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For this, my 40th and final column as your AFSA president, I sought and received support from the AFSA Governing Board to include a message from AFSA’s incoming president, Ambassador Eric Rubin. This gives me a chance to pass the baton to AFSA’s terrific new leadership team, right up front, in the opening pages of the FSJ.

I am deeply honored that Ambassador Rubin plans to continue with the priorities set by the Governing Board that I led for four years. I am so pleased that he chose to show this commitment by adopting “Strong Diplomacy” as the name of his slate. I am also honored that Ambassador Rubin asked me to officiate at the July 15 ceremony, swearing him in as AFSA’s new president. He will then, in turn, swear in the rest of the 2019-2021 Governing Board members.

As I wrap up four years as AFSA president—and, as it turns out, simultaneously wrap up a nearly 34-year career as a Foreign Service officer (I will take up a new role beyond State in September)—I would like to conclude my service by returning to where I began, in my very first President’s Views column: recognizing the extraordinary demands that are made of the extraordinary people who answer the call to serve in the U.S. Foreign Service.

I wrote in that first column about how within minutes of being sworn in with the Strong Diplomacy board, we had the opportunity to welcome the 183rd A-100 class to AFSA headquarters. We felt such pride in our profession that day, and in the continuity of one generation to the next.

I spoke to that group of new FSOs about what our pledge to worldwide availability means in practice. We commit to serve in remote corners of the globe, often in unsafe and unhealthy conditions, where good schools for our kids and jobs for our spouses are scarce, where duty and danger go hand in hand.

We master diplomacy in large part through on-the-job training, moving to a different job, often a different continent, every two or three years, never able to fully settle into a job and a place we love, never able to get fully comfortable and put down roots. These demands, along with the rigors of our competitive up-or-out system, keep the corps strong but inevitably take a toll on individual members of the Foreign Service.

The challenges of our service have grown during my time as AFSA president. Having just gone through Fair Share bidding myself, I understand and share the frustration many of you express with trying to find a career path that makes sense for you and your family while checking the boxes to comply with the new Human Resources Professional Development Program, announced in 2018, governing assignments today.

The PDP requirement for at least two greater hardship tours further complicates bidding. And with so many Foreign Service positions pulled from Moscow, Kabul, Baghdad, Erbil, Basra, Havana and Caracas during the past two years, many of you struggle to find an onward assignment overseas.

During my presidency, AFSA pressed relentlessly for a concerted effort to restore the position base at our overseas missions. This is critical for rebalancing the system and restoring a career path so members of the Foreign Service can get the experience they need to develop into tomorrow’s leaders. And it would solve the immediate need to get a full Foreign Service team in the field to avoid losing ground to rising powers, such as China.

We have found that these arguments resonate on Capitol Hill, where bipartisan support for keeping a full Foreign Service team on the field is remarkably strong. This bipartisan support from Congress is one of the key achievements of my time as your president, and I encourage each of you to do your part to keep it strong, in part by telling your own story of delivering for the American people.

AFSA also fought against the added requirements for service at greater hardship posts, arguing that this was a solution in search of a problem (the greater hardship posts were, prior to the PDP change, already filled with at-grade bidders) and that the dwindling number of greater hardship positions would make
it impossible for many members to meet a requirement for seeking promotion into the senior Foreign Service. AFSA took this issue (and, during my presidency, only this issue) to impasse resolution; and, unfortunately, we did not prevail.

I believe this issue should be revisited. Did the changes improve the bidding process enough to justify the added stress on the system and on individual members? And do we really believe, as HR argued in justifying the new requirements, that the only valid path to senior leadership is via at least two greater hardship tours?

While I value my own experience in war zones, I would argue that we should retain the possibility for a variety of paths to senior leadership to be sure we have a broad mix of expertise in our senior ranks. The administration’s marked movement away from “expeditionary diplomacy,” as evidenced by the drawdowns described above, also argues for a fresh look. Fixing this would be an easy lift; it wouldn’t even need congressional approval. What State put in place, State can revise.

As AFSA’s first Strong Diplomacy president, I would never argue for changes that weaken the corps, that undermine the strength and resilience of the Foreign Service.

At the same time, I believe the extraordinary demands made on individual members of the Foreign Service deserve full recognition—and certainly should never be made harder without a good reason.

I am profoundly pleased that our fellow Americans are much more aware today than they were four years ago of what America’s diplomats do and why it matters. Through the strategic partnerships AFSA forged, through our outreach efforts, and through the work of AFSA members (especially retired members), the proud story of the Foreign Service is being told in all 50 states across this great nation of ours.

Ours is a story of remarkable service and sacrifice, a story of delivering for our country in the face of unique challenges. I am proud of our collective story and more convinced than ever that what America’s diplomats do is instrumental in sustaining American global leadership and keeping us secure and prosperous at home.

It has been my great honor to serve alongside you these last four years and throughout the past 34 years, working to expand the reach of democracy; to help build a Europe whole, free and at peace; to fight corruption and help build good governance; to level the playing field for American business; and to forge consensus on protecting the planet we share.

As I pass the baton, I encourage you to both continue this tradition of exemplary service and fully own our story of taking on a uniquely challenging career and delivering for the American people.
Facing a Rising China

BY SHAWN DORMAN

China looms large today. This is a year of China-related anniversaries. In October 1949, 70 years ago, the Chinese Communist Party established the People’s Republic of China following the defeat of the Chiang Kai-shek Nationalist government.

It has been 60 years since the March 1959 Tibetan uprising against Chinese rule. China cracked down, and the Dalai Lama fled to India where he maintains a government in exile. In January 1979, 40 years ago, the United States and PRC established formal diplomatic relations.

It was 30 years ago, June 1989, amid student-led democracy demonstrations, that Chinese troops fired on protesters in Tiananmen Square, killing hundreds and sparking a broad crackdown across the country that still reverberates.

Today U.S. foreign policy is shifting away from all-hands-on-deck for the Global War on Terrorism to “great power competition” with a rising China. U.S. relations with China are strained by the abandonment of diplomacy, which has been replaced most visibly by U.S. presidential tweets, tariffs and a trade war. In June, Xi Jinping called Putin his new best friend.

The authors we hear from this month all independently agree on one point: We need diplomacy, and nothing good comes from not talking to an adversary, or a friend.

When Susan Thornton—who served as acting assistant secretary for East Asian and Pacific affairs (2017-2018) and as principal deputy assistant secretary for EAP before that—agreed to write for our China focus, I knew this edition would be consequential. She asks the provocative question: “Is American Diplomacy with China Dead?” and shares her views on what’s gone wrong and why the United States must engage strategically with the PRC.

William Reinsch, a trade expert and senior adviser at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, lays out the costs and the challenges of doing business with China in “U.S.-China Trade: If We Get to Yes, Will It Make Any Difference?” He urges the United States to take a multilateral approach to facing today’s challenges.

In “Dealing with the Dragon,” Philip Shull, a retired Foreign Agricultural Service FSO, offers an inside look at how to understand China, measuring our expectations based on knowledge of China’s history and worldview.

Former Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson Jr. tells us that the U.S.-China relationship will shape the geopolitical landscape for this century, and that Foreign Service work in China will be particularly important. Relevant and even timely excerpts from the FSJ Archives—from 1922 through 2012—round out the focus.

Our feature, “The Language of Dress” by freelance journalist Martha Thomas, steps into the space where diplomacy and fashion meet in Washington, D.C. (who knew?).

We are pleased to share the seventh edition of “Message from the Hill,” and can all take much pride, and even comfort, in knowing that many members of Congress from both parties understand the value of diplomacy and the role of the U.S. Foreign Service—and they want to speak to our community. This month we hear from Representative Ann Wagner (R-Mo.).

In Speaking Out, American Academy of Diplomacy President Ron Neumann presents the recommendations from AAD’s new report, “Strengthening the Department of State,” arguing that personnel reforms might just work this time. He introduces a proposed pilot project on Civil Service reform. We welcome your feedback on these proposals.

We will bid farewell in mid-July to the 2017-2019 Governing Board and to two-term AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson. It has been a privilege to work with Barbara, who took AFSA’s role as the voice of the Foreign Service to new heights.

Through her leadership, Amb. Stephenson bolstered a community and an institution shaken by the purging of the senior ranks and marginalization of diplomacy, and took the case for diplomacy funding to a receptive Congress. She has used the President’s Views column in a way few others have to lay out a strong vision for AFSA and for the Foreign Service, a vision of strength and stewardship.

We welcome Ambassador Eric Rubin as the new AFSA president, confident that he is the right person in the right place at the right time.

Shawn Dorman is the editor of The Foreign Service Journal.
Economic Security Is National Security

Ambassador Barbara Stephenson and Messrs. Daniel Crocker and Shaun Donnelly eloquently make the case for an immediate, deeper commitment to upping our economic and commercial diplomatic game in the January-February FSJ’s “Economic Diplomacy Works” focus.

Never have American firms faced such complex competitive challenges across the globe, ranging from well-financed state-owned entities, intellectual property theft and non-tariff barriers to aggressive marketing and secure deals.

Passage of the BUILD Act and U.S. EXIM Bank’s return to full financing capacity are good, but we must better integrate all elements of commercial diplomacy. Interagency advocacy alone will not win the day without a robust set of strategically positioned tools and boots on the ground.

Playing an indispensable role on the ambassador’s country team are Foreign Commercial Service officers deployed in more than 70 markets. Often drawn from private sector backgrounds, FCS officers work collaboratively within our overseas missions to define and support U.S. interests, open markets, win deals, and promote investment and jobs in the United States.

The recent FY19 congressional appropriation for State operations represents a welcome down payment to move State economic reporting officers back into the field overseas. In contrast, FCS struggles with declining resources that have shrunk our officer corps by 10 percent and left more than 100 key vacancies in the United States and overseas.

Fortunately, our congressional appropriators continue to recognize that FCS returns $392 for every appropriated dollar, temporarily staving off even more draconian budget cuts. Our assistant secretary designate fully understands the challenge, bringing strong leadership and fresh perspectives to the issues. For the first time since 2015, we are recruiting new FCS officers to rebuild the ranks. We have seen a small, initial thaw in our years-long Civil Service and locally employed staff hiring freeze. These long-overdue personnel moves will help to address the trade deficit, made especially urgent as our Asian and European competitors grow their overseas staff by double digit percentages.

American global economic competitiveness is a multigenerational challenge that will require a sustained, bipartisan strategy that integrates policy goals, department budgets and outcomes. The ballast that vibrant U.S.-host country commercial ties can provide is critical to balancing other even more contentious areas of a bilateral relationship, be they in labor and human rights, counterterrorism or law enforcement and intelligence cooperation.

Muscular, properly resourced economic diplomacy can support and advance broader U.S. foreign policy interests—but only if we provide the resources to do so. If we truly believe that our economic security is intrinsically linked to our national security, we need to put our money where our mouth is.

Michael A. Lally
Senior FSO
USFCS, Embassy Kyiv

Peacekeeping and Borders

I read with interest Ambassador Dennis Jett’s May article on the dismal record of recent United Nations peacekeeping efforts (“Why Peacekeeping Fails”). Having served as the deputy special representative of the secretary-general of the Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA) at its creation, I share his concern.

As we worked to put together MINUSCA in 2014, I saw firsthand how difficult it was to line up troop-contributing countries. To a large extent, MINUSCA ended up with the troops it could get, not the ones who were truly prepared to operate in the violently chaotic environment that awaited them.

Where Ambassador Jett begins to go astray, however, is in identifying violent extremism as the key cause of state failure in his five target countries (Sudan, South Sudan, CAR, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Mali). I do not claim much knowledge about the Sudans. But he misses the mark on the other three.

Violence in the DRC, for example, has been blamed on many factors, but violent extremism is not one of them. In CAR, the “Seleka” rebel force of 2013 may have been largely Muslim, but they were fortune-seekers, not jihadists. Their focus was on controlling major income sources, ranging from diamond and gold mining to the lucrative regional cattle trade.

In Mali, it is true that jihadist groups have played a major role in the violence. However, the struggle to control lucrative trafficking routes and long-standing North-South tensions are at least as important.

Jett is somewhat closer to the mark in focusing on the role of systemic governance failure. But while governance has long been an egregious problem in the DRC, the governments of Mali and CAR have not been particularly repressive. Nor have their levels of corruption been unusual within the region.

In fact, Mali was seen as a political and economic success story only a few years ago, while CAR’s current president emerged from an election widely considered one of the fairest in the region. In short, poor governance alone does not
The international community has doggedly pursued political solutions that prove ephemeral because those holding guns have little interest in peace. By default, peacekeepers are then forced to remain indefinitely—with steadily diminishing effectiveness.

The lesson is not that peacekeeping does not work, but rather that it cannot work alone.

Larry Wohlers
Ambassador, retired
Amissville, Virginia

Identity

We read with interest the article written by self-identified Indian-American FSO Sandya Das about “navigating the rocky waters of ethnic and gender identity” in the May issue of FSJ, and congratulate Ms. Das for arranging a meeting between a group of Americans and the Dalai Lama.

Nevertheless, we were dismayed to read that when the holy man asked Ms. Das where she was from, she first responded, “California,” before changing her response to “Kerala, India” after the Dalai Lama repeated his question another way: “No, where are you really from?”

Ms. Das is really an American Foreign Service officer from California. We’re not hyphenated Americans when we’re overseas representing the United States; all of us are Americans, and proud of it. Identity politics has no place in the U.S. Foreign Service.

Guy W. Farmer & Fred LaSor
USIA FSOs, retired
Carson City & Minden, Nevada

CORRECTION

The June letter “Speaking of Father-Son Ambassadorships” is from Ambassador (ret.) Jack Binns of Tucson, Arizona—not John Treacy (who had a letter in May). We apologize to both for the mix-up.
Support Our Diplomats to Maintain U.S. Leadership

BY REPRESENTATIVE ANN WAGNER

The United States faces a range of serious challenges, including humanitarian crises of unprecedented scale, rising authoritarianism around the world and transnational criminal networks. Rivals like China and Russia exploit rising instability to undermine democratic values and respect for human rights.

In this uncertain threat environment, U.S. diplomacy is more important than ever. As a former ambassador, I know firsthand that U.S. priorities such as safeguarding human rights, fostering peace, and promoting economic development and good governance are simply not possible without a capable and resolute diplomatic corps. In the coming years, we will increasingly rely on you—our Foreign Service officers and specialists in embassies, posts and consulates around the world—to navigate a complex and unpredictable international system.

Some, however, question the necessity of robust U.S. leadership. Correspondingly, funding for the State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development has been deemphasized. This is misguided. To paraphrase the oft-quoted General James Mattis: if we don’t fund the State Department, we must buy more bullets.

In my testimony, I outlined a few spaces in which congressional support can have a special impact. The first of these is in the area of preventing complex crises.

Preventing Complex Crises

Peace and stability are prerequisites for prosperity. But as we see in Syria, Burma and elsewhere, many states are engaged in large-scale violence against their own citizens. The humanitarian crises these conflicts have spawned have ripple effects that can destabilize whole regions.

The Department of State has tools to mount flexible, efficient response efforts on the front end of an evolving crisis. For example, the Complex Crises Fund is a critical global account that enables the United States to respond swiftly and efficiently to unforeseen crises, filling a gap when other monies are unavailable.

U.S. Foreign Service officers and USAID workers in the field rely on the CCF to mitigate incipient humanitarian crises and prevent complex conflicts from spinning out of control. Data analysis from the Institute for Economics and Peace indicates that strong funding for the CCF could actually save taxpayer money in the long run: if countries in conflict received increased funding for peacebuilding activities, the cost of conflict would be reduced by 16 dollars for each dollar invested in early peacebuilding.

Ending Human Trafficking

Ending the scourge of human trafficking is a task that requires extensive cooperation among all members of the international community. The State Department’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (known as the TIP Office) has been instrumental in building partner-nation capacity and providing incentives for the implementation of effective anti-trafficking measures worldwide.

That office also researches the annual Trafficking in Persons Report, a diplomatic tool that has contributed to significant improvement in many countries. USAID’s anti-trafficking programs protect marginalized communities that are...
especially vulnerable to labor and sexual exploitation. They also integrate activities to counter trafficking in persons into broader U.S. development programs.

Each of these anti-trafficking programs makes a unique, significant and complementary contribution to reducing slavery and trafficking and to assisting those who are victimized. The programs help countries protect child and adult victims, prosecute and deter perpetrators, and prevent slavery from taking root in vulnerable communities.

It is critical that we also work harder to reduce demand for commercial sex by holding buyers accountable and fight online sex trafficking and sexual exploitation. What is illegal offline must also be illegal online. Through my Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act (FOSTA), H.R. 1865, which became law in April 2018, Congress took steps to hold accountable online businesses that facilitate trafficking and prostitution.

This is a global fight, however, and we must work with partners to ensure that no country enables online trafficking.

Remaining a Reliable Partner

America excels at helping our partners build capacity, good governance practices and democratic institutions. And countries around the world want—and need—to remain a reliable partner.

I believe there is a bipartisan consensus in Congress that understands how important the Foreign Service is in achieving these goals. We support your mission and will ensure you have the tools you need to advance our priorities and safeguard our interests abroad.

Together, we are more than capable of overcoming the challenges we face. I thank you for your service and your dedication to our country.

---
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Senate Confirms Under Secretary of State for Management

The Senate confirmed Brian Bulatao as under secretary of State for management in a 92-5 vote on May 17.

Bulatao, a business executive and a former classmate of Secretary of State Mike Pompeo at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, served as chief operating officer at the Central Intelligence Agency when Pompeo was director there.

Bulatao’s appointment was delayed for almost a year when Senator Robert Menendez (D-N.J.) placed a hold on the nomination. The senator lifted the hold after the State Department agreed to provide documents, requested by Menendez, linked to an investigation into political retribution in the department.

In June 2018, Foreign Policy reported that Mari Stull, a political appointee in the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, had been vetting the social media accounts of senior-level Foreign Service members in search of “signs of ideological deviation.” The State Department has also launched an investigation into the allegations of political retribution, Bloomberg reported in May. Secretary of State Pompeo swore Bulatao in on May 17. The under secretary post had been vacant since January 2017.

Ortagus Debuts as State Department Spokesperson

In her first official interview as State Department spokesperson on May 14, Morgan Ortagus told Fox News’ Guy Benson that she’s aiming for press briefings five days a week. The former U.S. government official and Fox News contributor was appointed by Secretary of State Mike Pompeo on April 3.

Ortagus began her government service as a public affairs officer for USAID, serving in Iraq in 2007. From 2008 to 2010, she served as the deputy U.S. Treasury attaché to Saudi Arabia, and then in 2010, she moved to the Treasury Department’s Office of Intelligence and Analysis, working to designate terrorists for placement on the United Nations Sanctions List. She is an active U.S. Naval Reserve officer.

She replaces Heather Nauert, a former Fox News anchor.

Pompeo Challenges China on Human Rights

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo strongly criticized China over its human rights record in a prepared statement on June 3 about China’s crackdown against Tiananmen Square protesters 30 years ago.

“Over the decades that followed, the United States hoped that China’s integration into the international system would lead to a more open, tolerant society,” Sec. Pompeo said in the statement.

“Those hopes have been dashed. China’s one-party state tolerates no dissent and abuses human rights whenever it serves its interests,” he continued.

“Today, Chinese citizens have been subjected to a new wave of abuses, especially in Xinjiang, where the Communist Party leadership is methodically attempting...”

Contemporary Quote

Russian intelligence officers who are part of the Russian military launched a concerted attack on our political system. ... They used sophisticated cybertechniques to hack into computers and networks used by the Clinton campaign. They stole private information and then released that information through fake online identities and through the organization WikiLeaks. The releases were designed and timed to interfere with our election and to damage a presidential candidate.

... If we had had confidence that the president clearly did not commit a crime, we would have said so. We did not, however, make a determination as to whether the president did commit a crime.

I will close by reiterating the central allegation of our indictments—that there were multiple, systematic efforts to interfere in our election. And that allegation deserves the attention of every American.

—Robert Mueller speaking on May 29 at the U.S. Justice Department. These were his first public comments since the start of the special investigation into Russia’s interference in the 2016 presidential election two years ago.

"
to strangle Uyghur culture and stamp out the Islamic faith, including through the detention of more than one million members of Muslim minority groups.”

Sec. Pompeo called on the Chinese government “to make a full, public accounting of those killed or missing” in the Tiananmen Square uprising as well as to release “all those held for seeking to exercise these rights and freedoms.”

Beijing responded sharply. Secretary Pompeo’s statement “maliciously attacks China’s political system, denigrates the state of China’s human rights and religious affairs, wantonly criticizes China’s Xinjiang policy and severely interferes in China’s domestic affairs,” foreign ministry spokesman Geng Shuang said in a press briefing. “These lunatic ravings and babbling nonsense will only end up in the trash can of history.”

Senators Introduce Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act

The Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2019, introduced by Senators Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) and Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), aims to hold Chinese officials accountable for alleged abuses against the minority group, Voice of America reported June 3.

The legislation would create positions in the State Department and intelligence agencies to monitor China’s internment program, says VOA, adding that it would also impose sanctions against Chinese officials involved in programs detaining Uyghurs.

