Make a tax-deductible planned gift to AFSA and help Foreign Service families make college more affordable for their children.

The AFSA Scholarship Fund has helped deserving students every year since 1926 receive a college education by providing need-based financial aid scholarships and merit achievement awards. With a scholarship in your name, or in memory of a loved one, your family becomes an integral part of the AFSA Scholarship Program, and student recipients will learn about your connection to the Foreign Service.

Give back to the profession that has served you well.
For more information on AFSA Planned Giving, call (202) 944-5504 or email scholar@afsa.org.

AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATION
2101 E STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20037

WWW.AFSA.ORG/SCHOLAR
Understanding the Risks of Uninsured Motorists Across Different Countries

Unemployment and recent economic sluggishness has caused an alarming spike in the number of uninsured motorists across the globe, according to Reuters. These uninsured drivers represent a growing danger to Foreign Service members, who already have the challenge of adapting to unfamiliar roadways with each new overseas assignment.

Reported Accidents on the Rise

In the U.S., uninsured drivers represent over 12% of all drivers, while around the globe, the percentage of those uninsured or under-insured could be double or triple this figure. What would this mean for you and your family? Such a large uninsured driving population poses a troublesome threat in the form of expensive potential repairs, liability, and other expenses which would not be covered by insurance.

For example, while driving on the notoriously safe roadways of Panama City, a Foreign Service officer on assignment in Central America was hit while driving his 2012 RAV4 by a local vehicle. The local driver immediately fled the scene after the collision, leaving the FSO with a severely damaged vehicle. With no Uninsured Motorist coverage, the out-of-pocket cost to repair the wrecked car was nearly $10,000.

To protect against serious financial risks in the event of a collision (as in the example above), Foreign Service members should ensure their auto insurance policies include Uninsured Motorist (UM) coverage.

About UM Coverage

UM insurance is intended to compensate for financial losses as a result of the negligence of an uninsured, underinsured, or hit-and-run driver. Coverage would provide payment for any damage, mechanical as well as cosmetic, caused to your vehicle by an uninsured driver. Local nationals, particularly in underdeveloped countries, only have minimum coverage with very low payout amounts — and they have no assets that could be taken in a civil lawsuit.

Protect Your Vehicle

To prevent tens of thousands of dollars in out-of-pocket repair costs, FSOs have an interest in securing the proper auto insurance that reflects the realities of their base countries. While it is impossible to control others on the road, it is possible to proactively protect your vehicle with Uninsured Motorist coverage. If you plan to drive abroad, or are already doing so, consult with a specialized international insurance provider, like Clements Worldwide, to ensure you have this critical coverage.

PREPARE TO GO ABROAD

In addition to Uninsured Motorist coverage at no extra cost, Clements’ international car insurance can include comprehensive, collision, theft, and liability coverage to keep you protected during foreign assignments. In addition you should ask for the following benefits:

- **Political Violence Coverage** — covers loss due to malicious damage such as riots, civil commotion, and acts of terrorism
- **Accident Forgiveness** — your low rate stays the same even after your first accident
- **Worldwide Liability Protection** — you’ll still be covered if an accident-related case follows you back home
- **Universal Coverage** — policy adjusts to any minimum local liability requirement
- **Transit Coverage** — all-risk, from departure to arrival
- **Fast & Efficient Claim Processing** — reimbursements paid in USD and other major currencies

In order to protect yourself, your family, and your property, go to clements.com/FSJ to get a free, instant quote and purchase your policy online. Bonus: With Clements, you get a special discount.

* Based on date from the Insurance Information Institute and the Insurance Research Council.
WORRIED ABOUT ACCIDENTS ABROAD?

WITH US, YOU DON’T.

ARE YOU COVERED?

With Clements Worldwide, you are. Other insurers may hike your rates after your first accident abroad. Not us. With our Accident Forgiveness protection, you can have peace of mind that your coverage will keep you safe from worries, anywhere in the world.

As the trusted Foreign Service insurer for more than 67 years, Clements provides you the auto insurance you deserve. We automatically include Political Violence and Transit protection—others may not. And you can count on our unsurpassed claims-handling and customer service to always be there for you.

So, don’t worry. Contact us today for a free quote.

Visit clements.com/FSJ
or call us at +1.800.872.0067
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Preface: The Foreign Service is a diverse, rotating cast of characters. Perhaps you will find a familiar face in this column, inspired by the chancery scene in the John Le Carré novel, *A Small Town in Germany*. Thank you for the privilege of serving as your president for the past two years. Let’s all support the incoming team led by Barbara Stephenson.

The weekly meeting took place as usual at ten o’clock on Friday. It had the air of a religious procession, with the congregants filing in to take their anointed seats around the table. The staff aide performed a silent roll call to ensure everyone was in place before the ambassador arrived.

The deputy chief of mission as usual joined just as the last of the congregants was seated. “Did you see the item in the papers this morning about the deaths from vodka poisoning?” The DCM nodded, “Whah’s Filly?” The station chief was missing but would no doubt turn up later in the morning.

The ambassador arrived and set a business-like tone. These proceedings were more about lateral coordination than top-down communication, and she wanted to hear from the counselors.

The political counselor, on her left, went first. On his third overseas tour and recently arrived from deputy directorship of the country desk, Rawley was the youngest in the room, except for the staff aide. His briefing on the political groups behind the week’s demonstrations was fluent but lacked the intimate insights gained from extended on-the-ground contacts. That would come in time. The DCM was taking mental notes for an upcoming mentoring session.

Fernandez was the public affairs counselor. At 62, still radiating strength dating to halcyon days as a campus organizer of protests against South African apartheid, he built on Rawley’s briefing, talking about young leaders in the opposition identified for embassy exchange programs. Fernandez was wrapping up a 35-year career organizing public diplomacy events on four continents.

After the RSO and Consul General detailed new security and Amcit notification measures, USAID Mission Director Forcier described his visit to a health clinic project in the ethnic minority community supporting the demonstrations. Forcier had acted as Rawley’s embassy sponsor, with introductions around post and to the best grocery shopping and cheap restaurants. Forcier was a key factor in Rawley and family getting off to a good start.

“Now for something completely different,” Crabbe called out. He took the next spot as economic counselor and focused on support for U.S. export firms in-country, a theme picked up by the commercial and agricultural counselors, with differing emphases. Those three are well coordinated, thought the DCM, making a note to ask Crabbe to be acting in August.

Colonel Kaplan, the military attaché, seemed stressed. He spoke only of the many visitors on the horizon. Each U.S. delegation, headed by a senior general, wanted a meeting with the country’s chief of staff, and there was danger of overkill. The ambassador said she would meet with Kaplan and the DCM to prioritize and rationalize the meeting requests.

“Raise your hand if you have completed the annual conflict of interest disclosure form due today?” Only the ambassador and DCM raised their hands. Jalokby, the management counselor, sighed. She was sure the ambassador’s OMS had helped. “I am reporting the rest of you to Washington.” Jalokby had a way of getting action; she had grown up in the Foreign Service and knew the culture better than anyone else at post.

The final voice around the table was von Klemm, the community liaison officer who happened to be Fernandez’s husband. He announced the next CLO outing to a reptile petting zoo; all embassy children were invited. Parents needed to sign liability waivers.

The proceedings were winding down as the ambassador wished all a good summer weekend. It was time to go back to the office and get things done.

Be well, stay safe and keep in touch,

Bob

SilvermanR@state.gov

Robert J. Silverman is the president of the American Foreign Service Association.
Educating *the* Whole Person

In addition to the hard work that takes place inside the classroom, students at Georgetown University in Qatar participate in various sports and social activities, take part in community service initiatives, engage in research projects, and intern for organizations in government, international banking, consulting, journalism, and many other fields. The University offers a Bachelor of Science in Foreign Service (B.S.F.S.) degree in the following majors:

- International Politics
- International Economics
- Culture and Politics
- International History

[qatar.sfs.georgetown.edu]  [+974 4457 8100]
"Diplomacy is always going to consist to some extent of serving people who do not know that they are being served, who do not know that they need to be served, who misunderstand and occasionally abuse the very effort to serve them."

George Kennan, May 1961 FSJ

Diplomats have long been the unsung heroes of international relations. As George Kennan famously observed, no bands will ever play for the Foreign Service. Our profession is and has always been misunderstood, if thought of at all, by the American public. The Foreign Service Acts of 1946 and 1980 call for the United States to have a professional diplomatic corps, but the implementation of that goal frequently bends to the political winds.

For all these reasons, the institution seems to be in a perpetual existential crisis. So in this issue, we consider the current state (pun not intended) of the Foreign Service and the diplomatic profession today. Just how bad are things? Is the Service truly in crisis and, if so, is the situation indeed more serious than in the past?

First, American Academy of Diplomacy President Ronald Neumann, a distinguished three-time ambassador, summarizes AAD’s latest report, American Diplomacy at Risk. Released in April, the study sounds the alarm about a Foreign Service under increasing threat. Its authors lay out the problems—in particular, the degradation of the role of Foreign Service officers in the policy process due to a variety of factors, including an influx of political appointees and non-career officials. They then offer a set of 23 specific recommendations for renewing the career Foreign Service’s role in formulating and implementing U.S. foreign policy.

We shared links to the report and the recommendations with AFSA members, and you will find their feedback in the compilation, “Continuing the Conversation.” The specialists we heard from were particularly unhappy that their role was only given a one-line nod, even as the report devoted considerable space to assessing the Civil Service.

This touches on a central theme that deserves further discussion: how to define the “diplomacy team.” Who gets to be on that team, and how do we reconcile the need for a truly professional Foreign Service with the reality that diplomacy is being carried out more broadly by more types of agents than ever before?

In this month’s Speaking Out column, “America Needs a Professional Foreign Service,” retired Ambassador Charlie Ray poses a different question: Is the Foreign Service a profession? His answer may surprise you.

Next, we hear from the head of the brand-new British Diplomatic Academy, Jon Davies, who shares the goals and plans for this first-ever institution—much of it actually online—to educate and train members of the British Foreign Service. The opportunity for collaboration between the United States and the United Kingdom in diplomatic training has never been greater.

In “Five Things You Should Know about the QDDR,” FSO Chris Degnan brings us back to the United States and the current state of the Foreign Service, offering a look at the strategic plan for the State Department and USAID. Here’s hoping some may find inspiration there.

Finally, we share the full text of the George Kennan article I quoted at the start of this column, “On Diplomacy As a Profession.” Based on a speech Kennan gave at AFSA, it was published in the May 1961 Foreign Service Journal.

As promised last month, and as a follow-up to our April focus on Vietnam, we bring you “Uncovering the Lessons of Vietnam,” including two 1975 Lessons Learned memos—one by State FSOS, the other by Henry Kissinger. They illustrate two very different interpretations of what one could, or could not, learn from the American involvement in the Vietnam War. We discovered the memos thanks to Ambassador David Lambertson, who drafted the State memo. State Department Historian Steve Randolph frames the two pieces with a useful intro.

In “Surviving Al-Jazeera and Other Public Calamities,” FSO Alberto Fernandez deconstructs the uproar over one comment he made in an interview with Al-Jazeera, offering insight into the art and craft of speaking publicly today.

Help us keep the conversation about the state of the Foreign Service going; send letters to journal@afsa.org or submit a Speaking Out column.
Obsession with Security

Kudos to Jim Bullock for his provocatively written piece questioning the ever-growing security budget and the preoccupation with security at State.

Bullock knows what he is talking about. I served with him in Baghdad, where “Mr. Out and About” should have been his position description. There are no better officers serving this country than Jim Bullock.

Our obsession with security has paralleled the expansion of the U.S. military in the Middle East. The 1991 Persian Gulf War was the most visible example of the U.S. government’s steady retreat from global engagement since Vietnam. As a commercial officer in the region from 1981 through 2002, I watched this inexorable shift of power from State to the Defense Department with great dismay.

The trajectory of USAID since 1975 is an excellent barometer of these shifts.

Everyone, especially our generals, says we “cannot just kill everyone,” and no one says most of the conflicts in today’s world can (or will) be solved by force. Tragically, nobody seems to want to engage in the kind of commitment the civilian side of conflict resolution requires.

