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Counting on Diplomacy

BY BARBARA STEPHENSON

Writing in the midst of the transition, as The Washington Post headlines, “State Department Sidelined in Trump’s First Month,” I find this edition of the FSJ particularly grounding. The articles on U.S. relations with Europe, some written by old friends and colleagues, help me find my footing, take a long view of our work as diplomats, and reflect on what endures.

Former Ambassador to Germany and Assistant Secretary for European Affairs John Kornblum recalls being told in A-100 that it was folly to specialize in Europe, that careers were made in hands-on jobs in the Third World. Kornblum argues that U.S.-European security is indivisible, that we must remain closely integrated with the world’s great democracies or face a messy clean-up after a crisis has broken out.

Having spent my own career roughly equally balanced between hands-on crisis work and tending relations with European partners, I have come to see the two kinds of diplomatic work as two sides of the same coin, part of the ebb and flow of diplomatic capital.

Through the long, slow, steady work that we American diplomats do building strong relationships with like-minded allies (by no means all in Europe), we build up metaphorical bank accounts. When crisis strikes, as it regularly does, we draw on those bank accounts to address the crisis. As deputy coordinator for Iraq in 2007, for example, I drew heavily on those accounts as I pleaded with one ally after another to stay the course, leave troops in Iraq for just a while longer.

What does this mean for the daily work of my Foreign Service colleagues serving in Europe or with other like-minded allies? Regardless of the headlines of the day or the challenges of transition, when policy guidance can be slow in coming, you are always doing the right thing by the American people, always serving our national interests, when you get out and do the hard work of tending the bilateral relationship and building up the account.

As I used to tell participants in the Ambassadorial Seminar, no one in the U.S. government cares more than you and your country team about the strength of that bilateral relationship; tending it is central to your job.

So get out of the embassy and meet people, establishing and strengthening personal relationships, reminding your host country of the ties that bind us, reinforcing and refreshing those ties for a new generation.

If appropriate at your post, advocate for a goal in the Integrated Country Strategy that makes an explicit embassywide commitment to increased contact work and trust building.

I once saw an ICS goal of “restoring the foundations of trust” work wonders with a close ally, providing ready justification for expending resources—time, travel funds, representational funds, exchange visitor slots—to rebuild after a rough patch in the relationship had drained the bank account.

Make a personal commitment—ideally captured in your work requirements—to increase your contact work and use the language skills you worked so hard to gain. Don’t wait for démarche instructions to set up the appointment; just commit to meeting the head of the Americas desk for coffee every few weeks. Reconnect with exchange visitors, one-on-one or in groups.

Some of you may say that, while the transition is ongoing and policy guidance is still being formulated, you are unsure what to say. Fair enough, but how bad would it be for American diplomats to be caught listening and trying to understand how our partners see the world?

That kind of nuanced, in-depth understanding is not only what we in the Foreign Service do best. It is also pure gold, especially when crisis strikes.

In honor of this edition of the FSJ, focused on the future of Europe and trans-Atlantic relations, I challenge my colleagues serving in Europe to double down on the many relationships writ small that underpin the trans-Atlantic relationship writ large.

America wins when you do the hard work of keeping our alliances and other partnerships strong. And you may find, as I have, that you win on a personal level, developing enduring friendships that are also pure gold.

Ambassador Barbara Stephenson is the president of the American Foreign Service Association.
LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

Living History

By Shawn Dorman

In her President’s Views column, Ambassador Barbara Stephenson has eloquently introduced our special focus on the trans-Atlantic relationship. Drawing from the three distinguished authors writing from and about Europe—Ambassador (ret.) John Kornblum, Lord Menzies Campbell and Giles Merritt—she underlines that a primary responsibility for members of the Foreign Service now, and always, is to do the hard work of tending bilateral relationships, to “be caught listening and trying to understand how our partners see the world.”

Former Secretary of State George Shultz emphasized this wisdom in his interview with Ambassador (ret.) James Goodby in the December 2016 FSJ with a memorable gardening analogy: “If you plant a garden and go away for six months, what have you got when you come back? Weeds. And any good gardener knows you have to clear the weeds out right away. Diplomacy is kind of like that. You go around and talk to people, you develop a relationship of trust and confidence, and then if something comes up, you have that base to work from. If you have never seen somebody before and you are trying to work a delicate, difficult problem, it is hard.”

The focus on Europe closes with an article from the March 1967 Journal, “The United States and Europe,” by James Ramsey. We will continue to surface perspectives from years past that still, or again, have relevance, as part of a series of occasional reprints, “From the FSJ Archives.”

This brings us to the wonderful news that the entire archive of The Foreign Service Journal dating back to 1918 has been digitized and all the files optimized for discoverability.

The complete digital archive will be launched online in late April. Access will be free and open to all, available through the AFSA website at www.afsa.org/fsj-archives. We encourage everyone to dive into this treasure trove of primary source material and wisdom.

The Journal bylaws spell out the publication’s mission: to provide “a forum for the lively debate of issues of interest to foreign affairs professionals.” The Journal welcomes and seeks a wide variety of opinions and voices, aiming to advance the discussion of diplomacy, development and the FS career in the real world. It is a place to air ideas, to spark and continue conversations, and a venue for debate.

The Journal is both a forum for practitioners to share ideas and also a bridge to the world outside the Foreign Service, as colleagues on Capitol Hill, in other agencies and in universities find food for thought in the FSJ pages.

The views expressed in the articles we publish do not—and should not—only represent the views of AFSA. As stated plainly in the masthead, material appearing in the Journal represents the opinions of the authors and not necessarily anyone else. (The association’s priorities, activities and position statements can be found in the AFSA News section and the President’s Views column.)

The Journal must remain a place for honest discussion of issues of concern to today’s Foreign Service.

We are always seeking submissions for the following departments—Letters, Speaking Out, FS Know How, FS Heritage, as well as Features (on any topic of relevance to the foreign affairs community) and upcoming Focus topics (see the Editorial Calendar on the AFSA website).

In addition, please send your remarkable photos to Local Lens and feel encouraged to pitch a book review. All submissions can be sent to journal@afsa.org.

Finally, please consider volunteering to help shepherd this treasured 99-year-old publication into its next century by volunteering to serve on the FSJ Editorial Board. See page 33 for details, and let us know by April 10 that you’re interested.
Ambassadorial Appointments

The January-February issue of the FSJ was of special interest largely—but by no means entirely—due to its focus on the change of administrations. What I found most compelling were the pieces by two old (should I say aging or elderly?) friends and former colleagues, Ambassador Ed Peck and Tom Boyatt.

Ed set forth a persuasive, but I believe somewhat superficial, plea to end political ambassadorial appointments; Tom outlined the executive branch’s “constitutional officers” that include ambassadors, ministers and consuls. The latter are precisely why I challenge Ed’s goal.

The power to name ambassadors resides with the president, subject, of course, to Senate ratification. I am sure Ed recognizes that all presidents are loath to undermine or diminish their limited powers and, hence, are understandably unwilling to end the practice of nominating political allies, whether “bundlers” or distinguished former officials, academics or others with excellent qualifications.

That power is not going to be ceded—not now, not ever—barring constitutional amendment. And that’s not going to happen. Let us grow up and acknowledge that fact. If I speak heresy, so be it.

Where we may be able to make some progress is in ensuring that the Senate carries out its obligation to ensure appointees are well qualified for the position. I have had the honor to serve under five political appointee ambassadors, including Elliot Richardson and Kingman Brewster; I also had the opportunity to see Edwin Reischauer in action in Japan.

They were all extraordinarily able, more than equal to most of their career peers. Do we wish to lose this type of “political” ambassador? I certainly don’t.

I also had the opportunity, as director of Northern European affairs, to oversee the operations of embassies headed by eight political appointees, only four of whom seemed competent to me, and a couple of those only at the margin. But then one of the two career ambassadors in that group of countries was relieved for improper behavior.

My bottom line is to urge AFSA and its members to accept that no president is going to give away the ambassadorial appointment power; that the Senate is legally obligated to ensure ambassadorial nominees are well qualified, and should be pressured to meet that goal; and that highly distinguished Americans from outside the Service can perform as well as or better than their career counterparts.

That most political appointee ambassadors do not should tell us that the core problem is not the concept, but its execution: ensure the Senate confirms only those who are well qualified.

Jack R. Binns
Ambassador, retired
Tucson, Arizona

Merge USAID Fully into State?

Bilateral economic development assistance continues to be an important U.S. diplomatic tool in our complex and fractured world. Thomas Adams highlights this well in his January-February article, “Foreign Assistance: Time to Sharpen a Vital Diplomatic Tool.”

If adopted, his eight well-thought-out recommendations for improvement would make our assistance more effective and efficient.

But Adams does not address the peculiar administrative status of our main assistance agency, the U.S. Agency for International Development. I was with USAID at its creation, being a project officer with the predecessor agency Development Loan Fund. Presently USAID is neither fish nor fowl, being half in and half out of the State Department.

The duplications and costly overlaps of USAID and State are substantial. Mr. Adams notes that State houses a large assistance operation—the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. In addition, both entities have humanitarian relief offices, development assistance policy and planning offices, assistance budget and congressional liaison operations, as well as management offices.

The Trump administration may opt to leave things as they are. But if the administration truly wants to reduce duplications and make the management of assistance more rational and effective, and less costly, there are two options.

One is to make USAID a separate agency again, mustering in it all State Department development activities and as many of the other assistance spigots around government as possible (e.g., the Millennium Challenge Account, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Trade and Development Agency, and others).

The other is to fold the rest of USAID completely into State as a separate Development Bureau and specialty (cone) equal to other bureaus and specialties, at the same time absorbing as many of the other spigots as possible and gaining greater influence over the rest.

The first option seems unlikely; the trend is to reduce the number of pro-
grams and agencies. Thus the second seems best to me.

Economic development purists argue that, if completely within State, long-term development objectives would be sidetracked in favor of short-term political considerations more than they are at present.

I wonder. It seems to me that being an integral part of a powerful department such as State could make development consideration—both long- and short-term—more cohesive, prominent and stronger.

A well-staffed bureau responsible for negotiating and managing hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers’ money should be able to swing great weight in the department and achieve reasonable balance between long- and short-term considerations.

Moreover, operating costs would decline by ending the overlaps mentioned above and eliminating USAID’s separate management superstructure as well as those of absorbed spigots.

There are also advantages in combining the current separate USAID and State personnel systems. Development Foreign Service officers and specialists would be equivalent to economic, political and consular officers and specialists, with the same advantages and career possibilities.

One can envision development specialists taking occasional out-of-cone tours as economic officers and deputy chiefs of mission, economic specialists having tours as development program officers and consular officers being involved on the ground in managing humanitarian relief operations.

Raymond Malley
USAID Senior FSO, retired
U.S. Air Force Reserve, retired
Hanover, New Hampshire, and McLean, Virginia
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Dissenting from the Current Trend

Of all the presentations and lectures in the A-100 course, the one that remains the sharpest for me even now, some 14 years later, is the one delivered by retired Ambassadors Tom Boyatt and Edward Peck on dissent in the Foreign Service.

They spoke about proud traditions, celebrated awards and professional integrity in terms that were compelling, even to a room full of rookies who could not fully appreciate their gravity.

Now, nearing the expiration date of my third diplomatic passport, and in an increasingly contentious political environment where it seems State is fighting for relevance and her loyal servants for credibility, those words have even more resonance.

The Dissent Channel has been used historically to great effect as a private, internal instrument. If you have not yet had an opportunity, I encourage you to watch the video of the dissent discussion that AFSA hosted on Feb. 17, with AFSA Awards Committee Chair Annie Pforzheimer and Ambassador Charles Rivkin, both of whom articulately argue for its continued use in that manner.

I would like to echo their comments, speaking not as the chair of the awards committee or an experienced ambassador, but as one of you: a mid-level officer who joined State in the smoldering ashes of 9/11, intent on getting involved and making a difference.

While I applaud the courage and integrity of my colleagues—of you—for speaking up when it matters, I worry that misusing the Dissent Channel, this unique tool we have to challenge policy, threatens to weaken its power and undermine our institution.

As diplomats, we need to be able to distinguish between policies we disagree with personally and those we disagree with professionally. If you are not the officer being asked to implement a given policy, any disagreement you have with it is personal, not professional; and your dissent, however well meaning, undercuts the officer who is tasked with carrying it out.

Real dissent, requiring the timely response of the Secretary of State, should be the prerogative of the most proximate implementer, not of any of us who happen to have an opinion.

The current trend—toward group dissents, aired in public—takes the precious and rare ability we have to provide unfettered guidance based on reason, empirical evidence and the expertise we have cultivated during careers of service and sacrifice, and reduces it to a Facebook post and a competition for “likes.”

The fleeting fame that accompanies authoring a public dissent does not outweigh the damage that our institution will suffer when that dissent is dismissed—rightly or wrongly—as the amateurish rant of disloyal bureaucrats, and we find ourselves increasingly marginalized and ignored by this or any future administration.

Our institution understands that individual dissent takes courage; that is why it is protected. Group dissents, leaked to the media, belie our confidence in that protection and reek of risk-free self-aggrandizement, not of an honest attempt to shift policy.

We work in an underappreciated and often misunderstood business. We generally make headlines in only three instances—incredible successes, spectacular failures and tragic deaths—all of which ignore the hard work we do day in and day out to advance U.S. interests and hopefully create a more secure and prosperous world.

I encourage you to dissent when you are the person best placed to give voice to a break from policy, and when all of your other options are exhausted. If those conditions are not met, I encourage you to look again at whether your disagreement with policy is personal or professional.

State might be the oldest Cabinet agency, but the height of our seat at the table is adjustable. It is incumbent on all of us to refrain from weakening our position through well-meaning, but poorly executed, dissent.

Jonathan Peccia
Political Counselor
U.S. Embassy Tunis

Shame on the Journal

Shame on the Journal for publishing TJ Lunardi’s Jan. 19 letter of resignation, a letter which degrades the administration and leadership for which the Foreign Service presumably works.

This act of publication can only provoke further suspicion of the existence of a shadow political opposition (the so-called “Deep State”) bent on undermining the U.S. government from within. The letter’s content even hints at this—“Some may counter that the threat posed by Mr. Trump calls for people of conscience to remain in the department...to resist his agenda.”

Mr. Lunardi, of course, has every right to express feelings and views directed against the president. But their featured appearance in the FSJ—a journal about diplomacy, and one entrusted with guarding the interests of the Foreign Service—will be taken as an AFSA endorsement and will encourage the chorus calling for a top-to-bottom house-cleaning at State.

Richard W. Hoover
FSO, retired
Front Royal, Virginia
Diplomacy: What We Do, and Why We Do It

BY THOMAS M. COUNTRYMAN

Preparing my retirement ceremony remarks on fairly short notice, I intended them to be a quick personal reflection on why the Foreign Service meant so much to me. I was surprised and pleased that many colleagues found my talk inspiring and shared it.

One month later, my apprehension—that this White House will not learn to depend upon the knowledge and talent at State—has only grown. What has also grown is my admiration for those who remain in the department and who persist in dedicated and imaginative service to the American people.

I hope readers find my remarks of value as they ponder how each of us can best serve our nation while staying true to our personal values. I recommend more strongly the farewell address of one of our great ambassadors, Dan Fried, who brilliantly explained how U.S. foreign policy has served well the rest of the world and our own most noble values.

Some of you have asked if recent events have left me disgruntled. The answer is no; I am probably the most “gruntled” person in the room. When Ambassador Robert Pelletreau retired 20 years ago, he said, “The State Department doesn’t owe me anything. It has given me everything.” It is the same for me.

In my very first tour, the department gave me more than I could ask for in a lifetime. It sent me to Belgrade, where in 1984 I met my wife, Dubravka Trklja, the greatest thing ever to happen to me. She reminds me often that she could have had a better husband, but I suspect she feels what I feel so strongly: that I could never have had a better friend. And as a result, I have something else, the only thing for which you should envy me: Stefan and Andrew, the two best sons and the two most remarkable young men anyone could have.

The department gave me and my family the opportunity to see the world, and not just as tourists. It allowed me to see the reunification of families divided by the Iron Curtain, and to see Israelis and Palestinians negotiate face to face. I saw—and contributed a little to—the restoration of democracy in Serbia. And for the last few years, it’s given me the chance to speak for the United States about a priority shared by 11 successive presidents: reducing the risk of a nuclear holocaust.

High Road, Hard Ball

This career gave me a constant resurgence of energy in the form of bright young officers with brilliant careers ahead of them, people like Rafik Mansour, Patrick Connell, Daniela Helfet, Seth Maddox, Lizzie Martin and David Kim.

It allowed me to work for ambassadors legendary in the Foreign Service (some of them here today), like David Anderson, Dick Miles, Barbara Bodine, Emil Skodon, Patrick Theros, Skip Gnehm, Frank Wisner, Bob Pelletreau, Marc Grossman and Charlie Ries.

From them I learned the four words central to diplomatic success: “High Road, Hard Ball.” And it gave me the great honor to stand beside exemplary Secretaries of State like Madeleine Albright, Colin Powell, Hillary Clinton and John Kerry.
The department gave me the chance to be part of, and to lead, amazing interagency teams at embassies abroad, in the European Bureau and at the White House. These were great organizations; but it was only when I spent 1½ years in the Political-Military Bureau and five years in the International Security and Nonproliferation Bureau, that I came to fully value the true strength of the department, a Civil Service cadre every bit as talented as the Foreign Service. It was perhaps my highest honor to learn from, to guide and to take credit for the accomplishments of the deepest bench of experts in any agency.

The State Department owes me nothing. But we still owe America a lot. We still have a duty—you have a duty, to stay and give your best professional guidance, with loyalty, to the new administration. Because a foreign policy without professionals is, by definition, an amateur foreign policy. You will help to frame and make the choices. Because that is what we do.

**Diplomacy in Detail**

Our work is little understood by our fellow Americans, a fact that is sometimes exploited for political purpose. When I have the opportunity to speak to audiences across this amazing land, I explain: “We do not have a Department of State—we do not have a foreign policy—because we love foreigners. We do it because we love Americans.”

We want Americans to prosper, to sell the world’s best food and the world’s best products everywhere in the world. We want Americans to be protected and safe when they are abroad, whether they are missionaries, tourists, students, businessmen or (for those you have done consular work) the occasional false messiah.

We want Americans to sleep the sleep of the righteous, knowing that the smallest fraction of their tax dollar goes to ease poverty and reduce injustice. We want them to know that our consular officers are the first of many lines of defense against those who would come to the United States with evil purpose. We want the families of America’s heroes—our servicemen—to know that their loved ones are not put into danger simply because of a failure to pursue nonmilitary solutions.

And we want Americans to know that the Statue of Liberty is not just a magnet for immigrants: It is a projector, shining the promise of democracy around the world. The United States is the world’s greatest economic power and the world’s greatest military power; and, with your vigilance, it always will be. But the greatest power we project is hope, the greatest power we project is hope, the greatest power we project is hope.

If our interaction with other countries is only a business transaction, rather than a partnership with allies and friends, we will lose that game too. China practically invented transactional diplomacy, and if we choose to play their game, Beijing will run the table.

Business made America great, as it always has, and business leaders are among our most important partners. But let’s be clear: despite the similarities, a dog is not a cat. Baseball is not football. And diplomacy is not a business. Human rights are not a business. And democracy is, most assuredly, not a business.

**Why We Do It**

Each of us came to this work with our identities more or less fully formed, and we have preserved our values, with greater or lesser success, against the professional deformation caused by any bureaucracy. I myself came here with my identity framed: as a Christian, as an Eagle Scout, as a taxpayer.

These didn’t require me to go into the State Department, but they define my obligations as a citizen: to spend tax dollars wisely; to look out for the best interests of the United States and its people; to share the best of America with the world; and to be not only optimistic, but also—to use a word so suddenly fallen from favor—altruistic.