“Today, we are all Uyghurs, and China’s horrific and systematic abuse of its Uyghur minority is an affront to all people who value the principles of universal human rights,” Sen. Menendez said in a statement after the bipartisan

Championing American Business Through Diplomacy

China views Africa’s growth as an opportunity for geographic and ideological expansion through their Belt and Road Initiative, which preys on developing nations, leaving them largely in debt traps. The United States must provide a better alternative to China’s exploitation. I have met with African governments, ambassadors and business leaders. They all tell me the same thing: that the United States is their preferred partner, but we are just simply not there.

The United States brings quality, transparency and partnership, but we must show up to the game to compete. That is why my bill, the Championing American Business Through Diplomacy Act, is so important. It helps ensure that State better supports American companies of all sizes looking to invest in Africa and elsewhere bringing prosperity and, most importantly, stability.

—Ranking Member Michael McCaul (R-Texas), from his opening statement at the House Foreign Affairs Committee Hearing titled, “Democracy, Development, and Defense: Rebalancing U.S.-Africa Policy” on May 16.

Resources to Restore Diplomatic and Development Capacity

It [the bill] provides the necessary resources to restore diplomatic and development capacity at the State Department and USAID by returning Foreign Service and Civil Service workforces to levels prior to the administration’s hiring freeze.

—House Appropriations Committee Chairwoman Nita Lowey (D-N.Y.), from her statement at the full committee markup of the House FY2020 State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations bill on May 16.

Move to Get Diplomats Out in the Field

Since day one of my chairmanship, I have been working to move nominations that have been stalled in committee, and Brian Bulatao’s nomination is just one example of a nomination that has sat for far too long.

I am pleased to see Mr. Bulatao confirmed today by the full Senate, as he is eminently qualified for this role—a role that is incredibly vital to the day-to-day workings and operations of the State Department, at home and abroad. I am confident that he will do what is necessary to get our diplomats outside of our embassies and in the field to compete with the Russian, Chinese and Iranian governments.

—Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman James Risch (R-Idaho), on the confirmation of Under Secretary of State for Management Brian Bulatao on May 16.
bill was passed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in late May.

The Uyghur American Meshrep Group, which visited Washington in late May to lobby U.S. officials, claims that as many as two million Uyghurs are in prison camps in China’s Xinjiang province.

A May 22 *New York Times* investigation found that China is developing sophisticated programs for surveillance of Uyghur citizens in Xinjiang. “It is a virtual cage that complements the indoctrination camps,” the *Times* reports. “The program helps identify people to be sent to the camps or investigated, and keeps tabs on them when they are released.”

Speaking at the June 6 World Uyghur Congress in Washington, D.C., Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs David Ranz said: “As these abuses are progressively brought to light, people will pressure governments to respond and to stand up for universal human rights and fundamental freedoms.”

**Chinese Defense Minister Rebukes U.S. at Shangri-La Meet**

Chinese Defense Minister Wei Fenghe, speaking during the May 31-June 2 Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore, issued a “stern rebuke” to the United States over the ongoing trade war with China and tension over Taiwan and the South China Sea, CNN reported on June 2.

Wei told delegates that Beijing “would not yield an inch of territory” and that any foreign interference would be doomed to failure. He criticized the United States over its Taiwan Relations Act, a 1979 law that permits Washington to provide defensive weaponry to the island. “How can the U.S. enact a law to interfere in China’s internal affairs?” Wei asked.

In an unusual acknowledgment of the Tiananmen crackdown of 1989, Wei said that the Chinese government “was decisive in stopping the turbulence” in 1989. Those protests were “political turmoil that the central government needed to quell, which was the correct policy,” he added.

“As for the recent trade friction started by the United States, if the United States wants to talk we will keep the door open,” he said. “If they want to fight, we will fight until the end.”

Speaking at the conference a day earlier, Acting U.S. Defense Secretary Patrick Shanahan challenged China to adhere to a “rules-based order” to gain the trust of the international community.

The International Institute for Strategic Studies, a British think-tank, launched the annual Asia Security Summit, known informally as the Shangri-La Dialogue, in 2002. The dialogue brings together defense chiefs from 28 countries.
SecState Expresses Doubts on Middle East Peace Plan

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo told Jewish leaders during a closed-door meeting that the Trump administration’s long-awaited, Middle East peace plan might be “unexecutable” and might not “gain traction,” the Washington Post reported June 2.

“It may be rejected,” he said in an audio recording of the private meeting. “Could be in the end, folks will say, ‘It’s not particularly original, it doesn’t work for me,’ that is, ‘It’s got two good things and nine bad things, I’m out.’”

In an interview June 3 with Sinclair Broadcast Group, Sec. Pompeo clarified his remarks: “I can see how someone might be concerned that a plan that this administration put forward might, without knowing the true facts of what is contained in the plan, they might perceive that it was going to be fundamentally one-sided. And I was articulating that there because it’s just simply not true.”

The Trump administration has been planning to unveil economic portions of the peace plan at an economic conference in Bahrain at the end of June. But
Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s failure to form a majority coalition at the end of May and the call for new elections in September has cast doubt over when the administration might release political aspects of the peace plan.

Prominent conservative and pro-Israel voices, worried that the proposal could trigger political violence or kill efforts to create a two-state solution, are increasingly urging the White House to delay the peace plan, *Politico* reported on June 3.

**Visa Applicants’ Social Media to Be Screened**

Nearly all people applying for U.S. visas will need to hand over their social media usernames along with previous email addresses and phone numbers, according to a new State Department rule.

The change, proposed in March 2018 and enacted at the end of May 2019, is expected to affect 15 million foreigners applying for visas, *CBS News* reports.

To date, according to *CBS News*, the State Department sought social media usernames and other information only from applicants who were identified as needing extra scrutiny. About 65,000 applicants per year fell into that category.

How new the practice of screening social media is, however, is open to question. In *an opinion* in the June 10 *Washington Post*, a former consular officer states that visa officers have had the authority to investigate applicants’ social media postings since 2014.

State says the additional information “will strengthen our process for vetting these applicants and confirming their identity.” Applicants for certain diplomatic and official visa types will be exempt from the rule.

“As we’ve seen around the world in recent years, social media can be a major forum for terrorist sentiment and activity,” an unidentified State Department official told *The Hill*. Social media identifiers will be checked against U.S. government terrorist watchlists.

Consular officers will not request users’ passwords, according to a State Department FAQ about the new policy, “nor will they have any ability to modify privacy controls applicants may have implemented on these platforms.”

The department adds that “consular officers cannot deny visas based on applicants’ race, religion, ethnicity, national origin, political views, gender or sexual orientation.”

**PDAA Honors Outstanding Public Diplomacy Initiatives**

Four Foreign Service officers received the Public Diplomacy Association of America’s Awards for Achievement in Public Diplomacy at the association’s annual awards ceremony May 5 at the Army and Navy Club. PDAA recognized the diplomats for their creativity, strong leadership skills and innovative solutions to pressing social needs.

The four winners are: Natella Svidstunova, Embassy Belmopan, Belize; Debra Toribiong, Embassy Koror, Palau; Chris Hodges, Consulate Jerusalem (now the Palestinian Affairs Unit, Embassy Jerusalem, Israel); and Niles Cole, Embassy Kampala, Uganda.

The PDAA is a nonprofit organization that brings together professionals experienced in public diplomacy and foreign affairs to examine and support the connection between the two.

Natella Svidstunova worked on a project to combat gender-based violence in Belize. She enlisted the help of local businesswoman Marie Sharp, whose company produced a new hot sauce called “Pure Love” that was designed with messages to counter violence against women.

The wife of Belize’s prime minister participated in the launch, which was covered by every major media outlet in the country. Sharp committed to donate sales proceeds to Haven House, Belize’s only shelter for women and children fleeing domestic violence.
Toribiong launched a multipronged campaign to encourage the nation’s youth to embrace healthier diets and lifestyles. She worked with the Ministry of Education to redesign the school lunch program and helped arrange for the donation of sports equipment to increase students’ physical activity.

In Jerusalem, Chris Hodges was recognized for his work promoting media and public diplomacy engagement with Palestinians in Jerusalem, the West Bank and Gaza during a challenging period of U.S. policy changes. After the U.S. embassy moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, Consulate General Jerusalem merged with the embassy, becoming the embassy’s Palestinian Affairs Unit.

To counter Palestinian anger over the embassy’s move, Hodges enhanced outreach to Palestinians by framing the bilateral relationship as one between two peoples, not just two governments. He highlighted the message of the enduring U.S. commitment to Palestinians via press guidance, academic exchanges and interviews conducted in fluent Arabic. He also worked with the embassy to lead a workshop for Palestinian and Israeli staff during which they could listen to and learn from each other.

In Uganda, Niles Cole designed a cost-effective program to inspire young students, especially women, to pursue science, technology, engineering and mathematics-related careers. Cole helped launch a mobile STEM lab that travels to remote parts of the country to deliver a five-day program demonstrating the benefits of an interactive educational approach. So far, the Nile Explorer has visited 32 schools, reaching nearly 5,000 10- to 12-year-old students.

The PDAA Awards Committee gave honorable mention to three other nominees: Eveline Tseng, assistant cultural affairs officer in Kabul; Violeta Talandis, political/economic/public diplomacy officer in Asmara; and Yolonda Kerney, public affairs officer in Kinshasa.

This edition of Talking Points was compiled by Donna Gorman, Shawn Dorman, Susan Maitra and Cameron Woodworth.
Reforming State’s Personnel System Could Work This Time

BY RONALD E. NEUMANN

America needs a strong diplomacy. But this is impeded by problems with rigid personnel systems, staff shortages overseas, inadequate professional training and dissatisfaction among specialists—all of which are reducing State’s competitive hiring ability.

It is not only diplomats who think so, as a recent article, “Managing the National Security Workforce” by the Center for a New American Security indicates. Still, since the same issues continue year after year, is yet another proposal on how to fix things even worth writing?

The American Academy of Diplomacy thinks the answer is yes; the timing may be propitious. Our detailed proposals, which have been vetted by a group of senior former diplomats, are ready to be implemented.

We take Secretary of State Mike Pompeo at his word, that he cares about raising standards, morale and teamwork. The new Director General, Ambassador Carol Perez, is looking for new initiatives. Hence, the climate may be more open than in the past.

Also, there is still time in this administration, although just barely, to put new initiatives into practice before they die of bureaucratic inertia and the inevitable turmoil of a new term, even if it should be a continuation of the same administration.

However, extensive consultations with the unions of the Foreign and Civil Service will be essential if changes are to be accepted, implemented effectively and work to benefit employees, as well as management.

Effective American Diplomacy

The academy’s new study, “Strengthening the Department of State,” brought together people with far-reaching experience. The advisory committee included former Directors General and other former senior leaders of the State Department including Bill Burns, Tom Shannon and Roberta Jacobson (who offered Civil Service expertise). And we had input from the deep bench at the Partnership for Public Service, among many others.

We began work on this project when Rex Tillerson was Secretary of State, on the assumption that when the department someday crawled out of the rubble to which he was reducing it, a rebuilding plan would be needed. Secretary Pompeo’s arrival created a new atmosphere. We decided to refocus on a small number of important problems where we could present ideas in time for use by the current team.

Our focus is effective American diplomacy, which demands a strong State Department based on a strong Foreign and Civil Service.
management specialists (OMS) are still not being addressed. Thus, we focused particularly on the OMS, IT and diplomatic security (DS) cohorts that comprise some 70 percent of all specialists.

Our recommendations would revamp and strengthen the Foreign Service specialist system to attract and retain high-quality employees by adopting competitive compensation programs. Further, we recommend establishing additional senior positions in bureaus with large spans of control, oversight and increasingly complex policy and operational responsibilities.

Civil Service Reform: A Pilot Project

The State Department also faces challenges in having two different personnel systems for its American workforce (a third deals with locally employed staff). The Civil Service system is rigid, frustrating to managers and employees alike. In addressing these difficulties, we collaborated with the Partnership for Public Service, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization dedicated to making the federal government more effective.

Together we recommend a pilot project to establish an excepted service, rank-in-person model for part of the Civil Service. This would be supplemented by robust rotation and development opportunities, a more meaningful evaluation process and mandatory leadership training. A rank-in-person system should incorporate “up or out” promotion criteria, so that employees have an incentive to reach for higher positions and there is an upward flow of talent.

In developing our recommendations, we heard many concerns. Civil Service personnel were concerned that they would be forced abroad or somehow penalized by change. Foreign Service officers worried that there would be an erosion of good Foreign Service positions in Washington. They were also concerned that CS colleagues doing an overseas tour would compete for good FS jobs.

We believe these worries will prove misplaced because the rotations would be primarily domestic, and the CS rotations overseas would replace other CS overseas rotational programs already in existence and be very limited in number. We think that, in fact, the proposed pilot system will be a win for everyone.

Civil Service personnel in the pilot would have an opportunity to broaden their experience and mobility. The recommendation is for a voluntary system, so no one would be forced into the program. And the overwhelming majority of rotations would be domestic.

For the Foreign Service, the new system would reduce the loss of domestic Foreign Service positions when the need to rapidly meet a staffing priority has often meant conversion of a Foreign Service position to Civil Service because the Foreign Service assignment system is too slow to meet crisis needs.

The new system would allow for both CS and FS rotations, so positions would not need to be converted; and, if occupied by a Civil Service employee, the change would not be permanent. Some Washington positions of high value for Foreign Service learning at the desk level may revert to the FS.

Personnel management at State would benefit, as well. Our recommendations would better align State’s management with national security agency counterparts as State competes for Civil Service talent.

Professional Education

Another area in which the State Department has fallen short for years is professional education and training. A broad lack of professional education—as opposed to training—has been repeatedly identified by us and by other commentators, but the department has made limited progress. The problem is cross-cutting, affecting the Foreign Service and the Civil Service.

We recommend new attention be paid to a career-long devotion to continuing professional education. From the military to law, every endeavor with a claim to professionalism requires and provides for such education. It is time for the diplomatic profession to catch up.

In particular, we recommend establishing a human capital account for the Foreign Service Institute within the State Department’s Working Capital Fund, for all Foreign and Civil Service employees. Such a longer-term funding mechanism is essential for rational professional education planning. Fees from other agencies...
and State bureaus would feed into the consolidated FSI account, providing it predictability and prominence, and bolstering its capacity to better use resources and provide equal training for all department employees.

State rightly asserts that its strength lies in its people. To work effectively, employees must believe they are valued, trusted and empowered to carry out their responsibilities and have opportunities to grow professionally. Recent conversations and studies of job satisfaction show that this faith has been seriously eroded and, no matter what the Secretary may wish, has not yet been restored.

Naturally, State would immeasurably benefit from a robust budget, long-term fiscal certainty and a true training float, all of which we strongly endorse. Responsibility for these lie with the administration and Congress; we concentrated on areas where State has authority to make changes on its own.

**Significant Steps**

Irrespective of the budget, the department can, and must, do better by and for its employees. Our proposals will not fix all the problems of personnel, some of which are governmentwide and emanate from outside State. But we believe they mark significant steps toward a stronger American diplomatic tool. They are designed to help employees and their professional development, and to assist management in fulfilling its responsibilities to its people and its national security mission.

State is subject to falling behind other U.S. government agencies in the competition for talent at home just as the risks, challenges and threats to U.S. global leadership intensify abroad. Bold, urgent action is necessary to inspire, shape and support a workforce empowered, equipped and prepared to conduct successful U.S. diplomacy.
How did we get to a place where the United States government, egged on by clickbaiting media and others, actively shuns talking as a way of solving problems? We need look no further than the wreckage of recently abandoned treaties and international agreements to understand that American diplomacy has indeed fallen on hard times. Whereas U.S. diplomats used to be relied on to prevent crises, to solve international problems, to devise new agreements, rules and institutions, they are now viewed by their own government with suspicion, and the word “global” has become an epithet.

China’s rise in a rapidly changing world presents a challenge that only strategic, patient, firm coalition diplomacy can meet successfully.

By Susan A. Thornton

Diplomats are trained to discern how the dynamics of other countries are different from our own; how, left to their own devices, they will affect our interests; and how we might shape or harness them to service our interests, or at least not harm them. This requires curiosity, patience, listening, persistence and, above all, a realistic analysis of our interests and where they diverge or overlap with others. If a convergence of interests cannot be found and exploited through persistent, low-cost diplomacy and persuasion, we must then assess what higher costs we are willing to bear to force our interests on another country, and whether that force will succeed or fail.

Susan A. Thornton served as acting assistant secretary for the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs from March 2017 through July 2018, when she retired. Prior to that, she was principal deputy assistant secretary for EAP. During a 28-year Foreign Service career, she served as deputy chief of mission in Turkmenistan, in addition to postings in Beijing, Chengdu, Yerevan, Almaty and Washington, D.C. She is now a senior fellow at Yale Law School’s Paul Tsai China Center and, with her family, runs a farm in Maine.
It is important here to make an accurate assessment of what other countries are likely to do to defend their interests in the face of U.S. coercion, which is another area where diplomatic expertise comes in handy. Because we should at least know what we’re getting ourselves into, right?

**Waning U.S. Influence in a Changing World**

The abandonment of U.S. diplomacy at this juncture is especially fraught. We are in the midst of a shift in the global power structure, while at the same time, technology and globalization are accelerating the pace of change in our world. American strategies for and responses to these changes will have long-term, indelible effects on the future of our country. We cannot hold back the change. Our future success will depend on our ability to coax (not coerce) cooperation from others, our ability to provide leadership and build coalitions to tackle transnational problems, our resilience in adapting to change and, most of all, our ability to set an example that others want to follow. We are currently deficient in each of these areas.

But nowhere are the effects of abandonment of U.S. diplomacy more evident or more consequential than in the ongoing U.S.-China meltdown. Some may protest and say that we are engaged in diplomacy with China. This is not serious. President Donald Trump and Secretary of State Mike Pompeo have met more in the last year with North Korean leader Kim Jong Un than they have with their Chinese counterparts. Exchanges of “beautiful letters” are a poor substitute for real face-to-face discussions, and a narrow contest of wills over a trade dispute cannot substitute for the hands-on management of the serious challenges that plague U.S.-China relations.

The current “get tough” approach bears more resemblance to the antics of an overly cocky teenager than major power diplomacy. Administration officials refuse to meet Chinese counterparts, humiliate Chinese leaders with “tweet storms” and trash-talk Chinese initiatives and companies on the global stage. The FBI director names China a “whole-of-society threat,” and a high-ranking political appointee State Department official asserts that the United States is involved in a “clash of civilizations” with China “because Chinese are not Caucasians.” U.S. military encroachments and surveillance missions close to Chinese territory spur a daily high-stakes game of cat and mouse, and U.S. officials assert publicly that Washington and Beijing are already in a “cyber war.” U.S. district attorneys travel the country to warn about talking shop to ethnic Chinese co-workers. Rafts of anti-China legislation spew from the printers of congressional staffers. And there are many other, more risky gambits being unspooled behind the black curtain. Even during the most hair-trigger days of the Cold War, the Soviet Union was not treated to such mindless and peripatetic hostility from the U.S. government.

“China deserves it,” we say. “They have behaved badly, stolen our property, sold us cheap goods.” “They aim to kick us out of the Pacific, undermine our alliances, displace the United States in the world.” “China breaks international conventions, incarcerates its ethnic minority populations and aims to export a model of authoritarian capitalism.” These are just some of the salient complaints—and there is no question that China’s rise poses real challenges, and its behavior presents real concerns.

**The China Reality**

China is the largest country by population in the world, containing one-fifth of humanity. It has the second-largest economy and, by most estimates, will have the largest economy within the next 20 years. It has the second-largest military in the world, and its military spending is increasing, although less rapidly than before. It is resource-poor and spends extensive political and financial capital on securing raw materials for its economy. It has land borders with more countries than any other country in the world—14 sovereign states and 2 special territories.

The country is governed by a Chinese Communist Party that is at once both paranoid about threats to China’s stability and the party’s legitimacy, and intent on maintaining one-party,
Most countries, including China, do not formulate their national strategies—or think about their futures—through the prism of other countries.

top-down state control. Although ruled by a communist party, its economy is a highly dynamic and unique mixture of market capitalism and state paternalism, inspired by Deng Xiaoping’s vision for modern China and by lessons Chinese communists took from the collapse of the Soviet Union. In sum, China is an authoritarian colossus in a fragile transition, whose trajectory will have a major impact on every other country in the world, including the United States. It is clearly in the interest of all countries to try to shape China’s interests and future to converge with our own. And that will require a renewal of strategic, patient and firm coalition diplomacy to maximize the chances for success.

Some will say that our attempt to accomplish this over the past four decades failed, that the deadline by which China was to have transformed has been crossed, and that it didn’t happen. Others claim that China’s interests are increasingly diverging from those of the United States. Some claim that our efforts to engage China were naive, as if turning China into a democracy were the only goal of Nixon’s opening or of World Trade Organization accession. It is time now to abandon such efforts, they say, to “face reality and to get tough.”

In this telling—we’ll call it the “clash of titans” (not the “clash of civilizations”)—Xi Jinping’s “China Dream” will inevitably be raised as evidence of China’s “Secret Strategy to Replace America as the Global Superpower.” The Chinese state, as this narrative has it, is seeking a global strategic military presence under cover of its Belt and Road Initiative and global and military technological superiority through its Made in China 2025 program (which encourages intellectual property theft); and its “community of common destiny for humankind” is a trope for a Sino-centric order in East Asia and beyond. Those who spin this narrative cite as evidence their reading of Chinese strategic and military documents, isolated cases such as the Sri Lankan port of Hambantota, and quotes from various Chinese officials and scholars.

