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One year ago, AFSA launched a Foreign Service reform initiative with this explanation:

"Our personnel system has not adequately adapted to changes in its operating environment. Because of that, the Foreign Service as a whole lacks the organization, abilities, and outlook needed to carry out our mission at a superior level of performance. This exposes us to the danger that some outside force could impose changes that — intentionally or unintentionally — 'reform' us out of existence. However, if we who know the Service the best can seize the opportunity to advance a strategy for modernizing our personnel system, we stand a better chance of assuring a new renaissance of the career Foreign Service."

This warning about "some outside force" trying to "reform us out of existence" proved prescient this past June and July when some in Congress pushed to strip the visa function (perhaps even the entire consular function) out of the State Department. The White House, Secretary Powell and AFSA lobbied hard against that move and, as I write these words, it appears that there will be no overturning of the Rogers Act that created the modern Foreign Service in 1924 by combining the consular and diplomatic corps.

But anyone who cares about the future of the Foreign Service should be very concerned about the argument that was advanced to justify the transfer of the visa function. Simply put, some in Congress felt that the culture of the Foreign Service places a higher value on good bilateral relations (i.e., keeping foreign governments and publics happy) than on actively promoting vital American interests. Significantly, a similar argument was behind the decision a generation ago to transfer the commercial function from State to the Department of Commerce.

We prevailed this time, in part because Secretary Powell personally reassured Congress that this argument was wrong, emphasizing that "we take our responsibilities in the State Department and our consular responsibilities with utmost seriousness, and we are seeing what else we need to do to make sure that we are doing everything to guard our nation, to guard our people." It is now up to the Foreign Service and State Department to live up to that pledge.

In so doing, we must guard against a repeat of the injudicious e-mails that a handful of Foreign Service members sent this past July with comments disparaging members of Congress. That episode only reaffirmed our critics' views that some in the Foreign Service lack the judgment and discipline to properly serve the country.

We must also focus on the underlying cultural issue by continuing our push to reform and reinvigorate the Foreign Service so that no one can question our commitment or ability to actively promote U.S. interests. We must prove that we are not just "pin-striped diplomats" as White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer dismissively referred to us last April, but instead that we are tough enough to staff the front lines of national security in a dangerous world.

Interestingly, the producer of the short-lived Fox TV drama "The American Embassy" (aka "Emma Brody") told me that had the series continued the scripts would have become more serious. The reason was that viewer focus groups meeting after the Sept. 11 attacks told the show's producers that they expected the U.S. diplomats who stood between them and foreign foes to be strong, serious professionals.

The task before us is to meet those expectations. AFSA is committed to playing a leading role in that vital effort.
Editor's Note:
Honestreporting.com, a Web site that says it is “only interested in ensuring that Israel receives the fair media coverage that every nation deserves,” posted an item condemning Jerri Bird’s article in the June FSJ, “Arab-Americans In Israel: What Special Relationship?,” and urging its members to write the Journal and the State Department to express their outrage. We have received several hundred e-mails, letters and faxes (and some phone calls) quoting the following text, partially or fully:

Foreign Dis-Service Journal

The magazine written for American diplomats around the world runs an article calling Israeli actions “terrorism.” The Foreign Service Journal has probably one of the most exclusive readerships in the world. Published by the American Foreign Service Association, the de facto “union” of State Department employees, the Journal is written for and by American diplomats around the world.

The June edition provides the inspirational story of Harry Bingham, an American vice consul in Marseille at the start of World War II, who defied U.S. immigration policy and issued 2,500 visas to Jews, including artist Marc Chagall. Scorned by the State Department, Bingham ended his career in 1946.

However, the June edition also contains a vicious attack on Israel by a long-time anti-Israel propagandist, Jerri Bird, the wife of a retired diplomat. The article calls Israeli actions “terrorism” and claims that Israel systematically “tortured and incarcerated” Arab-Americans.

Bird heads “Partners for Peace,” a “sister organization” of the anti-Israel Council for the National Interest headed by Bird’s husband, Eugene, and former congressmen Paul Findley and Pete McClosky. (McClosky is praised heavily on neo-Nazi Web sites — see www.zundelsite.org)

Jerri Bird’s Journal article is a rehash of accusations she made last July in “The Link,” an anti-Israel smear-sheet published by the “Americans for Middle East Understanding.” Part of Bird’s charges are based on the 24-year-old cables of a junior Foreign Service officer, Alexandra U. Johnson, who interviewed Palestinian visa applicants and “detailed the treatment of Arab prisoners.” Bird hides the fact that Johnson was later fired from the State Department; according to a 1979 Washington Post report, Johnson was “engaged to one of the Palestinians” cited in her cables.

The battle against terrorism shared by the United States and Israel.

HonestReporting asks:
• Why did the Foreign Service Journal permit such a piece of rehashed propaganda — so at odds with American policy — to be published?
• Is the anti-Israel article a tool to direct attention and criticism away from Saudi Arabia and Egypt, the breeding ground for al-Qaida terrorists? Would the Journal consider an article on a topic recently aired in Congress: American children abducted by their Saudi fathers and held in Saudi Arabia?
• The battle against bin Laden and the international terrorist network, as conducted by the United States, requires intense interrogation of captured terrorists who may possess information about “ticking bombs” ready to explode. Would the Foreign Service Journal consid-
er an article critical of American interrogation tactics?

Serving American Interests?
I'm sure by now you've read HonestReporting.com's carefully researched and compelling criticism of Jerri Bird's article. It brings to question the scholarship and honesty of your journal and makes me wonder how you could allow such a misleading piece to be published. We live in a time in which the knowledge we take in from the Foreign Service Journal could be a basis for a world with less hatred and prejudice. But Bird's article shows that you are encouraging bias and hatred between people. It's a throwback to propaganda and hate. Is this what our dedication to a world of peace and harmony to the nations in which they are serving? How does this serve American interests?

John W. Hoffman
Boca Raton, Fla.

Mobilized Outrage
You will undoubtedly have received an avalanche of objections because you chose to publish the article by Jerri Bird in the June issue of the Foreign Service Journal. I have been visiting Israel-Palestine intermittently since the early 1960s. My wife and I worked for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) as doctor and nurse, respectively, in the Gaza Strip for two years. We appreciate your courage in publishing the Bird article and wish you well in dealing with the "righteous outrage" that will have been mobilized in response to it.

Dr. Iain Chalmers
Oxford, U.K.

Consular Assistance in Israel
The article by Jerri Bird on Arab-Americans in Israel (June FSJ) was extremely interesting to me since I served many years in the Middle East and in the NEA Bureau. I had already heard about the situation Bird describes from someone who served in Jerusalem. That person told me that consular personnel in Jerusalem would like to offer Palestinian-Americans effective assistance, but are prevented from doing so by Embassy Tel Aviv.

Lucy D. Quinn
FSO, retired
Cumberland, Md.

A Momentous Day
Thanks to AFSA for giving the Harry Bingham family a momentous day to remember at the State Department. The ceremony in the Ben Franklin Room June 27 will be cherished by my siblings and Harry's other descendants for generations to come. We were thrilled to hear Secretary Colin Powell posthumously praise Harry's life-saving activity while he was posted as a consul in Marseille from 1939 to 1941 and were impressed by the stories of the other honorees. You and your staff did a tremendous job organizing the successful event. Congratulations from my grateful family!

I am also most appreciative of your support for the Hiram Bingham IV postage stamp proposal. The USPS just wrote that "Mr. Bingham is currently under consideration by the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee as a future stamp issuance." In no small way, your actions and those of Secretary Powell bolstered the stamp campaign, which began with a petition to the Postmaster General in December 1998.

Thanks for the great day in Washington, and thanks for the wonderful article about my father in the June Foreign Service Journal.
Robert Kim Bingham
Salem, Conn.

Several Jewels
The June 2002 issue of the FSJ contains several jewels. David Jones' appreciation of Ambassador Robert Strausz-Hupe (Letter to the Editor) was a diamond. It is a great analysis of his career, suggesting Strausz-Hupe's role in fighting and contributing to victory in the Cold War on the intellectual level, as opposed to others who also played important roles by, inter alia, branding our opponents as the Evil Empire. And Jones' last paragraph gives a superb summary of the Cold War — in three sentences!

The "AFSA Dissent Awards" focus of the issue was a pearl, and suggests answers to questions often asked about the Dissent Channel and dissent in general. Several friends commented favorably on it.

And the last page, Postcard from Abroad, contains the ruby: "Peshawar Memory." This piece is a poem, masquerading as an essay. It cries out to be read aloud. Poets in these times and places don't make much money, their reward is the satisfaction of expressing an emotion and sharing it with others.

Thanks, Mary Cameron Kilgour, for sharing this ruby with us.

Francis Xavier Cunningham
FSO, retired
Arlington, Va.

Present-Day Dissenters
As a 1994 winner of AFSA's William R. Rivkin Award for constructive dissent by mid-level officers (a member of the group of 13 dissenters from the Clinton
Administration’s policies in the former Yugoslavia) and as a former FSJ editorial board member, I wish to take exception to the conclusions reached by Gilbert Kulick’s Speaking Out, “Let’s Put Foreign Policy Back into Creative Dissent,” and David T. Jones, “Is There Life After Dissent?” in the June issue.

Kulick bemoans what he views as the “serious dilution of the standards by which courage and creativity in the Foreign Service are measured today” compared with the actions of those who opposed U.S. policy in Southeast Asia in the 1960s and 1970s. Jones concludes that “there has been a corporate conclusion within the Foreign Service that while (gently) rocking the boat probably will not trigger obvious, overt retaliation, it also doesn’t do any real good.” I could not disagree more with both assertions. While we would all benefit from learning more about and honing the heroism that Kulick and his colleagues displayed in the last days of South Vietnam, and while I agree with Mr. Jones’ conclusions about the utility of the formal Dissent Channel, I believe I can speak for many “constructive dissenters” of the past decade in asserting that, in at least a few cases, we made a real difference.

Bosnia is a good example. Without exaggerating the role our dissent played in prompting the dramatic changes in U.S. policy in the Balkans that began in 1995 — as there were many other factors and many more influential contributors — it should suffice to note that our principal recommendations were adopted by the Clinton administration within two years of our dissent.

One of our group became ambassador to Bosnia soon thereafter, another is the current deputy assistant secretary responsible for Balkans policy, and every other member of the group has had a successful career since receiving the award.

While the Foreign Service could do even better in encouraging constructive dissent and welcoming differing views, I think it deserves credit for being more open to and supportive of dissent than most other institutions in both the private and public sectors.

Eric S. Rubin
U.S. Consul General
Chiang Mai, Thailand

Getting History Right

I find it ironic that, in their eagerness to deride author Khaled Abdulkareem’s feel for American history, letter writers Casavis and Boyatt (June FSJ) take glee in denying there existed a “Republican Party” in 1812. In fact, the Republicans of that era were the party of government; Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, as well as the War Hawks, called themselves Republicans. It was the party of that name and its mutations which eventually became the Democratic Party. As they say, you can look it up.

Arnold Isaacs
FSO, retired
Falls Church, Va.

Family Member Employment

I am a member of the State Department’s Family Member Employment Working Group, composed of representatives from the Family Liaison Office, the Office of Overseas Employment, the Office of Employee Relations, and the Policy Coordination Staff, and led by the Human Resources Bureau’s Deputy Assistant Secretary John Campbell. We read Rebecca Park’s Speaking Out piece, “Do Family
Member Associates Matter?” (May FSJ), with great interest and sympathy. We were struck by how similar the issues she raised were to many we have been trying to address in the Working Group over the past year. Many of her points are indeed legitimate and need to be addressed.

First, we want to clarify that the FMA is an employment mechanism, not a program for spouses. The “A” stands for “Appointment,” not “Associates.” There has been confusion between the FMA and an earlier now-defunct program for spouses called AFMA, American Family Member Associates.

All eligible family member (EFM) employees, regardless of the employment method used to hire them, are eligible for job training and performance counseling.

The term “PIT” (Part-time, Intermittent, Temporary) is being tossed into the dustbin of history: it sends the wrong message and was never a usefully descriptive term. Under the FMA and any other U.S. government appointment, part-time employment qualifies for U.S. government benefits, whereas intermittent or temporary employment does not. (See the July 9 cable, 02 State 131614.)

As for pay administration, the steps awarded with a change in grade, either up or down, are being reviewed. Under current regulations, EFMs with experience and qualifications may be considered for a Superior Qualifications Rate and be appointed at a higher step. Entry level into a position should depend on the qualifications of the candidate selected. Language incentive pay is another area we will be looking into for cases where language proficiency is a necessary part of the job.

Park’s concerns about difficulty vesting in the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) need clarification. When an EFM employed on an FMA leaves a position, the employee usually goes into Intermittent-No Work Scheduled (INWS) status and the FMA is not terminated until the five-year expiration date of that appointment. That employee remains on State’s employment rolls, and is not reported to the TSP Service Center as separated. No TSP contributions are lost, even though the employee may have served for less than three years in the position.

Even on those rare occasions when the employee’s FMA is terminated prior to vesting, losses would be minimal. The employee loses only the one percent agency contribution, plus associated earnings. The employee gets to keep all of his/her own contributions with earnings, plus all of the agency’s matching contributions (up to four percent) with earnings, no matter when the appointment is terminated.

In our Working Group, we have deliberated about paying a post differential rate and a post cost of living allowance (COLA) to EFM employees employed on an FMA. There is some flexibility for the post COLA. A few posts — generally in high-labor-cost countries — do pay COLA to family members employed full-time under the FMA. COLA is payable for EFMs only in those posts where an exception has been approved by the department, and only to full-time employees. If an EFM employee on an FMA is eligible for COLA, it lowers the basis for the career employee’s family-size COLA calculation, but there is still a net gain.

The post differential, based on hardships and living conditions, is more complicated. There is an
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equity issue as to how we should compensate family members who are not employed at post for their hardships living in the locality.

Please be assured that the Family Member Employment Working Group is diligently exploring ways to improve and increase family member employment opportunities at our posts abroad.

Bob Regelman
Human Resources
Management
Specialist, Office of
Overseas Employment
Washington, D.C.

GRITS in the Middle East

Soon I will be going to post, on my last assignment with USAID. I sought out an assignment in the Middle East, stirred, as were many others, by a resurgent sense of patriotism due to the events of Sept. 11.

I am not a soldier (I’m a gramma) and cannot defend my country with arms, and besides, I am basically a “peacenik” type. So, I am going out as a contracting officer with USAID.

Before I set sail (or jumped on a plane, as the case may be), I needed to say ‘goodbye for now’ to all of my ‘kith and kin’ located in and around western North Carolina. As I usually do on my visits south, I stopped at the first Cracker Barrel restaurant across the North Carolina line. On this occasion, I was looking for a Girls Raised in the South (GRITS) baseball cap to bring with me to post. I asked the waitress if they had any of these caps in stock, and we got to chatting. I told her the reason that I wanted the cap was to remind me of home when I am overseas. She asked if I was with the military and I told her no, explained I was with USAID and told her a bit about the
agency and what it does to help people in developing countries. She left with my order and later returned to tell me she was sorry, but they had no GRITS hats in stock. Then I saw her talking to the Cracker Barrel manager. After a few minutes he approached me with a navy-blue baseball cap with the words “Cracker Barrel” emblazoned in gold on the front. He handed it to me and said, “We here at the Cracker Barrel want you to have this in appreciation. We appreciate all our citizens — military and civilian — who are helping America by serving our country over in the Middle East.”

Until that moment, I had been feeling a little sad thinking about leaving my family and friends in the U.S. for four years overseas. However, what he said galvanized my feelings of patriotism, reminding me that we non-military types also serve our country and that what I do, even as a simple “paper pusher,” is important. Those of us who work in foreign aid — bombing them with butter, you might say — also serve.

I never did locate a GRITS baseball cap. However, this former civil rights worker now proudly wears her “cracker” cap!

*Margaret Dula, FSO
USAID Mission Cairo*

---

**PRESIDENT**

**THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN CAIRO**

The Trustees of the American University in Cairo are conducting a search for President. AUC, founded in 1919, is a leading university advancing the ideals of American liberal arts and professional education and life-long learning. Students are from all segments of Egyptian society as well as from other countries. Candidates must have a distinguished record of accomplishment in higher education, diplomacy, NGO and/or other professional fields. An earned doctorate is preferred. While Arabic language skills are not required, a deep respect and appreciation for Egypt and its culture is a prerequisite. Under the university’s protocol with the government of Egypt, the president must be an American citizen.

**The Search Committee invites applications and nominations for the position, which should be sent prior to October 1, 2002 to:**

Malcolm MacKay, Managing Director
Russell Reynolds Associates,
200 Park Avenue, 23rd floor, New York, New York 10166
fax: (212) 286-9709, mmackay@russellreynolds.com

---
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---

**Year-End Roundup of FOREIGN SERVICE AUTHORS**

The December 2002 Foreign Service Journal will include a list of recently published books by FS authors in an special section: “In Their Own Write.” Send a copy of the book, along with a press release or backgrounder with information on the author, to:

Susan Maitra
Associate Editor
Foreign Service Journal
2101 E Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037-2990

Deadline for submissions is Oct. 1.
Majority of Americans Still Shun World News

One year after the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11 shocked the nation and the world, Americans are still casting a blind eye toward international news, according to a recent survey conducted by the Pew Research Center (www.people-press.org). Surprisingly, nearly half of those who said they did not follow international news said they did so because they believe it does not affect them.

The 2002 report, released in June, is based on data collected from 3,002 adults during the time period from April 26 to May 12. This year's results were compared with those from two years ago. Researchers found that the percentage of those who follow international news very closely rose modestly from 14 to 21 percent, while the number of those following somewhat closely actually fell one percentage point, from 45 to 44 percent. The aggregate of these numbers constitutes a slight overall increase in the number of those Americans who track international news.

The survey attributed this small increase to growth within the demographic groups that typically follow foreign news: wealthy, highly educated, older Americans. Those who are less affluent, less educated or younger are not significantly more interested in foreign news coverage than they have been in years past, according to the Pew study.

These numbers came in stark contrast to predictions made just a year ago, when polls taken shortly after Sept. 11 indicated that the American public's interest in foreign news would likely rise substantially across a wider spectrum of society.

If America wants to get out of recession and get its stock market pumped up again, and if the European Union wants to survive, and Asia wants its stagnation ended, the only answer is facilitating the development of Africa.

Africa is the missing link of the global economy. ... Africa can answer the world's economic needs right now if we only focus on African potential rather than African problems.
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Africa is the missing link of the global economy. ... Africa can answer the world's economic needs right now if we only focus on African potential rather than African problems.


The ICC Won't Go Away

The Bush administration's bold "un-signing" of the Rome Statutes for the new International Criminal Court in May, and the subsequent adoption by the U.N. Security Council of a face-saving compromise giving American peacekeeping forces a one-year exemption from prosecution, have, at least temporarily, buried the latest challenge to America's definition of sovereignty.

It is safe to say, though, that while the ICC may no longer be on the front page, and the U.S. is by no

registered among those who follow international news. Only 6 percent paid very close attention to that particular issue, a trend that was emblematic of American foreign news coverage that fails to extend far past major issues like terrorism and the Middle East.

In an interesting development, the survey also found that the American public's ability to follow international news is hindered by a lack of background knowledge necessary to fully understand the news itself. Researchers found that nearly two-thirds of those who reported only moderate or low interest in international news cited a lack of background information as a reason for not following it.


— Eric Ridge, Editorial Intern
means the only major nation that has refused to join the organization, the
issues it raises will not go away. Heralded by many as historic, the
ICC's development taps into the upsurge in human rights concerns in
the wake of the Rwandan genocide in Africa, the Balkans experience,
and the continuing violence and destruction in the Middle East and
elsewhere. Simultaneously, the pressure of globalizing trends in
commerce and communications is pushing the issue of world order —
and all the attendant questions of multilateralism versus unilateralism,
equity, democracy and sovereignty — insistently to the fore.
The Internet offers a range of resources for the interested lay person
alike to stay up-to-date on the ICC and the issues it raises. Perhaps the most
comprehensive and compact information on the ICC can be found at the
Web site of Human Rights Watch (www.hrw.org/campaigns/icc/), the
largest U.S.-based human rights organization, an NGO launched
in 1978. The United Nations' ICC Web
html) is limited, but authoritative.
Another U.N. news page (www.un.org/
News/facts/iccfact.htm) contains an
overview Q&A on the ICC.
More exhaustive documentation
on the ICC can be found at the
Web site of the Coalition for an International Criminal Court

Site of the Month: www.smartreminders.com

The days when a bout with temporary amnesia was an excuse for forget-
ting your best friend's birthday or missing your business meeting are
over, all thanks to one very useful and free Web site. SmartReminders
shows us how handy the Net can really be with an easy-to-use site that allows
Web surfers to identify their interests, important dates, even favorite sports
teams and receive e-mail information and notifications accordingly. Part per-
sonal assistant, part personal news watcher, the value of SmartReminders
stems from the fact that it has the potential to save the average Web surfer
a lot of time and trouble. Sorry, it can't make photocopies like a living, breath-
ing personal assistant, but it can save you much embarrassment by sending
you an e-mail reminding you of all those important dates that are otherwise
so easy to forget.
Birthdays and business meetings are just the beginning. The site has
numerous other practical applications to help you efficiently manage
your finances, your vehicles and appliances, and more. For instance,
SmartReminders can send you a message reminding you that the time to
change the batteries in your smoke detector is fast approaching, or that you
need to rotate the tires on your car or get a 75,000-mile servicing.
The site doesn't just send e-mails for important dates, either; messages can
also be triggered by current events. For instance, you can be automatically
notified of factory recalls concerning products you own — from kids' toys to
car mufflers. Users can sign up for an e-mail to be sent when one of the
major U.S. stock market indices drops by 100 points in a day, or when severe
weather is forecast for a specific region. The content of these messages is cus-
tomizable, so there is no need to sort through information that you don't
need.
The site's scheduled daily and weekly e-mails are very useful too. For
example, SmartReminders can send you messages about current gasoline
prices, college basketball odds, and even TV show ratings, among many other
subjects. The best part is that the site is free; all you need to do is register,
and you can start receiving your personalized e-mails.

50 Years

Ago

The old Greek principle of
moderation in all things is
particularly needed these days.
There is too much extremism,
too much exaggeration and
sensationalism, too shrill and
hysterical a note to life.
— George H. Butler, retired FSO,
in his Letter to the Editor, FSJ,
September 1952.
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Do you have basic financial questions you would like to see answered by experts who are knowledgeable about the special needs of Foreign Service personnel?

If YES, please send them to our Advertising & Circulation Manager, Ed Miltenberger, via e-mail at miltenberger@afsa.org. He will then match your questions to the appropriate experts. The resulting Q&A columns will appear periodically in AFSA News.
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(www.iccnow.org), the coalition of more than 1,000 NGOs from around the world that spearheaded establishment of the international court. The site contains information on all supporting NGOs, and a detailed chronology of the history of the ICC initiative. The Coalition’s monthly newsletter is posted, along with a calendar of events concerning the court. Should you be interested, you may sign up to receive e-mail notifications on day-to-day developments pertaining to the ICC.

The U.S.-based Crimes of War Project has a useful Web page on the ICC and the United States (www.crimesofwar.org/onnews/news-us-icc.html), which discusses the U.S. “unsigning” and its implications in an informed and measured way. The page also contains links to relevant documents pertaining to the ICC. The Crimes of War Project was formed in 1999 to raise public awareness of the laws of war and their application to situations of conflict, with the aim of clarifying this seemingly arcane subject and the developments and debates around it, for a wider, nonspecialist audience.

Finally, in the category of “resources galore,” note the Web page of the University of Chicago’s library dedicated to the ICC (www.lib.uchicago.edu/~llou/icc.html#internet). This page lists literally thousands of links to articles and documents on the ICC. Many of the links are broken, but that still leaves many hundreds of worthwhile sources to explore.
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Just Like Home.
SECRETARY Colin Powell has rightly earned high praise for doing more to promote equal opportunity than any other secretary of State in history. Early in his tenure, he implemented bold initiatives to correct glaring employment imbalances in an agency which, contrary to stated U.S. government policy, still does not look like America.

In particular, Hispanics already account for 12.5 percent of the U.S. population and are poised to become the largest American minority. As they naturally become more politically active, they are demanding better representation in both public and private institutions. Private enterprise, President Bush and Secretary Powell all understand this phenomenon and are responding to it, demonstrating what can happen when upper management sets clear public goals and provides the necessary resources to reach them.

Accordingly, Powell's dynamic leadership at State has included an unapologetic advocacy for increasing involvement of Hispanic-Americans in the Foreign Service. Toward that end, he has dramatically augmented the recruitment budget and has even hired a full-time recruiter to target Hispanic applicants. He has also signed partnership agreements with organizations such as the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities to identify more highly qualified Hispanic interns for the State Department.

As a result of these efforts, record numbers of Hispanics are taking the Foreign Service examination for State's entry-level programs. More importantly, the number of Hispanic personnel entering the Service has also increased.

True, there is still a long way to go. Secretary Powell himself has declared it unacceptable that just four percent of the employees at State are Hispanic, compared to six percent of the overall federal workforce. And even that latter number means that Hispanics continue to be the most underrepresented ethnic group within the federal government: the Hispanic U.S. civilian labor force now stands at approximately 35 million — over 12 percent of the total population. But it is undeniable that State is making progress.

USAID Lags Behind

Sadly, the trend is going the opposite way at the U.S. Agency for International Development. Already one of the poorest performers in the federal government in terms of diversity, its record has actually deteriorated over the past decade. In 1992, there were 105 Hispanic employees at USAID out of 3,346 total personnel; 3.14 percent. Ten years later, there are only about 70 Hispanic employees out of 2,100 or so staff, representing just 3 percent of the total workforce at USAID. (To keep pace with the current makeup of the U.S. civilian labor force over the period, there should instead be closer to 250 Hispanic employees at the agency.) In fact, Hispanics are the only underrepresented minority at USAID.