I line up with Steven Pinker. In his book, _The Better Angels of Our Nature_, Pinker describes the “escalator of reason”—“an intensifying application of knowledge and rationality to human affairs.”
That is how we do it. That’s the very definition of the work I’ve been privileged to do, that I will pursue now in different clothes, and that I leave to you.

That’s the sermon, and in a moment I will let you go in peace. First, I want to thank you for so many messages of support and appreciation. One of you here compared the situation to the scene in “Star Wars” when Obi-Wan Kenobi is struck down, and I found that touching. Another compared it to the scene when Princess Leia strangles Jabba the Hutt, and I found that confusing.

The most meaningful came from my son Stefan, a future Nobel laureate in physics, who wrote: “I am proud of your decades of service to this country and the world. You gave everything you could for the people of this world in a slow and painful line of work. You have given more than your share. The values you upheld in your career are part of what makes me who I am.”

And that is why we do it.

Even if you don’t have your own children, what you do in this building tomorrow can mean another generation will live in a habitable world and can enjoy peace and liberty. If we are firm in our principles, steadfast in our ideals and tireless in our determination to uphold our oath—to “defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic”—then for many generations, other Americans will stand in this spot with the same satisfaction and hope I feel today.

I leave you with one last thought, from one of my favorite philosophers. If you’ve never read him, or not for many years, I urge you to take the time now. His name is...Winnie the Pooh. And he said: “How lucky I am to have something that makes saying goodbye so hard.”

Thank you and God bless you!
Military Officers, Lawmakers Speak Out Against State and USAID Budget Cuts

On Feb. 27, following reports that the presidential budget proposal included cuts of as much as 37 percent in funding for the Department of State and USAID, more than 100 officers from across the armed services wrote a letter to U.S. lawmakers urging that they fully fund U.S. diplomacy and foreign aid. Numerous legislators also spoke out.

“As you and your colleagues address the federal budget for Fiscal Year 2018, we write as retired three and four star flag and general officers from all branches of the armed services to share our strong conviction that elevating and strengthening diplomacy and development alongside defense are critical to keeping America safe,” the military leaders wrote to Speaker Paul Ryan, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell and Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer.

Their letter continues: “We know from our service in uniform that many of the crises our nation faces do not have military solutions alone—from confronting violent extremist groups like ISIS in the Middle East and North Africa to preventing pandemics like Ebola and stabilizing weak and fragile states that can lead to greater instability. There are 65 million displaced people today, the most since World War II, with consequences including refugee flows that are threatening America’s strategic allies in Israel, Jordan, Turkey, and Europe.

“The State Department, USAID, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Peace Corps and other development agencies are critical to preventing conflict and reducing the need to put our men and women in uniform in harm’s way. As Secretary James Mattis said while Commander of U.S. Central Command, ‘If you don’t fully fund the State Department, then I need to buy more ammunition.’ The military will lead the fight against terrorism on the battlefield, but it needs strong civilian partners in the battle against the drivers of extremism—lack of opportunity, insecurity, injustice and hopelessness.

“We recognize that America’s strategic investments in diplomacy and development—like all of U.S. investments—must be effective and accountable. Significant reforms have been undertaken since 9/11, many of which have been embodied in recent legislation in Congress with strong bipartisan support—on human trafficking, the rights of women and girls, trade and energy in Africa, wildlife trafficking, water, food security, and transparency and accountability.

“We urge you to ensure that resources for the International Affairs Budget keep pace with the growing global threats and opportunities we face. Now is not the time to retreat.”

Many legislators, including prominent Republicans, joined in emphasizing the critical importance of “soft power” and the danger of slashing the 150 account for diplomacy and foreign assistance.

“This budget destroys soft power, it puts our diplomats at risk and it’s going nowhere,” said Senator Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations. “When I hear if we cut foreign aid we can balance the budget, it’s just a complete lie,” he added.

“I for one, just speaking for myself, think the diplomatic portion of the federal budget is very important, and you get results a lot cheaper frequently than you do on the defense side,” said Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.). “So, speaking for myself, I’m not in favor of reducing what we call the 150 account to that extent.”

“Foreign aid is not charity,” tweeted Senator Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), “We must make sure it is well spent, but it is less than 1 percent of the budget and critical to our national security.”

“Underscoring diplomacy and foreign aid makes our military’s job harder,” said Senator Chris Murphy (D-Conn.), “Trump’s ‘security budget’ completely misses the point.”

—The Editors

The State of State: Questions Abound

The State Department and Secretary of State Rex Tillerson have been the object of increasingly intense media attention in the months since President Donald Trump’s inauguration.

From the dismissal of career diplomats from top-level positions and lack of progress in filling key slots at State to the month-long hiatus in daily press briefings, the report of a White House budget that proposes to slash the 150 account by as much as 37 percent and the unusually low profile of Secretary Tillerson, questions about U.S. foreign policy and its management abound.

In a March 1 article, which has been widely shared, The Atlantic portrayed a State Department that is “adrift and listless.” Activity has slowed to a crawl, the White House has shown no interest in tapping State’s expertise, guidance is not forthcoming on the issues of the day, and employees are mostly in the dark about the new administration’s plans for the department.

For some, the outlook is truly grim. “I don’t think this administration thinks the State Department needs to exist,” one mid-level State Department officer told The Atlantic. “They think Jared [Kushner, Pres. Trump’s son-in-law] can do everything. It’s reminiscent of the developing countries where I’ve served. The family

—The Editors
rules everything, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs knows nothing.”

Others argue that the “chaos” at the department is already affecting foreign policy, making it more difficult to remain tough on Iran, for example, and advance religious freedom around the globe, The Daily Caller reported.

Carol Morello and Anne Gearan of The Washington Post suggested that State has been sidelined. After the White House reportedly vetoed Tillerson’s choice of Elliott Abrams for deputy secretary (D), this number two position at State has yet to be filled (and the second D position has been eliminated).

Including ambassadorial posts, there are more than 200 vacancies at the department, according to staffers for Senator Ben Cardin (D-Md.), the top Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Concern has been echoed in the media across the country. “As we write, there is no deputy secretary of state and only one of the six under secretaries of state is in place,” retired FSO John M. Koenig and former State Department official Carol Kessler wrote in The Seattle Times. “To have a coherent and effective foreign policy, senior positions, including assistant secretaries and ambassadors, should be filled as soon as possible.

Appointees should be selected on the basis of their qualifications, not their political connections.”

As for Tillerson, himself, some say the Secretary of State’s low profile is deliberate: “Tillerson may be playing a long game,” wrote Politico’s Nahal Toosi on March 6. “Considering how erratic the president himself can be on certain foreign policy topics, Tillerson may deem it safer not to say things in public that might end up contradicting his boss and further confusing foreign capitals carefully watching for infighting in the administration.”

“I’m rooting for him,” one State Department official told Toosi, noting that the people who remain the most zen about the situation are those who have served in multiple administrations. “Colleagues who have briefed him are impressed. They find him thoughtful, inquisitive and professional,” the official added.

Toosi said that while many State staffers expected a restructuring—indeed, in his welcome address at the department Sec. Tillerson had promised change: “we can’t sustain ineffective traditions over optimal outcomes”—the size of the proposed cuts was “a gut punch.”

Tillerson has agreed in principle to the cuts, the Associated Press reported, but wants to spread them out over three years to soften the impact and, according to State’s press division, has been making his influence felt behind the scenes.

What all of this means for U.S. foreign policy and national security remains to be seen. “There’s no question this is the slowest transition in decades,” R. Nicholas Burns, a retired FSO and former State Department official told The New York Times on March 12. Burns added: “It is a very, very big mistake. The world continues—it doesn’t respect transitions.”

—The Editors
Media Challenges: The VOA Experience


Bennett argued that we are not yet in a post-truth world, but that challenges to objective journalism remain enduring. This is well understood, she said, among VOA’s diverse workforce of reporters, many of whom could not practice objective journalism in their country of origin and were often the target of retribution.

Having fled after fearing for their safety, many VOA reporters now broadcast objective journalism back to their home nations in their native languages, providing a balanced perspective in heavily polarized and politicized media landscapes.

VOA viewers, whose numbers grew by a record 50 million in a single year from 2015 to 2016, rate its trustworthiness at 86 percent. VOA reaches a total of 236 million viewers weekly.

“Pressure is applied by everyone, this is nothing new in journalism,” Bennett said. Even members of Congress have applied pressure, she states, asking VOA, for instance, to take a tougher line on adversarial nations like Russia.

But VOA must be steadfast in adhering to its charter, Bennett emphasized. Signed into law more than 40 years ago, that charter states as one of three principles: “VOA news will be accurate, objective, and comprehensive.”

Bennett expressed concern over outlets devoted to disinformation, saying she refers to the phenomenon as “deliberately false information” rather than “fake news.” The rise of disinformation, she said, has prompted greater concern for objective journalism and reporting the truth—a good thing.

In response to a question on combating misinformation, David Ensor, Bennett’s predecessor at VOA who was in the audience, stated: “Our experience is that the truth is more powerful than propaganda.”

—Dmitry Filipoff, Publications Coordinator

Lantos Human Rights Prize Awarded to Vian Dakhil

On Feb. 8, the Lantos Foundation for Human Rights and Justice presented the 2016 Lantos Human Rights prize to Vian Dakhil, an Iraqi parliamentarian who drew the world’s attention to the genocide of the Yazidi people by ISIS and has been dubbed its “most wanted woman.”

Ms. Dakhil’s visa was revoked following President Trump’s Jan. 27 executive order refusing entry to the United States for travelers from certain countries (including Iraq). However, following a legal challenge which suspended the ban, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson personally reissued her visa on Feb. 4, allowing her to travel to the United States and receive the award in person.

Accepting the prize from House Minority Leader Rep. Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.), Ms. Dakhil reminded the audience that, although much has been done to aid the Yazidi people, there are still more than 3,900 women and girls in captivity.

Referring to the executive order banning travelers from seven countries, Ms. Dakhil said that Iraqi citizens have fought and died alongside American soldiers for many years, yet the order did not take in to account that most Iraqis are victims and not perpetrators of terrorism.

The Lantos Foundation for Human Rights and Justice was founded by the late Congressman Tom Lantos, a Holocaust survivor and U.S. Representative for 27 years. Previous winners include His Holiness the Dalai Lama, Elie Weisel and Israeli President Shimon Peres.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

Bye-Bye, BBG

On Dec. 23, then-President Barack Obama signed into law the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (S. 2943). One of the bill’s many provisions that flew largely below the radar is Section 1288, which is likely to have a profound effect on U.S. international broadcasting, reports Broadcastingcable.com.

Championed by House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Edward R. Royce (R-Calif.), this provision abolishes the bipartisan Broadcasting Board of Governors that has long overseen government-backed, nonmilitary international media outlets.

These include the Voice of America, the Office of Cuba Broadcasting, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Radio Free Asia and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks.

The BBG will eventually be replaced by a five-member International Broadcasting Advisory Board, headed by the Secretary of State. The president will select the other
Created in 2005 as an expat blog, www.expat.com has grown into a community of more than 1.8 million members worldwide.

Present in more than 197 countries and 500 cities, the website provides a forum for expats to talk about their unique lives, find employment in their new country and deal with the logistics of moving around (e.g., health insurance, moving companies and finding housing options).

Signing up is free, and members can also be “Experts”—a group of volunteers who liven up the forums and make themselves available to answer questions about their host country.

Those questions could be anything from “Where can I find kosher marshmallows in Vietnam?” to “How did you ship your pet cat to Costa Rica?” The experts have been there, done that, got the t-shirt and are willing to share their experiences.

American expats make up the top 10 largest communities of expats on the site, closely followed by Australians and Egyptians.

Expat.com also hosts offline events in a number of countries, where expats can meet in person and engage with each other and the local community.

The search function allows the user to find those in or going to his or her country of interest, and also to narrow the search by nationality, interests and age.

Each country page also has links to bloggers from the area and a dedicated page of the larger forum for country-specific questions and tips.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

SITE OF THE MONTH: www.expat.com

four members from a list of candidates compiled by Congress.

They will report to the BBG’s Chief Executive Officer (currently John F. Lansing), who will be answerable to the White House alone, and will have free rein to hire and fire network heads and set guidelines for programming.

The CEO will also have statutory authority to meld all U.S.-government international media outlets except VOA into a single, consolidated, private, non-profit corporation.

The new entity’s mission would be to: (1) counter state-sponsored propaganda; (2) provide uncensored local and regional news and analysis; (3) help countries help themselves in terms of indigenous news capabilities; and (4) promote unrestricted access to uncensored information sources, especially the internet.

Some experts have sounded the alarm about the potential dangers of this development.

Writing on ForeignPolicy.com on Dec. 15, Jeffrey Gedmin, who was president and CEO of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty from 2007 to 2011, concedes that RFE/RL and other outlets have been consistently hamstrung by the BBG’s dysfunction and poor governance.

But, Gedmin points out: “The BBG
was never there for oversight alone. As a bipartisan body with four Democratic and four Republican members, plus a representative of the Secretary of State, it has always played the crucial function of a firewall, safeguarding the outlets editorial independence from the whims of its funder, the U.S. government. This was how the networks won trust with their foreign audiences—but this independence is on the way out.

More sanguine about the new organization’s prospects, however, is Joseph B. Bruns, a former director of the International Broadcasting Bureau, which manages the transmission, distribution, digital media development, marketing and support services for the U.S. international media networks under the BBG’s aegis.

In a Jan. 2 post to the Public Diplomacy Council’s website, Bruns encourages “those who care about [international broadcasting] to cease the hand-wringing over the loss of the so-called firewall, roll up our sleeves and get down to the practical work of operating in the new paradigm.”

Recommendating several specific steps to do just that, Bruns declares: “The fear of a presidential appointee running rogue should not be allowed to paralyze positive action, to build on the past, to discard what no longer works and to embrace the future.”

—Steven Alan Honley, Contributing Editor

Contemporary Quote

“The United States may, from time to time, disagree with European Union perspectives, as friends do. At the end of the day, no one should misinterpret occasional policy differences and debates as a signal of anything less than total commitment to our alliances in Europe. That commitment is strong. ... The United States thinks it’s possible to have a better relationship with Russia—after all, we confront many of the same threats. But greater cooperation with Russia cannot come at the expense of the security of our European friends and allies.”


Diplomatic Security Special Agents Recognized

Three Diplomatic Security Special Agents from the New York field office were named Federal Law Enforcement Foundation Investigators of the Year in 2016. The DS special agents were part of an investigative team that brought down a transnational human trafficking network.

The investigation, involving the Department of Homeland Security, Internal Revenue Service, U.S. Postal Inspection Service and New York Police Department, resulted in charges being brought against 11 individuals for laundering money from illegal brothels in New York.

The FLEF awards honor representatives from each federal law enforcement investigative agency and the offices of the U.S. Attorney(s) for the Western, Eastern and Southern Districts of New York. Personnel selected for the awards are recommended by the head of each agency and approved by the FLEF board of directors.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

Senator Defend Dissent

In a Feb. 16 letter, every Democratic member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as well as Senator Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.), urged Secretary of State Rex Tillerson to respect and take advantage of the State Department’s unique Dissent Channel.

A message, “Alternatives to Closing Doors in Order to Secure Our Borders,” had been submitted through the Dissent Channel on Jan. 30 that was reportedly signed by more than 900 State employees.

In their letter to the Secretary of State, the 11 senators expressed their concern at the reaction of White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer to the dissent. In a Jan. 30 press briefing Spicer said that those who dissented “should either get with the program or they can go.”

The senators underlined the guidance from the State Department’s Foreign Affairs Manual concerning the Dissent Channel: “freedom from reprisal for Dissent Channel users is strictly enforced.”

Describing State Department employees as “among those most dedicated of our public servants, on the front lines safeguarding our nation’s security,” the senators also thanked members of the Foreign Service for their insight and counsel to the SFRC over the years.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor
Why We Need a Better Intranet and How to Get It

BY BRADLEY MEACHAM

Organizations around the world are spending significant resources to better manage their information via internal websites, or intranets. These tools help employees navigate oceans of data, including news, day-to-day work and social media. Done right, intranets empower employees and minimize distractions.

Consider typical Foreign Service officers. They are bombarded with news about the United States, their current country and previous assignments. They navigate management updates from post and Washington, plus a thicket of internal online resources and websites that don’t necessarily work well together. This leaves little energy to process important messages, let alone think about strategy and goals.

Before joining the State Department I had worked for years as a journalist and corporate communications executive. I had led projects to revamp the intranet at T-Mobile USA and at Vertafore, a software company with about 1,400 employees. Here at State, I quickly noticed opportunities to improve communications among 80,000 people across more than 300 locations.

During my recent tour in Mexico City I led a revamp of the SharePoint intranets of the embassy and nine constituent consulates in U.S. Mission Mexico. From the beginning the project was much more than redesigning a website—it involved rethinking work processes and information flow across a complex mission of 2,800 employees. The goal was to share knowledge, save time and provide common space to collaborate on policy goals and, ultimately, help us become better diplomats.

Problems for users were easy to identify through existing employee surveys. There was little use of the intranet for collaboration, and the sites were not accomplishing the goal of sharing information across the mission. Some employees said they didn’t understand how their work fit into the mission’s goals or what other offices were doing, and it was difficult to find the resources they were seeking.

Introducing Mexico Information Exchange (MIX)

To fix this, we followed an ambitious 12-step plan including research, design, development and training. Our SharePoint was rebranded with a new name, Mexico Information Exchange, or MIX, with several important characteristics:

- **Common starting point.** The MIX homepage was designed to be the common online starting point for employees each day, like a virtual “town square” for the mission community. Updating the design of the SharePoint master page gave the entire site a clean, modern look consistent with the State Department’s global branding standards and distinct from the blue-and-white style that comes with out-of-the-box SharePoint straight from Microsoft.

  The homepage prominently features news, including management announcements and security notices, a calendar and a shortlist of links to most-used internal websites. MIX can be set as the default homepage for Internet Explorer and Chrome on office computers so that everyone gets the same messages at least once a day.

- **Simplified content structure.** No matter how pretty it is, an intranet only works if it’s useful. To that end, MIX reflects the tasks employees do every day instead of the organization chart.

Usage data and focus groups helped identify those needs. The most-common tasks and most-requested information were grouped into new pages under a “Services” dropdown at the top of the
MIX homepage.

For example, 65 percent of traffic to Finance’s section of the SharePoint site was seeking details about how to get reimbursed for private, value-added tax payments. So this went onto a new page, reachable with a single click under “Services.” It includes procedures, Frequently Asked Questions and information on pending reimbursements. Making the most-sought information easier to find should lead to fewer phone calls to the Finance office and less need for in-person meetings.

A new Travel page centralizes information that had been spread among General Services, Finance and the Regional Security Office. A Health page gives everyone access to the same information about, say, Zika. Medical providers at the consulates can focus on serving patients rather than posting duplicate versions of the same thing. Other management topics and mission-wide resources (e.g., maps, biographies, media links, awards) got the same treatment.

Each office retained its own section within SharePoint, which became a tool for employees in those offices to collaborate online.

- Users empowered with ownership. SharePoint is often referred to as a place where documents go to die. That’s because people often have incorrect permissions or lack technical know-how, and content quickly gets out-of-date.

MIX largely eliminates the need to update individual pages. Content is arranged in document libraries, and pages are set up to automatically draw from those libraries. If a document is updated or replaced in a library—as easy as putting a document in a computer’s shared drive—it automatically appears on the corresponding pages.

This ensures there’s a single version of each document.

One or two Locally Employed staff were recruited from each office—about 40 people in all—to assume full control of their online section as “content owners.” They received training to manage their document libraries and the permissions for their pages, and their name appears prominently on their page so users know who to contact if something isn’t correct.

- Connect locations. We initially pursued an additional SharePoint site collection for MIX and also asked to pilot the newest version of SharePoint. Neither effort gained the necessary approvals, so we applied the new MIX “look and feel” to the 10 existing site collections of the embassy and consulates so they would appear seamless, utilizing the existing version of SharePoint.

