harriman, both suffering from insomnia, met in the kitchen of the residence in Rabat over a glass of hot milk (it was Harriman’s idea to add a shot of whiskey, Yost recalled). Barely 18 months later both men would be members of the diplomatic team advising JFK during the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Amb. Yost returned to the United States shortly after the king’s funeral, in March 1961, to become deputy U.S. representative to the United Nations.

Yost’s reserved manner fooled many, friend and foe alike, who faced him across the negotiating table.
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A VICTORY ON CAPITOL HILL

Senate Releases Hold on 1,800 FS Careers

On April 11, thanks in large measure to AFSA’s advocacy, the Senate confirmed the commission, tenure and promotion of all but a handful of the nearly 1,800 members of the Foreign Service whose careers had been held up by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In some cases, these individuals’ careers had been on hold for as long as 15 months, with this unprecedented situation directly affecting more than 10 percent of our colleagues.

Over the past several months AFSA has been deeply involved in efforts to rectify this injustice, meeting repeatedly with management from the foreign affairs agencies and with SFRC members and committee staff from both sides of the aisle.

A Well-Coordinated Strategy

On March 7, AFSA’s president, State vice president and director of advocacy brought all parties together to seek agreement and an end to the hold.

Through these discussions, AFSA learned that the committee staff was seeking an enhanced vetting process for those put forward for confirmation, while making it clear that they were not questioning the integrity of any individual.

Negotiations continued, and on March 27 AFSA sent a letter to SFRC Chairman Robert Menendez, D-N.J., and Ranking Member

Continued on page 53

Conducting Diplomacy in Dangerous Places

On March 25, AFSA welcomed Ambassador Gerald Feierstein to AFSA headquarters to discuss the challenges of conducting diplomacy in dangerous places.

That is certainly a topic Ambassador Feierstein—now principal deputy assistant secretary for Near Eastern affairs—knows firsthand. While serving as U.S. ambassador to Yemen from 2010 to 2013, he had the unenviable distinction of having an al-Qaida bounty put on his head; anyone who killed him was to be rewarded with six pounds of gold.

Amb. Feierstein addressed the changing attitudes toward diplomacy in danger zones, distinguishing between the pre- and post-Benghazi periods.

From 9/11, and particularly following the March 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq, the emphasis was on expeditionary diplomacy. But since the tragic incident in Libya on Sept. 11, 2012, attitudes have shifted back toward risk-aversion, Feierstein pointed out.

Zero tolerance for threats to a diplomatic mission has negative consequences in terms of the ability to maintain a U.S. presence overseas,

Continued on page 60
Millennial Diplomacy*

The millennial generation is changing the Foreign Service and how it works, lives and views the world.

New hires have traditionally adapted their behavior to conform to the system. Today, given the numbers of new hires (more than 50 percent of the Service—granted, not all of them millennials), it’s more two-way: the establishment also has to adapt to this new generation.

The millennials are challenging, sometimes subtly and other times more overtly, the internal order and its prevailing work-life norms. This generation’s more global, interdisciplinary and digitally connected perspective is also opening up new diplomatic solutions.

At the same time, this generation shares the same passion for and dedication to the Foreign Service as others. It values the Service’s inter-generational contact and opportunities to learn from those who have gone before. Together, the millennials, generation X and baby boomers are shaping—perhaps in new ways and with different approaches—the premier diplomatic workforce of the 21st century.

**Work**

The millennial generation’s general characteristics-confidence, optimism about the future and openness to change—carry over into the workplace. There is an expectation of full-digital integration at work, including tools that provide for extreme transparency inside and outside the department, here and abroad.

The generation is less accepting of what it views as onerous security requirements, in terms of both technology and physical facilities. These digital natives are frustrated by the department's use of technology and find it inadequate compared to other agencies in the U.S. government (e.g., the military and intelligence), not to mention private-sector firms.

Millenials also have different career expectations than Gen X and the Baby Boomers. They are less likely to have “one employer for life.” If the Foreign Service wants to capture the best and brightest, it needs to be able to accommodate those who are looking to join for a limited number of years.

Millennials expect responsibility, meaningful work and advancement opportunities, and are subtly influenced by the success and fortunes of their counterparts in the private sector. They regard Facebook founders Marc Zuckerberg and Chris Hughes as peers, even if their experience is one in three billion.

**Life**

Finally, the generation has different expectations for the quality of work/life. They are likely to subscribe to Wharton Professor Stew Friedman’s “Total Leadership” philosophy and, unlike past generations, set limits on the number of hours in the workday.

Millenials are marrying later (if at all), having fewer children and espousing more liberal views on many political and social issues than previous generations.

With Foreign Affairs Manual regulations touching on topics like “promiscuous behavior” in an age where the definition of promiscuity often varies widely (see 3 FAM 4139.14 on “Notoriously Disgraceful Behavior”), State may need to re-evaluate its policies and disciplinary regulations.

**World Outlook**

The recent crisis in Crimea reminds us of the importance of perspective to diplomacy. The millennial generation was raised with a different view of Russia than gen X or the baby boomers. It came of age knowing Russia as a post-Soviet Union country the West was trying to incorporate into a post-modern world order—not as a historical foe. Some were surprised by a perceived negative bias in media coverage of the Sochi Olympics.

In a post-ideological world, millennials appreciate digital interconnectedness across national borders between people of different races and religions. They are more likely to form associations and make Facebook “friends” (and no, not the kind that warrant Diplomatic Security contact reporting) with people from around the world.

What does all this mean for U.S. diplomacy? Such a differing generational perspective may contribute to a diversity of views about the national interest at stake in a given country or crisis, as well as different emphases, initiatives or engagement strategies.

It also suggests that the Foreign Service would do well to increase training on geography, history and culture, to ensure that we are operating from a common platform of understanding.

Millenials matter. They are already shaping the culture of the State Department, more rapidly than department leadership ever expected, and will continue to do so as they rise through the ranks.

Share your own millennial story with me on twitter @matthewasada.

Next month: Post-Benghazi Security

* This column draws on the 2010 and 2014 Pew Research Millennial Surveys. The millennial generation generally refers to those born after 1980 (i.e., the first generation to come of age in the new millennium). Generation X covers people born from 1965 through 1980; and the baby boomers are those born between 1946 and 1964.
New USDA Under Secretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs

The Farm Bill passed by Congress at the start of February includes a provision mandating a reorganization of trade functions, and the establishment of a new Under Secretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs position at USDA.

It is not clear yet how the reorganization will be done or what kind of impact it will have on FAS, but this is an area we will be tracking over the next few months.

The law requires USDA to report an implementation plan to Congress within six months and carry out the changes within the next year.

The main impetus for the change appears to be a desire to improve coordination on sanitary and phytosanitary import and export issues; and to establish a single, high-level USDA representative for trade negotiations with senior foreign officials and within the executive branch.

The Farm Bill does not specify how the reorganization will take place below the level of the new under secretary position. Nor does it specify what current under secretary position will be eliminated (the total number of authorized USDA under secretaries stays the same).

FAS will obviously come under the new under secretary’s purview, but it is still an open question how other USDA agencies will be affected. Though the goal is to improve coordination, particularly on SPS issues, it is not clear how this will be accomplished.

We have requested that AFSA be given pre-decisional involvement in the implementation of the Farm Bill changes, as well as any potential organizational changes within FAS.

Based on what I have heard so far, we don’t expect any changes in FAS on the scale of the 2006 reorganization. Nor do I expect major changes at our sister agencies, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service and the Food Safety and Inspection Service. But as we go to press, it is still early in the process.

Staying on top of this and making sure AFSA members have a voice in any changes is one of our top priorities.
As we celebrate 90 years of the Foreign Service and AFSA, our legislative team is engaged on an increasing number of fronts to serve our membership. Our goal is to ensure that AFSA’s voice is heard on Capitol Hill, making it a vital resource going forward—for another 90 years!

Priority Issues
In accordance with the AFSA Governing Board’s strategic plan, our key issues remain career development and professional capacity, overseas security and overseas comparability pay. These are the themes we hit in every meeting we have on the Hill, and we are pleased to note that congressional staff members are becoming increasingly conversant on these issues as a result of our advocacy. Not every member of Congress will support our issues, but maintaining strong relationships across the board is important for AFSA.

In recent weeks, AFSA has been very much engaged in pushing through the commissioning, tenure and promotions of close to 1,800 members of the Foreign Service at the Department of State, USAID, Foreign Commercial Service and Foreign Agricultural Service. This is a tremendously important issue to our members, directly affecting your salaries, onward assignments, living arrangements, family-member employment and educational options. (See page 51 for up-to-date information on this issue.)

Similarly, we have pushed hard on the Senate to clear the logjam of ambassadorial nominations that are languishing on the Senate floor; as of this writing 33 such nominations await confirmation.

New Alliances
Our recent advocacy for AFSA’s “Guidelines for Successful Performance as a Chief of Mission” is another way we are showcasing our value to Congress and the White House. AFSA has been able to engage with a large number of stakeholders on the guidelines issue, and in the process has made new alliances with congressional offices with which we previously had very little contact.

We are also engaging more with state legislatures. For instance, in Virginia we are working to establish a new state license plate honoring the Foreign Service and diplomacy. Any Virginia resident who is interested in this initiative should let us know at murimi@afsa.org.

AFSA is also working on a resolution honoring the Foreign Service and the association on the occasion of this year’s 90th anniversaries. Keeping and maintaining healthy relationships on Capitol Hill is our number-one priority.

People Over Programs
The more people we reach on Capitol Hill, the better are our chances of promoting our core issues. “Friends of friends,” as we like to call them, have become increasingly influential and beneficial as we expand the AFSA brand and talk about the brave men and women of the Foreign Service. “People over programs” is our motto when we talk to Members of Congress. You are the face of the nation abroad, and Congress needs to know the importance of your work, wherever you may be serving.

Capitol Hill is changing fast, and so are the players. As Congress continues to see members retire in record numbers, AFSA is seizing the opportunity to introduce ourselves to new senators and representatives, familiarizing them with the Foreign Service and our issues from their first days in office.

We also continue to educate appropriators and authorizers on the importance of Foreign Service work and the need for the right amount of funding to do your jobs successfully. We hope we can continue to count on your support as we work on your behalf in Congress.