Worse, Congress does not seem interested in altering the funding and related policy priorities to energize a new vision of U.S. civilian diplomatic international engagement. And that is not a pretty picture for U.S. diplomacy, as Jim Bullock so articulately explains.

Charles Kestenbaum
FSO, retired
Former AFSA FCS VP (1997-1999)
Vienna, Virginia

Out of the Cold

Thank you for publishing the remarkable poem by Jim Owen, “Coming Out of the Cold” (May FSJ), which evokes with grace and humor how a 12-year-old coped with the xenophobia of Moscow in the 1950s.

Jim’s poem brought to mind a passage from George Kennan’s memoirs, in which he describes an incident that occurred a few days before the abrupt and wrenching end of his brief tour as ambassador in Moscow in 1952.

A spontaneous playful encounter between his 2-year-old child and a group of friendly Russian children was sternly broken up by the Russian embassy guards.

“It was a small episode, but it came at the end of a difficult and nerve-wracking summer,” Kennan writes.

“And something gave way, at that point, with the patience I was able to observe in the face of this entire vicious, timid, medieval regime of isolation to which the official foreigner in Moscow was still subjected. Had I been the perfect ambassador it would not, I suppose, have given way. But give way it did, and it could not soon be restored.”

Within 48 hours, Kennan had publicly compared serving in Moscow with internment by the Nazi regime. His ambassadorship was at an end.

What makes Jim Owen’s and George Kennan’s experiences of more than just literary or historical interest is the renewed groundswell of anti-foreign sentiment that has been building in recent years in Russia.

Most recently, the passage of “undesirable organization” legislation by the Duma marks an escalation of the regime’s efforts to foment a climate of suspicion about contact with foreigners.

Perhaps Jim Owen’s poem should be included in briefing materials for current assignees to Russia.

Bob Rackmales
Senior FSO, retired
Northport, Maine

State’s Equality Efforts

On April 16, I was shocked and saddened to read comments from GLIFAA and its president in an article titled “Gay Diplomats Say State Department Is Failing Their Families,” published on BuzzFeed.com.

Having served in the Marine Corps under “don’t ask, don’t tell” for many years before starting my career in the Foreign Service in 2009, I feel that GLIFAA has completely misrepresented the incredible determination the State Department has put into being an inclusive and welcoming employer for its entire workforce.

As diplomats, most of us are aware that functioning in a multinational and multicultural world comes with limitations. The United States pushes its agenda abroad, recognizing that we will not be able to realize all of our goals at once.

I remember how proud I was when I read the first demarche that advocated the accreditation of gay employees’ spouses and pushed foreign governments to treat their own gay citizens better. This was a huge step, because it meant that LGBT issues were now officially included as a U.S. foreign policy objective.

The principal complaint voiced by GLIFAA was the inability of people to live (and I assume that means openly and without harassment) in all posts worldwide. This is a worthy goal, but it is not just gay men and women who are limited by conditions overseas.

Families are separated for security...
reasons at high-threat posts. Special-needs families are limited to posts that have quality care. Colleagues with medical issues are limited to posts that have adequate health care facilities or from which they can be quickly evacuated.

We cannot order a foreign government to change; we can only advise and act as an example.

Bidding is a negotiation, and there are positives and negatives for all posts. I am currently in Haiti after assignments in Algiers and Islamabad. I was married the entire time. Islamabad was an unaccompanied post. In Algiers, the State Department pushed on behalf of my spouse, then offered to pay me involuntary separate maintenance allowance because of the country’s refusal to grant diplomatic accreditation to same-sex spouses.

That gesture showed a willingness to take care of an employee and his family in the face of discrimination by a foreign government.

I worked with the task force that Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton stood up when the decision was first taken to make same-sex spouses eligible family members. GLIFAA is not the only point of contact in the State Department for gay issues.

Again, I wish to express my full support for the efforts of the Bureau of Human Resources team and the entire State Department leadership. Many others, I believe a majority of State employees, share my point of view. The department is a leader when it comes to LGBT inclusion in the workforce. I am honored to be a part of the Foreign Service and look forward to many future years of happy employment.

Antonio G. Agnone
FSO
Embassy Port-au-Prince

Empowering Women in Nepal

There are many initiatives to help Nepal after the devastating earthquakes, but I would like to share a story that spotlights the State Department.

Under Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, a program was launched to support female leaders around the world. These women are selected from developing countries to receive training for a few weeks during the summer at participating U.S. women’s colleges to advance their work back home.

Last May, I was delighted to meet the women leaders of 2014. Radha Paudel had been chosen from Nepal. Her English was not great, but she benefited tremendously from the training in project development and management during the summer program.

After the course, Ms. Paudel visited me in San Diego before returning to Nepal. I learned that she is a nurse who was selected for the award due to her selfless work to bring health care to women and children in the most remote regions of Nepal—Jumla and Karnali—through her nongovernmental organization, Action Works Nepal (www.actionworksnepal.com).

She single-handedly reduced the high number of women dying in childbirth, set up the first clinic in the area and started classes on hygiene and empowerment for local women and girls. She also helped the women start a small tea-growing business.

I visited Nepal again later in the year, and threw a tea in her honor in Kathmandu to celebrate her selection for the State Department award. I invited the U.S. embassy’s USAID deputy and heads of some NGOs (which are run primarily by women of the highest caste).

Ms. Paudel told me that they had refused to meet with her previously because her “skin was too dark.” Despite the tea and few attendees, she has kept working on behalf of women and girls without significant Nepalese or American support.

This was all before the earthquakes. Thankfully, she finally responded to my emails. She survived both quakes, but no housing is safe in the village she is in. The people are in dire need of everything, and she is there trying to help as the only outside person on the spot.

I consider her to be a true leader and heroine.

Marilyn J. Bruno
FSO, retired
Former State Rep on the AFSA
Governing Board (1997-2000)
Oceanside, California

Correction

In “Diplomatic Security Triage in a Dangerous World” by Anthony Quainton in the May Foreign Service Journal, we printed an Associated Press photo of the front of Embassy Dar es Salaam after the August 1998 terrorist bombing. The caption identified the two men in the photo as a U.S. Marine and an FBI investigator, which is the information provided with the purchased photo.

An attentive reader alerted us to the fact that the “FBI investigator” (in the maroon shirt) is actually Regional Security Officer John DiCarlo, now retired.

RSO DiCarlo had arrived at post only days before the Aug. 7, 1998, attack, but noticed right away that the local guards were not operating the vehicle sally port.
He instructed them to open only one entry/exit gate at a time, instead of both.

This change in procedure surprised the bombers (they had surveyed the site earlier) and prevented them from getting as far into the compound as they had planned, saving American and local employees’ lives.

We salute RSO DiCarlo, and regret the error in identifying him. ■

Share your thoughts about this month’s issue.
Submit letters to the editor.
journal@afsa.org

5K Fun Run &
Welcome Back Picnic

Sunday, September 20, 2015
5K Fun Run – 3:00 - 4:00 PM
Picnic – 4:00 - 6:30 PM
Nottoway Park
9601 Courthouse Road
Vienna, Virginia

All are Invited: Gather your FS friends for food and fun, and a family friendly 5K run at the park. Join FSYF as we welcome home FS families returning from overseas.
Please bring a side dish or dessert to share.
For more information contact FSYF:
703-731-2960 www.fsfy.org
Public Diplomacy Awardees Cited for Creativity, Courage

Winners of the 18th annual Public Diplomacy Alumni Association awards for innovative and effective PD strategies were honored on May 3 in Washington, D.C.

The eight awardees, chosen from nominations from State Department posts in every region of the world, demonstrated creativity, courage and tenacity in addressing critical issues ranging from Ebola in Africa and women’s rights issues in Afghanistan to electronic messaging in China and trade agreements in Europe.

Award winner Said has managed the first American Corner in Afghanistan since 2004. Despite physical attacks and threats on his life and his family, he expanded women’s participation at the Corner from almost non-existent to more than 28,000 in 2014.

He organized roundtables where female experts led discussions on issues ranging from education and computer skills to stopping violence against women, countering violent extremism and promoting democratic values.

“He is the heart of what we do around the world,” said Jean Manes, principal deputy coordinator in the Bureau of International Information Programs, in accepting the award for Said.

Outstanding work on Ebola garnered five awards. Kimberly Phelan-Royston and Emily Green from Embassy Conakry, Sally Hodgson and Molly Westrate from Embassy Monrovia and Hollyn Green from Embassy Freetown were hailed for developing and implementing public health messaging campaigns that helped mitigate the transmission of Ebola.

Their work included utilizing local radio stations, creating survivor videos and comic books, sending out public health voicemails and partnering with both local religious leaders and traditional healers to help inform both rural and urban populations.

In Guangzhou, Consul General Jennifer Zimdahl Galt was recognized for her exceptional work in overcoming the Chinese government’s ironclad restrictions and expanding the U.S. government’s presence on such major Chinese social media websites as Weibo, WeChat and Youku (“YouTube”), primarily through her hashtag #CG Galt. Galt’s frequent posts, written in fluent Chinese, reached an estimated 1.2 million Chinese followers.

FSO Thao Anh Tran, who nominated Galt and accepted the award on her behalf, noted that Galt’s posts “carved out a space for Chinese to debate controversial issues in an environment of otherwise pervasive censorship... and established a foundation for effective outreach for future generations of public professional and government officials operating in China.”

Misinformation about what trade agreements can and cannot do is widespread, whether in the United States or abroad. But Trade Officer Angela Palazzolo spearheaded the development and implementation of Mission Poland’s Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership public outreach strategy so effectively that it was cited as a best practice by the department and incorporated into a pilot program for three other European posts.

In Washington to accept the award, Palazzolo said that to counter “anti-globalization forces” she held press conferences, conducted roundtables and gave speeches. She also created an advocacy group, “Friends of T-TIP,” consisting of Polish contacts who ran coordinated social media campaigns to distribute information and counter negative messaging during the negotiations.

PDAA (www.publicdiplomacy.org) is a volunteer, nonprofit organization of current and former State Department, broadcast, academic and private-sector public diplomacy professionals. Its mission is to foster understanding, recognition of and support for public diplomacy through educational and social activities.

—Susan Brady Maitra,
Managing Editor
Foreign Service Furniture: The Good, the Bad and the Just Plain Ugly

In the Foreign Service, there is the good, the bad and the ugly—post furniture, that is. So popular is the topic that a simple Google search of “Foreign Service furniture” yields hundreds of results. Here are a few that caught our eye.

One common thread of contention resurfaces frequently: the plain ugliness of State-provided Drexel furniture. Luckily, there are some creative workarounds.

- An FS spouse, Liz, of Adaptation House has a list of “Drexel Hacks.” She explains how to camouflage furniture, like the Drexel “Queen Anne” bookshelves, with a tension rod and fabric and even how to make a headboard with cardboard boxes. She suggests temporary furniture modifications like swapping out dated draw pulls with modern ones.
- FSO Victoria Reppert’s Tunisian home was spotlighted on the popular blog Design Sponge. When decorating, she utilizes the host country’s interior design trends and breaks up big rooms by using screens. She uses muted slipcovers to hide the dated State-provided couches—a tip repeated by many other FS bloggers.
- Hardship Homemaking is a collaborative blog effort to “make life overseas at hardship posts easier.” Tips shared include how to temporarily reupholster chairs with nothing more than a screwdriver and fabric.
- There’s even an entire Pinterest board, “Foreign Service-friendly decorating,” dedicated to ways to repurpose furniture and add flair to your home at post.
- Perhaps you’ve accepted your fate of being surrounded by decades-old Drexel furniture for the rest of your career. Don’t worry; you’re not alone.

- The Tumblr blog Foreign Service Problems certainly understands. In fact, the site tackles a variety of awkward or annoying topics unique to the Foreign Service, such as the furniture situation.
- Z. Marie, of the blog Something Edited This Way Comes, hosted an informal “Best-Disguised Foreign Service Couch” contest. Entries included one hidden in laundry and one enhanced with Photoshop—apparently, some things just can’t be fixed.
- FS Spouse Kelly Bembry Midura has an entire category (“Drexel Hell”) dedicated to post furniture woes on her blog, Well That Was Different. She writes about dated furniture such as “the poopy blue brocade sofa of doom,” which has followed her to each post since 1989. Consequently, Midura is also very fond of furniture slipcovers.
- The Diplopundit blog doesn’t shy away from the FS furniture discussion. Topics tackled include the State Department’s hefty $5 million contract for handcrafted glasses and the decision to send “critical pool and picnic resources to Sudan.” Or, check out a rap video featuring the infamous Drexel furniture (you’ll probably recognize the avocado green couches).