Now they share the same navigation banner across the top of the page with five categories of dropdowns: Mission, Services, Embassy, Consular, Locations. Users in Tijuana and Guadalajara, for example, see different homepages—each with locally controlled content—but they can easily navigate to information shared across Mission Mexico. As a result, usage of the intranet has been
steadily growing each month since launch.

**Making It Happen**

Here are a few keys to upgrading an intranet at post:

- **Top-level sponsorship.** A project like this can’t be a skunk works. Change is difficult and will inevitably face some institutional resistance. Strong support from the top, in this case from the management counselor and regional information management officer, will be needed.

- **Planning.** It’s tempting to make something that looks like a flashy commercial website. It’s better to keep it simple. Try to make important content reachable with one or two clicks from the homepage. This is especially important in areas with low-bandwidth internet or latency issues.

- **Use what you have.** MIX doesn’t use custom software code and was designed to be imitated. The department’s current application, SharePoint 2010, offers many features and widgets that can be used by posts without extensive modification.

- **Online content.** For a successful intranet, content is king. Writing for the web is unique and potentially powerful. For example, sentences tend to be shorter and more active, while bullets and white space help make text more readable.

  MIX includes brief articles about town halls, a new metrics-based management program, takeaways from important visits and other topics so that everyone can benefit from common information. A photo-sharing feature was designed to introduce new people at the embassy.

  Of course, developing a cadence of compelling articles and video—and deploying the right people to write and edit—remains a big opportunity. Ideas include analyzing components of the Integrated Country Strategy and providing updates that everyone should know, even if outside their day-to-day work. The best cables and ideas at post could also be showcased. If you publish meaningful content, people will come.

- **Dedicated staff.** Someone needs to be in charge of the structure and maintenance of the intranet, as well as coordinating and encouraging content owners. Since an intranet is 10 percent technology and 90 percent content, the ideal person is a tech-savvy writer/editor who enjoys the challenge of online communication.

  In Mexico City we ultimately created a new LE staff intranet manager position to ensure MIX would continue to gain momentum. Most companies have someone dedicated to running their intranet, and the role is also key to ensuring attention and improvement for a post’s intranet.

  Finally, content owners need ongoing training and support from their bosses and should include their intranet duties in their work requirements.

  Revamping an intranet takes more time than might be expected. But there’s huge potential benefit from helping make our processes more efficient and our workplace more collaborative.
Both Europe and the United States have a vital stake in preserving and improving the trans-Atlantic relationship.

The guiding lights for my approach to foreign affairs have been United Kingdom membership in the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organizaion, support for the United Nations and a profound belief in the trans-Atlantic relationship. These principles have been complementary and mutually reinforcing.

They have their roots in the recognition that a rules-based system provides the most effective means to preserve and promote peace and security. A rules-based system may seem perfect in conception, but less so in practice. Still, history teaches us that the alternatives are less effective.

Out of the ashes of the Second World War a new order was established, comprised of Bretton Woods, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations, NATO and the European Union, and other international organizations. The purpose was to thwart nationalist ambition, to foster cooperation, and to achieve and sustain postwar reconciliation and reconstruction. Or, to put it another way, the goal was to identify and prevent the causes and the consequences of conflict.

Have the members of these institutions always met the obligations incumbent upon them? Of course not; because even in a perfect world, if such existed, national interests would never be entirely subordinate to supranational agreement. But the obligations and the inherent values that these institutions and relationships embraced have provided a benchmark against which citizens could measure the performance of their governments and signatories could judge their fellows.

We should not hesitate to describe these institutions and their values as liberal. Nor should we hesitate to recognize that without them our world would have been less secure.

Brexit and New Challenges

But now we face challenges of an entirely different nature, reflecting the disillusionment and even discontent many citizens feel toward governments which, both in their domestic policies and internationally, have acted in accordance with the obligations these organizations and relationships impose.

The unexpected outcome of the so-called Brexit referen-
dum in June 2016 has resulted in the United Kingdom setting a course for leaving the European Union, of which it has been a prominent member for more than 40 years. Now less and less weight is given to the fact that the integration of Europe and Britain’s contribution to it during the last four decades prevented a recurrence of the kind of conflicts that scarred the continent in the past.

Indeed, the decision of the British people has raised the possibility that the very existence of the European Union itself may be at risk, thanks to the encouragement it has afforded to parties of the right in France, Germany and Holland. In the forthcoming elections in all three countries, these parties will press even harder for withdrawal, spurred on by the British example.

It is presumptuous to offer an opinion on the circumstances which led to Donald Trump’s election to the presidency of the United States, and it is also dangerous to invoke parallels. But it can reasonably be said that there are certain similarities in the public mood in both the United Kingdom and United States. Not the least of these is the rejection of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, whose qualifications and experience became a hindrance rather than an advantage in the eyes of many American voters because they identified her with what they regarded as a discredited establishment.

Against this background, it is necessary to consider what the consequences of these events are for a rules-based system and for the trans-Atlantic relationship, particularly as it affects the United States and United Kingdom. This task is not made any easier by the fact that at the time of writing there is no clear view of the foreign policy positions which the United States may take under its new president.

We face challenges of an entirely different nature, reflecting the disillusionment and even discontent many citizens feel toward governments.
How Special a Relationship?

We British like to think that we enjoy a unique “special relationship” with the United States. In America that relationship is often thought to be rather less exclusive than the British would prefer, even when it is described as essential. But however it is characterized, there is no doubt that both countries look with favor on their closeness. Practical illustrations of this are to be found in the sharing of intelligence of the highest possible quality and close cooperation over nuclear weapons. We are each other’s first ally of choice.

History shows us that when there is a warm personal relationship between a president and a prime minister, the bilateral relationship is closest. Winston Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harold Macmillan and John F. Kennedy, Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, and George W. Bush and Tony Blair are all testimony to that—although many U.K. citizens thought the last of those pairings proved extremely disadvantageous when it led to their joint policy of military action against Iraq’s Saddam Hussein.

The bilateral relationship has not always been perfect. British Prime Minister Harold Wilson refused to send any troops to support the United States in Vietnam despite the request by President Lyndon Johnson for just one company of the Black Watch and its pipe band. Prime Minister Thatcher’s exchanges with President Reagan when the United States unilaterally and without warning invaded Grenada in 1983 were incendiary.

As U.S. foreign policy emerges under President Trump, London and Brussels should take every opportunity to encourage him to recognize the need to maintain the United States’ commitment to a rules-based system and to a trans-Atlantic relationship in which Britain can play a prominent and effective role. At a time when there is more fragile uncertainty internationally than at any time since 1989 when the Berlin Wall came down, NATO and that relationship have never been more important on both sides of the Atlantic.

Pres. Trump has a point when he says that the European members of NATO have not contributed sufficiently to the cost of their own defense. The target of 2 percent of annual gross domestic product (GDP), which the 2014 NATO summit in Wales set, is a bare minimum; yet three years on only a handful of NATO members have reached it. Indeed, some argue that even the countries which have reached that level have done so by virtue of creative accounting. In the case of the United Kingdom, London has met the goal, but many commentators warn that 2 percent of GDP is inadequate to meet both the country’s domestic and international responsibilities.

The credibility of the alliance depends on its capability. And capability depends not only on how much is spent, but how it is spent. European members can make a much more effective contribution if they embrace the principles of force specialization, common procurement and interoperability. Proposals for a so-called European army are not credible and would constitute unnecessary duplication.

NATO Is Not Obsolete

The judgment that NATO is obsolete does not reflect reality. When Russia deploys nuclear-capable missiles to Kaliningrad, it is not only the Baltic states that should feel concerned, but the whole of Europe. When Russian generals are reported to have endorsed the use of battlefield nuclear weapons, every NATO member should be concerned. Such developments are eerily reminiscent of the Cold War. They give rise to the risk of accident, misjudgment or provocation, real or imagined.

The relationship between London and Washington is the central pillar of the principles of conventional and nuclear deterrence set out in NATO’s strategic concept, and reaffirmed at the 2016 NATO summit in Warsaw.

The obligations contained in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty are only credible if the United States and the United Kingdom stand ready to fulfill them. Those Americans who question the strength of that obligation should recall that the only occasion on which it has been invoked was in 2001, when terrorists struck the Twin Towers and the Pentagon.

Equally, it is not credible to contemplate offering a sphere of influence in Europe to Russia. To do so would only assist President Vladimir Putin in achieving his twin objectives of undermining the European Union and destabilizing NATO.

NATO is the essential glue in the trans-Atlantic alliance.
Without wholehearted commitment by all of its members, the alliance would be weakened severely, possibly fatally. It is optimistic, to say the least, to believe that belligerence in the Kremlin will be replaced by benevolence. History tells us that those who enjoy spheres of influence are rarely satisfied by what they control. Characteristically, they look to expand.

Diminishing the American commitment to Europe can only further encourage Putin. It is said that a deal can be struck with him, and that better relations can be achieved. This is both pragmatic and laudable. But what would such a deal involve? Do not such dealings involve concessions on both sides? What would Putin be prepared to offer in such a bargain, and what could he be offered in return?

Buoyed by his diplomatic and military success in the Middle East, why would he be in any mood to make concessions? Who’s to say he would not simply bank any concession made to him without reciprocating? And even if such a deal were achieved, the continued maintenance of the deterrence which NATO provides would be a necessary safeguard.

Pres. Trump has a point when he says that the European members of NATO have not contributed sufficiently to the cost of their own defense.

Protecting U.S. National Interests

It is easy to see that Europe has a real stake in preserving the trans-Atlantic relationship. But what of the United States? A stable and secure Europe making a proper contribution to its own defense is the best means of protecting American
interests on the continent. U.S. investment and trading interests are served by stability. There is a close and productive relationship between the United States and the two European nuclear-weapon states in NATO, the United Kingdom and France.

In Europe, Washington would continue to find a partner which upholds the rule of law, protects freedom of speech and assembly, and is based on democratic values. What better partner could there be in an increasingly uncertain world? But beware. There are already those in Europe and the United Kingdom who argue that the language of Pres. Trump’s campaign must be taken seriously and is likely to emerge as established policy. They further assert that Europe can no longer look to the United States with the same certainty as before; and that a Europe on the one hand destabilized by the United Kingdom’s decision to withdraw from the European Union and, on the other, by a diminished commitment from Washington would have to learn to go it alone.

That this outcome is even thought possible makes it imperative that those on both sides of the Atlantic who understand and value the relationship actively resist any moves in that direction. Yes, the United States is entitled to require the European members of NATO to meet their commitment to spending at least 2 percent of their GDP on defense. In return, European members are entitled to expect the Trump administration to curtail its reliance on conducting policy via the informality of social media. Foreign relations in government need to be formulated and conducted with deliberation and clarity, following consultations with allies.

British Prime Minister Theresa May has an obligation and an opportunity to be an honest broker and candid friend on both sides of the Atlantic. She can bring home to the Europeans that their relationship with Washington must become less one-sided, and she can help the Trump administration see that maintenance of that relationship is essential to advancing their own interests.

---
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The questions hanging over the E.U.-U.S. relationship are made all the more daunting by Europe’s own difficulties—economic stagnation and a demographic crisis.

There’s a sense of fin d’époque in the air this year. Changeover time at the U.S. mission to the European Union has stoked uncertainty over the future direction of the trans-Atlantic relationship.

And that’s not all. A succession of surprise political shifts in Europe has prompted American analysts to rethink once-immutable policy positions.

Not far from Belgium’s royal palace in central Brussels, Tony Gardner bade farewell to the team he headed for three years as America’s ambassador to the European Union. It was an emotional moment, made all the more poignant by the stark bareness of his office walls, where the familiar pictures and memorabilia have been replaced by faded patches and metal hooks.

A few miles away on the city’s outskirts, Truman Hall, the imposing residence of U.S. ambassadors to NATO, also stands empty. The moving vans have long since taken away the personal effects of Doug Lute, the knowledgeable former army general who since 2013 had represented the United States on the North Atlantic Council.

The world’s eyes have not been on Brussels but on Washington, D.C., where Donald J. Trump has become the 45th president of the United States. But the mood in Brussels, as in all of Europe’s national capitals, is anxious and even apprehensive. What, ask the E.U.’s “Eurocrats”—officials of the European Commission and other institutions—will happen to trans-Atlantic relations now?

The questions hanging over the E.U.-U.S. relationship are made larger and all the more daunting by Europe’s own difficulties. The looming departure of the United Kingdom from the E.U.’s ranks following last summer’s “Brexit” vote has deepened a climate of doubt. Europeans are no longer confident that their 60-year project of progressive economic and political integration still has a rosy future.

Fears over immigration and resentment against the job-shifting effects of globalization have seen the rise of anti-establishment populists on both the extreme left and the extreme right ends of the political spectrum. From Greece to Italy to Spain, and even in level-headed Scandinavian countries, the apple carts of the old order are being upset by newcomers who challenge the European Union and its values.

This year will see scheduled elections in France, the Nether-
lands and Germany, and quite possibly elsewhere if the political temperature in Europe rises. More volatile developments are overtaking the relatively manageable details of trade agreements and “level playing fields” for business rivals handled by policymakers and diplomats.

Europe’s difficulties may well be compounded during the coming months by significant changes in longstanding U.S. policies. But the important point is that Europe has serious structural difficulties of its own making to deal with. It is beginning to suffer the first effects of a huge demographic deficit, and it has at the same time failed to address the poor productivity that has been gnawing away at its competitiveness in the global marketplace.

Cause for Alarm

Alarm bells on both these issues have been ringing for some time, but were widely ignored by vote-seeking politicians. The answer to the continent’s rapid aging and growing labor shortages is to increase immigration—a visceral issue that has seen populist parties across Europe garner millions of votes. Even in prosperous Germany, the arrival in 2015 of about a million refugees and economic migrants from conflict zones in the Middle East triggered a surge of support for the anti-E.U. Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) Party, which has come almost from nowhere to gain support from 16 percent of voters.

Just as alarming are Europe’s productivity problem and its economic stagnation. Sluggish growth as the continent slowly recovers from the global financial crisis of 2007-2008 has seen Europe slip downward in the international economic league tables. Ten years ago, 17 of the world’s 50 largest corporations were European; today, they number only seven, compared with China’s eight.

In the closing quarter of the 20th century, annual improvement in Europe’s productivity outstripped that of the United States. Average productivity growth was 2.7 percent a year, more than double the American figure of 1.3 percent. But at the dawn of the 21st century, most European countries made the wrong business choices; their focus on tried-and-tested sectors like heavy industry and banking led them to neglect the digital revolution.

The result has been a reversal of the trans-Atlantic productivity equation. Since 2000 the United States has been steaming ahead with productivity gains of more than 2 percent a year, while Europe is floundering at barely half that rate. The profits of Europe’s top 500 companies are consequently much reduced and now run at roughly half those chalked up by their American competitors.

Over the same period, the E.U. has also lost a good deal of political momentum, and its project of ever-closer political and economic union lies becalmed. The question that many policy analysts are asking themselves is whether the waning of Europe’s ambitions has acted as a brake on the tough reforms and industrial policies needed to stimulate growth, or whether it’s the decline in Europe’s wealth creation that has discouraged far-sighted political strategies.

In fact, the two trends feed on each other. The disruptive effects of the economic crisis that began to bite hard in 2008 very quickly eclipsed the E.U.’s grandiose plans for centralizing more powers in Brussels. Those plans were replaced by far more urgent priorities, such as saving the Eurozone. The European single currency, launched to much fanfare in 1999, enjoyed a trouble-free decade; but by 2012 debt crises in Portugal, Italy, Ireland and Spain—and in Greece, most of all—threatened the euro’s very survival.

For a time, Brussels was at least able to point to a huge growth in E.U. membership. In 2013, the arrival of Croatia as the 13th new member-state since 2004 was greeted as a sign that the European project still exerts its old magnetism. But the E.U.’s enlargement from 15 to 28 countries also created major strains. The mantra that Europe could widen as well as deepen gave way to a realization that the E.U. has become an unwieldy body often riven by divergent interests.

The formerly communist countries of Eastern and Central Europe have, on the whole, thrived economically after overcoming the hardships of adapting to free-market conditions. Less positive has been their political relationship with the rest...
of Europe. Relations with Brussels and the E.U.’s policymaking machinery, in particular, are increasingly combative—perhaps a legacy of their resistance to the Soviet yoke, or a symptom of the E.U.’s much-criticized “democratic deficit.”

Also troubling for the E.U. is the North-South divide separating its Western European members. The fiscal austerity forced on southern debtor countries by Germany and other northern Eurozone states has accentuated economic disparities between them. Youth unemployment and backward industries with little high-tech innovation have become hallmarks of the so-called “Club Med” Mediterranean economies.

Developments in France will be crucial to the continent’s future. Although geographically a “Club Med” country, France has been one of the E.U.’s economic powerhouses. In recent years, though, the wasting of its industrial sinews has become cause for concern. The populist siren calls, notably anti-immigrant rhetoric and demands for trade barriers to protect French jobs, have produced a steady rise in support for the far-right National Front Party. Elsewhere, extremists on both the left and right, offering simplistic solutions to complex problems, have become prominent figures in national politics, and pose very real threats to Europe’s continued integration.

The Demographic Dilemma

The deceptively straightforward nostrums offered by these populist politicians fly in the face of a single, overwhelming reality: Europe is aging at an alarming speed, and its workforce is shrinking while social security costs are soaring. As a rough average, there are at present four working-age people to support each pensioner. But by mid-century, that ratio will have shrunk to just 2:1.

That’s clearly unsustainable, yet this grim demographic outlook is scarcely discussed in national debates. Nor is there much focus on the more immediate consequences of labor shortages on the overall European economy. The reality of a dwindling working-age population is being eclipsed in the public mind by the headline figures of joblessness among young people.

There’s no question that school-leavers and even university graduates in many parts of Europe have a tougher time finding work than did earlier generations. The years since 2008 have seen unemployment in the E.U. rise by 10 million people to 26 million, contrasting sharply with the previous decade during which 25 million new jobs were created. This rollercoaster is, though, of much less importance than the size of the labor force.

It is generally accepted by economic analysts that a growing labor force is key to growth in a country’s overall economy. Even if tighter immigration controls lead to a slowdown in America’s forecast demographic growth from 320 million to around 400 million by mid-century, the U.S. economy is on a steady upward trend. That of Europe is not.

The present population of the European Union, including the United Kingdom, is 510 million—and looks likely to fall to around 450 million by 2050. Raw numbers like these are less significant, though, than the ratio between workers and dependents. How far and how fast Europe’s workforce will shrink is going to be determined by the flow of immigrants.

By mid-century, the E.U.’s workforce of around 240 million people today will be down to about 207 million, assuming that immigration into Europe continues at its present rate. That is worrying enough, but there’s a growing risk that immigration will be stifled. The surge in 2015 and 2016 that saw some 1.5 million refugees and economic migrants from conflict zones like Syria and across Africa undertaking perilous journeys to reach Europe provoked much sympathy, but also a strong anti-immigration backlash.

Voters are increasingly anti-immigrant. It’s a mood that did much to determine the outcome of the Brexit referendum in the United Kingdom, and it is shaping election outcomes across the continent. Yet the economic effects of halting or severely curtailling immigration are potentially catastrophic. Without new blood from beyond Europe’s borders, the present workforce could number only 169 million in 2050, taking a huge chunk out of the European economy and limiting its maximum attainable growth rate in gross domestic product to barely 1 percent a year.

No one is more worried about this trend than Germany’s hugely successful export industries. Daimler, the Stuttgart-
based producer of luxury Mercedes automobiles, has warned that, come 2020, more than half its skilled workers will be more than 50 years old—and it is struggling to find enough young apprentices to replace them. Meanwhile, Volkswagen has revealed that a third of its vehicles are already being produced by factories in Asia.

The TTIP-ing Point?