–David Murimi, Senior Legislative Assistant

AFSA on the Hill: The Multiplier Effect

A Panel on the Foreign Service Career

On March 28, AFSA State Vice President Matthew Asada, at left, joined Pearson Fellows Dena Brownlow and Mark Shapiro for a panel on Capitol Hill about life in the Foreign Service. Asada underlined the importance of training to develop a professional diplomatic workforce. He noted Congress’ decision not to fund the 2014 request for additional personnel positions that would ensure officers and specialists receive the language and security awareness training they need to work and survive overseas. Shapiro stressed cultural differences between State and the Hill and the need to improve understanding between the two.
AFSA Honors Toni Tomasek on Foreign Affairs Day

Each year on Foreign Affairs Day, we have the solemn duty and honor to recognize some of the best of the Foreign Service—those who gave their lives while on duty, in pursuit of the highest goals of American diplomacy and development.

On May 2, AFSA President Robert Silverman leads AFSA’s memorial ceremony in gratitude for the service and sacrifice of the 244 individuals already inscribed on our memorial plaques in the Department of State’s C Street lobby. This year, another name joins this roll of honor as Antoinette “Toni” Beaumont Tomasek becomes the 245th honoree at our 81st memorial ceremony.

A returned Peace Corps Volunteer and specialist in international public health and intercultural education, Toni began her Foreign Service career with the U.S. Agency for International Development in 2009. In postings from Indonesia to Haiti, she worked to better the lives of others.

In Haiti she ensured that a local clinic had adequate supplies to treat the children of the community. Tragically, on June 29, 2013, at the age of 41, she was killed in a car accident on her way back from that clinic to the USAID mission in Port-au-Prince.

In Indonesia, where she was a development leadership initiative officer, she established a groundbreaking program that offered grants to local organizations working to prevent and treat tuberculosis. She was also one of the principal authors of Indonesia’s Global Health Initiative strategy, which continues to guide the work of USAID Indonesia.

Toni was tireless in her fight to make the world a better place, and brought to the Foreign Service years of experience designing and implementing health programs.

Before becoming a diplomat, she studied in Spain and Brazil, served as a PCV in Paraguay, worked in the United States with migrant and seasonal farming communities, and was a health lead for the Inter-American and Pacific region at Peace Corps headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Toni’s career speaks to her nature as a humanitarian and exemplary diplomat. Her unwavering dedication to development and foreign assistance positively improved the lives of many vulnerable families.

Her husband, Adam, and their two children, Alex (9) and Amelie (7), cherish the memory of her commitment, kindness and energy.

Toni Tomasek’s legacy is a true testament to the sacrifice and accomplishment inherent in a Foreign Service career.

Secretary of State John Kerry and USAID Administrator Rajiv Shah will both make remarks in Toni’s honor during the May 2 memorial ceremony. We ask that all members of the Foreign Service community take a moment on that morning to remember Toni and the 244 individuals who precede her on the memorial plaque.

—Perri Green, Special Awards and Outreach Coordinator

Show Me Diplomacy!

To celebrate the 90th anniversary of AFSA and the Foreign Service, AFSA is assembling a slideshow that will be shown at AFSA events throughout the year and posted on our website.

Please share a Foreign Service memory with us by sending a photograph that represents diplomacy and a memory from your career. Our goal is to show the last 90 years of the Foreign Service through your lens. We want all types of photos: happy or sad, a person, place or animal or object. Show us diplomacy in action!

Please send just one picture and include your name and a caption giving the location of the photo and the year it was taken. Submit your photo by e-mail to 90FS@afsa.org, use #90FS on Instagram, or leave your photo as a comment on AFSA’s Facebook page.
UNA-NCA Honors Amb. Edward Perkins at AFSA

On April 2, AFSA had the pleasure of hosting the United Nations Association of the National Capital Area as it presented its Lifetime Achievement Award to Ambassador Edward Perkins. Dedicated to enhancing support for the U.N. in the United States, the UNA-NCA is one of AFSA’s partner organizations.

Amb. Perkins is a true Foreign Service legend. He broke countless barriers as an African-American diplomat, and served as ambassador to Liberia, South Africa, the United Nations and Australia.

The first African-American to serve in South Africa, his appointment garnered international attention and some controversy. Later, he became the first African-American director general of the Foreign Service. In that position, he spearheaded significant Foreign Service reform.

AFSA Executive Director Ian Houston welcomed the large crowd that gathered to celebrate Amb. Perkins and his inspiring life in the Foreign Service.

UNA-NCA President Ambassador Donald Bliss introduced Amb. Perkins, who regaled the audience during a moderated conversation with UNA-NCA’s Recardo Gibson. Despite being 85 years old, the statesman remains a captivating storyteller.

Following the discussion, Liberian Ambassador to the United States Jeremiah Sulunteh came forward to present the award to Amb. Perkins. It was a touching moment, and affirmation of an admirable and pioneering life of devotion to diplomacy and human rights. AFSA was honored to play a part in recognizing Amb. Perkins for his innumerable contributions to the Foreign Service.

AFSA looks forward to continuing the partnership with UNA-NCA, and we expect to offer additional joint events later this year. You may learn more about UNA-NCA at www.unanca.org.

—Ásgeir Sigfússon, Director of New Media

Department of State by State

In March, the Department of State’s Bureau of Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs introduced a new online feature, “the Department of State by State.” It is an interactive map that shows the effect the department, its personnel and American diplomacy have in each of the 50 states.

A rich source of information, the map is an exemplary public outreach tool. For instance, by using the map you can illustrate that the Department of State’s programs help support 130,000 jobs in Montana, $8.9 billion in exports from Arkansas, $1.2 billion in services exported by Maine companies and a $7.3 million contribution to Alaska’s fishing industry.

There are numerous such facts for each state, including the number of foreign individuals on a work- or study-based international visitor exchange program in the state, the number of residents holding passports and information on notable state residents who have been diplomats.

The map is available at www.state.gov/statebystate.

—Ásgeir Sigfússon, Director of New Media
Members Give Time to Support AFSA’s Art and Academic Merit Awards Program

During March and April, 25 AFSA members from the Washington, D.C., area were busy serving as judges for AFSA’s youth Merit Awards program.

This year, 94 graduating Foreign Service high school seniors, in the U.S. and abroad, competed on their academic and art accomplishments for $48,500 in prize money to be used for college education. The winners will be announced on May 2.

As usual, AFSA will spotlight the award winners and donors who support the program in the July-August issue of The Foreign Service Journal, but we want to take this opportunity to salute the volunteer judges who are the critical “behind-the-scenes” players in this program.

**MOTIVATED TO GIVE BACK**

Wanting to give back is a prime motivator for the individuals involved in this activity, but that’s not all. Retiree Mort Dworken, who has served as an academic merit and now an art merit judge, says, “I would not come back year after year if I did not enjoy this experience so much.”

A first-time judge, active-duty State Department employee Frances Chisholm adds, “It validates for me the immense potential of the next generation of our youth.”

All volunteer judges attended an orientation meeting to learn the mechanics of scoring, spent 10-12 hours of their own time to evaluate applications over a three-week period, and then participated in a panel meeting to select some winners and finalists.

Scholarship Committee members, who are also merit award judges, then volunteered for a second round to evaluate the finalists from all panels and select the remaining award winners. Since 2012 the AFSA Merit Awards program has used an online student application submission and judge evaluation program called “Fluidreview” to manage the process.

**THE JUDGING PROCESS**

Five academic merit panels and one art merit panel scored the 78 academic merit applications and 16 art merit applications AFSA received this year. Just as the academic applicants are divided into balanced panels by their grade point average and standardized test scores, so are the judges.

AFSA staff members use the following criteria to assign judges to each panel: gender, active-duty versus retiree status, new or repeat volunteer, agency repre-

Continued on page 63

**National High School Essay Contest in 16th Year**

This year, AFSA’s National High School Essay Contest enters its 16th year. In honor of the 90th anniversary of the Foreign Service, students were challenged to write about an important topic from diplomatic history.

The available topics were the Cuban missile crisis, the 1978 Camp David Accords, the end of the Cold War, the Northern Ireland Peace Process/Good Friday Agreement, the post-World War II period/Marshall Plan, and diplomacy through development. The most popular topic was the Cuban missile crisis.

We received more than 400 essays from 47 states and six countries, with just over 100 qualifying to move onto the second round of judging, in early April; the final round of judging began April 15.

The winning essay earns the student an all-expense paid trip with family to Washington, D.C., to meet the Secretary of State, a $2,500 prize, and an educational voyage courtesy of Semester at Sea when the student enrolls in an accredited university.

Learn more at www.afsa.org/essaycontest or by contacting AFSA’s Coordinator for Special Awards and Outreach Perri Green at green@afsa.org or (202) 719-9700.
AFSA Advocates for Foreign Service Child Care Options

One of AFSA’s five strategic goals is working to implement policies that improve the quality of employees’ work and family life. For some, that means improving available child care options in Washington, D.C.

State facilitates child care through three separate contract agreements at FSI, SA-1 (Diplots) and the soon-to-be-opened SA-17 (Diplots Too). Waiting lists range from 80-120 children (approximately nine months to one year) at FSI to 500-800 children (2.5 to 3 years) at SA-1. Top priority at FSI is given to children of Foreign Service employees assigned to training; at SA-1 priority is given to the siblings of an already enrolled child.

Identifying private child care facilities in the Washington metro area can be very challenging, and many centers have average wait times of two to three years (sometimes longer than a typical domestic assignment). Many employees with small children who cannot get into a center ultimately choose to hire or find a nanny-share arrangement.

However, both options are costly and take a lot of time to find and arrange. Employees may offset some of their child care costs by participating in the department’s child care subsidy program.

Last year, AFSA expressed concern about child care procedures and policies at department-supported centers that appear to disadvantage employees who are required to move every few years and those with only one child.

In several letters to the department and Diplots, we proposed that instead of relying solely on the waitlist, an initial allocation of SA-17 child care spots also be made available on a modified lottery basis. Such a lottery would ensure that all employees, wherever and in whatever status, have an equal chance of securing a spot for their child.

In addition, we suggested that the SA-1 and FSI waitlists be online and worldwide-available so that FS members posted overseas have access to them, and that they provide equal opportunity to single-child and multi-children families.

Ultimately, the department and Diplots decided not to change their process when opening the new center at SA-17, arguing that the sibling preference and waitlist were standard practice in D.C. AFSA maintains that our transient, international FS personnel system points to the need for a more customized solution.