—Brittany DeLong, Assistant Editor

State Issues 2015 Greening Diplomacy Awards

On May 13, the State Department held its annual Greening Diplomacy Initiative program. Three awards were given: the Greening Council Award, the People’s Choice Award and the honorable mention for Excellence in Utility Management.

The awards are designed to “recognize innovative leadership within the department for sustainability, energy and environmental diplomacy.”

State’s Greening Council Award went to Embassy Ouagadougou. The embassy staff achieved a substantial reduction in water and energy use, and engaged in environmental diplomacy to promote the same sort of reductions across the country.

Specifically, they supported the creation of local-level recycling programs,
In my time as Secretary-General, I have seen too many leaders turn a deaf ear to the voices and dreams of their people. It is as though they rule with noise-cancelling headphones. Again and again, I have urged leaders to listen carefully and sincerely to the aspirations of their people. But listening is not just for leaders. It is just as important for average citizens to turn to each other with open minds and open ears.

Yet I fear that people are increasingly reluctant to hear dissonant voices. They are comfortable in their echo chambers. Too many communities rush to point out an affront against them, but ignore the legitimate grievances of others. We must close the “empathy gap” that is so prevalent in our world today.

—United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon, speaking at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service Commencement Ceremony on May 16.

Contemporary Quote

Europe’s Mediterranean Migrant Crisis

During the four months between January and April this year, 18 times as many refugees perished in the Mediterranean Sea as during the same period last year, according to estimates from the International Organization for Migration.

Despite this, a record number of crossings—which mainly include people from the Middle East and Africa, looking to escape war and oppression—are still occurring. International aid groups, as well as the European Union countries to which the migrants are fleeing, are scrambling to respond.

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, headed by António Guterres, recently announced a Central Mediterranean Sea Initiative.

The plan emphasizes collaboration among countries of transit and first asylum, and recommends mass information programs along transit routes to inform people of the risks of onward movement.

“We can’t deter people fleeing for their lives. They will come. The choice we have is how well we manage their arrival,”
Summer is a great time to get out and experience local food and culture wherever you may be. Since 2011, husband-and-wife team Laura Siciliano-Rosen and Scott Rosen have sought to make that easier than ever with their blog “Eat Your World: A Global Guide to Local Food” (www.eatyourworld.com).

Featuring more than 130 cities with listings of the most important—and delicious—traditional foods to try, the blog aims to bring attention and access to native or traditional food and drink all over the world, creating an online compendium of regional cuisines in the process. “We believe that tasting the distinct foods and drinks of a destination is absolutely essential to experiencing it, as they illuminate that region’s unique culture, history, geography and lore,” say Siciliano-Rosen and Rosen. They tend to feature food items, rather than restaurants, letting travelers find their own variations on the items posted.

The couple hope that, over time, the blog will serve as a form of “culinary preservation,” and are therefore interested in traditional recipes that are both in and out of favor today.

The site is built on user submissions, and participation is highly encouraged. Just upload a picture of your food recommendation and send it in. Alternatively, you can jot down a “food memory” about dining experiences past for submission.

Currently featured on the home page are: Po’ Boys from New Orleans, kulle from Delhi, roasted bone marrow from London, poutine from Montreal, appeltaart from Amsterdam, boza from Istanbul and pølse from Copenhagen, along with an extensive guide on what to eat when in Dakar.

In addition to the wonderful city guides found on the site, “Eat Your World” has published 11 food and travel guides in ebook form for easy transport covering Istanbul, London, Amsterdam, Delhi, Oaxaca and Mexico City. Bon appetit!

—Shannon Mizzi, Editorial Intern
If military power is becoming less relevant to the problems confronting us, what are the alternatives? American power, the active projection of the American ethos, must be seen as a whole. Military power is a component of national power, standing with and reinforcing our political, economic, moral and spiritual power. We are not, however, a new Sparta claiming leadership on the basis of military power alone. We are trying, imperfectly and haltingly, to identify with and articulate a universal human consensus, to appeal to the hope in the heart of Everyman for dignity, self-realization and a better life for himself and his children.

The reaction abroad to President Kennedy’s death, in addition to the tribute to the man, was perhaps a measure of the partial success of the efforts. We have spent, and properly so, billions of dollars for the development of great weapons systems. The broader and more complex challenges of the current world now require a comparable commitment of resources for the development of new and more sophisticated instruments for the non-military application of American power.


50 Years Ago

A Comparable Commitment of Resources

for June 5, will now take place on June 29.

Critics of Nkurunziza’s decision to seek a third term say it is unconstitutional, because the constitution specifies a two-term limit. But the president argues that because his first term was the result of a secure transition after the civil war, and not a direct election, pursuit of a third term is in fact constitutional.

While the Constitutional Court has ruled in the president’s favor, the majority of Burundians do not agree. Although they considered Nkurunziza a hero for helping Burundi heal in the wake of its civil war, many are unhappy with widespread government corruption and increasing authoritarianism.

Burundi had been remarkably successful in smoothing ethnic tensions after its long civil war. There are strict quotas in police departments, the army and parliament to ensure that the Tutsi minority has a share of power.

However, in an attempt to shift the focus, the president’s office has already accused Tutsis of being behind the protest. The government has shut down many media outlets that could provide alternative views, and hundreds of members of the opposition have been arrested.

Half-hearted attempts at organizing peace talks seem doomed after the May 23 assassination of opposition leader Zedi Feruzi.

—Shannon Mizzi, Editorial Intern
America Needs A Professional Foreign Service

BY CHARLES A. RAY

With the broad array of problems facing the United States and the world today, we need a strong, professional diplomatic service to look after our nation’s global interests. This has not always been the case. For more than a hundred years after independence, America’s foreign and diplomatic affairs were in the hands of amateurs.

There were two principal reasons for the lack of a professional diplomatic corps. First, during the colonial period, foreign affairs were handled out of London. Second, and perhaps most important, early American political leaders equated diplomacy and ambassadors with European monarchies and didn’t trust either. Thomas Jefferson, America’s first Secretary of State, believed that an independent America had no need for diplomats other than commercial consuls.

The senior American diplomatic representatives were ministers extraordinary and plenipotentiary, ranking below ambassadors, which was considered appropriate for a second-rate power. Embassy and consulate staffs, and commercial consuls, were individuals who had connections with the American ruling political elite. After elections, there were often wholesale changes in diplomatic and consular representation abroad. This patronage system reached a peak during the administration of Andrew Jackson, when the mantra in Washington was “to the victor belong the spoils.”

Late to the Dance

In the late 1800s, as a global economic power, the U.S. need for elevated representation led to sending ambassadors to the main European capitals. The first American ambassador was Thomas Bayard, appointed to the Court of St. James’s in 1893. Embassy secretaries, however, continued to come from the wealthy classes—individuals who could afford to live abroad on the meager salary paid to diplomatic secretaries.

It wasn’t until the Rogers Act of 1924, which consolidated the diplomatic and consular services, that career personnel were assigned to staff embassies and consulates. Some career people were also posted as ambassadors to some of the smaller countries.

Prior to World War II, American foreign policy was essentially passive, and concerned primarily with protecting commercial interests. But the United States emerged from the war as a superpower—economically, militarily and politically—and adopted a more activist, forward-leaning policy.

Both the Foreign Service Act of 1946, which created the U.S. Foreign Service, and the Foreign Service Act of 1980 recognized the need for a professional career Foreign Service to assist the president and the Secretary of State in conducting foreign affairs.

Do we have one?

A Profession or a Collection of Experts?

Let’s begin with an understanding of what constitutes a profession. Don Snider, a professor in the Strategic Studies Institute of the Army War College and a senior fellow in the Center for the Army Profession and Ethic at West Point, offers the following criteria:

Professionals are those who:
• Provide a vital service to society that it cannot provide for itself but must have to flourish.
• Work with expert (abstract) knowledge developed into human expertise (i.e., not routine or repetitive work) that takes years of study and experiential learning.
• Earn and maintain the trust of their society by the effective and ethical application of their expertise.
• Enjoy relative autonomy in the application of their work’s art and expertise.

Missing from Snider’s list is an additional element that I believe is essential to any profession: a formalized code of ethical behavior that is easily accessible and understood by members of...
the profession and by the general public.

In a talk at AFSA on May 29, 2014, Prof. Snider outlined the differences between professions and bureaucracies. As opposed to workers in a bureaucracy, members of a profession accept lifelong learning and unlimited personal liability; they measure effectiveness rather than efficiency; and they have a self-policed ethos.

An essential element of any career system, Prof. Snider believes, is a mechanism to provide basic standards and rules to protect it from political abuse. The ethical standards of a profession constitute a powerful means of controlling individual behavior in groups that must function in ambiguous, chaotic or dangerous situations.

By contrast, controls in a bureaucracy are based on promotion and monetary rewards. In addition, unlike bureaucracies, senior members of professions are stewards who serve as mentors to entry-level personnel and promote, preserve and protect the standards of the profession.

After more than 30 years in a calling that I dearly love, doing work that I would not trade for any other, I fear I may offend many by my conclusion that we are not yet a profession. In my view, the U.S. Foreign Service is a collection of highly intelligent, intensely dedicated and loyal experts in the art and craft of diplomacy.

Where Do We Miss the Mark?

While it is an inarguable fact that we provide a vital service to American society, the sad reality is that the majority of Americans, including those in positions of political leadership, don’t recognize or acknowledge what we do. As stated in American Diplomacy, edited by Paul Sharp and Geoffrey Wiseman, “with only a few minor exceptions, (professional) U.S. diplomats do not capture the popular imagination. ... The United States relies extensively on diplomacy and diplomats, but has trouble acknowledging the fact.”

Similarly, though members of the Foreign Service have extensive experience working with abstract knowledge to perform tasks that are not routine, they fall short in the area of long-term learning.

Education. The Foreign Service Institute does an excellent job of providing language training, as well as some training in specific skills. What we lack is a system of career-long education designed to develop our diplomatic skills.

Unlike our military counterparts, who spend a significant percentage of their careers in long-term training, we in the Foreign Service are lucky to get much beyond language and tradecraft training. An Army officer, for instance, can spend up to four years of a 20-year career in training (see “The Army Approach to Leader Development,” FSJ, July-August 2012), with as much as two years of that time devoted to long-term (a year or more) education. In contrast, FS members are lucky to get such training once during a career.

In the military, training and education are required. In the Foreign Service, employees have to actively seek it out—even demand it. During my 30 years, I had two years of long-term training, including senior training at the National War College and the Senior Seminar.

More than one colleague warned me that so much training, taking me out of the “rating loop,” could be detrimental to my career. Until long-term career education is valued and rewarded by promotion boards and assignment panels, we will continue to be deficient in this area.

Ethics. There is no shortage of ethical regulations and prohibitions in our line of work, and no one can say that Foreign Service personnel are unethical in general. The current regulations, however, are prescriptive, couched in dense legal jargon and spread through the Foreign Affairs Manual, making them relatively hard to access. To build the trust necessary to be truly effective, we need a clear, formal code of ethics that is prescriptive and aspirational, easy to understand and apply evenly and fairly, and understood by people who are not part of the Foreign Service. It is not that society does not trust us; it does not know what to expect from us.

Autonomy. Relative autonomy in the conduct of diplomacy is essential. In some assignments I had a great deal of room to operate because I worked in a country or area of little interest to the Washington bureaucratic and political establishments, or because I was in an area where communications with Washington were limited or nonexistent. In other assignments I experienced intense micromanagement.

When ambassadors visiting Washington have to ask permission to make appointments with members of Congress, as was the case in one bureau in which I worked, I have to conclude that members of the Foreign Service, regardless of rank, have little real autonomy.

How to Change the Situation

If the Foreign Service is to adequately serve the American people now and in the future, it is imperative that it become the professional service intended by legislation over the past 91 years. This is not an easy task. It requires political will from elected leadership to provide
the necessary direction and resources. It also requires action on the part of every member of the Foreign Service.

Here are some of the actions I believe are necessary.

Establish a system of professional education for the Foreign Service.