The “China Dream”

But the “China Dream” is not defined in terms of the United States. Its mission is not, as Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev famously declared of his country, to “bury us.” Most countries, including China, do not formulate their national strategies—or think about their futures—through the prism of other countries. China has its own long and proud history and has conducted its own affairs for thousands of years. Chinese officials will tell you that the main focus of national energy is to be a well-off socialist society by 2049, the hundredth anniversary of the founding of the People’s Republic of China. Like their counterparts in other governments, they couch their goals in domestic and patriotic terms. The “China Dream” is to be rich, powerful, modern and admired. In other words, the China Dream is to be more like the United States.

This will be well understood by State Department employees around the world who are used to seeing American “soft power” at work in the field. The leadership, attitude and example of the United States as an open, free and tolerant society has powerful attractive force in the world. Even when governments in places like Iraq, Iran, Cuba and the Soviet Union opposed the U.S. government, their people were attracted by our principles. Even as a unipolar superpower that lurched, at times, into misadventure, the United States, as a benevolent hegemon, got the benefit of the doubt and the world’s support.

At a recent event in China, a high-ranking State Security Ministry official and a People’s Liberation Army general separately sought advice from American counterparts on getting
their children (their only child in both cases) into universities in the United States. These children are not studying in technical fields. One wanted to study communications and media, the other international relations. These parents, who are not rich, are prepared to spend a huge proportion of their savings and income on sending their children to the United States to study. President Xi Jinping's daughter studied and worked in the United States until he was elevated to general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party. As any parent who has sacrificed for their children's education knows, that says more about China's attitude toward America than any strategy document or communist party pronouncement.

When you go to China and talk to young people, they'll tell you that they don't like the way the U.S. government talks about their country, but they all want to go to school in America, work for a U.S. company or travel to the United States. This is what success looks like. America is still "a shining city upon a hill" for most Chinese. They understand that China's ability to reach its dream is inextricably bound up with continued connections to the outside world, including the United States. Of course, there are exceptions: Chinese nationalists who preach autarky, PLA officers who advocate militarism, Chinese CEOs who want protectionism. Some are powerful, as vested narratives, we abandon the effort and miss the opportunity to help shape China toward a better future, our children will rightly blame us. Even if China does not become an electoral democracy, the power of American influence in the world will surely change China, just as China's growing influence will change America. It is delusional to think otherwise. The question is whether U.S. diplomacy will have some input in its design, or not.

We could, of course, continue to shun diplomacy and stoke the escalatory cycle of strategic adversity. This seems to be the direction for the foreseeable future. Those promoting this approach say that Beijing only responds to force, that tension is a necessary feature of the relationship and that Chinese and U.S. interests are implacably opposed. But even if claims about a secret Chinese plot to bury the United States were accurate, it is difficult to see how an endless string of U.S. provocations without a strategy and absent coordination with others will achieve anything other than heightened suspicions, further recriminations and, likely, a premature crisis. This will do nothing to further U.S. interests, to say nothing of the interests of our allies around the world, and it will harm U.S. credibility and leadership.

Allies and partners of the United States, many of whom rely on China's economy as an engine of growth at home, are loath to see a rupture in Sino-American relations. They do not want interests tend to become in maturing systems and economies, but they are a vocal minority.

**U.S. Strategy Needed**

It is impossible to say at this point what China's future will be. It is still an open question. Those who would claim that China's future course is set and unchanging are mistaken. If, due to our own ideological blinders and shortsighted political
to have to choose between the two biggest powers as they did during the Cold War. Some in the international community have even begun to voice fears that the United States, traditionally relied on to be the global guardian of peace and stability, has become ground zero for sowing disorder, instability and distraction. Not only is this not a productive strategy (or even a strategy—what is it meant to accomplish?), but it is playing into Chinese hands, undermining global confidence in U.S. leadership and squandering opportunities to reshape the international system in ways conducive to U.S. interests and power.

The other possibility is to pursue a mix of engagement aimed at shaping and cooperation, while pursuing a policy of balancing and deterrence that has worked well for 40 years and shows few signs of being seriously challenged by China in the near term.

First, we need to put the lie to the notion that China doesn’t change, that it won’t respond to diplomacy, that talking to China is a waste of time, that it disregards agreements and wants to overturn the international system. Diplomacy has fundamentally changed China over the past 40 years, and has been a major contributor to the peace and prosperity that East Asia has enjoyed over that same period.

Although it has land borders with 14 countries and 2 special territories, a few of which remain disputed, China has not been involved in any major conflict since the normalization of diplomatic relations with the United States in 1979. This would certainly not have been predicted at the time, based on past

Even if China does not become an electoral democracy, the power of American influence in the world will surely change China, just as China’s growing influence will change America.
behavior. Indeed, deterring Chinese military aggression toward what it views as a "renegade territory," Taiwan, has been a chief preoccupation of U.S. diplomacy with Beijing since Nixon’s opening. So far, it has been successful.

Co-Evolution in the International System

China does not want to overturn the current U.S.-led international system. Chinese leaders understand that it is China’s opening and joining the international community that has brought about its spectacular modernization and the prospect of achieving the “China Dream.” The Chinese narrative on this is as follows: When Deng Xiaoping launched China’s opening and reform and the PRC gained China’s United Nations seat from Taiwan, China began a frenzy of joining international instruments and institutions. China had not been in on the rulemaking in the international system; but, starting in the 1970s, it joined every international convention and began to remold Chinese society accordingly. The Chinese government introduced a legal system, a market economy and national institutions that could contribute to the United Nations, other international organizations and to international decision-making.

The United States says China doesn’t follow the rules; but from China’s perspective, it has changed tremendously to incorporate international structures for the sake of international participation. We have seen great progress through decades of diplomacy on issues from nonproliferation to product safety, from contributing to solving regional conflicts to combating climate change. China has recently moved to a much more active and participatory profile on the international stage, something that the George W. Bush and Barack Obama administrations had held out as desirable in the “responsible stakeholder” concept to counter perceptions of China as a “free rider” on the international system.

China is now making several efforts to contribute more to international public goods through, for example, increased contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations, efforts to combat pandemic disease in Africa and leadership in international organizations. It is providing infrastructure financing to the developing world through its creation of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank and the Belt and Road Initiative, both of which have been maligned by the United States but have been attractive to many countries. In short, China understands that it has benefited tremendously from its participation in the international system, and that the continuation of the system is crucial to China’s continued growth and development. It is prepared to contribute to the strengthening of the system.

This does not mean that China rejects the need for reforms and adjustments to the international system; there are, indeed, aspects of the system that it does not like. But China is very invested, first and foremost, in the continuation of the international trading system; it does not want to see the dissolution of the World Trade Organization or the development of rival trading blocs. Because of its reliance on global trade for continued growth and development, China is willing to discuss needed changes in the interest of strengthening the WTO. China has also talked frequently about the need for “democratization” of international affairs, but it is not clear what implications this would have for specific reforms.

As for the dislikes, most obviously China has rejected U.N. oversight of its human rights performance, an area of increasing concern with the incarceration of a significant proportion of its indigenous Muslim population on grounds of “terrorism prevention” and increasing suppression of views deemed critical of the leadership. This backsliding and frenzied increases in party control in recent years are causing grave concern about China’s
future governance trajectory. China’s continued participation in U.N. human rights bodies, however, reflects its sensitivity about international opinion and its desire to be seen as a responsible player.

The international community must continue to put pressure on China to improve in these areas, to call out bad behavior, and to demand that China subject itself to criticism and improvement, in accordance with international expectations. While this may not produce immediate solutions, it has had and will have beneficial effects over time. Chinese bridle at what they see as continual interference in their sovereign internal affairs, but they are increasingly aware that this is the price of being in the international system. We should encourage the PRC to see these restraints on its internal behavior as positive for its own development, and the United States should set an example in this regard.

Given China’s rising role, continued U.S. leadership of the international system and the need to make adjustments to strengthen that system in the face of global and technological shifts, the only realistic path forward is for the United States and China to co-evolve, through cooperation and competition, into an adjusted and sustainable order. This is the path we have been on for the last 40 years without naming it. The United States, in many cases via the international system, has changed China. But China, through its modernization, has also changed the United States and every other country.

China’s active participation in international structures is now crucial to the development of the rest of the world. Its contributions will be key to making progress on the greatest challenges we face, which will continue to be transnational in nature. U.S.-China co-evolution in a globalized international system is the only realistic and productive path forward.

Doubling Down on Our Strengths

I recently had the chance to meet with a former Chinese leader who had spent a lot of time working with Americans on U.S.-China relations. He was sober about the turn things have taken in the relationship after 40 years of obvious sweeping benefits to both societies and the world. He reflected the perplexity of many Chinese I’ve spoken to recently when he said, “I don’t understand why you Americans are so afraid of China.”

He continued: “The United States has an ideal geographic location, friendly neighbors, rich resources, a young and talented population, the largest and most productive economy in the world, the most well-endowed military on the planet that outstrips the next eight combined, more than 50 allies and more than 100 military bases all around the world. You should be confident. America is not in decline—it is in constant renewal. Actually, if you think about it, America and China are the two most similar countries.”

“But as a friend of America,” he continued, “I must tell you that in international relations, pressure, sanctions and arrogance are corrosive and counterproductive. China is learning this lesson now and is trying to reach out to countries more positively.” He pointed to China’s outreach through the Belt and Road Initiative projects as an example. “China is not trying to replace the United States on the global stage,” he said. “We need U.S. global leadership, but we need it to be more humble.”

The skeptics will say that this is a trick. They will point to China’s military buildup, its development of advanced weapons, quotes by hardliners on social media and elsewhere as evidence of the “Secret Strategy.” And those Chinese prone to see threats also believe that the United States has its own “Secret (or maybe Not-So-Secret) Strategy” for containing China, blocking its modernization, infiltrating its military defenses and overturning the regime and the Chinese system. They have ample evidence they can point to in bolstering their case. But most Americans and most Chinese do not see each other as a threat and do understand that globalization will not go backward. It will continue to bring our two countries into more frequent contact, posing opportunities, challenges and dangers.

As the Chinese official cited above indicated, the United States remains the best-equipped nation to absorb and adapt to these wrenching changes, which will pose major challenges to all countries. But we must stop with the political distractions, put faith in our elected leaders and focus on real challenges. We must band together with partners, double down on coaxing China into the global community and strengthen international structures against looming pressures before it is too late. The stakes are high and the responsibility for getting it right is great.

Bring on the diplomats!
The rapid rise of China to the status of economic powerhouse has roiled marketplaces all over the world and caused serious disruptions in the global trading system. Part of this was inevitable—in economics, as in many things, size matters, and China is the proverbial 800-pound gorilla. Once it emerged from its largely self-imposed economic cocoon, it was bound to leave a very large footprint.

But that footprint has proved heavier than expected, in large part because of the policies China has chosen to pursue. Having watched the rapid development of Japan, the original “capitalist developmental state” (a term coined by Chalmers Johnson), and then the Asian Tigers—South Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan—China has developed its own blend of state control and market policies, with the emphasis on the former.

It did not start out that way, however. When China sought to join the World Trade Organization, its premier at the time, Zhu Rongzhi, made clear that his government saw WTO accession and the obligations it required as a means of bringing China into the Western trading system and forcing internal reforms. That was then. Now, the current Chinese leader, Xi Jinping, strongly favors state-owned enterprises over private companies and uses a mix of tactics that are creating consternation in developed economies, beginning with the United States. These changes, and the negative consequences they have for China’s own economy, are well documented in the latest book by Nick Lardy of the Peterson Institute, *The State Strikes Back* (2019).

The past several U.S. administrations have all complained about Chinese theft of American intellectual property, unfair and discriminatory treatment of U.S. companies operating in China, forced technology transfer, channeling of resources to state-owned enterprises and massive subsidies. But they softened such criticism to obtain cooperation on other foreign policy goals, such as Iran, North Korea and climate change. In contrast, the Trump administration decided to tackle these practices head on.

In the summer of 2017, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer began an investigation of Chinese policies and practices under Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974. That section authorizes retaliation against “acts, policies or practices that are unreasonable or discriminatory and that restrict or burden U.S. commerce” (emphasis added).

A trade agreement with China will be good news in the short term, but the path to lasting improvement in the relationship, as well as political success for President Trump, is a narrow one.

BY WILLIAM A. REINSCH
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U.S.-CHINA TRADE

If We Get to Yes, Will It Make Any Difference?

The Cost of Doing Business with China


I. Unfair Technology Transfer Regime for U.S. Companies in China. The Chinese government uses formal and informal joint venture requirements to prohibit U.S. companies from operating in certain industries without a Chinese partner, often requiring the Chinese partner to be the majority shareholder. The government uses licensing processes to force U.S. companies to transfer technologies to their Chinese joint venture partner. Provisions in licensing and review processes are vaguely worded, giving Chinese authorities wide discretion on which rules to apply. Foreign companies either comply or risk being shut out of the Chinese market.

II. Discriminatory Licensing Restrictions. China’s technology regulatory regime forces U.S. companies to conduct technology transfer on non–market–based terms, and prohibits them from negotiating their own terms with Chinese partners. China applies different rules for technology transfer between domestic firms than between a Chinese and a foreign firm. Regulations for the latter are burdensome and discriminatory, mandating that licensees can use the technology in perpetuity even after licensing contracts expire.

III. Outbound Investment and Subsidies. The Chinese government encourages outbound foreign direct investment, particularly in the tech sector, to advance its military and economic strategic goals. Chinese companies have established presences in Silicon Valley with the objective of acquiring technologies. Investments are often driven by state-owned enterprises or financed by government-backed banks, which gives Chinese companies an unfair competitive advantage when investing in technology, because they are not constrained by risks. In addition, Chinese government subsidies artificially inflate acquisition costs, which allows Chinese companies to expand global market share at the expense of U.S. companies.

IV. Unauthorized Intrusions into U.S. Commercial Computer Networks and Cyber-Enabled Theft of Intellectual Property and Sensitive Commercial Information. China has used cyber intrusions into U.S. commercial networks to gain access to “trade secrets, technical data, negotiating positions and sensitive, proprietary, internal communications.” Cyber intrusions target a wide range of industries, but are most pervasive in high-tech sectors.

The report identified several other issues including “Chinese measures purportedly related to national security or cybersecurity; inadequate intellectual property protection in China, including widespread trade secret theft, counterfeiting and bad faith trademarking; China’s anti-monopoly law; China’s standardization law; and China’s talent acquisition strategy.”

Experts estimate that the United States incurred annual damages of $50 billion due to unfair Chinese practices and policies. On Nov. 20, 2018, USTR released an update to the report, stating that Chinese unfair technology policies persist.

While some elements of Chinese policy are similar to those Japan employed in the 1980s, there are some important differences. Ironically, one is that China is more open to imports than Japan was. At $32.67 billion, China had a global trade surplus (its exports are 15 percent greater than its imports) in March 2019; by comparison, Japan had 26 percent more exports than
imports in 1985. China has bilateral deficits with many countries—including South Korea (-$55.6 billion), Australia (-$26.8 billion) and Brazil (-$7.4 billion)—and as its gross domestic product (GDP) growth is expected to slow down, its global trade balance may begin to shift toward deficit, as well.

The more significant differences, however, have been China’s willingness to use extra-legal tactics to obtain technology from advanced countries and its growing direct and indirect control over its economy, not to mention Chinese society—a stark contrast to Japan’s Ministry of International Trade and Industry’s (now the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry) “guidance” to Japanese companies on where and how they should compete.

The Trump Administration’s Response

The Trump administration’s determination to deal with these issues led first to the imposition of tariffs on a broad base of $250 billion worth of Chinese exports to the United States. If the purpose of the tariffs was to get China’s attention, it succeeded. The two governments have for nearly a year now engaged in protracted negotiations that first languished, then picked up speed after the Trump–Xi Jinping dinner in Buenos Aires on Dec. 2, 2018, where the two presidents agreed on a 90-day time frame for finishing the talks.

That deadline came and went amid a flurry of “good faith” and “making progress” statements from both sides, and there was continuing optimism that the two would reach agreement. The mood shifted in mid-May when the United States accused the Chinese of backing off commitments they had made, and President Donald Trump increased the third tranche of tariffs from 10 to 25 percent and threatened to impose new tariffs on virtually all remaining Chinese imports. As of mid-May, it appears that the impasse may continue for some time, although an agreement remains the most likely ultimate outcome.

If an agreement is reached, it will likely have three components, along with the resolution of a number of specific bilateral trade irritants that have been pending for some time. The first part is the easiest—Chinese commitments to buy more American goods. That is not difficult for China to do, and it scratches the president’s itch for a visible concession that he can brag about, and which will reduce our bilateral trade deficit. Ironically, however, the real issues here may be the United States’ ability to manufacture as much stuff as the Chinese have agreed to buy and the wisdom of putting too many trade eggs in a Chinese basket at the expense of other markets. In the long run, that would create a dependence on the Chinese market that would make us more, rather than less, vulnerable.

The second component of an agreement will address the structural reforms that go to the core of our dispute. The most likely outcome is that the Chinese give us some, but not all, of what we have been asking for by making commitments on intellectual property theft, forced technology transfers and opening investment in China, and agreeing to do away with various forms of discrimination against foreign companies. One particular change—doing away with joint venture requirements—would go a long way toward reducing the threat of forced technology requirements, which often occurs as a consequence of negotiations between the U.S. company and the required Chinese partner.

Missing from this will be unequivocal promises to turn away from a state-dominated economy—subsidies, support for state-owned enterprises and implementation of Made in China 2025 (the Chinese government’s guidebook for developing national champions in 14 critical technologies)—and move in the direction of a genuine market economy. While doing that would make sense, the Chinese Communist Party’s primary goal has always been maintaining control, and the past few years have made it abundantly clear that for Xi Jinping, that includes maintaining the government’s heavy hand in directing the economy.

At the same time, pursuing that policy poses the risk of further slowing growth, which would increase grumbling within both the party and the public. Xi’s dilemma is that such an outcome may, in the long run, prove a greater risk to party control than shifting to a market economy.

The third element of any agreement will be an enforcement package, and that has proved to be the most contentious part of the debate. The United States insists that China give it the unilateral right to determine compliance and to act unilaterally if Washington believes it is necessary. The Chinese view that as a violation of their sovereignty and argue for a consultative process, which is not sufficient for the administration. That issue,
as well as the disposition of the existing tariffs, will likely end up in the laps of the two presidents.

**The Importance of Building Coalitions**

A trade agreement with China will be good news in the short term, because it will produce a positive bump in the financial markets. But the path to lasting improvement in the relationship, as well as political success for President Trump, is a narrow one. It requires a strong agreement that the Chinese actually implement. If the agreement is only about buying more stuff with a few intellectual property concessions thrown in, it will be heavily criticized as both a policy failure and a failure of the president’s self-proclaimed negotiating skills.

Even if it is better than that, the likelihood of full Chinese compliance is low. So what might look like, and will certainly be touted as, a great success when it occurs may not look so great a year later if it becomes clear that very little has changed, or the United States has restarted the trade war with new tariffs due to Chinese noncompliance. President Trump, who does not have a history of looking ahead to the possible consequences of his actions, should do so very carefully in this case, as the negative outcome that is possible next year will be a lot closer to the election than the success of an agreement announced this year. Sadly, that may be the most likely outcome, even though it does not serve either country’s long-term interests.

One important piece missing in this equation is the role of other countries. President Trump, who is a noted skeptic of coalition building also implies a recognition that the real commercial battleground with China is neither here nor there, but in third countries where the playing field is more level.
multilateralism, prefers to approach issues bilaterally in the belief that American dominance is so great we can leverage the behavior we want from the other party. That worked with South Korea, worked up to a point with Mexico and Canada, and may well work with Japan. But it does not appear to be working with either the European Union or China, both of which are bigger than we are. Size matters in the global economy, and the U.S. footprint continues to shrink.

In the case of China, this is a particularly important missed opportunity. Historically, China has been uncomfortable being the outlier, and joint efforts by Western nations have generally been more successful in changing Chinese behavior than individual ones. That makes even more sense now, since other nations, notably in the E.U., have begun to show higher levels of concern about China’s policies, suggesting they are ripe for coalition building. However, aside from a useful effort to develop a trilateral (U.S.-E.U.-Japan) paper on redefining subsidies in the World Trade Organization, there has been little effort so far to bring other nations together to act in concert.

In the end, that may prove a fatal mistake. Building a coalition does not simply mean persuading others to make the same demarches to the Chinese government that we have made. It also means building or strengthening institutions that give meaning to the open, rules-based trading system Western nations have supported since the 1944 Bretton Woods Agreement. That is what the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership were really about: creating structures that would stand for, and enforce, common rules based on openness, transparency and sound science—which other nations would have to respect if they wanted access to the markets covered by those agreements. Since both sets of signatories represent large consumer markets, China would have a significant incentive to adhere to their rules and perhaps ultimately join the agreements.

Coalition building also implies a recognition that the real commercial battleground with China is neither here nor there, but in third countries where the playing field is more level. Pursuing more open markets in China is a noble exercise that deserves to be undertaken, but governments doing it need to be realistic about the prospects for success, particularly in the short term. They also need to focus more of their resources on competing in other countries that are more open to their efforts.