AFSA will continue to advocate for a preference category system that fairly addresses the transient nature of Foreign Service families of all sizes, and for online, worldwide-available waitlists for department-supported centers. And we will continue to advocate for additional child care options, whether through partnership with third-party providers such as Care.com or inclusion in facility expansion plans.

The department recently provided additional resources for child care, including a pilot program for emergency backup care covering domestic and overseas locations. AFSA will support making this pilot permanent if employees find it useful.

We want to hear from you about your experience with child care. How did the existing process work for you? What ideas or suggestions do you have for improving the employee child care experience? Please send us your feedback at afsa@state.gov.

–Matthew Asada, AFSA State Vice President

AFSA @ BYU

On March 20, AFSA Executive Director Ian Houston spoke to a group of students at Brigham Young University’s David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies. He discussed AFSA, the Foreign Service career, development and diplomacy as a part of AFSA’s effort to engage students and young professionals in exploring the Foreign Service as a career choice. He also met with officers of the school’s Foreign Service Student Organization, and provided advice to students who are interested in international careers.

NEWS BRIEF

Last year, AFSA expressed concern about child care procedures and policies at department-supported centers that appear to disadvantage employees who are required to move every few years and those with only one child.
International Studies: AFSA Meets Academia

This year, for the first time, AFSA set up shop as an exhibitor at the International Studies Association convention, the largest annual gathering of international relations academics in the world.

Created to promote research and education in international affairs, ISA is the premier organization for connecting scholars and practitioners in the fields of international studies. Some 6,000 members attended the annual convention.

The majority of the 80-some exhibitors at the four-day conference, held March 26–29 in Toronto, were academic and commercial publishers selling books and networking. A number of related organizations also had booths at ISA, including Gallup, Council on Foreign Relations and Statecraft Simulation.

AFSA and ADST

Our neighbor was the State Department recruitment office, represented by the New York region’s Diplomat-in-Residence Patricia Guy, D.C.-based recruiter and retired FSO Ramona Harper, and Michael Wolfe, the student program and fellowship division chief.

AFSA shared a booth with the Association of Diplomatic Studies and Training, although ADST did not send any staff to Toronto. Retired FSO and member of the material that is the ADST oral history collection—1,800 first-person accounts of events in diplomatic history that are searchable and available at no cost.

Some two dozen professors took copies of the book for possible course adoption.

Several attendees who teach at military institutions were pleased to learn about Inside a U.S. Embassy, and one from the Air Force said it was exactly what they needed for an upcoming course.

The book went over well with academics teaching in the U.S., as well as those teaching in other countries.

Dry and Dorman met with representatives from the Diplomatic Studies Section of ISA and with many others interested in building bridges between academia and diplomatic practice.

AFSA's reps spoke with several hundred conference participants, introducing them to AFSA and ADST.

AFSA's reps spoke with several hundred conference participants, introducing them to AFSA and ADST programs and sharing copies of The Foreign Service Journal, AFSA's Inside a U.S. Embassy book and information about ADST—especially its oral history program (which happened to be the focus of the March Journal).

Building Bridges

The AFSA and ADST materials seemed a perfect fit for this audience. A few professors and Ph.D. candidates practically cried with enthusiasm about the treasure trove of primary source
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“Nowruz Pirooz!”—AFSA Celebrates Persian New Year

Persian New Year (“Nowruz”) is celebrated annually on the vernal equinox, when Earth is renewed with the coming of spring.

Partly rooted in Zoroastrianism, the holiday is enjoyed by people all over the world including Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, India, Pakistan and Turkey.

With Nowruz comes the setting of the “Haft-seen” (seven ‘S’) table, so named because it includes seven meaningful items whose names start with the Persian letter ‘seen’:

- Senjed (dry fruit of a lotus tree) denotes love and affection
- Sumaq (Sumac) symbolizes sunrise and the warmth of life
- Seeb (apple) stands for health and beauty
- Seer (garlic) indicates good health and well-being
- Samanu (wheat pudding) represents the sweetness of life
- Sabzeh (sprouted wheat grass) represents the renewal of life and the rebirth of nature
- Sonbol (hyacinth) stands for prosperity and good will in the new year.

On the eve of the last Wednesday of the old year, Iranians celebrate Chahar Shanbe Suri. They gather, light small bonfires in the streets and jump over the flames saying, “May my sickly pallor be yours and your red glow be mine.” The flames symbolically take away all the unpleasant things from the past year to prepare one for the New Year.

Nowruz lasts 13 days. The last day is called “Sizdeh Bedar,” which literally means “getting rid of the thirteenth.” Families and friends spend the day picnicking outdoors to get rid of bad luck.

—Raeka Safai, AFSA Staff Attorney

Feierstein argued. He also deplored the trend toward one-year and unaccompanied assignments.

“I do not think it is possible for our diplomats to do a good job in only one year,” he stated. He also noted that U.S. missions in dangerous countries are forced to rely too heavily on entry-level personnel.

Negative Consequences

Another effect is that U.S. missions are becoming increasingly militarized. “When I left Yemen, we had 110 Marines at the embassy,” observed Feierstein. “I truly appreciate the work of the Marine Corps. But if you have this number of military [personnel] in an embassy, it is noted by the public.”

Restrictions on movement for embassy personnel and their families increased dramatically, as well. Feierstein cited Sanaa, where all employees had to move into a nearby hotel.

“Our personnel can’t go anywhere,” Feierstein said. “It is crucial for our diplomatic goals that our FSOs be able to connect with the locals and have host-country neighbors.”

Making matters worse in Sanaa, he noted, during the 2013 embassy closings the 15-minute drive from the hotel to the embassy was considered too dangerous, and all diplomatic personnel had to sleep in their offices.

A Realistic Analysis of Risk

Acknowledging that safety is a legitimate priority for our diplomatic posts, Feierstein suggested that “an adult conversation about what we are trying to do, weighing risks and benefits,” is overdue. He pointed to the embassy closings in 2013 as the kind of “knee-jerk reaction” that is not helpful.

Feierstein also questioned whether State adequately articulates what the Foreign Service does and why we need to be overseas within the interagency community, given that State officers are often the ones pulled out first in a closure.

“This is exactly wrong,” Feierstein commented. “As we go forward, our battle is less in the dangerous posts than it is in Washington. We have to continue convincing the State Department that it is important to have people there.

“I still don’t think that the correct response is to build fortresses and to lock down our diplomats. We need a more nuanced approach.”

The large audience, in what was AFSA’s first members-only event, engaged Feierstein in a lively question-and-answer session following his remarks.

To view the discussion online, please visit www.afsa.org/video.

—Julian Steiner, Communications Intern
May Event: The Foreign Service and Professionalism

On May 29, AFSA will present an event in collaboration with the association’s Professionalism and Ethics Committee. “The System of Professions and Professionalism—Relevance to the Foreign Service” will look at the concept of professionalism and apply it to the realities of the Foreign Service.

What is Foreign Service professionalism? What does it look like? Should these ideas be part of every Foreign Service employee’s training?

Our speaker is Don Snider, emeritus professor of political science at West Point, from which he retired in 2008. He serves now as a senior fellow in the Center for the Army Profession and Ethic at West Point and as Distinguished Visiting Professor in the Strategic Studies Institute at the U.S. Army War College.

Dr. Snider’s continuing research examines American civil-military relations, the identities and development of the U.S. Army officer, military professions and professional military ethics. He was research director and co-editor of The Future of the Army Profession (2nd edition, McGraw-Hill, 2005) and Forging the Warrior’s Character (2nd edition, McGraw-Hill, 2008).

He also co-authored The Army’s Professional Military Ethic in an Era of Persistent Conflict (U.S. Army War College, 2008) and was co-editor with Suzanne Nielsen of American Civil-Military Relations: The Soldier and the State in the New Era (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).

This program takes place at AFSA headquarters, 2101 E St NW, and begins at 2 p.m. on Thursday, May 29. Please RSVP to events@afsa.org.

NEWS BRIEF

Save the Date and Donate: The 2014 AAFSW Art & BookFair


The fair will feature books, jewelry, art, collectibles, stamps and coins from all over the world. Proceeds benefit Foreign Service families and the AAFSW Scholarship Fund.

Donations of rare books, jewelry, art items, stamps and coins are now being accepted. To have your donations picked up, please call (202) 223-5796 or email bookroom@aaafsw.org.

If you are interested in volunteering to help us out during this annual event, please contact AAFSW at (703) 820-5420 or visit www.aaafsw.org. If you love books and exotic items, you won’t be disappointed!

Financial Analysis

Helping do what’s best for you...

A Former State Department Employee Stationed Overseas Understands Unique Financial Situation of Foreign Service.

Services Include:
- Tax Preparation
- Financial Analysis
- Retirement Analysis
- Lump Sum Retirement Options

MARY CORNELIA GINN
10303 Greenwood Place
Oakwood, Virginia 22124
Phone: (703) 938-0074
e-mail: mginn@ceteranetworks.com

Registered representative offering securities through Cetera Advisor Networks LLC, member FINRA/SIPC. Cetera is under separate ownership from any other named entity. Financial analysis and tax services offered through MCG Financial Planning. Each office is independently responsible for the services provided.
AFSA Helps Out Common Ground Book Festival

AFSA welcomed the invitation to support the fifth annual Common Ground International Book Fest & Business Expo at Shepherd University in Shepherdstown, W. Va.

The March 1 event showcased the work of authors, playwrights, filmmakers, musicians and craft vendors with a host of activities, seminars and book signings. It was organized by Women for Shepherd University, the Shepherd University Foundation and Harambee Conference.

AFSA arranged for retired Foreign Service officer Patricia McArdle to be the featured speaker at the event’s keynote luncheon. McArdle is the author of the novel *Farishta* (Riverhead Hardcover, 2011), winner of the Amazon Breakthrough Novel Award.

In addition to copies of *The Foreign Service Journal*, AFSA also donated copies of *Inside a U.S. Embassy: Diplomacy at Work* that were given as awards in various student competitions and as a door prize.

March Job Search Program Reception

On March 28, AFSA and DACOR co-hosted the graduation reception for the most recent Job Search Program group at the Foreign Service Institute. We were pleased to honor the 46 Foreign Service employees who were retiring from diplomatic service with champagne and hors d’oeuvres.