Where, then, do Europe’s difficulties leave the trans-Atlantic relationship? The short answer is largely unaffected for the time being, but vulnerable to substantial change in the longer term.

More than half a century of trade and investment across the Atlantic has created an extraordinarily robust joint economy. American-owned assets in Europe are worth $14 trillion, says the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, accounting for 60 percent of all U.S. foreign investment around the world. For their part, European investors account for two-thirds of all foreign-owned holdings in the United States. The fairly recent U.S. “pivot” to Asia still has a long way to go before it makes a dent in the trans-Atlantic relationship.

Trade in goods across the Atlantic is, at about half a trillion dollars yearly, rather less buoyant. That’s a reflection of the competing local attractions of the European and American domestic markets, but also of protectionist tendencies in both. It is also why, in recent years, Brussels and Washington invested a good deal of political capital in the unsuccessful effort to conclude a Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership.

The idea has been to overcome regulatory differences, and also to fashion a common U.S.-E.U. front against the inroads that Asian competitors—China today, India tomorrow—are making in global markets. “The TTIP is not a free trade agreement; it’s a hell of a lot more than that!” says Christian Leflfer, the former Swedish diplomat in charge of economic and global affairs at the European External Action Service, the E.U.’s increasingly powerful foreign policy arm. “Its importance lies in a shared approach to regulations and standards.”

Elements of the agreement may survive the protectionist sentiments of Pres. Trump and some members of his Cabinet, but much of it looks set to share the fate of the cancelled Trans-Pacific Partnership. The closing months of 2016 saw TTIP increasingly bogged down, both on key questions like disputes settlement arrangements and also over abstruse and unimportant details. “There seemed irreconcilable differences, for instance, between American experts who insisted that the purity of, say, oysters and clams depended on the water they’re grown in,” recalls former U.S. Ambassador Tony Gardner, “and Europeans whose testing methods concern their freshness.”

Still, the immediate outlook for trans-Atlantic trade should not be cause for concern. The bureaucratic hurdles erected by European or American officials are not insuperable, if there’s enough goodwill. It’s also unlikely that the flows of goods and services across the Atlantic will be quickly disrupted, even by ugly spats between political leaders.

More worrying is the longer-term risk that the European Union and the United States may be embarking on divergent geopolitical paths. Their shared concerns during the post-World War II years are fading. The certainties of the Cold War are a quarter-century out of date, and have anyway been eroded by disagreements over policy toward the Middle East, with Syria following Iraq and Iran, and by increasing differences of approach toward militant Islam and Russian assertiveness. Although these disagreements arise within Europe as well as across the Atlantic, the overall trend seems to be away from the common threat assessments that have been such a strong feature of U.S.-E.U. relations. Differences over security are creating sharper frictions than competing economic interests have ever done.

Some began to question the value of the North Atlantic alliance after the 1989 fall of the Berlin Wall and the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union. Since then, Russia’s military resurgence and more assertive foreign policy have given NATO a new lease on life, but that has been somewhat negated by the failure of its European members even to maintain their modest defense budgets. Their “freeloading” has long provoked irritation in the United States, and Pres. Trump’s apparent hostility to the alliance may even spur European governments into plowing funds into defense.

In the ever-tougher conditions of the globalizing world economy, Europeans know that not even the continent’s largest countries can expect to make their voices heard and advance their own interests.
For Europe to take greater responsibility for its own defense seems highly desirable, even if the consequences are unpredictable. It could be that the result will be a more muscular E.U. “defense union” that initially parallels NATO, but then diverges once Europe has the means to concentrate on its own priorities, notably in unstable and overpopulated Africa.

**Ostrich-like, Europe has for many years refused to face up to its structural weaknesses.**

**The E.U.—Down But Not Out**

Where does that leave the European Union? It is assailed by a lengthening list of challenges. Some are new and others have long been unresolved. Ostrich-like, Europe has for many years refused to face up to its structural weaknesses. As well as its demographic shrinkage and comparative decline in terms of the global economy, attitudes within European society spell serious trouble ahead. Unlike America’s “melting pot” culture of absorbing immigrants, people across Europe resent and resist newcomers. Whether speaking of longstanding Turkish communities in Germany or North Africans in France and Belgium, the record on successful integration is poor and the political signposts suggest worse to come.

None of this means the European Union is going to collapse. Although the Eurosceptic tide has been running strongly in recent years, as opportunists heading the new breed of populist parties have played on widespread resentment of the austerity policies that followed the last decade’s economic downturn, it’s far too soon to herald the E.U.’s disintegration.

Brexit is frequently seen as the domino that will topple other countries into leaving. Instead, the E.U.’s message that Britain
will derive no profit from going
has convinced public opinion
in the remaining 27 countries
of the compelling advantages
of membership. In the ever-
tougher conditions of the
globalizing world economy,
Europeans know that not even
the continent’s largest coun-
tries can expect to make their
voices heard and advance their own interests.

This is not to say that the next few years will be smooth
sailing for Europe. The need for concerted intergovernmental
action to protect the euro and recover the E.U.’s popularity
is plain to see, but hard to achieve. Ranged against a more
dynamic approach are the electoral costs of supporting more
bonds with Europe when so many voters want fewer. Success-
ive European Union member governments have habitually
blamed Brussels for unwelcome developments, thus devaluing

Without Washington’s
encouragement, the E.U. risks
stagnating, robbing America
of its most powerful ally.

in America’s own interest and remains so to this day. Washing-
ton will continue to exert a major influence on the E.U.’s future,
and the European Union will doubtless continue as a bloc.

Without Washington’s encouragement, the E.U. risks
stagnating, robbing America of its most powerful political and
economic ally; but with renewed and sustained U.S. backing
Europe will be far better placed to survive and thrive. Just as
no single E.U. country can go it alone in the 21st century, nor
should America envisage a future of splendid isolation.
Globalization and digitalization present as fundamental a challenge to the U.S.-European alliance as the task of rebuilding after World War II.

During my first weeks in the Foreign Service in 1964, I told the chairman of my A-100 course that I wanted to specialize in European affairs. His reaction was to suggest that my plan was at best misguided and at worst suicidal. Europe was no longer a problem, he told me. No careers were to be made in Europe. The European Economic Community and the Berlin Wall had defined Europe into two parts, and the Western part would soon be able to stand on its own.

Over the dramatic years which followed, I thought back to this conversation from time to time, because it revealed one of the basic dilemmas of American diplomacy. Even at the peak of the Cold War, senior State Department officers preferred hands-on jobs in the Third World to the geopolitics of Europe and Russia.

Assuming that our vision of American particularism was all the strategy we needed, American leaders have from the earliest days of our republic, chosen short-term, “transactional” diplomacy over longer-term strategies. President Donald J. Trump’s preference for dramatic deals rather than careful tending of a strong Atlantic community is only somewhat more pronounced than that of his two immediate predecessors. The great American commentator Walter Lippman noted that this predilection often led to the “insolvency” of American foreign policy.

Needless to say, my career did not suffer from toiling for many years in the European vineyard. There were great moments and more than enough tragedy. Along the way I also came to understand how central the task of rebuilding Europe had been to the success of the great Pax Americana that stabilized the postwar world.

John Christian Kornblum served as U.S. ambassador to Germany from 1997 to 2001, when he retired after 30 years in the Foreign Service. As a Europe specialist, he was also posted to Austria, Belgium and Finland in addition to Washington, D.C. High-level diplomatic positions included service as minister and deputy commandant in Berlin, deputy U.S. permanent representative to NATO, ambassador to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, assistant secretary for European and Canadian Affairs, deputy head of U.S. Delegation to the Dayton Balkan Peace Talks and special envoy to the Balkans.

Amb. Kornblum is now an international business adviser and commentator, living in Berlin. He currently serves as senior counselor to the German law firm Nörr LLP. He is also a senior adviser for the Europe Program of CSIS, founding chairman of the John F. Kennedy Atlantic Forum and chairman of NPR Berlin. In addition, he serves on numerous nonprofit boards and committees, including the American Academy in Berlin, the Deutsche Oper in Berlin and the American Chamber of Commerce in Germany.
Navigating the Difficult Postwar Years

Most of the goals and methods of America’s new global role were hammered out in Europe during the difficult years after 1945. The same holds true for the global reach of American multinational corporations: as of 2015, American investment in Europe was two and one-half times larger than it was in China. As Richard Holbrooke stated in his groundbreaking article in the spring 1995 edition of *Foreign Affairs*, circumstances had conspired to make America a European power.

The “normality” of this status, of which my bosses were so certain in 1964, was not, however, a natural occurrence. To achieve it, we had struggled with a Europe beset by historic conflicts, unstable in its existence and unsure about its future. The “normality” of Europe was to be deeply divided and strategically paralyzed. This remains the case today. Had America not been on the scene, it is not hard to imagine what would have happened.

In addition, the Cold War gave an essentially isolationist America a reason to be engaged in the world. Distrust of Europe was replaced by a sense of joint commitment to maintaining the peace. Loss of that sense of common purpose after the Cold War is one of the reasons there is so much debate on both sides of the Atlantic about the future of the Western world.

But the news is not all bad. Since 1990, America’s digital leadership has resulted in a virtual integration of our economic systems. Whatever Pres. Trump and his advisers may believe, it would be difficult if not impossible to unravel the complex ties that have been built. And the effort to keep the partnership running is minor compared to the costs of its collapse.

But if this is so, why is there again a wave of isolationist sentiment in the United States? A sentiment so strong that it helped propel Donald Trump into power? Why, in the flush of victory in the Cold War, did the Bush administration turn its back on “old Europe” in favor of “coalitions of the willing”? And why did Barack Obama run so fast from leadership in Europe that, after 2014, he essentially turned relations with Russia over to Germany to manage?

Behind the Isolationist Impulse

There are two answers to that question. The first is change—dramatic, rapid and fundamental change. As the late Alvin Toffler suggested in his 1970 classic, *Future Shock*, too much change overloads us psychologically, affects our decision-making and weakens our ability to act rationally. The relentless pace of globalization has led to a sort of collective post-traumatic shock disorder among Western leaders and publics. It will not end soon.

The second answer goes back to the beginnings of America’s relationship with the rest of the world. From the earliest days of their existence, the new United States felt pushed and threatened by their cousins in Europe—often rightly so. Europeans were ready to pounce on the weak new republic. George Washington warned against foreign entanglements in his famous farewell speech in 1796, and his words have been repeated regularly ever since.

Even after the horrors of the two world wars, President Franklin D. Roosevelt shocked Winston Churchill in 1945 by telling him the United States would take care of Japan, but Europe was Britain’s to put back together. Luckily the Russians changed our minds.

America’s skepticism about global engagement has always been more than a policy; it is an expression of a national point of view about ourselves and our place in the world, a view that contrasts the simple virtues of our republic with the subtle and complex qualities (some say corruptions) of foreigners. We always feel somehow cheated by others, even by our closest friends. One need only follow the Trump Islamic scare to understand the point.

Once challenges such as the Cold War were overcome, packing up and going home became the essence of our long-term strategy. In 1992, Francis Fukuyama even proclaimed the end of history, suggesting that Pax Americana was now an automatic thing.

By 2011, Europe’s loss of strategic importance was certified by none other than the president of the Council on Foreign Relations, Richard Haass. In “Why Europe No Longer Matters,” published in June 2011 by *The Washington Post*, Haass suggested that Europe had become irrelevant to American interests. He concluded: “If NATO didn’t exist today, would anyone feel compelled to create it? The honest, if awkward, answer is no.”

Haass may have, in fact, accurately predicted the way many Americans would answer his question. But his answer,
nonetheless, was the wrong one. The postwar settlement, which included NATO, was predicated on the lessons of two World Wars and a lost peace during the 1930s. NATO provides the United States with an important multiplier for defense and strategic influence. But don’t be too hard on poor Richard—he at least waited until the Cold War was over to make the pronouncement. I remember well a high-level meeting in the Secretary of State’s conference room in 1975, where not one of the very senior participants could tell us why the United States still had troops in divided Berlin.

U.S.-European Security Is Indivisible

Yet the reason is rather obvious. Better to unify and remain vigilant than to be forced to come in to clean up after a crisis has broken out. And better to remain closely integrated with the rest of the world’s great democracies than to believe that deals with authoritarian states can better serve American interests.

I participated in one such clean-up in the Balkans in the 1990s. During a visit to Belgrade in June 1990, Secretary of State James Baker replied to a question about possible war in the Balkans with a classic piece of Texas wisdom. “We ain’t got no dog in this fight,” the Secretary said. Serbian President Milosevic later told me that those words had electrified him. “That was my go-ahead to start a war.” One could argue that President Obama’s silence on Syria had the same disastrous effect.

In other words, we and Europe cannot escape each other. Bosnia and Syria and the fight against terrorism have demon-
strated that American and European security is indivisible. The United States cannot pivot away from Europe any more than a tree can pivot away from the soil in which it is rooted. We are constituent parts of one another in ways that we are not with any other part of the world.

Writing in 1943, during the depth of World War II, Walter Lippmann suggested in *American Foreign Policy, Shield of the Republic* that an Atlantic alliance would be the best foundation for postwar governance:

“The original geographic and historic connections across the Atlantic have persisted. The Atlantic Ocean is not the frontier between Europe and the Americas. It is the inland sea of a community of nations allied with one another by geography, history and vital necessity. . . . There is a great community on this earth from which no member can be excluded and none can resign. This community has it geographical center in the great basin of the Atlantic.”

In a sense, Lipmann was only elaborating on something Alexis de Tocqueville had written more than a century earlier in *Democracy in America*. There de Tocqueville argued that Europe and America “can never be independent of each other, so numerous are the natural ties which exist between their wants, their ideas, their habits and their manners.”

**A Pointer to the Future**

So what does this all mean for the future? It means that Europe and North America have already joined into one community, dubbed “Transatlantica” by German management guru Hermann Simon. We may often disagree, but we will never break up. Only this time, the task will not be rebuilding Atlantic security, but rather to define a new sort of “global Atlantic” that can help ensure that Western principles guide the new era of digitalization—a task as fundamental to our future prosperity as was the recovery following World War II.

During the past 20 years the world has slipped rapidly, almost without notice, into a new digital and globalized era. The world of formal structures, the world of hierarchical methods of management, the world of nonporous national borders has disappeared, without most of us even knowing what was happening. The existing treaty-based world order is being turned on end faster than any dictator could have done in the past.

The U.S. National Intelligence Council’s 2004 Global Trends Report, “Mapping the Global Future,” described globalization—a growing interconnectedness reflected in the expanded flows of information, technology, capital, goods, services and people throughout the world—as “an overarching ‘mega-trend,’ a force so ubiquitous that it will substantially shape all the other major trends in the world of 2020.”

Western values now dominate the software of this system, but those values also unnerve leaders in countries such as Russia and China. Freedom of information and civil society challenge the influence of authoritarian regimes as no military alliance could ever do. They are already fighting back, as we learned during our recent election campaign.

So unless “Transatlantica” finds a new sense of common purpose to manage the challenges of globalization, we may not be able to ensure that Western values of openness, freedom and tolerance will continue to define the operating system of the digitalized world.

The unprecedented challenges brought about by globalization and digitalization make almost irrelevant our demands that Europe pay a bigger share for the defense of the West, or that new bilateral trade agreements replace multilateral efforts such as TTIP. Digitalization is extending the battlefield to a new globally integrated domain where national interests and projection of power will be defined more by dynamics within networks than by the behavior of individual actors.

Mastering these challenges will be as complex and important to the survival of democracy as was winning the Cold War. Europe cannot manage this new industrial revolution without America, and America should not want to manage it without Europe.
During the mid-1960s, as tensions grew between the United States and Europe, many sought a re-evaluation and updating of trans-Atlantic ties.

As a result of World War II and its disasters, the United States has for over 20 years been a participant on the European scene on a scale not before known in its history. During this time the Americans have established a strong military presence in the Western half of the continent and have actively influenced the defense, foreign and, to a certain extent, even the internal policies of most of the states in this area.

In retrospect, the development of an active American role in European affairs appears to have been both inevitable and necessary—in inevitable because the Europeans managed their own affairs so badly that U.S. intervention was required to save the situation; and necessary, at least from the Americans’ point of view, in order that the security of their country should not again be threatened from that part of the world.

In the early postwar period, the U.S. presence on the European continent was generally taken for granted as a natural consequence of the most disastrous conflict in history. Even more, Americans were, with few exceptions, welcome there both as a stabilizing influence and for the economic resources they possessed. The strong Soviet challenge to the existing political and social order made the development of an effective counterforce appear more essential than ever, and the American presence was in time institutionalized through a military alliance and a series of other collaborative arrangements.

Until recently the relationships so created were accepted by most West Europeans as being in the natural order of things. Since the Soviet Union was generally less than accommodating toward its Western neighbors, the latter were only too glad to have the active support and assistance of a major power in their efforts to rebuild the political, economic and social structures shattered by the war.

This state of affairs is now undergoing a substantial transformation with changes occurring almost daily. The reasons for the changes are complex and range from certain resentment over U.S. predominance on the continent to uneasiness concerning the American stance on various world problems. The underlying cause, however, appears to be a desire on the part of all Europeans, both in West and East, to lead again a normal life free from the tensions and threats of cold and occasional hot wars.

Changes Afoot in Europe

In this picture of an order which the Europeans are now gropingly fashioning for themselves, the United States occupies a much less prominent place than it has been accustomed to assume in the past. In a sense this is only natural in that if the Europeans show competence in handling their own affairs, there is a reduced need for intervention by an outside power. But even more, it reflects a growing feeling of urgency on the part of the Europeans about putting their own house in order.

The desire of the Western Europeans for greater stability arises both from the abnormality of the circumstances created by the war and its aftermath, and from a growing realization that the United States no longer has the answers to the problems facing their continent. For many years, the U.S. position on vital issues affecting their countries was accepted without serious questioning by European
leaders. In part this was based on a genuine mutuality of interests, and in part it was grounded in the hope that with perseverance backed by American power the division of the continent could one day be ended. Such a hope has now become illusory. There is a growing feeling in Europe that the United States, by its lack of willingness to face facts in time, has been contributing not to the end but to the perpetuation of the hostile confrontation that divides the continent. Most Europeans now seem to consider, for example, that the recently abandoned U.S. attempts to foster greater military integration were out of step with changing historical conditions and served only to obstruct the evolution of a much-needed and desired détente.

It is in the field of politico-military affairs that the United States is facing its greatest difficulties in Europe. Having insisted for over a decade and a half on the indispensability of an American troop presence to guarantee European security and help bring about an eventual Cold War settlement, the United States now finds for a very mundane reason—to wit, lack of money—that this is not quite so essential as it seemed. And instead of working together with its allies in search of a solution to the East-West tangle, the United States has begun to talk about arrangements with the Russians while pressing the Europeans to make greater financial contributions to the maintenance of its defense establishment on their territory.

The results of this kind of maneuvering are predictable. As far as the Europeans are concerned, it will mean a lessening of confidence in the reliability of the United States as an ally and a more questioning attitude toward American ability to achieve the goals it has proclaimed for Europe. The Russians, for their part, may view these developments with equanimity, if not satisfaction, since they appear to be on the verge of achieving a long-standing objective—namely a U.S. troop withdrawal—without the necessity of giving up anything in return.

Although the United States can take small comfort from this situation, it may find that as a result of such tribulations its relationship with the Europeans will eventually be established on a sounder basis. The United States has become too closely involved on the European scene and is too much identified with certain groups of interests. Such involvement is neither desirable nor necessary. First of all, it calls forth latent resentments and leads to charges of meddling and interference. Secondly, while European and American interests frequently converge, this is not always the case, and each side should be free to pursue its affairs in whatever way is appropriate.

Rethinking the U.S. Role

Given the present constitution of the world, it would in fact be more satisfactory for the United States and Europe to have a less interdependent relationship. The U.S. economy is in some respects so volatile, and American political preoccupations in some parts of the world so intense, that a too-close integration could have serious consequences on both sides of the Atlantic. Ideally, one side should be able to come to the aid of the other in case of need, as the United States has done since 1945 and as Europe may be required to do in the not-too-distant future if present trends continue.