Develop a long-term academic training program in diplomacy—either at the Foreign Service Institute or through a cooperative agreement with a university or universities in the Washington, D.C., area—designed to prepare members of the Foreign Service for senior diplomatic responsibilities.

There should be training opportunities post-tenuring and at the mid-level designed to increase individual skills in primary career tracks, while also offering education in diplomacy and leadership.

Every member of the Foreign Service should be required to complete a year of academic study relevant to his or her career track before being eligible for promotion to the Senior Foreign Service.

The department should create a true “training float” of 10 to 15 percent above the level required to staff all authorized positions, to allow Foreign Service personnel to take long-term training without posts and bureaus having to suffer long gaps. This will require a commitment by the department’s leadership not to use these positions to meet future manpower requirements—a practice that consumed the two previous authorizations.

Ensure opportunities for professional development through assignments.

In coordination with the White House, the department should ensure that an adequate number of senior positions (assistant secretary, ambassador, deputy assistant secretary, etc.) are designated to be filled by Foreign Service personnel.

Priority should also be given to
In the military, training and education are required. In the Foreign Service, employees have to actively seek it out—even demand it.

assignment of Foreign Service personnel to lower-level positions, such as regional office directors and desk officers, as much as possible.

Reconcile the differences between Foreign Service and Civil Service personnel systems. The department must recognize that while both are essential to the success of our mission, the Foreign Service and Civil Service personnel systems are inherently different.

Attempts to obliterate the differences benefit neither, and do not contribute to national security in any meaningful way. Action needs to be taken to improve career prospects within both systems.

Consideration should be given to creating a position of Director of Human Resources responsible for Civil Service personnel, and having the Director General of the Foreign Service responsible only for Foreign Service personnel, as envisioned by the 1946 Act that created the position.

In addition, the Director General should be given more authority over discipline and career development of Foreign Service personnel.

Establish a formal code of ethics for the Foreign Service. An essential element of any career personnel system is a mechanism to provide basic standards and rules and to protect it from political abuse.

The American Foreign Service Association established a Committee on the Foreign Service Profession and Ethics in 2012 with the primary mission to develop such a code. I had the honor of being the first chair of the PEC and am happy to report that significant progress has been made on this during the past three years.

Working with the Institute of Global Ethics, the PEC conducted a worldwide survey of Foreign Service personnel and then began creating a draft code. Information on the PEC’s work can be found on AFSA’s website at www.afsa.org/ethics. Details on the results of the survey on professionalism and ethics can be found at www.bit.ly/1L1LoJq.

Learning from History

The first three steps I’ve outlined require buy-in from our political leadership. But the fourth—creation of a formal Foreign Service ethics code—is primarily our responsibility.

That the U.S. Foreign Service is made up of people who conduct themselves professionally is not in question—but we have yet to achieve true professional status. It’s not enough to call ourselves a profession. We must be acknowledged by those outside the fold as such.

Fortunately, we have the ability to influence external opinion by acting as an organization to clearly define what we are, and what we aspire to be.

As a global power that must grapple with issues that affect not only the lives of every American, but the lives of people throughout the world, we need to field a diplomatic team that can do more than punch above its weight. We need to be represented by professionals in fact, as well as name.
Despite many excellent people and successes, American diplomacy is facing serious problems. American Diplomacy at Risk, the latest report from the American Academy of Diplomacy, goes beyond cataloging problems to offer numerous specific, actionable recommendations.

The problems it addresses were initially surfaced in a Washington Post opinion piece published on April 11, 2013, which I joined former AFSA President Susan Johnson and retired Ambassador Thomas R. Pickering in writing. The op-ed drew strong support and some strong criticism, particularly charges that it was elitist and anti-Civil Service. Those criticisms were wrong then and they are wrong now, as a close reading of our report will show. (The full text is available at www.academyofdiplomacy.org.)

Ronald E. Neumann, a retired Senior Foreign Service officer who served as ambassador to Algeria, Bahrain and Afghanistan, is president of the American Academy of Diplomacy.
ADAR (as we will refer to the report henceforth) does not just describe the problem, but offers solutions. The contents of the report should concern all active-duty, retired and prospective Foreign and Civil Service personnel. It is the product of a year’s work by a drafting team including Thomas Boyatt, Susan Johnson, Lange Schermerhorn and Clyde Taylor under an advisory committee co-chaired by Thomas Pickering and Marc Grossman and a red team, listed in the report.

The Politicization of State

The report starts from the basic proposition that a strong State Department, based on a strong Foreign Service and a strong Civil Service, is a critical component of America’s security. Both services are diminished by the increasing politicization of American diplomacy and by the lack of flexibility and career possibilities in the outmoded Civil Service personnel system. One aspect of this is the change in who occupies senior leadership positions (which we defined as assistant secretaries and their equivalents, and above).

In 1975, more than 60 percent of the then-19 assistant secretary positions were held by Foreign Service officers. Civil Service professionals accounted for just 3 percent. (There were also 12 positions that might be considered assistant secretary equivalents, of which six were held by FSOs.) By 2014, FSOs in assistant secretary and equivalent positions and above, now expanded to 57, had shrunk to only 18, approximately 30 percent. The Civil Service contingent remained at 3 percent.

In press guidance issued on April 12, 2014, the Department of State tried to refute our assertion about the erosion of the policymaking role of the Foreign Service by omitting our definition of senior positions as assistant secretaries and the equivalent, and enlarging the numbers by including all ambassadors and deputy assistant secretaries. This blurred the issue of the Foreign Service role in policymaking without even trying to make the case that all of these positions have the same importance for policy formulation, a case our critics would have considerable trouble sustaining.

Our point is much larger than protecting turf. To quote the report:

“1. Loss of long-term field perspective—knowledge essential for melding the desirable with the possible. FSOs speak foreign languages and have extensive knowledge of foreign nations and their policies, cultures, thinking, peoples and regions. They have spent years living among and working abroad with people from all walks of life and with leaders whose cooperation we need if U.S. policies are going to be successful. No other part of the federal government provides this knowledge.

2. Loss of Washington experience—loss of the Washington positions that provide essential experience necessary for FSOs to excel in the critical interagency aspects of making and implementing foreign policy, and loss of the benefits in the interagency process of the unique blend of field and Washington experience among those who have implemented foreign policy abroad. This result leaves too many FSOs without sufficient Washington experience to match their overseas experience, which is essential to the development of officers’ careers, such as that of former Deputy Secretary William Burns.

“The price for the declining representation of the professional Foreign Service at senior levels in Washington is three-fold:...
“3. Loss of merit-based incentives”—failure to motivate and to maintain high morale when career advancement depends not on professional merit, but mainly on personal networking and political affiliations. Low morale inevitably develops when either Civil Service or Foreign Service employees see short-term, non-career appointees with less institutional knowledge moving into rungs above them on the career ladder.”

We recommend a righting of the balance. For example, at least one of the two Deputy Secretaries of State and the under secretary for political affairs should be drawn from the Foreign Service. We also recommend changes to the Deputy’s Committee, which makes career ambassadorial nominations to the Secretary, and a restoration of the stature of the Director General of the Foreign Service and Director of Human Resources to the level required for ensuring a strong, professional Service.

A second problem of politicization is the increase in political appointees at ever-lower levels in the department. Of particular concern is the tailoring of new appointments in the Civil Service to meet the qualifications of political friends, who then become a permanent part of the Civil Service. This practice needs to stop.

A third problem is the appointment of non-career ambassadors on the basis of their political contributions rather than their qualifications. We recognize that there have been outstanding ambassadors from outside the career Foreign Service, and we support the continuation of that practice. What we oppose is the blatant sale of offices to the unqualified in contravention of the law.

With this in mind, we recommend that the Foreign Service Act of 1980 be tightened to include a prohibition on appointments based on bundling, as well as direct political contributions, and that a cap of 10 percent be legislatively imposed on non-career appointments.

Required by Law, but Clearly Not State Practice

Congress, in a series of laws extending over nearly a century, has held that our nation requires a professional Foreign Service.
The Frederick S. Pardee School of Global Studies is Boston University’s newest school. Our students take courses with world-class faculty, and have access to University-wide resources and all our affiliated regional and thematic studies centers.

Rigorous graduate programs—including joint and dual master’s degrees—offer small classes, language proficiency, and support for research travel.

Gain real-world expertise before you graduate. Experience the Pardee difference.
A second problem of politicization is the increase in political appointees at ever-lower levels in the department.

The Foreign Service Act of 1980, still the law that the State Department should be enforcing and implementing, has very specific provisions and requirements.

Section 101 of the act states: "The Congress finds that (1) a career Foreign Service, characterized by excellence and professionalism, is essential in the national interest to assist the President and the Secretary of State in conducting the foreign affairs." It further specifies that "the members of the Foreign Service should be representative of the American people... knowledgeable of the affairs, cultures and languages of other countries, and available to serve in assignments throughout the world" and that it "should be operated on the basis of merit principles."

Section 105 states: "All personnel actions with respect to career members and career candidates in the Service (including applicants for career candidate appointments) shall be made in accordance with merit principles." The guiding statute identifies only the Foreign Service to perform these functions in this manner.

This law is the basis on which Foreign Service officers take an oath similar to the one their military colleagues take. They agree to serve where required, including under conditions of danger and hardship, accept up-or-out promotion, selection out and frequent rotations. Yet it is our contention that the basis for a high-quality, well-trained and professionally educated Foreign Service able to carry out the national purpose abroad and play a key policy advisory role at home is being undermined.

This stems from numerous factors, some deliberate and some the accretion of diverse, ad hoc and nontransparent management practices. In total, the practices and the declarations of the State Department constitute a deliberate effort at nullification of the Foreign Service Act.

This weakening and de-professionalizing of the Foreign Service will not serve U.S. diplomacy. It is time to recognize diplomacy as a profession and provide the support the Foreign Service needs, like any other specialized professional service.

One area that we find particularly troubling is what appears to be a deliberate effort to homogenize the Foreign and Civil Services, without requiring the CS to accept the same disciplines based on needs of the State Department as their FS colleagues. This may have begun as a necessary effort to meet emergency needs and redress the feeling of many in the Civil Service that they were treated as second-class citizens by the Foreign Service.

That needed to change. But the effort has gone well beyond the notion of “one mission, one team,” to undercut the very concept of a separate Foreign Service. This charge is serious, and many who have not been involved in these matters find it incredible. We believe the evidence is extensive.

Consider State’s April 2013 press guidance, responding to our Washington Post op-ed, stating that it is the department’s policy to “break down institutional, cultural and legal barriers” between the Foreign Service and the Civil Service. (The full text of that guidance, including the names of the drafting and clearing officers, is reprinted in our report). A year later there was a reaffirmation of policy, although with a changed rationale, when the then-acting Director General told the Board of the Foreign Service (see the May 8, 2014, Summary of Proceedings) that it is the policy of the department to “break down barriers” between the Foreign Service and the Civil Service in the interest of “managerial flexibility.” That is a very flexible term, indeed, but not one based in the law.

Actions to implement this policy include the regular, Orwellian substitution of the word “generalist” for the term “Foreign Service officer.” A further undermining of the profession occurs with the Director General’s assertion, until recently, of the right to convert Civil Service personnel into Foreign Service officers even when there is no shortage in the designated cone. The transformation of desk officer positions from FS to CS occurs for many reasons; but when such conversions become common practice, the Foreign Service loses positions essential for the professional development of new officers, including how to understand and work in the interagency system.

To put it bluntly, as detailed extensively in the full AAD report, the Foreign Service is being reduced, both intentionally and inadvertently. That combination is destructive to the Service and to the department—and, most of all, to the national interest and security of the country and people the Foreign Service serves and represents.
To rectify this situation, we are recommending a variety of steps, from restoring proper respect for commissioned Foreign Service officers and returning several matters to proper negotiation with AFSA to limiting certain powers of the DG.

**Physician, Heal Thyself**

If the Foreign Service is to play the role established by law, which we believe it should play, it needs also to improve itself. We are enthusiastic about the quality and diversity of entry-level officers. However, we have found that many have great gaps in their basic knowledge and understanding of the profession they are entering and its role. Diversity does bring benefits, but State has a responsibility to furnish all officers with foundational education to bring them to a minimum common level of knowledge. The Foreign Service Institute has developed new programs to improve professional education, but it lacks the resources for the scale of change necessary.