Earlier that week, AFSA’s Membership Department hosted a brown-bag lunch with the same group to let them know about AFSA’s services to retirees. AFSA looks forward to welcoming them as retiree members of the association and continuing to work on their behalf as they begin a new chapter in their lives.

David L. Mortimer, CPA, has more than 20 years of experience in tax planning, research and compliance. This experience includes developing tax minimization strategies, planning business transactions and tax audit representation.

- Income tax services
- Financial planning
- Practiced before the IRS
- Electronic tax filing
- Member AICPA

America Counts on CPAs

David L. Mortimer, CPA
5500 Holmes Run Parkway C4
Alexandria VA 22314
Tel: (703) 743-0272 Fax: (202) 204-5199
E-mail: David@mytaxcpa.net
Web site: www.mytaxcpa.net
sented, availability for panel discussion meetings and, in the case of the art judges, expertise. As mentioned above, each panel had an AFSA Scholarship Committee member on it, too.

Academic merit award applicants receive a score for their unweighted grade point average, standardized test scores, higher-level courses taken, a two-page essay, high school activities and any special circumstances. Letters of recommendation are also taken into consideration.

Art merit award applicants must have at least a 2.0 GPA, but do not need to submit their standardized test scores. These candidates submit two to five art samples in one of the following four categories: creative writing, visual arts, performing arts or musical arts. They also submit an essay and two letters of recommendation, and answer various questions on their artwork.

The competition is open only to children of AFSA members who are active duty or retired Foreign Service employees.

REWARDING FS STUDENTS

“I am happy we have this AFSA program and that we are able to reward the students we do,” says Ambassador Lange Schermerhorn, chairwoman of the AFSA Scholarship Committee. “However, there are still many deserving applicants AFSA cannot recognize because of the funding constraints, so we must, at times, make tough decisions.”

Overseen by the seven-person AFSA Scholarship Committee, which is made up of representatives from all Foreign Service agencies, AFSA’s Merit Award program is now in its 38th year. Thirteen top prizes ($2,500) and 12 honorable mention prizes ($1,000), along with a $750 prize each for the Best Essay Award and Community Service Award are bestowed annually.


The Merit Award program is part of the AFSA Scholarship Program, which also includes a need-based Financial Aid Scholarship program providing $200,000 in educational aid to FS students annually. The AFSA Scholarship Program is managed by two AFSA staff members and a one-semester intern.

For more information on the program and to view the full list of merit award winners, visit www.afsa.org/scholar.

—Lori Dec, Scholarship Director

ALL THE COMFORTS OF HOME

TurnKey Housing Solutions makes finding a furnished residence in the Washington D.C. area easy and hassle free.

- Convenient locations in Maryland, Virginia and Washington DC
- Flexible lease terms
- Great amenities including swimming pools, fitness centers, business centers, garage parking and more
- Wireless high speed Internet service
- Easy access to public transportation
- Billing within government per diem and State Department sliding scale per diem
- Local customer service with over 15 years experience in the Washington DC housing market

Call 703.615.6591 or email us at RightAtHome@tkhousing.com

tkhousing.com

Volunteers Paul Cox, a first-time judge, and Maureen O’Neill, a member of the AFSA Scholarship Committee, review applications at an academic merit panel meeting.
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Inside a U.S. Embassy has been adopted for more than 50 university courses, as well as at least a dozen courses for U.S. military personnel. Help raise awareness about the Foreign Service and the role of diplomacy and development by sharing the book when you teach a course or give a presentation.

I use Inside a U.S. Embassy in my classes on diplomacy. It gives the students a great sense of how diplomacy actually happens, which they don’t always get from the standard texts or even from the invited practitioners.

-Professor Paul Sharp, Head of Political Science, University of Minnesota Duluth
Co-Editor, Hague Journal of Diplomacy
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Shawn Dorman, EDITOR
AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATION
Navigating Two-Way Streets

Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy
Reviewed by Ken Moskowitz

In her introduction to this collection of case studies (Volume 6 in an ongoing series of “Explorations in Culture and International History”), Jessica Gienow-Hecht correctly avers that “the more interactive the structure of the cultural diplomacy program is, the more likely it is to be successful.”

While that principle has gained new prominence thanks to social media, two-way dialogues have rarely, if ever, been absent from successful public diplomacy. For instance, the principle of mutual understanding was spelled out in the 1946 law establishing the Fulbright Scholar program, which has always aimed to educate the American public as much overseas audiences.

Gienow-Hecht and her co-editor, Mark Donfried, are on less firm ground, however, in declaring that cultural diplomacy must always be delinked from political messages, with the Cold War as the best-known example. A cultural program entirely devoid of political content might draw big audiences, no doubt—but to what end?

If your post’s public diplomacy program centers on organizing concert tours by American musicians even as local extremists are plotting to attack the embassy, why should U.S. taxpayers support it, no matter how well attended those performances are?

Similarly, one could enjoy a Confucius Institute seminar on, say, Chinese architecture, but still disapprove strongly of Beijing’s human rights record or foreign policy. In such cases, appeals to mutual understanding have a hollow ring.

While the editors deserve credit for assembling so many varied perspectives on cultural diplomacy, the results are uneven. The profile of Nitobe Inazô, a former under-secretary general for Japan at the League of Nations, who spent a year teaching in the U.S. and then wrote in English about Meiji Japan, is interesting enough, but adds little to our understanding of the topic.

Even more baffling is the chapter about the Bensberger Memorandum, a 1968 document by a West German Catholic lay group proposing improved relations with communist Poland. This example of efforts by non-state actors, which we conventionally label people-to-people diplomacy, can hardly inform diplomats about best practices given official constraints.

More instructively, the repeated failures of Soviet diplomats and correspondents to engage Americans during the Cold War cited in the book serve as excellent negative examples of public diplomacy. As one Russian journalist warned at the time, the fear of deviation from prepared texts only “indulges anti-Soviet lore.”

Yet while the task of trying to sell Soviet culture and society while on the losing side of history is a fascinating story, we current practitioners of PD should not be smug. At one time or another, all public diplomacy officers are tasked with making a silk purse out of the sow’s ear of bad policy.

Proponents of English teaching as a public diplomacy tool could benefit from the chapter recounting the challenges French diplomats confronted in their Syria and Lebanon mandates between the world wars. The prevalence of the French language in so much of the world, including Russia and West Africa, convinced them it was an “international instrument” that went hand-in-hand with their superior culture and “civilizing mission.” American diplomats should be careful never to give the impression that we feel the same way about the English language or our own culture.

While this is a useful and varied collection of case studies, the editors could have benefited from collaboration with a ruthless wordsmith. Readers will struggle with some of the contributions by foreign writers, but even the essays by Americans have not been closely edited.

For example, one U.S. ambassador’s information officer is called his “press agent,” while another essay refers to “Soviet impression management.” But my favorite example of gobbledygook discusses two governments that “tried to promote interactive cultural programs and cooperative cultural policymaking to promote mutuality among regional members.”

On balance, however, Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy is well worth the time of anyone interested in this important topic.

Ken Moskowitz, a Foreign Service officer with USIA and State since 1986, currently serves in the Office of the Inspector General. His overseas assignments include Budapest, Tokyo (twice), Sofia and Kyiv.
Christopher Michel Lance Brown, 57, an FSO with the U.S. Agency for International Development, died peacefully at his home with family and friends in Lake Placid, N.Y., on March 23.

The son of Vince Brown, a senior USAID mission director (one of the first development officials appointed to implement the Marshall Plan), and Francoise Brown, a former French citizen, Chris Brown was in many ways born into international development.

Mr. Brown was raised in Islamabad and Kabul, where he learned Urdu and Dari, as well as French and English. He received his B.A. degree from Occidental College and his master’s and doctoral degrees in agricultural economics from the Fletcher School. His doctorate was based on extensive field work in Liberia.

Shortly after graduating from the Tufts University’s Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Mr. Brown and his wife, Betsy, began a remarkable joint career with USAID. Over the next 20-plus years, they worked in more than 50 countries promoting democracy, economic growth, health, agricultural development and strategic planning.

Mr. Brown was devoted to educational opportunities in Afghanistan, including the reconstruction of the American University of Afghanistan (which was built on the rubble of his former high school). One of the highlights of his career was putting schoolbooks into the hands of millions of children across Afghanistan after the fall of the Taliban in 2001.

Family members, colleagues and friends recall his dazzling command of seven languages and a zest for life which enabled him to thrive while living with cancer for 23 years. Kind and generous, he worked throughout his life to build a sense of community, bringing people together in celebration with food, music and poetry.

Mr. Brown loved dogs and the outdoors, and had a passion for new adventures. An accomplished skier, snowboarder, water skier, wake-boarder, rock climber and kayaker, he surprised family and friends with his perpetual willingness to try new things—even taking up ballet and giving his first (and only) recital at the age of 50.

A Christian Scientist, he embraced Judaism as part of his family faith.

Mr. Brown is survived by his wife of 34 years, Betsey Hulnick Brown, of Lake Placid, N.Y.; his son, Michael Lawrence Brown of New Orleans, La.; his daughter, Danielle Raymonde Brown, of New Haven, Conn.; his mother, Francoise Brown; his brother, Gregory, and sister, Valerie Brown Ewins; his father and mother-in-law, Don and Barbara Helnick of Tupper Lake, N.Y.; and extended family members in the United States and France.

In lieu of flowers, the Browns welcome donations to the Rotary Club of Lake Placid, the American University of Afghanistan Scholars Fund (www.AUAF.edu.af/giving/) or Planned Parenthood of the North Country New York (www.ppcnyc.org). Please note “Chris Brown” in the subject line for any donations.

Peter W. Colm, 90, a retired Foreign Service officer who specialized in China, the Far East and Sino-Soviet relations, died on Jan. 5 at his home in Graham, N.C., of congestive heart failure.

Mr. Colm was born in Germany on Jan. 18, 1924. His father, Gerhard Colm, was an economist and his mother, Hanna, was a psychotherapist. Shortly after Hitler came to power in 1933, the family emigrated to the United States.

During World War II, Mr. Colm served in the infantry in China, Burma and India as a corporal and sergeant assigned to the 124th Cavalry (Mars Task Force) and to the Chinese Combat Command. His combat experience in the northern Shan and Kachin areas of Burma, and seven months in Kunming, China, where he spent his off-duty hours learning Chinese, sparked a lifelong interest in Asia.