The European scene is currently characterized by so much diversity and inner vitality that it is difficult to see how, as a practical matter, the United States can continue to play the role of guardian it has assumed for the past 20 years. Not only is this becoming technically impossible, but it is also to a certain extent a self-defeating proposition from the point of view of achieving U.S. objectives in Europe. The United States must learn to be more detached, to be available for assistance and help if called upon rather than attempting, as it now so frequently does, to influence the course of events by interference and manipulation.

At the present time, the United States is much too emotionally involved in too many international conflicts and quarrels, both in Europe and elsewhere. American officials, wherever they are located, appear to have a compulsion to assume a stand on every troublesome issue, whether it concerns them directly or not. While such an approach is theoretically admirable, especially in light of the self-imposed U.S. mission for keeping the peace, the results often turn out to be meager in terms of time, effort and money spent.

As applied to the European political scene, the American attitude of compulsive neighborliness is coming to be less and less appreciated. From a purely practical or realpolitischer point of view, the United States has already passed the stage where its counsels are accepted on the basis of shared ideological conviction.
tions. Something more in the way of justification than the usual clichés about solidarity of “free world interests” is now required in order to present a credible position. Europeans are currently searching for pragmatic solutions to the problems that beset them, and American fundamentalism is considerably less attractive than it was at a time when continental affairs were hopelessly and uncompromisingly entangled in a maze of mutual recriminations.

A natural result of the lessened receptivity toward the American point of view on many policy issues is a growing lack of meaningful dialogue between the United States and its European allies. When American spokesmen try to make a case for concerted action on Cuba or Vietnam, such appeals find no response in countries to which they are at best matters of secondary concern.

Stay Ahead of History

Even more, there is in Europe a rising uneasiness over the lack of U.S. flexibility in dealing with so many vital questions. In this sense, General de Gaulle might be considered as the spokesman of a growing body of as yet largely inarticulate opinion in most European states which is disturbed over the course of events and favors the development of less binding associations with American power.

The future Europe may or may not conform to General de Gaulle’s vision of a collection of nation-states living in harmony from the Atlantic to the Urals. One thing can, however, now be said with certainty: the power of both the United States and the Soviet Union to influence the actions of individual countries on the continent and to make them conform to their respective models is rapidly decreasing.

It is up to the United States to recognize this change and to accept it gracefully. There is a lack of reality evident in waiting for certain uncomfortable phenomena to disappear from the scene so that one may return to the status quo ante. Once a country puts itself in this position it becomes retrograde and falls behind the course of events. In the long run, this constitutes a situation which no amount of power can hope to rectify. If the United States is to avoid such an entrapment, it must keep pace with history or, better still, stay a little ahead of it.

COMING SOON

99 YEARS OF DIPLOMATIC HISTORY

In spring 2017, AFSA will unveil the entire 99-year archive of The Foreign Service Journal and its predecessor, the American Consular Bulletin, online. A treasure trove of primary source material and wisdom, this digital archive is a rich legacy of the U.S. Foreign Service, diplomacy and AFSA.

We hope you take advantage of this unparalleled resource.
Embassy Kyiv’s oral history project will prove useful to historians and may be a model for other posts interested in instituting “exit interviews” of departing staff.

After Ukraine’s Revolution of Dignity in 2013-2014, Embassy Kyiv staff designed a program for “Oral History in Real Time,” collecting the recent memories of colleagues who served in Ukraine during this critical period. The collection may one day prove useful to historians, but the process itself was valuable for all involved.

Other posts around the world might look to Embassy Kyiv’s project as a model, especially those interested in instituting “exit interviews” of departing staff.

At Watch in the Task Force Room

As the protests heated up and then cooled down during the bitter Kyiv winter of 2013, and then flared up again in January-February 2014, in what would come to be known as the “Maidan Revolution,” teams of dedicated Foreign Service members, U.S. government employees from other agencies, eligible family members and Locally Employed staff followed events closely, sometimes on 24-hour shifts, in a special task force room set up adjacent to the embassy’s sensitive areas.

There was a hum of activity: local staff monitoring real-time feeds of the protest zone, a public affairs liaison to handle press inquiries, an editor to collate the shift’s news and up-to-the-minute reporting. For me, it was another night as the Kyiv Task Force watch officer, interacting with the front office, officers in the field and with the State Department’s Operations Center in Washington, D.C.

At shift’s end we had our product, a briefer that would be read by high-level principals across the federal government. Our bulletin was timely and relevant because of our unique position close to the front lines of this democratic revolution. And in a good-government tradition, the excitement of the moment was punctuated by a mundane, but important requirement: record-keeping. We turned every task force report—more than 250 during the six-month crisis—into a “Record Email,” a digital document meant to ensure that every report from the period would be searchable and accessible for years to come.

When historians write of this time they will ask: “What did the U.S. government know?” “When did they know it?” “How did they acquit themselves in the fog of Ukraine’s revolution?” And I am glad that we will have the answers for them in those records.

The Broader Embassy Machinery

The work of the task force was but one piece of the constantly revolving machine that was an embassy in crisis, but it was perhaps the best documented. We also went through an authorized departure for dependents, after which many of the remaining personnel and families moved to hotels for several weeks due to instability in their neighborhoods. After the revolution, we witnessed a pro-
found change in U.S.-Ukraine relations, even as Russia occupied Crimea and began its aggression in eastern Ukraine.

As an entry-level management officer assigned to Embassy Kyiv, I saw the wide breadth of my colleagues’ efforts. Much of my work involved running down a client’s requests, or consulting with a section on its future human resource and financial plans; and through those conversations I gained a sense of the broad range of U.S. interests at work in helping Ukraine achieve its democratic, European ambitions. That said, while we had a policy in place to take down the minute-by-minute experiences of our task force teams, we had no mechanism to record our officers’ longer-term memories and strategic perspectives.

There have been great diarists in the history of diplomacy—Charles Ritchie, the former Canadian ambassador to the United States, and the late U.S. Ambassador Richard Holbrooke come to mind. But relatively few diplomats feel the compulsion of history, the need to reflect on their important daily work and commit their thoughts and feelings to paper soon after an important event.

By the time some do, after retirement, they have become memoirists, and that defining moment in their careers will be filtered through 20 or 30 years of subsequent memory. Surely there is some value, I thought, whether to historians or to colleagues in training on their way to other posts, to having a contemporaneous record of our work available from a wide range of perspectives.

“60 Minutes,” Kyiv Edition

It turned out that I wasn’t the only one to have that idea. One day in the spring of 2015, our deputy chief of mission’s spouse suggested to our management counselor that we might want to interview officers at post during the revolution. The management counselor, in turn, mentioned it to me; and I contacted the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, the nonprofit organization housed at the Foreign Service Institute that specializes in conducting oral history interviews of retired diplomats.

I felt like our role during the Maidan was to bear witness, to understand as deeply as we could, truly, what was going on, and to convey that to Washington. And it was hard to do because there were so many elements of the Maidan that were almost unbelievable unless you were there. And we saw that in the rumors that came out. Even Ukrainians who weren’t here for the Maidan, who for whatever reason were doing fellowships in the States, came back and would say, “I didn’t get to experience that, and I know I don’t know what it means.”

Bearing witness to the fact that this was a movement of the people for the people, a movement of dignity, self-organized—to bear witness to what the government’s troops were doing or not doing. ... I think it was an extraordinary time, when you saw resources and people coming together, and to explain that and to convey that to Washington was important. [It was important] to say it’s not just any old protest. And to explain also that there were some fundamental values that people were supporting, and why it was in our interest to help make sure that there was a space for people who were protesting, that there was a democratic way to do this. That’s what I think our role was—and the role of the diplomat.

—Deputy Economic Counselor Elizabeth Horst

---

THE DIPLOMAT’S ROLE

felt like our role during the Maidan was to bear witness, to understand as deeply as we could, truly, what was going on, and to convey that to Washington. And it was hard to do because there were so many elements of the Maidan that were almost unbelievable unless you were there. And we saw that in the rumors that came out. Even Ukrainians who weren’t here for the Maidan, who for whatever reason were doing fellowships in the States, came back and would say, “I didn’t get to experience that, and I know I don’t know what it means.”

Bearing witness to the fact that this was a movement of the people for the people, a movement of dignity, self-organized—to bear witness to what the government’s troops were doing or not doing. ... I think it was an extraordinary time, when you saw resources and people coming together, and to explain that and to convey that to Washington was important. [It was important] to say it’s not just any old protest. And to explain also that there were some fundamental values that people were supporting, and why it was in our interest to help make sure that there was a space for people who were protesting, that there was a democratic way to do this. That’s what I think our role was—and the role of the diplomat.

—Deputy Economic Counselor Elizabeth Horst
It was civilized, and that’s something that I don’t think came through very easily in the pictures and the news stories. It was very civilized in the face of a lot of violence, in the face of a lot of what the government threw at them, in the face of horrible weather—I mean, how many nights was it snowing down there and freezing? People were universally polite.

The only time I saw people get upset was if the Maidan self-defense force—basically the self-appointed police of Maidan—would bounce someone from the barricades who looked like they might have been drinking, or looked like they might be an agitator. … There was a high degree of civility, and almost gentleness, associated with it, so you’d see art out there on Maidan. Maidan artists would come and do things; there’d be people playing a piano. It was an atmosphere that people wanted to be a part of.

But what was interesting was that the folks who were there, contrary to pro-government press, were generally not unemployed. They were regular people who believed in it strongly enough to go. And at the very end of this sort of movement, after the politicians had been elected and moved into office, sure, a lot of people trickled out of the square, and a fraction of the folks remaining might not have had anywhere else to go. But especially in the beginning, we’re talking about well-dressed grandmas and middle-class folks [there on the square] …

The people that stick out in my mind were contacts. You’d call them up to ask a question related to their business or field, and they’d say, “Sorry, I’m not in the office; I let half of my company go down to Maidan because we’re all supporting this.”

So my point is that it was civil, it was gentle in a lot of respects in the beginning, and it involved people in a really organic manner that I don’t think came across in the international media, because the pictures that people remember are burning tires, bands of people moving back and forth with maybe a cleric holding up a cross. … I mean, these are really iconic images that will probably win photo contests for years, but it certainly wasn’t the whole thing. It wasn’t how it all began.

—Entry-Level Economic Officer Christopher Greller

ADST mentored me on interviewing techniques, and off we went! I wrote a position description for a summer hire employee and subsequently hired Maria Turner, the daughter of our public affairs counselor, to be my assistant for the project. We then secured space in the embassy’s media studio, where the ambassador sometimes gave television interviews, and started signing up interested colleagues. During the summer we completed more than 20 interviews, each lasting about an hour, with employees from across the mission, including State Department and other agency officers, family members and Locally Employed staff (see excepts from them in the accompanying boxes).

While I had a basic list of questions to ask every participant, I tried to keep the conversation as broad as possible. As I anticipated, everyone had a preferred way of framing their experience. Some talked about the political and economic underpinnings of the revolution; others focused on their roles as supervisors and managers making sure their employees, both American and Ukrainian, were resilient in the face of an evolving political climate. And still others focused on their families and how they helped their children to understand what they were seeing on the streets through their apartment windows.
When I first got here, the OSAC Council was a subcommittee of the American Chamber of Commerce, and it was kind of a secondary thought. I mean, it didn’t get paid much attention. ... So when I got here, one of my goals was to fix that. I had started working on it, and we had planned to have our initial council meeting the first week of December [2013]. We had some interest, but not a whole lot of interest, because at the time, Ukraine was considered safe. ...

But then Maidan happened, and then all of a sudden [the members thought], “Oh, my gosh, we really need to talk to the U.S. embassy because it’s crisis mode.” And so we ended up pushing our meeting back into January [2014], but we had an emergency council meeting to bring folks in and talk about crisis preparedness: What you could do with your employees, setting up telephone trees, radio networks, getting communications. A lot of folks didn’t even know what their employees’ cell-phone numbers were, so if they had to get hold of them in an emergency, they didn’t even know how.

And then we talked about what we call go-bags. If you have to just pick up and leave the country, you have a suitcase prepared with emergency supplies, clothing, maps, cell phones, things like that. And we invited ... all of our contacts throughout the American business community, and we had about 200 people show up in the multipurpose room. It was standing room only; we had every single solitary chair filled, and people were lining the walls and in the back of the room standing, because they were so desperate for some kind of information and for some kind of security help. ...

Having this link to the RSO office ... made them feel better. You know, they finally had somebody’s ear who actually cared about them and was giving them information. And so that’s how our council restarted. And now it’s one of the best councils, actually, in all of Europe. We meet quarterly and we have at least a hundred people come every time, and they’re so enthusiastic about sharing their practices with each other ... It’s been really neat to watch it evolve, and I was really glad to be a part of that.

—Deputy Regional Security Officer Jennifer Babic

Overseas Security Advisory Committee: The Official Link Between RSOs and American Businesses Community
The interviews also shed light on the day-to-day work of embassy employees that rarely makes the news.

The interviews also shed light on the day-to-day work of embassy employees that rarely makes the news—how consular officers assessed the revolution’s impact on migration patterns through interactions at their visa windows; the unique challenges for regional security officers (RSOs) protecting U.S. officials, including congressional delegations, while they visited protests; or the emotional story of one Locally Employed staff member, mobilized into the Ukrainian military to help fend off Russian aggression, who received assistance from his fellow local staff colleagues so he could be properly outfitted when he deployed to the front.

We recorded each interview with audio and video equipment and produced transcripts that participants could review. What resulted was hours of useful material that provide an unusually detailed look at diplomacy and the diplomat’s life, as seen through the eyes of diplomats themselves.

Continuing the Story, and Stories

I am now working with ADST to find the right venue for these materials, including choosing excerpts that could be released or exhibited to educate the American public about the historic work the Foreign Service, and the U.S. government more broadly, perform overseas.

While my initial motivations for the project were based on interest in preserving history and educating the public, I came to learn that the simple act of sitting down and talking about one’s experiences can have unexpected benefits. Many participants told me it felt refreshing to get out of their day-to-day grind and have a chance to reflect, even if for only an hour, on their experiences at post—to gather their thoughts and develop a comprehensive view of their assignment. For others, just participating in the project was cathartic after such a stressful year.

Given how many of my colleagues benefited from their participation in the project, perhaps as an organization we should consider adopting oral history as a form of exit interview at more posts—particularly ones that have faced a crisis—as a way to bring assignments to a close in a manner that affirms the experiences and contributions of all our employees overseas.
AFSA Welcomes the New Secretary of State

On Feb. 2, the newly confirmed Secretary of State, Rex Tillerson, addressed Department of State employees at the Harry S Truman building in Washington, D.C.

In his welcome speech, Secretary Tillerson recognized the unique contributions of Department of State employees: “You have accumulated knowledge and experience that cannot be replicated anywhere else. As your Secretary, I will be proud to draw upon all these qualities in my decision-making.”

The Secretary also spoke of his intention to focus on the safety and security of his workforce, saying that his first thought each morning is, “Are all our people safe?”

Following the address, AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson welcomed the Secretary. She escorted him and Mrs. Tillerson to the AFSA memorial wall, which honors members of the Foreign Service who lost their lives while serving the United States abroad. Ambassador Stephenson, the Secretary and Mrs. Tillerson each laid a flower at the wall and paused to honor the sacrifice of those whose names are etched in marble. The memorial wall is the focal point for AFSA’s Foreign Service Day events, which take place this year on May 5.

AFSA deeply appreciates Secretary Tillerson’s gesture of respect for our fallen colleagues and looks forward to working with him to address challenges to American leadership abroad—and to ensuring that the American Foreign Service continues to deploy all around the world to protect and defend America’s people, interests and values. Even if that means that not everyone makes it home safely.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson and Secretary of State Rex Tillerson at the AFSA memorial wall following the new Secretary’s welcome address to State Department employees on Feb. 2.
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CALENDAR

April 4
12-1:30 p.m.
Town Hall with AFSA Governing Board Candidates

April 5
12-1:30 p.m
AFSA Governing Board Meeting

April 6
Luncheon: 145th Specialist Class

April 6
2-3:30 p.m
AFSA Book notes: The Dust of Kandahar by Ambassador (ret.) Jonathan Addleton

April 10
Luncheon: 13th Consular Fellows Class

April 12
Luncheon: 190th A-100 Class

April 23-28
AFSA Road Scholar Program

May 3
12:130 p.m.
AFSA Governing Board Meeting

May 5
Foreign Service Day/AFSA Memorial Plaque Ceremony

May 29
Memorial Day: AFSA Offices Closed

June 7
12:1:30 p.m.
AFSA Governing Board Meeting

June 20
4-6 p.m.
AFSA Awards Ceremony
Open Season for New MSI Award Program

As all American taxpayers know, April 15 is rapidly approaching. In addition to being an important date for the IRS, it is also an important date for Foreign Service employees—it’s the first date on which you may submit nominations under the new Meritorious Service Increase award program. (Nominations will be accepted until June 15.)

The most important thing for you to know, understand and embrace is that anyone can nominate a colleague—you do not have to be the nominee’s supervisor. The nomination form is streamlined and easy to complete, taking much less time than a full evaluation form.

Unlike an evaluation, the MSI nomination focuses only on recent performance and/or service. There is no need to demonstrate ability to perform at a higher level than the current grade, and there is no need to tie the nomination to the employee’s work requirements.

Unlike other award nominations, MSI nominations do not have to go through the Post Awards Committee before being sent to Washington, D.C. Instead, they will be submitted directly to the relevant bureau’s MSI Awards Committee.

The lengthy “open season” for MSI nominations was designed to make it easy and convenient for people to draft and submit nominations. Some people prefer to think about and draft award nominations during evaluation season so that they can copy and paste relevant language; others prefer to do it later, once they’ve had a chance to recover from all the evaluation drafting.

Whatever your preference, the new nomination season makes it easy to participate and help recognize and reward exceptional performance and/or service.

I’ve heard a few colleagues grumbling about what they perceive as the added burden of “having” to nominate colleagues for MSIs. If you’re in that camp, I encourage you to try to reframe your thinking; look at it more as something you “get” to do.

I’m not saying that to sound cheesy, but because I genuinely believe it. Annual evaluations are something you “have” to do, and (although extremely important) they can be unpleasant. You’re required to write one for every single individual you supervise; you’re required to list an area which needs development; and, in the case of suboptimal performance, you’re required to document how and why the employee underperformed. You’re required to do all of this year after year, even when the employee in question is not eligible for promotion.

In contrast, awards nominations (whether for MSIs, Superior Honor Awards, departmentwide awards, AFSA awards or other awards) practically write themselves. If you have an employee or a colleague who has gone above and beyond and whose performance or service has been truly exceptional, it can actually be fun and rewarding to help recognize and reward that person by writing an awards nomination.

You don’t have to worry about making sure you cover a specific checklist of areas, you don’t have to say anything negative, and you don’t even have to spend that much time writing—you simply describe why that employee’s performance and/or service was so exceptional and why they should be rewarded.

A few well-written paragraphs that describe the true impact of both substantive accomplishments and meaningful service are all you need.

If you need a refresher on the details of the new program, check out 16 STATE 129334 (dated December 5, 2016) as well as the Human Resources/Performance Evaluation website. If you’re new to drafting awards nominations or feel like you’re not a strong writer, fear not!—HR/PE has resources to help you understand what a strong, well-written nomination looks like.

Reach out to colleagues known for their drafting skills, and ask them to review your nomination before you submit it. Even better, reach out to a friend or colleague known for making sure his or her employees receive appropriate awards, and ask that individual to help you craft a strong nomination.

If you can tell the story of why an employee should be rewarded, then someone out there can help you put that story into a compelling written version without having to spend a great deal of time on it.