Our report has numerous recommendations in this area. These include university-level distance education that would begin with entry and need to be completed for promotion to the Senior Foreign Service. Another is a six-month “practicum” after the introductory orientation A-100 course, which would combine working four days a week in the department with one day in a structured program at FSI. At the mid-level, the report recommends an expanded role for the Bureau of Human Resources to balance long-term career development with the short-term considerations that now dominate the interaction between officers and bureaus.

The report notes the difficulty of creating enough senior officers with the breadth of experience to lead in the interagency system. It laments the long-term drift of positions in State functional bureaus from FS to CS designation. Foreign Service expertise is a necessary ingredient to policymaking and implementation, just as such service is necessary to broaden the understanding of FSOs for future leadership responsibilities. The Foreign Service needs to serve in these positions and promotion boards to recognize the merit of such work.

To rectify this, ADAR recommends a requirement to serve at least one tour in a functional bureau or other agency as a basis for promotion to senior ranks. It also recommends reinstatement of multifunctional promotions and the removal of cone designations at the senior level, all to fix the problem of forming officers with the breadth of experience needed at the most senior levels.

We recognize that many related problems affect Foreign Service specialists, a group essential to the department’s proper
functioning. We did not deal with this aspect largely because AAD is far less qualified to address it than to address the other issues. We believe politicization does affect the specialist corps, although probably less than the officer corps given the greater degree of specificity about degrees, experience and certificates required for many staff specializations. We would strongly support a study by AFSA, or another qualified group, of problems facing Foreign Service specialists.

Strengthening the Civil Service

ADAR starts from the position that it is as necessary to modernize and strengthen the Civil Service as the Foreign Service. It recognizes that too many senior Civil Service employees find themselves trapped without a satisfactory career path or career mobility, facing constrained rotation opportunities. State Department efforts to increase rotations—a principle the report supports—have run into two problems. Abroad, rotations have not always kept to their intended purpose of returning better-trained personnel to the Civil Service; nor have they fully observed the agreements negotiated with AFSA. Domestically, conversion of FS positions to CS has created zero-sum turf fights with the Foreign Service, because once a domestic position is converted, it is permanently lost to the Foreign Service.

The report makes a number of recommendations for the Civil Service, including better professional education and development and large steps to deal with the major problems. One is to take control of senior Civil Service positions out of the bureaus and manage them centrally so that there is a larger universe for career mobility. The second is to establish a new option for Civil Service employees, a “Career Policy Program” for domestic positions that incorporates rank-in-person, mobility and up-or-out competitive promotions. These would allow qualified Civil Service employees to bid on up to 10 percent of Foreign Service domestic positions on the yearly list of openings.

This new competitive service within the Civil Service component would give employees the chance to broaden their experience through rotations and expand their opportunities for advancement. At the same time, it would respect the norms that govern Foreign Service assignments, is of a dimension that should not create inordinate assignment problems for FSOs, and avoids the difficulties that ensue when Civil Service employees who have no finite assignment length encumber Foreign Service positions that normally have defined tours of duty. Acceptance of this recommendation will require a large effort to review position classifications at State strategically.

Tackling the Broader Issues

In working through the issues in the report, larger underlying issues emerged. First, there is no clear definition in the department of the separate and complementary roles and missions of the two services, further adding to confusion, competition and squabbling. Second, over the years State has had to deal repeatedly with inadequate funding, repeated crises and personnel shortages. Department managers have been creative in developing ad hoc fixes and workarounds to meet the challenges. But the result has been that systematic personnel management has gradually been submerged in so many exceptions and changes that there is very little “system” left.

Accordingly, we have recommended a very substantial overhaul of State’s management practices going well beyond the issues in our report, not only to modernize and make the system efficient, but to accommodate the need for greater flexibility and agility in the Civil Service components of the State Department that changing times require. Clearly, much that needs doing requires money. Some may believe our recommendations are unrealistic in the current budget climate. Our rejoinder is that vision is essential for long-term change. It is in recognition of this fundamental challenge that the first and most central recommendation in ADAR is this:

The Secretary and the State Department should continue to press the Office of Management and Budget and Congress for resources—positions, people and the funds needed to support them—to restore to American diplomacy the ability to play its critical role in the country’s national security.
As part of an effort to expand the important conversation about the state of the Foreign Service and diplomacy and to bring in more active-duty FS voices, The Foreign Service Journal sent out a message to AFSA active-duty members requesting feedback on the recently released American Academy of Diplomacy report, American Diplomacy at Risk. We shared the summary statement from the report, the 23 recommendations and links to the abridged and full versions of the report (http://bit.ly/ADARlong and http://bit.ly/ADARshort).

For this issue of the FSJ, AAD President Ronald Neumann provided his overview of the report and the concerns and recommendations it offers for discussion. What follows is a compilation of the feedback comments received by the Journal in May. We welcome and encourage further discussion, so please send your letters to journal@afsa.org.

Disclaimer: The contributors to this compilation are writing in their private capacities, not on behalf of their agencies. Details about their FS positions are for information only.

—Shawn Dorman, Editor

Major Unanswered Questions

I can’t say I disagree with any of the key recommendations in this study, which, like most recent reviews of how to fix our diplomatic architecture, starts with more money, more personnel and fewer politicos in key positions. But I do wonder if it doesn’t miss some of the major unanswered questions we are facing as an institution, issues which would require some strategic decisions before we get to the additional people and cash. Two issues seem to me to loom large.

First, what is our mission abroad, and are we organized to accomplish it? I had a debate with a mentor once, in which I argued for activist microposts that pushed our personnel out as broadly as we can to match a flatter world (think Parag Khanna and Thomas Friedman), while developing the capacity to participate actively in institution-building in fragile states. He argued that the business of diplomacy is to influence governments, which is done in capitals.

We are just coming out of a period of incredible diffusion of personnel across several war zones, having even formed a bureau to ostensibly support these kinds of operations, and seem to be parked somewhere between the demarche-laden capital and the operation-laden field. Do we intend to continue
Corruption and Cronism at State

The American Academy of Diplomacy’s report, *American Diplomacy at Risk*, could not be more timely. It pulls back the curtain on the hyperpoliticization of State Department positions, policies and programs.

Let’s start at the top. In one bureau, the assistant secretary—a political appointee—reports to an under secretary who is one of the eight-out-of-10 non-career senior diplomats reported by the AAD and is married to another of the eight-out-of-10 non-career senior diplomats. In the same bureau, one deputy assistant secretary arrived as a Presidential Management Fellow and catapulted from there after marrying a political appointee—who is now a DAS in a different bureau. Schedule B and C appointments continue to fill the precious few GS-15 slots in the bureau.

This has to stop. It is wrong, and it sends a very bad message to young officers who are expected to demarche foreign counterparts about corruption and cronyism.

By disclosing the extent to which domestic politics dictates department staffing and policies, the report also has brought to light an alarming trend heretofore ignored by the media: the White House’s near-total micromanagement of the State Department. Young staffers are cavalier in pushing unfunded mandates tied to short-term administration politics. The damning list of 59 special envoys could be read to correspond, in numerous cases, with domestic constituencies.

Kudos to the AAD also for telling it like it is regarding the separate worlds of Civil Service and Foreign Service colleagues. Unfamiliarity and distrust are growing between the two services, ironically at least in part due to the department’s efforts to gloss over the very real differences in conditions of employment for the two. Leadership should be bridging the divide by educating all employees about what different positions require, not masking the differences or pretending they don’t exist.

The bottom line: Foreign Service personnel must learn languages and work overseas for a great part of their careers. Meanwhile, our Civil Service colleagues may elect to keep their families in Washington, D.C., and never deal with living conditions abroad. On the other hand, their opportunities to move up in the hierarchy are limited.

The report is right to call for far more training and job opportunities for Civil Service colleagues. Politicization eats up both Civil and Foreign Service jobs. The two parts of State’s family need to work together to put an end to cronyism run rampant.”

—An active-duty FSO

with the kinds of field/capacity-building operations we have done or are doing in Colombia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Darfur, Somalia and Pakistan, or do we get back to the capitals?

A related question raised by Rufus Phillips in “Fostering Positive Political Change—the Key to Stabilizing Vulnerable States” (National Strategy Information Center, February 2012), is whether the State Department should be satisfied delivering our position and reporting back the other guy’s position, or whether we should be more involved in supporting political transitions.

Second, we are an institution that expects its senior leaders to be part George Patton and part George Kennan. I don’t know many senior leaders in the department who combine the ability to manage large complex organizations while also being at the top of the policy game. Those who do certainly stand out. Many gravitate to whichever they are comfortable with and delegate the other; some don’t really do either very well. If we truly want this kind of well-rounded, operationally capable but policy-savvy leaders, we may need to restructure key aspects of our career system, something that for the most part is not at the mercy of budgets or personnel constraints.

The AAD report hits some of this. But, as with most recent changes in personnel imperatives, the creative workarounds are always there. To really get this right, I am afraid we would simply have to go to a more directed process for assignments, in which “the good of the Service” is not just about Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan, but how each assignment builds a future leader. The military has a number of lessons on this that could easily be applied.

—Keith W. Mines
Political Counselor
Embassy Tel Aviv

“Politickization eats up both Civil and Foreign Service jobs. The two parts of State’s family need to work together to put an end to cronyism run rampant.”

—An active-duty FSO
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"We need to make our profession more understandable and accessible to those who fund us and evaluate our product."
—Daniel Hirsch

Elitism Doesn’t Equal Demographic Exclusivity

I just wanted to express my support for the concept of an elite Foreign Service—with the caveat that elitism doesn’t translate into privilege and exclusivity for a few members of America’s demographics. The Department of State has a long way to go before it establishes a Foreign Service reflective of the country’s current and changing demographics.

The aphorism “Male, Yale and Pale” needs to be permanently relegated to a footnote of American diplomatic history.

—Irvin Hicks Jr.
Management-coned officer
Bureau of African Affairs Management Rover
Embassy Libreville

We Need to Change the Paradigm

The biggest problem affecting the Foreign Service today—with implications for all of the concerns expressed in the AAD report—is that the American public does not understand why it should fund us, and why a professional Foreign Service is needed at all. That, in turn, is related to the way that we define and market our Service.

AFSA, AAD and other supporters of the Foreign Service define us as America’s diplomats. That is a misleading and extraordinarily dangerous definition for a 21st-century Foreign Service that includes members of many professions, including diplomacy, who share certain skill sets and obligations that enable us to perform our numerous professions in support of American interests overseas.

Defining our entire Service in terms of its most elite and esoteric members perpetuates the stereotype of the Foreign Service as elitist and out of touch with the day-to-day needs of ordinary Americans. Most congressional constituents don’t care about the ability of an American ambassador to negotiate a treaty, or understand why a civil servant or political appointee cannot do equally well at the task. The AAD report’s excellent explanation of why the differences matter is not going to matter to them.

We also don’t highlight enough the work of consular officers, Diplomatic Security special agents, commercial officers and others who not only produce the bulk of the product that means the most to our clients, but also perform jobs with which average Americans can identify. The average American has never met an ambassador. But they know a doctor. An IT professional. An office manager. A logistician. A security professional. A marketer. They know people in professions similar to those comprising the bulk of positions in the Foreign Service.

We need to change the paradigm to make our profession more understandable and accessible to those who fund us and evaluate our product. We need to tell the American public a story about people who do jobs familiar to most Americans, but do those jobs in far-away, sometimes isolated, sometimes dangerous places, using specialized skills and accumulated experience to produce products—ranging from American citizen services, trade creation, aviation safety and environmental protection to national security—that benefit Americans. Until we can tell that story, the concerns expressed in the AAD study won’t resonate with our clients and won’t resonate with Congress.

—Daniel Hirsch
Management Officer
Management Counselor
Embassy Tunis

Specialists Don’t Count?

I am an Office Management Specialist with State, serving in one of largest consular sections in the world. I work my butt off in a section of more than 60 direct hires and 120 local staffers. My section makes up at least half of the consulate.

I stopped reading American Diplomacy at Risk when it stated that specialists didn’t count.