The reality of modern competition is that if one is in a race, there are only two ways to win: run faster or trip the opponent. The Trump administration’s policy, as well as much of the ensuing congressional and public debate, has focused on the latter. But the surer path to success is the former.
Winston Churchill famously referred to Russia as “a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma.” Doubtless, many would agree the same could be said of China. During nearly four decades dealing off and on with China, first as a university teacher and then as a diplomat with the Foreign Agricultural Service, I have seen hundreds of officials and exporters from dozens of countries smack their foreheads in surprise and frustration at Chinese behavior—

from unjustly rejected shipments and illogical lurches in negotiating positions to blatant disregard of World Trade Organization commitments.

Since the United States and the People’s Republic of China established diplomatic relations in 1979, the relationship has swung back and forth between one of glowing expressions of optimism about shared interests in a peaceful and prosperous world, and one of tension and mutual mistrust. Always underpinning hopes for a happy future on the U.S. side was the basic assumption that China would join the international community as a “responsible” player, and that the obvious benefits of a “rules-based” system of trade and diplomacy would inevitably lead China in that direction, to the betterment—and enrichment—of all.

Since Beijing’s accession to the WTO in 2001, trade with China has exploded and the country’s potential as a market has become greater than ever. Yet the promise of China operating as a trusted
and conventional member of the international community has not been realized and seems further away than ever. Instead, China’s spectacular economic rise has led to outrageous behavior and unfair competitive practices. China’s frequent and flagrant flouting of WTO rules has resulted in many billions of dollars in lost trade and consternation among U.S. and “like-minded” traders, policymakers and negotiators.

So, what’s going on? Why doesn’t China behave like a “normal” country and play by the rules? Why does Beijing act in ways that undermine the confidence of the global community? Why would China take these self-destructive actions now, precisely when its historic achievements have made it the second-largest economy in the world, and when its new prominence on the world stage has rekindled a desire to be seen as a global leader and to reclaim what it sees as its rightful position as “The Middle Kingdom”? Most importantly, how do we encourage China to be a positive force in a world where its impact is so huge?

Rules as Objective Requirements vs. Optional Tools

It will come as no surprise to diplomats and other international practitioners that China’s actions and reactions—which many Americans find shocking—may be traced in large part to fundamentally different expectations and worldviews. When it comes to global economic competition, those differing views include (a) the role and responsibility of government and (b) the role and purpose of rules and regulations.

While the American ideal of the government’s role in trade is to create and police a transparent, predictable egalitarian system in which participants may compete and strive for “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,” the Chinese ideal is very different. Most Chinese I know believe the government not only may, but must take a far more active role. Because government has the responsibility to ensure domestic tranquility and provide prosperity, it is only natural for government at all levels to become active and biased participants in promoting trade.

Similarly, while the American view is that rules and regulations should be equally applied and consistently enforced, Chinese government officials are expected to use rules and regulations as simply another set of policy tools to be used or set aside in the pursuit of broader policy objectives that serve the national interest. The U.S. government and U.S. companies are not the only ones that have had secrets stolen or shipments unjustly rejected. Indeed, when it comes to violating international trade norms, China has been a model of nondiscrimination.

The Chinese are genuinely puzzled by our reverence for “principle” and see it as a weakness to be exploited. I have been in many trade negotiations where the Chinese seek to defend an unjustified trade barrier by quoting from the WTO’s declaration that each country has the right to establish its own regulations. Fundamentally, China rejects and is even confused by a trading system based on “rule of law,” and tries to operate instead according to a “rule by law” of its own making.
The Chinese term \textit{mao dun} (literally “spear shield”) is used to describe two irreconcilable differences. It comes from a famous folktale about an endless battle between two warriors—one with a spear that could pierce any shield, and the other with a shield that could stop any sword. Here, drawn from my personal experience, is a sampling of common Chinese practices that run counter to our sense of right and proper international behavior.

\textbf{Inconsistent application of import regulations.} A product rejected at one Chinese port may well be accepted at another. I was meeting with an importer when he got a call about an arriving shipment. “Yes ... good ... What?! NO! The ship must dock at BERTH SIX! That is where things are arranged!” he exclaimed. Vastly different tariffs may be assessed for the same product, as well. In one case I worked on, one company importing a product with a 44 percent tariff paid zero, while another importer paid 100 percent.

\textbf{Ignoring their own trade bans and their own rhetoric.} For many years in the trade, there was a running joke that because Beijing banned a certain U.S. product, China was only our fourth-largest market for it. During a break in one negotiation in which I had been told yet again how U.S. meat was unsafe and posed a grave risk to Chinese, my opposite number came up to me and said, “Minister Counselor Shull, I want to tell you my wife and I are so happy our son will be going to university in the United States!”

\textbf{Changing requirements in the middle of a negotiation.} When Chinese officials were surprised to learn we could comply with a new technical requirement for an agricultural product, they called a break and then announced a stricter one.

\textbf{Rejecting shipments that are no longer profitable.} If the price of an imported product has dropped between the signing of the contract and the delivery, chances rise that Chinese inspectors will find the shipment does not meet contract specifications and reject it.

\textbf{Ignoring some laws and regulations to achieve a more important objective.} During the peak of the “one-child policy” in the late 1980s. I discovered in my crop travels that most farmers were ignoring it. When I asked a Beijing official in charge of rural policy about this, he said: “Local officials must adapt central government policies to local conditions. The one-child policy in the villages might be very unpopular with the peasants.”

\textbf{Relationships trump laws and rules.} One joint venture executive shared two kernels of wisdom: “The signing of the contract marks the beginning of the negotiations,” and “If the relationship is not good, the contract won’t save you.” (These attitudes toward relationships played out even inside the embassy. In the early days of ICASS, the admin section put out a notice that agencies could no longer share office supplies. When one Foreign Service National was challenged for using another section’s copier, she replied, “Oh, it’s okay, because one of your officers is married to one of our officers, so we are related.”)

\textbf{Mistrust of “The People.”} Even otherwise open-minded Chinese I have spoken with say China is “too big” for democracy. When I spoke with demonstrating pro-democracy students in Tiananmen Square in 1989, some told me: “Well, of course, we can’t let everyone vote. Peasants don’t have education and would vote to raise food prices, and that would be destabilizing.”

\textbf{Mistrust of “The Market.”} During the early introduction of market reforms, one local grain official asked me, “How does the U.S. government set the price of bread?” I explained that our government doesn’t do that; the price floats. “If there are 100 people and 50 loaves of bread, there is one price; and if there are 50 people and 100 loaves of bread, there is another price,” I said. He paused for a moment and then asked, “How does the U.S. government set the price of bread?”

\textbf{Setting impossible standards.} One way China has tried to reconcile millennia of absolute government power over commercial operations with an objective and egalitarian rules-based system of trade and laws is to set standards no one can meet, and then give officials the discretion about whether to enforce them. This practice alone has disrupted billions of dollars in U.S. food and agricultural exports.

—Phil Shull
China’s actions and reactions—which many Americans find shocking—may be traced in large part to fundamentally different expectations and worldviews.

Understanding China’s Behavior

The root of China’s interventionist and authoritarian role in trade and all other parts of its economy may be found, among other places, in its searing experience with scarcity, especially food scarcity.

As I learned in a Foreign Service Institute area studies class decades ago, no country in the world has known more starvation than China. The impact of recurring famine was so common and so profound that it became embedded in the Chinese language. The Chinese word for “population” is made up of “person” + “mouth,” and a colloquial way of saying hello is, “Have you eaten yet?” (By contrast, in English we talk in terms of “per capita,” which comes from the Greek “per head.” Most Western language greetings inquire about health and family, perhaps because it was disease rather than starvation that was the greatest threat to life.)

One of the worst famines in China’s history took place after the founding of the PRC in 1949. While estimates vary, it is widely agreed that Chairman Mao’s Great Leap Forward resulted in tens of millions of Chinese dying of hunger from 1959 to 1962. Significantly, this occurred during the formative years of most of China’s current top leadership.

Combined with the powerful weight of history and imperial Confucian tradition, these long years of tremendous suffering and turmoil refreshed and entrenched the conviction in the Communist Party that strong, centralized authority is essential to bringing a higher standard of living for the people, and a bright future for China. Yet as confident as the PRC leadership is that its power and position justify its behavior, many Chinese officials also recognize that China’s continued growth and prosperity depend on constructive economic relations with other countries.

The PRC’s lack of respect for the WTO and other international norms is also because China had no part in their creation, and its experience with international treaties has been far from pleasant. After many centuries as the richest and most advanced country in the world, China experienced invasions and “unequal treaties” in the 19th and 20th centuries. Profoundly humiliating, these experiences still help shape how Chinese leaders approach international trade and security questions—including their aggressive steps to assert China’s centuries-old “Nine-Dash-Line” territorial claims in the South China Sea. Of course, to understand unacceptable behavior is not to excuse it.

I agree with many others who believe that the best way to change China’s behavior is to work together with our allies. Beijing’s modus operandi is to divide and conquer. While the United States is strong enough to go “toe-to-toe” with China, many others are not. China respects power. To the extent we can enlist those countries in our efforts, we will all stand that much taller.

Competitive Leadership

One of the most eloquent and insightful statements about international leadership I have seen is in President Dwight David Eisenhower’s farewell address. Delivered in 1961, at a time when the United States was the dominant power in the world, he said: “Understandably proud of this pre-eminence, we yet realize that America’s leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interests of world peace and human betterment.”

This truth is a basic lesson Chinese leaders have not yet learned. As long as China behaves with such narrow self-interest, it cannot join—much less displace—the United States as a top global leader. China is still trapped in the mindset that “might makes right” and that being the biggest means being the best.

There is a reason why many countries have prominent boulevards and plazas named Roosevelt, Kennedy and Eisenhower. Global leadership is demonstrated and earned by pursuing policies that work toward the common good, and by honoring commitments and following rules even when they disadvantage the country in a particular case. The reservoir of goodwill and trust the United States has built up over the decades endures, despite occasional missteps. When combined with the quality of our products and trustworthiness of our traders, the United States is well placed to retain its role as a global leader and its tremendous competitive advantage in global trade.

To give credit where it is due, hard work, determination and economic reform policies have transformed China, lifting hundreds of millions out of dire poverty and making it a leading world economy. But without a fundamental change in behavior that makes it less of a riddle, mystery and enigma, China will not become a leader of nations.
THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA AT A CROSSROADS

America’s Foreign Service officers are important voices for, and representatives of, our country abroad. Your hard work and diplomacy are vital to ensuring that America’s policies and priorities are understood by foreign leaders. I believe your work in China will be particularly important as the U.S.-China relationship will shape the geopolitical landscape for this century. I hope you find this article useful in considering this important bilateral relationship.

There’s a lot of finger pointing between Beijing and Washington these days. It is important to understand how the United States and China arrived at this moment of heightened tension. The drivers of the current downward spiral aren’t complicated.

First, we have diverging interests. On many issues where the United States and China should agree, such as North Korea, we often pursue divergent approaches.

Second, the United States and China disagree about important rules governing the international system. One example is maritime rights and customs—which brought our navies into a near-collision on the high seas last September.

Third, American and Chinese views are opposed in critical

Statesmanship and creativity are needed as Washington and Beijing renegotiate a relationship that is too big to fail.
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areas. For example, China and Russia argue for cyber sovereignty and the right of the state to control cross-border data flows. The United States and the European Union both reject those views.

Taken together, these and other drivers have fueled a new consensus in Washington that China is not just a strategic competitor, but very possibly our major long-term adversary. America’s long-standing “engagement” policy is now widely viewed as being of little use for its own sake. Nobody is arguing against dialogue. But nearly everybody is arguing that the results of U.S.-China dialogue and engagement have been poor.

Underlying tensions will persist beyond any single issue between our countries, such as trade, because the problems we face, and our divergence of views—even in the economic area—are broad. Unless these broader and deeper issues are addressed, we are in for a long winter in U.S.-China relations.

**Economics, for Example**

Let’s take economics. The United States played the decisive role in facilitating China’s entry into the World Trade Organization. Yet 18 years later, China still hasn’t opened its economy to foreign competition. It retains joint venture requirements and ownership limits. And it uses technical standards, subsidies, licensing procedures and regulations as nontariff barriers to trade and investment. This is simply unacceptable. It is why the Trump administration has argued for change and modernization of the WTO system. And I agree.

But it also helps explain why so many influential voices in America now argue for a “decoupling” of the two economies. This negative view of China unites politicians from both left and right who agree on nothing else. Trade with China has hurt some American workers. And they have expressed their grievances at the ballot box. So, while many attribute this shift to the Trump administration, I do not.

What we are now seeing will likely endure for some time within the American policy establishment. China is viewed—by a growing consensus—not just as a strategic challenge to America, but as a country whose rise has come at our expense. In this environment, it would be helpful if the U.S.-China relationship had more advocates. That it does not reflects another failure.

In large part because China has been slow to open its economy since it joined WTO, the American business community has turned from advocate to skeptic, and even opponent of past U.S. policies toward China. American business doesn’t want a tariff war, but it does want a more aggressive approach from our government. Even though many American businesses continue to prosper in China, a growing number of firms have given up hope that the playing field will ever be level.

Some have accepted the Faustian bargain of maximizing today’s earnings per share while operating under restrictions that jeopardize their future competitiveness. But that doesn’t mean they’re happy about it. Nor does it mean they aren’t acutely aware of the risks—or thinking harder than ever before about how to diversify their risks away from, and beyond, China.

**The Risks Are Real**

That brings us to the risks. Sadly, I think the risks of a new age of disruption are considerable. For 40 years, the U.S.-China relationship has been characterized by the integration of goods, capital, technology and people. And over these years, economic integration between the two countries was supposed to mitigate security competition. But an intellectually honest appraisal must now admit that the reverse is taking place. And economic tensions are reaching a breaking point.

After 40 years of integration, a surprising number of political and thought leaders on both sides advocate policies that could forcibly de-integrate the two countries across all four of these baskets. The integration of trade in goods could come undone—as supply chains are broken, especially for sensitive technology. Integration through cross-border capital flows will come under greater pressure as restrictions on Chinese investment take hold across big sectors in the United States.

Indeed, if this trend continues, integration of global innovation ecosystems may well collapse as a result of mutual efforts by the United States and China to exclude one another. Meanwhile, the integration of people, especially the brightest young students, could stall—as Washington potentially bans Chinese students from studying whole categories of science and engineering subjects.
If all this persists, I fear that big parts of the global economy will be closed off to the free flow of investment and trade. And that is why I now see the prospect of an economic “Iron Curtain”—one that throws up new walls on each side and unmakes the global economy as we have known it.

A U.S.-China Divorce?
But here’s the problem for those in the United States who advocate a U.S.-China “divorce”—decoupling is easier when you’re actually a couple. The United States can try to divorce; but what if others, especially in Asia, don’t want to follow suit? As a function of geography, economic gravity and strategic reality, I do not believe that any country in Asia can afford to divorce China, even if it wishes to. So in its effort to isolate China, America risks isolating itself.

But let’s also be clear that if Beijing wants to keep its relationship with the United States from spinning out of control, it’s going to have to look hard at some of its policies. Above all, China will need to rediscover the spirit of market-driven reform. 2018 marked the 40th anniversary of “reform and opening” in China, the remarkable transformation launched by Deng Xiaoping and other leaders in 1978.

It’s been a good run for China over these years. And it’s been an especially good run for China since it entered the WTO in 2001. Its $1 trillion economy in 2001 has become a $14 trillion behemoth today. Its $220 billion in foreign exchange reserves ballooned to a staggering $3 trillion.

But what China has lost, especially over the last decade and a half, is the bold impulse to reform that led leaders like Zhu Rongji to undertake significant changes to the state-led sector in the 1990s, as Beijing prepared for its WTO accession. Today, the prevailing view in the United States is that China is increasingly content to pursue its own standards, privilege its domestic rules, and erect rather than demolish walls for foreign competitors.

So I continue to encourage China’s leaders to pursue meaningful competitive and commercial reforms, and to do more to foster and protect innovation. The key to avoiding an economic “Iron Curtain” is for China to see its interest in making these reforms and changes. If China doesn’t move quickly, divorce is a real risk.

Considerations for Both Sides
While the current trajectory cannot be easily reversed, I offer these considerations for both sides.

For China: First, do no harm. For example, implement robust rules of engagement to prevent People’s Liberation Army Navy captains from undertaking the kind of maneuver that nearly resulted in a collision in the South China Sea last September.

Second, work constructively with America’s allies.

Third, be bold. Open your economy. Have confidence that your firms no longer need to hide behind a wall of government protection.

Fourth, be proactive in protecting proprietary foreign know-how and end policies that compel technology transfer.

Fifth, work with the United States on its top strategic priorities, especially North Korea.

As for the United States: First, dial down the rhetoric. Strategic competition is a fact. China does not pose an existential threat to American civilization. In the 243rd year of our great democratic experiment, we should have more confidence in America and the resilience of our system. We should prepare for the obvious challenges from China. But let’s not sacrifice those values that have made us the strongest, most competitive and most admired country in the world.

Second, enlist partners. And then, working in coalition with these partners, try to foster some workable understandings with Beijing. The World Trade Organization is perhaps the best example. It is in desperate need of an upgrade. So, China and the United States could be part of leading efforts to bring the WTO into the digital age.

In a similar vein, I wish President Trump would reconsider the withdrawal from the Trans-Pacific Partnership. A TPP 2.0 would offer a ready-made vehicle to shape the trade environment in which Beijing operates.

Third, negotiate with China and find frameworks to resolve issues.

If the United States and China cannot find a way to develop a workable consensus, it will pose a systemic risk of monumental proportions

New Framework Needed

If the United States and China cannot find a way to develop a workable consensus, it will pose a systemic risk of monumental proportions—not just to the global economy, but to international order as we know it, and to world peace. Both countries need an international system that functions, because international order is one of those things that is simply too big to fail. And so, the alternative is unacceptable. And that is why I am hopeful that statesmanship will prevail.

We are proceeding down divergent paths, and we are in danger of facing a long winter before we reach what may still be a rather patchy spring. But I believe a spring will come. So the questions are, how long will this winter last, and how much unnecessary dysfunction and pain will be inflicted along the way?

The answer will be determined by the capacity and willingness of leaders in Washington and Beijing to think creatively—and sometimes even disruptively. In 1972, our leaders established a framework for a world beset by Cold War and locked in ideological conflict. At various points, they’ve had to recalibrate. Today’s world looks nothing like the world of the 1970s, or of the 2000s, or even of the years when my friend [People’s Republic of China Vice President] Wang Qishan and I tackled the financial crisis in 2007 and 2008.

We’ve reached another of those consequential moments. And the stakes are higher than ever before. We must craft a new framework that works for today’s world, not the world of the past. And for that, we need statesmanship—wise and strong leadership in Washington and Beijing.
A New Experience for Both Countries

Sino-American relations may be the single most important relationship, in terms of its impact on the international situation. If China and the United States are in a cooperative relationship, it will be easier to construct an Asian and global system on the basis of common objectives and purposes.

If we are in a confrontational position, many if not most countries in Asia will have to choose sides. This will strain their domestic structure and lead to stagnation in international politics—and if it were to lead to war, it would result in the exhaustion of both sides.

At the same time, global cooperation with equals is not the national style of either country. There’s a difference in cultural perspective, in the sense that we believe our values are relevant to the entire world, and the entire world are aspirant Americas. As a result, there’s a strong missionary spirit in American foreign policy.

Chinese believe that their values are exceptional but not accessible to non-Chinese. And, therefore, the Chinese concept of world order is one in which their importance is recognized and respected by other countries.

We are both challenged to modify our historical approach. It’s a new experience for both countries.

—Henry Kissinger, in an interview with AFSA President Susan Johnson, "Four Decades after the Opening to China," Sept. 2012 FSJ.

China’s Economic Growth: Source of Disorder?

The most immediate impact of China’s rapid economic growth has been on its Asian neighbors. When Deng Xiaoping jump-started economic reforms in 1979, he not only introduced the market into China but also opened up the country to foreign trade and investment. This essentially helped to build up China as a major link in the regional supply chain—first in low-end manufactured products such as textiles, toys and shows and then, more recently, in higher-technology electronic and electrical appliance products that are primarily exported to the United States and other more developed economies.

In the 1980s, Hong Kong basically moved its manufacturing lock, stock and barrel to the mainland as its own production costs rose, thus accounting for up to 70 percent of foreign direct investment in China. In its wake, Taiwan, Singapore, South Korea and Japan also began moving more of their factories to the Chinese mainland, contributing to steadily increasing FDI.

Thus, while benefiting from increasing FDI inflows, China helped sustain Asia’s economic growth by providing a new source of relatively inexpensive land and labor for the more developed economies in the region. At the same time, as often the last link in this regional supply chain, China expanded as a market for raw material and component products from other countries around the region.

Many in the United States continue to focus simplistically on China as the chief culprit behind our increasing global trade deficit. There have been persistent calls in Congress for economic sanctions against Beijing for alleged “currency manipulation” due to its fixed exchange-rate policy. This is in sharp and ironic contrast to our pressure on it to maintain this policy in the late 1990s during the Asian financial crisis. When the rest of the region experienced dramatic currency depreciation, we looked to China to maintain currency stability. Now we blame it for our global trade deficit.