After returning to Harvard University at the end of the war, he changed his major from physics to political science and Asian studies, graduating in 1946.

Mr. Colm joined the State Department in 1949 and the Foreign Service in 1960. In 1961 he was posted to Taiwan for six years, where he served as supervising political officer in the embassy in Taipei and continued his study of Mandarin Chinese in Taichung.

From 1968 to 1978, he worked as a research analyst for the Institute for Defense Analyses in Alexandria, Va. He returned to the State Department in 1978 as a political analyst specializing in Soviet and Asian affairs and Sino-Soviet relations. From 1980 to 1982, he was chief of the political section at the U.S. consulate general in Hong Kong.

On returning to Washington, D.C., in 1983, Mr. Colm became a senior political analyst of East Asian, South Asian and Soviet affairs, holding that post until his retirement in 1987. He continued to work part-time for the State Department until 1992.

Mr. Colm was a music lover, and introduced his children to Pete Seeger and the Weavers, Bob Dylan and Louis Armstrong, as well as Beethoven’s late quartets.

Following retirement, he and his wife, Pamela, moved from Washington, D.C., to Lusby, Md., where they enjoyed entertaining grandchildren, catching crabs and kayaking almost every evening in the inlets around Solomons Island. They also made several long-distance trips, to Hawaii, Cambodia, Germany and China. In 2010, the couple moved to Graham,
VICTOR H. DIKEOS, 90, a retired Foreign Service officer, died of cancer on Jan. 14 in Pasadena, Calif.

Born in Devils Lake, N.D., on Oct. 15, 1923, Mr. Dikeos graduated from Montana State University and worked in the private sector for several years before volunteering for the U.S. Navy’s V-5 program. There he trained as a Corsair aircraft pilot, attaining the rank of ensign.

He is survived by his wife of 32 years, Pamela L. Colm of Graham, N.C.; his children from his previous marriage to Sandra Kubat Colm: Janet Colm of Pittsboro, N.C.; John Colm of Lakewood, Ohio; Sara Colm of Stuart, Va.; and Martha Behnke of Graham, N.C.; four grandchildren: Jackie Colm of Lakewood, Ohio; and Daniel Fields, Sara Behnke and Lea Behnke of Graham; and two sisters, Anne Repaske of Star Tannery, Va., and Stine Levy of Bloomington, Ill. A brother, Claus H. Colm of Lake Bomoseen, Vt., predeceased him in 2013.

Samuel W. Lewis, 83, a retired Foreign Service officer and former ambassador, died on March 10 at his home in McLean, Va., of lung cancer.

Samuel Winfield Lewis Jr. was born on Oct. 1, 1930, in Houston, Texas. He graduated from Yale University, where he became interested in foreign affairs, in 1952. After receiving a master’s degree from Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies in 1954, he joined the Foreign Service.

Mr. Lewis’ first posting was as a consular officer in Naples. He then served as a political officer and acting principal officer in Florence (1955-1959) and as officer in charge of Italian affairs at the State Department (1959-1961). From 1961 to 1962, he served as special assistant to the under secretary of State, and from 1963 to 1964 he was a visiting fellow at Princeton University.

In 1965 he was detailed to Rio de Janeiro as deputy assistant director for
technical cooperation for the U.S. Agency for International Development, and in 1966 served as executive assistant to the U.S. ambassador there.

He returned to Washington, D.C., in 1967 as assistant director for development in the Office of Brazilian Affairs at USAID, becoming director of that office in 1968. He was then detailed to the National Security Council as a senior staff member.

Mr. Lewis served as special assistant for policy planning in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs from 1969 to 1970 and as special assistant to the director general of the Foreign Service from 1970 to 1971.

From 1971 to 1974, he was deputy chief of mission in Kabul, serving as chargé d’affaires in 1973 when King Zahir Shah was overthrown in a coup. He then returned to Washington, D.C., to serve as deputy director of the Policy Planning Staff until 1975, when he became assistant secretary of State for international organization affairs.

In 1977 President Jimmy Carter appointed Mr. Lewis U.S. ambassador to Israel, a position he held until 1985. Ambassador Lewis played a major role in negotiating the Camp David peace talks that resulted in the historic treaty between Egypt and Israel on Sept. 17, 1978.

Following his return from Israel, Amb. Lewis served as the second president of the U.S. Institute for Peace from 1987 to 1992. He left USIP the next year to become executive assistant to the Department of State and political counselor in Jakarta. He also served in India and Pakistan, and had an assignment in Washington, D.C., as director of the Office of East Asian Regional Affairs, which involved policy coordination for the entire area.

Following his retirement from the Department of State in 1981, Ambassador Masters was adjunct professor of Asian studies at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy (1981-1982) and later at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (2000-2003). In 1982 he joined the San Francisco-based Natomas Company, a Fortune 500 energy and shipping firm, as senior vice president for international affairs. He left the company after a hostile takeover, and was elected president of the National Policy Association, a nonprofit organization that brought together business, labor, agricultural interests and academia to focus on critical national issues in the fields of trade, productivity and international competitiveness.

In 1994 Amb. Masters founded the United States-Indonesia Society because he felt it was not in the U.S. national interest that most Americans knew so little about Indonesia. His envisioned that USINDO would promote mutual understanding between the two countries and strengthen the bilateral relationship.

Amb. Masters’ prescription for solving bilateral problems over the long run in developing countries was through education at all levels. Toward that end, in 2009 USINDO established the Edward E. Masters Fellows program, which has brought 17 highly qualified Indonesians for graduate study at top U.S. universities.

Amb. Masters served as USINDO’s president until 2001, then as the organization’s U.S. co-chair, and later as co-chair emeritus. For his commitment and advancement of the U.S.-Indonesia relationship, the Indonesian government
awarded him the Bintang Jawa Utama, the highest award given to a foreigner.

Mr. Masters is survived by his wife of nearly 58 years, Allene; his daughter, Julie Hellman (and her husband, Robert); his son, Edward R. Masters; and grandsons Nathan and Nicholas Hellman.

The family requests that any memorial contributions be made to USINDO.

Charles Donald (Don) Matthias, 87, a retired FSO with the U.S. Agency for International Development, died unexpectedly on Dec. 31, in Gig Harbor, Wash.

Mr. Matthias was born in Bridgeport, Conn., in 1926 and served in the U.S. Army during World War II from July 1943 to April 1946.

His career in the Foreign Service with USAID and its predecessors began in 1952 and took him and his family to Jordan, Iran, Somalia, Vietnam, Bolivia, Pakistan and Chile.

After retirement in 1981, he settled in Gig Harbor, where he enjoyed boating in the San Juan and Canadian Gulf Islands.

Mr. Matthias was a member of DACOR, AFSA, NARFE and the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary.

He is survived by his wife, Elisabeth (Betty) Hutchison of Gig Harbor; his daughter, Karen Auchter, and grandson, Andrew; his son, Patrick Lawson; and a brother, Robert.

Caroline V. Meirs, 69, a retired Foreign Service officer with the U.S. Information Agency, died on Feb. 28 of cancer in Rochester, N.Y., surrounded by family members.

Born in Brooklyn, N.Y., Ms. Meirs was educated at The Cathedral School of St. Mary in Garden City, N.Y., received her B.A. from Wellesley College in 1966, and earned her M.A. from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in 1972. A great believer in lifelong learning, she spoke French, Italian, German and Spanish fluently.

Ms. Meirs returned to South America in 1985 as counselor for public affairs in Bogota, and then moved on to Berlin as senior branch public affairs officer from 1989 to 1992. She returned to Washington, D.C., as a policy officer in the Office of the Assistant Director for European Affairs (1992-1994). Her last post was in Washington, D.C., as deputy director of USIA’s Office of International Visitors.

Following her retirement from the Foreign Service in 1995, Ms. Meirs served as a spokeswoman for the Federal Emergency Management Agency from 1997 to 2009. She also worked for the U.S. Agency for International Development, served on the Foreign Service Grievance Board of Appeals and was a leader in the Foreign Leaders Exchange Program.

Ms. Meirs was chair of the Foreign Service Journal Editorial Board from 2001 to 2003.

During her 12-year battle with salivary gland cancer, Ms. Meirs participated in numerous clinical trials in the hope of advancing knowledge of this rare and stubborn disease. She shared her experience by participating in support groups and writing a blog on the M.D. Anderson webpage.

Ms. Meirs never wavered in her commitment to living each day to its fullest by traveling extensively, visiting with friends and family, skiing and swimming, walking her beloved dog and exploring the many cultural opportunities available in the Washington, D.C., area.

Ms. Meirs was predeceased by her parents, John and Virginia Meirs. She is survived by her sister, Susanna Meirs Morgan; her brother, John Meirs; five nieces: Elizabeth, Susanna, Mary Anne (Morgan), Abigail and Tara (Meirs); seven grandnephews; and one grandniece.

In lieu of flowers, donations may be made in her memory to Christ Church, 118 North Washington Street, Alexandria VA 22314 (www.historicchristchurch.org/) or to the M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Head and Neck Cancer Research, P.O. Box 4486, Houston TX 77210-4486, or online at www.mdanderson.org/gifts.

Benedicta S. Monsen, 92, the wife of the late FSO G. Richard Monsen and founder and president of an advocacy organization dedicated to providing support for patients with lupus, died of congestive heart failure on Feb. 15 at her home in Bethesda, Md.

Benedicta Quirino dos Santos was born in Campinas, Brazil, and learned English while attending an American school in Brazil. She was also fluent in French, Italian, Spanish and her native Portuguese.

She attended the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in the late 1940s before moving to Washington, D.C., to work as a writer, translator and researcher.

After becoming a U.S. citizen in the 1950s, Mrs. Monsen accompanied her husband on diplomatic postings around the world for the next 30 years. She was often responsible for entertaining visiting dignitaries in cities like in Paris, New York and Brussels.

After her daughter Christine was diagnosed with lupus, Mrs. Monsen helped organize what is now the Washington area chapter of the Lupus Foundation of America. She served from 1974 to 1977 as the nonprofit organization’s first president.

For many years, she helped lead fundraising, advocacy and public awareness efforts on behalf of lupus patients and their families.


Survivors include a daughter, Lauren Monsen O’Donoghue of Bethesda.

Jack Richard Perry, 83, a retired Foreign Service officer, died on Feb. 16, in Davidson, N.C.