—Linley G. Wartenberg
Office Management Specialist
Consulate General Guangzhou
A Serious Error of Omission

As an AFSA member and Foreign Service member for five years and in my third overseas tour, I am committed to American diplomacy and take the need for change seriously. It is demoralizing, though, to realize that I am not important enough to be included in the AAD project that resulted in this report. As a specialist, I am part of the 42 percent who make up the Foreign Service—the same Foreign Service that the report says is in trouble and needs immediate strengthening. Omitting the specialist corps from this project creates more trouble and weakens the clarity, unification and esprit de corps that the report seeks.

I want to call attention to page 11 of the report: "America’s security interests and international goals require top-quality diplomacy, consistent with the letter and spirit of the [1980 Foreign Service] Act. We need to reduce politicization and readdress education, training and the professional formation of the Foreign Service from top to bottom. The time has come to address both the parallel and differing problems that undercut top-quality Foreign and Civil Services and clearly define the respective roles of all involved in diplomacy. While we recognize and respect the vital role of the career Foreign Service specialist corps, the parameters of this project do not permit an exploration of its contributions, roles and needs.”

I can only hope that AFSA will ask AAD to address this faux pas in the near future, perhaps even with a conversation about doing away with generalist and specialist categories/titles and creating one unified Foreign Service with position-specific titles.

Despite my disappointment, I do agree with the overall recommendations made in the report. I see four, in particular, as priorities: 2d, specifications for nomination of chiefs of mission; 3a, capping the percentage of politically appointed ambassadors at 10 percent; 12a, developing a supervisory-mentoring module for mid-level management; and 18, conducting a comprehensive review of the department’s entire system of human resources management, including recruitment, position creation and classification methodology, as well as staffing, assignment and promotion.

—Janie James-High
Assistant Attaché/Office Manager
Office of the Deputy Chief of Mission
Embassy Ljubljana

"Omitting the specialist corps from this project creates more trouble and weakens the clarity, unification and esprit de corps that the report seeks.”

—Janie James-High

Important Obstacles to Getting the Job Done

I read the AAD report with interest, and I think it makes many good points. At the same time, a few of the assertions struck me as bizarre, such as the assertion that the department deserves applause for “upgrading” facilities overseas. Upgrading? Since many of the authors seem to be drawn from the ranks of long-retired former ambassadors, I wonder how many of these facilities they’ve personally visited.

“Upgraded” overseas facilities are often poorly located on the fringes of towns, feature security precautions that most people would associate more readily with a military fort or a maximum security prison than with a beacon of liberty. Staff are crammed into ever-tinier office spaces or the euphemistically titled “open space” cubicles. While these buildings are probably a lot safer from car bombs, that’s about the only sense in which most of them can be viewed as an improvement.

The conversation that the report seeks to open is valuable. However, in my view, the report overlooked some of the biggest problems the Foreign Service faces. One is the increasing over-centralization of authority and decision-making in Washington. Another is the increasing forced diversion of overseas staff away from the most interesting and valuable aspects of the job (i.e., interacting with the people of the country and getting out and about as much as possible) and into the writing, rewriting, clearing, discussing and negotiating of an endlessly escalating and frequently overlapping number of studies, reports, plans, strategies, reviews and other internal documents. A third is the huge escalation in time-consuming but largely nonproductive labor.

The three phenomena—hypercentralization in Washington, extreme proliferation of report production for Washington and the sharp increase in workload—are, of course, inter-related. The ever-growing stream of plans, studies, reviews, strategies and
reports must be produced to enable Washington’s ever-escalating efforts to micromanage every aspect of overseas operations. Both the micromanagement and the endless document production escalate workload.

All three of these phenomena are closely intertwined with one issue that is mentioned in the report: the extreme proliferation of special envoys, coordinators and representatives. One of the consequences of numerous special functionaries is that each such official generally feels the need to call for the development of plans, reports, strategies, conference calls, digital videoconferences, etc., on their special topic with drastic consequences for staff workload, but much less clear benefits for advancing the topic being studied. The AAD report seems focused on the impact of these special representatives on the authority of the traditional bureaus and the career paths of more senior FSOs.

More important, in my view, is the role of these offices in escalating staff workload while also diffusing accountability, blurring lines of authority and, in many cases, making it difficult to get the real job done.

—A USAID FSO

Twenty-three recommendations, and not one addresses the “vital role” specialists play in creating the underpinnings that allow diplomacy practitioners to do their jobs. It’s especially disappointing because many of the recommendations that apply to FSOs could easily be applied to specialists. For example: Recommendations 12, 12a, 12b, 13 (especially since specialists often supervise many more people, earlier in their careers, than FSOs) and 21.

I disagree with Recommendation 10a regarding modifying the FS entry exam to balance knowledge fundamental to diplomacy with currently desired skill sets and a commitment to diversity; true diversity is more than just demographics. You need diversity in background and thought to ensure that our officers truly represent America and have the capacity to perform the varied jobs officers perform around the world.

Not every officer needs to be the next George Kennan, so crafting a test that eliminates all but those who have an in-depth knowledge of “American political and economic history, culture, politics and international relations” diminishes our diversity. The knowledge that is fundamental to diplomacy can be learned. The entry exam already does a good job of bringing in the brightest people with well-rounded knowledge—now, let’s teach them how to be diplomats.

Recommendation 10, to lower the maximum age for entry to 45, goes against other reported goals to ensure that the Foreign Service is “committed to diversity” and wants people who come into the Service with a “wide range of work experience.” I guess those who want to use the expertise they’ve gained in previous employment to further the State Department’s mission should just forget it. Or might this be a way of reducing the number of retired military veterans, who receive preference points to join the Service?

I also disagree with Recommendation 6b to merge the conversion programs for the sake of “efficiency and transparency.” Different career mobility programs meet different needs. Some specify that you compete against a like employee category; others, such as the Mustang program, do not make that distinction. Presumably, if a specialist and a civil servant applied to the Mustang program at the same time, they would compete against each other, negating the need to level the playing field.

One can only assume that AAD would like to see a restriction on the opportunities available to proven employees to join the officer ranks in favor of someone who joins from outside of the State Department. It would seem that AAD assumes that every specialist who wants to convert used their entry as a Foreign Service specialist as a backdoor to becoming an FSO, rather than assuming that capable people might actually

While I agree with much of this report, particularly the recommendations to have career diplomats at our highest ranks and to rein in the number of political appointees, as an FS-4 Office Management Specialist I found the paragraph on page 11 dismissing the specialist corps demoralizing.

—A USAID FSO

One Team?

The ever-growing stream of plans, studies, reviews, strategies and reports must be produced to enable Washington’s ever-escalating efforts to micromanage every aspect of overseas operations.”
want to contribute in different ways to the mission of the State Department.

I really appreciate what AFSA has accomplished on behalf of the Foreign Service and I have definitely benefited from initiatives like closing the overseas comparability pay gap. But after 12 years of paying my dues, and in light of this report, I have to wonder why there hasn’t been a focus by AFSA on more of the issues specifically related to specialists—not benefits gained by specialists as a byproduct of FSO concerns. Why didn’t AFSA advocate on our behalf with AAD to ensure that specialists were included in this report?

—Sara Sorensen
FS-4 OMS
Deputy Coordinator for Specialist Orientation
Foreign Service Institute

Still, A Few Well-Thought-Out Recommendations

On page 11 the AAD report states with regard to the career Foreign Service specialist corps: “The parameters of this project do not permit an exploration of its contributions, roles and needs.” This entire report ignores the contributions and roles of nearly half of the Foreign Service corps? That is extremely disheartening.

If we are to truly move forward to create a fully functioning, adaptable Foreign and Civil Service that serves the American people with a high caliber of diplomacy, all employees need to be a part of it. FS specialists represent a hugely talented population of workers, many of whose daily duties include adaptability and thinking outside of the box. By ignoring their contributions as professionals in this report, a huge opportunity is lost to review how the specialist skill codes could be adapted and updated to better serve the Foreign Service.

Retention is a very important issue to many specialist skill codes. If you constantly tell a group of people that their careers are not important and that they have no value to contribute to the organization, they will eventually leave. And that would be a tragedy for the department, the American people we serve and the world of diplomacy.

That said, the report does offer some well-thought-out recommendations. Recommendation 2, on including career diplomats in the most senior State Department positions, is very important, and I hope to see more career Foreign Service personnel considered for top posts. It’s important for chiefs of mission, in particular, to understand the challenges faced by and the potential of everyone serving in their missions.

As for Recommendation 10b, to provide incentives for acquiring languages before entry, while it’s good to encourage recruitment of people who already have language abilities, State should expand the opportunities for language training after hiring, especially for specialists. The number of language-designated position opportunities on the bid lists with time built in for language training is extremely low for all the specialist skill codes compared to the generalist codes. As a result, many specialists go out to posts with no language training at all, which greatly impairs their ability to communicate effectively.

Recommendation 10d, to make pre-entry cone selection temporary, is an excellent idea. It will enable people to have a better understanding of what the cones are and make an informed choice based on their abilities and experience. Recommendation 22, to establish an online course on U.S. diplomatic history and practice, is another great idea, but access to the course should not be restricted to certain grades or skill codes.

—Jessica
Foreign Service Office Management Specialist

Start Using the Stick

The AAD report places too much emphasis on political appointee creep (a road we insist on going down over and over again) and surrendering too much Foreign Service responsibility to the Civil Service. As noted in a May 4 Washington Post article, people leave federal employment chiefly due to job satisfaction and work environment issues, both of which are only moderately affected by civil servants and political appointees.
A much bigger issue (untouched in the report) is the consistently subpar record of the career Foreign Service in weeding out FSOs and FS specialists with performance and conduct suitability or discipline issues. An even greater factor here are those supervisors who ignore or enable them—often shooting the messengers and blaming the victims in the process.

We’re all about carrots, not sticks in the Foreign Service. Let’s start using the stick more effectively by being aggressive about ridding ourselves of those with performance and CSD issues, and denying poor career leaders promotions and plum assignments (including deputy chief of mission jobs and ambassadorships).

—Matt Weiller
FSO, FE-OC (Management Officer)
USAF Political Adviser
Washington, D.C.

Expanded Training and Mentorship Make Sense

Aside from my A-100 swearing-in ceremony, and a regrettable “Aren’t-you-someone-famous” encounter in a Main State hallway, I have never met Ambassador Bill Burns. By most accounts, and as evidenced by news reports of his diplomatic accomplishments, he is a paragon of quiet diplomatic achievement: the “secret diplomatic weapon” who rose from his 1983 posting in Amman to advise presidents of both political parties and to spearhead our nation’s most critical diplomatic negotiations.

His success across the decades has led many to debate how to “find the next Bill Burns.” Indeed, 35 years since the passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, the Foreign Service is not only challenged by how best to “find” or even “build” the next Bill Burns, but also by how best to mentor, train and lead the next Bill Burns, should he or she be sitting in today’s A-100 class.

The American Academy of Diplomacy’s American Diplomacy at Risk puts forward policy recommendations which address not only how to groom and train the next generation of Foreign Service leaders, but also how to clarify and preserve the distinct and congressionally mandated characteristics of the Foreign Service itself.

To this entry-level officer who is, lamentably, no Bill Burns, the Academy’s call for expanded entry- and mid-level officer training and mentorship makes sense. The push for a consistent and strengthened mentorship regime is likely a relief for officers on the losing end of the pronounced and inexplicable mission-to-mission variance in mentorship programs. Those of us who have benefited from genuine and robust Foreign Service mentorship recognize the contributions that mid- and senior-level officers have made to our careers and want the same enriching experiences for all of our colleagues.

The Academy’s rationale for their proposed six-month Washington practicum echoes feedback shared by entry-level colleagues who served in domestic assignments prior to reporting overseas. These officers almost uniformly note how their Washington experience facilitated a richer appreciation of the State Department’s role in foreign policy formulation and provided context for the outreach and reporting overseas missions conduct and produce. This practicum could serve to demystify Main State operations while providing a foundational exposure to diplomacy-in-action.

The recommendation to provide entry-level officers with career track flexibility by designating their initial cone selection as “temporary” could benefit officers and the Service alike. By assigning tenured officers to career tracks more consistent with their interests and abilities—and in alignment with Service needs—the department would no longer hold officers to career track selections made when they were the least knowledgeable about the Foreign Service.