—Robert Wang, FSO economic minister-counselor in Beijing, from his article by the same title in the Focus on China in the May 2005 FSJ.

As Hong Kong’s Takeover by China Looms

The future’s so bright for Hong Kong’s business community, members may have to don shades this summer. With 24-carat gold frames, of course. That kind of unbridled confidence continues for a glowing business climate after China’s takeover, fueled by the belief that the mainland won’t tamper with what has made this city one of the world’s leading financial centers. Yet a small group of pessimists fear that, if Beijing has its way, the city may see more shadow than light.
According to the results of an annual business confidence survey by the American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong, more than 95 percent of the 663 members surveyed believe the city’s business environment will be “favorable” or “very favorable” for the next five years—the highest approval rating since the survey began in 1992.

—Dan Kabiske, a Foreign Service spouse and freelance writer, from “A City Bullish on Itself” in the March 1997 FSJ Focus on Hong Kong.

Delinking MFN Status from Human Rights: Lessons Learned

In the six-month aftermath of President Clinton’s decision not to link human rights with Most Favored Nation status for China, the two most important lessons learned were about politics: the enormous influence wielded by the U.S. business bloc in Washington and the subtle influence of U.S. companies in China in moving forward Clinton’s agenda there.

The United States wields tremendous influence in China—most notably through resident U.S. companies. Those who work here feel it every day. Americans are consulted by government ministries on the wording of laws; American businesses’ complaints receive hearings at the highest levels of government; American executives visit towns and cities in China’s hinterlands as celebrities, representatives of the all-powerful Western capital. Any third-string manager from an American company can get a meeting with a city mayor in China, and the hint that a company may be considering an investment is considered a red alert that will draw officials away from other duties to listen to whatever criticisms the foreigner might have of the local investment environment. Americans are strong partly for cultural reasons, but mostly because of their happy and well-paid look. Americans carry the promise of prosperity.


Did the U.S. Miss a Chance to Change Postwar History in Asia?

Ever since Robert Blum’s article “Peiping Cable: A Drama of 1949” appeared in the Aug. 13, 1978, New York Times and revealed the existence of a top secret message to the “highest American authorities” purportedly from Chou En-lai, there has been speculation as to its significance for Sino-American relations. Some scholars have strongly questioned its validity, while others have cited it to support the view that the United States had a genuine opportunity to reach an understanding with the Chinese Communist leadership in the late spring of 1949.

In the course of some research at the Public Record Office in London in the late spring of 1981, I came across Foreign Office documents dealing with this same message as it was received by the British government.

Both versions argued that the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) was bitterly divided between a strongly pro-Moscow radical faction under the leadership of Liu Shao-ch’i and a liberal faction under Chou En-lai’s leadership. The latter advocated early establishment of relations with the Western powers since they alone could help China out of its dire economic straits. A victory for the Chou faction would mean that the CCP would not always follow Moscow’s foreign policy lead but would exercise a moderating influence, thus reducing the danger of war.

—Edwin W. Martin, a retired FSO who served in China (1946-1949) and as director of the State Department Office of Chinese Affairs (1958-1961), from his “The Chou Démarche” in the November 1981 FSJ.

What Lies Ahead for America and China?

The convulsions in Chinese political life today baffle insight into our future relations with Peking, because they are the chaotic phenomena of a revolutionary transition.

Mao’s personal rule has already outlived its historical usefulness for China, and like all anachronisms eventually will be superseded. Yet the issue of China’s destiny can only be determined within the Chinese political structure.

Meanwhile, the United States is obliged to help frustrate Mao’s policy of militaristic expansionism, whether direct as in the case of India or indirect as in the case of Laos and Vietnam. The choice afforded the United States is between a firm containment which keeps doors open to the possibility of a fundamental change in policy by China... and a policy of progressive escalation, directed at finding a terrain on which U.S. “victory” (and Chinese humiliation) can somehow be established.

The keys to a wise choice between them are patience, prudence, and steadfastness: the patience to realize that changes in China’s attitude toward the outside world will come slowly, through modification of the entire regional environment, and not through isolated military measures; the prudence to adjust the necessary use of force to the dimensions of the particular issue at stake; and the steadfastness where necessary to sustain drawn-out, indecisive campaigns throughout the Asian periphery as the price of an eventual stabilization.

—William N. Stokes, FSO, from his article, “The Future between America and China,” in the January 1968 FSJ.
American Foreign Policy and China

One of the most vexing problems of the international scene for more than a decade and a half has been the Sino-American confrontation. It would not be an exaggeration to say that throughout this period the U.S. and the communist Chinese have been in a de facto state of war with one another.

The Chinese at this stage of their history are suffering from all manner of complexes, foremost among them a sense of inferiority. The leaders in Peking and the people themselves, whatever their differences, are both struggling with the inheritance of the years when Chinese territory was fought over, partitioned, and expropriated by foreign powers. The backwardness and impotence of their country is something the communists are determined to put an end to once and for all, whatever the cost.

Various proposals have been put forward for relaxing the official American stand on such issues as admission of Peking to the United Nations, the trade embargo and exchanges of various sorts. The United States must first recognize in its own mind the reality of China and its place in the world. Having done this, American policy can then come to grips with the issues requiring settlement. As long as the U.S. maintains its Biblical position of treating China as a prodigal son who must repent before he can return to the fold, there is no hope of any progress.

—James A. Ramsey, FSO, from his article by the same title in the October 1966 FSJ.

Shanghai: How the Iron Curtain Is Drawn Tight Around a City

When the Chinese Communists took over Shanghai they soon summoned newsmen to a “discussion forum” where the Red version of press freedom was explained: “Press and publications which serve the interest of the people will be granted freedom. Those detrimental to the interest of the people will not be granted freedom.” It was as easily stated as that.

USIS was told summarily to close, or, as the Wen Hui Pao newspaper put it: “The megaphones of the Imperialists in this city have been ordered to cease their activities.”

Soon the innumerable bookstalls of Shanghai began to be flooded with booklets and pamphlets following The Line as the published houses were taken over. One of the first such pamphlets accused Chiang Kai-shek of granting Americans “all conceivable rights” to reside where they pleased, travel where they liked, to engage in any kind of business, or to gather intelligence. Quite an impressive list. And the conclusion was: “China has thus been turned into a satellite nation of Imperialistic America, or an American colony.”

The Red drive to wipe out the scourge of imperialism soon rid the city of such street names as Wedemeyer Road. It substituted Chinese for English on such manufactured items as soap.

By such maneuvers the Communists were able within four months after their capture of Shanghai to plug every hole in the iron curtain, excepting only the Voice of America. Unlike the Russians, they did not yet have the jamming equipment to do that.

—Earl J. Wilson, Foreign Service staff officer, from his “The Line Forms to the LEFT” in the March 1950 FSJ.

Opium and Consuls

Just as it was the slave trade that made the African coast well known to the mariners of the 18th and early 19th centuries, it was the opium trade that familiarized the British and American seafaring men with the coast and commercial opportunities of China. Gradually, however, public sentiment became aroused against the opium traffic and in 1880 the United States concluded a treaty with China, by which the governments of the two countries mutually agreed to prohibit the importation of opium by Americans into China or by Chinese into the United States.

Our legislation putting this treaty into effect dates from 1887, and it is this statute which makes the smuggling of opium back and forth across the Pacific a criminal act.

Ever since this enactment, the detection of opium smugglers has been one of the best known activities of American customs and consular officers. The trade is now, as always, extremely lucrative—provided the smuggler is not caught—and, despite the fact that action taken by our authorities in China has resulted in the confiscation and destruction of large quantities of opium, clandestine traffic continues.

One of the most daring schemes for selling opium was that unearthed by Vice Consul Walter A. Adams at Changsha, China, in June 1921.

—Consul Edwin L. Neville, from his article by the same title in the August 1922 American Consular Bulletin.
The Language of Dress

In Washington’s diplomatic community, fashion and diplomacy go hand in hand.

BY MARTHA THOMAS

Toward the end of the first-ever Glamour & Diplomacy fashion show, organized by the Associates of the American Foreign Service Worldwide and held at the State Department in April, Changu Mazama Newman, wife of David John Newman, Botswana’s ambassador to the United States, took a star turn. Earlier that morning, Newman had modeled a modern take on a traditional Tswana dress with a head scarf. The vibrant olive green and red dress was accented with a Masai-style beaded neck piece and bracelet.

 Appearing in a second outfit, Newman twirled to show off a full cotton skirt, patterned in a traditional African black, green, gold and rust print. She stopped to pose, one hand on her hip, so we could take in the blousy black top, its high neck tied with a bow, sleeves long, sheer and cuffed.

The audience in the Dean Acheson Auditorium cheered. The emcee, Czech Ambassador Hynek Kmoniček, announced that the designer of the outfit, Isabel dos Santos, will soon be opening a shop in Maputo, Mozambique, and will also sell her creations online.

Diplomacy and Design

“As an ambassador’s wife, I can’t open a boutique in Washington, D.C.,” dos Santos, who is married to Carlos dos Santos, Mozambique’s ambassador to the United States, later tells me. “We aren’t allowed to work.”

Indeed, spouses of diplomats from Mozambique and many other countries are not permitted to work in Washington because their governments have not signed bilateral work agreements with the United States, meaning spouses of U.S. diplomats

Martha Thomas is a freelance journalist in Baltimore. She previously wrote for the Journal in May 2016 (“It Takes a Village”) about the aging-in-place movement.
posted to those countries are not permitted to work there, either. Spouses of U.S. and foreign diplomats can only work in countries with reciprocal work agreements.

These restrictions may explain in part why a fashion show held at 10 a.m. on a Tuesday—complete with dramatic multicolored stage lighting, a DJ and a backdrop of photos from around the world—was able to enlist a host of models, representing 21 countries, many of them married to diplomats. The weekday morning event drew an audience of more than 400, about two-thirds of them women, many dressed in evening attire.

But there’s more to the story. “We wanted it to be elegant,” says Jan du Plain, whose public relations firm, Du Plain Global Enterprises, helped organize the event. Rather than showcasing traditional fabrics and folk dress from around the world, says du Plain, “we wanted to showcase up-and-coming international designers.”

Seeing the array of couture clothing, modeled by glamorous ambassadors’ wives, says du Plain, who wore a frothy white floor-length gown to the event, means that those unfamiliar with Gaborone, Tashkent or Asunción “can see that these are very sophisticated, cosmopolitan places.”

The Origin of the Designs
At the same time, many of the designs conveyed something of their origins in the fabrics, stitchery techniques or cultural propriety. Dos Santos’ cotton print, for example, is familiar to Mozambicans as *capulana*, a piece of rectangular fabric with multiple uses. “You have to take a capulana wherever you go,” the designer explains. “You always have to cover your legs, so you would have one to tie at the waist and a second for the top. If you need to sleep somewhere, you can use it as a cover.”

Likewise, the long sleeves and modest neckline of her design conformed with local practice. “If you speak to my mother, she will tell you it is very important to cover your knees and your arms,” dos Santos says. Younger people in Mozambique are less restrained, she points out, explaining that the dress was a nod, if not to her mother, then “mostly for the mother-in-law.”

Dos Santos herself modeled another of her own creations, a long silk dress with a cream cap-sleeved bodice and a long black pencil skirt surrounded by an outer skirt that billowed behind her. The dress, she says, was inspired by the designers she loves, including Carolina Herrera and Christian Dior.

Dos Santos began dressmaking in earnest as a bored diplomat’s wife in Berlin: “I couldn’t speak the language. I was frustrated.” She groused to her aunt, a retired dressmaker in Maputo. “She told me, ‘Buy a sewing machine. Stop complaining.’ And I did, and that was it.” Dos Santos bought some fabric and a Vogue pattern, and immediately found her calling: “It was my first dress. And I could wear it.”

From Mozambican *Capulana* to Uzbek *Ikat*
Dos Santos says she was intrigued by other entrants at the Glamour & Diplomacy event, particularly Markhamat Umarova from Uzbekistan. Umarova, whose company is called Maru, turns *ikat*, a fabric that is part of her country’s history and economy, into designs suited to an international clientele.

Ikat is made by using dyed threads in the warp of a woven fabric. While it’s recognizable, and has become popular, as a geometric pattern with fuzzy outlines, the finest examples of the...
technique have shapes with clean, sharp edges. Ikat fabric can be velvet, silk or cotton—or a combination thereof.

Umarova wore an asymmetrical gold silk dress of her own design, with a front panel of red and gold velvet ikat, while the model representing Uzbekistan, Dildara Rakhmatullaeva, wore an adras (silk and cotton) A-line dress in a blue and cream ikat print. A band of silver crushed silk began as a pocket on the left hip and moved across the back to the right shoulder, forming a long-sleeved half-jacket attached on one side.

“We wanted to showcase up-and-coming international designers.”
–Jan du Plain

Umarova, who started her company in 2006, says she integrates the traditional Uzbek textiles into clothing for a global audience with a goal of, yes, diplomacy. “Fashion is a unique language,” she says. “Sometimes it works better in establishing connections between people from different countries than just words.” When she works with female ambassadors and diplomats, and the wives of diplomats, she says, “I see their interest and respect for our culture.”

According to Umarova, a former U.S. ambassador to Uzbekistan, Pamela Spratlen, has purchased Maru clothing. Umarova says that Spratlen’s interest in Uzbek culture and folk arts increased the respect the ambassador received during her time in that country. “This interest was demonstrated in having the products of Uzbek designers,” says Umarova.

Dressing for Diplomacy

The clothes you choose while posted abroad matter, points out Indira Gumarova, who is married to the Czech ambassador to the United States and helped to organize and curate the Glamour & Diplomacy show. “The language of clothes is a form of communication,” she says. Gumarova, who has worked in public relations in New York, points to the criticism First Lady Melania Trump faced for her choice of a colonial-style pith helmet on a visit to Kenya, and how Michelle Obama chose clothing by U.S. designers that acknowledged local customs when she traveled abroad.

Many people make blunders, she concedes, recalling a time she wore a pair of inexpensive shoes to meet with the first lady of the Czech Republic and Manolo Blahnik, the designer she calls “the king of shoes.” The shoes were ruined in the rain on the way to the Prague Castle, so she showed up to high tea barefoot. “Fortunately, they had a sense of humor, so we were laughing with me,” she remembers.

Gumarova says she was dismayed when she arrived in Washington and began to entertain at the Czech embassy. “If I put
on the invitation to dress up, women would show up in a black dress and pearls,” she says. And if the invitation called for smart attire, “that means a black dress with no pearls.”

The April event will be the first of many, according to Gumarova. For future events, she says, she hopes to also emphasize men’s fashion.

Gumarova founded the organization Diplomacy & Fashion LLC with a goal of understanding “how the language of fashion can be used to deliver the message of diplomacy.” In Washington, D.C., she explains, diplomats’ spouses “have book clubs and bridge clubs, but nothing around fashion.” She worked with Sheila Switzer, program chair for AAFSW, to put together the fashion show at the State Department.

Along the way, Gumarova met Isabel dos Santos and encouraged the Mozambican ambassador’s wife to pursue her dream of opening a boutique. The Glamour & Diplomacy event was dos Santos’ debut as a designer.

In Mozambique, dos Santos led an entirely different life, working for the National Demining Institute as a program officer for the organization tasked with removing land mines. “It had nothing to do with fashion,” she notes. “But when I’m posted with my husband, I’m a homemaker. Our jobs are to entertain and help our husbands.” For dos Santos, designing clothes means she can contribute to international diplomacy in her own way.

Dos Santos began dressmaking in earnest as a bored diplomat’s wife in Berlin.
AFSA Welcomes Members Ahead of Foreign Service Day

For the second year in a row, AFSA hosted a day of networking and programming during an open house on May 2, the day before Foreign Service Day.

Members were able to connect with colleagues and old friends while they waited for photographer Joaquin Sosa to take their free professional headshots. Association staff were on hand to answer questions and share information and materials about membership benefits, retirement services, The Foreign Service Journal, and outreach and advocacy. The new AFSA animated video on economic diplomacy was available for viewing and a station was set up with the FSJ archive available for searches.

Two food trucks parked outside during lunchtime: Smoking Kow BBQ and Scoops2U. AFSA provided coupons to visitors for a free ice cream from the latter.

AFSA's Director of Advocacy Kim Greenplate and AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson hosted a seminar outlining AFSA's advocacy work in Congress during the past year. Greenplate's “Congress 101” talk described the state of play in today’s divided Congress, explaining the 2018 election outcome and discussing AFSA’s work with the congressional committees of jurisdiction vis-à-vis the Foreign Service and with particular members of Congress.

Amb. Stephenson shared AFSA’s specific initiatives on the Hill, explaining how AFSA appeals to different audiences there. She touched on how AFSA frames core diplomatic capability spending, how members of Congress utilize AFSA’s data and how AFSA is working to build a domestic constituency in support of the U.S. Foreign Service.

They also debuted AFSA’s new video “Economic Diplomacy: What Diplomats Do and Why It Matters”—read more about the video on page 60.

Attendees received copies of AFSA’s Fiscal Year 2020 appropriations testimony, an advocacy vocabulary sheet and a template for writing letters to the editors of their local newspapers. Both active-duty and retired members were there, demonstrating broad interest in AFSA’s advocacy work.

The “Tips and Best Practices for Local Outreach” program was based on our March survey of AFSA Speakers Bureau members. Christine Miele, AFSA’s manager of retiree outreach and engagement, joined forces with Professional Policy Issues Director Julie Nutter to share the results of the survey, which identified three key areas for discussion: finding speaking opportunities, presentation tips and best practices, and AFSA resources.

Miele shared a list of organizations that often host speakers, and participants offered ideas for other possible speaking venues. Participants discussed common challenges and issues, such as why “preaching to the choir” is still important (our supporters are interested in what we have to say; they, too, need to understand the facts on the ground; and they can use AFSA talking points in their own outreach) and how to answer audience questions, such as “How can I help?”

One participant told of inviting someone from her local Global Ties to present alongside her and share volunteer opportunities for hosting foreign professionals taking part in the International Visitor Leadership Program.

The session also allowed participants to share creative tips for engaging audiences, such as using local handicrafts from past posts and finding ways to relate what diplomats do to the lives of the people in the audience.

AFSA General Counsel Sharon Papp and Labor Management Counselor Colleen Fallon-Lenaghan at AFSA’s Foreign Service Day reception at the U.S. Diplomacy Center.

Director of Advocacy Kim Greenplate outlines AFSA’s advocacy goals for the upcoming year.
The day concluded with a panel discussion, “Taking Up the Pen—Writing and Publishing in the Foreign Service.” See page 55 for more on this, the second in AFSA’s Next Stage series.

On May 3, following the memorial ceremony at the State Department (covered in the June FSJ), AFSA hosted its annual reception for members, held this year in the pavilion of the U.S. Diplomacy Center.

With drinks and a delicious buffet, the AFSA reception provided an opportunity for those participating in the day’s events to relax, socialize and enjoy the exhibit celebrating The Foreign Service Journal’s centennial, “Defining Diplomacy for 100 Years.”

It was wonderful to see so many AFSA members over the course of the two days. AFSA plans to make the Foreign Service Day AFSA Open House an annual event, so please save the date for next year: April 30, 2020.

AFSA’s Christine Miele offers tips for members of AFSA’s Speakers Bureau.

Member Accounts Specialist Ashley Baine greets members at the AFSA Open House May 2.

FS Day Proclamation by the city of San Antonio.

Guests mingle at the Foreign Service Day reception.

CALENDAR

July 4
Independence Day – AFSA Offices Closed

July 15
2019-2021 AFSA Governing Board Takes Office

July 17
12:30 p.m.
AFSA Governing Board Meeting

July 25
11:15 a.m.–12:45 p.m.
Luncheon: 153rd Specialist Class

July 31
12:15–1:45 p.m.
Luncheon: 199th A-100 Class

August 13
12:45–2 p.m.
Luncheon: 19th Consular Fellows Class

August 15
9 a.m.–1 p.m.
AFSA/Smithsonian Associates: “Inside the World of Diplomacy”

August 21
12:30 p.m.
AFSA Governing Board Meeting

August 30
Job Search Program Graduation Reception at FSI

August 30
Deadline: 2019 Sinclaire Language Award Nominations

September 2
Labor Day – AFSA Offices Closed

September 13
7:05 p.m.
Fourth Annual Foreign Service Night at Nationals Park
Letters to the Editor Campaign Spreads Awareness

Once again, AFSA urged its members to place letters to the editor in their hometown papers on the occasion of Foreign Service Day. Based on notifications from our members and online searches of newspapers, we found that more than 50 letters appeared in newspapers around the country this year.

The letters appeared in papers from coast to coast. The readers of the Laramie (Wyo.) Boomerang read about the U.S. Foreign Service, as did those of the Orlando Sentinel, the Petoskey (Mich.) News Review, the Santa Fe New Mexican, the Knox County (Me.) Courier-Gazette and the Red Bluff (W.Va.) Daily News—see the graphic for more.

We want to thank our many members who accepted this challenge and sent in personalized versions of AFSA’s template letter, using their own experiences and backgrounds to make the letter compelling to their friends and neighbors. Telling the story of the Foreign Service so that it resonates in one’s own community enables us to educate our fellow Americans about the importance of diplomacy and a strong, professional career Foreign Service.