The agency's outreach and recruitment resources are woefully inadequate to correct this problem. There is no full-time outreach recruiter at the agency of any kind, let alone one focusing on minorities. Recruitment is done part-time by one rotating Foreign Service officer who works with a budget of barely $10,000 a year, compared to seven full-time recruiters at State whose budget was increased by $500,000 this year. At this level, USAID can only be represented at two or three major job fairs a year. What's more, funds are practically nonexistent for promotional materials and advertising. Serious recruitment efforts simply cannot be implemented at this low level of support.

Even so, USAID would only have to increase its intake of Hispanic employees by 10 to 15 a year over the next decade to achieve parity.
with the private sector. That should be an easy target to meet given a population base of 35 million U.S. Hispanics — were it not for USAID’s institutional tendency to “blame the victim” for its own failure to address diversity concerns. Consider the following excuses heard all too often around the agency:

- “Hispanics are too family-oriented and not interested in working overseas.”
- “Hispanics with the right qualifications can demand higher salaries from other employers and are not willing to work for USAID.”
- “There just aren’t enough qualified Hispanics.”

Those Hispanics who do pursue Foreign Service careers at USAID face obstacles at all levels. Career-enhancing assignments are infrequently available to Hispanics and no attempt is made to make use of their cultural qualifications. For example, currently there are no Hispanic Foreign Service contract officers posted in any Latin American country.

In 2001, no Hispanics were promoted into the Senior Foreign Service. Nor were any chosen for long-term training or assigned to Senior Management Group positions last year. And there are currently just three Hispanic employees in either the Senior Foreign Service or Senior Executive Service at USAID, compared with nine in 1991.

**Fixing the Problem**

The problem has been around for the last 25 years at USAID, regardless of which administration was in power. Neither Republicans nor Democrats have shown enough political will to change things — in the very agency that spends millions of dollars a year overseas on democracy and governance programs promoting full political participation of all sectors of society.

In 1990, for example, the agency contracted LCA & Associates, Inc. to prepare a study focused on enhancing assignments are infrequently available to Hispanics and no attempt is made to make use of their cultural qualifications. For example, currently there are no Hispanic Foreign Service contract officers posted in any Latin American country.

In 2001, no Hispanics were promoted into the Senior Foreign Service. Nor were any chosen for long-term training or assigned to Senior Management Group positions last year. And there are currently just three Hispanic employees in either the Senior Foreign Service or Senior Executive Service at USAID, compared with nine in 1991.

**Fixing the Problem**

The problem has been around for the last 25 years at USAID, regardless of which administration was in power. Neither Republicans nor Democrats have shown enough political will to change things — in the very agency that spends millions of dollars a year overseas on democracy and governance programs promoting full political participation of all sectors of society.

In 1990, for example, the agency contracted LCA & Associates, Inc. to prepare a study focused on
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“Achieving Workforce Diversity.” LCA’s March 1991 report concluded that USAID “has not demonstrated a willingness to make difficult decisions to insure the development and implementation of policies” addressing affirmative action and equal employment opportunity.

The study contained a number of excellent practical recommendations to address the problem, including increasing budgetary and staff resources for USAID recruitment activities, as Secretary Powell has now done successfully at State. Other proposals addressed retention, career advancement and training. The report also recommended a more assertive role for the EEO Office at USAID, noting that it “suffers from both a lack of visibility and a lack of credibility.” Regrettably, most of these steps were never implemented.

The Hispanic Employee Council for Foreign Affairs Agencies at USAID has met on three separate occasions during the past 10 months with Administrator Andrew Natsios and two assistant administrators to discuss these concerns. At our most recent meeting with him, HECFAA made the following recommendations:

- Announce support for diversity at USAID, encouraging senior managers to improve representation of all underrepresented groups but emphasize Hispanic levels in particular;
- Hire a full-time, professional Civil Service outreach recruiter and increase the outreach and advertising budget;
- Budget funds to cover costs of candidates being interviewed for openings with the agency;
- Consider supporting other programs such as the Student Loan Repayment program and paying some relocation expenses; and
- Increase training opportunities for minorities at all levels and monitor selections to ensure diversity.

These proposals are relatively modest but would represent a concerted, good-faith effort by management to correct long-standing diversity problems at USAID. In fact, some of these recommendations would be beneficial to non-minorities, as well. HECFAA also pointed out that Presidential Executive Order 13171, signed on Oct. 16, 2000, mandates all federal agencies to establish and maintain a program for the recruitment and career development of Hispanics.
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As of this writing, Natsios and his staff still have not responded formally to our concerns. Our attempts to follow up have elicited the same excuse that their predecessors cited: a low operating-expenses budget. Yet the amount of funding needed to make a real difference in promoting diversity, around $150,000, would constitute only a miniscule percentage of the agency's total operating expense budget of $560 million in Fiscal Year 2002.

If increasing Hispanic employment were a true agency priority, USAID could find the money. After all, it seems to have no trouble funding multimillion-dollar initiatives of highly questionable utility, such as the New Management System costing more than $100 million. And USAID could easily include diversity issues in the scope of the major reorganization currently being implemented by the Business Transformation Executive Committee. (The BTEC is overhauling and modernizing the entire portfolio of systems supporting USAID’s procurement, human resources, information technology, financial and administrative management functions.) Thus, the lack of action is more a matter of management will than wallet.

The Powell Model

The time has come for the measures State has instituted to promote diversity to be adopted at USAID, where Hispanics continue to be neglected in employment, promotions, career development and assignments.

It is true that the relationship between USAID and State has never been clearly defined. In fact, USAID was never meant to be a permanent agency and so its degree of independence has varied under different administrations. But it has always been clear that the head of USAID reports to the secretary of State and that the two leaders’ policies should be in sync.

Yet the two agencies’ personnel structures seem to reflect opposed visions of how America should present itself to the rest of the world. State appears genuinely committed to promoting diversity and proactive in solving its problems. USAID, however, beyond a few token efforts, still does not include Hispanic-Americans in significant roles in foreign affairs.

Secretary Powell should be proud of his initiative to create a more diverse Foreign Service. But as de facto leader of both State and USAID, he should ensure that the same policies are implemented at both agencies. Hopefully, now that the problem has been identified, the same innovative efforts will be aggressively implemented at USAID. Only then can the two major U.S. foreign affairs agencies be truly representative organizations embodying the rich diversity of the American people.

Francisco Zamora has been a health development officer with the U.S. Agency for International Development since 1980, when he joined the agency as an international development intern. As an FSO, he has served in Mali, Liberia, Honduras and Egypt, and is currently an assignment and performance counselor in USAID’s Office of Human Resources. Mr. Zamora is also the president of the Hispanic Employees Council for Foreign Affairs Agencies (HECFAA) at USAID.
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ANDREW NATSIOS: GETTING USAID ON ITS FEET

Administrator Andrew S. Natsios is rebuilding USAID from the dark days when absorption into State was likely, but there is still much to be done.

By Ben Barber

When Andrew S. Natsios, the head of the U.S. Agency for International Development, went to the Heritage Foundation on Capitol Hill in May to defend his foreign aid program, he walked into the proverbial lion’s den. Arrayed on tables in the entryway were a half-dozen treatises by Heritage scholars basically saying that Natsios’ task was mission impossible. Foreign aid doesn’t work. Trade, not aid, works. U.S. tax dollars are going down a rat hole. Corrupt foreign elites grow fat off American aid.

Natsios, a conservative former Massachusetts legislator brought to Washington during the first Bush administration,
Focus

One of Natsios’ biggest fans is the man who sat in his chair before him,

J. Brian Atwood.

is mild-mannered in public, so it was never quite clear how he felt confronting so many critics. But what was immediately clear was that he was willing and ready to defend his agency’s $8.5 billion budget against charges that foreign aid has frequently failed to improve living standards.

He began by reminding critics of the great success since 1960 of U.S. foreign assistance in East Asia, which helped develop impoverished Korea, Thailand and Malaysia into Asian tigers. “Private domestic investment and rapidly growing human capital were the principal engines of growth,” he said. Nor can foreign aid reduce poverty without “sound macroeconomic management,” he noted, citing a key ingredient of the Bush administration’s view of foreign aid.

Admitting that USAID had made mistakes in the past, Natsios then stole the thunder of his critics by citing economist William Easterly, the dean of USAID critics, to signify his willingness to reform the agency. Quoting from Easterly’s recent book, The Elusive Quest for Growth (MIT Press, 2001), Natsios said: “Broad and deep development happens when a government that is held accountable for its actions energetically takes up the task of investing in collective goods like health, education, and the rule of law.”

This is another key conservative concept in foreign aid that has been widely adopted by many foreign aid experts around the globe. Even Natsios’ predecessor at USAID under Bill Clinton, J. Brian Atwood, adopted this concept and shut down USAID programs in corrupt or poorly managed developing countries and ended aid to countries such as Thailand which had “graduated” from depending on foreign handouts. Atwood also paved the way for Natsios’ reforms by insisting on “sustainable development,” which means that aid projects should ultimately generate more income than they consume — including consumption of environmental resources.

Having placed himself on the side of the angels by citing Easterly, Natsios then waved before his critics the “Millennium Challenge Account” announced by President Bush two months earlier at the Monterrey Conference on Financing for Development, which some observers call the biggest shock to the world of foreign assistance in a decade. The president pledged to increase U.S. foreign aid from $10 billion to $15 billion a year over the next three budget years, but said this “smart” assistance will be targeted to governments that provide good governance, rule of law, sanctity of contracts and free markets. Recipient nations must also make their own contributions to improved health and education as well as develop economic, currency, trade and investment policies that encourage private foreign and domestic investment in sectors vital for growth such as education and infrastructure.

For countries that meet those standards, Bush and other donor nations pledged in the draft Monterrey Consensus document to “commit ourselves to mobilizing domestic resources, attracting international flows, promoting international trade as an engine for development, sustainable debt financing and external debt relief, and enhancing the coherence and consistency of the international monetary, financial and trading systems.”

Third World governments lacking such policies would be lured into adopting them by the promise of the cash and technical assistance to set up the required institutions. In part, some believe, the Bush administration acted out of concern after Sept. 11 that isolated swamps of poverty and discontent in the developing world could provide a ready ideological justification for terrorists as well as a pool of recruits.

Thus, despite having run on a conservative platform decidedly hostile to foreign aid, Bush and his appointee, Natsios, now argue that foreign aid is a vital ingredient in U.S. foreign policy. The justification may be terrorism, humanitarian crises, environmental challenges, world stability or all of the above. But regardless, the Bush administration is now as firmly entrenched in the quest for effective foreign aid as any of its predecessors dating back to Harry Truman.

A New Marshall Plan?

In an interview in his office at the Ronald Reagan building recently, Natsios recalled how the Marshall Plan had influenced his own thinking about the world.

Ben Barber is the State Department correspondent for the Washington Times.
"As a kid I was in Greece to see my grandfather when per capita income was $200," he said. The devastation of World War II and the threats of communist insurgencies or political movements in Greece and other European countries had paralyzed the economy of the region. The Marshall Plan's massive infusion of income-generating projects and materials turned things around. In later visits Natsios saw his grandfather's village blossom and income shot up to $10,000 per capita.

Some foreign aid analysts hope that similar income-generating assistance — they frequently call for "a new Marshall Plan" for sub-Saharan Africa, Central Asia or other poverty zones — can drain support for anti-American terrorism, much as the Marshall Plan drained away support for communism in Western Europe. This is an approach Natsios was clearly comfortable with, having witnessed up close the humanitarian horror of corrupt and indifferent rulers as head of the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance under the first President Bush and then as vice president of World Vision, a major non-governmental organization delivering assistance around the world.

"If there are venal and predatory governments, foreign aid can keep people alive but the country won't develop," said Natsios in a March interview in his office. He said it is legitimate to ask why foreign aid investments sometimes fail and sometimes work.

"In Mali, Uganda, Ghana, Mozambique, El Salvador and Jordan — where there's a reform process going on, where there is a political will" — aid has worked, he said.

Natsios says the agency has learned from its successes and mistakes. "We know what works. You need political will and competent policy reform. Investing in health and education works — we learned that from Asia. And partnerships help — linking ODA [Overseas Development Assistance from all donor nations], private sector investment and the $30 billion a year [in remittances] diasporas in America send back home each year."

Fighting Terrorism

Would that lessons learned in one battle could be so easily applied to others.

Unfortunately, at a June symposium at USAID, Princeton economist Alan Krueger and others on the panel dashed hopes that the agency might easily play a large role in the all-consuming fight against terrorism. "Any connection between education, poverty and terrorism is indirect, complicated and probably weak. Terrorism is not a response to economic conditions. It's a violent political act," he said.

USAID Assistant Administrator for Policy and Program Coordination Patrick Cronin agreed that evidence shows "no compelling direct link between poverty and terrorism," though USAID programs are at least partially aimed at having an impact on the justification of terrorism and recruitment.

Krueger said that foreign aid can reduce terrorism through "changing the content of education." One goal would be to divert students away from the intolerant ideology taught at some Islamic schools (madrassas), where the Taliban were trained and thousands of students are still being taught to hate America.

"The message of Monterrey is you need to focus on what works — not just the amount of money," Natsios added. "When people stand up to corruption we have to stand alongside them. [But] without local leadership, it won't happen."

Natsios also backed the often painful policies in which donor countries and banks urge poor nations to cut subsidies for food, schools and health in order to balance their budgets — the highly unpopular "structural adjustment policies" that have set off riots in many nations in recent decades. "If you don't have macroeconomic stability," he said, "if you have rampant inflation, an economy can't grow. If you don't have convertible currency you can't trade. You have to balance your budget. We help countries balance their budgets."

The Atwood Years

If there is one major ideological difference between the Natsios and Atwood administrations — and it may be due to the new post-Sept. 11 emphasis on counterterrorism — it is that Atwood's zeal to promote democracy is now somewhat on the back burner at USAID. Stability in the face of terrorism is viewed more highly at USAID these days than the Atwood-era faith in giving the poorest and least educated people in the world control over the levers of power, in the belief that approach will bring about either improved living conditions or greater world security.

This shift also reflects the influence of the two administrators' respective secretaries of State. Warren Christopher and Madeleine Albright both espoused a deep belief that democracy was the elixir capable of tam-
Focus

Natsios believes that his agency has a far clearer mandate to work since the Sept. 11 attacks.

ing man's savage instincts. Colin Powell, although more liberal than his counterparts in the Bush national security team, appears more skeptical about the benefits of pushing rapidly for democracy, especially in countries with neither education nor traditions that support it.

In addition, while Clinton was sympathetic to Atwood's goals, neither he, Christopher nor Albright appeared willing to stand up to congressional critics of foreign aid when it really counted. As a result, Atwood's attempts to reform USAID were largely stymied, though he did manage to defeat a campaign by Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C., to merge USAID into State.

It is no surprise, then, that Natsios says that he inherited an agency badly in need of reform and repair. "Problems with USAID include personnel, the financial management system, computers, the procurement system and the system of grants and contracts," Natsios said. "These affect everyone. Congress wants information [on USAID programs], the NGOs want quick action [on proposals] and we can't do it."

Of course, since most administrations accuse those that went before them of leaving a house badly in need of repair and reform, it's hard to know whom to blame. But a Republican House staff aide with long experience overseeing the foreign assistance budget confirms that USAID suffered a huge loss of brainpower during the Atwood years. Not only was total foreign aid funding cut throughout the mid- to late 1990s, but about half of what remained was earmarked for Israel and Egypt to support the 1979 Camp David peace accord. Other aid was earmarked for child survival programs, leaving very little money for the kind of nuts-and-bolts development work that planners feel is needed to build productive economies.

Those cuts also forced Atwood to order major reductions in force. In 1990, there were 3,262 USAID direct-hire employees; in 2000, there were only 1,947. Recruitment of younger staff was also curtailed as work was farmed out to contractors instead of being handled in-house. This left a vast gap in the ranks of mid-level experts today.

The situation finally stabilized in 2001, when for the first time in years the agency was permitted to try to keep pace with attrition. But the staffer warns that USAID still faces a personnel crisis: the people who know how to run the system are about to retire and there are few rising stars in their 30s and 40s to replace them.

The damage from the massive budget cuts and firings was deepened by the waste of $100 million on various initiatives, chief among them a badly executed attempt to leapfrog technologically from 1960s-era Wang computers to a state-of-the-art system.

Tackling the Problems

Before becoming USAID administrator, Natsios had already spent more than a decade struggling with ever-larger bureaucracies — among them, stints as director of USAID's own Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance and assistant administrator of its Bureau of Food and Humanitarian Assistance (now the Bureau of Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance) during the first Bush administration; vice president of World Vision U.S.; and, in 2000, back in Boston as a trouble-shooting director called in to straighten out the mammoth, over-budget "Big Dig" project that buried a major highway under downtown Boston. So he plunged into his new role with purposeful energy.

He is primarily focusing on the management systems in five areas: procurement, personnel, financial management, computer services and administrative services. He's begun to introduce electronic systems to replace paper in hiring and other areas. He says he's replacing an 18-year-old system of writing contracts with a new automated system and will bring a new financial management system to the field next year.

The 2,200 Foreign and Civil Service officers he manages, as well as the 4,000 Foreign Service National employees, are about 40 to 45 percent below levels of the 1990s due to the RIFs. So Natsios says he wants to bring more out of the staff by getting more of them out in the field — where they also will learn more about how foreign aid works in the political, economic and social climate of the current decade. And he is committed to increasing Foreign Service staffing overseas: in 2003, for the first time in over five years, there will be 700 FS slots at USAID's missions worldwide.
He is also responding to critics who say USAID contracts go mainly to former officials who set up large firms with the know-how to write proposals and contracts within the agency. "Small business can't break into USAID so now one criterion is how much of a budget is in subcontracts — the more the better — to stop the perception of an old boy network" dominating the USAID system, he said.

One of Natsios' biggest fans is the man who sat in his chair before him. "I've followed him closely and speak often to Andrew — I hold him in the highest regard," said Atwood in an interview from his new office as dean of the Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis. "He's leading USAID into a new era, especially with respect to resources."

Atwood admits he's jealous that Natsios now has increasing supplies of cash. He predicts USAID will likely get a lion's share of the $5 billion Millennium Challenge Account because "it's the agency with the ability to deliver on the ground."

While he believes Natsios' reforms are "generally sensible," he was at first concerned that democratization programs were being channeled into a back burner role inside the bureau for crisis management and post-conflict issues. But Atwood acknowledges that Natsios has taken steps to see that democratization programs are central to sustainable development."

Atwood also notes that one of Natsios' strongest assets is his longtime relationship with a fellow Massachusetts ex-legislator, White House Chief of Staff Andy Card, who was the best man at Natsios' wedding. Thus, any plans to turn USAID into a grant-making foundation or a subsidiary of State, as once proposed by Sen. Helms, have now been shelved.

For his part, the man who controls the USAID budget — Rep. Jim Kolbe, R-Ariz., chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations — agrees Natsios "is doing a good job."

"Natsios inherited a difficult [agency] that historically
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lacked management and he’s been good to his word,” said Kolbe in an interview. “He has begun the process of cleaning up management and putting systems in place. I would not give him an ‘A+’ but in terms of effort there has been an ‘A’.”

Due to this effort, Kolbe was optimistic that the $5 billion foreign assistance increase President Bush pledged at Monterrey will be approved. “I think there will be support in the House,” he said. “What’s new is he is focused on results. He’s making sure aid goes to countries where it will make a difference economically. We put billions into Africa and the per capita income there is lower than it was 25 years ago. You’ve got to go where institutions can accommodate the aid.”

While Kolbe said Natsios “is tackling the problems” at USAID, the Republican legislator said he’d like to see a new personnel system in place and a change in the contracting system. But management changes are not all that Kolbe would like to see USAID consider. The day he was interviewed, Kolbe said the House subcommittee held its first hearing on the Millennium Challenge Account and listened to visionary Latin American economist Hernando DeSoto discuss one of the most revolutionary development ideas — the idea of helping peasants use their land as capital to borrow money to pay for investments such as farm machinery, irrigation, fertilizer, transport and the like. Because most peasants lack legal documents giving them title to their land, banks won’t make loans. DeSoto proposes that USAID and other development agencies help set up local banking systems geared to unlock trillions of dollars in wealth already in the hands of the poor but unusable as collateral assets at present.

The DeSoto plan is an idea similar in many ways to the innovative microcredit systems developed by Bangladesh’s Grameen Bank and the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee 20 years ago. It’s one of the visionary approaches to development some at USAID and other agencies think can make a difference in countries from the Congo to Guatemala, where poverty, illiteracy and disease fueled by social, tribal and other rivalries, keep billions of people from achieving the minimal
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living standards that are seen today as a natural human birthright.

Relations with State
Natsios has worked hard to improve relations between USAID and State. In the past, the relationship between the two sister agencies was frequently tense. When the USAID mission in a country such as Egypt or Thailand once gave out billions in aid, and housed hundreds of U.S. experts—a far larger staff than the local U.S. embassy—a certain rivalry for power tended to develop. In addition, in some countries, the USAID mission of development was not necessarily the primary mission of the State Department.

But Natsios has put to rest any suspicion that he has an agenda independent of Secretary of State Colin L. Powell. On Powell’s trip to Africa last year, Natsios was along and was given a chance to come back in the plane and talk to reporters—a gesture of trust between the two men that symbolizes the nature of their relationship. Natsios made clear that there is one foreign policy chief in the administration, Powell. And Natsios is part of the small core of close advisors who meet every day with Powell at 8:30 a.m. to set a common approach to issues and problems.

Natsios was in awe of Powell, the legendary son of Jamaican immigrants who rose from his Bronx neighborhood, through City College of New York, to command the U.S. Army in the Gulf War and serve as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the first Bush administration before becoming the first black secretary of State last year. But he quickly learned how to work with Powell, whose leadership style resembles that of President Bush. Both men expect their subordinates to bring with them not just the issues, not just the problems—but the solutions to those problems. “He wants you to say what you want to do,” recalled Natsios. “Now I know if I bring a problem, he wants a set of options.”

“Powell is a very secure person—he let me speak on the Africa trip. It’s disarming to work for someone like that who does not worry about ego questions. There is no rivalry at the senior level.” This is a far cry from recent reports that Natsios is fighting a turf war with State and other agencies to control foreign assistance. It may be that Natsios, Powell, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice and other Bush administration foreign policy heavies like to wrestle. Each offers their view and argues it. But when the die is cast—by Bush—all fall into line like the good soldiers they appear to be. Even within the State Department’s corridors, Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage and Natsios both find themselves considerably more conservative than Powell. But this does not prevent Powell and Armitage from being “best friends,” says Natsios, who has now developed a habit of frequent phone conversations with Armitage.

Looking Ahead
Natsios agrees with the critical analysts of foreign assistance who say trade is capable of greater growth than aid. He cites the example of Uganda, which is exporting $9 million a year in flowers and selling vanilla to Europe with the help of USAID expertise and assistance. However, Natsios disagrees with critics who say the Bush farm bill, with its billions in subsidies for American farmers, is undercutting Third World efforts to increase agricultural production. These critics say that when U.S. and European subsidized wheat, corn and rice hit world markets, it drives down prices below the break-even point for Third World farmers. Natsios counters by saying “our experts think it’s exaggerated—we help subsistence farmers,” who neither buy cheap U.S. grains nor sell to their own domestic or export markets. Cotton was the only crop he said might be depressed by U.S. farm supports.

Natsios also dismisses as unfounded fears expressed by diplomats that the Bush plan to convert some World Bank loans into grants might undermine the international financial institutions which have huge amounts of cash to support development work because they see that loans are repaid.

Above all, Natsios believes that since Sept. 11 his
agency has a far clearer mandate to work. He says the Bush administration's foreign policy has three legs — defense, diplomacy and development with its humanitarian component. Even before the attacks, the U.S. government was the biggest donor fighting famine in Taliban-ruled Afghanistan as well as North Korea — two countries seen as enemies of the United States.

Natsios and other USAID experts hope to find a way to push investment in social sectors, good governance and economic freedom to build good will, prevent the despair that breeds anti-Americanism and defend American interests through the apparently altruistic system known as foreign assistance — a system for development that is itself in the midst of development.

"President Bush, in his March 14 speech, set a new direction for development assistance by insisting on performance, not mere promises, to determine which countries would qualify for assistance under the new Millennium Challenge Account," said Natsios at the Heritage Foundation last May. The 50 percent increase in U.S. foreign aid failed to satisfy critics calling for the United States to meet a donor level of 0.7 percent of gross domestic product, set at previous U.N. development conferences. But it was a recognition that even with the Cold War over and the global economy inserting far more cash into the Third World than the roughly $50 billion a year in total overseas development assistance given by all donors, the Bush administration thinks foreign aid is 50 percent more important than it was in the recent past.

If Natsios has had a part in bringing the Bush administration to this point in the road, he can call that a success.

"If there are venal and predatory governments, foreign aid can keep people alive but the country won't develop."

— Andrew Natsios
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America's Development Challenge

President Bush's New Compact for Development is the first major new foreign assistance initiative in over 40 years. USAID Administrator Andrew Natsios explains it.

By Andrew S. Natsios

On June 5, 1947, Secretary of State George C. Marshall gave a speech at Harvard College that set the nations of Western Europe on the road to economic recovery and political integration. In the process, the United States abandoned the isolationism that had been our peacetime policy since independence and embarked upon the path of international engagement we have maintained ever since.

In his remarks, Marshall cited the "hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos" that threatened the nations of post-war Europe, and called on the people of the United States to "face up to the vast responsibility that history has
clearly placed upon our country.”

“The truth of the matter is that Europe’s requirements for the next three or four years ... are so much greater than her present ability to pay that she must have substantial additional help or face economic, social, and political deterioration of a very grave character,” he said.

Thus began the Marshall Plan, the most successful foreign assistance program in history. While most Americans are familiar with the aid that we furnished, and the remarkable use Europe made of it, the demands we placed on the Europeans before they could get it are often overlooked. But Marshall was specific about them from the beginning:

“There must be some agreement among the countries of Europe as to the requirements of the situation and the part the countries themselves will take,” he stated clearly. “It would be neither fitting nor efficacious for this government to undertake to draw up unilaterally a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. ... The initiative, I think, must come from Europe.” Thus, Marshall determined that obtaining European ownership was a critical component of its own development.