In the end, whether he or she is “found” or “grown,” deciding how to mentor and lead the next Bill Burns is not just an academic debate. Nor is the question of how to manage and groom the next Ryan Crocker, Ruth Davis, Terence Todman, Anne Patterson, Robert Ford, Nancy J. Powell and John Negroponte, among others.

In providing their roadmap for how to reach this goal, the Academy has initiated a thoughtful and critically important discussion.

—Allyn Brooks-LaSure
FSO, Consulate General Melbourne
A second-tour officer, Brooks-LaSure joined with other entry-level officers for a 2014 roundtable convened by ADAR report authors.
In a quest to become the “best diplomatic service in the world,” the U.K. establishes an institution dedicated to equipping its representatives with the necessary skills, knowledge and tradecraft.

BY JON DAVIES

It’s an honor to be asked to contribute to *The Foreign Service Journal*. Throughout my 25 years in the British Diplomatic Service, I have been lucky enough to serve with, and befriend, many brilliant, delightful colleagues from the U.S. State Department. I have learned much from them, and continue to do so in my current role as director of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office’s new Diplomatic Academy.

It surprises many around the world—and indeed in our own country—to hear that until now, Britain has never had an institution dedicated to equipping its representatives with the skills, knowledge and tradecraft for diplomacy. Despite our long diplomatic history, or perhaps in part because of it, we have got this far without an equivalent of your Foreign Service Institute.

Of course, that doesn’t mean we did no learning or training. For many years we had a Training Department, running a range of courses from induction onwards. We have a long tradition of language instruction. More recently, we have transformed the professionalism of our consular work. But there was still an expectation that those we recruited would become professional almost entirely “on the job.”

**Why Now?**

So why set up such a diplomatic training institution now? In essence, we have recognized that the expectation that we could rely on “on the job” training was increasingly unrealistic, and that we needed to ensure we could provide consistently strong learning across the whole range of what constitutes diplomacy.

As William Hague, who was British Foreign Secretary at the time the creation of the Diplomatic Academy was announced, put it in a statement to the House of Commons last July:

“The Academy, which will be a central part of the Foreign
Office with dedicated rooms, including a library area within the King Charles Street headquarters, is vital to building up the long-term strength and effectiveness of the Foreign Office as an institution. It is at the heart of my vision of a Foreign Office that is an international center of ideas and expertise; that leads foreign policy thinking across government; that is recognized as the best diplomatic service in the world; and that is able to defend our country’s interests in an unpredictable and competitive international landscape for the long term.

I am sure that the more competitive among our State Department colleagues reading this might not welcome our aspiration to be the best diplomatic service in the world! But that is indeed the goal. And it is not just the goal of the political leadership of the Foreign Office in the person of William Hague or, now, Philip Hammond—though I was delighted to hear the new Foreign Secretary confirm his support of this aspiration in his first all-staff meeting after our recent general election.

The senior officials leading the organization, with Permanent Under Secretary Sir Simon Fraser in the vanguard, have also championed the idea, both as part of an effort to improve how we learn and develop as individuals and as an organization, and also as an essential part of his Diplomatic Excellence Initiative. One of the key themes of that initiative is a strong and skilled workforce, alongside a strong global network, policy excellence and consular excellence—all underpinned by the initiative’s values: taking responsibility; encouraging innovation; working together.

We needed to ensure we could provide consistently strong learning across the whole range of what constitutes diplomacy.

One of the other fundamental principles is to make much better use of the knowledge, skills and expertise already available in that huge cast of talented colleagues from across the FCO and the entire U.K. government. I am sure there is a similar situation in the American system: vast reservoirs of untapped learning. It’s not that people do not want to share what they know—on the contrary, they enjoy doing so. Nor is it that people sit around thinking they know it all already—there is a huge appetite to learn more and improve performance. But we have struggled to find a system to help make this learning sufficiently easy and structured that it becomes a habit. I hope that the Diplomatic Academy will help us do that.

What the Academy Will Do

So what will people learn and share through the Diplomatic Academy, and how?

We decided early on that we needed a way to make sure that the learning in the Academy was aligned with what the Foreign Office and the British government more broadly actually needed. Drawing on the experience of private- and public-sector institutions, we opted for a faculty system. The 11 faculties cover...
all the key areas specific to engaging internationally in our country’s interests: international policy; diplomatic practice; states and societies; understanding the U.K.; consular and crisis management; economics and prosperity; Europe; multilateral; security, defense and intelligence; law; and languages.

At this point, I need to set out a couple of major differences between our model and that of FSI. The central Diplomatic Academy team is very small, about 15 people in total at the moment. We rely heavily—and expect to continue to do so—on colleagues with other full-time “day jobs” to lead the creation of learning and drive engagement in it. (More on that in a moment.) This means that the faculties are headed by a director-level colleague for whom that is just one part of a heavy list of responsibilities.

We have done this in part because those senior leaders should bear much of the responsibility for ensuring their workforce has the right knowledge and skills, and for knowing what the capability gaps and priorities are for their area of the business. In other words, they know what they need people to do and have a strong interest in them learning how to do it, and do it well.

We are also beginning to flesh out a very simple three-level system: Foundation, Practitioner and Advanced. We have just launched the Foundation level, which (as the name suggests) represents the basic knowledge and skills which anyone representing the U.K. should ideally have. Put another way, it’s what you’d be embarrassed not to know.

There will be relatively little use of face-to-face classroom teaching at the Academy. Instead, instruction in the eight modules will employ a blend of techniques, including e-learning. It will also introduce to a wider FCO audience the idea of learning groups. The modules are designed so that individuals can work through them alone, but such a learning experience would be poorer. We are putting the responsibility on individuals to make sure that they get involved in a group and work through the curriculum with fellow members to get the most out of the material.

Successful completion of all eight modules will lead to an externally accredited qualification.

Working with Embassy London

I’m delighted to say that one of the Foundation-level units provided the latest example of excellent collaboration between our two governments.

Your ambassador to the U.K., Matthew W. Barzun, and his team have been great supporters of the Academy even before we were formally launched. He has already given a solo master class; shared a doubles act with our ambassador in Washington, Sir Peter Westmacott; spoken at our “Faculty Teams Retreat”; and sampled some of our training for heads of mission.

In early May, British and American colleagues used our new Foundation unit on the U.K. elections for some very timely joint learning. I should also note that our new Inspirational Speakers Series was launched with a hugely successful appearance by former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, who was in magnificent form.

Let me also thank Nancy McEldowney and her team at FSI for a fascinating visit last November. We had already drawn heavily on FSI’s experience when creating the Academy, but it was great to see it in person and talk to those working and learning there. I confess to leaving with envy of the resources secured for it, and the “training margin” (also called the “training float”) to make good use of it.
There will be relatively little use of face-to-face classroom teaching at the Academy.

Making Time for Learning

One of our greatest challenges, both in reality and in terms of people’s perceptions, is helping employees make time for learning. Your readers don’t need to be reminded how the world we work in grows more complex, fast-paced and, indeed, threatening as each year goes by. But I hope by making sure what the Academy does is of the highest quality, and by allowing people to discover just how their performance can improve when they make use of that, that they will consider the time required for learning an essential investment in their own future and that of our organization.

We will also, where appropriate, be hard-wiring some Academy learning into our evolving promotion model. Successful completion of the Foundation level, for example, will become essential at one particular step up the ladder. And for entry to our senior management structure, colleagues will have to have reached Practitioner level in a number of faculties.

There are other challenges, too, not least ensuring that our curriculum and materials keep pace with that new complexity and the new environment. Among other things, that means trying to stay up with the curve on new media (do follow us on Twitter at @UKDipAcademy, by the way) and big data; or on resilience—I have had really useful discussions recently with colleagues at FSI on that.

At the same time, we need to ensure we keep today’s diplomats equipped with the knowledge and skills which have always been essential to our work, from understanding a country (or institution) and its language and culture, to the unchanging fundamentals of influencing and negotiating.

One final thought: Our countries work together to extraordinary effect around the world, and our diplomats are often at the heart of that. I hope the birth of the Diplomatic Academy gives us a new way, working with FSI, to add a new element to that collaboration—learning together, so we can work together even more effectively. I look forward to it.
Chris Degnan, a public diplomacy-coned Foreign Service officer since 2002, is serving as the public diplomacy adviser for the 2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. His overseas assignments have included Kingston, Amsterdam and Curacao. Prior to joining the Foreign Service, Degnan worked as a chemical engineer and a radio sportscaster.
The final product—mercifully succinct and short on bureaucratese—meets my hopes. No, it does not solve every problem, but it does move the ball down the field on critical issues and addresses key policy and management priorities.

Of Mice and Men

Global events will always remain unpredictable and crises inevitable, but that is no excuse for failing to plan for them. As Dwight Eisenhower observed, “Plans are useless, but planning is indispensable.” The 2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review aims to model this kind of long-term thinking by laying out policy goals we can all use as signposts, along with internal reforms to help get us there. Combined with the implementation guidance that will follow, it is designed to have a meaningful impact on the daily work of diplomacy and development at headquarters and in the field.

From the beginning of the QDDR process in April 2014, the QDDR office, reporting to Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources Heather Higginbottom, engaged Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development employees of all ranks and specialties, both in Washington, D.C., and overseas. We visited or spoke with staff serving at more than 50 posts and consulted the larger foreign affairs community: nongovernmental organization stakeholders, retired Foreign Service professionals and our allies overseas who are facing similar challenges.

The QDDR office reflects a similar diversity, comprised of Foreign Service officers and specialists, civil servants, political appointees, contractors and detailees from USAID, the Department of Defense and think-tanks. We also conducted an online QDDR Sounding Board Challenge, a separate channel from the regular State Sounding Board, in which 4,700 participants from all levels of State and USAID took part. Their responses helped make the QDDR a document that truly reflects the thinking of both organizations, not just a few voices.

Finally, we are also grateful to the American Foreign Service Association for the series of thoughtful papers that they contributed to this process and the constructive spirit with which their representatives participated in the development of the QDDR report and its plans for implementation. AFSA’s contributions were essential to many areas of the final report, including the emphases on investing in a skilled and diverse workforce, enhancing economic leadership, managing and mitigating physical risk, and promoting employee work-life wellness.

Through months of engagement, a number of recurring themes emerged. The people who work for our organizations are dedicated, mission-oriented professionals with a passion for promoting America’s interests abroad. Most of them want the QDDR to offer clarity about U.S. foreign policy priorities and improve the tools to produce results in a rapidly changing world. Based on their extensive input, here are five specific ways the QDDR is attempting to meet that standard and make the lives of everyone on our teams a little easier:

1. Technology and Knowledge Management

Although State and USAID have come a long way from the infamous Wang computers of the 1990s, Foreign Service personnel serving overseas, in particular, now face a different communications challenge: how to respond to a constant flood of emails and taskers from Washington and still find time to engage beyond embassy walls. To help them cope with this dilemma, the QDDR calls for a comprehensive knowledge management strategy at both agencies, one that averts the need to “reinvent the wheel” every time we tackle a problem.

The great news is that we have a distinct advantage in this area: offices like the Information Resource Management Office of eDiplomacy have been working on knowledge issues for more than a decade, and the department has a deepening understanding of methodologies and techniques. We need a comprehensive strategy now to address the call by Secretary of State John Kerry for better knowledge management: “In a world of information saturation, State and USAID must improve our knowledge management, data and analytics to achieve these goals.”

We received countless helpful suggestions from the field which fed into our ideas on knowledge management, such as one from Matt Chessen, currently of the Bureau of East

The QDDR is our chance to look beyond the crises of the day to modernize every aspect of our work.
Asian and Pacific Affairs, to create a “full-time organization which supports and incubates innovative projects.” This feedback helped shape our proposal to establish a hub for data, diagnostics and design to increase our capacity to find, filter and leverage information throughout our operations. A space has been assigned for this hub, which will provide the equivalent of a garage for a startup tech company. The team coming together there will pilot ways to translate massive amounts of information into timely, user-friendly tools for decision-makers.

This is not about replacing relationships with robotics—quite the opposite. It is about using technology and information management to free those in the field to spend more time engaging directly with people. As Sec. Kerry told our chiefs of mission at their recent worldwide conference: “We must understand the force of Twitter, but it will never replace a handshake.” Better data and diagnostics will inform and amplify our work in the field, by helping diplomacy and development professionals respond more efficiently to taskings from Washington and thereby freeing us to develop and cultivate contacts outside the embassy.