Mr. Perry was born on March 21, 1930, in Atlanta, Ga., the son of William Berrian Perry and Nellie Edwards Perry, both natives of Jackson County. He was educated at the Boys’ High School in Atlanta and at Mercer University in Macon, Ga., where he graduated summa cum laude in 1951. He served for three years in the U.S. Army, including a year in Japan.

Following army duty he returned to Georgia, where he worked as a newswriter for the Associated Press in Atlanta, as a reporter for The Macon (Georgia) Telegraph and as director of the news bureau at Mercer. During this time he met and courted Elizabeth (Betsy) Smith, whom he called “the joy and light of my life.” The couple married in Macon on June 8, 1957.

From 1956 to 1959, Mr. Perry did graduate study at the Russian Institute of Columbia University in New York. During the first year he was also a newswriter for the Associated Press in New York. He received his M.A. and Ph.D. in political science from Columbia.

In 1959 he entered the U.S. Foreign Service, serving until 1983. He served at the State Department and overseas. Following postings in Moscow and Paris, Mr. Perry returned to Washington, D.C., serving on the Soviet desk in the State Department.

An assignment to the Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President was followed by two assignments as deputy chief of mission, in Prague and Stockholm. From Sweden, Mr. Perry returned to the department as deputy executive secretary of State.
After serving as ambassador to Bulgaria (1979-1981), he headed the Senior Seminar in Washington, D.C., and was a diplomat in residence at The Citadel in Charleston, S.C., before retiring from the Foreign Service in 1983.

In 1985 Mr. Perry went to Davidson College as professor of political science and the first director of the new Dean Rusk Program in International Studies. He retired from that position in 1995, although he and his wife continued to reside in Davidson, moving to The Pines in 2007.

Mr. Perry also spent two years (1997-1999) teaching and administering international studies at UNC Charlotte. From 1984 on, he wrote numerous columns for the Charlotte Observer. He often said that being able to express his opinions freely in a newspaper with a fine tradition was one of the great privileges of his later life.

After entering his 80s, Mr. Perry wrote: “I had a three-time blessed life. I was given a wonderful human being as my wife, with all the good things that come from marvelous children and a happy family. I was given a diplomatic career which took me to fascinations around the world, and which let me be a part of the great Cold War era in which two nuclear powers proved that by negotiation, not armed conflict, they could keep the peace. And I was given the great gift of teaching a decade at a superb college with inspiring students. I am one fortunate man.”

Jack Perry is survived by his wife, Betsy, of Davidson; one son, James William Perry (and his wife, Elizabeth Hanes) of San Carlos, Calif.; three daughters, Leslie Perry Wingate, Jennifer Perry (and her husband, Brandon) Bates, all of Atlanta, Ga.; and eight grandchildren: Ellen Perry, William Perry, Sarah Wingate, Sydney Karpenko, Emily Wingate, Zachary Karpenko, Richard Bates and Rebecca Bates. He is also survived by his sister, Jane Perry Adams, and her husband Gerald, of Atlanta.

Donations may be sent to the Jack Perry Scholarship Fund, Dean Rusk Program, Davidson College, Davidson NC 28035 or to Crisis Assistance, Ada Jenkins Center, 452 South Main Street, Davidson NC 28036.

Barbara Shelby-Merello, 81, an FSO with the United States Information Agency, died on Feb. 14 in Austin, Texas.

Ms. Shelby-Merello was born to Marian Eikel Shelby and Robert Evart Shelby on June 21, 1932. She grew up in Teaneck, N.J., and attended the University of Texas at Austin.

In 1960, she joined the U.S. Information Agency, managing cultural exchanges until 1987. Her overseas tours included Brazil, Ecuador, Spain, Costa Rica, Argentina, and Peru, with short postings at the United Nations in New York City and in Belgium, Zaire and Tunisia, in addition to Washington, D.C.

Ms. Shelby-Merello translated 12 books by Brazilian authors of widely differing styles (including Jorge Amado, Gilberto Freyre, Antonio Callado, Joao Guimaraes Rosa and Dom Helder Camara) from Portuguese into English for the publisher Alfred A. Knopf. She was a finalist for the 1968 National Book Award for her translation of Freyre’s Mother and Son.

For several years she wrote an internationally syndicated column in Spanish,
“América Joven,” about the interests of young people in the United States.

In 1979, she married Agustín Merello, an Argentine futurist. The couple retired to Austin in 1987, where they enjoyed the Learning Activities for Mature People program at the University of Texas, did mediation and taught adult literacy, and hosted a Tibetan refugee for his first months in the United States.

A member of the Foreign Service Group of Texas, Ms. Shelby-Merello was a docent for more than 10 years at the LBJ Library and kept an eagle eye on local and national politics.

The couple traveled widely, visiting Dr. Merello’s family in Argentina; the North American Institute in Barcelona, where Ms. Shelby-Merello had served as director; her small medieval house in Talamanca, Spain; and the town of Tregaron in Wales, from which her ancestor Evan Shelby emigrated in 1735.

Ms. Shelby-Merello was predeceased by her husband. She leaves a sister, Jane Richardson and her family of North Carolina, and many cousins in Austin and elsewhere.

Gerald M. Sutton, 78, a retired Foreign Service officer, died in Las Vegas, Nev., on Feb. 12.

Born in Chicago, Mr. Sutton and his family moved to Los Angeles; he later graduated from Venice High School and then UCLA in political science (with honors) in 1956. He then did postgraduate work at the National University of Mexico.

During his Foreign Service career, Mr. Sutton served in Spain, Jamaica, Colombia, Cuba, Japan, Nicaragua and Ecuador. He was chief of the political section in Nicaragua from 1974 to 1976 and in Ecuador from 1976 to 1979, where he also served as chargé d’affaires in 1979.


As director of the Office of Terrorism and Narcotics Analysis from 1986 to 1990, Mr. Sutton’s intelligence analysis led to the apprehension of the hijackers of the Achille Lauro cruise ship. As a senior inspector in the Office of the Inspector General toward the end of his service, Mr. Sutton eventually visited more than 110 countries.

He received several Superior Honor, Meritorious Honor and Career Achievement awards from the State Department and was decorated with the National Medal of Merit by the Ecuadoran government for his contribution to the transition from military rule to democracy in the late 1970s.

In addition to State Department assignments, Mr. Sutton was a member of then-Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney’s team on the Continuity of Government project for post-nuclear attack planning. He also served as deputy chairman of the Interagency Committee on Terrorism Reporting.

Following his retirement from the State Department in 1998, Mr. Sutton moved to Las Vegas. He was an avid sports fan (backing the Redskins, Lakers and Dodgers) and a collector of modern and folk art.

Mr. Sutton is survived by his devoted wife, Shigeko Sutton, his son Matthew, and his sister Courtney.

Maria Lucia Trezise, 83, the wife of retired FSO Arthur Dayton Trezise, died on Feb. 26, 2013, in Gunnison, Colo., where she had relocated to be with her son’s family.

Born the 11th of 12 siblings on July 12, 1929, in the upstate São Paulo city of Barretos. Mrs. Trezise became known as “Puzas” as a young child; it was a nickname her father, Dr. Francisco de Assis Bezerra, gave to her.

She completed her postgraduate studies at the Faculdade de Psicologia Sedes Sapientiae in São Paulo, later working there with abandoned children. In 1960, she moved to Rio de Janeiro as an auditor with the Ministry of Finance.

In 1966 she returned to São Paulo, where she married Arthur Dayton Trezise of St. Albans, N.Y., who had been transferred to Brazil by his employer, the American Can Company. The couple raised three children in Brazil, where they attended American schools.

On her retirement from the Finance Ministry, Mrs. Trezise accompanied her husband in his second career, as a U.S. Foreign Service officer assigned to São Paulo, Bogota and Paris.

In Bogota, she put her lifelong dedication to children and her knowledge of Spanish and French to use in counseling single mothers at a religious shelter. In Paris, she ably complemented her husband in his responsibilities as commercial counselor.

Since 1974, the couple resided in both Fayston, Vt., and São Paulo.

Mrs. Trezise is survived by her husband, Arthur, and their children and grandchildren: Bridie Bezerra Musser, her husband, Steven, and their sons Will and Ben of Minneapolis, Minn.; Arthur A.B. Trezise, his wife, Heather, and their children Clara, Macy and Wyatt of Gunnison, Colo.; and Patrick Bezerra Trezise and his wife, Silvia, of Sant Cugat del Valles, Spain. She also leaves behind two sisters, Silvia Camara and Neuso Reiff, and a beloved group of nieces and nephews in Brazil.
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WILLS/ESTATE PLANNING by attorney who is a former FSO. Have your will reviewed and updated, or a new one prepared. No charge for initial consultation. M. Bruce Hirshorn, Boring & Pilger, P.C. 307 Maple Ave. W., Suite D, Vienna VA 22180 Tel: (703) 281-2161. Fax: (703) 281-9464. Email: mbhirshorn@boringandpilger.com

ATTORNEYS EXPERIENCED IN representing Foreign Service officers and intelligence community members in civil and criminal investigations, administrative inquiries, IG issues, grievances, disciplinary investigations and security clearance issues. Extensive State Department experience, both as counsel to the IG and in L, in representing individual officers. We have handled successfully some particularly difficult cases confronting Foreign Service and intelligence officers, both before the Foreign Service Grievance Board and in the federal and local courts. We work closely with AFSA when appropriate and cost-effective. Doumar Martin PLLC. Tel: (703) 243-3737. Fax: (703) 524-7610. Email: rmartin@doumarmartin.com Website: www.doumarmartin.com

PROFESSIONAL TAX RETURN PREPARATION Arthur A. Granberg, EA, ATA, ATP, has more than 40 years of experience in public tax practice. Our associates include EAs & CPAs. Our rate is $110 per hour; most FS returns take just 3-4 hours. Located near Ballston Mall and Metro station. Tax Matters Associates PC 4420 N. Fairfax Drive, Suite 500 Arlington VA 22203 Tel: (703) 522-3828. Fax: (703) 522-5726. Email: aag8686@aol.com