From the very beginning, then, the Marshall Plan was a bargain, an agreement between the United States and the Europeans about the economic and political reforms they needed to make before they could get our assistance. Given their history, coordinating their own reconstruction efforts proved difficult for the Europeans. But soon the benefits — to Europe and the United States — became abundantly clear to everyone. There is no question that the prosperous, stable, democratic Europe we take for granted today owes much to the process the Marshall Plan began.

The New Compact for Development

Today, the United States is once again launching a major new foreign assistance initiative, one whose significance may one day rival that of the Marshall Plan. I refer to President Bush’s New Compact for Development, unveiled in Washington, D.C. and Monterrey, Mexico, this past March.

Only three times since World War II has a president gone to the American people and introduced a new foreign assistance program. Each has been issued in times of peril, and each time the president explained his reasons in terms of compassion and national security.

The first was in March 1947, three months before Marshall’s historic speech, when President Harry S Truman warned of the grave threats facing Greece and Turkey. The second was at the height of the Cold War, when President John F. Kennedy launched the Alliance for Progress in March 1961. Soon he would follow this initiative by creating the U.S. Agency for International Development. The third such time was this past March 14, when President Bush announced as a key component of his new development compact, the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA).

Why, after years of relatively flat budgets, would the president propose a new account, one that will amount to five billion dollars a year by Fiscal Year 2006? There are several reasons:

First, our country maintains a long tradition of fighting poverty and helping those in need. “As a nation founded on the dignity and value of every life, America’s heart breaks because of the suffering and senseless death we see in our world,” President Bush said. Poverty casts “a dark shadow across a world that is increasingly illuminated by opportunity. Half the world’s people still live on less than $2 a day. For billions, especially in Africa and the Islamic world, poverty is spreading and per capita income is falling.”

Second is the relationship between poverty and national security, a relationship that the events of Sept. 11 have underscored and one that has been duly noted by the president. “In Afghanistan,” he stated, “persistent poverty and war and chaos created conditions that allowed a terrorist regime to seize power. And in many other states around the world, poverty prevents governments from controlling their borders, policing their territory, and enforcing their laws.”

The third reason is that our foreign assistance has not produced the results we would like. Indeed, we are not

Like the Marshall Plan, the Millennium Challenge Account is an incentive-based approach to foreign assistance.

Andrew Natsios is the administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development.
alone as our fellow donor nations and the multilateral development banks we support have also failed to produce enough measurable successes for the resources we’ve expended in the developing world. There is no substitute for good governance and holding developing nations accountable for their own development success. Thus, a new commitment with a new approach was required.

Reforming USAID

Improving that record is my single highest priority as USAID administrator and it remains a top commitment of Secretary Powell as well. To achieve this objective we began by reforming USAID from the top down:

• We have implemented a new management structure with both a functional and geographic matrix.
• We created four new pillar bureaus, giving our programs a tighter focus with both performance measurement and management-for-results as key components of our new approach.
• We have formed a new “Business Transformation Committee” composed of senior USAID managers and newly-arrived appointees to identify better ways of doing our development business and implementing those changes quickly and effectively throughout the organization.
• We are strongly promoting trade and economic growth as the real engines of development and giving new emphasis to agriculture; after all, three-fourths of the people in the developing world live in rural areas.
• USAID is also now spending more money in the field, where it matters, and less in Washington.
• We are building new alliances with a host of private sector partners, pooling our experience with their energy, ideas and financial resources. Indeed, there is no copyright on good development and in many cases private voluntary organizations, non-governmental organizations and the private sector can do a better job.
• We are designing programs that offer incentives and demand new levels of accountability from the developing countries with whom we work.

Still, more needs to be done. As the president observed, “many of the old models of economic development assistance are outdated. ... The needs of the developing world demand a new approach.” At USAID we are heeding that call.

The Millennium Challenge Account

The heart of this new approach is an emphasis on holding governments accountable for the policies they pursue. Like the Marshall Plan, the MCA begins with a bargain. As the president put it, countries that wish to take advantage of our generosity need to “adopt the reforms and policies that make development effective and lasting.” In short, it is an incentive-based approach.

Over the last 40 years at USAID we have learned that there are three essential building blocks to successful development and they are the foundation of the new MCA. The funds in the Millennium Challenge Account will be distributed to developing countries that demonstrate a strong commitment toward:

• Good governance. President Bush has stated that “good government is the essential condition of development. Rooting out corruption, upholding human rights, and adherence to the rule of law are essential conditions for successful development.
• Investing in their people through health care and education. Healthy and educated citizens are the agents of development, so we will reward nations that invest in better health care, better schools and broader immunization. Indeed, developing nations need to build the capacities for sustainable development.
• Sound economic policies that foster sustained economic growth through enterprise and entrepreneurship. More open markets, sustainable budget policies, environmental stewardship and strong support for individual entrepreneurship all unleash the enterprise and creativity for lasting growth and prosperity.

Let me add here that while the general outlines of the MCA are quite clear, discussions are still under way about the criteria that will be used to determine which countries will be eligible for MCA funding.

Why Countries Fail to Develop

When I was obtaining my master’s degree at Harvard’s Kennedy School, there were two basic schools of thought about public administration. The first — the quantitative analysis school — relied heavily on mathematical models and economic analysis to decide the proper public policy decision in a given circumstance. While this approach was interesting, people could seldom use it. After finishing school, they would return to the government agencies or ministries where
they worked and immediately be confronted with the same political realities that were there when they left. Public policy in the real world is not decided through mathematical formulas: politics always intervenes.

The second school of thought relied on political or “stakeholder” analysis. This looks at a given question from the point of view of the people who have a vested interest in the outcome. As someone who has spent much of his adult life in government at the state, national and international level, I find it hard to believe that anyone still dismisses this approach. Without understanding whose interests are at stake and how these interests are brought to bear on the people who make decisions, one simply cannot understand why countries make the choices that they do.

There are reasons why many developing countries have failed to raise the living standards of their citizens despite receiving millions of dollars in outside assistance. Invariably, there are vested interests, economic and political oligarchies that exploit the economic and political weakness of the state and profit from people’s lack of political power and human rights. In short, there is no sustainable constituency for reform.

The solution is to identify reformers, agents of change whom we can support so that they can compete with these vested interests for the good of their people. At the same time, we are looking to create competition among countries for our development dollars. The new resources the MCA will make available — five billion dollars a year — will be a powerful incentive to encourage them. During this process, we will work closely with Congress to build a sustainable model of successful development.

We expect that only a relatively small number of countries will be selected for MCA funding at the beginning, so those that do can expect a substantial reward. In the meantime, we are refashioning our mandate in USAID for non-MCA countries, to focus on helping these nations qualify for MCA at some point in the future. In fact, MCA is quickly becoming a way for us to reform how we provide development assistance.

Still, there are predatory governments that put little stock in the well-being of their people. Not surprisingly, they have little to show for the foreign assistance they have received. The fact is that until they change, there is little we can do to help them, except through our emergency or humanitarian programs.

**The Foreign Service Component**

There are those in the development community and Congress who believe that all that is needed for development to be successful is to throw money at it. This is nonsense. It defies history and it defies the lessons we have learned about the way countries grow and develop. It ignores the uses to which development money is put and the negative effects of corruption, incompetence and ill-conceived policy choices. And it begs the entire question of accountability, performance assessment and sound management.

President Bush’s New Compact for Development will take money, but official development assistance is hardly the only source for it. As the president stated when he announced the Millennium Challenge Account, “most funds for development do not come from international aid. They come from domestic capital, from foreign investment, and especially from trade. ... Trade is the engine of development, and by promoting it, we will help meet the needs of the world’s poor.”

The MCA is one of the most exciting new developments in the field of foreign assistance in many years. It promises a 50-percent increase in the resources this country will devote to fighting poverty, disease and weak or corrupt governance. And most importantly, it promises a more effective approach, one that emphasizes accountability and sound policy.

USAID has long benefited from the expertise, the ideas and the diligence of the Foreign Service community and we look forward to continuing our collaboration as the details of the MCA become more clear. But already we know that the opportunity to effect real, substantive change in the developing world has never been brighter. With development, defense and diplomacy as key components of our national security strategy, we will make those opportunities a reality.
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FOREIGN AID: HELP OR HINDRANCE?

FOREIGN AID HAS FAILED, DESPITE THE BEST EFFORTS OF MANY DEDICATED PROFESSIONALS AT USAID, THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND ELSEWHERE.

BY DOUG BANDOW

Here may be no more pitiful sight than tides of impoverished and starving refugees; there may be no greater irony than grievous want in the Third World amidst exploding possibilities in the First World. Nearly a quarter of the world’s population lives on less than $1 a day. More than half survive on less than $2 a day. These images and numbers are used by supporters of foreign aid to shake money out of tight-fisted politicians and keep the U.S. Agency for International Development afloat.

Of course, the term “foreign aid” encompasses a host of programs with different goals. Ever since the Cold War,
much U.S. assistance has primarily been political and military, dedicated to buying and subsidizing friends; the large annual flows to Egypt and Israel have nothing to do with economic development, for instance. Whatever the theoretical arguments for these sorts of transfers in the past, it is hard to justify them today, other than, perhaps, to buttress fragile regimes threatened by fundamentalist Islamists, such as Pakistan. And Washington continues to pay a potentially high price by allying itself with such morally repugnant regimes.

Or take humanitarian assistance. Hard to criticize in theory, in practice long-term aid programs can create significant problems. For instance, Food for Peace shipments are more efficient at dispersing domestic agricultural surpluses than feeding starving foreigners. They also have a sad record of ruining indigenous farmers in countries like Haiti and India.

Informational and technical assistance — how to organize a stock market or run elections, for example — is useful, yet this kind of assistance is widely available from private sources, either businesses, individual philanthropists or nongovernmental organizations. The same applies to medical and scientific research; Bill Gates' $750 million donation to the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunizations dwarfs what most governments can supply.

But the most important form of government "assistance" is the least justified: economic or development aid. Such programs were instituted 40 years ago when people believed the Third World was poor because it lacked money. Today we know that isn't true.

An Expensive Failure

Even during the Cold War, most aid was officially extended for development purposes. Yet the result has been an expensive wasteland, strewn with spectacular failures. For instance, Zaire received some $8.5 billion from a multitude of sources between 1970 and 1994, but imploded six years ago. (So bad was this experience that even former USAID Administrator J. Brian Atwood has acknowledged that "The investment of over $2 billion of American foreign aid [in Zaire] served no purpose.") Yet in 1996 U.N. Ambassador Bill Richardson made a pilgrimage to the newly minted Democratic Republic of the Congo, promising to provide $50 million in aid to the new dictator, Laurent Kabila, despite his authoritarian tendencies and the atrocities committed by his military.

In fact, virtually every nation in crisis, from Somalia to Liberia to Haiti to Burundi, has received billions of dollars from the West. Between 1970 and 1995, aid to Africa, excluding Nigeria and South Africa, averaged 12.3 percent of the recipients' GDP, five times the peak share of much shorter Marshall Plan transfers to France and Germany.

Perhaps even more instructive is the failure to discern any positive relationship between aid levels and economic growth. The United Nations Development Program reported in 1996 that 70 developing countries were poorer then than they were in 1980; 43 were poorer than they were in 1970. USAID itself acknowledged in a 1989 report that "only a handful of countries that started receiving U.S. assistance in the 1950s and 1960s have ever graduated from dependent status." Yet 13 years later, the ideological commitment to state-led development planning funded by the West is alive and well, and the international affairs establishment has continued to push for more money.

The latest justification for underwriting assorted venal autocrats is the post-Sept. 11 imperative to "do something" about terrorism by helping developing countries. The theory is that poor people lacking hope their lives will improve are more likely to resort to violence. Of course, this approach ignores the fact that if there were such a link between terrorism and poverty, America would already have been combatting terrorists from sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia for decades.

In reality, the case for skepticism about foreign aid is just as strong now as it was last Sept. 10.

Doug Bandow is a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute and a former special assistant to President Reagan for policy development. He is the author of The Politics of Plunder: Misgovernment in Washington (Transaction Publishers, 1990) and co-editor of Perpetuating Poverty: The World Bank, the IMF, and the Developing World (Cato Institute, 1994).
as strong today as it was last Sept. 10. Such skepticism has nothing to do with isolationism, the term of opprobrium routinely tossed at anyone who critiques any international initiative. Instead, it reflects a hard-headed analysis of the facts, a realization that the world must be taken as it is, not how people might wish it to be.

Today there is no serious dispute that markets are required for growth, and that aid cannot work in the absence of markets. There is growing agreement that assistance cannot buy market reforms. All that an increasingly beleaguered band of aid defenders now claim is that foreign assistance may be useful if extended to governments which have already adopted good economic policies.

**Making Things Worse, Not Better**

Perhaps the best broad-based study of economic policies over the last two decades is *Economic Freedom of the World* (published by an international coalition of think tanks and updated annually) compiled by economists James Gwartney, Robert Lawson and Robert Block. They created an index measuring 17 components of economic freedom, as well as three alternative summary indexes. Although international comparisons are fraught with difficulty, two clear lessons emerge.

First, economic policies matter, with better policies yielding higher rates of growth. Second, changes in economic policy affect growth rates.

For years the late economist P. T. Bauer was almost alone in criticizing the efficacy of foreign aid. But his views are now mainstream. Particularly impressive are studies by Peter Boone of the London School of Economics and Center for Economic Performance. After assessing the experience of nearly 100 nations, he concluded in a 1994 Center for Economic Performance working paper that foreign transfers had no impact on recipient country investment levels. “Long-term aid is not a means to create growth,” reported Boone. As he explains, “Aid does not promote economic development for two reasons: Poverty is not caused by capital shortage, and it is not optimal for politicians to adjust distortionary policies when they receive aid flows.”

Boone also reviewed the impact of foreign assistance on recipient regimes and found that it mostly benefited local political elites. Similar results turn up in research by Michael O’Hanlon and Carol Graham of the Brookings Institution. Their 1997 study, *A Half Penny on the Federal Dollar: The Future of Development Aid*, supports continued aid funding, but their data actually undercut that policy prescription. They found that “the negative relationship between aid flows and performance is clear at a general level. [Moreover,] absent a sound economic framework and functioning market in a recipient country, few such efforts can work.” Even after endorsing limited aid initiatives, they cautioned: “Larger initiatives are unlikely to be effective unless recipients have sound economic and demographic policies.” In fact, foreign aid actually discourages reform by cushioning the price of policy failure and reducing the urgency of making politically painful changes.

Backing this conclusion, Hoover Institution scholars Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and Hilton Root report in the Summer 2002 *National Interest* that “On average, every dollar of per capita foreign aid improves an incumbent autocrat’s chance of surviving in office another year by about four percent,” even after accounting for a myriad of independent factors. “Since the average autocracy gets about $8 per capita in aid, foreign assistance may boost the survival prospects of poorly performing leaders by 30 percent or more,” they conclude.

With more and more countries moving toward free markets (no thanks to foreign aid), some advocates contend that there are now more places in which such transfers can play a truly beneficial role. But the fact that there might be some benefit in some limited cases is hardly adequate justification for a program that has spent, in current dollars, over $1 trillion since World War II.

**Can Aid Buy Reform?**

As these insights have reached Capitol Hill, spawning greater resistance to funding, assistance advocates have desperately concocted a new justification for old aid programs: the promotion of policy reform and good governance. Specifically, they now claim that foreign assistance may be useful if targeted toward governments that have already adopted good economic policies.

Of course, there are cases of aid recipients that have adopted reforms. But it’s hard to find any convincing evidence that they did so because of such assistance. Take three of the most dramatic examples: China, India and the Soviet Union. All chose a reform path over the last two decades, but
foreign aid had nothing to do with that decision. Rather, all three changed course for the same reason: the old statist strategy had failed, and failed disastrously. The only alternative was reform.

Still, might there be a few cases where well-administered aid might materially speed up the development process? It seems doubtful, but even if so, to use that as the justification for maintaining foreign aid demonstrates just how far the debate has shifted. After all, if speeding up growth that would otherwise occur was a good reason for foreign aid, the U.S. itself should be a recipient. And as Heritage Foundation President Edwin Feulner notes in his preface to Heritage's Index of Economic Freedom, "countries with free economies generally don't need U.S. development assistance [anyway], because their economies are growing and prospering."

Indeed, success begets success. Today private capital, particularly investment, flows account for 80 percent of net long-term financial transfers, up from 30 percent a few decades ago. Net foreign direct investment increased tenfold during the 1990s, to about $200 billion annually; total trade more than doubled, to $4.6 trillion. Of course, private capital flows have been concentrated in particular developing states. That creates enormous risks when countries stumble, as was evident during the 1997 Asian economic crisis. But shifting investment patterns also demonstrate the power of the private marketplace to reward good policies.

That leverage is undercut, however, when donors fail to hold recipients to their promises of economic and political reform. This past June, for example, African leaders met with U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan to make a pitch for more aid, with the promise of better governance in exchange. But before rushing to provide more assistance, donors would do well to recall that no African government has ever been disciplined by its neighbors for corruption and incompetence.

Responding to such criticisms, Harvard's Jeffrey Sachs has variously called for "a carefully designed program," "a better focused foreign aid program," and one "limited in duration," accompanied by "a plan to phase it out." But there is no reason to believe that any reinvention of development assistance or reorganization of USAID would make any real difference. Given the very nature of aid, beyond the obvious problems in its administration by USAID and micromanagement by Congress, targeting and more selectively appropriating assistance would only reduce the money wasted.

**A Cautionary Tale**

Ignoring these lessons, President George W. Bush coupled his announcement of the Millennium Challenge Account at the Monterrey Summit this past March with a commitment to make aid more effective. But there is little reason to believe that this latest initiative will work any better than the billions spent in the past at encouraging reform.

Consider the IMF's current strategy of bailing out countries in crisis, which dates from the 1996 "rescue" of Mexico. This, too, was supposed to be an entirely new, and limited, approach to aid. But it has become both common and expensive. Charles Calomiris, a professor at Columbia Business School, argues that bailouts produce three perverse effects: "(1) undesirable redistributions of wealth from taxpayers to politically influential oligarchs in developing economies; (2) the promotion of excessive risk-taking and inefficient investment; and (3) the undermining of the natural process of deregulation and economic and political reform which global competition would otherwise promote."

First was Mexico, which was supposed to be unique. Its economy was intimately tied to that of America — the two nations had only recently inked the NAFTA trade accord — and refugees might flood across the border if prosperity was not restored. America's southern neighbor could not be allowed to fail.

The argument was never convincing, since the slump in an economy a tenth the size of America's in no way threatened U.S. prosperity. But at least the contention had some surface plausibility. And there was only one Mexico. No other developing state could make a similar claim.

Although the bailout has been widely hailed as a suc-
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cess, Calomiris argues otherwise. The Mexican government has never attempted to hold responsible the original debtors after purchasing $45 billion in bad debt from insolvent banks, causing "the transfer of billions of dollars from Mexican taxpayers collectively to the country's wealthiest and most politically powerful enterprises and individuals. The economic result of these taxes is more than a pure transfer to the rich; taxation has also slowed recovery from the recession." Equally significant, the banking system remains unreformed, a ticking financial time bomb.

Then came Indonesia, whose trade with America is negligible. Indonesia had been liberalizing a bit, but only a bit. The economy remained bedeviled by inefficient monopolies, insolvent banks, harmful trade barriers, wasteful food subsidies and political favoritism. Being a relative, or married to a relative, of President Suharto was long the surest way to wealth. His back to the wall, Suharto agreed to the conditions of an IMF bailout in 1998, but did his best to resist its terms. And a succession of weak governments since his ouster has done virtually nothing to open the economy, despite repeated promises.

All of these countries — and others, such as Argentina, Brazil and Turkey — are in trouble not because of forces beyond their control, but their own policies. Politicized banks are often at the root of such economic disasters. Only after the bubbles burst — when loans go bad, companies go bust, currencies crash, foreign exchange reserves plummet and debt repayment falters — are the countries forced to address the underlying issues. Furthermore, because borrowers in crisis are likely to do only the minimum necessary to receive aid, foreign assistance only postpones true reform. Were the countries left to their own devices, they would have to adopt all of the policies necessary to recondition their economies and reassure foreign investors, who tend to be more careful with their own cash than are international aid bureaucrats with tax monies from industrialized states.

The Bottom Line

Now that Washington has intervened again and again, both bilaterally and multilaterally, what nation does not expect help? Even the supposedly tough-minded Bush administration endorsed the Turkish bailout. So much for Sachs' idea of "a better focused" foreign aid program! In practice, every case is judged to be exceptional, warranting intervention.

This proclivity to intervene creates a further danger, what economists call "moral hazard." The expectation of a subsidy encourages people to behave irresponsibly, as did many owners of federally-insured savings and loans associations here in the U.S., causing the S&L crisis of the late 1980s. International aid has similar effects. Warns economist Allan Meltzer, "[foreign] banks and financial institutions can now act safe in the knowledge that the IMF will provide a safety net to protect them from some, or even most, of their losses."

This is unfair, of course, a form of corporate welfare conducted by government institutions that act as Robin Hood in reverse. But there is an even more perverse effect. In Calomiris' view, "by insuring foreign creditors who fuel developing economy risk-taking, the IMF and U.S. government are undermining the natural process of reform in many emerging economies." As he explains: "The incentives for oligarchs to liberalize can be strong if foreign sources of capital are only willing to provide funds to economies with appropriate capitalist infrastructures — that is, those which are based on the rule of law, the protection of creditors and stockholders rights, a predictable means of laying claim to title, an orderly bankruptcy procedure, an intelligible system of accounting principles, a non-confiscatory tax system and fair competition in markets. ... [But if] foreign investors are protected by the IMF and the U.S. government, foreigners will be less discriminating about where they place their funds, and thus provide less of an incentive for reform in developing economies."

For all these reasons, foreign aid has failed, despite the best efforts of many dedicated professionals at USAID, the State Department and elsewhere. Nor is reform a real option. Whereas advocates once claimed that international transfers would move developing states into the industrialized age, an increasing number of supporters now acknowledge that the only cases in which it might work are where countries have already adopted market reforms. But in those cases it is not needed.

After a half-century of failure, it's time to stop wasting the taxpayers' money and to look for new strategies to ease the agony that afflicts so many of the world's peoples.
Focus on USAID

The Ghosts of Luena

Two brushes with death in Angola, seven years apart, have reinforced for one FSO the importance of the work USAID and similar organizations do.

By Jeffrey Ashley

My life has long been enmeshed in adventure and risk. In addition to two brushes with death in Angola, I have been lost and hypothermic in the highlands of Scotland, ambushed in both Guatemala and Peru, violently seasick and despondent in the fjords of southern Chile, and marooned on an uninhabited island in the South Pacific. I have survived a bus accident in Argentina, a train derailment in the Andes mountains, a flood in Mexico, and a head-on collision in the wild bush of northern Namibia. I have seen war and violence in too many places to count, witnessed the horrific results of genocide in Rwanda, the astounding survival of post-genocide Cambodia, and have
even felt the fierce hands of heated violence and assault on my own body. I understand risk and darkness. But I am also extremely lucky to have known and relished light and beauty as well.

From 1993 to 1994, shortly before joining the Foreign Service, I lived in Angola at the height of the civil war. I was working for a humanitarian relief non-governmental organization providing emergency public health interventions to vulnerable people in need of immunizations, prenatal care and maternal and child health care and nutrition.

In early 1994, I was on assignment in Luena, a city in eastern Angola that was frequently attacked and bombed by UNITA forces (the opposition party). Yet even as the fighting raged all around us, our team continued to implement and extend public health services to the people suffering from the conflict. Since I was in charge as the NGO site manager for the Luena program, I constantly had to figure out how to obtain logistics support for our operations in a place that was extraordinarily poor even by Angolan standards. With so many people to help, our resources would have been inadequate to the task even in peacetime. And we were surrounded by death and destruction, forcing me to make impossible choices over and over again.

But one day was particularly horrific, forever etched in my memory.

On a deceptively quiet Sunday in March 1994, my Brazilian colleagues and I were in the process of finishing a breakfast filled with laughter and glorious conversation when UNITA launched a heavy offensive. Since our tiny bunker could only accommodate at most eight people, I had to decide which of our neighbors and Angolan staff, if any, could join our expatriate staff there during bombing attacks.

Such life-and-death decisions are, by definition, excruciating — but how much more so in the midst of chaos and panic. I remember asking myself, how could I possibly choose which of our friends and neighbors would find safety with us in our small bunker? (In fact, I could not even be sure that we would survive, given the intensity of the shelling.) What would I tell the many other desperate, innocent people who also sought refuge with us? That they could not come in because expatriates had priority? Who or what gave me the right to put a higher value on our lives than theirs? Me? Rules? Who? And how could I make the situation less frightening for everyone, or at least help them cope with it?

Somehow, I managed to make what I hoped were rational decisions. And while I will never know if I made the “right” decisions, I did all I could to protect as many people as possible from the attack.

I found out later that the civilian casualties around the city resulting from that UNITA attack were numerous, the violence enormous. But my staff were safe and fortunately our neighbors were spared, as well. In fact all of those in the compound were safe, even those who were not in the bunker with us. However, others in the central market approximately six blocks from our compound were not so fortunate. I don’t recall the precise number killed that day, but it was high.

I left Luena shortly after the attack on a medical evacuation due to severe malaria and hepatitis A. I was sent to Windhoek, Namibia, for medical care and recuperation. After my release about a month later, the doctors told me I could go back to Angola just long enough to pack my things and leave. The danger of another malaria episode was too great, especially given the lack of quality medical care in Angola. I knew they were right but I also felt I needed more time, that I had much more work to do, many more people to try to help in Angola. In particular, Luena was very special to me and, in its own way, beautiful despite the horror. But I followed the doctors’ advice. I returned to Luena and within 24 hours, packed up my few things, said goodbye to my friends and staff, and left, very heavy-hearted and weighed down by the chapters of my personal and professional life.