So go forth and nominate—the success of the new MSI program depends on it!
Language Training

I recently met with a number of commercial officers at the Diplomatic Language School in Rosslyn, Virginia—a prime vendor of language training services to the Foreign Commercial Service. Many of you have been through DLS training, and many more of you will do so (again?) in the near future. As a result, the Commercial Service’s program bears a closer look.

The program took an important turn in 2012 when commercial officers were no longer required to take language training at the Foreign Service Institute. There were many reasons behind the change, including the cost of training and the FSI monopoly over testing certification in particular.

Some FCS officers still choose to attend classes at FSI, while others opt for the mostly one-on-one instruction characteristic of DLS. (In 2014 a third vendor—the International Center for Language Studies—was added as a language training option, with positive feedback so far.)

The fact that, since 2002, first-tour officers have been required to take language training in the Washington, D.C., area has been a sore point, but other aspects of the program may be changing.

Many of my FCS colleagues have made suggestions for improvement and raised questions to clarify the language training process. Here are some of the questions and concerns I hear:

- What, precisely, is the waiver policy in the event an officer does not achieve the language score necessary to go to post?
- Why is there a requirement for officers to proceed “immediately” to post after language training so as to arrive at post no later than one month after final testing?
- What are the FCS sick and annual leave requirements/limitations while in language training, and why are these different from those of the State Department, especially around the winter holidays?
- What is the rule about commercial officers taking area studies before, during or after language training?
- Why are the number of hours of language instruction each day at DLS different than, say, at FSI?

In closing, it has been more than two years since AFSA and CS management held a series of meetings to review and update Commerce’s Foreign Service Personnel Management Manual (Subchapter 800) as it relates to language training. We made enormous progress at that time, but more needs to be done.

In a world of “less is more,” sequestration, reduced budgets and the demand for “more bang for the buck,” the new administration will have to carefully consider how training (and language training, in particular) fits into their future plans for the FCS.

In a world of “less is more,” sequestration, reduced budgets and the demand for “more bang for the buck,” the new administration will have to carefully consider how training (and language training, in particular) fits into their future plans for the FCS.

What more can be done to ensure commercial officers are equipped with the most up-to-date, thorough language training in order to help U.S. industry compete and the United States to successfully attract foreign direct investment in the 21st century?

If you have thoughts on this extremely important issue, I would like to hear from you. Please write to me at Steve.Morrison@trade.gov.
What Is AFSA?

What is AFSA? For the first 50 years of our existence (AFSA was established in 1924) the answer would have been simple.

AFSA was a professional association designed to enhance and broaden its members’ capabilities as diplomats, and to explore the subjects with which they engaged in their profession.

Beginning in the late 1960s that simplicity disappeared. President Nixon issued an executive order authorizing unions in the federal workforce.

Secretary of State Bill Rogers sought an exemption from that executive order, which was granted—but only if State and its employee organizations could agree on a substitute employee-management system that would be consistent with the unique and rigorous terms of service of Foreign Service personnel.

Executive Order 11636 establishing the employee-management system of the Foreign Service was the result. That executive order was later incorporated into the Foreign Service Act of 1980.

These developments generated a rigorous debate within AFSA and, indeed, throughout the Service. Should AFSA compete with established unions to represent the Service as its “exclusive employee representative” (then as now a euphemism for “union”), or remain a professional organization?

Emotions ran high. The sitting AFSA board held a referendum on the matter, and a majority voted for the union option. The most senior member of the AFSA board resigned. The Service itself was equally divided.

The 1971 AFSA election was dominated by the union issue. The winning slate took the position that AFSA should remain a professional association and become a union: that the two roles were reinforcing, not mutually exclusive; and that AFSA would benefit greatly from the dual role.

In the event, AFSA defeated the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliate, the American Federation of Government Employees, and has been the Foreign Service’s union for what will soon be 50 years.

By any metric, the dual-role concept has proved a smashing success. In 1971, AFSA had one full-time FSO, a handful of other staffers, 8,000 members, a small annual budget and a large mortgage on the headquarters building.

Today we have a full-time president and four full-time vice presidents. We have official space in the agencies; our annual budget is about $4,500,000; our staff numbers 32; membership is more than 16,000; and our balance sheet is $14 million, of which the value of the fully owned HQ building is the smallest part.

In fact, this success has added another dimension to AFSA. AFSA is a business. Like all businesses (and unlike bureaucracies), AFSA’s officers and board are responsible for our own income. We sell our services to members who pay with their dues. Our fiduciary responsibilities extend to managing the budget, the staff and the balance sheet of what in commercial terms would be a mid-sized business.

So there you have it. AFSA has been a very successful professional association, union and business for almost a century. It has shown a capacity for reinventing itself to adapt to changing circumstances.

As for the prospects going forward, like many, I sense that we are approaching another tipping point. Future success, as always, will have to be earned. ■

FOREIGN SERVICE DAY IS MAY 5

Foreign Service retirees from all the U.S. foreign affairs agencies are welcome to attend the State Department’s annual homecoming event.

In addition to remarks by senior State Department officials, Foreign Service Day also includes the AFSA memorial ceremony honoring FS personnel who have died while serving abroad under circumstances distinctive to the Foreign Service.

There will also be two sessions of off-the-record seminars on foreign policy issues and a luncheon.

Reservations for the luncheon ($60 per person) will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. Payment by personal check, made payable to Foreign Affairs Day, must accompany reservation. In recent years, the luncheon has sold out quickly, so mail in your RSVP card and payment as soon as possible.

Retirees who haven’t attended Foreign Service Day recently may request an invitation by emailing the following information to foreignaffairsday@state.gov: first and last names, date of birth, retirement date, whether Civil Service or Foreign Service, U.S. foreign affairs agency from which they retired, mailing address, phone number and email address. ■

NEWS BRIEF
Ambassador Nancy J. Powell to Receive AFSA’s Premier Award

The American Foreign Service Association is proud to announce that Ambassador Nancy J. Powell will receive the AFSA 2017 Lifetime Contributions to American Diplomacy Award in honor of her outstanding career in the Foreign Service and enduring dedication to diplomacy.

Amb. Powell is the 23rd recipient of this award, and the fourth woman to be honored. The award will be presented at the AFSA Awards Ceremony on June 20 at 4 p.m. in the Benjamin Franklin Diplomatic Reception Room at the Department of State.

Nancy Jo Powell was born in Cedar Falls, Iowa, in 1947 and earned her B.A in history and teaching from the University of Northern Iowa in 1970. She taught high school social studies in Dayton, Iowa, before joining the Foreign Service in 1977.

Throughout her 37-year diplomatic career and into retirement, Amb. Powell never stopped learning and taking on new challenges. She has served in a variety of high-level positions both overseas and in Washington, D.C. She taught high school social studies in Dayton, Iowa, before joining the Foreign Service in 1977.

For her service as the State Department’s senior coordinator for avian influenza, she received the Homeland Security Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medal (known as the Sammies) from the Partnership for Public Service in 2013.

Following her retirement in 2014, Amb. Powell continued to work for American interests, coordinating the State Department’s response to the Ebola virus and mentoring ambassadorial seminar classes.

Many in the Foreign Service community have witnessed Amb. Powell’s gift for identifying and developing talent at all levels. In 2003, she received the Arnold L. Raphel Memorial Award in recognition of her efforts to promote and develop the people around her, especially entry-level officers.

For her service as the State Department’s senior coordinator for avian influenza, she received the Homeland Security Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medal (known as the Sammies) from the Partnership for Public Service in 2013.

Following her retirement in 2014, Amb. Powell continued to work for American interests, coordinating the State Department’s response to the Ebola virus and mentoring ambassadorial seminar classes.

Many in the Foreign Service community have witnessed Amb. Powell’s gift for identifying and developing talent at all levels. In 2003, she received the Arnold L. Raphel Memorial Award in recognition of her efforts to promote and develop the people around her, especially entry-level officers.

We invite all AFSA members to join us in honoring Ambassador Powell, as well as this year’s recipients of AFSA’s dissent and performance awards, at the June 20 awards ceremony. Contact AFSA Awards Coordinator Perri Green at green@afsa.org for additional information.

—Theodore Horn, Communications Intern
AFSA Hosts UT Austin Researchers

In December, a team of 15 graduate students and their faculty advisers from the University of Texas at Austin’s LBJ School of Public Affairs traveled to Washington, D.C., as part of an ongoing AFSA-sponsored exercise to identify best practices in diplomacy. The countries under review are Brazil, China, France, Germany, India, Russia, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

The team spent its days meeting with a variety of stakeholders, including veteran diplomats who serve on AFSA’s Ambassadorial Advisory Council and select members of the American Academy of Diplomacy; experts from other countries’ diplomatic services; think-tank representatives from the Center for American Progress, the Brookings Institution, the Crisis Management Initiative and the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars; and the Department of State’s Bureau of Human Resources.

During these encounters, the students presented their preliminary findings regarding the various roles that diplomatic services play, i.e., messengers delivering information to the host country’s government, intermediaries whose reporting informs policymaking in their respective capitals or primary foreign policy makers.

Of note, early findings show that entry into every service requires a highly competitive examination process and that, while not the only country to utilize political appointees, the United States is an outlier in terms of the number of political appointees occupying high-level positions within its foreign ministry.

The week’s meetings were designed to add to the students’ understanding of the theoretical underpinnings and practical considerations of their research. Meeting participants offered constructive feedback and suggestions on where to go and with whom to inquire to find more data.

Following the visit, the students returned to Austin, where they are spending their second semester incorporating the findings from their conversations and following up on new leads. They will present their final report to AFSA at the end of the spring 2017 semester.

AFSA plans to use the findings to help shape a proactive advocacy agenda on Capitol Hill and with the Department of State. The overall goals of AFSA are to foster: (1) a Foreign Service that continues to attract a highly qualified cadre of career candidates; (2) an FS personnel system that ensures that those who come in are offered a work environment in which they can thrive and develop into exceptionally skilled diplomats who are equipped to lead the country’s foreign policy 20-25 years into their careers; and (3) a strong professional Foreign Service whose presence, skill and ability to deliver on behalf of Americans are unmatched in the diplomatic sphere.
Leadership Webinar Draws 50

On Jan. 25, AFSA hosted a webinar, “Making Time to Lead,” at its E Street headquarters building. Speaking with approximately 50 participants online, AFSA Governing Board State Representatives Don Jacobson and Jason Donovan explored why making a place for regular conversations about work performance and professional development is vital to the optimal functioning of a team.

Jacobson and Donovan, both members of the iLead initiative, addressed the roles of supervisors and supervised officers and provided practical advice and deeper insights into managing workplace challenges.

They also discussed a range of professional and leadership development initiatives being pursued by “champions” at the State Department as well as at posts abroad.

In the Q&A session that followed, members asked about dealing with toxic management, learning how to have difficult conversations and transitioning from being an action officer to a manager.

The presenters referred participants to links and resources that are available via the AFSA website, www.afsa.org/leadership.

For those with access to the Department of State’s intranet, a number of other resources are available through the department’s leadership and mentoring portals.

AFSA looks forward to hosting other leadership webinars in the near future. Sign up for AFSAnet emails for more information about upcoming events and opportunities.

If you have particular leadership questions or themes you would like to address, please contact Allan Saunders at saunders@afsa.org.

—Allan Saunders, Outreach and Communications Specialist

AFSA Welcomes New Members

In February, AFSA hosted three recruitment luncheons at its headquarters building.

On Feb 9, AFSA State Vice President Angie Bryan welcomed the 144th Specialist class (93 members), speaking to them about the role of AFSA as a professional association and labor union.

Members of the 189th A-100 class (83) attended a luncheon at AFSA on Feb. 13, and members of the 12th Consular Fellows class were welcomed on Feb 15. AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson greeted both classes.

Amb. Stephenson, State VP Bryan and other members of the AFSA Governing Board were on hand to speak with new members of the Foreign Service and answer their questions about AFSA and the many ways the association can assist, protect and advocate for them.

Above (right), AFSA State Representative Susan Danewitz introduces herself to the new specialists and (left) AFSA Secretary Bill Haugh answers questions from members of the 189th A-100 class.
Announcing the 2017-2019 AFSA Governing Board Candidates

The AFSA Committee on Elections has approved the following candidates for positions on the ballot for election of the 2017-2019 AFSA Governing Board.

AFSA members are encouraged to visit the AFSA Community forum to participate in an online discussion forum with candidates.

Candidates and members may post questions or comments to the discussion thread 2017 AFSA Governing Board Election & Bylaw Amendments. All members must log in to participate and have personal email addresses stored on their profile. (Note: government email addresses will not be accepted on the AFSA Community site.)

A Town Hall meeting has been set for Tuesday, April 4, at 12 p.m. in the first-floor conference room at the AFSA HQ building, 2101 E Street NW, Washington DC 20037.

This event will be taped and made available on the AFSA YouTube channel. The candidates’ statements will be posted on the AFSA website on April 3.

If you have not already done so, please ensure AFSA has your current address on record. To update your address information, send an email to member@afsa.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMINEE</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>NOMINEE</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Stephenson *</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Thom Wright</td>
<td>FAS Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Boyatt *</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Christopher C. Ashe</td>
<td>State Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Anthony (Tony) Wayne *</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Lawrence W. K. Casselle *</td>
<td>State Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe De Maria</td>
<td>State VP</td>
<td>Anne Coleman-Honn *</td>
<td>State Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Kero-Mentz *</td>
<td>State VP</td>
<td>Josh Glazeroff *</td>
<td>State Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Posner</td>
<td>USAID VP</td>
<td>Martin McDowell *</td>
<td>State Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel T. Crocker *</td>
<td>FCS VP</td>
<td>Thomas Michaels</td>
<td>State Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Morrison</td>
<td>FCS VP</td>
<td>Salina Rico</td>
<td>State Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoa Van Huynh</td>
<td>FAS VP</td>
<td>Andrew J. Scheineson</td>
<td>State Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Haugh *</td>
<td>Retiree VP</td>
<td>Adam Vogelzang</td>
<td>State Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John K. Naland</td>
<td>Retiree VP</td>
<td>Tricia Wingerter *</td>
<td>State Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Hiligendorf</td>
<td>FCS Rep</td>
<td>George Colvin</td>
<td>Retiree Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Wylegala</td>
<td>FCS Rep</td>
<td>Alphonse F. La Porta *</td>
<td>Retiree Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John J. Hurley</td>
<td>APHIS Rep</td>
<td>Philip A. Shull *</td>
<td>Retiree Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven L. Herman</td>
<td>BBG Rep</td>
<td>* Member of the Strong Diplo-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOOK FOR YOUR BALLOT: VOTE IN THE AFSA GOVERNING BOARD ELECTION

The election for the 2017-2019 AFSA Governing Board officers and constituency representatives is underway. Details about the election, including the rules, can be found at www.afsa.org/elections.

Candidates’ campaign statements and videos will be made available to members on the AFSA website. We remind our readers that campaigning using an employer email by any member is prohibited (with the exception of the three preapproved candidate email blasts).

**Ballots:** Ballots will be distributed on or about April 17. If you have a valid email address on file with AFSA, an email containing a unique passcode and instructions for voting online will be sent to you. Regular members who were in good standing as of March 17 can also visit the secure online ballot site www.directvote.net/AFSA after April 17 and request that an email containing unique login credentials be sent to them. Be sure to add noreply@directvote.net to your approved sender list to ensure delivery.

Printed ballots will be sent to all retired members via the U.S. Postal Service.

If an online and a printed ballot are returned for the same member, only the printed ballot will be counted. If you do not receive a ballot by May 8, please contact election@afsa.org. Requests for a duplicate ballot can be sent by email or in writing to AFSA Committee on Elections, 2101 E Street NW, Washington DC 20037. Please include your full name, current address, email address and telephone number.

**Ballot Tally:** On June 8, at 8 a.m. EDT, the printed ballots will be collected from the post office in Washington, D.C. Printed ballots must be received at the post office by that time to be counted. The online voting site will close at 8 a.m. EDT on June 8.

All AFSA members are strongly encouraged to vote in this election. Please review your options for voting and ensure that you cast your ballot in a timely manner.
New Staff Join AFSA

Dmitry Filipoff joins AFSA as the new Publications Coordinator. Dmitry graduated from the University of California, Merced, with a bachelor’s degree in political science. He has interned and worked for various public policy organizations in Washington, D.C., and volunteers as the editor for the Center for International Maritime Security. Born in Thousand Oaks, California, Dmitry enjoys reading, writing and exercise in his free time.

Julie Hagarty Nutter joins AFSA as the new Director of Professional Policy Issues. Julie comes to AFSA following a 30-year career in the Foreign Service. She has served in Nigeria, Liberia, Iraq, the United Kingdom, Belgium and Washington, D.C. She has two master’s degrees: one in national strategic resource management from the National Defense University, and the other in international economics from Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service, where she also obtained her undergraduate degree in international politics. Immediately before taking the position at AFSA, Julie completed a professional certificate in group facilitation from Georgetown’s School of Continuing Studies. She has two daughters and lives in Vienna, Virginia.

Welcome to Spring Interns

AFSA is happy to welcome our new spring interns.

- Scholarship: Matt Mitzel is a senior at the University of Maryland, majoring in communications on the public relations track with a minor in Spanish. He is originally from Carroll County, Maryland.
- Communications: Theo Horn is a junior at Syracuse University, studying political science and policy studies. Theo hails from Kutztown, Pennsylvania.
- Awards: James Schiphorst is from Melbourne, Australia, where he is currently in his final year of a bachelor’s degree in international relations.
- Executive: There are two interns for the executive session this spring; Maggie McMorrow is a sophomore at George Washington University, studying international affairs with a minor in Spanish. She is from Ipswich, Massachusetts. Benjamin Mooney is a freshman at American University, studying finance and business administration. He is from Brookline, Massachusetts.

- Advertising: Iván Esca-milla is a graduate student at American University, studying international affairs. He hails from Dyer, Indiana. AFSA thanks departing interns Tyler Dumont, Katherine Perroots, Kellen Johansen, Rebecca Yim, Abi Raj and Eka Cipta Putera Chandra for their great work: Wish them the best.

WRITE FOR THE JOURNAL!

We welcome your writing on any topic of concern to the FS community, or choose among the focus topics (available via the AFSA website, www.afsa.org/edcalendar). The Journal is always seeking strong Speaking Out submissions (1,500-1,800 words), Reflections (700 words) and features (1,500-2,000 words). See Author Guidelines for more detail (www.afsa.org/fsj-author-guidelines).

We also invite you to share your thoughts on Journal articles by sending a letter to the editor. Please send feedback and submissions to journal@afsa.org.
AFSA NEWS

AFSA Outreach in Austin

In January AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson accepted an invitation to attend the University of Texas at Austin Forum on Diplomacy and Statecraft, hosted by the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs.

The Jan. 12-14 event brought together foreign affairs professionals from the State Department, the Department of Defense and diplomats representing the European Union’s External Action Service, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Finland, the Netherlands, Brazil, Colombia and Israel.

The forum opened with an appeal from the organizers to diplomats to make policy choices that reflect their country’s larger strategic framework, rather than the crisis of the day. The arc of strategy often gets lost due to bureaucratic fragmentation and because “the urgent crowds out the important.”

Among other topics featured were the rise of populism, energy and water resource challenges, race in America, drone technology, climate change and diplomatic training worldwide.

Amb. Stephenson led a session on reforms that have made the U.S. Foreign Service stronger—as well as remaining challenges. She cited gains in attracting a diverse workforce as a key improvement, observing, “We still have work to do, but we are getting closer to our goal of making the Foreign Service reflect and represent the rich diversity of America.” She also highlighted the importance of leadership and management training, noting that AFSA members value the training, want more of it, and believe it makes them more effective at their jobs.

Taking advantage of the travel to Austin, Amb. Stephenson and AFSA Outreach Coordinator Catherine Kannenberg met with representatives of GlobalAustin, the local affiliate of Global Ties U.S., along with entrepreneurs from the area and faculty members from UT Austin and Southern Texas University.