FREE TAX CONSULTATION for overseas personnel. We process federal and state returns as received, without delay. Preparation and representation by enrolled agents includes TAX TRAX, a unique mini-financial planning review with recommendations. Full financial planning also available. Get the most from your financial dollar! More than 30 years of experience. Financial Forecasts, Inc. Barry B. DeMarr, CFP, EA & Bryan F. DeMarr, EA 3918 Prosperity Ave #318, Fairfax VA 22031 Tel: (703) 289-1167. Fax: (703) 289-1178. Email: finfore@FFITAX.com Website: www.FFITAX.com

TAXES FOR U.S. EXPATS: Brenner & Elsea-Mandojana, LLC, is a professional services firm that specializes in U.S. tax, financial planning and accounting for expatriates and their businesses. Jim Brenner, CPA/ABV, CGMA, has been a certified public accountant for over 30 years. He provides U.S. individual tax planning and tax preparation services tailored toward individuals, partnerships, corporations, trusts and estates. Jim is also an IRS-certified Acceptance Agent for persons needing assistance with taxpayer ID numbers. His firm can e-file most tax forms, including the Report for Foreign Bank and Financial Advisors Accounts (FinCen114), directly with the U.S. Treasury. Tel: (281) 360-2800. Fax: (281) 359-6080. Email: info@globaltaxconsult Website: www.globaltaxconsult.com

FINANCIAL PLANNING FOR FS FAMILIES. Carrington Financial Planning LLC of Arlington, Va., provides financial planning services to Foreign Service families worldwide. Principal William Carrington is a Foreign Service spouse with 19 years of FS experience. Web-based process provides customized, collaborative, financial planning services. Specially approved to use Dimensional Funds. Fee-Only, Fiduciary-Standard, Registered Investment Adviser (RIA). Licensed and insured. Email: william@carringtonFP.com Website: www.CarringtonFP.com

APPRAISALS

MANDEL APPRAISALS Personal property, antique and decorative arts valuation for insurance, estates and charitable donations, including inventories and consultations. Contact retired FSO Pamela Mandel. Tel: (703) 642-2572. Email: mandelappraisals@gmail.com Website: www.mandelappraisals.com
DISTINCTIVE FURNISHED RESIDENCES

AKA BALANCES THE style and hospitality of an intimate hotel with the space and comfort of an elegantly appointed luxury apartment. Designed for long-term comfort and value, AKA Virginia Square offers fully furnished one- and two-bedroom suites with exceptional hotel-style services and such amenities as state-of-the-art kitchens with stainless steel appliances, HD flat screen TVs, full-size washer and dryer, housekeeping, in-suite dining and complimentary Wi-Fi. Additional complimentary onsite amenities include parking, a business and fitness center, 24-hour resident services desk, weekday breakfast and a rooftop garden terrace with spectacular views.

Located in the heart of Arlington’s educational and cultural center, AKA Virginia Square is just steps away from fabulous restaurants and shopping and a short Metro ride away from Washington, D.C. Tel: (703) 294-6415.
Email: RONeill@stayaka.com
Website: stayaka.com/virginiasquare
AKA Virginia Square
3409 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington VA 22201

Email: msusmann4@gmail.com

CAPITOL HILL, FURNISHED housing: 1-3 blocks to Capitol. Nice places, great location. Well below per diem. Short-term OK. GSA small business and veteran-owned. Tel: (202) 544-4419.
Email: brian@capitolhillstay.com
Website: www.capitolhillstay.com

CORPORATE APARTMENT SPECIALISTS: Abundant experience working with Foreign Service professionals and the locations to best serve you: Foggy Bottom, Woodley Park, Cleveland Park, Chevy Chase, Rosslyn, Ballston, Pentagon City. Our office is a short walk from NFATC. One-month minimum. All furnishings, houseware, utilities, telephone and cable included. We work with per diem. Tel: (703) 979-2830 or (800) 914-2802. Fax: (703) 979-2813.
Email: sales@corporateapartments.com
Website: www.corporateapartments.com

Email: info@piedaterredc.com
Website: www.piedaterredc.com

SHORT-TERM RENTALS • TEMPORARY HOUSING

WASHINGTON, D.C., or NFATC TOUR? EXECUTIVE HOUSING CONSULTANTS offers Metropolitan Washington, D.C.’s finest portfolio of short-term, fully furnished and equipped apartments, townhomes and single-family residences in Maryland, D.C. and Virginia. In Virginia: “River Place’s Finest” is steps to Rosslyn Metro and Georgetown, and 15 minutes on Metro bus or State Department shuttle to NFATC. For more info, please call (301) 951-4111, or visit our website at: www.executivehousing.com.

DC GUEST APARTMENTS: Not your typical “corporate” apartments—we’re different! Located in Dupont Circle, we designed our apartments as places where we’d like to live and work—beautifully furnished and fully equipped (including Internet & satellite TV). Most importantly, we understand that occasionally needs change, so we never penalize you if you leave early. You only pay for the nights you stay, even if your plans change at the last minute. We also don’t believe in minimum stays or extra charges like application or cleaning fees. And we always work with you on per diem. Tel: (202) 536-2500.
Email: info@dcguestapartments.com
Website: www.dcguestapartments.com

FIND PERFECT HOUSING by using the free Reservation Service Agency, Accommodations 4 U. Tel: (843) 347-8900.
Email: vicki@accommodations4u.net
Website: www.accommodations4u.net

SERVING FOREIGN SERVICE PERSONNEL FOR 25 YEARS, ESPECIALLY THOSE WITH PETS. Selection of condos, townhouses and single-family homes that accommodate most breeds and sizes. All within a short walk of Metro stations in Arlington. Fully furnished and equipped 1-4 bedrooms, within per diem rates.

EXECUTIVE LODGING ALTERNATIVES
Email: Finder5@ix.netcom.com

TURNKEY HOUSING SOLUTIONS: Experience working with Foreign Service professionals on standard and distinctive temporary housing solutions in the D.C. area’s best locations (NW DC, Arlington, Alexandria, Northern Virginia, suburban Maryland). Northern Virginia-based company offers local customer service and a personalized touch. Tel: (703) 615-6591.
Email: eric@tkhousing.com
Website: www.tkhousing.com

ARLINGTON FLATS: 1-BR, 2-BR and 4-BR flats in 2 beautiful buildings 3 blocks from Clarendon Metro. Newly renovated, completely furnished, incl. all utilities/Internet/HDTV w/DVR. Parking, maid service, gym, rental car available. Rates start at $2,600/month. Per diem OK. Min. 30 days.
Tel: (571) 233-4289.
Email: ClaireWaters826@gmail.com
See 2-BR at website: www.dropbox.com/sh/6mkfwnz2ccrubv7/FSM8fhZzz

GREAT DC B&B. Visit www.bedandbreakfastdc.com. Otis Place NW, 4 minutes walk from Metrorail.

THE REMINGTON at Foggy Bottom will accept per diem. Pet friendly. Contact: Rosemary at arreyarjavis@aol.com

LUXURY 2-BEDROOM. 2-bath home for rent in The Atrium, with gorgeous view of Georgetown. Walking distance to Rosslyn Metro station and FSI Shuttle stop. Use of swimming pool, tennis court, gym, Internet, cable and parking included. $4,800/month; six months min., per diem accepted. Sorry, no pets or smokers.
Tel: (703) 395-8683, (202) 679-0800.
Photos available at: retina010@gmail.com

FOR RENT, NORTH ARLINGTON. 3 bedrooms, 1 bath, garage, fenced yard, pets OK. 1 mile to FSI and Ballston Metro; 2 blocks to Safeway, restaurants and bike path. Furnished, $3,100/month, incl. utilities, TV and Internet. Available August; short-term lease negotiable.
Email: richardheffern@hotmail.com
ADVANCING TO MAIN STATE OR FSI? I offer FS personnel 28+ years of experience providing Exclusive Representation. My focused approach to home buying/selling makes the transition easier for you and your family. FS references gladly provided.

Contact Marilyn Cantrell, Associate Broker, licensed in VA and DC. McEnearney Associates
1320 Old Chain Bridge Rd., Ste. 350
McLean VA 22101
Tel: (703) 860-2096.
Email: Marilyn@MarilynCantrell.com
Website: www.MarilynCantrell.com

WHAT ARE YOUR RETIREMENT/2nd HOME PLANS? We have a large buildable lot below market price for sale on the 15th hole of a Championship Golf Course at The Resort at Glade Springs, WV.
Ray & Laurie Meiningers.
Email: meiningers2@hotmail.com

LONG-DISTANCE REALTOR will make technology work for you when you’re ready to buy or sell a home, even from overseas.

Looking for a competent manager to take care of your home when you go to post this summer? Based in McLean, Va., Peake Management, Inc. has worked with Foreign Service officers for over 30 years. We are active board members of the Foreign Service Youth Foundation and many other community organizations. We really care about doing a good job in renting and managing your home, so we’re always seeking cutting-edge technology to improve service to our clients, from innovative marketing to active online access to your account. We offer a free, copyrighted Landlord Reference Manual to guide you through the entire preparation, rental and management process, or just give our office a call to talk to the agent specializing in your area. Peake Management, Inc. is a licensed, full-service real estate broker.
6842 Elm St., Suite 303, McLean VA 22101
Tel: (703) 488-0212.
Email: Erik@Peakeinc.com
Website: www.peakeinc.com

PROFESSIONAL REAL ESTATE services provided by John Kozyn of Coldwell Banker in Arlington, Va. Need to buy or sell? My expertise will serve your specific needs and timeframe. FSO references gladly provided. Licensed in VA and DC.
Tel: (202) 288-6026.
Email: jkozyn@cbmove.com
Website: www.cbmove.com/johnkozyn

DC METRO AREA: Whether you’re buying, selling or leasing, Jack Croddy, a former Senior career FSO, will help you achieve your real estate goals. An expert negotiator, Jack is affiliated with W.C. & A.N. Miller Realtors, a Long & Foster Company and exclusive affiliate of Christie’s Great Estates.
Tel: (301) 229-4000, ext. 8345.
Cell: (301) 318-3450.
Email: arnold.croddy@longandfoster.com

FOR SALE: Elegant Lakefront Chalet, Lake Lure, NC (near Asheville). In Golf Resort w/private dock on mountain lake, entertainment decks with crafted stone outdoor fireplace, screened porches & gazebo-hot tub, landscape lighting; furnished (or unfurn.); 3BR, 2BA. Rental options until sold. $429K.
Contact/Realty info: Tel: (828) 980-1353.
Email: patpearson@aol.com
Website: www.vrbo.com/96742 ; www.tinyurl.com/kde26

ADVANTAGES OF ALWAYS HAVING A PROFESSIONAL REAL ESTATE

INTERNATIONAL ADOPTION
ADOPT WHILE POSTED OVERSEAS! Adopt Abroad, Incorporated was created to assist expatriates with their adoption needs. U.S.-licensed and Hague-accredited, we conduct adoption home studies and child placement services, using caseworkers based worldwide.