Ever since then, Luena has occupied a very special, very sad place in my heart. Memories of the Sunday attack, memories of the war, the desperation, the pro-

Dr. Jeffrey Ashley is a Foreign Service officer currently serving as the Director of Projects for the USAID Mission in Luanda. A public health scientist specializing in international health and epidemiology, he has been with the agency since 1995, serving as health officer in Tanzania and Cambodia before arriving in Angola last year. Before that, he worked with emergency and humanitarian relief NGOs in Nicaragua, Honduras, Angola and Rwanda from 1992 to 1994 and also served as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Paraguay from 1990 to 1992. He has traveled extensively in over 75 countries throughout the world.
found, nearly impossible needs, and my personal work there filled my thoughts long afterward.

**The Return**

After I finally left Angola, I spent six weeks recuperating in Los Angeles at the home of some close friends before going back to work. I then went to Rwanda, where I helped refugees in the aftermath of the 1994 genocide. Shortly thereafter I entered the Foreign Service and began my work with USAID as a health officer in February 1995, serving in Tanzania and Cambodia.

When the opportunity to work in Angola as the General Development Officer and Director of Projects of the USAID/Angola Mission appeared, I felt the time was right to go back and attempt to finish the work I had left behind. I wanted to try... again. So I bid on Luanda and was granted the assignment.

I returned in January 2001 to find a people even more war-torn and weary than I had remembered. But I observed and felt the same paradox of great beauty in its darkness and concomitant iniquity in its beauty that I had experienced eight years before. And I was just as driven to do my part to deliver quality public health services and create a healthier, perhaps better future for the Angolan people.

As soon as I arrived in Luanda, I knew that I would have to return to Luena, a place that had been locked in my memory and heart. I had to make peace with the war I had seen there, the war I felt in my heart as a result of the decisions and choices I made that dark Sunday back in early 1994. Fortunately, the opportunity soon presented itself.

On Wednesday, July 11, 2001, I traveled to Luena with two colleagues as part of a 10-member delegation led by the Vice Minister of the Ministry of Health, a tremendously gifted, dedicated and passionate Angolan senior government official. We were on board a 10-seat, twin-propped United Nations World Food Program plane, on a mission to establish a five-year, $5 million malaria prevention program sponsored by USAID.

It was my intention to conduct a small, private meditation ceremony of forgiveness there, so in my backpack I was carrying some blessed Buddhist jah sticks (incense) I had obtained in Cambodia. I wanted them with me so that I could light them as soon as I arrived. This rite would enable me simultaneously to embrace Luena and finally let her go once and for all.

As we began our descent toward the runway at Luena Airport, our pilots lost control of the King Air plane about 1,000 feet up. Perhaps because they had to follow the spiral-down descent pattern mandated for landing in the many war-torn areas of Angola, the pilots misjudged the runway of the airport and the plane narrowly missed hitting the trees. It slammed into a land mine field about 30 meters outside the entrance to the runway leaving a deep hole where it hit the earth.

Part of the landing gear collapsed and the plane bounced up and smashed into the cement lip of the runway entrance, collapsing the remaining landing gear. That very likely saved our lives since the plane automatically stabilized itself after impact. Had we not lost both landing gear, the plane would have rolled over and surely exploded.

After we hit the lip of the runway, the plane slammed onto the runway and dragged on its belly for over one kilometer. I heard the sickening, deafening sound of metal scraping against tarmac and was petrified that the floor of the plane would rip up and tear my legs off. In fact, I was more focused on losing my legs than the possibility of the plane exploding, at least at those moments of the crash-landing.

By another piece of luck, as the plane careened against the tarmac, the propellers hit the runway and were damaged, but the wings (where the fuel tanks are stored) did not touch the ground. Had they made contact with the runway, as we were told over and over again afterward, they would have ignited and exploded.

During the crash, I closed my eyes as countless thoughts flooded my mind. I thought of love and a lover and those who I believed loved me. These particular thoughts gave me a modicum of solace as I confronted what I fully expected was impending death.

The plane finally came to a stop in the middle of the runway. When the initial shock of the crash subsided, I shouted that I smelled smoke and burning metal. I had to repeat the admonition before I got a reaction.
from anyone. A few moments later a USAID colleague of mine who was seated in front of me also smelled burning metal and shouted the same warning. Yet the pilots remained silent for what seemed like several minutes before reacting. At first I thought they had been seriously injured or killed, but they were just in shock.

I attempted to get the door of the plane open, but couldn’t. I initially thought that was because I was too dazed to read the instructions properly, but I learned later the door was too severely damaged to open. At the time, all I could think was that it would have been my fault had we been unable to get out of the plane in the event it caught fire. The thought haunted me even after we all eventually escaped safely through the emergency window and saw the extensive damage to the plane.

**While I will never know if I made the “right” decisions,**

**I know I did all I could to protect as many people as possible.**

---

**Finding Peace**

Although some of us had bumps and bruises and we were all in shock, we fulfilled our mission to provide resources for the malaria program. We solidified a bond of friendship and camaraderie that I think will forever remain constant in our lives. And we each took with us in our privacy profoundly personal feelings of a most momentous event.

Before we left Luena after the crash, a USAID/Washington colleague who had been with me in the plane helped me light the jah sticks I had brought. We stood silently next to the wreckage on the runway and watched a solemn wind carry the smoke of the incense into the quiet breeze and grayness of the sky as we bowed our heads and meditated. It was a very special moment, one I will always hold...
sacred with my friend and colleague.

While I had already spent six months in the constant turmoil of Angola prior to the plane crash, the accident forced me to take a break from all my responsibilities and exigencies. I needed to rest, to come to terms with what I was feeling and all the memories it summoned up, good and bad.

So I went to the States to reflect, to spend time with people who care for me, to laugh and spill some tears and sleep late, to read literature, eat good ice cream and drink good coffee, and to embrace the comforts of ubiquitous opportunity and option.

I spent a month there before returning to Angola refreshed and restored, reminded of what is truly important: love, beauty, compassion, empathy, friends, goodness and giving. The crash helped me see more clearly that those qualities are my constant companions. And I am convinced they are infinitely more important than any one experience, even one that could have easily ended my life.

Angola will always be in my soul, as are my colleagues who experienced the crash with me. But despite the accident, I believe the ghosts of Luena are now put to rest. I now embrace my work with renewed commitment. I have no greater passion than the pursuit of beauty, the opportunity for giving and helping the many who are bereft of basic public health care around the world. And forever I am reminded, forever certain, that even in darkness and iniquity, there is joy.

Although some of us had bumps and bruises and we were all in shock, we fulfilled our mission to provide resources for the malaria program.

---

Although some of us had bumps and bruises and we were all in shock, we fulfilled our mission to provide resources for the malaria program.
USAID hasn’t yet found a magic formula for development that works worldwide. Yet it has done a lot of good.

By Joseph C. Guardiano

At different stages of my Foreign Service career, USAID has tried a series of different “development” strategies. Certainly we have not yet stumbled across a magic formula for development that works worldwide. We have tried regional development, community development, small is beautiful, agricultural-led development, export-led development, Title IX activities that revolve around cooperatives and community-centered projects, integrated rural development, food for peace, food for development, water for peace, reimbursable development, legal and democratic training — a virtual encyclopedia of development jargon. But one wonders whether our successive strategies were designed more
AFSA AWARDS CEREMONY

AFSA Honors Dissenters and Outstanding Performers

It was a shining moment for AFSA and for the Foreign Service when Secretary Powell presented a "Special Posthumous Award for Constructive Dissent" to Hiram Bingham IV during the June 27 AFSA Awards Ceremony. The award was accepted by Benjamin Bingham — representing all of Hiram "Harry" Bingham's children — on behalf of his father. As AFSA President John Naland pointed out, this was the first time the U.S. government has recognized Bingham's achievements. Bingham issued over 2,500 life-saving visas to Jews and other anti-Nazi activists while serving as a Foreign Service consular officer in Marseille, France from 1939-1941. In addition, he helped smuggle refugees out of Nazi-occupied France. (For the full story, see the June Foreign Service Journal.)

During the AFSA Awards ceremony, Secretary Powell also presented the Award for Lifetime Contributions to American Diplomacy to Thomas Pickering, and a special award of recognition to his wife Alice Pickering. "My friends," said Powell, "in recognizing Tom and Alice Pickering today, we are honoring the Foreign Service. . . . When I think of the Foreign Service, I immediately think of Tom Pickering. During his 42-year career, he was the quintessential FSO."

AFSA greatly appreciates Secretary Powell's positive remarks about the Foreign Service during the ceremony. Powell said that he has "time and again witnessed that culture, that fraternity of men and women of extraordinary skill and dedication who represent the Foreign Service." Powell thanked AFSA "for all the support that they have given me since I became secretary of State last year." He went on: "We have worked through a number of contro-

AFSA'S NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL ESSAY CONTEST

Secretary Powell Presents Certificate to Winner

Elizabeth Carlisle of Missoula, Montana won AFSA's 2002 National High School Essay Contest for her essay "After 9/11: Foreign Service Contributions to Short-Term Relief and Long-Term Solutions." On June 27, just before the AFSA Awards Ceremony, Secretary Powell personally presented the winner's certificate to Carlisle in the Treaty Room at the State Department. During the

Secretary Colin Powell with the Bingham family.

Ambassador Tom Pickering (center) with the 2002 Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellows.

Secretary Colin Powell with high school essay winner Elizabeth Carlisle.
Legislative Update: Still on Hold

We are still awaiting final congressional action on the State Department’s 2002-03 Authorization Bill. We hope it will implement some key AFSA legislative agenda items including virtual locality pay, changes to the dual compensation rules restricting payment to retired FS members, and retirement credit for PIT employees who served during the 1990s.

New Book on Foreign-Born Foreign Service Wives

Up to half of all women married to U.S. Foreign Service officers are foreign-born. What do they experience as de facto representatives of their adopted country? Find out in the new book by Australian-born author Margaret Bender, Foreign at Home and Away: Foreign-Born Wives in the U.S. Foreign Service. The book, recently published by ADST (The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training) and DACOR (Diplomatic and Consular Officers, Retired), is the first of the ADST-DACOR diplomat and diplomacy book series to examine the roles played by Foreign Service spouses. Bender draws on her own 25 years’ experience as a Foreign Service spouse and in-depth interviews with 40 Foreign Service wives from 28 countries. The book can be ordered from ADST at (703) 302-6990, or through online bookstores.

FSYF Welcome Back Picnic Sept. 8

All Foreign Service families with children ages nine to 19 are invited to attend the Annual Foreign Service Youth Foundation Welcome Back Picnic on Sunday, Sept. 8, from 4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. For more information, please contact FSYF at (301) 404-6655 or fsysf@fsyf.org.

AFSA News on the Web

You can now find AFSA News on the Web every month. Look for it on the “In the News” page of the AFSA Web site (www.afsa.org/news/).
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Consular Duties Should Stay at State

The push to reorganize the U.S. government to meet the terrorist threat included an initiative in the House of Representatives to move the visa function out of State and into the new Department of Homeland Security, which presumably would staff overseas consular positions with a new cadre of visa adjudicators.

No one disagrees that shoring up our nation’s defense, including tightened visa procedures, must be urgently addressed. But the damage this proposed fix would wreak on the integrity of embassy operations around the world is immense.

The core issue is that Congress itself has been loosening visa requirements for decades at the behest of the travel industry, manufacturing sector, academic community, civic and religious associations and a host of other legitimate interests. If Congress now wishes to reverse that policy and tighten visa requirements, let it say so. State’s veteran consular service will continue to adjust, as it has already done, to the new security demands. An expensive and unwieldy new bureaucratic arm would take months to recruit, years to train, and, in the meantime, leave our country more open to visa fraud than it is now. Imagine adding yet another agency — comprised of new hires lacking language skills and cultural sensitivity, and reporting through separate channels — to the chief of mission's plate in the war on terrorism abroad.

Regardless of its fate, this initiative revealed yet again a lack of understanding by the public and Congress of what consular officers do. In mounting a vigorous campaign to keep consular affairs firmly in place at State, AFSA sought to explain the importance to national security of having professional diplomats carrying out the visa function.

AFSA made these arguments in several approaches to Congress, including a meeting with 14 staffers of the Government Reform Committee of the House, and culminating in a letter that AFSA President John Naland sent on July 3 to 26 key lawmakers. I encourage the many retirees who share AFSA’s concern to use the following points from the Naland letter in any contacts you might have with the public and Congress on this issue:

- Press criticism that not all applicants get personal interviews overlooks the fact that there have not been funds appropriated for this for decades. If Congress wants to budget for this, State could assure the interviews.
- The majority of the over 10 million annual visa applicants do not speak English. If other federal employees take over visa duties, they would need training in over 60 languages already spoken with above-average aptitude by Foreign Service members.
- Outside adjudicators would have the same burdens of service as the Foreign Service: unhealthy posts, family disruptions, physical danger.
- Most visa work is on the visa line. Lack of advancement possibilities would, as Under Secretary Green testified in June, result in high turnover by employees of a caliber he characterized as “rent-a-cop.”
- Removing visa adjudication from State would weaken a vital check and balance if this function were placed in the same agency doing port-of-entry examination. The current two-step, two-agency procedure has long advanced homeland security.

This initiative revealed yet again a lack of understanding by the public and Congress of what consular officers do.
Call for Nominations for the 2003 - 2005 AFSA Officers and Constituency Representatives

Election of AFSA Officers and Constituency Representatives

It is time to elect the next AFSA Governing Board, which will take office July 15, 2003, and serve for two years. AFSA needs a strong and dynamic leadership in order to best represent the interests of all our Foreign Service members. Selecting AFSA's leadership is an important process, and we hope that all AFSA members will participate.

Call for Nominations for AFSA Officers and Constituency Representatives

This election call, issued in accordance with Article VII (2)(a) of the AFSA bylaws, constitutes a formal notice to all AFSA members of the opportunity to participate in nomination and election of a new governing board. All of the officer and constituency positions listed below are for two-year terms beginning July 15, 2003.

A. Positions to be Filled

1. The officer positions to be filled in this election are:
   - President
   - Vice President for State
   - Vice President for USAID
   - Vice President for CS
   - Vice President for FAS
   - Vice President for Retirees
   - Secretary
   - Treasurer

   The President and State, USAID, and FAS Vice-Presidents are full-time positions detailed to AFSA. The CS Vice President is detailed 50 percent time to AFSA. These employees are assigned over complement and eligible for time in class extensions.

2. The constituency representative positions to be filled in this election are:
   - State Department Representatives (six positions)
   - USAID Representative (one position)
   - CS Representative (one position)
   - FAS Representative (one position)
   - IBB Representative (one position)

Retired member Representatives (four positions)

Article V (4)(b) of the AFSA bylaws authorizes a constituency vice president for each constituency with a minimum of 100 members and one constituency representative position for every 1,000 members or fraction thereof. Active-duty constituency representatives work full-time in regularly assigned non-AFSA jobs, with time allowed for AFSA activities in accordance with AFSA's labor management agreements.

B. Nomination Procedures

1. Any AFSA member in good standing (i.e., a member whose dues are automatically deducted or who has paid dues as of Nov. 14, 2002) may submit names — including his or her own name — in nomination for any or all of the above-mentioned positions for which the nominee is eligible. No member may nominate more than one person for any one officer position or for more than the number of representatives established for each constituency. No member's name may appear on the ballot for more than one position.

2. In order to be nominated, a person must be a member in good standing and remain in good standing through the election process and, if elected, for his/her term of office.

3. The Foreign Service Act restricts employees occupying certain positions in the foreign affairs agencies from serving on the Governing Board. Only employees in AFSA's bargaining unit may serve on the AFSA Governing Board or nominate others to serve on the board. Therefore, individuals who will be serving as management officials and confidential employees (as defined below) when the new board takes office on July 15, 2003, are ineligible to occupy a position on the Governing Board. In addition, management officials and confidential employees may not make nominations for Governing Board positions. For the purpose of the above discussion, management official means an individual who:

   - is a chief of mission or principal officer; occupies a position of comparable importance to chief of mission or principal officer; is serving as a deputy to the foregoing positions; is assigned to the Office of the Inspector General; or is engaged in labor management relations or the formulation of personnel policies and programs of the foreign affairs agency. Confidential employees are employees who act in a confidential capacity with respect to an individual who formulates or carries out management policies in labor management relations.

   Furthermore, the Foreign Service Act also places a two-year restriction on the movement of Foreign Service personnel between certain positions in AFSA and certain Washington-based jobs in the foreign affairs agencies. The pre-AFSA restrictions:

   - Any individual who has served 1) in a management position in Washington in which he or she has engaged in labor management relations or the formulation of personnel policies and programs or 2) as a confidential employee (as defined above) within two years prior to taking office in AFSA is ineligible to hold the position of AFSA president or constituency vice president.

   Post-AFSA restrictions: In addition, any individual who has held one of the foregoing positions in AFSA may not serve 1) in a management position in Washington which involves labor management relations or the formulation of personnel policies and programs or 2) as a confidential employee, for two years after leaving AFSA.

   Members should consider these restrictions before deciding whether to run for
AFSA Governing Board positions covered by these restrictions. Please direct questions regarding this issue to Sharon Papp, General Counsel at phone (202) 647-8160; fax (202) 647-0265, or e-mail papp@state.gov.

4. Nominations may be submitted individually or in slates. To qualify as a slate, a proposed slate must have a minimum of four candidates from at least two constituencies. Slate designations will be noted on the ballot.

5. All nominations must be submitted in writing by letter, cable, fax or e-mail. All written nominations must be addressed to the AFSA Elections Committee, 2101 E. Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037. To be valid, they must, without exception, be received at this address no later than 12 noon on Nov. 14, 2002. Members overseas can send “AFSA Channel” cables marked for delivery to the AFSA Elections Committee. They must be received in the Department’s Communications Center within the same time limit. Faxes can be sent to (202) 338-6820 and e-mails to exec@afsa.org.

Alternatively, nominations can be hand-delivered to a committee member who will be in the AFSA office, Room 1251, Department of State, from 11 a.m. to noon on Nov. 14, or to a committee representative at AFSA headquarters at 2101 E Street N.W. during that same time period.

6. A nominee can indicate his or her acceptance of a nomination by appending a letter to the letter of nomination or by appropriate notation on that letter, or by communicating with the Elections Committee, AFSA, Room 1251, Department of State, or AFSA, 2101 E Street N.W. Washington, DC, 20037, or by fax or e-mail as described above. Otherwise, an authorized representative of the Elections Committee will communicate with each nominee (excluding members who nominate themselves) as quickly as possible after the receipt of each nomination to determine whether the nominee wishes to be a candidate. Any member who so accepts the nomination must confirm his or her acceptance in writing through one of the channels described above addressed to the AFSA Elections Committee to be received no later than noon on Nov. 21, 2002. Any nominee whose written acceptance of nomination has not been received by the Elections Committee by the above time limit will be considered to have declined candidacy.

C. Election Campaign

1. All candidates nominated under the procedure outlined above will be given the opportunity to submit campaign statements for dissemination to the AFSA membership with the election ballots. Further information regarding such statements and editorial deadlines will be contained in the “Instructions to Candidates,” which will be issued by the Elections Committee on or before Nov. 14, 2002.

2. The AFSA bylaws provide that, should candidates wish to mail supplementary statements to the membership, the association will make available to them on request, and at their expense, the membership mailing list or address labels. Further information on this and other campaign procedures will be included in the “Instructions to Candidates” mentioned above.

D. Voting

Ballots will be distributed on or about Jan. 3, 2003, to each person who is a regular AFSA member as of Dec. 1, 2002. Candidates or their representatives may observe the ballot distribution process if they so desire. Each member may cast one vote for President, Secretary, Treasurer, and constituency Vice President, and, in addition, one vote for each Representative position in the member’s constituency. Votes may be cast by voting for candidates listed on the official ballot, or by writing in the name(s) of member(s) eligible as of Nov. 14, 2002, or by doing both. To be valid, a ballot must be received by Feb. 28, 2003, at the address indicated on the envelope accompanying the ballot. More detailed balloting instructions will accompany the ballots.

E. Vote Counting and Announcement of Results

On or about March 3, 2003, the Elections Committee will count the ballots and declare elected the candidate receiving the greatest number of votes for each position. Candidates or their representatives may be present during the tally and may challenge the validity of any vote or the eligibility of any voter. The committee will inform candidates individually of the election results by the swiftest possible means and will publish the names of all elected candidates in the next issue of the Foreign Service Journal. The elected candidates will take office on July 15, 2003, as provided in the bylaws.

F. Questions, Suggestions, Complaints or Challenges

Any member may file a written question, suggestion or complaint concerning the conduct of the 2003 election. These should be addressed to “Chair, AFSA Elections Committee” and mailed or delivered to either AFSA, Room 1251, Department of State, Washington, DC 20520 or AFSA, 2101 E. Street N.W., Washington, DC 20037 by May 30, 2003.

Members may also file a written challenge to the outcome of the election. Such a challenge must be filed by April 18, 2003, and should be addressed to “Chair, AFSA Elections Committee” and mailed or delivered to either address stated above. The AFSA Elections Committee will respond in writing to the challenge within three months of receipt of the challenge. If the member is not satisfied with the AFSA Elections Committee’s response, the member may file a written complaint with the U.S. Department of Labor’s Office of Labor-Management Standards. Such a complaint must be filed within one month of receipt of the Elections Committee’s response.
A Call for Outsourcing

During a four-week period last spring, AFSA filed three institutional grievances against the Commerce Department, as well as one charge of unfair labor practices (ULP), and asked the Federal Impasse Panel to assist in mediating. (Over the past 10 years, AFSA has filed three institutional grievances against all other foreign affairs agencies combined.) Commerce has severe problems meeting its Foreign Service personnel obligations. AFSA has raised this issue with the secretary of Commerce and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As of this writing, I have no positive actions to report.

Few if any complaints have been filed about FCS work overseas. In fact, the number of letters praising our officers’ performance is staggering. Yet there is universal concern about the management of our human resources. It is difficult if not impossible to negotiate with FCS management. On the few occasions when the negotiations are successful, FCS tends to either renege on the agreement or immediately call to reopen what AFSA had thought was a signed and final agreement. The problem has now reached significant proportions and is causing embarrassment to Commerce management. Their initial response was to blame AFSA for interfering, but that fell on deaf ears as AFSA doesn’t have the authority to take the offending actions.

This is not a new problem, but what is the solution? Most suggestions would either create new problems or be very hard to implement. Four of the concepts often mentioned are: 1) move FCS back to State; 2) create a new Department of International Trade and Industry; 3) convert FCS from a foreign affairs agency to a Civil Service organization; and 4) outsource the personnel management functions. The first three would require legislative action and could create even more problems than they solve.

The fourth option, outsourcing, has potential. Currently, the National Finance Center manages the FCS payroll, the Department of Interior processes our vouchers, and State supervises the pension program for our retirees. State is the obvious choice for an outsourcer service vender. However, USAID or the Department of Agriculture may also be able to provide certain services. I would suggest that FCS maintain control over all the activities included in personnel planning and the management system, such as work plans, evaluations and selection boards. But all other personnel management activities could be open for bidding.

FCS retirement management can serve as an example. State currently assumes responsibility for FCSOs at retirement. The FCS human resources staff is responsible for pre-retirement counseling of the approximately five Foreign Commercial officers who retire each year. It would make sense to have officers nearing retirement go directly to the organization that manages their retirement for counseling. The most frequently mentioned objection to the concept is that FCSOs would become dependent on a larger and less familiar bureaucracy, and be treated like they are in “coach class.”

I have asked FCSOs for comments on this concept, and would appreciate comments from retirees and FSOs outside Commerce. Unlike many in Commerce, I am willing to admit that FCS is a foreign affairs agency that needs advice on how to operate as a foreign affairs agency. With your input perhaps we can improve the situation.

Essay • Continued from page 1

Bookfair 2002

The Associates of the Foreign Service Worldwide invites you to visit the 42nd annual BOOKFAIR. BOOKFAIR will be held in the Exhibit Hall of the State Department from Oct. 18-27. Open to employees, retirees (with retiree passes) and spouses, and escorted guests Oct. 18 from 2-5 p.m. and Oct. 21-25 from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m. Open to the public the weekends of Oct. 19-20 and Oct. 26-27 from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Questions: call (202) 223-5796 or (202) 362-6514.
Finance Committee Members
American Foreign Service Association and Associated Organizations

We have audited the consolidated financial statements of the American Foreign Service Association and Associated Organizations (the Association) for the year ended December 31, 2001, and have issued our report thereon dated April 2, 2002.

The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) has established the requirement for independent auditors to communicate certain matters related to the conduct of each audit to those who have responsibility for oversight of management's financial reporting process.