At that event, Amb. Stephenson spoke of the importance of government-funded exchange programs such as the International Visitor Leadership Program in maintaining American global leadership.

The visit also included a meeting with the executive director of the World Affairs Council of Austin. Finally, Amb. Stephenson and Dr. Kannenberg met with the president of the Foreign Service Group, AFSA retiree member John Wood, to coordinate AFSA speakers for upcoming events in Austin.

—Catherine Kannenberg, AFSA Outreach Coordinator

AFSA Sponsors HECFAA Interns at State

AFSA and the Hispanic Employees Council of Foreign Affairs Agencies have co-sponsored interns at the Department of State since 2014. This past year, Carolina Abraham and Mauricio Cortes honed their diplomacy skills in the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs and Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs’ Office of Policy Planning and Coordination, respectively.

Ms. Abraham attends Florida International University, where she is studying for her master’s degree in public administration and criminal justice. She has previously studied overseas in Switzerland, France and Belgium and hopes to continue deepening her understanding of foreign policy implementation. Mauricio Cortes is pursuing a master’s degree in public administration at Cornell University. Mauricio previously served in the U.S. Navy, completing three tours in the Middle East. He is passionate about providing educational opportunities for low-income families and minorities, and hopes to join the Department of State to work on these and other issues.

HECFAA Interns Carolina Abraham (left) and Mauricio Cortes at AFSA headquarters.
Consent Agenda: The Governing Board approved the consent agenda items, which were: (1) the Jan. 4 Governing Board meeting minutes; (2) the appointment of Stephen Wixom as FAS representative.

Elections Committee Chair: On behalf of the Committee on Elections, AFSA Secretary Bill Haugh moved that the Governing Board accept the resignation of Mort Dworken as (Acting) Chair and appoint Susan Wong as Chair. The motion was approved unanimously.

FSJ Editorial Board: Speaking as FSJ Editorial Board representative, Governing Board State Representative Lawrence Casselle presented a report on the status of The Foreign Service Journal—recent and upcoming activities and initiatives. Executive Director Ian Houston also provided information about the Journal’s advertising revenue.

Concluding the report, Mr. Casselle noted that five members of the FSJ Editorial Board would be departing in summer 2017. He moved that a solicitation be sent to the AFSA membership seeking volunteers to fill those spots. The FSJ Editorial Board will review applications and make appointment recommendations to the Governing Board. The motion passed unanimously.

Sinclaire Language Awards: State Representative Josh Glazeroff, on behalf of the Awards and Plaques Committee, moved that the Governing Board accept the recommendations for the recipients of the Matilda W. Sinclaire Language Awards. The motion was approved unanimously. The names and biographies of the recipients will appear in a future issue of the Journal.

Resolution on the FSJ: After yielding the chair to State Vice President Angie Bryan, AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson moved that the Governing Board recognize the “outstanding work of the Foreign Service Journal Editorial Board and staff, whose refined judgment and dedicated service combine in equal measures to produce one superb edition of The Foreign Service Journal after another.” The motion was approved unanimously.
AFSA NEWS

Reaching Out with National 4-H

On Jan. 19, AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson spoke to more than 500 people at the 4-H Citizenship Washington Focus: Presidential Inauguration event.

4-H is a national organization representing more than six million young Americans, and provides experiences where they can complete hands-on projects in areas like health, science, agriculture and citizenship. 4-H regularly brings youth from across the country to Washington, D.C., to learn about citizenship and civic leadership.

In her speech, Amb. Stephenson spoke about the role of the Foreign Service in developing and implementing U.S. foreign policy, as well as advising on and protecting American commercial and economic interests through our embassies abroad.

Speaking about her first overseas assignment, she recalled working in Panama with the U.S. Animal Plant and Health Inspection Service to contain the parasitic screw-worm that had once plagued cattle in Florida and across the Southern United States but had been halted, through work by American embassies with government officials in Mexico and Central America, at the Darien Gap in Panama.

Thanks to the APHIS program, the work by Embassy Panama staff and engagement with the host government, Amb. Stephenson reported, when she returned to Panama as ambassador in 2008, the program was thriving with a network of Panamanian volunteers participating in a U.S.-sponsored program to inspect all cattle moving by truck through the Darien, preventing the spread of the pest and protecting the U.S. cattle industry—a classic case of diplomacy delivering a double win.

Praising 4-H’s commitment to global awareness and the organization’s acknowledgement of the importance of overseas markets to U.S. farmers, Amb. Stephenson encouraged the young audience to make their local groups aware of what the Foreign Service does, including closing deals on agricultural exports, helping U.S. citizens abroad and briefing Washington on current events.

“4-H touches six million young people in the United States and another million around the globe, and you understand the importance of meeting global challenges,” she said. “The State Department needs leaders like you.”

Following her speech, Amb. Stephenson met with individual delegates and answered their questions about the Foreign Service.

Retirees Speak at 4-H Youth Summit

AFSA retiree members Phillip Shull and Emmy Simmons spoke to a number of young people at the 4-H National Youth Summit on Agri-Science held in Maryland on Feb. 2-3.

Retired Foreign Agricultural Service Officer Shull gave the keynote address, speaking about his experiences overseas with FAS, promoting food security and agricultural trade. He then took questions from the audience for almost an hour.

The next day Shull was joined by Emmy Simmons, retired USAID FSO, in a career panel designed to allow the youth participants to learn more about what the Foreign Service does, and how it works with agricultural systems and businesses worldwide to enhance food security and thereby promote peace and prosperity.

To share your experiences with a wider audience, consider joining AFSA’s Speaker’s Bureau (www.afsa.org/speakers) and help raise awareness among the American public about what diplomats and development experts do and why it’s important.
AFSA News

AFSA Kicks Off Discussion Series on Professional Issues

As part of the effort to engage more substantively on professional issues affecting our members, AFSA inaugurated a new discussion series in February.

The first discussion—“Why Is Dissent Important?”—was hosted by AFSA Awards Committee Chair Annie Pforzheimer and former Ambassador Charles Rivkin (pictured below) on Feb. 17. The event focused on the importance of disciplined, constructive dissent in the Foreign Service.

Three more discussions took place through early March, all hosted by State Department representatives on the AFSA Governing Board.

On Feb. 23, Alison Storsve led a conversation on the basics of tradecraft. Jason Donovan hosted a session on Feb. 27 on how and why the work of the Foreign Service matters to our fellow citizens. Finally, Don Jacobson facilitated a Mar. 3 exchange on how to navigate change.

All the sessions were well attended, and the first three can be viewed on the AFSA website at www.afsa.org/video.

We welcome ideas on possible topics to cover in future sessions; please share your suggestions by emailing events@afsa.org.

—Ásgeir Sigfússon, Director of Communications
Handling Stress and Trauma in the Foreign Service

On Feb. 6, a panel discussion on resilience was held at AFSA headquarters. The event was sponsored by the State Department and USAID, in partnership with the Una Chapman Cox Foundation, the International Peace & Security Institute and the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training.

The members of the panel were Ambassador (ret.) Charles Ries, USAID Office of Transition Initiatives Team Leader Rachel Karioki, Director of the Center of Excellence in Foreign Affairs Resilience Beth Payne and Program Director for international programs at IPSI, Andrés Martinez. Panelists focused on building resilience and on managing and preventing stress-related problems, including post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), for Foreign Service personnel and other frontline civilians.

Amb. Ries gave the keynote, recalling his experiences as U.S. ambassador to Greece when a rocket propelled grenade hit the embassy building in January 2007. Thankfully no one was hurt, but the attack nonetheless had a profound effect on the embassy community.

Ries discussed his use of town hall meetings to provide information quickly and reassure embassy staff, which he believes helped reduce the severity of stress-related problems for those affected.

Following the presentation, the panel took questions from the audience about resilience strategies, dealing with PTSD and the perceived stigma that remains around mental health issues.

As Andrés Martinez, noted during the discussion, “Resilience is not a trait that people either have or don’t have.”

IPSI, in conjunction with the Una Chapman Cox Foundation and ADST, have launched the Resilience Hub for Frontline Civilians (www.frontlinecivilian.com), an anonymous online resource center for training, education, self-assessment and tools to help individuals and groups build resilience and prevent PTSD.

A recording of the event is available at the AFSA website, www.afsa.org/video.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor
No Simple Answers

America’s Continuing Misadventures in the Middle East
Reviewed By Keith W. Mines

I never miss a Chas Freeman article—he is colorful, provocative and engaging. While others might make similar arguments, who else would accuse our leaders of saying, “Don’t just sit there, bomb something”—or warn that “Strategic incoherence invites punishment by the uncontrolled course of events”?

This collection of speeches given to widely varying but serious audiences is vintage Freeman, and reminds me why I love his work. At the same time, I found many of his critiques in this collection unfair, and his suggestions largely undeveloped. The challenges of the Middle East are simply more complex, more varied and less prone to simple solution than Freeman would often like to concede.

On the issue of what went wrong in the Middle East, Freeman has an almost Noam Chomskyesque sense for how the region was before U.S. involvement, and for how it could be if the United States were to leave it alone.

When reflecting on taking up his posting as ambassador to Saudi Arabia 26 years ago, he describes it as having been a “zone of tranquility”—a jarring characterization for a country where one could lose a limb for petty theft, and that was facing a menacing Saddam Hussein intent on regional hegemony.

Elsewhere, Freeman states how the U.S. invasion of Iraq ended that country’s “domestic tranquility”—a tranquility enforced by the gassing of its own people and the draining of wetlands that were the historic homeland of the Marsh Arabs for centuries. Whatever the U.S. invasion unleashed, it did not unleash it in a country with domestic tranquility.

For Freeman, mistakes made in Washington had a great deal to do with why and how relative stability in the Middle East disappeared.

In several places he lays out a linear narrative of increasing U.S. involvement starting with the larger military presence required for the dual containment of Iran and Iraq, growing animosity in the region as a result, the backlash of terrorism, more intervention, more terrorism and, ultimately, the collapse of whole states and the rise of ISIS.

Freeman also expresses a consistent animosity for Israel, which he blames for much of what has transpired.

In the midst of all this, he says, the United States lost its soul—with torture, rendition and the “promiscuous use of drone warfare.” He stresses the “limitations of purely military solutions to political problems” throughout.

In the realm of solutions, Freeman begins by stating U.S. objectives in the region: securing a place for Israel, keeping oil and gas at reasonable prices, maintaining freedom of navigation, engaging in commercial relations and promoting stability and expansion of liberty.

But the recommendations culled from various chapters add up to more of a list of what not to do than what to do. He argues for stopping the militarization of our strategy (“when in a hole, stop digging”), ceasing the facilitation of “Israel’s indulgence in denial and avoidance of the choices it must make,” and ending the free ride we are giving our Arab partners on their defense.

These are all good points, and a narrative that is largely defensible when taken piecemeal. But my own experience leads me in a different direction.

The idyllic version of the Middle East, if it ever truly existed, has been collapsing under the weight of the multiple transitional challenges the region has confronted over the past four decades. Tribal societies are giving way to the demands of civil society; dysfunctional command and oil-based economics must move to open capitalist economies to provide for a growing population; religiously organized and rural societies are becoming urban and being challenged by pluralism; and citizens are demanding a say in government, leaving traditional totalitarian systems reeling.

All of this has unfolded against a demographic picture that would make Malthus cringe: Of the 20 countries in the world with the highest population growth rates, six are in the Middle East and North Africa.

Whether or not one accepts this as a counter-narrative, Freeman could, at a minimum, concede more historical inevitability within these societies and ascribe less blame to Washington.
it is accurate to argue that U.S. ineptitude has made everything more difficult, with or without the United States it was going to be a long, difficult transition into the modern world for the countries of the Middle East. For it is a transition destined to be uneven, unsteady and fraught with violence and deprivation.

It is also important to note that the results of whatever mistakes we have made in the past will be compounded if we don’t stay involved in the Middle East on a corrected course.

Freeman also makes the case for strengthening the instruments of U.S. diplomacy, some of which are out of our hands given the “constant turnover of inexperienced amateur policymakers, placed in office by the spoils system in a highly militarized civilian political culture.”

But surely, as Freeman argues, some improvements could be made, even within the existing system and resources, such as correcting the fact that American diplomacy is “missing in action when it is most needed—as the fighting ends.” The ups and downs of our reconstruction and stabilization capacity point to a persistent avoidance of truly taking on this mission.

Freeman cites a failure to professionalize diplomacy as one reason we contribute so little to the task, contrasting our profession with the “superbly professional leadership of the U.S. Armed Forces.” Again he gives few specifics, but judging from the number of times we jump over the entire Service and bring a retired diplomat in to lead a critical mission—something that would be unthinkable in the military—it is hard to argue that there isn’t room for taking a more systematic approach to developing leaders, rather than the wholly ad hoc system we currently have.

In the end, America’s Continuing Misadventures in the Middle East is a very good and thought-provoking read, not to be missed by any who are serious about considering the full range of views and opinions on this critical region.

FSO Keith W. Mines is currently an Interagency Professional in Residence at the U.S. Institute of Peace, working on Middle East peace and federalism in failed and fragile states. He has served in Europe, the Western Hemisphere and the Middle East in a variety of military and Foreign Service assignments. He may be the last true believer in the imperative of nation-building as a key undertaking in facing today’s challenges.

Exploring the History-Policy Nexus

The Power of the Past: History and Statecraft


Policymakers instinctually search for historical lessons that they can use to guide their statecraft.

Secretary of State Alexander Haig, for example, once remarked that “international conflicts attract historical analogies the way honey attracts bears.” President Barack Obama famously absorbed the lessons of Doris Kearns Goodwin’s Team of Rivals before choosing his Cabinet. And President George W. Bush tackled an extensive reading list of histories and biographies.

Similarly, Foreign Service employees prepare themselves for a new post by steeping themselves in the history
of their country of assignment. Professional historians, though, cry foul and assert that historical events are too complex and unique to draw lessons for the present from them; the past, they assert, is more unlike today than similar.

In *The Power of the Past*, Hal Brands and Jeremi Suri use the work of noted scholars to tackle the interplay between these two dynamics. The result is a compelling work which draws on events from contemporary history such as U.S. decision-making during the 1991 Gulf War, intervention in the Balkans and reaction to the 9/11 attacks.

Other chapters look at how analogies to Vietnam and Munich have guided policymaking, the ambiguities of humanitarian intervention, and Henry Kissinger’s unique approach to learning from history.

The book’s firsthand accounts are especially powerful. Former Deputy Secretary James Steinberg notes the influence in the Clinton and Obama administrations’ decision-making of both widely read historical works and policymakers’ personal life experiences.

Former Republican officials William Inboden and Peter Feaver perceive similar forces at work in the George W. Bush White House, but also note the important role played by history as the common language through which experts in varying disciplines communicated.

Former State Department Counselor Philip Zelikow draws on examples from the Iraq War, the 2008 financial crisis and other instances (such as Pearl Harbor) to discuss the difficulty in understanding and explaining historical events.

Several chapters note how the same historical event can prompt contradictory lessons learned. Both Pres. George W. Bush and Senator Edward Kennedy likened the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq to the Vietnam War. Yet they drew very different lessons from that comparison. Vietnam’s lesson for Kennedy was that

---

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS DAY**

*The Annual Homecoming for Foreign Service and State Department Civil Service Retirees*

**May 5, 2017**

There will be a luncheon at 1 p.m. in the Benjamin Franklin Room. Reservations are first-come, first-served. $60 per person.

To RSVP, please email foreignaffairsday@state.gov with your full name, retirement date, street address, email address and phone number.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson at his confirmation hearing on January 11, 2017
The Power of the Past takes important steps toward challenging historians to make their work more policy-relevant and useful. At the same time, it encourages foreign policy practitioners to become more sensitive to history’s complexities and self-aware about the sources and influences of their own historical assumptions.

American power is inherently limited and overreach dangerous; the lesson for Bush was that the bold, decisive use of military power is necessary if success is to be achieved.

Similarly, different views of Balkans history divided American and European counterparts in trying to come up with a common approach to the Bosnia and Kosovo crises.

Another series of essays points to history’s more subtle influences. The lineage of current diplomatic efforts against human trafficking, we learn, is past campaigns against “white slavery.” Today’s discussions over Japan’s military strength are heavily influenced by the post-World War II U.S. occupation authorities’ narrative proclaiming that both U.S. and Japanese peoples were victimized by Japanese militarism.

Scholars evaluating President Ronald Reagan’s National Security Council are urged to look beyond well-known indications of grave dysfunction and instead note the NSC’s remarkable success in achieving Reagan’s key policy goals. “Containment” evokes memories of U.S. diplomatic pre-eminence and eventual Cold War success. But we are reminded that this strategy—crafted to achieve victory over the USSR—may not be applicable to current challenges because it was targeted at the Soviet Union’s unique strengths and weaknesses.

The premise of the book suggests questions for future research. It would be interesting, for example, to learn if policymakers in other countries have the same struggles with history as those in the United States. Also worth examining is whether powerful analogies such as Munich and Vietnam are losing their power as generations too young to have experienced them become leaders.

I would urge any current foreign policy practitioner to read The Power of the Past to gain insights into history’s power, as well as an understanding of its promise and pitfalls when deciding the best courses of action for today.

—

Todd Kushner, a retired Foreign Service officer, lives in Rockville, Maryland.
ATTORNEY WITH OVER 25 YEARS’ successful experience SPECIALIZING FULL-TIME IN FS GRIEVANCES will more than double your chance of winning: 30% of grievants win before the Grievance Board; 85% of my clients win. Only a private attorney can adequately develop and present your case, including necessary regs, arcane legal doctrines, precedents and rules. Call Bridget R. Mugane at: Tel: (301) 596-6175 or (202) 387-4383. Email: fsatty@comcast.net Website: foreignerservicelawyer.com Free initial telephone consultation.

EXPERIENCED ATTORNEYS REPRESENTING FS officers in grievances, performance, promotion and tenure, financial claims, discrimination and disciplinary actions. We represent FS officers at all stages of the proceedings from an investigation, issuance of proposed discipline or initiation of a grievance, through hearing before the FSGB. We provide experienced, timely and knowledgeable advice to employees from junior untenured officers through the Senior FS, and often work closely with AFSA. Kalijarvi, Chuzi, Newman & Fitch. Tel: (202) 331-9260. Email: attorneys@kcnlaw.com

JOEL CASSMAN CPA LLC. Retired Foreign Service Officer with 30+ years tax experience. Specializes in international and real estate tax issues. Tel: (571) 221-0784. Email: joelcassmancpa@yahoo.com Website: www.JoelCassmanCPA.com

DAVID L. MORTIMER, CPA: Income tax planning and preparation for 20 years in Alexandria, Va. Free consultation. Tel: (703) 743-0272. Email: David@mytaxcpa.net Website: www.mytaxcpa.net

IRVING AND COMPANY, CPA. Scott Irving, CPA, has more than 18 years of experience and specializes in Foreign Service family tax preparation and tax planning. Tel: (202) 257-2318. Email: info@irvingcom.com Website: www.irvingcom.com

PROFESSIONAL TAX RETURN PREPARATION
Arthur A. Granberg, EA, ATA, ATP, has more than 40 years of experience in public tax practice. Our Associates include EAs & CPAs. Our rate is $125 per hour; most FS returns take just 3-4 hours. Located near Ballston Mall and Metro station.
Tax Matters Associates PC
4420 N. Fairfax Drive, Suite 500
Arlington VA 22203
Tel: (703) 522-3828. Fax: (703) 522-5726.
Email: aag8686@aol.com

WE PROVIDE FREE TAX CONSULTATION. Specializing in Foreign Service and overseas tax returns for 30-plus years. Income tax preparation and representation by Enrolled Agents. Electronic filing of tax returns for fast processing. Taxes can be completed via: email, phone or in person. We handle all state filings. Custom comments provided on each return to help keep our clients heading in the right financial direction. TAX TRAX, a financial planning report card, is available. Tax notices and past due returns welcome. Office open year round. Financial planning available, no product sales, hourly fee. Send us your last 3 returns for a free review.