Adopt Abroad, Inc.
1242 N. 2nd Street, Harrisburg PA
4213 Sonia Ct., Alexandria VA
Tel: (888) 687-3644.
Website: www.adopt-abroad.com
PHARMACY

SHOP IN AN AMERICAN DRUG STORE BY MAIL!
Morgan Pharmacy
3001 P St NW
Washington DC 20007
Tel: (202) 337-4100. Fax: (202) 337-4102.
Email: care@morganRx.com
Website: www.carepharmacies.com

PET TRANSPORTATION

PET SHIPPING WORLDWIDE: ACTION PET EXPRESS has over 44 years in business. 24-hr. service, operated by a U.S. Army veteran, associate member AFSA. Contact: Jerry Mishler.
Tel: (681) 252-0266 or (855) 704-6682.
Email: info@actionpetexpress.com
Website: www.actionpetexpress.com

ADVERTISE YOUR PRODUCT OR SERVICE

PLACE A CLASSIFIED AD: $1.45/word
Tel: (202) 944-5507.
Fax: (202) 338-8244.
Email: miltenberger@afsa.org

AFSA Resource Marketplace

Find the Most-Requested Resources from the Overseas Briefing Center Online at www.afsa.org/Marketplace

1. FSI’s Transition Center
2. U.S. Department of State Overseas Briefing Center (OBC)
3. Security Overseas Seminars: PSOS, ASOS, SAA, SOS, SOS
4. Transition Center Training home page for eligible family members and members of household (MOH)
5. International Jobs - Working Overseas
6. Country Information (Bidding Resources)
7. Transition Center Courses
8. Preparing to Go Overseas
9. Pets and International Travel
10. Foreign Service Assignment Notebook: What Do I Do Now?
11. U.S. Department of State Career Transition Center (CTC)
12. Personal Post Insights
13. Elementary School Stuff
14. Arrange Medical Clearance and Immunizations
15. High Stress Assignment Outbrief Program

FOREIGN SERVICE YOUTH FOUNDATION

FSYF
Supporting FS Youth for 25 Years!

Enjoy these FSYF Programs & Activities:
- Academic Merit Awards
- Art & Essay Contests
- Community Service Awards
- Parent & Youth Newsletters
- Workshops & Webinars
- Social & Networking Activities

Join Today! For more information go to: www.fsyf.org
REAL ESTATE & PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

Created by Foreign Service. Managed by Foreign Service.

Supporting the Foreign Service.

Well Respected & Valuable Advice in Property Management & Real Estate Sales

McGrath
REAL ESTATE SERVICES
Solving Your Real Estate Puzzle.

McGrathRealEstate.com
(703) 709-2264
761C Monroe St. Herndon, VA 20170

For a video on the “Landlord Experience” visit our website!
Who’s taking care of your home while you’re away?

No one takes care of your home like we do!

While you’re overseas, we’ll help you manage your home without the hassles. No panicky messages, just regular reports. No unexpected surprises, just peace of mind.

Property management is our full-time business. Let us take care of the details.

6923 Fairfax Road • Bethesda, MD 20814
email: TheMeyersonGroup@aol.com

REGULAR INSPECTIONS • RENTAL SERVICES • 24 HOUR ON-CALL SUPPORT
COORDINATE MAINTENANCE • OVER 24 YEARS EXPERIENCE
ENJOY PEACE OF MIND • EXCELLENT REFERENCES
PROPERTY MANAGEMENT FOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

Call us today!
(301) 657-3210

Serving Foreign Service families for over 20 years with worry-free residential property management.

www.promaxrealtors.com
Trust a proven leader for all of your real estate needs.

From managing your property while you're on assignment, to helping you relocate anywhere in the world, McEinarney Associates is here to assist you.

Property Management
McEinarneyPM.com
703-537-3340
pm@mceinarney.com

Relocation & Sales
McEinarney.com
877-624-9322
relo@mceinarney.com

Property Specialists, Inc.
A professional and personal service tailored to meet your needs in:
• Property Management
• Tenant Placement
• Tax-deferred Exchange
• Real Estate Investment Counseling

Specializing in

PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

4600-D Lee Highway Arlington, Virginia 22207
(703) 525-7010 (703) 247-3350
E-mail: info@propertyspecialistsinc.com
Web address: propertyspecialistsinc.com
Serving Virginia, Maryland and D.C.

WJD Management
Active.

Managing rental property is our ONLY business!
Residential property management and leasing specialists serving all of Northern Virginia.

Proactive.

WJD MANAGEMENT
wjdpm.com
703.385.3600
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“Remember to eat beforehand, and drink lots of water. We don’t want anyone passing out.”

My group of badge-wearers nods in agreement. Even in the palatial gilt foyer of the American ambassador’s residence in Paris, there’s no air conditioning. But there’s no time to worry about the unusual heat. This is the official Fourth of July party, and there are major logistics to consider. A reputation to uphold. Expectations to surpass.

The volunteer coordinator quickly moves on with the briefing, ticking off a subgroup of people: the few, the proud, the fluent French-speakers. They will have the honor of welcoming guests through the front doors and quickly herding them out to the back garden.

The rest of us embassy spouses and interns sag a bit, as if we didn’t make varsity. But not to worry: there’s plenty of guest-wrangling responsibility to go around. Group B will cover the terrace. Group C will hand out gift bags.

Our volunteer coordinator pushes ahead.

“Now, the VIPs will have stickers on their invitations. All VIPs go to the left.”

Left: through the stunning teal salon, with enough gold molding to make Louis XIV stop and gape. But there’s no time for admiring the architecture. Volunteers have got to keep those 300 or so Very Important People moving toward the receiving line at all costs.

And what about the rest of the guests? The 1,000-plus not-quite-as-important people who managed to score an invite?

“To the right. And don’t let them stray up the stairs!”

To the right: directly out onto the sunlit terrace. From there we see workers installing Route 66 signs along the garden path. On the manicured lawn sit a dark blue Harley Davidson and a creamy white vintage Pontiac convertible, ready for a très Americaine photo op. It’s important that guests get a little piece of Americana with their canapés, after all. They need some shiny reminders of why they love—and should want to work with—the good old U.S. of A.

Our leader snaps his volunteer corps back to attention. The terrace is where the ambassador will give his opening remarks at precisely 19:10, or so the plan goes. That means the terrace needs to be closed off no later than 18:50. (The party starts at 18:00.)

The group stands silent, doing the math. A hand shoots up. “So you’re saying we have about 50 minutes to get 2,000 people through the door?”

“That’s right.”

Just a beat passes before the troops regain confidence. “Eh, we invaded Normandy. We can handle it.”

It seems the American spirit is alive and well, even in the surreal realm of diplomatic party planning. The group pushes onward, descending briefly to the lawn before turning sharply toward some shrubbery-hidden stairs. We file down into the basement of the residence, the volunteer “war room.”

An old table and a few beat-up chairs sit under fluorescent lights. Well, at least it’s cool. And there’s plenty of space to store our munitions: extra water, Band-Aids for blistered feet, Powerbars.

We get a brief look at the one available volunteer restroom and then exit down a long hallway. To the left, a florist’s workshop overflows with arrangements while a woman makes last-minute stem adjustments. To the right, an industrial-size kitchen bustles with a team of sous chefs. The air hums with the sound of 10 or so extra refrigerators lining the wall.

Pushing past a few caterers, the group marches up the back staircase, arriving once again in that opulent foyer. As the volunteer coordinator reviews arrival times and gives his final orders, BlackBerrys are pulled out. He’s about to confirm a critical detail when the florist staggers in, lugging a huge box of what looks like wheat.

“Of course. The Amber Waves of Grain.”

Our leader leaps into action, making space for the burgeoning arrangement and offering to go grab the next box.

“You see, you guys really need to be ready to help with anything. Whatever might arise!”

The group nods, stands a bit straighter. For this party, we’re ready to be all we can be.
On a recent trip to visit a USAID soil and water conservation project in southeastern Haiti, I lagged behind the group to take a few pictures of the landscape. Within a few seconds, I happened to notice a couple of young girls collecting firewood as they walked toward me. I asked them if I could take their picture, and they politely smiled for me. I rewarded them with a pack of chewing gum. As a result they followed us around for the next hour or so, attempting to get into as many pictures as they could. Despite the hardship imposed by collecting firewood, they were very spirited and photogenic.

Ron Savage, who calls the southwestern United States home, is the deputy office chief with USAID’s Office of Food for Peace in Haiti. He has worked in 10 different countries and finds Haiti to be among the most photogenic. He took this picture with a Canon 60D, Canon 28-135, F 8 1/200 at IS 200.

Enter your favorite, recent photograph to be featured in Local Lens. Images must be high resolution (at least 300 dpi at 8 x 10”) and must not be in print elsewhere. Please submit a short description of the scene/event, as well as your name, brief biodata and the type of camera used, to locallens@afsa.org.
Why waste hundreds on your international insurance coverage.

Our customers save an average of $300.

Embassy Risk Management offers a single policy for your automobile and property.

Get a fast quote today at embassyrisk.com or +1 540 437 3019.

Embassy Risk Management is part of the Rockingham Group, personal lines insurance specialists since 1869. We provide 24/7 claims support, dedicated customer service, and convenient online quoting and binding.

Rockingham Group is “A” rated by A.M. Best.
Worldwide Accident Insurance at Group Rates Exclusively for Foreign Service Members

The American Foreign Service Insurance Plan provides worldwide personal accident coverage at affordable rates. Created for AFSA members, the program is now available to all Foreign Service members under 70, whether on active duty or retired.

- Guaranteed insurability to age 70, renewable to age 85
- War risk, acts of terrorism at full limit
- Medical evacuation and repatriation
- Available in $50,000 increments up to $500,000 for $1/thousand
- Underwritten by Chubb, the world’s most stable insurance company

For more information, call the American Foreign Service Desk: 800.242.8221. To apply: hirshorn.com/USFS