New Resources for AFSA Outreach

AFSA has recently updated and expanded its online outreach resources for Speakers Bureau members (www.afsa.org/outreach-resources-speakers), providing a one-stop destination for resources and information to members who are active in telling the story of the Foreign Service.

With this update, AFSA talking points and resources are now easier to find. For example, the page includes links to the AFSA president’s monthly column in The Foreign Service Journal, AFSA’s latest congressional testimony, talking points and the ever-popular ambassador tracker and list of senior official appointments.

Also included are links to the content AFSA has developed on economic diplomacy, including an original three-minute video on what diplomats do and why it matters, as well as articles from the January-February 2019 double issue of the FSJ featuring “tales from the field,” examples of successful economic diplomacy. Information on Inside a U.S. Embassy and The Foreign Service Journal’s digital archive are also readily available.

The page contains resources for creating local outreach opportunities, including a list of organizations interested in speakers and tips and best practices from members of the AFSA Speakers Bureau.

The “State and USAID Resources” section includes fact sheets from both agencies, as well as the always-useful “State by State” map, which outlines how the work of the State Department benefits the American people in each state.

Finally, find links to resources produced by AFSA’s strategic partners, such as the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition and the American Academy of Diplomacy.

We encourage members who are active and/or interested in outreach efforts on behalf of the Foreign Service to visit the updated Outreach Resources page.
Next Stage: FS Writers and Publishers Offer Advice

As part of its pre–Foreign Service Day activities, AFSA welcomed members to the second event in its new Next Stage series, which highlights post–Foreign Service career options and activities. AFSA Retirement Benefits Counselor Dolores Brown moderated “Taking Up the Pen: Writing and Publishing in the Foreign Service,” a panel on how best to pursue writing in tandem with life in or after the Foreign Service. AFSA invited four successful FS writers, editors and publishers to speak at this standing-room-only event.


He recounted colorful and not-so-positive examples of the FS in film and books— including the infamous 1976 film “The Omen,” in which the son of the U.S. ambassador to London is actually the devil. Palmer has made it his goal, however, to create positive and realistic FS characters in his work. If you are a fiction writer, Palmer said, it’s a must to have an agent to shop your work around.

Maggery Thompson, the publishing director at the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, advises diplomats and others on editing and publishing matters. She works primarily with university presses, which tend to be the most likely takers for most foreign affairs manuscripts. Thompson underscored the need for every writer to work with a skilled editor.

Ambassador (ret.) Charles Ray, who has published more than 100 works of fiction and nonfiction ranging from Westerns to ethical dilemmas in the practice of diplomacy, emphasized the discipline behind writing and the need to put words on paper—in his case, at least 2,000 per day. Amb. Ray provided concrete information about how to successfully self-publish—and actually make money. According to the self-described “pulp fiction” writer, in the end you should write because you love to write.

Donna Gorman, the associate editor of _The Foreign Service Journal_, has written articles for _Time_, _The Washington Post, Huffington Post_, and many other outlets. She emphasized the need to mine your FS experiences when you write, turning small moments into fleshed-out stories with a beginning and an end. She discussed the pitfalls of writing for free to build up your portfolio, and explained how to get your foot in the door at nationally known publications.

The entire program can be viewed at www.afsa.org/video.

### CORRECTION

In the June issue (p. 49), Sinclaire Language Award recipient Fredric Nicholas (Nick) Stokes’ first name was inadvertently misspelled. We regret the error.
Like a Rock

When I started in this position two years ago, I titled my inaugural column “Like a Bridge.” Back then we had a Secretary of State who halted hiring into the Foreign Service, slashed promotions within the Foreign Service, reduced the number of Foreign Service officers and specialists, and forced large numbers of our most experienced diplomats into early retirement.

In that column, I made the point that AFSA was here to help us through troubled times, and I believe it has. AFSA President Barbara Stephenson and her team convinced friends and allies on the Hill to stand up and defend the Foreign Service, and for the first time in my memory, journalists across the country were promoting the need for U.S. diplomacy.

When the dust settled, hiring began again in earnest, and efforts to undermine the Foreign Service were abandoned. Things are still far from perfect, on many levels, but I believe that those direct attacks are behind us. And for that I say, “Amen!”

In the two years since I wrote that first column, I’ve learned a great deal more about this organization, and my respect for it remains unshakable. I no longer view AFSA as simply a bridge. It’s a rock. It’s your rock. It’s the place you can go to be heard, by people who care, and by people who are ready—whenever possible—to go to the mat on your behalf.

AFSA works tirelessly to make the Department of State a better place to work, and we do so because we understand the Foreign Service is not just our job—it’s our life. Being a member of the Foreign Service affects our spouses, families back home, kids, friendships, even our pets. And AFSA makes sure that the department understands the complexities of our work and our lives. We work with State to develop collaborative solutions to our day-to-day challenges, to make State a better place to live and work.

We advocate for members when they’ve been wronged, and we ensure due process for those who find themselves in hot water. We work with affinity groups and employee organizations alike to reinforce and promote our shared goals. Over the past two years I’ve worked particularly closely with Balancing Act, Working in Tandem, GLIFAA and Foreign Service Families with Disabilities Alliance (FSFDA) to push the department to do more to allow us to keep our families together while we serve abroad.

We helped convince the department to allow women on obstetric medevac to telework. We fought for increased DETO (Domestic Employees Teleworking Abroad) positions, so important for tandem couples, as well as providing fobs for those on leave without pay so folks can bid for an onward assignment while on leave.

Thanks in part to our advocacy, the costs associated with obtaining visa renewals (including travel, per diem and fees) for spouses who do not receive residency visas while posted overseas with their Foreign Service family would be reimbursed by the department (an important win, especially for same-sex spouses in host countries that refuse to offer privileges and immunities, or even residency visas).

And our partnership with FSFDA is finally, after months of vigorous advocacy, yielding positive results for Foreign Service families with children who have special educational needs, with streamlined bidding and enhanced clarity in allowances.

Beyond that, we do things that help our Foreign Service profession thrive. We’ve worked with the Office of Performance Evaluations to enhance language in the Promotion Precepts to combat toxic workplace behavior and bullying, ensuring that our next generation of leaders rejects the “kiss up, kick down” model of the past.

During the 2017 hiring freeze debacle, we worked tirelessly to tell your story, ensuring that political decision-makers understood the difficulties those cuts were causing to our diplomatic missions worldwide. And during the 2018-19 government shutdown, AFSA remained open and available to assist our members, getting answers from the department and passing along your concerns.

AFSA is, indeed, the rock you can rely on.

Two years ago, I pledged to honor the trust you placed in me by representing and encouraging our members through the challenges we’ve faced. I’ve heard your stories, and I’ve shared your concerns. I’ve sung your praises, and I’ve defended your work. These are still challenging times—there’s no doubt about that—but we crossed that bridge together, and we’re better for it. Thank you for the opportunity to work for you and, with my AFSA Labor Management colleagues, to make our Foreign Service world a better place to be.

And remember: Be kind to one another and, most importantly, take care of yourself. America needs you.
A Small Player Generates Big Returns

After two years as AFSA’s FCS vice president, I have a few parting observations. We are part of a much larger Foreign Service community, but at the same time, we’re housed within Commerce, an agency that is more focused on domestic priorities like the Census, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Patent and Trademark Office. This creates a challenge that we need to meet: ensuring that our Secretary of Commerce, the administration and Congress all understand and support how we advance America’s economic security.

The Foreign Commercial Service does not formulate policy. Instead, we salute and execute the administration’s priorities. In 76 countries overseas, and with 106 offices throughout the United States, we are the first stop for any U.S. company that needs help overseas.

We are an integral part of challenging unfair trade and investment practices overseas, which are increasingly being deployed for geopolitical purposes by such countries as China. And our results are impressive.

Using only $320 million in appropriations in Fiscal Year 2018, we assisted 33,000 U.S. companies overseas, generating more than $100 billion in export benefits and another $20 billion in inward investment, and supporting more than 570,000 jobs in the United States. We generated $392 of economic benefit for every $1 given to us by Congress.

Our work supports jobs in every congressional district. When we help a company overcome a barrier and win business in a challenging market, that company retains or grows jobs back at home. We know when we’re successful because the companies we work with tell us. We document it. And that’s where the numbers come from.

Being a small player within a $10 billion agency makes it difficult at times to ensure that the administration and Congress are aware of what we do for American businesses overseas. But I remain optimistic that our political leadership will see the value in what we do and, ultimately, fund us accordingly.

Challenges Facing AFSA

A new AFSA Governing Board takes office on July 15. Here is my advice to them based on my eight years’ service on four governing boards since 1999.

Future of the Foreign Service: The last two years have witnessed the dramatic acceleration of the long-term trend of a diminution of the Service’s role as the main instrument for conducting U.S. foreign policy. For example, a historically low number of Foreign Service members are currently serving as assistant secretaries of State or U.S. ambassadors.

The time is approaching for AFSA, in cooperation with other concerned organizations, to think deeply about the future of the Foreign Service, focusing on organization, professional education and areas of expertise.

Black Swan Event: The Trump administration’s unprecedented attacks on federal employees and their unions have so far been blunted by Congress or the courts. But AFSA may someday face an existential threat to the career Service or to AFSA itself.

Prudent governing boards over the past 15 years have amassed reserves exceeding $3 million. If needed, AFSA must draw on those funds to wage a legal battle to protect career diplomacy.

Centennial: The incoming governing board should begin planning to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the 1924 founding of the Foreign Service and AFSA. With only eight open spaces left on the AFSA Memorial Plaques, the first task is to create space for our fallen colleagues to be honored in the coming decades.

A key objective of the centennial celebration must be to educate the American public about the U.S. Foreign Service. AFSA should think creatively about how to achieve that goal.

Member Services: As always, AFSA must focus on providing valuable services and programs to members. Since most of that work is done by AFSA’s professional staff, the incoming governing board should maintain the necessary working conditions and benefits to retain them.
AFSA Welcomes Newest Foreign Service Members

On May 16, AFSA welcomed 57 members of the 152nd Specialist Class to its headquarters in Washington, D.C.

The class consists of 25 women and 32 men who are joining the Foreign Service as construction engineers, security engineering officers, medical providers, couriers, information management specialists and more.

Between them they speak 20 languages. They have some fascinating backgrounds: one member is a certified skydiver; another runs ultramarathons; still another rode a bicycle from California to Minnesota, raising $117,000 along the way to feed hungry children.

Table hosts included Ambassador (ret.) Bob Beecroft, Mette Beecroft, Ambassador Piper Campbell and former Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security Greg Starr. More than 90 percent of the class chose to join AFSA.

The following week, AFSA again opened its doors to welcome members of the 198th A-100 Class.

The 28 women and 47 men of the class speak two dozen languages. Nearly 50 percent of them have prior U.S. government experience, and approximately one-third have prior experience at the State Department. Almost all of them have postgraduate degrees.

Table hosts included AFSA Governing Board members Roy Perrin, Deborah Mennuti, Ken Kero-Mentz and Jeff Levine.

Welcome to the Foreign Service!

Retirees Tour Muse Vineyards

Two dozen Foreign Service retirees visited the Muse Vineyards in the Shenandoah Valley on April 26.

The vineyards are owned by Ambassador (ret.) Sally Grooms Cowal and her husband, Robert Muse.

Amb. Cowal (pictured on left) led a tour, explaining the grape-growing and wine-making processes. Participants sampled the vineyards’ award-winning wines and enjoyed lunch and conversation.

The event was a joint outing of the Foreign Affairs Retirees of Northern Virginia and the Foreign Affairs Retirees of Maryland and Washington.
**FSJ Wins for Publishing Excellence**

At the Association TRENDS 40th annual “Salute to Association Excellence,” *The Foreign Service Journal* received an award for publishing excellence.

The FSJ earned a Bronze in the commemoration/tribute category for the July-August 2018 issue commemorating the 1998 East Africa embassy bombings. The award reads: “Association TRENDS recognizes this organization for the high quality and creativity evident in the preparation and production of this product. We congratulate the organization’s staff and members for their work.”

The event is attended by more than 500 association professionals each year to honor stars within the association community.


In all, 224 people were killed, and thousands more were injured in the attack carried out by the al-Qaida network. As the 20th anniversary of the attacks loomed, the FSJ put out a call to the survivors—both American and locally employed staff—to share their experiences.

What followed was a powerful and moving collection of 41 stories of that fateful day and the aftermath. Contributors shared intimate, moment-to-moment details of the chaos that erupted after the bombings, how the experience changed them, and how in the face of overwhelming shock and loss they still found the strength to go on.

---

**AFSA Governing Board Meeting, May 23, 2019**

**Management Committee:** It was moved and seconded that item number six in the AFSA Standard Operating Procedures on Budget Preparation and Approval be changed to, “reviewed by the Management Committee and presented to the full Governing Board.” The motion was adopted.

It was moved and seconded that item number five have the following sentence added: “Governing Board members shall receive the proposed budget at least 10 days in advance of voting” after the words “Management Committee.” The motion was adopted.

It was moved and seconded that the Governing Board adopt the “Standard Operating Procedures on AFSA Budget Preparation and Approval as stated on the handout with “executive” being replaced with “management” in all three instances when it is mentioned as amended. The SOP was adopted.

**FSJ Editorial Board Committee:** The memo from the FSJ Editorial Board Committee proposing eight new Editorial Board members and 4 backup members to replace eight departing members was approved.

**Awards and Plaques Committee:** On behalf of the Awards and Plaques Committee, it was moved that the Governing Board revise the criteria for the Nelson B. Delavan award to “recognizes the work of a Foreign Service office management specialist who shows exceptional performance, innovation, leadership and/or team building in carrying out the duties of the profession. Their skills play a pivotal role in strengthening the team at post.” The motion was adopted.
AFSA Rolls Out Economic Diplomacy Animated Video

As part of our ongoing Economic Diplomacy Works initiative, intended to connect the work of the U.S. Foreign Service with the economic concerns of Americans at home, AFSA recently released a promotional video, “Economic Diplomacy: What Diplomats Do and Why It Matters.”

The short original animation, which premiered May 2 during pre–Foreign Service Day activities at AFSA, is now posted on the AFSA website and accessible on our YouTube channel, AFSAtube. The Una Chapman Cox Foundation provided funding for the video, which AFSA produced in collaboration with Next Day Animations.

When most Americans think of our country’s global leadership role, they focus on military power. This video invites them to consider the wider presence of the U.S. Foreign Service in 277 embassies and consulates. With 95 percent of potential markets for American goods and services located outside our borders, the work U.S. diplomats do to help American businesses succeed overseas promotes prosperity back home.

By encapsulating aspects of Foreign Service work overseas, the video aims to increase general awareness of U.S. diplomacy. It emphasizes American public support for strong U.S. global leadership, noting that diplomats are valued by U.S. businesses for their work to promote prosperity and by military leaders as partners in protecting security.

AFSA invites you to show the video during engagements with local audiences. It could help launch a discussion of Foreign Service economic work with local business groups, or serve as a scene-setter for a speaker’s personal narrative with student groups.

AFSA has developed a set of Frequently Asked Questions and other materials—available at www.afsa.org/outreach-resources-speakers—to help speakers incorporate this video into their presentations.
Meet the 2019 AFSA Merit Award Winners

Founded in 1926, the AFSA scholarship program awarded $352,000 this year. In need-based Financial Aid Scholarships, $223,000 was divided among 64 students. In Merit Awards, 41 awards totaled $129,000.

Below are the 2019 AFSA Merit Award winners, honored at the annual Youth Awards Ceremony on June 26 in the Marshall Center at Main State. Winners received $3,500, Honorable Mentions $2,000, and the Best Essay $1,000. AFSA thanks all of the judges and donors who made this year’s Merit Awards possible.

Academic Merit

Joseph Banks – son of Jared (State) and Laura Banks, graduated from home school, Ashburn, Virginia. Plans to attend the University of Virginia to study computer science and math.

Elena Bauermeister – daughter of Melania Arreaga (State) and Vince Bauermeister, graduated from the International School of Estonia. Plans to attend Northwestern University to study history.

Jude Bedessem – son of Joseph (State) and Ecklas Bedessem, graduated from Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Technology, Alexandria, Virginia. Plans to attend the College of William and Mary to study physics and mathematics.

Zoe Elizabeth Benson – daughter of Carlton (State) and Elzieta Benson, graduated from Catalina Foothills High School in Tuscon, Arizona. Plans to attend the University of Arizona Honors College to study English and ecology & evolutionary biology.

Quentin Bishop – son of Melissa (State) and Geoffrey (State) Bishop, graduated from Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Technology, Alexandria, Virginia. Plans to attend the University of Virginia to study computer science.

Alyssa Burkhalter – daughter of Edward (State) and Susan Burkhalter, graduated from West Springfield High School, Springfield, Virginia. Plans to attend Vanderbilt University to study musical performance.

Victoria Chen – daughter of Ligang Chen (State) and Heather Smith, graduated from the American Community School Abu Dhabi, UAE. Plans to attend University of California Berkeley to study pre-med.

Aimee Dastin-van Rijn – daughter of Michele Dastin-van Rijn (State) and Paul van Rijn, graduated from St. John’s International School, Belgium. Plans to attend the University of Maryland to study economics, public policy and theater.

Jasper Duval – son of Thomas (State) and Carole Duval, graduated from Cambridge Rindge and Latin School, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Plans to attend Northeastern University to study biology.
Logan Freeman – son of Jeremy (State) and Cheryl (State) Freeman, graduated from the International School of Ouagadougou. Plans to attend Utah State University to study mechanical engineering.

Luca Dean Emerson Giles – son of Jessica Copeland (State) and Daron Giles, graduated from Canyon Crest Academy, San Diego, California. Plans to attend University of California Berkeley to study psychology.

James Declan Golsen – son of James P. Golsen (FCS) and Erin Golsen, graduated from Fairfax High School, Fairfax, Virginia. Plans to attend Wake Forest University to study international relations and politics.

Eleanor Holtzapple – daughter of Rick (State) and Eleanor Holtzapple, graduated from Washington-Lee High School, Arlington, Virginia. Plans to attend New York University in Abu Dhabi and is currently undecided on her major.

Dan Vinh Huynh – son of Hoa Huynh (FAS) and Mai Nguyen, graduated from St. Albans School, Washington, D.C. Plans to attend Yale University to study mechanical engineering.

Sophie Johnson – daughter of Brent (State) and Julie Johnson, graduated from the American Community School in Amman, Jordan. Plans to attend Duke University to pursue a liberal arts degree.

Sophie Aïssa Kane – daughter of Kristin (State) and Hamed (State) Kane, graduated from the American School of Brasilia, Brazil. Plans to attend Yale University to study political science.
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Anton Katula – son of Michael Katula (State) and Agnieszka Gmys-Wiktor, graduated from Wakefield High School, Arlington, Virginia. Plans to attend the University of Virginia and is currently undecided on his major.

Veronica Lang – daughter of Stephen (State) and Karin (State) Lang, graduated from McLean High School, McLean, Virginia. Plans to attend Smith College to study mathematics.

Andrew Letvin – son of John (State) and Gretchen Letvin, graduated from Lake Braddock Secondary School, Burke, Virginia. Plans to attend the University of California Los Angeles to study computer science.

Elizabeth Liston – daughter of Stephen (State) and Susan Liston, graduated from Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, Bethesda, Maryland. Plans to attend the University of California Berkeley to study political science.

Nicholas Loh – son of Sunny Kim (State) and Paul Loh, graduated from St. Andrew’s School, Middletown, Delaware. Plans to attend the University of Pennsylvania to study medical anthropology and global health. Nicholas is also the winner of an Art Merit Honorable Mention Scholarship.

MariElena Ramnath – daughter of Stephanie Syptak-Ramnath (State) and Gautam Ramnath, graduated from OASIS International School of Ankara, Turkey. Plans to attend Liberty University to study electrical engineering.

Nicola Nordstrom – son of Eric (State) and Melissa Nordstrom, graduated from Oasis International School of Ankara, Turkey. Plans to attend Liberty University to study electrical engineering.
Bram Sterling – son of Adam Sterling (State) and Veerle Coignez, graduated from the British School in the Netherlands. Plans to attend Columbia University and is undecided on his major.

Harlan Stevens – son of William Stevens Jr. (State) and Melica Stevens, graduated from James Madison High School, Vienna, Virginia. Plans to attend Brigham Young University to study engineering.

Jackson Hans Stoner – son of Jeffrey (State) and Katherine Stoner, graduated from the International School of Prague, Poland. Plans to attend the University of Virginia to study engineering.

Thomas Maxwell Basilio Turi – son of Katherine Monahan (State) and Joseph Turi, graduated from Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, Bethesda, Maryland. Plans to attend Southern Methodist University to study business.

Tessa Webster – daughter of Jon (State) and Patty Webster, graduated from Washington-Lee High School, Arlington, Virginia. Plans to attend the University of Virginia to study neuroscience.

Lilian Weisert – daughter of Drake (State) and Tamar Weisert, graduated from the Anglo-American School of Sofia, Bulgaria. Plans to attend the College of William and Mary to study education.