Specific areas to be communicated are as follows:

* Auditors' Responsibility under Auditing Standards Generally Accepted in the United States of America
* Significant Accounting Policies
* Management's Judgments and Accounting Estimates
* Significant Audit Adjustments
* Auditors' Responsibility for Annual Reports
* Disagreements with Management
* Consultation with Other Accountants
* Major Issues Discussed with Management Prior to Retention
* Difficulties Encountered in Performing the Audit

Our comments regarding these matters, as they relate to the fiscal year 2001 audit of the Association, are presented in Exhibit A* of this report. Should you desire further information concerning these matters, we will be happy to meet with you at your convenience.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Finance Committee Members, the Governing Board, and management of the Association, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

April 2, 2002

* Exhibit A and a complete set of the audited financial statements is available at the AFSA office at 2101 E St. N.W., Washington, DC 20037.
American Foreign Service Association and Associated Organizations  
Consolidated Statement of Financial Position  
December 31, 2001 and 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents, including restricted cash of $119,335 in 2001 and $165,782 in 2000</td>
<td>$156,667</td>
<td>$259,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term investments, including restricted short-term investments of $34,178 in 2001 and $45,049 in 2000</td>
<td>69,130</td>
<td>69,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable, less allowance for doubtful accounts of $30,000 in 2001 and $20,161 in 2000</td>
<td>166,456</td>
<td>119,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest and dividends</td>
<td>19,265</td>
<td>21,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and other assets</td>
<td>92,498</td>
<td>127,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>504,016</td>
<td>697,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noncurrent Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, building and equipment, net of depreciation</td>
<td>580,117</td>
<td>597,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily restricted marketable securities</td>
<td>4,158,473</td>
<td>4,886,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted marketable securities</td>
<td>574,905</td>
<td>424,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total noncurrent assets</strong></td>
<td>5,313,495</td>
<td>5,908,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>5,817,511</td>
<td>6,605,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Liabilities and Net Assets | | |
| **Current Liabilities** | | |
| Accounts payable | $30,983 | $26,750 |
| Accrued expenses | 54,517 | 67,626 |
| Deferred revenue | 246,913 | 274,678 |
| **Total current liabilities** | 332,413 | 369,054 |
| **Commitments and Contingencies** | | |
| | | |
| **Net Assets** | | |
| Unrestricted | 1,438,533 | 1,300,511 |
| Temporarily restricted | 4,046,565 | 4,936,410 |
| **Total net assets** | 5,485,098 | 6,236,921 |
| **Total Liabilities and Net Assets** | 5,817,511 | 6,605,975 |

A complete set of the audited financial statements is available at the AFSA office at 2101 E St. N.W., Washington, DC 20037
American Foreign Service Association and Associated Organizations
Consolidated Statement of Activities
Years Ended December 31, 2001 and 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue, Gains, and Other Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues</td>
<td>$1,655,234</td>
<td>$1,609,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising sales</td>
<td>458,963</td>
<td>410,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>340,684</td>
<td>604,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>252,519</td>
<td>227,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends and interest</td>
<td>137,986</td>
<td>127,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>32,422</td>
<td>33,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>8,399</td>
<td>8,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net realized and unrealized (losses) gains on marketable securities</td>
<td>(835,098)</td>
<td>(69,020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue, gains, and other support</td>
<td>2,051,109</td>
<td>2,951,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>720,855</td>
<td>638,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor relations</td>
<td>488,954</td>
<td>497,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>338,988</td>
<td>345,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderhostel</td>
<td>211,668</td>
<td>207,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional affairs</td>
<td>173,093</td>
<td>161,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees</td>
<td>90,778</td>
<td>60,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional issues</td>
<td>89,724</td>
<td>86,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership services</td>
<td>80,412</td>
<td>89,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public affairs</td>
<td>27,543</td>
<td>24,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay contest</td>
<td>24,535</td>
<td>22,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Associates</td>
<td>24,285</td>
<td>19,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education</td>
<td>17,540</td>
<td>20,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach / Speakers bureau</td>
<td>14,523</td>
<td>31,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th Presidential libraries</td>
<td>12,890</td>
<td>47,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total program services</td>
<td>2,315,788</td>
<td>2,277,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and general</td>
<td>259,440</td>
<td>281,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership support</td>
<td>125,475</td>
<td>124,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and President</td>
<td>62,767</td>
<td>32,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election</td>
<td>21,378</td>
<td>2,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>18,084</td>
<td>12,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total supporting services</td>
<td>487,144</td>
<td>453,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>2,802,932</td>
<td>2,731,146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in Net Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(751,823)</td>
<td>220,806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A complete set of the audited financial statements is available at the AFSA office at 2101 E St. N.W., Washington, DC 20037
Personnel Issues
BY JAMES YORKE,
LABOR MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST

Overseas Housing:
Tips for a Painless Checkout

Q: After my pack-out from post, someone from the General Services Office came, as required, to do the inventory of government property, and to assess the state of the furniture, carpets, etc. The office then sent me an enormous bill, claiming that I had damaged the chairs and soiled the carpets. How should I proceed?

A: This problem arises more often than it should, and warrants attention throughout your occupancy of the house or apartment. You need to be aware of what you have and its condition. When you move into your government housing, the first thing you must do is ensure that you have an accurate inventory and description of the condition of the furniture and fittings (anything from air conditioners and stoves to brooms and items from the welcome kit). This gives both you and the GSO a baseline from which to work. If there are stains, wear or other damage on any furniture, carpets or fittings, then document precisely where the damage is located and its nature. Take pictures if you like, and make sure they are reliably dated.

Throughout your occupancy, it goes without saying that you should take care of the furniture and fittings. If any damage occurs, make a note of the extent of it and when and how it occurred. This will ensure that you are not taken by surprise during the checkout inspection, and will enable you to identify damage that was not caused by you or your family.

You should be present during the checkout inspection. Compare your observations to those you made on arrival. Make sure you get a copy of the report, but go over your own list as you inspect the house.

If you disagree with the bill when you get it, review it with the GSO. Bear the following in mind:

- Fair wear and tear is not your responsibility. Things wear out over time unless you avoid walking on the carpets or sitting on the chairs.
- If you have damaged something that must be replaced, depreciation should be taken into account. You should not get charged the cost of a new armchair for replacement of a 10-year old armchair.
- Look at any proposed re-upholstery charges carefully. If necessary, compare the proposed costs with other upholsterers. You should not be charged for fair wear and tear.
- On the other hand, be realistic. Damage or soiling from pets and/or children does not count as fair wear and tear and you are responsible for repair or clean-up. Large scratches and cigarette or other burns on furniture are not fair wear and tear either, and are your responsibility.

If you need help negotiating with the GSO, speak with your AFSA Rep, who may contact the AFSA Labor Management Office for assistance.
CLASSIFIEDS

TAX & FINANCIAL SERVICES

TAX RETURN PREPARATION AND PLANNING by experienced tax professional Federal and all State returns. Year round assistance. JANE A. BRUNO; Tel: (561) 470-7631. Fax: (561) 470-4790. E-mail: jbruno@americanaxhelp.com. Web site: www.americanaxhelp.com

ATTORNEY, FORMER FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER: Extensive experience w/ tax problems peculiar to the Foreign Service. Available for consultation, tax planning, and preparation of returns. M. Bruce Hirshorn, Boring & Pilger 307 West Maple Ave W., Suite D, Vienna, VA 22180 Tel: (703) 281-2161, Fax: (703) 281-9464. E-mail: mbhirshom@boringandpilger.com

PROFESSIONAL TAX RETURN PREPARATION: Thirty years in public tax practice. Arthur A Granberg, EA, ATA, ATP. Thirty years in public tax practice. Arthur A Granberg, EA, ATA, ATP. Our charges are $55 per hour. Most FSO returns take 3 to 4 hours. Our office is 100’ from Virginia Square Metro Station, Tax Matters, Associates, PC 3601 North Fairfax Dr. Arlington, VA 22201 Tel: (703) 522-3828 Fax: (703) 522-5726 E-mail: aag8686@aol.com

PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

PEAKE MANAGEMENT: Looking for a great property manager experienced with FS clients? Call me to set up an appointment, or to receive our free Landlord Manual. The Manual clearly explains the rental management process no matter which company you choose. We’re professional, experienced, and friendly. In business since 1982, Lindsey Peake: 6842 Elm St. McLean, VA 22101. Tel: (703) 449-0212 E-mail: Lindsey@peakeinc.com

WJD MANAGEMENT is competitively priced, of course. However, if you are considering hiring a property management firm, don’t forget the old saying “You get what you pay for.” All of us at WJD have worked for other property management firms in the past, and we have learned what to do and more importantly what not to do from our experiences at these companies. We invite you to explore our web site at www.wjdpm.com for more information, or call us at (703) 385-3600.

REALTY GROUP, INC. DC PROPERTY MANAGEMENT AND SALES of single family homes, condos & small apartment bldgs. We serve owners who appreciate personalized service & quality maintenance. Amy Fisher, CRS: (202) 544-8762 E-mail: amyfisher@realtygroupinc.net. Visit our Web site: dcpropertymanagement.com

H.A. GILL & SON, INC.: Family owned and operated firm specializing in the leasing and management of fine single-family houses, condominiums and cooperatives in Washington, D.C. and Montgomery County since 1888. While we operate with cutting edge technology, we do business the old-fashioned way - providing close personal attention to our clients and their properties. We provide expertise in dealing with jurisdictional legal requirements, rent control, property registration, and lead paint requirements. We closely screen all tenant applications and are online with Equi-Fax Credit Information Services which provides our firm with instantaneous hard-copy credit reports. You can rest assured while you are abroad that your property will be in the most capable hands. Please call John Gill, Jr. at (202) 338-5000 or for more information or a brochure. E-mail him at: hagill@erols.com

FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATES: has fully furnished apartments at River Place just 5 minutes from NFATC and one block from Rosslyn Metro. Efficiencies, and 1 bedrooms are fully furnished with kitchens, cable TV, telephone, linens, and all utilities included. Call: (703) 477-5955, or E-mail: FSAssoc1@aol.com. Web site: www.foreignservicehousing.com

PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

PRUDENTIAL CARRUTHERS REALTORS: (FORMERLY J.P. PROPERTIES & DIPLOMAT PROPERTIES): Complete professional dedication to the management of residential property in Northern Virginia. Our professionals will provide personal attention to your home, careful tenant screening, and video inspections of your property. We are equipped to handle all of your property management needs. We work 7 days a week! Over 22 years real estate experience and Foreign Service overseas living experience. JOANN PIERNEY. Vienna: Tel: (703) 936-0909 Fax: (703) 281-9782 E-mail: Vienna@prudentialcarruthers.com. Arlington: Tel: (703) 522-5900 Fax: (703) 525-4173 E-mail: Arlington@prudentialcarruthers.com

MANOR SERVICES: Former federal law enforcement officer: offers best tenant screening. Frequent inspections. Mortgages paid. Repairs. Close personal attention. We’re small, but very effective. FS refs. Our rates are lower than anyone on this page. And our service is better. Compare. We do "hands-on" management only. TERSH NORTON Box 42429, Washington, D.C. 20015 Tel: (202) 363-2990 Fax: (202) 363-4736 E-mail: norton@erols.com

TEMPORARY HOUSING

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

ROSSLYN METRO IN ARLINGTON HONOR MOST GOV'T PE DIEM 1 BLK TO METRO, NFATC SHUTTLE Efficiency, 1 and 2 bedroom apartments, Fully equipped kitchens, Cable, phone, linens, gym & pool GOVERNMENT FRIENDLY LEASE Tel: (703) 553-8225 E-mail: Riverplace@aol.com Web site: www.temporaryrentals.com
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HEADED TO D.C.? Start planning now for house hunting in Northern Virginia. Let me help you find the perfect home for your family. Call Betsy (202) 234-5789, info@roommatespreferred.com www.roommatespreferred.com

WASHINGTON STATE ISLANDS: Spectacular views, wonderful community, climate, boating, hiking. Access Seattle & Vancouver, B.C. Former FSO Jan Zehner, Windermere Real Estate/ Orcas Island, (800) 842-5770; www.orcas-island.com e-mail: jane@rockisland.com

OCEANFRONT CONDO AT Bay Watch Resort, North Myrtle Beach, SC. Wide, sandy beaches. "Golf Capital of the World." Family programs, entertainment and great seafood, all close by. Sleeps six; Please Call (800) 763-7469 or (843) 272-6266 and ask for Unit #603. FSO Bryan Smith, owner. See www.sandsresorts.com

WALL STREET INCOME TAX enhances gracious living in Sarasota, the cultural capital of Florida’s Gulf Coast. Contact former FSO Paul Byrnes, Coldwell Banker residential sales specialist, through e-mail: bymes@family-net.org or Toll - Free: (877) 924-9001.

FLORIDA BEAUTIFUL SOUTHWEST FLORIDA: SARASOTA - Sunshine, blue skies, excellent values in real estate. Call former FSO Tom Farley, AFSA member. New homes and condos a specialty. Broker-Associate. Keller Williams Realty. Tel: (941) 926-8550, or toll-free: (888) 391-0380. E-mail: CSI@SQRQ@aol.com

FLORIDA

BEAUTIFUL SOUTHWEST FLORIDA: SARASOTA – Sunshine, blue skies, excellent values in real estate. Call former FSO Tom Farley, AFSA member. New homes and condos a specialty. Broker-Associate. Keller Williams Realty. Tel: (941) 926-8550, or toll-free: (888) 391-0380. E-mail: CSI@SQRQ@aol.com

FLORIDA

FLORIDA

NAPLES. Cosmopolitan, yet friendly. Let me help you with your real estate needs. Call Peggy Finn, Realtor, widow of former NSA member and current AFSA member, Independent Brokers Realty, Naples, FL. Tel: (239) 514-2321, cell (443) 629-5093, e-mail: pfinn514@comcast.net.

MORTGAGE

BUYING OR REFINANCING A HOME?

Save money with some of the lowest rates in 40 years. Jeff Stoddard specializes in working with the Foreign Service Community, along with Washington Mutual’s broad product line. Jeff offers first-class customer service while structuring a loan to fit your specific needs, seeing it quickly through the process every step of the way. Call today and experience the Power of Yes! Tel:(703) 299-8625 or e-mail: jeffstoddard_wamu@compuserve.com

PRECHT-HM

CLOSE-IN BETHESDA. Fully furnished house 3 BR, 3 Bath. Fenced yard. Available June-October. Minimum one month. PrechtHnM@aol.com

FOGGY BOTTOM APARTMENT:

Efficiency furnished apartment for rent on 922 24th St. N.W. Quiet, overlooks courtyard with swimming pool, one block to Foggy Bottom Metro, three blocks to Kennedy Center. 10 minute walk to Main State. Rent is $1,200/month, One month sec. deposit and one year contract (flexible). Avail. Immediately. Please call (703) 560-7437.

Books:

OLD ASIA/AMERICAN BOOKS BOUGHT
Asian rare books. Fax: (212) 316-3408, E-mail: arbs@erols.com

HOW NOT TO BECOME AN AMBASSADOR.

DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS by Robert G. Morris. Author of Diplomatic Circles, now in paperback from www.thebookden.com

Employment:

PROPERTY SPECIALISTS, INC.
CAREER OPPORTUNITY
Independent real estate firm primarily serving the foreign service community & doing business in D.C., Maryland and Virginia is offering positions in areas of property management and/or sales.

Call: Donna Courtney (703) 247-3357 E-mail: propspec@nwar.com web: www.propepryspecialistsinc.com

Miscellaneous:

SHIPPING
PLANNING TO MOVE OVERSEAS?
Need a rate to ship your car, household goods, or other cargo going abroad? Contact SEFCO-Export Management Company for rates and advice. Tel: (718) 268-6233, Fax: (718) 268-0505. Contact Joseph T. Quinn. Visit our Web site at www.sefcy-export.com E-mail: info@sefcy-export.com

110 - 220 VOLT STORE
MULTI-SYSTEM ELECTRONICS
PAL-SECAM-NTSC TVs, VCRs, AUDIO, CAMCORDER, ADAPTOR, TRANSFORMERS, KITCHEN APPLIANCES
EPORT WORLD ELECTRONICS
1719 Connecticut Ave. N.W.
Tel: (202) 232-2244, Fax: (202)265-2435, (800) 513-3907.
E-mail: export@covad.net URL www.220AV.TV
Government & Diplomat discounts

Navco MALL
Over 200 Shops and Stores!
Save Time and Money
Everything you're looking for, from A to Z.
Sales and Bargains at Every Store!

SOLDERS and HAMMERS
COMMERCIAL, RESIDENTIAL, MUNICIPAL
COMPANY CARDS
SOCIETY PLACE, 10001 FULTON AVENUE, BETHESDA, MD 20814
(301) 519-1800
E-mail: info@navcosa.com
to sustain USAID than they were to achieve sustainable development.

Stages of Development —
The European Model
When I started out on the Somali desk in the early 1960s, the U.S. had just recognized the many newly-independent states of Africa, established embassies and begun to initiate assistance programs. In those heady days when we thought we could change the world, we believed that the underdeveloped countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa were essentially “primitive” versions of European nations. In time, having gone through patterns of change similar to the more advanced nations, they might “develop” the institutions and standards of living of Europe and North America. And given that the Marshall Plan had been a resounding success, we thought that we had a blueprint for our assistance programs in the rest of the world.

Yet success came more slowly and with greater effort in Africa than in Asia or Europe. There are many reasons for this. Africa’s stage of economic development demands more constancy and larger inputs from abroad. Most of the continent suffers from a shortage of counterpart funding for operational costs, a sparseness of qualified local personnel, tribal conflicts, immense health problems and only skeletal infrastructure to support nation-building.

Another factor impeding our effectiveness in Africa is American ignorance of local customs. One U.S. technician once complained to me, for example, that his counterpart wouldn’t give him the time of day. I discussed it with the African official and found out that the American never shook his hand! The Africans always shook hands when they first met each day, and they often held hands with other men, spending half an hour to say hello. When I explained this to the American advisor, his initial reaction was that he thought it was a European custom, and he wasn’t about to perpetuate their habits! But he changed, and so did the situation.

The USAID country strategy for Zaire in the 1970s and 1980s is illustrative of how little we understood our clients. Fifteen years after completing my three-year tour in Zaire I returned on a TDY and noticed that the USAID mission was following a development strategy that I had written. I had originally written the plan without the benefit of trained social scientists on the staff and without the benefit of a long working relationship with the Mobutu government. At the end of my first tour in Zaire, I already had suspicions that my strategy would only be partially effective. It relied on the assumption that working closely with central government ministries was the only way to ensure local support and success. That assumption was incorrect, yet an aid strategy that should have been scrapped in the mid-1970s was still being followed in the late 1980s.

While stationed in Niger, I used to think that President Hamani Diori was correct in his assessment that, due to the Peace Corps experience, some day the U.S. would develop a mature outlook on the world and a better understanding of its realities. But it seems that just the opposite has occurred. Many Americans still have the attitude that poverty is a sign of laziness, indifference or an entitlement mentality. And at the other extreme, many former Peace Corps Volunteers regard Africans as helpless victims, and therefore feel compelled to keep sending charity to their “families” long after leaving. Similarly, some former USAID personnel have established private voluntary agencies to undertake good works on that unfortunate continent. But these are palliatives, not solutions. The missionary view that we need to do good for those poor folk may help them to some degree, but only long-term and sustained efforts will truly change the situation in those countries.

The early groups of volunteers were given anthropological and sociological training on the countries where they were sent to serve. Out of those experiences came an excellent book, Living Poor: A Peace Corps Chronicle (University of Washington Press, 1969), that realistically
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reported on how a culture, or at least how the poor in that culture, are captives of their environment. Disease, malnutrition and the monotony of their lives all act to oppress the villagers and leave them with little energy or ambition. But inexplicably, many PCVs did not seem to understand either this situation or the local cultures. Maybe they never read the book! Similarly, in the early days of USAID, U.S. advisors were given six weeks of training, both in USAID documentation/practices and in country specifics. Sadly, those brief yet useful sessions were eventually dropped, victims of budget cuts, no doubt.

Custom-Tailoring Aid

In the 1960s, USAID instituted an impressive set of manual orders for custom-tailoring each aid program to the particular needs of the recipient country. Field missions prepared elaborate annual strategies, budgets and program and project planning documents. Each mission annually had to submit a balance of payments estimate for its client country. The requirement was dropped when USAID's chief economist pointed out that given the discrepancies in the estimates and the large size of the payment gaps relative to the amount of assistance that USAID might be able to provide, the reporting was not worth the effort. It was retained only for countries where our program included funding for balance of payments support.

We also designed strategies for each country as if our "social soundness" analyses really explained how the societies work. In virtually all cases we designed and required impossibly complicated planning documents that even few USAID bureaucrats understood. We rarely relied on a truly in-depth knowledge of the local sociological scene for shaping our strategies and practices. "Will this project work in this country at this time?" is a crucial question that most U.S. experts have difficulty answering adequately. I was dismayed, for example, to read a detailed project description for a new agricultural extension project proposal in Niger. The project relied heavily on an elaborate fleet of vehicles, touring the countryside, gathering statistical data and dispensing advice to farmers. It would have required major recurring operational costs. The U.S. advisor designed it in the only way he knew, he said, the way he had carried out agricultural extension programs in the U.S. Similarly, when U.S. technicians changed the design for the purchase of trucks for the Sudan and specified sand tires instead of the four-wheeled vehicles proposed by British expatriates, it opened the bidding to U.S. vehicles (since we didn't produce four-wheeled trucks). Unfortunately it also confirmed the expatriates' predictions that the U.S. trucks would founder in the Sudanese sand. But the American experts insisted that's the way they had done it in Arizona.

On the other hand, some U.S. advisors may have been too understanding about how things worked in their countries. One of them wrote in a draft planning document that, "The more we can hope for is that we can keep corruption within reasonable limits!"

Nor did it help that in the "good old days" we kept trying to spend the aid money in the U.S. We financed commodities, training and services for activities that were usually planned and designed by American technicians. Americans wrote the specifications for the commodities or services, the bids were mainly restricted to U.S.-made products from U.S. sources and in most cases, American technicians carried out project and non-project activities. From time to time we relied on host country agencies to prepare bid documents and to award contracts but to the extent we were vigilant in our reviews, the results seemed to coincide with what our own reviewers might have concluded. Concern with the impact of offshore spending began to assume special importance during the early Kennedy years when the Treasury Department noticed a growing balance of payments deficit. In the field we were even asked at one time to identify not only the portion of our program that was spent offshore instead of in the U.S., but also the relative division for personal consumption as well. We had to do this even though our trade deficit with these countries was relatively miniscule.

Country Studies

In the former French colonies in Africa we opted to allow the French to take a lead in virtually all development. We looked for "targets of opportunity," projects that would not add to the recipient's budgetary burden. We thus tended to finance "commodity drops." This practice also assumed that France could provide technical advisors because USAID would not be able to find U.S. technicians with adequate French-language capability. This led, for example, to an anomalous situation in 1963 in Chad. We had a nominal technical assistance program, but no technical assistance personnel. U.S. experts flew in for a few days, a week, or longer, reviewed their projects, made their recommendations and flew on to another country where there was also a similarly small "U.S. aid presence," but not
much more. USAID even tried for a while to eliminate having any development officers at post, in favor of using the U.S. embassy as a postal drop, with embassy personnel transmitting messages to and from Washington. Predictably, that approach failed abysmally in all respects.

In the late 1960s in Asia, Korea was already a success story. We had provided all forms of assistance, including budget support, and we even reviewed line items in the Korean budget to verify inclusion of self-help measures we had negotiated. The Koreans were an extremely hardworking, task-oriented and clever people. As part of the U.S. aid program, they were able to import U.S. commodities such as cotton and wheat, process them, and then sell the finished products abroad to U.S. and other consumers. The Koreans always had detailed shipping and receipt documents to support their distribution of U.S. PL480 foods. Not a pound of grain or a can of oil was ever lost according to their records. But our auditors were sufficiently alert to find diversions of U.S. commodities in a variety of activities, and we successfully negotiated refunds of millions of dollars from the government. “Trust but verify” was not an explicit motto, but we tried to follow the concept, if not the language, and we usually avoided adding substance to charges that the aid program made dictators rich. Although we did write checks to governments to support structural change (after I retired!), in most of my years as an aid bureaucrat we did not give money directly to governments, either corrupt or honest. For a long time we separated aid that was politically motivated from that which was solely developmental, even though the projects themselves might have been exactly the same. It often seemed this was more a labeling exercise designed to satisfy congressional carping.

But despite the tailored approach, the agency’s general emphasis seemed, at least initially, to center on capital formation and industrialization, basic economic issues that related directly to increasing investment and national income. For that reason, while USAID gave technical assistance on a grant basis, our policy for capital assistance was to provide “development loans.” In the Africa Bureau,
for example, if a capital project cost at least $400,000, it was immediately slotted for a loan rather than grant-financing. Arguments to waive the philosophy of using loan funds in such poor countries for basic roads, town water supplies, or similar capital projects were usually parried with the response, "They may be poor now, yet who would have predicted a few years ago that Libya would become so rich?"

In retrospect, tailoring our aid programs at that time to the requirements of the country was sometimes a bit bizarre. I look back in wonderment, for example, at our naiveté when in 1962 we proposed a long-range assistance strategy for the Sudan. USAID was willing to pledge a multiyear grant of some $2 million (!) subject to the Sudanese government’s having an acceptable development plan and undertaking associated self-help measures. I say naiveté because we thought we understood so much more than we really did, both about the development process and about Sudanese society. Moreover, $2 million was a rather paltry sum, even for those days. But Africa has always been the slighted continent in the USAID family.

We are, of course, captives of our own culture. Perhaps our experience in our own society with its seemingly boundless economic opportunities, its political freedoms, its geographic fortune, its rich resources and incredible development history dims our vision and overwhelms our judgment. Why can’t the rest of the world be like the U.S., we ask? When the minister of agriculture in Niger told me that his farmers couldn’t duplicate the results of the Chinese agricultural assistance teams who were obtaining multiple yields of rice from their demonstration plots, he said, “We are Muslims; we have to pray five times a day. The Chinese farmers don’t stop to pray. The Chinese are bachelors who work from sunup to sundown; we are family people and have to spend time on family matters as well as on farming.” My colleagues laughed when I told them this, but the minister was clearly highlighting a basic truism about exporting technology into another culture — a concept that is easy to understand but not always easy to recognize.

**Aid That Works**

My current views are not too different from what they were almost 50 years ago, but I am much more mindful of how complicated the world really is. The U.S. has only limited means to help other countries. We depend on high-tech solutions, using satellites, for example, for phone conversations, whereas in many countries the phone doesn’t even work for local calls. We’re impatient with the pace of change in our client states. We expect results and change to come the way we perceive they do in the U.S., but we forget that our own plumbing sometimes leaks and the family car dies on lonely roads. We rail against corruption among government and business officials who are surrounded by poverty and misery in the recipient countries, yet until recently, we ignored scandalous business practices here at home. And we lack the political will and national consensus to stay in the development game for the long haul. I’m afraid that instead of helping in a substantial way we’ll decide to identify and address only a few striking global problems (health, overpopulation, food production, etc.), looking for maximum impact with minimum investment. This is what we’ve typically done in the past; and this is what we appear willing to settle for in the future.