Financial Forecasts, Inc.
Barry B. DeMarr, CFP, EA & Bryan F. DeMarr, EA
3918 Prosperity Ave #318, Fairfax VA 22031
Tel: (703) 289-1167. Fax: (703) 289-1178. Email: finfo@FFITAX.com Website: www.FFITAX.com

FINANCIAL PLANNING FOR FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEES WORLDWIDE
Fee-Only, Fiduciary, Foreign Service Specialized. 20+ years of FS life experience. FSI financial planning subject matter expert/lecturer. Together, let’s make a plan that encompasses your TSP, IRAs, Investments, Retirement, Homeownership, College Funding and other goals. In-person or virtual meetings.
William Carrington CFP®, RMA® Email: william@carringtonFP.com Website: www.CarringtonFP.com

JOIE KEAT, DDS — GENERAL & COSMETIC DENTISTRY
FS spouse providing modern and gentle dental care since 1984. Focus on overall health and wellness. Alexandria Commons Shopping Center
3223 Duke Street, Suite G
Alexandria VA 22314
Tel: (703) 212-7070. Email: drkeat@totallydental.com Website: www.totallydental.com

ARE YOU STUCK IN A PARENTING CHALLENGE? Moving Forward Parent Coaching is your answer! As a PCI Certified Parent Coach®, Mary Trego can support and guide as you work together to find practical strategies and solutions. Mary has been a part of the Foreign Service community for 17 years. Email: MovingForwardPC@gmail.com Website: movingforwardparentcoaching.com

COFFEE BREAKS

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

FULLY FURNISHED, PETS welcome, one & two bedrooms. Courthouse & Ballston Metro. Executive Lodging Alternatives. Email: Finder5@ix.netcom.com

FURNISHED LUXURY APARTMENTS. Short/long-term. Best locations: Dupont Circle, Georgetown. Utilities included. All price ranges/sizes. Parking available. Tel: (202) 251-9482. Email: msussman4@gmail.com
DC LUXE PROPERTIES. In business for more than 20 years, our luxurious fully furnished and equipped apartments are uniquely ours. We don’t rent out “other people’s apartments” like most other providers of temporary housing. We specialize in fully renovated historic properties in the Dupont Circle neighborhood, close to everything, for the authentic D.C. experience. All our apartments have their own washer/dryer units and individual heating/cooling controls, as well as Internet and cable TV, etc. We never charge application or cleaning fees, and work with you on per diem. Please look at our website to view our beautiful apartments and pick out your next home in D.C.
Tel: (202) 462-4304.
Email: host@dcluxe.com
Website: www.dcluxe.com

ARLINGTON FLATS. 1, 2, 3 and 4 BR flats/houses in 25 properties located in the Clarendon/Ballston corridor. Newly renovated, completely furnished, all-inclusive (parking, maid, utilities). Rates start at $2750/mo. We work with per diem. Check out our listings. Welcoming Foreign Service for the last decade!
Tel: (703) 527-1614. Ask for Claire or Jonathan.
Email: manager@sunnsideproperty.net
Website: www.SunnsideProperty.net

LUXURY 5-STAR HOME lease in Tucson, Arizona, with private pool and on golf course. Recommended by Foreign Service guest.
Tel: (206) 679-6126. See pictures: www.vrbo.com/747585

PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

NORTHERN VIRGINIA PROPERTY MANAGEMENT. Are you looking for a competent manager to take care of your home when you go to post this summer? Based in McLean, Va., Peake Management, Inc. has worked with Foreign Service officers for over 30 years. We are active board members of the Foreign Service Youth Foundation and many other community organizations. We really care about doing a good job in renting and managing your home, so we’re always seeking cutting-edge technology to improve service to our clients, from innovative marketing to active online access to your account. We offer a free, copyrighted Landlord Reference Manual to guide you through the entire preparation, rental and management process, or just give our office a call to talk to the agent specializing in your area. Peake Management, Inc. is a licensed, full-service real estate broker.
6842 Elm St., Suite 303, McLean VA 22101
Tel: (703) 448-0212.
Email: Erik@Peakeinc.com
Website: www.peakeinc.com

REAL ESTATE

LOOKING TO BUY, sell or rent property in Northern Virginia? This former SFSO with 15 years of real estate experience understands your needs and can help. References available. David Olinger, Gri Long & Foster, Realtors.
Tel: (703) 864-3196.
Email: david.olinger@LNF.com
Website: www.davidolinger.lnf.com

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. Profession-alism is just a phone call away. Call Alex for solutions.
Alex Boston, REALTOR, JD, MPA
Long & Foster
6299 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church VA 22044
Tel: (703) 533-9566.
Email: alex@Lnf.com
Website: alexboston.Lnf.com

ARE YOU MAIN STATE OR FSI BOUND? For over 30 years, I have guided hundreds of Foreign Service clients through buying and selling real estate. When making such an important financial and life decision, you deserve to have the guidance and expertise of a seasoned real estate professional.
Contact Marilyn Cantrell, Associate Broker, licensed in VA and DC.
McEneaney Associates
1320 Old Chain Bridge Rd., Ste. 350
McLean VA 22101
Tel: (703) 860-2096.
Email: Marilyn@MarilynCantrell.com
Website: www.MarilynCantrell.com

GET YOUR FREE home inspection/appraisal (average $500 value) w/ any sale with Gigi completed by December 2017. Buying/Selling Real Estate in the Washington DC Metro area? Gigi Otar specializes in relocation and prides herself in working each deal personally. No annoying teams, just one professional focused on what matters most: your bottom line. Broker for 13 years in Virginia, Maryland and The District.
Email: GreaterDCrealestate@gmail.com

TIME TO LEAVE WASHINGTON? Retired FSO moving to NC, and their country home can be yours. Large house and barn on 22 acres in Madison County, Virginia—75 miles from Dulles, 85 miles from DC, 25 miles from Charlottesville.
Website: bit.ly/BerryhillHome

FLORIDA’S PARADISE COAST—Naples, Bonita Springs, Estero. Excellent amenities, activities, cultural events in beautiful Southwest Florida. Outstanding home values. Interested in another area? With an extensive network, I am able to assist statewide or nationwide.
Thomas M. Farley, LLC. Retired SFS.
Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices Florida Realty.
Email: tomfarley@BHHSFloridaRealty.net

OWN A CLASSIC Tuscan home. Three-story villa built in 1880s with garden and stunning views; situated among olive groves in the quiet countryside between Siena and Florence, less than a half mile from medieval town of Pergine Valdarno. Price: € 290.000 negotiable.
https://yourtuscanhome.wordpress.com

INTERNATIONAL ADOPTION

ADOPT WHILE POSTED OVERSEAS! Adopt Abroad, Incorporated, was created to assist expatriates with their adoption needs. U.S.-licensed and Hague-accredited. We conduct adoption home studies and child placement services, caseworkers based worldwide.
Adopt Abroad, Inc.
1424 N. 2nd Street, Harrisburg PA
Tel: (888) 526-4442.
Website: www.adopt-abroad.com

VACATIONS

CARRIACOU, GRENADINES. TWO-OCEAN VIEW house in Caribbean on four acres. Two bedrooms. $800/week. Check out link: www.korjus.x10host.com/wells/index.htm

TUTOR/TEACHING

DID YOU ALWAYS want to speak French? Native French Speaker/Teacher/Tutor/Paris Sorbonne Graduate offers flexible hours. 305/Hours/Student via Skype/Tango/Viber/VideoChat.
Email: Eycano@gmail.com

PLACE A CLASSIFIED AD: $1.50/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) 944-5507.
Fax: (202) 338-8244.
Email: miltenberger@afsa.org
NASTY, BRUTISH, AND SHORT
LESSONS AND LAUGHS FROM AN OVERSEAS OFFICER
TODD MILLICK

From England to Egypt, Pakistan to Haiti...
The collection of funny and moving essays
on overseas life you’ve been waiting for.
Nasty, Brutish, and Short
Out Now on Amazon!

SUBSCRIBE NOW
Go to afsa.org/fsj-subscribe
One-year subscription: $50
For more information or to request the discounted
student rate of $30, please email
Miltenberger@afsa.org or phone (202) 944-5507
ARE YOU PREPARING FOR YOUR NEXT OVERSEAS ASSIGNMENT?

One of the most important things to check off your long to-do list is to get a good property manager lined up well in advance of your departure. If you’re leaving this summer, it’s not too early to start planning. Don’t wait for the last minute!

BASICALLY, WHAT DOES A PROPERTY MANAGER DO?

- Evaluate your property for price and condition
- Suggest repairs and upgrades
- Review rental policies with you
- Organize marketing of your home
- Screen tenants and prepare the lease
- Collect rent
- Conduct periodic inspections
- Organize both routine and emergency repairs

---

COMPANY CULTURE. Consistently good service with a company you will enjoy working with is completely dependent on the company mission and culture. At Peake Management, our goal is simple. We want happy clients and happy tenants. We work hard towards that goal every single day. With happiness as the goal, everything else falls naturally into place.

cherishing experience. Peake has been a growing part of the Foreign Service family since 1982. Personally, I’ve been since I was born! We have learned from our successes. We listen to our clients. We understand the Foreign Service lifestyle. We love working with you all.

Technology is key. You want secure, quick access to your information. You’ll get it with Peake. Through your online portal, you can view inspections, documents, monthly statements and more. Tenants can pay rent using their phone. Payments are sent digitally. We want speed in everything!

Specialization & Stability. We’ve got competent and responsive managers, with average time with Peake over 12 years. You’ll always have ONE senior manager assigned to you. They’ll know everything about you and your property for years to come. There is comfort in stability.

Partnering with experts. To improve the marketing of the properties, we have teamed Better Homes & Gardens Real Estate Premier. Our partnership gives your property far greater online marketing exposure. Properties rent more quickly and often to more qualified tenants.

Responsiveness & Sound Business Practices. We will always be as quickly responsive to you as possible.

Hire us. It is easy to set up a meeting to answer your questions, evaluate your home and fill out the paperwork. Just email or call us.

Are you already overseas? It’s easy to do the paperwork digitally as well. Don’t let that stop you from hiring us!

Geoff Clopton, Director of Operations
703.891.5316 • Geoff@peakeinc.com

Lindsey Peake, Principal Broker/Owner
703.891.5314 • LindseyPeake@peakeinc.com
703.448.0212 • 450 N. Washington St, Suite M, Falls Church, VA 22046

---

How do you make your choice? All experienced property managers can easily handle all of the basic responsibilities. What differentiates them?

www.peakeinc.com
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.

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

Northern Virginia is our neighborhood

Phone: 703.642.5683
7007 Kilworth Lane • Springfield, VA 22151

Meeting our clients’ needs with a full range of real estate services.

www.promaxrealtors.com
Serving the DC metropolitan area since 1983.

WMS is the partner of choice for residential property owners and tenants who seek the experience, market knowledge, and customer service we provide. We keep our eye on the details so you can look ahead.

4405 East West Highway
Number 306
Bethesda MD 20814
Phone 301.654.1400
Fax 301.654.1426
www.WMSDC.com

Our goal is simple — treat each home as if it were our own.

703.537.3340 | McEnearneyPM.com

While you are halfway around the globe managing the World...
We are here, managing your Home.

McGrath
REAL ESTATE SERVICES

Providing Property Management & Sales Expertise throughout Northern Virginia
McGrathRealEstate.com
764C Monroe St · Ste 100 · Herndon, VA 20170 · 703.709.2264

Protecting the homes of those who are protecting our Country
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That Time I Was Acting Dean of a Mongolian University...

BY NICOLE SCHAEFER-MCDANIEL

I still remember my excitement when I first stumbled across the American University of Mongolia website in 2014. I had been searching for months for jobs in Mongolia—our next home, thanks to my husband’s work with the State Department Foreign Service—but had nothing to show for it yet. I wrote to AUM hopeful, never expecting such a tumultuous work experience.

The university was founded in 2012 with the vision of establishing a liberal arts-focused American university in Mongolia. In collaboration with the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, AUM developed an engineering curriculum, which students could enter after completing a “Bridge Program” that prepared them for undergraduate studies in English. Students would then study for two years in Mongolia and two in Fairbanks. AUM received some funding from USAID, and its English Learning Institute was supported by U.S. government grants.

The more I learned from afar, the more convinced I became of the virtues of AUM’s approach. I couldn’t wait to utilize my skills as a social scientist to support it. While I looked forward to the chaos often associated with start-up organizations, I was not entirely prepared for a request two weeks before arriving that I co-teach a math class in the inaugural program. “Teach math?!” I thought frantically as I googled “pre-calculus” and “college algebra.”

It turned out that our team included a Mongolian engineering professor, as well as an American math professor lecturing from the United States via the internet. I was responsible for assuring that our sessions mirrored an American college classroom, that our teaching methods followed a student-centered approach, and that we spoke only in English.

As I was to discover, however, one can never be sure what to expect in Mongolia.

Off the Beaten Path

Known for its eternal blue skies, harsh winters (with temperatures below -30F) and nomadic culture, Mongolia’s size in relation to its sparse population is as overwhelming as its beauty.

But daily life is not without its hardships: things don’t usually work as outsiders might expect them to, and the few resident expatriates quickly get used to vendors’ common refrain when asked for a desired product: “baikh gui”—no longer available.

In Mongolia, things happen on their own terms: holidays are rescheduled with a few days’ notice, people may or may not show up for appointments, roads and stores close without any discernible logic, and businesses regularly run out of money.

When I arrived in the capital, Ulaanbaatar (commonly called “UB” in English), in 2015, I could see evidence of economic hardship everywhere: abandoned construction sites, empty restaurants, growing shantytowns known as “ger districts” (so named after the Mongolian felt tents—gers—residents pitch) and people collecting food or plastic bottles to sell.

While the country has undergone many changes since the 1990 democratic revolution ended 70 years of socialism, reform of the educational system has lagged. Establishment of an institution like AUM was a huge step forward. Among other things, AUM was strikingly different from the traditional Soviet-style schools Mongolian students knew.

Our eight students came from all walks of life, from country kids with extremely limited English skills to one who had completed high school in the United States. It took one student three days to travel from his home in the far west of the country to UB. He had given up scholarships in Russia and Japan to stay in Mongolia, and was learning English as his fourth language. His determination and cheery demeanor never ceased to amaze me.

Teaching and Learning

One of my favorite moments occurred during a review session in which I introduced the idea of a “cheat sheet.” Used to learning by rote memorization, my Mongolian students had never thought about rewriting their notes or organizing the information in a way that made sense to them.

When I showed them my review sheet from a lecture my American counterpart

Nicole Schaefer-McDaniel holds a Ph.D. in environmental psychology and left academia when her husband, John McDaniel, joined the Foreign Service in 2009. After assignments in São Paulo and Vienna, they currently serve in Ulaanbaatar. She teaches in the study abroad program of the School for International Training and continues to work with the Board of the American University of Mongolia to reopen the university.
had just given, many jumped up in excitement, reaching for their cell phones to photograph my newly organized notes.  

On another occasion, in an effort to encourage our students to apply the rather abstract concepts of trigonometry to their lives, we asked them to research real-life applications that made use of the semester’s worth of formulas they had just learned. With a bit of coaching, they all eventually arrived at the “aha” moment we were looking for and realized that math is all around us.

Besides teaching, I went on recruitment visits to high schools around UB. I looked forward to these visits at schools that ranged from crumbling Soviet-style institutions to modern schools with new buildings and technology to match.

I never knew what to expect—sometimes I would meet the highest school official and talk with him through my interpreter; other times I would arrive to find half-dressed students whose gym class had just dismissed in a classroom that also functioned as a co-ed locker room.

One time a loudspeaker suddenly started barking loud Mongolian music along with a voice counting 1, 2, 3, 4. Unsure of what was happening, I looked around to see classroom doors fly open and students line up to squat, bend, flex and stretch for this mandatory exercise drill.

These visits and my own classroom experiences confirmed my belief that an alternative school like AUM was necessary. After two semesters of classes, our students’ English skills improved tremendously, and they were thriving.

They gained confidence, held their heads up high when giving a class presentation, and learned to ask questions and apply abstract concepts. They had also figured out that they needed to do their homework or risk a lower grade.

And then it all fell apart. As Mongolia’s economy slid deeper into an economic crisis that compelled the newly elected government to enact painful austerity measures, AUM was not alone in suffering financially.

Despite tireless efforts by the administration and board of directors, AUM had insufficient applicants for the upcoming academic year. Two weeks shy of the fall semester, in recognition of the economic realities, the board voted to suspend classes.

In the meantime, for unrelated reasons, I had stepped in as acting dean of general education. So after writing university policies and schedules for a semester of classes we would never teach, I had to tell our students that the school we had all come to treasure was forced to close, at least temporarily.

The Bigger Picture

After the initial shock wore off, I began to appreciate the bigger picture. Yes, AUM closed; but we did achieve something important and completely different for this part of the world.

In my view, the American University of Mongolia was five years ahead of its time. The momentum was (and is) growing for this type of educational initiative. Our efforts were not a failure by any means: Our students learned how to learn, as opposed to just memorizing, and they learned to think critically. Our Mongolian teachers developed a richer understanding of student-centered teaching, rather than lecturing students without follow-up or intermittent formative assessments.

I, too, have grown substantially in this past year, not just because I was given a job title outside of my comfort zone, but because I learned so much about the nuances of merging Mongolian and Western styles of education.

Our team-teaching approach allowed me to explore another academic language, and my co-workers and students enriched my understanding of why things are done the way they are in a country where the bureaucracy and strange customs sometimes fluster me.

And in my next job interview, I can say I was once acting dean of a university—in Mongolia. At the very least I will stand out from the rest of the applicant pool. And, who knows? There is still a possibility that I will be running a university here in UB in a few months or years.

This is Mongolia, after all, where anything can change at a moment’s notice.
This photo is a bit of a "view askew" of the To-ji Temple in Kyoto, Japan, one which puts the temple’s elaborate woodwork into stark relief. The temple is Japan’s tallest wooden tower and stands 180 feet high. The five-story pagoda dates back to 796, in the early Heian period. It is listed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site—one of many such sites in Kyoto.

Ásgeir Sigfússon, a native of Iceland, is AFSA’s communications director. He took this photo using a Nikon D5200 camera.
COMING SOON
99 YEARS OF DIPLOMATIC HISTORY

In spring 2017, AFSA will unveil the entire 99-year archive of The Foreign Service Journal and its predecessor, the American Consular Bulletin, online.

A treasure trove of primary source material and wisdom, this digital archive is a rich legacy of the U.S. Foreign Service, diplomacy and AFSA.

We hope you take advantage of this unparalleled resource.
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International Property Insurance

Insurance of Personal Effects Abroad, In Storage and In Transit

The AFSA plan is designed for and exclusively available to American Foreign Service members on active duty abroad.

- Full replacement value for personal effects, including international delivery cost
- Comprehensive coverage, including riot, theft, mysterious disappearance, breakage
- Exceptional claim service based on the honor system
- Same low rates regardless of assignment
- Coverage for natural disasters such as earthquake, flood or tsunamis
- **Worldwide** personal liability insurance for both international and US locations
- **Worldwide** property in storage
- $1 million excess liability coverage over personal and auto liability for $45
- Valuable items insured for agreed amounts
- Underwritten by the Chubb Group of Insurance Companies

**Ask Bernard**
215-242-8200 • bcooper@hirshorn.com
M-F 9:00 – 5:00 ET

For more information or to apply, visit hirshorn.com.
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*since 1931*

American Foreign Service Desk/The Hirshorn Company
14 East Highland Avenue • Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19118

Chubb Group of Insurance Companies ("Chubb") is the marketing name used to refer to the insurance subsidiaries of The Chubb Corporation. For a list of these subsidiaries, go to www.chubb.com. Actual coverage is subject to the language of the policies as issued. Chubb, Box 1615, Warren, NJ 07051-1615.