Jacob Wilson – son of Philip (State) and Maritza Wilson, graduated from Nicaragua Christian Academy International. Plans to attend Milligan College to study musical theatre.
Art Merit Scholarship Winner

Hazel Kevlihan – daughter of Laurel Fain (USAID) and Robert Kevlihan, graduated from the International School of Tanganyika, Tanzania. Plans to attend Wellesley College to study mathematics.

Art Merit Honorable Mention

Nicholas Loh – see biography under academic merit.

MariElena Ramnath – see biography under academic merit.

Anya Beatrice Stern – daughter of A. Michael (USAID) and Anchalee Stern, graduated from the International School of Creative Arts, U.K. Plans to attend the University of London to study fine arts.

Community Service Scholarship Winner

Monique Charlifue – daughter of James Charlifue (USAID) and Josephina Cervantes (USAID), graduated from Frankfurt International School, Germany. Plans to attend Leiden University College to study international studies.

Community Service Honorable Mention


Kiefer Coolidge Johnson – son of Mark (State) and Susan Johnson, graduated from the Academia Britanica Cuscatleca, El Salvador. Plans to attend the Pratt Institute to study architecture.

Tara Nally – daughter of Thomas (State) and Cora Nally, graduated from International School of Kenya. Plans to attend the University of Kenya to study physics.

Aldin Arthur Shaw – son of Gregory (State) and Layla Shaw, graduated from NIST International School, Thailand. Plans to attend the University of British Columbia to study international economics.

Best Essay

MariElena Ramnath – see biography under academic merit.
**Eugene “Gene” Aloysius Byrne, 96,** a retired Foreign Service officer with USAID, passed away peacefully surrounded by family on Jan. 6, at Freedom Plaza West in Sun City Center, Fla.

Mr. Byrne was born and raised in New York City. During World War II, he served in Europe as an artillery forward observer. After the war, he joined the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and remained in Salzburg, Austria, working with the displaced persons program.

When he returned to the United States, Mr. Byrne attended the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, graduating in 1951. He was recalled to military service during the Korean War and assigned to the National Security Agency in Washington, D.C. He remained with NSA until 1962, when he joined the U.S. Foreign Service.

As a Foreign Service officer, he served in Tripoli from 1962 to 1964; Kathmandu from 1964 to 1967; and New Delhi from 1967 to 1973.

Following his overseas assignments, Mr. Byrne worked in Washington, D.C., as assistant, deputy and acting director of the Office of International Training. He retired in 1976.

Mr. Byrne enjoyed travel, work in various cultures, the soaring song of a world-class tenor, fried shrimp, Baby Ruth candy bars and a good glass of scotch, which he unfailingly raised to toast love, life, friends and his cherished family.

Mr. Byrne was predeceased by parents John and Ellen, wife Ethel Marion Byrne, and brothers Joseph and John.

He is survived by his second wife, Nancy Filstrup Clark Byrne of Sun City Center, Fla; his son, Bryan Byrne of Oak Ridge, Tenn.; and a granddaughter, Summer Byrne, of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Byrne will be interred at Arlington National Cemetery.

**Dale Warren Dover, 69,** a former Foreign Service officer, died on Jan. 14 in Alexandria, Va.

Mr. Dover attended Harvard University, where he played basketball and led the team to a top 10 national ranking. He then became a player and coach for the Portuguese National basketball team, which led him to a career in international relations. He joined the Foreign Service in 1974.

Mr. Dover served as vice consul in Denmark and consul in Tel Aviv, Israel, before returning to Harvard, where he earned a doctorate in jurisprudence and became a corporate lawyer in 1984.

In 1990 Mr. Dover was elected the first African American mayor of Falls Church, Va., and opened his own law practice in Alexandria, advocating mainly for children.

Dover is survived by two children, Lauren and Noah; four brothers; and five grandchildren.

**Lisa Kay Harshbarger, 59,** a retired Foreign Service specialist, passed away on March 24 at the Treasure Coast Hospice Center in Stuart, Fla., following a long battle with early onset Alzheimer’s disease.

Ms. Harshbarger was a graduate of Manchester College and received a master’s degree in applied linguistics and a Ph.D. in linguistics from Indiana University. She began her first job as a teaching assistant in Indiana University’s Intensive English Language Program in 1982.

In 1985 she taught writing and speaking skills to students at the University of Shah Alam in Kuala Lumpur as part of a Midwestern University Consortium for International Exchange that prepared students for undergraduate studies at U.S. universities.

This first overseas job led her to accept two Fulbright junior lecturer positions in Yugoslavia: she taught speaking skills at the University of Mostar from 1987 to 1989, followed by an assignment at the University of Novi Sad from 1989 to 1990.

In 1991 she took on an English Language Fellow assignment with the U.S. Information Agency in Belgrade, Serbia. She moved to Ljubljana in 1992 to continue her ELF work.

When the ELF program in Ljubljana closed in 1996, she became a Department of Defense contractor for the School of Foreign Languages at the Slovenian Military Education Center, coordinating the development of standardized agreement (STANAG)-based reading, listening and writing tests, as well as English courses for NATO officers, civilians and members of peacekeeping units.


Highly decorated throughout her Foreign Service career, she was responsible for the design and implementation of English teacher training programs. At each post, she worked with local educational institutions to improve the teaching of English as a foreign language in the public and private sectors.

She organized and participated in conferences and workshops, conducted needs analyses, advised teachers’ associ-
lations, and consulted with host country officials on the implementation of these programs. Always working in a regional role, she covered five countries from Uzbekistan, six from Ukraine, 17 from Hungary, and four from the Philippines.

After she retired from the Foreign Service in 2013, her hobbies and interests included reading, keeping track of current events, spending time with her family and traveling around the world.

Lisa Harshbarger is survived by her husband, Jasimir Kalajdzic; her son, Haris Kalajdzic; her parents, Richard and Jane Harshbarger; and a brother, Jon Harshbarger.

Condolences and flowers may be sent to Jasimir and Haris by contacting them at jakalaj2002@yahoo.com (Jasmir) and haris.kalajdzic@gmail.com (Haris).

Joelle Holm, 91, a Foreign Service spouse, died on March 27 in Portland, Ore. She was predeceased by her husband of 55 years, FSO William “Bill” Helmer Holm, in 2004.

Joelle Marie Madeleine Lemarchand was born in 1927 in Marseille, France. She lived through the German occupation of France during World War II and survived the destruction of her family home in a bombing raid. After obtaining her baccalaureate in Aix-en-Provence, she moved to Stockholm, Sweden, where she met her future husband, Bill Holm.

Mr. Holm’s work as a consular officer took the couple to France, Greece, Ethiopia, Mexico, Somalia, Wales, Norway, Libya and Tunisia. Their four children were born in four different world capitals: Paris, Athens, Addis Ababa and Mogadishu.

With her resourcefulness and decorative acumen, Mrs. Holm established lovely homes for her family at each post. Family members say that her charm, elegance, wit and facility with languages all helped her husband’s Foreign Service career.

In 1980 the couple retired to Sharon, Conn., where Mrs. Holm blossomed as an entrepreneur and enjoyed working at the former Salisbury Antiques Center.

Mrs. Holm is survived by daughter Ingrid (and husband David Rabin) of Portland, Ore.; daughter Melinda of New York City; son William (and wife Anne) of New York City; daughter Stephanie (and partner Kit Ward) of London, England; seven grandchildren; goddaughter Isabelle Juhasz and niece Joelle Descovich of Paris, France; cousins Maryvonne Strauseisen and Monique Charpentier; and many other cousins, nieces and nephews.

Donations in Joelle’s memory may be made to your local hospice care team.


Mr. Lukens was born in Philadelphia and attended Episcopal Academy. He interrupted his university studies at Princeton University to serve with the 10th Mountain Division and the 20th Armored Division in Europe, where his unit liberated the concentration camp at Dachau.

Mr. Lukens graduated with honors from Princeton as part of the class of 1946, finishing in 1948, and he remained active in alumni affairs his entire life, including serving as class secretary and president.

Mr. Lukens joined the Foreign Service in 1951 and served for 36 years. After postings in Istanbul, Ankara, Martinique and Paris, in 1960 he represented the United States at independence ceremonies for Chad, Central African Republic, Gabon and Congo.

Mr. Lukens also opened the U.S. embassy in Brazzaville that year. He returned there as U.S. ambassador from 1984 to 1987. In the intervening years he served in Bangui, Paris and Rabat; as deputy chief of mission in Dakar, Nairobi and Copenhagen; and as consul general in Cape Town.

In Washington, D.C., he ran the Junior Officer Division in the Bureau of Personnel and worked on Western European affairs.

Ambassador Lukens was co-chairman of the Peace Commission of the National Cathedral from 1997 to 2002.

He served as president of DACOR and belonged to the Washington Institute of Foreign Affairs, the American Foreign Service Association, the Explorers Club and the Woodrow Wilson House Council.

He was a member of the Board of Governors of the Chevy Chase Club and president of the American Friends of Turkey.

Amb. Lukens is survived by his wife of 56 years, Susan Atkinson Lukens; his four children, Lewis (and Andrea) Lukens, Francie (and Jeff) Bennett, Susie Lukens and Timothy (and Jenny) Lukens; and 10 grandchildren.

Duncan Hager MacInnes, 71, a retired member of the Senior Foreign Service, passed away on April 22 in Sarasota, Fla.

Mr. MacInnes was born in Abington, Penn., on Dec. 15, 1947, to David and Kathleen (nee O’Neill) MacInnes.

In 1969 Mr. MacInnes received a bachelor’s degree in liberal arts from Clark University in Worcester, Mass. After graduation, he married Donna Ives, who would later pursue a career in international educational exchange, including the Fulbright program.
Richard Lugar, Diplomacy’s Champion

An Appreciation

Richard Lugar, 87, a six-term Republican senator from Indiana, died on April 28 in Falls Church, Va., of complications from chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy.

Born on April 4, 1932, in Indianapolis, Ind., he was the oldest of three children. An Eagle Scout, the highest rank in the Boy Scouts, Mr. graduated first in his class at Shortridge High School in Indianapolis and then at Denison University in Granville, Ohio. In 1954 he went on to Pembroke College, Oxford University, as a Rhodes Scholar, where he received an honors degree in politics, philosophy and economics.

Mr. Lugar volunteered for the U.S. Navy in 1956 and served as a naval officer from 1957 until 1960, ultimately assigned as the intelligence briefer for Admiral Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations. Returning home to run the family business with his brother, he would soon pursue life as a public servant and statesman.

Elected to the Indianapolis school board in 1963, he became mayor of Indianapolis in 1967. After two terms in office, however, his career shifted from local government to the national stage when he was elected to the U.S. Congress in 1976.

During 37 years in public service, Senator Lugar became one of his party’s most thoughtful and active leaders in the realm of foreign policy and national security. He twice chaired the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—from 1985 to 1987 and from 2003 to 2007—and was the SFRC’s ranking Republican from 2007 until 2013.

Senator Lugar’s most notable initiative came in 1991 when he teamed with Senator Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) on the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. Adopted with strong bipartisan support, the program safeguarded and dismantled weapons of mass destruction in the former Soviet Union and fostered a broad range of nonproliferation activities.

Also a prominent advocate for democracy, Senator Lugar led the effort to fight tyranny in South Africa by securing passage of the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, earning the praise of Nelson Mandela.

For his enormous contributions to American foreign policy and his consistent support for both the practice and practitioners of diplomacy, AFSA conferred its highest honor, the Lifetime Contributions to American Diplomacy Award, on Senator Lugar in 2005.

“Public diplomacy, private diplomacy and good Foreign Service work make the big difference for the United States and the world every day,” Senator Lugar told the Foreign Service Journal (June 2005) in a wide-ranging interview in connection with the award.

“Our country depends on the Foreign Service to temper a world that is often uncertain and dangerous. We take for granted that Foreign Service officers will venture into hostile circumstances to advance U.S. interests, often with far less protection than corresponding military units,” he said on receiving the award.

“Many Foreign Service officers have given their lives in service to their country,” Lugar continued. “Innumerable others have made the deep personal sacrifices of being away from their families, of risking their health in difficult posts, and of forgoing more lucrative financial opportunities in other fields. Rarely are these sacrifices celebrated or even understood by casual observers.”

AFSA honored Senator Lugar again, in November 2012, as he completed his Senate career. At a luncheon at AFSA headquarters, the association’s Governing Board presented him with a plaque in appreciation for his steadfast support of the Foreign Service and for bipartisanship in U.S. foreign policy.

On leaving Congress in 2013, he established The Lugar Center, a nonprofit public policy institute in Washington, D.C. The center’s work to carry on his legacy is focused in four areas: global food security, WMD nonproliferation, foreign aid effectiveness and bipartisan governance.

Senator Lugar received numerous awards and accolades for his extensive public service, among them the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2013 and the J. William Fulbright Prize for International Understanding in 2016.

Senator Lugar was a true friend to the U.S. Foreign Service, and he will be missed. He set an example by working across the aisle for the good of the nation. Few others have done so much for the United States in the realm of foreign policy and national security.
Mr. MacInnes worked as a photographer at the Yale University Art Gallery in Connecticut and the Museum of International Folk Art in New Mexico prior to pursuing a master’s degree in Middle Eastern studies at the University of Arizona’s Department of Oriental Studies in 1973.

He was awarded a grant to study Arabic for a year at the Center for Arabic Study Abroad at the American University in Cairo, Egypt.

Mr. MacInnes joined the U.S. Information Agency in 1984 through the mid-level recruitment program for speakers of Arabic. He was assigned to Doha, for his first overseas assignment as a public affairs officer.

He went on to serve in Yemen (where his son, Robert, was born), Sri Lanka, Israel and Australia as a cultural affairs officer. He also served as a desk officer for the Near Eastern Affairs Office at USIA.

As senior adviser and director of public diplomacy in the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, Mr. MacInnes supervised the State Department’s public diplomacy activities prior to and during the Iraq War. This was followed by a stint as director of the Foreign Press Centers in the Middle East.

In 2007 the Office of the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy asked Mr. MacInnes to create and head a new interagency public diplomacy initiative to counter the ideology and messaging of overseas terrorist organizations.

In his final assignment at the State Department, Mr. MacInnes served as the principal deputy assistant secretary in the Bureau of International Information Programs from 2008 to 2011.

Mr. MacInnes received the Edward R. Murrow Award for Excellence in Public Diplomacy in 2004 for his public affairs work during the Iraq War. In 2010 he was awarded the President’s Senior Distinguished Foreign Service Award.

During Mr. MacInnes’ 27-year career in the Foreign Service, he witnessed key events in the Middle East and South Asia, including the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990, negotiations for the Oslo Accords in Jerusalem, and the civil war in Sri Lanka.

The son of a naval officer, Mr. MacInnes had a lifelong interest in naval history and small boat building. He was an active whitewater kayaker and paddle boarder.

A trained photographer, he used his love of travel and nature to compile a body of work that produced three one-man shows. His latest work was a study of the landscape in Death Valley at Zabriskie Point.

Mr. MacInnes is survived by his spouse, Donna; his son, Robert; and his beloved dog, Kai, all of whom reside in Annapolis, Md.; and five siblings: David, Donald, Brian, Kathleen and Ian.

Gordon Wallace Murchie, 86, a retired Foreign Service officer with the U.S. Information Agency and the U.S. Agency for International Development, died on March 16.

Mr. Murchie was born on Oct. 2, 1932, in San Diego, Calif. During a 35-year diplomatic career, he served overseas in the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand and Costa Rica. He served throughout Africa, Asia, Latin America, Eastern Europe and the Middle East.

He received Superior Service awards from USIA and USAID and an award from the Order of the White Elephant from the Royal Thai government.

During his 39-year post-retirement career, Mr. Murchie and his wife, Anita, joined delegations to the People’s Republic of China, South Africa and Australia.

Mr. Murchie became active in the Virginia wine industry and served as the executive director of the National Wine Coalition and Virginia Wineries Association and as president of the Atlantic Seaboard Wine Association.

He helped create the Congressional Wine Caucus and Mount Vernon’s wine festival series. He was honored with the American Wine Society’s Award of Merit and a Commemorative Bronze Bust of George Washington bestowed by Mount Vernon. The Virginia Wineries Association established the Gordon Murchie Lifetime Achievement Award in his honor.

Mr. Murchie is survived by his wife of 63 years, Anita Murchie; children Scott Murchie and Tiia Murchie-Beyma; son-in-law Eric Murchie-Beyma; and grandchildren Madeline and Megan Murchie-Beyma.

Mary V. Prosser, wife of retired Information Management Officer James F. Prosser, died on May 12 in Green Bay, Wis.

Mrs. Prosser was born in Cataño, Puerto Rico, to a career U.S. Army officer. She worked at the Signal Corps Laboratories at Fort Monmouth, N.J., before joining the Foreign Service in 1995 as a communications clerk.

After training in Washington, D.C., she was posted to the U.S. embassy in Bonn and the consulate in Munich.

Following her marriage to fellow communicator James Prosser on Sept. 24, 1960, she moved with him to posts in Leopoldville (now Kinshasa), Brussels, Moscow, Geneva, Nairobi, Rome and Washington, D.C.

She worked for the Foreign Service in Leopoldville, Brussels and Nairobi.
In Moscow she worked for the U.S. Information Service, in Geneva for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and in Rome for the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mrs. Prosser was a member of the Associates of the American Foreign Service Worldwide.

She is survived by her husband, James of Green Bay, Wis.; her son, Stephen (and spouse Jodi) and grandchildren, Jennifer and Matthew, of Oak Hill, Va.

Cynthia Thomas, 82, a retired State Department employee and the widow of FSO Charles Thomas, died on March 13 in Minneapolis, Minn., at the home of her daughter.

Mrs. Thomas was born in Providence, R.I., on July 20, 1936, the youngest of four children. Her father was an accountant, and her mother left a career as an opera singer when she married.

After graduating from Sarah Lawrence College in 1958, she moved to Manhattan and began working as a researcher at Time magazine while pursuing an acting career. She appeared in two off-Broadway shows staged by the Living Theatre acting company.

In 1964 she met FSO Charles Thomas through a mutual friend. The couple married within weeks and moved to Mexico, where Mr. Thomas was posted as a political officer. A year later, their daughter, Zelda, was born there.

Mr. Thomas was abruptly “selected out” of the Foreign Service in 1969, and two years later he committed suicide. In the mid-1970s a State Department investigation, the result of Mrs. Thomas’ campaign on Capitol Hill, found that his dismissal had been the result of a clerical error, in particular the misfiling of an excellent review from his final posting at Embassy Mexico City.

Pressure from Congress, Mr. Thomas’ former colleagues and a federal lawsuit filed on behalf of the family forced the State Department to overhaul its promotions system and establish a grievance board where employees could appeal the rulings of the promotion boards.

In 1975 Mrs. Thomas received a formal letter of apology from President Gerald R. Ford. Mr. Thomas was posthumously restored to active duty in the Foreign Service, a designation that entitled his family to the salary and benefits he would have earned in the years since his death, and Mrs. Thomas was invited to join the State Department.

Cynthia Thomas, who never remarried, served as a political officer in India and Thailand, in addition to assignments in Washington, D.C. She retired in 1993, settling in Washington.

Declassified government files released in the 1990s suggested to Mrs. Thomas and historians who have studied the case that her husband’s career had been ended to stop him from asking unwelcome questions about the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy, Philip Shenon wrote in a March 20 obituary for Mrs. Thomas in The Washington Post. In 2016, suffering from rheumatoid arthritis and other health problems, Mrs. Thomas relocated to her daughter’s home in Minneapolis.

Cynthia Thomas is survived by her daughter, Zelda Thomas-Curti; a stepdaughter, Jeanne-Marie Thomas of Rome; and three grandchildren.

MacAlan “Mac” Thompson, 77, a retired Foreign Service officer with USAID, died on Dec. 17, 2018, at his home in Thailand, of cancer.

After serving in the U.S. Army, Mr. Thompson joined the U.S. Agency for International Development in 1968. He served for nine years with the USAID mission in Laos, where he worked to provide food and other assistance to communities upcountry, usually by airdrop.

He was the last AID officer to leave the USAID mission in Vientiane in June 1975 as the Pathet Lao communists took control.

Mr. Thompson then began working with the State Department on behalf of Indochinese refugees in Thailand. He was one of a handful of American officials essential to the success of the U.S. government effort to protect, assist and resettle refugees from Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam in the United States.

Colleagues, friends and many refugees whom he had helped come to America remember Mr. Thompson with respect.

After retiring in 1992, Mr. Thompson worked with the Thailand-Laos-Cambodia Brotherhood to build classrooms in Laos.

Mr. Thompson is survived by his wife, Sunee; his son, Chalee; and a sister, Anne.

Contributions in his memory can be made to the Thailand-Laos-Cambodia Brotherhood at tlc-brotherhood.com.
A Relentless Quest for History

Our Man: Richard Holbrooke and the End of the American Century
George Packer, Knopf, 2019, $30/hardcover, 608 pages.

Reviewed by Matthew Asada

Let me tell you a story, George Packer begins, about a diplomat whose rise was facilitated by restless ambition, whose fall coincided with the end of an era and who, in between, ended one war and laid the groundwork for the end of another.

That man is Richard Holbrooke—Our Man in Vietnam, Bosnia and Afghanistan; or, as Packer put it in a May 13 reading at the New York Public Library, Richard Holbrooke the man: young, middle-aged and old.