For that matter, just how relevant are USAID’s methods and approaches today? At one time we practitioners talked about appropriate technology. But we don’t apply the term to our own way of doing things, either in giving aid or in planning it. How can we recognize what it means when applied to those whom we’d like to help? What we can best offer is foreign exchange to cover the import of goods and services, and some techniques, methodologies and knowledge that can substantially improve life in the Third World.

Most U.S. technicians will never receive the recognition they deserve. But USAID’s aid *has* worked. I still feel good about being involved in our program to eradicate smallpox and control measles, among other killer diseases in Africa. I am pleased that my efforts helped get the JFK Bridge built in Niamey. I take pride in having sent the first Chadian to the U.S., on a participant training program, and recall that on his return, he proclaimed that with what he had learned about sorghum production in the U.S., he could transform agricultural production in Chad if he had the means. I still derive great satisfaction from knowing that I played a major role in initiating a successful integrated rural development project in Zaire. And I recall the pride I felt in more than one country when local companies, organizations, and governments feted American advisors for the difference they had made.
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CONTROLLING CONFLICT IN CENTRAL ASIA

What we now know as the sovereign territories of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan were created by Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin in the 1920s to divide and conquer the Central Asian peoples. The artificial boundaries separated communities, created ethnic enclaves, and disrupted patterns of trade and movement. With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, these unnatural dividing lines became international borders. To compound the tension, Uzbekistan, which is bordered by the other four Central Asian republics and Afghanistan, has militarized its borders in an attempt to combat the threats of terrorism, drug smuggling and illegal immigration.

Though the republics have a combined population of 55 million, a land mass larger than Western Europe and a significant share of the world’s oil and gas reserves, the people of Central Asia face a precipitous loss of socioeconomic security for all but the new elites. Competition between ethnic groups, artificial boundaries, poorly managed natural resources, and the conflict between Islamic fundamentalism and repressive secular governments are endemic problems. When this is coupled with an inability to express frustration through peaceful political channels, citizens’ alienation and grievances can easily erupt in the form of violent conflict, as has happened repeatedly over the past decade.

Because many conflicts in Central Asia have arisen at the local — rather than international — level and because USAID’s ability to change structural factors at the national level is limited, the agency has adopted a strategy to mitigate conflict that focuses on giving citizens opportunities to participate in decisions that affect their communities and improve their living standards. This strategy cuts across the agency’s four core objectives in the areas of economic development, democratization, health care and natural resources management.

PEACE AND STABILITY ARE FRAGILE AND YET ESSENTIAL TO ANCHOR A PROCESS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN CENTRAL ASIA. SO, FOR USAID, BUILDING CIVIL SOCIETY IS A PRIORITY.

BY BARBARA JUNISBAI
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Nurturing Civil Society

The majority of people in Central Asia, particularly those outside of large cities, believe that they are powerless over the issues that affect their lives. By increasing citizen participation in community decision-making and promoting cooperation within and between communities, between NGOs and local governments, and between citizens and their local government representatives, USAID/CAR is helping communities identify, prioritize and solve their own problems, problems that often lead to conflict, building on traditional models of self-help already existing in the local culture. Here are some of the program’s success stories.

Bridging Cross-Border Villages.

The Ferghana Valley in eastern Uzbekistan is especially notorious for Soviet-drawn borders that cut through villages and communities of surrounding Kyrgyzstan. There, in Batken Province, Kyrgyzstan, two villages are bisected by a slice of Uzbekistan’s territory. The Uzbek government closed the border in 1999, stringing barbed wire and imposing cross-border tolls and taxes on goods where none existed before, making life extremely difficult for the Kyrgyz villagers separated by the now strictly enforced border. Lines of communication and trade were sundered, families divided, and children in one village were prohibited by armed border guards and barbed wire from crossing through Uzbek territory to go to their school in the other Kyrgyz village.
To come to a solution, USAID-funded Counterpart Consortium worked with a local NGO and the local communities to conduct an intensive, participatory needs-assessment. Residents of the two Kyrgyz villages identified the lack of access to each other as their main problem and, on their own initiative, planned a solution and identified local resources to implement it.

Apart from the impossible border crossing, the only way to connect the two Kyrgyz villages was to traverse a small river. Residents determined to build a bridge using local labor and material. No grant was requested, and none was given, and the bridge was completed in fall 2001.

With this small act, local residents have significantly lowered cross-border tensions between the Uzbek and Kyrgyz sides. Confrontations between irate Kyrgyz citizens and Uzbek border guards have dropped dramatically. At the same time, the two Kyrgyz villages’ joint effort has proven to themselves that there is much to be gained by cooperating with one another.

Reducing Intercultural Tensions over Water. The village of Dusti (Friendship), a community of 1,500 people in the Sughd province of Tajikistan, uses water from Kyrgyzstan for irrigation. The same water supply is also used by farmers from the Kyrgyz village of Arka, located just across the border in Kyrgyzstan. Because the Kyrgyz villagers use this water to irrigate their land, they often block the channel to divert the water. As a result, farmers from Dusti do not receive enough water for their own irrigation needs.

With the assistance of Counterpart Consortium and a local NGO, Ittifok (Unity), Dusti community members developed a Community Action Plan in November 2001 to build 1,300 meters of underground pipeline from the main channel. However, the villagers from Arka opposed allowing Tajiks to lay pipeline through their territory. Leaders from Arka were invited to participate in a roundtable conducted by Ittifok, and, after discussing the situation, they signed an agreement permitting the pipeline. In return, the Tajik villagers agreed to repair a drain system located in Kyrgyz territory but used by both communities. Both groups also agreed to resolve future conflicts through negotiation and roundtable discussions. The pipeline was completed in January 2002.

Solving Local Environmental Problems. The ARMON Women’s Center for Environmental Law, in partnership with the USAID-funded American Bar Association/Central and East European Law Initiative, established the Environmental Public Advocacy Center in Uzbekistan in February 2001. Staffed by local lawyers and environmentalists, EPAC educates citizens on their environmental rights under both Uzbek and international law and helps them identify and address local environmental concerns. It also holds environmental public advocacy workshops, assists the public in resolving local environmental issues, and provides free legal advice to citizens and NGOs.

Recently EPAC assisted a group of citizens from Brichmulla, a town 150 kilometers from Tashkent and the site of Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan incursions in mid-2000, with a project to plant safflower seeds in 50 hectares of exposed land along the Chervok Water Reserve. After finally obtaining approval from the local mayor, the citizen group purchased seeds and planted 10 hectares of land as a pilot project. The project will prevent further erosion from dust storms that currently plague the area and will employ up to 40 local citizens. EPAC is helping the group register as an NGO and seek funds to purchase equipment.

EPAC’s efforts demonstrate both the public’s substantial need for legal and technical assistance to resolve local problems and the success of environmental advocacy as a tool to promote public participation and democratic practices in Uzbekistan.

Investing in a Community’s Response to Drought. On July 25, 2001, U.S. Ambassador Herbst and Esnazar Usenov, executive director of Atamakan, a non-governmental charitable organization, signed an agreement providing $25,000 to fund a potable water supply improvement project for residents of the Karakalpakstan community of Khalkabad. Khalkabad has suffered from a two-year drought that affected all of Karakalpakstan. This funding was provided by USAID’s Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance in response to the government of Uzbekistan’s request for emergency relief.

Atamakan, with the assistance of local communities, the city hokimiat (city mayor’s office) and local organizations, drilled 70 wells and installed hand-operated pumps. From the outset, Atamakan closely collaborated with mahallas (local communities or neighborhoods), the city hokimiat, and local organizations to plan the project. Executive Director Usenov, with the support of the local hokim and

Barbara Junisbai is an information specialist with USAID’s Regional Mission for Central Asia (USAID/CAR) in Washington.
mahalla representatives, organized participation of all residents in determining the location of the hand pumps. Representatives from more than 1,700 families actively participated in the preparatory phase. They selected 50 three- to five-person groups to monitor all work related to drilling wells and installing hand pumps. Atamakan contracted with local producers and construction firms for the actual drilling and installation. For example, 70 hand pumps were manufactured at the cotton-processing plant located in Khalkabad, using its idle machine shop and employees.

This project was followed closely by the Karakalpakstan public and received considerable attention from the local mass media. As a direct result of the project, nearly 10,500 residents of Khalkabad now have reliable access to potable water. One resident noted, “It is a great support for our families. Now we have a reliable source of water. It gives us a confidence in the future.”

A striking by-product of this process is that Atamakan received more than 20 proposals from mahallas and the city mayor’s office for assistance in resolving different social and economic problems.

**Opening up a Dialogue with Public Hearings.** Leninogorsk, a city with a population of 53,000, is located in eastern Kazakhstan near the Russian border. After participating in a USAID-sponsored study tour of Poland on decentralization reforms organized by the International City Managers Association, Ms. Galina Tischenko, secretary of Leninogorsk’s maslikhat (city council), convened the city’s first public hearings. These provided an opportunity for residents to discuss energy rate hikes, one of the most hotly debated issues in Kazakhstan.

To prepare for the hearings, Ms. Tischenko invited ICMA trainers to conduct a special seminar instructing official participants — city council deputies, the Anti-Monopoly Committee’s regional representatives and city government specialists — on conducting public hearings. The trainer was the Pavlodar city council secretary, Sansybai Akimbekov, an experienced local government practitioner. Ms. Tischenko chaired the hearings and kept the audience focused on the topic. Local energy providers, Anti-Monopoly Committee specialists and the mayor all openly discussed the issue with the audience.

As a result of the public hearings, energy providers agreed not to increase utility rates, and residents’ confidence in their elected officials was strengthened. Community members saw that they could play a role. Even the mayor agreed that the public must be informed about and participate in the decision-making process.

**Strengthening Local Government Independence.**

---

**USAID Goes Back to Basics in Central Asia**

Since 1992 U.S. assistance [to the Central Asian republics] has totaled more than $1.7 billion, including $650 million in USAID assistance. The expected results of USAID’s programs, based on the Eastern European model of rapid [structural] transition [to open market democracy], were too ambitious for the political and economic realities of the region. Some expectations about the pace of change possible in Central Asia were naive and unrealistic.

With the benefit of experience and greater realism, USAID’s new assistance strategy shifts focus and emphasis. The most important change is the increased emphasis on individuals, communities and the institutions that nurture and serve them. ...

The new strategy is more realistic about what is possible and what is required to bring about change. It is more selective about the assistance provided to each country, less centered on technical practice and more devoted to improving public knowledge and changing attitudes and values. And finally, the new strategy emphasizes a longer-term perspective: stressing fundamentals; focusing on basic sociopolitical issues; and designing ways to build relationships and partnerships between these new nations, their citizens and the world community. The need to build a constituency for reform across the board, in health, democracy and enterprise development programs, is fundamental.

These broad changes... stem from the hard lessons learned from eight years of development experience in the region...

Officials at the city level have created the Kyrgyz Republic’s first independent local government association, the Association of Cities. USAID’s implementing partner, the Urban Institute, facilitated the establishment of the association in late 2000, and has worked with the group to develop it as a real member-based organization independent of the national government. The association provides information to its constituents and advocates local governments’ interests through participation in government committees, law drafting, publications, televised interviews, research, and briefings by governmental officials.

The Kyrgyz Republic has a strong tradition of hierarchical, centralized rule in which all levels of government are subordinate parts of one apparatus. As a result, local governments lack meaningful experience in lobbying for their own interests.

Thanks to energetic interventions from several mayors who recognize the value of a separate, independent association, attempts to sweep the association into a larger grouping headed by national officials were rebuffed.

Mayors and council chairpersons mandated that the association actively solicit comments from city governments on upcoming local finance legislation and advocate their interests. To secure its independence, the Assembly of the Association of Cities formally voted on a membership dues structure of 30 to 0.5 (about half a cent) per person per year, which should yield roughly $6,000 in dues annually. Membership dues make the Association of Cities one of a very few NGOs in the Kyrgyz Republic to be able to support itself with funding sources outside of donor grants.

As these examples show, the participatory approach is proving to be the crucial instrument of empowering people, enabling them to believe in their own strengths in solving local problems. People in towns and cities throughout the region have commented that they had been waiting for someone else to solve their problems, never imagining that they could come together as a community to analyze and tackle them successfully on their own. USAID/CAR’s contribution to these efforts is like a small pebble striking water: the ripple effect extends beyond our original reach.
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Combating Threats of Emerging Diseases

Humans and mosquitoes (like other agents that cause or transmit disease) share a common disregard for border formalities along the huge frontiers that countries often share. Common sense, therefore, would seem to dictate that regional cooperation in public health matters be the norm rather than the exception.

In the context of international public health, regional cooperation is usually understood as that occurring among ministries of health of two or more countries in the region, but it can also involve cooperation among USAID missions. In fact, one could argue that strengthening regional activities at the mission level — rather than channeling resources through distant off-shore contractual mechanisms of bureaus at the central level — may be the most efficacious use of resources in terms of both technical effectiveness and sustainability. The recent experience of USAID missions in Latin America makes that case.

Since 1999, USAID/Bolivia, USAID/Peru and USAID/Brazil have actively promoted and supported activities to strengthen regional cooperation. Mutual assets such as institutional experience, project design documents, results of research and, most importantly, human resources (both from respective ministries of health and the missions themselves) have been openly shared and effectively utilized. As a result, a larger pool of regional resources has been generated, and technical assistance from institutions such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, USAID and the Pan American Health Organization has been better coordinated and targeted to serve the region.

Success Stories

The examples of such cooperation are numerous. In the HIV/AIDS arena, USAID/Bolivia and USAID/Brazil have been strengthening coordination related to prevention, control and epidemiological surveillance in key border portal towns. This cooperation may have helped curtail the extent of the pandemic in Bolivia (where there have only been 847 HIV/AIDS cases reported to date). Continued cross-border coordination is envisioned.

Regarding vector-borne diseases control, Peruvian experts from USAID and Peru’s Ministry of Health have participated in technical meetings on malaria and yellow fever control in Bolivia. Peru welcomed a Bolivian team to participate in antimalarial drug efficacy trials supported by its Project Vigia (an MOH/USAID collaborative activity), the Peruvian National Institute of Health, CDC, and the U.S. Naval Medical Research Detachment in Peru. The subsequent replication of these trials in Bolivia was accomplished with the support of these same organizations.

Further collaboration between ministries of health and other institutions from Peru, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Suriname and Venezuela is occurring under a new Amazon Malaria Initiative sponsored by USAID’s Bureau for Latin...
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America and the Caribbean, designed to roll back the resurgence of malaria in the region.

Turning to another ancient tropical scourge, yellow fever, USAID/Bolivia supported key research at the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston to determine the transmissibility of the genotype (II) of yellow fever virus found in Peru and Bolivia. This genotype exists among strains of mosquitoes common in rural areas. If the results of this research prove to be definitive, the findings may influence policy-makers in both countries to consider universal immunization for this life-threatening disease.

Coordinated Training

Another example of effective regional coordination is USAID/Bolivia's development of two interactive computer-based training programs in Spanish, which have been made available free of charge to all missions.

Based in La Paz, Dr. Charles Oliver manages USAID/Bolivia's infectious diseases, HIV/AIDS and child survival programs. Prior to joining the U.S. Foreign Service, he served jointly on the faculty of Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health and as a senior technical advisor for numerous USAID Missions and projects in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and USAID's Global Bureau for Health (Division of Infectious Diseases). He holds a master's degree in public health and a Ph.D. in epidemiology. He led the State Department to the 1986 Inter-Services Tennis Championship and received an award from Secretary of State George Shultz.

Dr. Jaime Chang Neyra, M.D., has worked extensively in the region and is recognized as one of the top medical epidemiologists in Peru. An FSN in Lima, he manages USAID/Peru's infectious diseases programs. He holds a master's degree in public health from the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. He is also an accomplished photographer and skydiver.

This article reflects the personal views and opinions of the authors and not necessarily those of USAID.

Mutual assets such as institutional experience, project design documents, results of research and human resources have been openly shared and utilized in the Latin-American region. One program instructs doctors, nurses, and medical students in the proper case management of tuberculosis; the other teaches a global diagnostic and treatment algorithm for the integrated management of childhood illnesses. After sharing the tuberculosis program at a regional conference sponsored by PAHO, several countries in the region, including Nicaragua and Peru, have already requested and received copies of this program, and both Brazil and Haiti have expressed interest in adapting versions in Portuguese and French, respectively. The overarching goal of the training programs is to save lives and resources by reducing the risk of antimicrobial resistance by ensuring strict compliance with treatment regimens.

Cross-border coordination efforts between the health services of Brazil and Bolivia may already have prevented the more virulent form of dengue fever (dengue hemorrhagic fever) from spreading to Bolivia from Brazil, where, according to the Centers for Disease Control, there were some 317,787 cases of the disease reported as of May 2002. More than 15 years ago, USAID/Bolivia helped to establish PROCOSI, a unique network of 24 Bolivian non-governmental organizations that provides vital basic health services and assistance for the poorest sectors of Bolivian society, mostly in remote rural areas of the country. During the past year, USAID/Brazil sent a team to explore the possibilities of adapting the PROCOSI model in the Brazilian context. Through the leadership of USAID, indigenous healthcare NGOs from Bolivia, Brazil and Ecuador (ProSalud, BEMFAM and CEMOPLAF, respectively) were encouraged to coordinate their efforts in the social marketing of basic health services and commodities.

There are also examples of bilateral inter-mission collaboration. USAID/Bolivia's and USAID/Peru's Health Teams share technical documentation and provide each other technical input, e.g., in the preparation and evaluation of proposals and reports presented by consultants. USAID/Peru contributed staff to conduct the evaluation.
of Bolivia's national immunization program, which resulted in Bolivia's adoption of key recommendations that led to significant improvements in its program. Conversely, USAID/Bolivia (as well as the Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean) sent technical personnel to participate in a joint evaluation of USAID/Peru's bilateral program for infectious diseases.

**Cross-border coordination efforts between the health services of Brazil and Bolivia may have prevented the spread of the more virulent form of dengue fever.**

**Battling Infectious Diseases**

The joint evaluation in June 2002 demonstrated the advantages of inter-mission collaboration. Peru chose to conduct a mid-term evaluation of its bilateral infectious diseases project with an infectious diseases advisor from the LAC Bureau, an infectious diseases epidemiologist from USAID/Bolivia and a Peruvian public health consultant. The team members had considerable prior knowledge of the project from previous regional coordination activities, which contributed to what was perceived as a highly effective approach to the design and implementation of the evaluation. More importantly, this approach was well received by counterparts in the Peruvian Ministry of Health, who appreciated being full partners in the process. For the first time, a member of Peru's Office of External Cooperation actively participated in the evaluation process. Moreover, this approach resulted in saving thousands of U.S. taxpayer dollars as the services of the two U.S. members of the team (both USAID employees, one of whom was already resident in the area) were provided at no extra cost.

After USAID/Ecuador's health program was phased out in 2000, USAID/Peru stepped in to provide important technical assistance related to infectious diseases in key border areas of Peru and Ecuador. Undoubtedly Ecuador could have done more and gained more from such regional cooperation to address tuberculosis, malaria and HIV/AIDS if its health program were to be at least partially revived—but, at the same time, all was not lost.

USAID missions in Bolivia, Brazil and Peru provided timely technical feedback in early 2002 to the center regarding a proposed regional strategy for HIV/AIDS in "basic" countries (those on the cusp of the epidemic). As a result, USAID missions in those countries will be able to retain management of their bilateral HIV/AIDS programming resources, with the additional benefit of technical oversight from the newly created HIV/AIDS Division of USAID's Bureau for Global Health. In addition, USAID/Brazil may step up its technical presence in the field, intensifying cross-border collaboration.

**Continuing Impact**

Other forms of cooperation among USAID missions need to be actively explored. For example, USAID/Nepal has supported development of a vector-borne diseases center at Hetauda in Nepal's tropical lowlands since 1995. In September 2000, a regional conference on strengthening cooperation on vector-borne diseases among neighboring countries of Bhutan, Bangladesh, India and Nepal was successfully conducted at the Hetauda center. Also in 2000, USAID/Bolivia supported a feasibility study for development of a similar center for tropical diseases in the Bolivian Amazon, which was subsequently established by a ministerial resolution in January 2002. If language differences can be sorted out, Bolivian scientists could gain much from the experiences and lessons learned from their Nepali counterparts. An earlier precedent for this type of cooperation was established in the 1990s when a Bolivian team was sent to Zambia to share their experiences with fortification of sugar with Vitamin A, a micronutrient that has proven to demonstrate multiple synergies in improving the health status of young children.

The success of these activities demonstrates the need to maintain in-country technical leadership by Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service Nationals assigned to manage the health programs of individual U.S. missions in the field. Fortunately, top management at the USAID missions in Bolivia, Brazil, Peru and elsewhere already recognizes the comparative advantages in supporting such regional cooperation activities, which will continue to have a significant impact on the health of our partners in the region. ■
Focus on USAID

Mainstreaming Trade at USAID: The Case of Egypt

On March 14, 2002, in the run-up to the U.N. International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, Mexico, President Bush said, "Trade is the engine of development and by promoting it we will help to meet the needs of the world's poor." Linking trade to development has become a cornerstone of this administration's foreign policy, an important theme being mainstreaming trade into development assistance protocols and helping developing countries understand the benefits of globalization. We have had considerable success with this agenda at USAID/Egypt and, while our mission's size makes the program novel, we have created models other missions can use.

Trade Comes On Line

Although pressure from the Bush White House has made USAID realize that trade capacity building is a theme that cannot be allowed to sink into its bureaucracy, the push inside the agency to "mainstream" trade into development strategies had begun earlier. During preparations for the 1999 Seattle World Trade Organization Ministerial, Ambassador James Michel, then Counselor, initiated an internal effort that led USAID to increase its participation in interagency processes on trade in Washington and Geneva.

After Seattle, an exchange of letters between Deputy Administrator Harriet Babbitt and Deputy U.S. Trade Representative Susan Esserman accelerated the process. The exchange confirmed that trade training has "strong demand from developing countries and broad international appeal," and that priorities are integrating trade capacity building into country strategies and fostering a "Geneva Dialogue" with key trade multilaterals such as the World Trade Organization, the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development, the International Trade Center (operated by UNCTAD-WTO), and the Common Fund for Commodities. The Africa Bureau and the Europe & Eurasia Bureau subsequently wrote grants to the WTO for accession and compliance programs. In April 2002, Assistant Administrator Robert Randolph signed memoranda of understanding with ITC and CFC, which gave Asia and the Near East missions access to their expertise, as we have done in Egypt.

From January 2001, the focus on trade intensified at USAID, leading to a reorganization that created a pillar Bureau for Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade and strengthened its Office of Emerging Markets. In late 2001, USAID funded a trade capacity building project with Nathan and Associates to provide field support and trade-related technical assistance. Further, OEM is working with ITC to formalize their relationship and give all missions access to ITC's market analysis services. Several field missions are adding positions for trade officers and/or offering trade and export projects.

Today, according to the agency's own surveys, USAID spends around $250 million on trade capacity building activities annually. Even so, how to coordinate these activities is a key question, as is deciding how to balance a demand-driven dialogue on trade with an entrenched internal bureaucratic process. And, with the impact of trade multilaterals clearly rising, USAID needs to find better ways to work with agencies like the ITC, CFC and UNCTAD, which can provide subsidized technical assistance, expertise and direct links to the WTO (the Common Fund will actually co-fund projects).

USAID/Egypt Has Led the Way in Linking Trade to Development, Creating Models Other Missions Can Use.

By Dr. J. W. Wright, Jr.
Focus

On the Ground in Egypt

Work at USAID/Egypt is complicated by several factors, including the mission's size. It has a current annual budget of around $650 million (down from over $1 billion in 1996-1997). As opposed to most missions, where the majority of funds come from the USAID core budget, funding in Egypt is primarily "Economic Support Funds" provided by the Department of State, making State-USAID cooperation necessarily strong. The Economic Growth Directorate controls the most funds, and focuses on four areas: sector policy and privatization, competitiveness and agricultural development, finance and information technology, and the Commodity Import Program. Trade falls within sector policy, where about $65 million in trade policy reform and trade-training activities are coordinated.

Three USAID-funded projects focus on trade or trade training: Pal-Tech’s Management Development Initiative, the International Executive Service Corps’ Center for Business Support, and Chemonics’ Technical Assistance for Policy Reform. Local partners USAID supports, such as the American Chamber of Commerce, the Alexandria Business Association and the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce, also work on trade issues. The agriculture-led export businesses project and the agriculture technologies utilization and transfer project work on sector-specific trade issues. The participation of firms that work with the mission’s Commodity Import Program, many of which also export, heightens our success.

At the high end, the mission has recently funded a $20 million assistance for trade reform project at the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Trade that promotes policy reform and will help establish a viable WTO unit. Unlike its unpopular predecessor project, which focused on policy and economic analysis, ATR is designed to provide sector-specific training, address services bottlenecks caused by MFT rules, and encourage MFT sectors and other ministries to accept international standards.

In addition, a customs reform and trade facilitation project is being designed that should set a new model. While improving tariff rates and valuation methods, this project will focus much more broadly on the impact poorly operated customs regimes have on services and will address issues like ports, transport and reporting efficiency.

In the mission’s Human Development Division, a $20 million Management Development Initiative II project has recently been funded that will provide training to the private sector on a range of management topics. It will also help Egypt establish a technical university focused on building information and communications technologies.

Immediate Measures Needed for Doha

By 2000, the increased volume of trade-related requests from Egyptian organizations indicated that the mission needed a trade advisor. Creating a new position was difficult, so a specialist was hired through the American Association for the Advancement of Science Diplomacy Fellowship program.

Initial consultations made it obvious that a sizable amount of trade-related activity was taking place, but serious contractor coordination was needed. There was little interaction among agencies within the government of Egypt on trade, and partially because of this, immediate measures were needed if the country was going to properly prepare for the WTO’s Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha, Qatar. Further, there was inadequate contact between the MFT and international trade support agencies, like ITC and CFC, and that resulted in an urgent need for trade flows analysis. Indeed, the MFT’s foreign trade sector was not basing its negotiating strategies on real market analysis.

To respond to this situation, an informal team of project ‘chiefs-of-party,’ whose projects could work on overcoming

There was little interaction among agencies within the government of Egypt on trade.

---

Dr. J.W. Wright, Jr. has served as the Chief Trade Advisor at USAID-Egypt for the past two years and, before that, was a senior advisor in USAID’s Office of Emerging Markets. Both positions were funded through the American Association for the Advancement of Science’s Diplomacy Fellows program. He currently designs trade and trade capacity building programs with PricewaterhouseCoopers. His publications include Structural Flaws in the Middle East Peace Process: Historical Perspectives (Macmillan, 2002), Economic and Political Impediments to Middle East Peace, with Laura Drake, (Macmillan, 2000), and The Political Economy of the Middle East: The Impact of Competing Trade Agendas (Routledge, 1999).
barriers to trade, was formed and discussions about how to offer more trade training were initiated. Two projects took the lead: MDI (I) for training and studies aimed at increasing Egypt’s global competitiveness, and TAPR for policy-reform-oriented training for the government.

We began by organizing market analysis and awareness building activity in Geneva. MDI funded a series of ITC-generated studies on opportunities for Egyptian exporters in the Maghreb, Gulf Arab, and Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa states, and organized a four-day workshop on “WTO Compliance and Competitiveness.” The workshop was held in February 2001, just as negotiations over Doha were beginning. Workshop participants spent most of their time at ITC, but also visited the WTO and UNCTAD and heard presentations from CFC, and met with the U.S. and Egyptian missions to the WTO. Egypt’s ministries of finance, foreign affairs, foreign trade, and international cooperation each sent several representatives. The group also included a team of executives from five Egyptian import and export firms. Several senior staff from USAID/Egypt, including the mission director, and embassy staff also attended, which helped to build consensus within the mission for trade training in general and cooperation with ITC in particular.

Evaluations following this exercise indicated that the participants better understood the negotiating positions being taken in advance of Doha, and the linkages between WTO compliance and export competitiveness. At home, the participants formed the “Geneva Group,” which

---

**Trade is Key: A Multilateral Consensus**

Participants discussed in Seattle but demanded in Doha that the WTO recognize that undeveloped trade capacities, generally, and weak services sectors, specifically, are the broken links in the developing countries’ benefit chain with global trade. The multilateral dialogue concurs that trade growth is dependent on liberalizing services and building firm-level awareness among producers that meeting core standards and beating market prices lead to profitability and greater global market participation.

The Doha Declaration made trade capacities a core issue for the next round of negotiations that will take place over the next two years, and recognizes that assistance must go beyond policy reform and address real bottlenecks to competitiveness — usually deficient capacities in services and standards. Sometimes this means identifying market opportunities for currently produced products and services and helping raise quality and standards that will allow developing country entrepreneurs to expand into other markets. In other cases, it means developing service industries that can lower overall import and export costs and allow a particular country to exploit geographical advantages.

More specifically, with Hong Kong, Singapore and Dubai serving as models, leaders on both sides of the industrial and digital divides are keenly aware that services sector liberalization creates cost efficiencies and raises employment most rapidly. They are also aware that areas without substantial production bases, like Djibouti or Palestine, must necessarily focus on building services-led economies if they want to benefit from trade.

The evidence is compelling that those countries that see services and international standards compliance as competitive factors win, while those who see them only as political factors lose. Generally, economies that used their development plans to address services and standards issues have far outpaced countries that did not in global growth participation. For instance, Egypt has not followed a services and standards approach, while countries in East Asia with comparable demographics have. Had Egypt followed Thailand and South Korea’s models (not to mention Hong Kong, Singapore or Dubai), exports would have been 10 to 20 times higher. It is also true that nations in East Asia trade with each other, which does not happen in the Middle East. This must change.

A simple comparison of Ireland to Italy reveals that the situation is no different in Europe. Having followed a services-led economic strategy, Ireland grew at a 7.1 percent rate in 2001, and maintained similarly high growth rates throughout the 1990s. However, Italy, which continues to rely on subsidies to producers and bureaucratic trade barriers, grew at only 1.6 percent in 2001, and has had a struggling economy for at least a decade.
requested follow-on activities and consistently supported these activities, staying involved in the seminar series we held before and after Doha.

**Moving to In-Country Activities**

Government participants were the most strident in their requests for in-country activities. In response, TAPR provided support for ITC specialists in trade information, executive development, and supply chain management to visit Egypt in April 2001, to present seminars and assess options for longer-term activities. The team met with various public and private sector players, and presented seminars in both Cairo and Alexandria.

Demand was clearly high. For the Cairo seminar members of the Geneva Group were each asked to invite five guests; over 120 people attended, 50 percent from the private sector. In Alexandria, about 25 people came, with 80 percent from the private sector. In May 2001, a team from UNCTAD held another trade information workshop in Cairo and approximately 100 people attended.

Summers in Egypt are poor times for conducting programs, but good times for planning. Both the outgoing and incoming ambassadors (Daniel Kurtzer and David Welch, respectively) felt the upcoming Doha WTO ministerial presented a window of opportunity to promote trade liberalization and generate positive publicity on U.S. programs; and U.S. Trade Representative Robert B. Zoellick wanted all the support we could give. Richard Albright, the embassy’s economic counselor, assembled an informal interagency team to work on Doha-related issues, such as simultaneous requests for commercial diplomacy support in advance of Doha at both the MFT and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Direct funding from the USAID mission was constrained by the time frame, so we again turned to our lead contractors.

What developed was a trade training and WTO awareness campaign presented by former high-level government officials and staff from international organizations who were actively working on the Doha ministerial:

- Simultaneous commercial diplomacy courses at

---

**Executive Lodging Alternatives**

**Interim Accommodations for Corporate and Government Markets**

- Apartments
- Townhouses
- Single Family Homes

**“FOR THE EXECUTIVE ON THE MOVE”**

finder5@ix.netcom.com

Locations throughout Northern Virginia and D.C.
Units fully furnished, equipped and accessorized
Many “Walk to Metro” locations
Pet Friendly

5105-L Backlick Road, Annandale, Virginia
Tel: (703) 354-4070 Fax: (703) 642-3619

---

**Need Auto Parts NOW?**

State-Side Auto Supply is your world-wide professional supplier of auto parts and accessories for all makes and models of automobiles manufactured for the U.S. market.

- We will get you the correct part FAST – usually in less than 7 days.
- If you are not sure of the exact parts, hardware or accessories you need, call us for assistance and we will help you place your order.
- We accept all Government PO’s as well as personal orders, and we give priority attention to urgently needed items.
- No order is too large or too small!

State-Side Auto Supply

211 Southwest Rd., Canterbury, NH USA 03224 • E-mail: stateside1@aol.com
PHONE: 603-783-9061 • FAX: 603-783-9257 Order forms sent on request
We accept VISA and MasterCard Call Bob Chisholm today

PHONE OR FAX YOUR ORDER 24 HRS. A DAY, 7 DAYS A WEEK
Focus

MFT and MFA, led by Geza Feketekuty, president of the International Commercial Diplomacy Project and a former senior assistant U.S. trade representative, were funded via TAPR and the Development Training II project.

- A “Trade Diplomats Discussion Series” was initiated by IESC to build public awareness of WTO issues and discuss the benefits of trade with the private sector. Eight retired ambassadors and senior speakers participated. (Although the Sept. 11 attacks occurred just as the series began, eight of the nine scheduled speakers came and showed great commitment.)

- A journalists’ training and roundtable series was supported by IESC, with help from ICDP staff and a critical role played by Embassy Cairo’s press office. Economic editors were given access to the trade diplomats through open-forum roundtables, but only if they attended training sessions on “Reporting on Trade Issues.”

The day after each session, private sector focus groups were held in the morning and roundtables with USAID staff in the afternoon (FSN staff were especially targeted).

In addition, a tour for ITC’s Executive Director Ambassador Denis Belisle was organized by MDI. The tour included a “Global Economy Series” lecture to an audience of over 300 people, a television interview with the Minister of Foreign Trade and private sector meetings. The tour also included a donors lunch with representatives from six embassies that support business development activities.

A panel of experts, who discussed the Doha Declaration agreed to the night before, concluded the campaign on Nov. 14. Over 50 (almost all positive) newspaper and magazine articles and a flurry of requests for a spring series materialized.

Responding to Doha

Our success indicated the need for renewed programming in early 2002, and we used the Doha Declaration’s focus on export capacity building to set the agenda. The mission’s human development strategic objective funded a training grant of $275,000 to ITC that would be managed under the economic growth strategic objective. ITC prepared new market studies and designed an intensive “Tools for Trade” export assistance series, delivered in collaboration directly with the MFT, MDI, TAPR, IESC, the American Chamber of Commerce and the Alexandria Business Association. The Alexandria Chamber of Commerce agreed to provide local support. IESC also collaborated with CFC (which contributed $50,000) to co-host a food exports conference, and MDI agreed to end the series with a seminar on Egypt’s competitiveness, led by Peter Cornelius of the World Economic Forum.

The specific topics addressed grew out of priorities identified by the focus groups held during the pre-Doha series: regional market opportunities, trade and information technologies, export trade finance, trade and tourism, trade and services, supply chain management, overcoming technical barriers to trade and quality management. Dr. Yousef Boutrous Ghali, Minister of Foreign Trade, asked that linkages to small and medium enterprises be explored, and declared March 2002 “SME Export Assistance Month.”

The initial session on “Trade and Information Technologies” was held in February and attracted over 160 attendees in Cairo and 70 in Alexandria, including people from the Egyptian government, USTR Geneva, and representatives from the Canadian, Danish, E.U. and Japanese embassies in Cairo. Between February and April, an average of about 100 people attended each of the 12 seminars in Cairo and an average of about 50 attended eight seminars in Alexandria. The CFC/IESC food exports conference in mid-June was attended by 92 people. The World Economic Forum finale at the end of June attracted well over 100 people in Cairo and 50 in Alexandria, the most sustained interest being generated by the Geneva Group.

What Next?

The obvious question is: Will Egypt’s interest and activity on trade matters continue to broaden and deepen? For the government, the level of continued interest is high. The Information Decision Support Center, the secretariat and main support center for parliamentarians and members of the president’s cabinet, now has access to ITC’s market analysis program and is providing it to both public and private Information Decision Support Center sector groups. And ITC received letters from the Minister of Foreign Trade, the Minister of Supply, the president of the Egyptian Organization for Standards, and the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce (under the Ministry of Supply) asking for more training in commercial diplomacy, trade information and market analysis, supply chain management and quality management. In the private sector, the Alexandria Business Association has asked ITC to help it establish a regional export services training center.
and support project. As a result of the CFC/IESC seminar, several agriculture groups are requesting assistance on enhancing commodity exports.

Of course, many organizations will accept any training USAID will finance, but in this case the core Geneva Group has loyally participated for almost two years, which indicates a deeper commitment (and also confirms that this was a good way to jump-start a trade training series). That their requests have reached ministerial levels also indicates commitment. The sustained participation from the private sector shows that more and more firms see the value of export services and meeting international standards.

Movement among contractors is one of the most significant things that has happened. As a direct result of the Doha series, two organizations — MDII/Pal-Tech and IESC — are adding trade and export training to their strategies and are both working directly with trade multilaterals. Through ATR, Nathan and Associates are institutionalizing ITC's market analysis service and commercial diplomacy training at the MFT. PricewaterhouseCoopers is also committing new resources to trade capacity building. Including these firms has helped significantly to increase the sustainability of the trade training and awareness programs, and to link them to trade multilaterals.

However, the most far-reaching changes may have been within USAID/Egypt itself. As indicated above, the new ATR project focuses on services and standards, and the winning bid specifically states they will work directly with ITC. MDI II was specifically designed to build competitiveness in services sectors and help to bridge the digital divide that so inhibits Egypt's trade. The new customs reform project's dual focus on tariff reform and trade facilitation is pioneering. This cross-sector style of programming is relatively new to USAID, but it represents a decisive shift in thinking within USAID/Egypt.

In the end, contractors may carry these agendas forward more quickly than anyone else: because local governments are demanding trade training and export assistance, field missions will increasingly emphasize these priorities in requests for proposals and contractors.

Creating A Better Market: What We Learned in Egypt

Our approach has helped to create a better market in Egypt by breaking the traditional policy reform mode with the addition of commercial diplomacy, coordination with international organizations, and a focus on services and standards as tools for competitiveness. The work has not been easy, but it has been satisfying, and now that the model is set it will certainly be easier for other missions. Our experience shows us that:

• Starting with industry reviews, product maps and market analysis is critical. Most Egyptian firms and/or bureaucrats are left out of global markets because they do not know their real market opportunities and priorities.
• Including commercial diplomacy training early on is also crucial because if key political constituencies do not understand either the benefits of increased trade or the aims/limits of the WTO, trade liberalization will not take place.
• Broad awareness campaigns are necessary so that both government and the private sector it should serve understand that meeting WTO/international standards is a competitiveness issue and can lead to greater profitability.
• Coordination with specialized trade agencies can be extremely effective for delivering trade training (although United Nations agencies in particular must readjust their bureaucracies in ways that make work with donors feasible).
• Contractor coordination across sectors is critical and, while time-consuming, can yield extraordinary results and enable missions to address a broader range of stakeholder and firm-level assistance needs in shorter periods of time.
• In addition, under certain circumstances, such as those we found in Egypt, it is necessary to find creative ways to respond to specific political needs, help influence policy across sectors and support reform-minded, inner-circle staff. Unlike elsewhere, in Egypt we have an open and impressive Minister of Foreign Trade who, even though he is restrained by a huge bureaucracy (in the 2002 World Competitiveness Report, Egypt ranks highest out of 75 countries studied in government red tape), realizes that open markets matter. In such situations, additional imaginative activity is called for. While this does curry political favors, it more importantly builds core institutional capacities.
Keeping Score in the Congressional Game

Over the past four years, AFSA has compiled three Congressional Scorecards. The first rated legislators' votes in the 105th Congress (1997-98), the second was developed for the 106th Congress (1999-2000), and this one looks at the votes from 2001 through early June 2002 for the 107th Congress. The AFSA Scorecard is intended to give our readers an analysis of how their elected representatives are voting on issues relating to providing funding for U.S. engagement and promoting U.S. participation in the international arena. The Scorecard also gives AFSA an opportunity to look at voting trends over the years to see what changes may be taking place.

Methodology

In developing the Scorecard, we have utilized two categories.

Engagement: First, AFSA believes it is in the interest of the United States that we remain actively engaged in shaping the world in which we live. It is no longer a question as to whether we can live in "splendid isolation," but rather what form our engagement will take. Thus, we looked at whether particular votes help or hinder active U.S. participation in the world.

Resources: Secondly, AFSA believes that adequate resources must be provided to support our foreign policy. Funding is needed both for operating expenses and for the tools of diplomacy, which range from public diplomacy, including exchange programs, to foreign assistance to participation in international organizations. Thus, our second question is whether members' votes reflect support for such engagement.

Over 170 votes in the House and the Senate were examined. Several categories of votes were automatically not used. For instance, in December 2001, the House of Representatives passed a resolution by a vote of 404-1 paying tribute to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for their contribution in promoting democracy over the last 50 years. These types of "motherhood and apple pie" votes do not reflect the intent of the scorecard and were not considered. Other votes were not included because they did not involve a question of providing funds but rather where within the 150 International Affairs account the funds should be used. For instance, some votes proposed moving funds from the Andean Anti-Drug Initiative to child survival programs within the foreign aid bill. Finally, we did not count several non-foreign affairs procedural votes that happened to take place when a foreign affairs bill was on the floor.

Of the 90 remaining votes, AFSA identified those that addressed key resource and engagement issues. In developing a score for engagement votes (E) in the Senate, 12 votes were examined and eight (67 percent) of these were used. For the House of Representatives, 40 engagement votes were examined, and eight (20 percent) of those were used. Likewise, on resources (R), 10 votes on the Senate side were considered and seven were used for scoring (70 percent), while 28 House votes were considered and five used for scoring (18 percent). The two subscores were then averaged according to their respective weights to produce a total score (T) for each senator and representative.

AFSA Rates Senators and Representatives on How Well They Supported American Engagement in World Affairs.

By Ken Nakamura
When a member did not vote, for whatever reason, AFSA counted it as a vote against the AFSA position because that abstention represented one fewer vote in favor of engagement or additional resources.

As in past Scorecards, the scores have been converted to a familiar 0-10 rating scale, with 10 representing a voting record that fully supports AFSA positions and a 0, of course, one that differs with AFSA on all votes counted.

Some Things to Consider

We do not assume that even the most internationally-oriented senators and representatives (or all AFSA members, for that matter) will agree with AFSA on every issue. Certainly there are many issues on which reasonable, internationally-minded people can disagree instances in which there are different views of how best to be engaged with the world.

AFSA does assume that the president is responsible for developing this nation’s foreign policy and that he should be supported in the implementation of that policy. And we have found that those senators and representatives in the president’s party will generally support his policy; and those in the opposition are more likely to express their concerns. During the Clinton presidency, for example, many Republicans offered and supported amendments to limit the placement of U.S. troops in the Balkans and therefore received lower AFSA scores because of efforts to fetter the president in the exercise of foreign policy. Likewise, several Democrats are concerned about the increases in the Andean Anti-Drug Initiative proposed by President Bush and seek to reduce funds for the program or place limitations on how those funds could be used. As a result, the party occupying the White House generally comes out better in the Scorecard because of this assumption, which could also be called an administration bias.

Ken Nakamura is AFSA’s Director of Legislative Affairs.
## Scorecard

### U.S. Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Sessions</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Shelby</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Murkowski</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Stevens</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Kyl</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McCain</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Hutchinson</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanche Lincoln</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Allard</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Nighthorse Campbell</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Dodd</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lieberman</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Biden, Jr.</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Carper</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Graham</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Nelson</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Cleland</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zell Miller</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Akaka</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Inouye</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Craig</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Crapo</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Durbin</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Fitzgerald</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Bayh</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lugar</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Grassley</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Harkin</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Brownback</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Roberts</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Bunning</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch McConnell</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Breaux</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Landrieu</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Collins</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia Snowe</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Mikulski</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Sarbanes</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Kennedy</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kerry</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Stabenow</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Levin</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Dayton</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Wellstone</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thad Cochran</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Lott</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Carnahan</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Bond</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scorecard

### U.S. Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Baucus</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad Burns</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Hagel</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Nelson</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ensign</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Reid</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judd Gregg</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Smith</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Corzine</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Torricelli</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Bingaman</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Domenici</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Rodham Clinton</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Schumer</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Edwards</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Helms (Ret)</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Conrad</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Dorgan</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike DeWine</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Voinovich</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Inhofe</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Nickles</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Smith</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Wyden</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Santorum</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlen Specter</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Chafee</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Reed</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Hollings</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strom Thurmond (Ret)</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Daschle</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Johnson</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Frist</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Thompson (Ret)</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Gramm (Ret)</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Bailey Hutchinson</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bennett</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrin Hatch</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Jeffords</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Leahy</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Allen</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Warner</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Cantwell</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Murray</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Byrd</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rockefeller IV</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Feingold</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Kohl</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Enzi</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Thomas</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scorecard

### House of Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonny Callahan (Ret)</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Everett</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Riley (0)</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert B. Aderholt</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert (Bud) Cramer Jr.</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Bachus</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Hilliard</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Young</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>at large</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eni Faleomavaega</td>
<td>Samoa delegate</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Flake</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Pastor</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Stump (Ret)</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Shadegg</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Kolbe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D. Hayworth</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Berry</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Snyder</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Boozman (0)</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Ross</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Thompson</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wally Herger</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Ose</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doolittle</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Matsui</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Woolsey</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Miller</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pelosi</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Lee</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Tauscher</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Pombo</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Lantos</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Fortney-Stark</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Eshoo</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Honda</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Lofgren</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Farr</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Condit</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Radanovich</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Dooley</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Thomas</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Capps</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elton Gallegy</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Sherman</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard P. Buck McKeen</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Berman</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Schiff</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Dreier</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Waxman</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier Becerra</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Solis</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Watson (Special Election 6/01)</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucille Roybal-Allard</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Napolitano</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine Waters</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Harman</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita Millender-McDonald</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Horn (Ret)</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Royce</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Lewis</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Miller</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Baca</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Calvert</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Bono</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Rohrabacher</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCORECARD

**House of Representatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Sanchez</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Cox</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Issa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Davis</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Filner</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Duke Cunningham</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Hunter</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana DeGette</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Udall</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott McInnis</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Schaffer (Ret)</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Hefley</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tancredo</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Larson</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Simmons</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa DeLauro</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Shays</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Maloney</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Johnson</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Castle</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>at large</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Holmes Norton</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Miller</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Boyd</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrine Brown</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ander Crenshaw</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Thurman</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Stearns</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mica</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ric Keller</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bilirakis</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.W. Bill Young</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Davis</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam Putnam</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Miller (Ret)</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter J. Goss</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Weldon</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Foley</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie P. Meek (Ret)</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ileana Ros-Lehtinen</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wexler</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Deutsch</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Diaz-Balart</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Clay Shaw, Jr.</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcee L. Hastings</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Kingston</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac Collins</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia McKinney</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lewis</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Isakson</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Barr</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxby Chambliss (0)</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Deal</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Norwood</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Linder</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Underwood</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Abercrombie</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy T. Mink</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. “Butch” Otter</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael K. Simpson</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby Rush</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Jackson</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Lipinski</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Gutierrez</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scorecard

### House of Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rod Blagojevich (0)</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Hyde</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Davis</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Crane</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Schakowsky</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Steven Kirk</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Weller</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Costello</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Biggert</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Hastert</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Johnson</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Manzullo</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Evans</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray LaHood</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Phelps</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Shimkus</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Visclosky</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Pence</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Roemer (Ret)</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Souder</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Buyer</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Burton</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Kerns</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hostetttler</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron Hill</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Carson</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Leach</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Nussle</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Boswell</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Ganske (0)</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Latham</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Moran</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Ryun</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Moore</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Tiahrt</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Whitfield</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Lewis</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Northup</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Lucas</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Rogers</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Fletcher</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Vitter</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jefferson</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J. “Billy” Tauzin</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McCreery</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cooksey (0)</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Baker</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher John</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Elias Baldacci (0)</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Gilchrest</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ehrlich (0)</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Cardin</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Russell Wynn</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steny Hoyer</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roscoe Bartlett</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah Cummings</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Morella</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Oliver</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Neal</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McGovern</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barney Frank</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Meehan</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tierney</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scorecard

### House of Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Markey</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Capuano</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Lynch</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Delahunt</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Stupak</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Hoekstra</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Ehlers</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Camp</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Barcia</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Upton</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Smith</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rogers</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Kildee</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bonior (Ø)</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Knollenberg</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sander Levin</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Rivers</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Conyers</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn kilpatrick</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dingell</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gil Gutknecht</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Kennedy</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Ramstad</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty McCollum</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Olav Sabo</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Luther</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin Peterson</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Oberstar</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Wicker</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennie Thompson</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip Pickering</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronnie Shows</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Taylor</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clay</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Akin</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Gephardt</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ike Skelton</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen McCarthy</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Graves</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Blunt</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ann Emerson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Hulshoff</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Rehberg</td>
<td>MT at large</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Bereuter</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Terry</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Osborne</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Berkley</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gibbons</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sununu (Ø)</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Bass</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Andrews</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank LoBiondo</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Saxton</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Smith</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marge Roukema (Ret)</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Pallone, Jr.</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Ferguson</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pascrell, Jr.</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Rothman</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Payne</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Frelinghuysen</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush Holt</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Menendez</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Wilson</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Scorecard

## House of Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Skeen (Ret)</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Udall</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Grucci</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Israel</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter King</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn McCarthy</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Ackerman</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Meeks</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Crowley</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrold Nadler</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Weiner</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edolphus Towns</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Owens</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nydia Velazquez</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vito Fossella</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Maloney</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Rangel</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Serrano</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot Engel</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nita Lowey</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Kelly</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Gilman (Ret)</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael McNulty</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sweeney</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Boehlert</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McHugh</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Walsh</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Hinchey</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Reynolds</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise McIntosh Slaughter</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John LaFalce (Ret)</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Quinn</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amo Houghton</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Clayton (Ret)</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Etheridge</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Jones</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Price</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Burr</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Coble</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McIntyre</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hayes</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Wilkins Myrick</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass Ballenger</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Taylor</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvin Watt</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Pomeroy</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>at large</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Chabot</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Portman</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Hall (O)</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Oxley</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Gillmor</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Strickland</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hobson</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Boehner</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy Kaptur</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Kucinich</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Tubbs Jones</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Tiberi</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherrod Brown</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Sawyer</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Pryce</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Regula</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Traficant</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ney</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCORECARD

#### House of Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steven LaTourette</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Largent</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Carson</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Watkins (Ret)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C. Watts Jr. (Ret)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest J. Istook, Jr.</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Lucas</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wu</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Walden</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Blumenauer</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter DeFazio</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Hooley</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brady</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaka Fattah</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Borski (Ret)</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Hart</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Peterson</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Holden</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Weldon</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Greenwood</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Shuster</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Sherwood</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Kanjorski</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Murtha</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Hoeffel</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Coyne (Ret)</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Toomey</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Pitts</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Gekas</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Doyle</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Platts</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Mascara</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phil English</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anibal Acevedo-Vila</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Kennedy</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Langevin</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Brown</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Wilson</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Graham</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim DeMint</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Spratt, Jr.</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Clyburn</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thune (0)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>at large</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jenkins</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Duncan</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach Wamp</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Hilleary (0)</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Clement (0)</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Gordon</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Bryant (0)</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tanner</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Ford</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Sandlin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Turner</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Johnson</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Hall</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Sessions</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Barton</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Culberson</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Brady</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Lampson</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Doggett</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chet Edwards</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Granger</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac Thornberry</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Paul</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Hinojosa</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvestre Reyes</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Stenholm</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Jackson-Lee</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Combest</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Gonzalez</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Smith</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom DeLay</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Bonilla</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Frost</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Bentsen</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Armey (Ret)</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Ortiz</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciro Rodriguez</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Green</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Bernice Johnson</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hansen</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Matheson</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Cannon</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Sanders</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>at large</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Christian-Green</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ann Davis</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Schrock</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Scott</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Randy Forbes</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil H. Goode, Jr.</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Goodlatte</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Cantor</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Moran</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Boucher</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Wolf</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Davis</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Inslee</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Larson</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Baird</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard &quot;Doc&quot; Hastings</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George R. Nethercutt, Jr.</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman D. Dicks</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McDermott</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Dunn</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Smith</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Mollohan</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Moore Capito</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Rahall II</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Ryan</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Baldwin</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Kind</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Kleczka</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Barrett (0)</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Petri</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Obey</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Green</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Sensenbrenner</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Cubin</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>at large</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORECARD**
DIPLOMATIC CATHEDRAL-BUILDING

AMERICAN-IMPOSED SOLUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS WILL PROVIDE ONLY ILLUSORY BENEFITS UNLESS THE NATIONS AFFECTED COME TO SHARE DEMOCRATIC VISIONS AND VALUES.