In Our Man Packer takes us through Holbrooke's origin story (Jewish, not WASP); his service to, and relationship with, three presidents (some better and closer than others, although both types spoke at his funeral); and his relentless pursuit of the office on the seventh floor from which to rule the building.

As Packer tells it, Holbrooke's story was not about the pursuit of power for its own sake, but rather the motivation to apply power toward a greater good, whether to alleviate suffering, end violent conflict or recognize the universal dignity of human life. Neither hagiographic nor damning, the book occupies—or rather defines—the space of a biography written about a man who imagined being the subject of a biography, though maybe not in the unvarnished colors Packer has used.

Yet without the affairs (there were plenty) and without the foibles (there were many), we would never have a true picture of the man whose accomplishments helped to write a chapter of history, and whose blueprint for Afghanistan may yet help write another. As one of Ambassador Holbrooke's special assistants in 2010, I had a front-row seat to Our Man's final chapter.

Benefiting from unfiltered access to Holbrooke's personal papers and extensive interviews with more than 250 people around the world, Packer tells us about the subject's experience with his Shakespearean frenemy Anthony Lake and the story of that fateful day on Mount Igman outside Sarajevo. He also tells us about moments of personal self-reflection that may, just may, reveal Holbrooke in a raw, natural and unembellished state (when no one was around to see or hear him).

Holbrooke loved history, as Packer writes, "so much that he wanted to make it." But as Packer said to me after his talk in New York City, sometimes Holbrooke's history wasn't exactly history. Even when reading the personal papers, Packer said he had to remind himself that this was Holbrooke's telling of Holbrooke's tale (and Holbrooke wasn't beyond attempting to correct the record, even when the record was the record—e.g., his remarks at the State Department on Vietnam or Embassy Kabul's reporting of Holbrooke's conversation with President Hamid Karzai).


In 1963, Richard Holbrooke wrote in a letter: "I enjoy the drama of the helicopter." Half a century later in Afghanistan, he continued to enjoy the drama of the ride. From left, Matthew Asada, LTG Caldwell and Ambassador Holbrooke.
In *Our Man* we read about Holbrooke’s misfiring of a .45 in Vietnam (never again did he pack heat), the letter from LTC (ret.) Banky challenging Holbrooke’s account of Mount Igman in *To End a War* (Modern Library, 1999), his recollection of General Jones’ attempt to fire him and Vice President Joe Biden’s dismissive view of the consequences of a precipitous withdrawal from Afghanistan.

But for current, former and retired members of the Foreign Service, perhaps the question that is foremost (we all have our Holbrooke stories) is this: Was Holbrooke effective? In 1996, when recommending Holbrooke for Secretary of State, then–Deputy Secretary Strobe Talbott described him to President Bill Clinton as “high value, high maintenance”—but could you have had a Holbrooke with the same drive, vision and sense of history without all of the drama?

Packer answers yes to the first, and no to the second. Without the drama there was no Holbrooke, and without Holbrooke there would have been no action. As he wrote in a private letter to the woman who would become his first wife: “Remember, what is true in foreign policy is also in this case true in love: Inaction, inactivity is as much an action as action itself; it is as much of a decision to do nothing as it is to do something.” And as he said to Strobe Talbott when lobbying for the Secretary of State position: “Sum of the actions, the good and the bad, produced whatever I am today.”

Can or should the U.S. Foreign Service produce another Holbrooke? His Peace Corps rater from Morocco said: “I wish I had a half dozen Holbrookes working for me.” But, paraphrasing Packer here, his career development officer in Vietnam told Holbrooke: “Forget FSO-1, or Assistant Secretary, you stand no chance of rapid promotion, or much promotion at all, unless your behavior improves.”

And Henry Kissinger described him this way: “Holbrooke was too much a swaggering American to understand why Russia might imagine it was being encircled.”

Perhaps like too many in the Foreign Service, Holbrooke’s dissent started out loud and grew softer, so that by the time he was the decision-maker—on Afghanistan—Packer writes, recalling a pivotal conversation between Holbrooke and Biden documented in Holbrooke’s papers, it had disappeared altogether.

Packer told me that he wrote the non-fiction book to read more like a novel and less like a biography, to “turn diplomacy into an adventure.” In 2014 he had begun reading the Holbrooke papers, which he had secured access to from Kati Marton soon after Holbrooke’s death.

In 2016 he began writing, he said, and the idea of paralleling Holbrooke’s life with the end of the American century came to him on Hillary Clinton’s unsuccessful election night in 2016.

This is my last Holbrooke piece, Packer told me. (He wrote the infamous 2009 *New Yorker* profile.) But Holbrooke, citing history, would be the first to remind him: Is anything ever final?

If to have read the book is to have met the man, then George Packer has done us an infinite service. With *Our Man: Richard Holbrooke and the End of the American Century*, he has made a contribution to our understanding of the conduct of diplomacy and the fact that foreign policy is not always determined exclusively by national interests. Big personalities matter, too—and Holbrooke did.

Matthew Asada is a Foreign Service officer currently serving as project manager for Expo 2020 Dubai in the Office of the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs. He served from 2010 to 2011 as special assistant to Ambassador Holbrooke and then Ambassador Grossman, the special representatives for Afghanistan and Pakistan. The views expressed in this article are the reviewer’s own and not necessarily those of the Department of State or the U.S. government.

**The Stunning Rise of Chinese Sea Power**


*Toshi Yoshihara and James R. Holmes,* Naval Institute Press, 2018, $36.95/hardcover, 376 pages.

Reviewed by Dmitry Filipoff

China is aggressively rising toward superpower status while emerging as the primary peer competitor of the United States. In the second edition of *Red Star Over the Pacific*, authors Toshi Yoshihara and James Holmes examine how the world’s oceans assisted in China’s meteoric rise while also becoming the scene of regional rivalry. They present the development of Chinese sea power within the larger context of Chinese grand strategy.

The authors begin their book with the chapter “Mahan’s Lingering Ghost.” Alfred Thayer Mahan, the maritime strategist who served as president of the
U.S. Naval War College in the late 19th century, penned the influential work *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History: 1660-1783*.

Mahan’s central argument is that the global pursuit of sea power is inseparable from the pursuit of great power status. An instant hit in its time, Mahan’s treatise strongly influenced the thinking of early 20th-century sea power proponents like Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt. As Yoshihara and Holmes show, the great maritime strategist is now also influencing the Chinese.

As they describe it, China’s “hyper-Mahanian” approach to sea power is a truly whole-of-government endeavor. China possesses the world’s largest Coast Guard, its largest fishing fleet, and by some counting methods, even its largest navy. This is all the more notable given how China was for millennia a continentally oriented state, exclusively focused on land power.

Modern China became a maritime superpower within the span of only two generations, a truly historic achievement that is still very much in the making. The authors trace strategic pronouncements from the heads of successive Chinese administrations in the excellent chapter “China’s Strategic Will to the Sea,” clearly revealing the escalating importance of the world’s oceans to Chinese statecraft.

As President Xi Jinping himself noted: “Building a powerful navy is an important symbol of building a world-class military, a strategic pivot for building the nation into a great maritime power and an important component of realizing the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation” (emphasis added).

The importance of the maritime domain to China’s rise is most evident in the economic sphere. China’s dependence on importing basic resources to sustain its economic growth rate is a principal driver of its maritime strategy. Reflecting this, China’s ability to process and generate maritime shipping exploded within the past two decades.

The authors present stunning statistics: of the world’s 20 largest ports today 13 are Chinese. Chinese ports processed six times more goods in 2015 than in 2000 (topping at 7.8 billion tons of goods). And in 2005 China’s inland ports were able to process a whopping 97 times greater volume of shipping containers than just 15 years earlier. Today more than 85 percent of China’s imports and exports travel by sea.

Chinese state propaganda and official pronouncements are rife with accusations of “Cold War thinking” when describing U.S. national security policy in the Indo-Pacific. Despite denials from the United States that it is pursuing a strategy of containment, China perceives something else. Three distinct island chains ripple out across the Pacific, from Kyushu through the Philippines to Singapore, from Yokosuka to Guam to New Zealand, and from the Aleutians to Hawaii.

China feels surrounded by concentric rings of American power and allies, an “infrastructure of containment,” the authors state, contending that “the archipelagic concept casts a long shadow over Chinese strategic thought.” The geography of force projection in maritime Asia turned China’s historic military advantages on its head.

When China was a continental power primarily concerned with invasions, it could take comfort in the vast strategic
depth offered by the country’s enormous size.

But when modern China looks seaward, it finds itself in a claustrophobic environment, where crucial maritime trade routes could be threatened close to home. The authors argue that “Chinese anti-access efforts in the diplomatic, economic, legal, normative, and military realms thus constitute a strategic danger of the first order to the United States and its allies.”

An opportunity to break free of the first island chain has always loomed before the People’s Republic of China. The state of Taiwan is roughly at the midpoint of this archipelago. As the authors note: “If the island chain is a Great Wall in reverse, then regaining Taiwan would open a breach in the wall.”

While comprehensive, Red Star Over the Pacific misses a key element of Chinese maritime strategy. The authors stress the particular importance of earning access as a major end goal of maritime strategy.

Yet they neglect to draw attention to the major ports for which China is signing long-term leases in strategically located states such as Pakistan and Sri Lanka. These Chinese-owned ports significantly enhance China’s maritime access across the Indian Ocean rim and feature prominently in its grand ambitions for developing infrastructure across the region. These far-flung projects commensurately increase the Chinese Navy’s responsibility for its relatively new “far seas protection” mission of defending China’s interests abroad. Despite this, the trillion-dollar Belt and Road Initiative lacks an entry in the book’s index.

The second edition of Red Star Over the Pacific is an authoritative work on Chinese maritime power and naval strategy. To understand the maritime domain is to understand core elements of China’s historic transformation into a superpower. And through understanding naval strategy in the Indo-Pacific, the outline of how China could pose a serious military challenge to U.S. regional hegemony becomes clearer.

Dmitry Filipoff is the publications coordinator for The Foreign Service Journal. He is also the director of online content for the Center for International Maritime Security.
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Not knowing he was a Russian asset, Gavrilo Princip fired his pistol, igniting a World War.

Twelve American Wars by Eugene G. Windyche
(tonkou Gulf—“Superb investigative reporting”, N.Y. Times.)
3rd edition at Amazon https://www.amazon.com/
Twelve-American-Wars-Nine-Avoidable/dp/1491730536
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looking to Buy, Sell or Rent REAL ESTATE in Northern Virginia or Maryland? Former FSO and Peace Corps Country Director living in NoVA understands your unique needs and can expertly guide you through your real estate experience and transition. Professionalism is just a phone call away. Call Alex for solutions.
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VERMONT PROPERTY INVESTMENT. Sale/Leaseback Opportunity. Shooting Stars Farm: 1840s Farm House with Barn and Out-bldgs. 22 acres on quiet country road, 45 min. from Dartmouth College. Further inquiry welcome. Email: nmetz@fairpoint.net

SUNNYSIDE PROPERTY. Over 30 furnished Arlington VA Walk-to-Metro rentals. We own and manage all our properties. Studio to 5 BR houses. Unique renovated, stylish homes in vintage buildings. Completely furnished, all inclusive (parking, utilities, maid). Starting at $2,500/mo. We work with per diem. Welcoming Foreign Service for 10+ years! For all listings/reservations: Website: www.SunnysideProperty.net

HEADING OUT? HEADING “HOME” TO DC? As an immigrant and Foreign Service spouse, I know what a hassle international moves can be—especially without a GSO or CLO! Whether you’re looking to buy, sell or rent, in DC or VA, I can help smooth your transition. For a realtor who understands the unique needs and strains of Foreign Service life, just call Marian. McEnearney Associates 4720 Lee Highway Arlington VA 22207 Tel: (703) 967-1796. Email: MThompson@McEnearney.com

NORTHERN VIRGINIA RESIDENTIAL SPECIALIST. This SFSO (retired USAID, Housing & Urban Programs) with 15+ years of real estate experience can advise you on buying, selling or renting a home. David Olinger, GRI–Long & Foster, Realtors. Tel (direct): (703) 864-3196. Email: david.olinger@LNF.com Website: www.davidolinger.LNF.com

ARE YOU TRANSFERRING TO THE D.C. METRO AREA? Let’s jump start your housing search now! I will provide you advance listings and help you identify the right property to buy or lease.

DO YOU WANT TO INVEST IN REAL ESTATE? Let me provide you commercial real estate options that require minimal property management. I can also suggest single and multi-unit residential investment opportunities with ongoing property management.

As a retired Foreign Service officer who spent a career leasing overseas embassy housing and office space, I will exceed your expectations. Russell Baum, Realtor’ Arlington Realty, Inc. 764 23rd Street S Arlington VA 22202 Tel: (703) 568-6967. Email: realtorbaum@gmail.com Website: http://www.russbaum.com

Remember Tom? I remember Tom fondly. For 25 years, Tom was my “go to” Realtor when buying and selling homes and investment properties in Northern Virginia.Posted overseas, having access to such a professional who knew the challenges of the FS and who we unconditionally trust, proved invaluable. He helped us purchase great properties and represented us, and his attention to detail was impeccable. I provide my clients with this same level of quality, individualized service.

If you’re looking for such a Realtor, a former SFSO helping clients make intelligent real estate decisions throughout Northern Virginia, then contact me.

ALAN DAVIS, REALTOR® Metro Premier Homes Direct Tel: (571) 229-6821 alandavisrealtor@gmail.com www.alandavisrealtor.com

PET TRANSPORTATION

PET SHIPPING WORLDWIDE: ACTION PET EXPRESS has over 48 years in business. 24-hr. service, operated by a U.S. Army veteran, associate member AFSA. Contact: Jerry Mishler. Tel: (601) 252-0266 or (844) 323-7742. Email: info@actionpetexpress.com Website: WWW.ACTIONPETEXPRESS.COM

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

TWIGA TUTORS. Don’t let your child fall behind American peers while living overseas. Our certified American EFM teachers support K-12 students in English, Math, Science, U.S. History, American Literature and Coding and Robotics. Reimbursable for most FS families. Enroll Today! Email: christianna@twigatutors.com Website: www.twigatutors.com

ENGLISH LANGUAGE WORKSHOPS for Locally-Employed staff. We travel to your post! Go to www.englishforthejob.com for details on packages and rates.

PLACE A CLASSIFIED AD: $1.60/word (10-word min). Hyperlink $11 in online edition. Bold text $1.00/word. Header or box-shading $11 each. Deadline: Five weeks ahead of publication. Tel: (202) 719-9712. Fax: (202) 338-8244. Email: ads@afsa.org
Curve ball. None thrown here.

WJD Management

Residential property management and leasing specialists serving all of Northern Virginia and clients around the globe.

Property Management is our only business!

Get to know us at wjdpm.com or email us at information@wjdpm.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
Email: info@propertyspecialistsinc.com
Web address: propertyspecialistsinc.com
Serving Virginia, Maryland and D.C.
looking to
BUY, SELL, OR RENT A HOME?

ALEX BOSTON — former FSO & Peace Corps
Country Director — understands your unique
needs and can expertly guide you through
your real estate experience.
Alex, a graduate of Harvard, Princeton and
Yale, will help you achieve your real estate
goals through his advocacy, knowledge
and experience. Allow Alex to put his Local
Knowledge and World Class Service to work
for you!

ALEX BOSTON
Realtor® | JD | MPA
Licensed in VA & MD
571-533-9566
Alex@LNF.com
longandfoster.com/AlexBoston

LONG & FOSTER
REAL ESTATE
6299 LEESBURG PIKE • FALLS CHURCH, VA 22044
703-534-9666

Global Brand...
...Local Awareness

James McGrath
(703) 318-0067
www.JimMcGrathRealEstate.com

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.

The Meyerson Group, Inc

Call us today!
(301) 657-3210

6923 Fairfax Road • Bethesda, MD 20814
e-mail: TheMeyersonGroup@aol.com
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The Paris Waiter: A Life Lesson

BY JOHN TREACY

It was a hot summer morning in 1986. Our train would be leaving Paris in 40 minutes.

My wife Susan and I had opted to stop for a few days here while in transit from Togo to our new assignment to Guatemala via Washington. Today’s visit to the beautiful cathedral city of Chartres would be a delightful side trip. Son Sean, 11, and daughter Elizabeth, 6, were with us.

We decided to stop for cool drinks in the small, drab café adjacent to the Montparnasse station. We snagged a table that other customers had just left.

A waiter appeared. Without greeting us, he hastily wiped down the worn tabletop and straightened up, waiting for us to speak.

“Good day. What kind of drinks do you have?” I asked in French.

“We don’t have fish,” he snapped. He spoke loudly enough that the French people at nearby tables could hear. “Poisson” (fish) and “boisson” (drink) can sound alike.

“Drinks,” I replied, putting exaggerated emphasis on the “B.”

“Up there,” he answered, gesturing impatiently at a yellowed placard on the wall behind Susan. We ordered bottled drinks, paying when he delivered them—it was that kind of place.

“What’s the matter with him?” Sean asked. Like many Foreign Service kids, he had the outsider’s gift of close observation. With French and Togolese playmates and French in school, his youthful ear was better than mine. “You didn’t say fish,” he said.

Annoyance at the waiter’s unfriendly demeanor and petty linguistic put-down would have been normal. On mature reflection, kindness and understanding were more in order.

The matter, I explained, is that the waiter was probably overworked and overtired. His feet may have hurt. He was very pale, had bad tobacco-stained teeth and appeared unhealthy. He was short and thin, and his eyes were red, from lack of sleep or too many hours in a dimly lit workplace.

He labored not in a fine gourmet restaurant nor even a warm neighborhood bistro where cordial regulars saluted him by name, but in a gloomy café where he served a daily stream of harried, anonymous travelers.

He was probably poorly paid and likely lived not in the lovely city center of Paris, but in one of the dreary high-rise suburbs we had passed on the inbound train from the airport three days before. Living in a nation that worshipped learning, he had almost certainly not had the opportunity to finish high school.

His lot was not a happy one.

Bitter and disappointed, he may have found the opportunity to win a small life victory by zinging a family of frivolous bourgeois foreigners irresistible. Susan’s beauty and the kids’ wholesome sun-splashed glow likely fueled his resentment.

As I spoke to Sean, Susan and Elizabeth were busy writing on paper napkins. Susan looked up to say, “We’ll leave a nice tip. He probably doesn’t get many.”

As we left, smiling, our bold, curly-haired Elizabeth was detailed to skip across the room and hand the waiter the napkin with a tip folded inside. The napkin was illustrated with a smiley face and carefully aided first-grade scrawls that read “Thank you very much” in English and French.

The waiter was stunned, his reaction one of pleasant surprise. He smiled down at Elizabeth and then nodded and smiled across the room at the Susan, Sean and me.

We remember the waiter, still. We hope that, for a time at least, he remembered us.
A once bustling port of ancient Rome gives way to nature. These umbrella pines provide welcome shade along the Main Street of Ostia Antica, an ancient Roman port town that was home to 100,000 inhabitants at its peak in the second and third centuries A.D. Once at the mouth of the Tiber River, Ostia Antica is now an archaeological site some three kilometers from the sea and is known for the excellent preservation of its ancient buildings, magnificent frescoes and impressive mosaics.

FSO Matthew L. Horner currently serves in Washington, D.C., as the Finland and Estonia desk officer in the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs’ Office of Nordic and Baltic Affairs. He has also served in Iceland, Cambodia, Mexico and Barbados. He took this photo during a visit to Ostia Antica in October 2017.

Please submit your favorite, recent photograph to be considered for Local Lens. Images must be high resolution (at least 300 dpi at 8” x 10”, or 1 MB or larger) and must not be in print elsewhere. Include a short description of the scene/event, as well as your name, brief biodata and the type of camera used. Send to locallens@afsa.org.
AFSA is pleased to announce the fourth annual

Foreign Service Night

AT NATIONALS PARK

September 13, 2019 @ 7:05 p.m.

Nationals vs. Braves

Visit afsa.org/nationals2019 for more information, including how to buy tickets.

This is a great way to reconnect with Foreign Service colleagues, especially those returning home from overseas service.
Professional Liability Insurance

A Worldwide Insurance Program Designed Specifically for American Foreign Service Members

- Extended discovery period after policy expiration
- Counsel and cost of defense in addition to your professional liability limit
- Eligible for premium reimbursement as determined by the United States Government
- Choose between several different professional liability options

An online application is available for your convenience: foreignservice.bmtc.com

Bernard Cooper
215.242.8200 | bcooper@hirshorn.com

foreignservice.bmtc.com

© 2019 Bryn Mawr Bank Corporation
Eligibility is subject to underwriting approval.

BMT Insurance Advisors is a subsidiary of The Bryn Mawr Trust Company, the principal subsidiary of Bryn Mawr Bank Corporation. Hirshorn Boothby, Hirshorn Foreign Services, and Domenick & Associates are trade names of BMT Insurance Advisors. BMT Insurance Advisors and its affiliates and vendors do not provide legal, tax or accounting advice. Please consult your legal, tax or accounting advisors to determine how this information may apply to your own situation. Insurance products are not available in all states.

INVESTMENTS & INSURANCE: NOT A DEPOSIT. NOT FDIC-INSURED. NOT INSURED BY ANY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY. NOT GUARANTEED BY THE BANK. MAY GO DOWN IN VALUE.