BY JAMES E. GOODY

George Shultz, Ronald Reagan’s second secretary of State, has described one aspect of diplomacy as gardening. “The way to keep the weeds from overwhelming you,” he wrote in his memoirs, “is to deal with them constantly and in their early stages.” We learned the hard way in Central Asia that when the weeds get the upper hand, we must sometimes turn to another type of statecraft — crisis management and the use of force.

But another aspect of diplomacy deserves its own metaphor, as well: “cathedral-building.” This approach aims to build a lasting order based on common values, as opposed to a transitory order based on balance of power or hegemony. It recognizes that American-imposed solutions to international problems will provide only illusory benefits unless the nations affected come to share democratic visions and values. Otherwise these solutions are built on sand.

Shakespeare, as usual, captured the idea memorably: “like the fabric of this vision, the cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces, the solemn temples . . . shall dissolve and . . . leave not a rack behind.”

To take the metaphor a step further, cathedral-building assumes that a structure erected on a foundation formed by similar modes of governance, a shared identity and common institutions will be more enduring than one imposed by hegemonic power alone. The results of this strategy are difficult to discern within the term of one president, yet a succession of American presidents in both parties, practical politicians all, have recognized that the spread of democratic values serves American interests — if for no other reason than because it reduces the risk of an attack against our country. As the first George Bush in his last foreign policy speech as president observed, “governments responsive to the will of the people are not likely to sponsor terrorism, or to threaten humanity with weapons of mass destruction.”

For proof, we need look no further than Western Europe, where a democratic peace has emerged, ending centuries of fratricidal war. We are still part of that process, and our policy of extending that peaceful order in Europe as far to the east as possible has been remarkably successful. The world is safer because of it. Elsewhere on the Old Continent, we have been painfully reminded that the transition to democracy can be a time of demagoguery and intolerance and that constitutional liberalism — the governing mechanisms of a democracy — is an indispensable component of the democratic peace. Nowhere is that clearer than in today’s Russia, where democratic institutions are still in the process of development. But the trends there are encouraging and in that lies our best hope for a peaceful future in Europe.

Standing Together

Joining with other nations in pursuit of some common goal is perhaps the most familiar example of cathedral-building statecraft. The coalition we assembled last fall to conduct the war against the Taliban and al-Qaida in Afghanistan helped to consolidate a growing consensus that the behavior of governments — even within their own borders — can be a threat to international peace and security, justifying intervention by the world community. And as such, it is but the latest in a series of precedents confirming U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan’s judgment that a new principle of international law is taking shape.

Yet despite its success in Afghanistan, the Bush administration has not made much use of this emerging rule of international behavior to support its policies elsewhere in the world, including the Middle East. Instead, it prefers to use the rhetoric of good and evil and the principle of the
right of self-defense to justify military intervention.

This reticence may spring from a concern that this principle could be misused, but a more likely reason is that the administration is allergic to the idea that international norms affect the behavior of nations. That skeptical view has a long and distinguished pedigree in the thinking of “realist” political philosophers. Yet the democratic principles that have bound the Western community of nations together for so many years seem to have a quality of permanence about them that makes one wonder whether the shifting sands of transitory coalitions can offer a better long-term approach to creating a peaceful order among nations. Coalitions are temporary, ad hoc affairs while common values, rules of behavior, and alliances that bind democracies one to the other are as enduring as anything can be in international affairs.

International solidarity was never more in evidence than in the reaction of ordinary people all over the world to the Sept. 11 attacks on New York and Washington. It was an unprecedented display of unity and sympathy. For the first time in its history, NATO invoked Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty, declaring that the attacks on New York and Washington were an assault on all the members of the alliance.

Yet less than a year later, the United States stood alone in the United Nations as the American ambassador vetoed the extension of a mandate for peacekeepers in Bosnia. Why? The United States, a non-party to the newly created International Criminal Court, had required an exemption from the court’s reach for any American citizen engaged in peacekeeping operations. And America’s closest friends — Canada, Mexico and all the European members of NATO — saw in this request a U.S.-imposed, self-serving amendment to the treaty establishing the International Criminal Court.

Do Americans and Europeans really have such different opinions about the importance of such issues? It is true that the European Union, having gained strength through pooling the sovereignties of its members, is now more willing to challenge the United States. Yet polls taken after the Sept. 11 attacks showed that huge majorities of Americans also favored multilateral responses to terrorism. More Americans in the fall of 2001 thought that top priority should be given to strengthening the United Nations than thought so four years earlier. And a poll taken in the fall of 1999 showed that 66 percent agreed that the United States should support an international criminal court.

I believe what we are seeing currently are policy differences driven by domestic politics, magnified by the writings of advocates of a frankly imperial role for the United States, rather than any fundamental change in attitude about the value of transatlantic solidarity.

Striking the Balance

Scholars have described the Jeffersonian legacy in American foreign policy as a tendency to oscillate between engaging in the world to make it look more like us or withdrawing from it to tend our own Garden of Eden. Now, it seems, isolationism is a thing of the past. Americans are too dependent on the rest of the world — and too aware that they are — ever again to withdraw into 1920s-style isolationism. We are all internationalists now.

So the new struggle in U.S. foreign policy seems to be between the poles of unilaterism (independence) and multilateralism (interdependence). Or to put it another way: do we have to accommodate ourselves to the conventions, rules, and norms of the international community, with all the constraints that entails, or can we act as though our interests and needs require freedom to accomplish our purposes — even if this results in declining support for the United States abroad?

The “realists” would have us believe that it is an open-and-shut case. But as our friends abroad know, it is not. We need to reflect, now and then, on how much of our influence comes from our nearly $400 billion annual defense budget and how much from our aspiration to be “a shining city on a hill.” Only a judicious balance between the ideas represented by the two
poles of independence and interdependence provides the basis for sound U.S. policy. Indeed, the genius of American diplomacy in the period following World War II was that it struck this balance in a way that made people want to be on our side.

Aiding this quest for balance is the fact that Americans tend to apply both moral standards and pragmatic thinking in foreign policy. "Grand designs" run against the grain but the rule of law resonates well, abroad as at home. Probably the closest President Clinton came to espousing a grand design was his genuine devotion to globalization, which he saw as the "central reality of our time." His administration was committed to promoting the rule of law on a global scale, through the rules of the World Trade Organization, to cite but one example. Similarly, the success of the negotiating team I led in 1993 in paving the way for the elimination of nuclear weapons in Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan owes something to the fact that the "norm" of nuclear non-proliferation had already sunk in everywhere and was being quite logically and vigorously reinforced, first by President George H. W. Bush, then by Clinton.

The Clinton administration was often criticized for using military force, either too readily or, as others saw it, too hesitantly. It was, in fact, only after much hesitation that President Clinton decided that certain principles of international behavior needed defending and that it was in the U.S. national interest to do so. In such cases he used American strength, amounting to hegemonic power, to imprint acceptable rules of behavior on recalcitrant governments. The Balkans are the best example of this, but Haiti is another. The relative success or failure of these efforts does not contradict the fact that order-building diplomacy, aimed at strengthening democratic value systems, was what the Clinton team was practicing.

In turning away from that approach from the beginning, with only a few exceptions (trade policy and relations with Latin America among them), the Bush administration's diplomacy had a consistency that is the hallmark of a carefully thought-out philosophy. The Bush team apparently believed, at least initially, that a stronger defense of American interests would be possible if the United States could drop the constraints of certain international agreements or multilateral obligations. Many in Congress, of course, saw things the same way. But even as early as June 2001, when he made his first trip to Europe, Bush used rhetoric that any traditional Atlanticist would endorse. A note of appreciation for the idea of an international community seemed to have crept into his official pronouncements.

We will never know whether it would have happened anyway, but after Sept. 11 there was a further course correction in the foreign policy of the administration. The president's energies were directed toward the war on terrorism and he believed that, as a wartime president, his administration would be defined by that. Personally involved day after day in dealings with foreign leaders, President Bush seemed to develop a new appreciation for the needs and concerns of other governments. He forged new security relationships with Pakistan and with the former Soviet republics of Central Asia. China's support for the war against terrorism was welcomed; and the administration's view of Beijing as the main competitor of the United States in the 21st century was much muted.

Some observers, myself included, quickly gave the president credit for this apparent realignment of his foreign policy. I thought that he had been convinced that international rules and norms are generally helpful to America's global interests. That judgment may have been premature, but it is undeniable that Bush has modified some of his positions from time to time in a direction that is congenial to those of us who see an interdependent world. He now accepts the need for nation-building and he has increased the U.S. budget for development aid very substantially. But he has gone the other way, too, on steel tariffs for example. So it is fair to say that his foreign policy is still a work in progress, as has often been the case with other administrations, even at this stage.

**Dreams of Empire**

The American democracy can only succeed in the international arena if it pursues a policy based on transparency, norms and rules, and steadiness in commitments. This is the American style, imposed on us by our history and culture. Any effort to act differently will not ring true, at home or abroad. To act differently we will have to turn into a different country.

Nevertheless, a rising chorus of mostly conservative voices insists that the salvation of this country can only be found in an explicit American policy of global hegemony. What they expect to achieve from such a policy is not entirely clear, however. Some argue that preventing the rise of peer competitors is the primary task of U.S. statecraft. Some, a little less ambitious, simply want to forestall hegemonic aspirations by rising powers. Others simply want to be rid of troublesome regimes or to settle old scores. Many of them agree that alliances are a good thing in principle because allies will refrain from building up competing military forces lest they lose their protector's favor. And, to the extent that these thinkers agree that international collaboration is sometimes required, they tend to
believe that the formation of limited, temporary coalitions is enough.

Yet such calls to arms ignore the moral and philosophical question of whether conscious, though muted, imperialism befits the American republic. There is also the practical issue of whether that option is even available to the United States on a sustained basis, or whether it would require budgets and actions that no administration is likely to propose and the American people would not willingly support.

Proponents of American hegemony also ignore the lessons of history. Henry Kissinger has written that “Bismarck was able in his lifetime to replace the philosophical constraints of the Metternich system with a policy of self-restraint. Because these nuances were not as self-evident to Bismarck’s successors and imitators, the literal application of Realpolitik led to their excessive dependence on military power, and from there to an armament race and two world wars.”

The hazards of repudiating constraints developed by the international community over decades are as real today as they were in the 19th century.

The character of the struggle in which we are now engaged requires modern military forces. Our allies in Europe and in Northeast Asia are second only to the United States in fielding highly capable militaries. Not least because of this, the struggle also demands a type of diplomacy that is multilateral and rules-based. There really is no other way. Combatting terrorism places a premium, after all, on asking other governments not only to observe but also to enforce norms of good behavior because it is in their — and our — national interest.

The current struggle tends to pit all legitimate governments against shadowy non-state entities. In essence, the world community is facing a new medievalism, that is, the privatization of large-scale violence coupled with fealty to movements that transcend frontiers. This is a clash between organizing principles for human society, between states and transnational militancy. If the states fail to act together to uphold the constraints imposed by international law and custom, the terrorists will win.

The Task Ahead

Thus, the next few years will be critical ones for the republic as the Bush administration and Congress together define the strategic approach that this country will take as it enters a new era, one that can no longer simply be defined as the “post-Cold War.” Many of the issues we face as a nation involve the basic terms on which we choose to be involved in the world. Do we see ourselves as part of a community of nations or as essentially alone — free of “foreign entanglements” and their obligations? The United States in the early 21st century has become so powerful that it is in a position to act with few constraints, except those imposed by the American people. And for this reason, foreign policy must and almost certainly will receive a higher priority among the concerns
of our elected representatives at all levels as they grapple with the challenges already before us:

- Can we fight transnational terrorism successfully as the leader of a league of democratic states without compromising our principles or theirs?
- Can we achieve a stable peace in Europe by strengthening the transatlantic relationship and by promoting conditions that will permit Russia to become a “normal” European country?
- Can we achieve a global equilibrium in which strategic restraint and shared interests as well as military power carry part of the load?
- Can we proceed with globalization with the assurance that it will not widen the gap between the rich and the poor?
- Can we strengthen our capacity to deal with intra-state conflicts, especially humanitarian catastrophes?
- Can we minimize the threats that unbridled regional arms races involving weapons of mass destruction pose to international peace and security?

Whether our nation will be successful in confronting these and many other global issues depends on whether the Bush administration’s practice of rule-based, order-building diplomacy becomes more the habit than the exception. We can be optimistic about that because the tradition of the rule of law runs very deep in American society. As a part of a balanced policy, American insistence on norms, rules, and institutions has achieved great results — great for us and great for the world.

The post-World War II evolution of Europe and Northeast Asia and the creation of the United Nations and international financial institutions are examples of this enlightened self-interest. But there is much more to be done. We need to get on with cathedral-building.
OUTLASTING THE BASTARDS

Cursed is the Peacemaker: The American Diplomat Versus the Israeli General, Beirut 1982

REVIEWED BY ARNIE SCHIFFERDECKER

Cursed is the Peacemaker: The American Diplomat Versus the Israeli General, Beirut 1982 is an overdue paean to the life and work of the late FSO Philip Habib. John Boykin's masterful analysis of Habib's crowning achievement, walking Israeli Defense Minister Ariel Sharon back from his disastrous 1982 invasion of Lebanon, ought to be required reading for anyone dealing with the Middle East.

After covering Habib's upbringing in a Lebanese-American family living among Orthodox Jews in Brooklyn and his education as a forester in Idaho, Boykin then details his rapid rise through the Foreign Service to under secretary of State for political affairs under Henry Kissinger. Habib retired from the Service in 1980 due to persistent heart problems, but was brought back two years later as a special envoy to the Middle East.

In June 1982, Israeli Defense Minister Ariel Sharon had used then-Secretary of State Alexander Haig's virtual "green light" to send Israeli Defense Forces into Lebanon, ostensibly to protect Israel's northern border. The IDF then drove into the suburbs of East Beirut, linking up with Bashir Gemayal's murderous Phalange militia in a bid to destroy the PLO and oust Syria from Lebanon, turning it into an Israeli fiefdom.

Working with his small staff of FSOs and career ambassadors in the region and reworking his official instructions when necessary, Habib built a series of "understandings" piece by piece for the removal of the PLO from Lebanon and the stand-down of IDF troops. With Haig's forced resignation on June 25, 1982, and replacement by George Shultz, Habib got considerably more coherent support from Washington, but the Israeli siege of Beirut continued to exacerbate the situation.

Boykin's account of Habib's brusque but effective tactics, based on recently declassified documents and interviews with key U.S. diplomats, amounts to a virtual school on diplomacy. Habib's strengths lay in his absolute integrity, grasp of detail, logic and patience — and forcefulness. When he hit a stumbling block, he habitually raised his voice, using colorful, earthy language — just to let his interlocutors know that he was serious, he later recounted. But according to Boykin, Habib saved his most towering rages for those he believed had lied to him, frequently accusing Sharon of playing fast and loose with the facts and trying to undermine his peacemaking mission.

Ultimately, Habib's persistence ("outlasting the bastards," as he called it) in shuttling through mine fields — diplomatically and literally — enabled him to defuse the immediate crisis. Boykin gives a riveting account of the many snags Habib and his colleagues overcame to implement the painstakingly complex arrangements for the PLO's evacuation from Beirut. Shortly thereafter, Sharon and his Phalangist allies covered themselves in shame through their invasion of West Beirut and wanton murders of hundreds of innocent Palestinian civilians in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps. Although Sharon's Lebanese adventure was then cut short by a chagrined Israeli political leadership, he managed to save his political skin to live and fight another day.

Sadly, by the time a grateful President Reagan awarded Habib the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest U.S. civilian honor, in September 1982, his exhausted special envoy had expended most of his personal and political capital in the region. In subsequent missions he was unable to prevent the savage outbreaks of Lebanese in-fighting nor the murderous 1983 attacks on the American embassy and U.S. Marines in Beirut. Nonetheless, Phil Habib's courage and indefatigable pursuit of
peace, taken at great cost to his health (he died in 1992 during a private visit to France), redefined and expanded the practice of diplomacy, inspiring an entire generation of Foreign Service officers. Boykin’s account is worthy of close study by today’s policy-makers.

Retired FSO Arnie Schifferdecker is a member of the Journal’s Editorial Board.

Diplomacy 101

Bilateral Diplomacy

REVIEWED BY EDWARD MARKS

Judged by its unpretentious title, Bilateral Diplomacy might initially appear to be a mere stocking-stuffer, a mere primer for newcomers to the profession of diplomacy. But upon closer examination, it turns out to be a comprehensive survey of the subject that far outshines most other examples of the genre.

Over the course of a 35-year career, its author, Kishan S. Rana, served as India’s ambassador to Algeria, Czechoslovakia, Kenya, Mauritius and Germany, as well as its consul general in San Francisco. In addition to that extensive experience, he spent six months organizing and managing a diplomatic training program for Namibia shortly after that country obtained its independence and has written extensively on various aspects of diplomacy, including a study of the Indian Foreign Service. Thus he knows whereof he speaks and does so clearly and comprehensively.

The book is well organized, divided into four sections (Purposes, Institutions, Methods and Conclusions) preceded by an introduction entitled “Why Bilateral Relations?” which could stand by itself as a useful essay. In it the author succinctly reviews the old debates as to whether diplomacy is an art or a science, and whether diplomatic skills can be taught or only acquired by practice. He is convinced that diplomacy can be taught, or that at least “there are standard methods that need to be set out in descriptive form and learnt in training programs. These create a frame of reference...”

The 16 chapters methodically cover a wide range of subjects: the work done by embassies and consulates to strengthen bilateral relations, diplomatic reporting, negotiating strategies and performance evaluations. He also speculates about future trends in diplomacy.

Each chapter includes sidebars with examples and amplifications and concludes with a number of questions obviously designed for teaching purposes, plus references and extensive, substantive notes. For instance, the chapter on embassies and consulates includes questions such as “What are the tasks of junior officials in the mission?” and “How do the duties of the DCM differ from those of the counselor?” The writing is clear and free of academic jargon, a model of good drafting.

Although obviously based on the author’s personal experience, the discussion ranges over the experience of many countries and is free of any special pleading or national bias. The chapter on performance includes discussion of the German as well as the American inspection system, French ambassadors’ instructions, U.S. mission program plans, British experimentation with corporate techniques,
and Singapore’s “cutting edge” administrative concepts.

As Rana notes, his book is designed for “students of diplomacy at academic institutions who are interested in practical issues and particularly young diplomats who are under training or at the early phase of their careers.” It would indeed be useful as a part of FSI’s still essentially non-substantive A-100 curriculum, for orientation background for political appointees to the State Department (department appointments as well as ambassadors) and the interested general public. It would also benefit media contacts, many of whom obviously do not believe that knowledge of diplomatic theory and practice is a requirement for writing about those subjects.

Retired FSO Edward Marks is a member of the Journal’s Editorial Board.

The Days of Bill and Boris

The Russia Hand: A Memoir of Presidential Diplomacy

REVIEWED BY
BENJAMIN R. JUSTESSEN

The Russia Hand: A Memoir of Presidential Diplomacy promises much: an insider’s view of foreign policy during the Clinton years, told by the president’s key confidant and long-time personal friend. Disappointingly, it mirrors both the flaws of the administration and the leader it describes and the deadline-driven shallowness of most modern journalism. Its breezy tone alternates between irreverence and occasional cattiness, while its long verbatim quotes from conversations might just as well have been tape-recorded.

Yet it is far from a bad read, thanks to Talbott’s sharp eye for detail and subdued-yet-gossipy prose. This is no “tell-all” book, however. Primly alluding to the Monica Lewinsky scandal, for example, Talbott simply notes that “The uproar it caused seemed to have little effect on Clinton’s standing abroad. Foreign leaders and publics alike tended to shake their heads at the whole frenzy and hope that it would subside.”

Likewise, he ignores reports of outright rancor toward his own candidacy to succeed Warren Christopher in 1996, when certain senators reportedly blackballed him, privately calling him “the uncrowned king” of State. Instead, he emphasizes how much he enjoyed his successful, dutiful relationships with “Chris” and “Madeleine,” as he often calls them.

With similar loyalty, Talbott struggles throughout the book to maintain the polite fiction that Clinton was the “Russia hand” of his title, insisting that the president’s “personal diplomacy” with Boris Yeltsin was “frequent and intense.” What seems clear, instead, is that Russian politics showed up only episodically on Clinton’s radar screen, and even more rarely stirring him intellectually. Indeed, Clinton’s virtual absence from the stage for long stretches is puzzling. Talbott fills some of the resulting vacuum by detailing Yeltsin’s problems with health, alcoholism and private scandal, and other racy morsels about foreign diplomats.

The roller-coaster relationship between the two leaders is effectively the memoir’s unifying thread. Yet the very fact that “Bill” and “Ol’ Boris” met 15 times (often contentious; during the 1999 NATO bombing of Serbia, Yeltsin all but cursed Clinton over the telephone) over seven years may say far more about Clinton’s apparent personal fascination with “Ol’ Boris” than with the intricacies of the two nations’ sudden emergence from enmity — as if Yeltsin were part court jester to a lonely, isolated Clinton. What personal bond the two very different men might have shared remains a mystery.

After Yeltsin’s retirement in 1999, Clinton’s waning interest in things Russian grew cold almost overnight. Perhaps it just wasn’t fun anymore. Yeltsin’s successor, Vladimir Putin, was polite but unwilling to cultivate Clinton, obviously preferring to wait for a successor. The stinging letdown left Clinton oddly philosophical; his comments ranged only from irritation at being patronized to perplexed humor at Putin’s tactics. “Either he’s dense or thinks I am,” Clinton muttered before rushing off to get a farewell bear hug from Yeltsin.

Intentionally or not, this memoir only reinforces the conventional wisdom that Talbott himself was the administration’s real expert on Russian affairs, even after stepping up to the more demanding portfolio of deputy secretary at State. He had, after all, been an expert on the Russian language and the current Russian political state ever since his days as Clinton’s Oxford roommate. His encyclopedic grasp of the ups and downs of Russia’s government — the endless parade of Yeltsin’s prime ministers among them — is genuinely impressive.

Sadly, as the decline of its name-sake unfolds, The Russia Hand loses most of its credibility as a memoir, and borders instead on parody. At the end, we have been duly entertained, but are hardly wiser for the ride.
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"We’re on a tiger hunt and we’re not afraid." That song of childish bravado is actually about lions, not tigers, but it kept echoing in my head as we trooped through the tall grass of the mangrove swamps of southwest Bangladesh: home to the Bengal tiger.

Well, maybe we were a little anxious.

Of course, we were not literally hunting any tigers. Rather, we were on a photographic expedition, hoping to catch sight of them.

Dense forest bordered an expanse of grassland where tigers could easily camouflage themselves and lie in wait for a quick pounce on an unsuspecting deer or tourist. "Oh, that looks like a juicy one, the one with the glasses," I imagined the tiger to be saying to itself as I nervously scanned the jungle just to the right of the padu.

Before embarking on our trip, I had read an article detailing the tiger’s unique hunting capabilities: “finely adapted stalk-and-ambush hunters,” “powerful jaws and legendary canines,” “… their striped coloration blends into shadows of forest edge and dry grasses.” The article went on to state that each adult tiger needed to consume 6,600 pounds of prey a year. I hoped that we wouldn’t be the next meal for one of them.

Our guide, on loan from one of the Sundarbans forest outposts, was nervous and didn’t want us to go further. In addition to being nervous, he had a disconcerting habit of clearing his throat and spitting, a custom obnoxious to Americans but common to many parts of the world, particularly South Asia. I silently referred to him as Mr. Hack’n’Spit.

Mr. Hack’n’Spit was unarmed as were the rest of us. Normally, two guides with rifles are assigned to accompany each tourist group. The forest service could spare only one man for our protection. Regulations required that two rangers could carry rifles, but not one, so our one guide came unarmed. Could someone explain the logic of that?

Coincidentally, just that morning, the BBC radio news had reported that only 284 Bengal tigers remain in the mangrove swamps of the Sundarbans, mostly in the Indian portion of the nature preserve. Saving the tiger from extinction seems like a futile endeavor with the loss of their habitat and food sources and with the poaching of the big cats themselves for their supposed medicinal and curative properties.

Selfishly, I suppose, each person in our group hoped to catch a glimpse of a Bengal tiger so he could say that he had seen one in the wild. While waiting and hoping, we were regaled with the bird life of the Sundarbans, both indigenous and migratory: brilliantly colored kingfishers, bee-eaters, elegant, long-necked white egrets, and the stately Brahminy kites which reeled overhead and seemed at times to escort us. We also saw crocodiles, monkeys, gangetic dolphins and chital (spotted deer, which some claim to be the most beautiful of the deer family). We even heard the bark of the elusive barking deer, one of the more diminutive deer species.

Although we saw plenty of paw prints and fresh feces, evidence of their presence in the area, the elusive Bengal tiger eluded us on this trip. Perhaps the tiger is wise to avoid humans, for human contact with this magnificent animal seems only to point to its eventual demise. Again, the line from that childhood song comes to mind, "... and we’re not afraid." We should be afraid. Afraid of forever losing one of creation’s most regal species: the tiger.
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