2. Work, Families and Personal Life

Creating a more nimble organization also means recognizing changes in the broader culture. Dual-career marriages are increasingly the norm; many of us are taking on responsibility for aging parents; and smart phones too often mean there is no such thing as “outside the office.” Lisa Kyriienko, a construction executive in the Bureau of Overseas Building Operations, won the QDDR Sounding Board Challenge with 174 votes for her well-reasoned argument that “A strong State Department needs strong families,” which led to a digital videoconference with Special Representative Tom Perriello.

As Kyriienko noted: If we do not address the challenge of spousal employment, we “risk losing many qualified officers—male and female—who find that in our modern world, few spouses are willing to sacrifice the potential of a career” to follow their partners around the world for 20 years. With this in mind, we came up with a plan to expand top-level departmental support for the excellent, but understaffed, Family Liaison Office and its Global Employment Initiative, which currently has just 16 global employment advisers for 12,000 eligible family members. The QDDR will also facilitate greater career flexibility for employees who need to address family, health or educational needs through a new Career Break program that allows them to take extended leave while still maintaining their career.

Doing our job right is not just about encouraging agility and engagement, but fostering innovation.

Taking proper care of one’s mental and physical health is vital in any line of work, and good managers understand that. The QDDR contains recommendations for increasing resilience training to help people navigate a full career that will likely include some challenging posts. It also proposes increased support for wellness committees at overseas posts, as well as travel to posts by medical personnel to confer with those committees when necessary.

3. Agility, Innovation and Risk

During the QDDR’s discovery phase, our team heard repeatedly from frontline diplomats and development professionals about the urgent need to address increasingly complex physical risks around the world. Indeed, there are few, if any, countries where our personnel face no security threats at all. Regrettably, such threats are inherent to performing our duties in the post-9/11 era, but a new risk management framework, created by the Office of Management Policy, Rightsizing and Innovation under the under secretary for management, will be invaluable as the department begins carrying out the QDDR’s proposal for a senior-level agility review.

State and USAID need to implement a standard approach for managing and mitigating risks, and Sec. Kerry is beginning a dialogue with Congress and the American people about how to get this balance right. To do our work well, we must get into the field and work with local contacts; but as organizations, State and USAID must balance this imperative with security needs. Many of our colleagues feel that this balance needs to be readjusted.

I can attest to this dilemma firsthand. As a public affairs officer in Jamaica, I was planning to visit an NGO that had received an embassy grant to educate young people about preventing HIV/AIDS. Because the group operated in a
Top 10 QDDR Highlights

1. **Family-Friendly Policies.** Expanded career breaks for employees and career support for eligible family members
2. **Training.** Support for the Diplomatic Mastery curriculum at FSI; real-time training modules for posts; more long-term training opportunities with substantive performance evaluations; and increased partnerships with universities
3. **Leadership.** Hands-on coaching for first-time managers; roundtables at posts led by more experienced managers; feedback and accountability at all levels
4. **Nimble Workforce.** More excursion tours and movement into and out of the department; more senior opportunities for civil servants and locally employed staff; and greater agility to hire/deploy expertise quickly
5. **Wellness and Resilience.** Support wellness initiatives at home and at posts; train our people for resilience before, during and after challenging postings
6. **Prioritizing Good Governance.** Combating corruption and promoting the rule of law to advance the full range of our strategic priorities, from promoting inclusive growth to preventing violent extremism
7. **Agility and Risk.** Conducting a senior-level agility review, implementing the new risk management framework; starting a candid, public dialogue about inherent risk and the necessary tradeoffs for advancing America’s interests abroad
8. **Engage America.** Greater opportunities to connect directly and virtually with American students, civic groups and diaspora leaders to promote a “whole of America” approach to diplomacy and development
9. **Economic and Climate Expertise.** Ensuring that all State and USAID officials increase competency on inclusive economic growth and climate as essential elements of professional development
10. **Partnerships Beyond the Nation-State.** Adjusting to reflect the shift in power from hierarchies to networks—i.e., adapting from Westphalia to the Wiki-World—by increasing engagement below and beyond federal government, from mayors and governors to CEOs and citizen leaders

QDDR staff

designated “no go” neighborhood, the trip was initially rejected. But with creativity, teamwork and an understanding of the mission, we worked with the Regional Security Office and the local police to find a way for me to visit the site and meet those performing this vital work.

Doing our job right is not just about encouraging agility and engagement, but fostering innovation. With the help of suggestions from people like David Dzebisashvili, a USAID employee currently serving in Tbilisi, the 2015 QDDR emphasizes the need to build a stronger culture of innovation, where taking smart risks is rewarded and diplomats and development professionals are not afraid to fail and derive the necessary lessons learned in order to stay on a path toward greater success.

### 4. Leadership Coaching and Accountability

As AFSA regularly reminds management, more than 60 percent of current State Foreign Service personnel have been in the department for less than 10 years, due to the large influx of new hires during Secretary Hillary Rodham Clinton’s Diplomacy 3.0 initiative. Newer officers often need to adjust to the department’s ethos, but that should not be a one-way process. Our organizational culture needs to adapt to their needs, as well, and this requires a new style of leadership.

While researching various archives for the QDDR, we discovered an interview with a retired ambassador involved in a similar reform effort 30 years ago. This person had heard sentiments expressed such as, “Training is for dogs” and “There’s no morale problem at my post; if people don’t like it they can leave.” Clearly, we have made progress from the days when this mentality was the norm. Sec. Kerry has made clear in the QDDR and elsewhere that only leaders and managers who treat their people as human beings first and employees second will succeed. Our organizations need to start developing leadership early, ensure we have the tools to succeed and avoid burnout by providing a psychologically sustainable career.
trajectory. This approach fed into a number of our report’s recommendations.

For example, the QDDR supports an overhaul of leadership and management training to elevate hands-on, in-context coaching, not just the study of abstract ideas. It also supports broadening and deepening vetting for people who will assume State and USAID’s highest positions, so that these leaders demonstrate a pattern of treating their teams professionally and inspiring them to their best performance before assuming greater responsibilities.

5. Diplomatic Mastery and Professional Development

The QDDR strives to change State and USAID’s organizational culture to reflect larger societal changes. Both organizations need a more agile, nimble and diverse workforce that can quickly adapt to the fluid and unpredictable nature of global events. The QDDR endorses the new Diplomatic Mastery curriculum being developed at the Foreign Service Institute, as well as new “blended and continuous” training materials being developed for real-time use at posts.

In addition, our report advocates giving Foreign and Civil Service employees more opportunities to circulate within and between State and USAID and take more long-term training and excursion tours. Given the understandable fear that such rotations will take employees out of their career trajectory, the QDDR calls for more serious and meaningful performance evaluations for such “out-tours.”

No organization changes its culture overnight—certainly not large bureaucracies with their own traditions and mores. Many of the things we “have always done” exist for a good reason. But to stay on our toes and keep up with the world’s changes, we need to continually re-examine our practices, and change course where necessary.

The QDDR team believes these are important reforms, but we know that they do not mean anything without a concrete plan for implementation. If there is one thing I learned from this process, it is that the review was shaped by the people who showed up. I believe the same will be true of its implementation and impact.

Toward that end, please consider how you might engage with our office or at your post to be part of the difficult but rewarding work of making this a better place to work, so that each of us can have even greater impact around the world. Please go to www.state.gov/qddr to find out more, and write to us at QDDRideas@state.gov.
George Frost Kennan (1904-2005), scholar, diplomat and historian, is perhaps best known for his role in developing U.S. foreign policy in the immediate aftermath of World War II. In response to a State Department request for an explanation of Soviet behavior in early 1946, Kennan traced the basic features, background and prospects of Soviet foreign policy and the implications for American policy in a memo now known as the "Long Telegram." The most famous of all his writings, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," was published in the July 1947 issue of Foreign Affairs under the authorship of "X." In that article, Kennan outlined the policy of "containment" that would guide U.S. relations with the Soviet Union for the next four decades.

During a distinguished Foreign Service career from 1926 to 1953, Kennan served in Geneva, Hamburg, Tallinn, Riga and, later, Prague, Berlin, Lisbon and London. In 1933, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized the Soviet Union, Kennan accompanied the new ambassador,William C. Bullitt Jr., to establish the embassy in Moscow, serving there for four years. In July 1944, he returned to Moscow as Ambassador Averell Harriman’s deputy chief of mission. Subsequently, he served as director of the Policy Planning Staff in the Department of State from 1947 to 1949, ambassador to the USSR in 1952 and ambassador to Yugoslavia from 1961 to 1963.

Kennan retired from the Foreign Service in 1953, and in 1956 joined the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey, where he taught, researched and wrote for the rest of his life. His first book, American Diplomacy, 1900–1950 (1951), was praised on both literary and historiographical grounds, and he won Pulitzer Prizes for two later works, Russia Leaves the War (1956) and Memoirs: 1925–1950 (1967).

His subsequent publications continued to stir interest because his views, if sometimes out of step with official U.S. policy—including his prediction of the demise of the USSR—were often vindicated by history. Even when they weren’t, he was recognized for having raised the level of public discourse.

Ambassador Kennan served as president of AFSA from 1950 to 1951. This piece, excerpted from a speech he delivered at AFSA on March 30, 1961, was published in The Foreign Service Reader (AFSA, 1997). The full transcript of the speech was published in the May 1961 Foreign Service Journal.
People have often alleged that the invention of the telegraph and other technological changes have detracted from the importance of this task—that they have reduced the diplomatist to a glorified messenger boy. This view could not, I think, be more mistaken. The sort of communication which the modern diplomatist is called upon to effect demands from him an independent contribution fully as responsible, and just as replete with possibilities for originality and creativity, as that of any other profession.

Any of us who has had so much as a single year in this work has learned, I am sure, the first great lesson it has to teach: and that is, that what is important in the relations between governments is not just, or even predominantly, the “what” but rather the “how”—the approach, the posture, the manner, the style of action. The most brilliant undertaking can be turned into a failure if it is clumsily and tactlessly executed. There are, on the other hand, few blunders which cannot be survived, if not be redeemed, when matters are conducted with grace and with feeling.

Of course, the Foreign Service officer is not alone responsible for the style of diplomacy. The basic responsibility lies with people above him! But the manner in which he handles his task is a very important component in the determination of his government’s style of action, as well as in the creation of the intellectual climate out of which this style is forged. The Foreign Service is in effect a co-partner with the senior political echelons of the government in the double task of studying and comprehending the nature of our world environment, and of communicating with other governments concerning the requirements and the aspirations that flow from the life of our society.

Scholarship and Diplomacy

And this is, as I see it, outstandingly an intellectual task. It is just as much an intellectual task as teaching or scientific research or medicine. It will absorb all that anyone can give it in the way of reflectiveness. It yields to no other profession in the demands it places on the capacity for scientific analysis and creative thought. It is, in fact, a species of scholarship.

Whenever I talk about this connection between scholarship and diplomacy, which for obvious reasons is close to my heart, I have to smile at myself for something that happened to me years ago. At a friend’s house, in a book about Confucius, I came on a passage which pleased me mightily. It was part of a dialogue
The conduct of foreign policy rests today on an exercise in understanding, truly staggering in its dimension—understanding not just of the minds of a few monarchs or prime ministers, but understanding of the minds and emotions and necessities of entire peoples.

between Confucius and one of his followers, named Tsekung. It reads as follows:

*Tsekung asked Confucius: “What kind of a person do you think can properly be called a scholar?”*

*Confucius replied: “A person who shows a sense of honor in his personal conduct and who can be relied upon to carry out a diplomatic mission in a foreign country with competence and dignity can properly be called a scholar.”*

As I say, I was very pleased about this. I saw in it a vindication of my own personal conviction about the connection between the two professions. But I was somewhat nonplussed when I read further down the page and came across the following:

“What do you think of officials today?”

“Oh!” said Confucius, “those rice-bags! They don’t count at all.”

There is a special reason, in my mind, why it is important to recognize this connection between diplomacy and the life of the intellect. Diplomacy is a profession which until recently had never fully found its own soul or discovered its own proper dignity. As you all know, it had its origins, as an institution, in the relations among the royal and imperial courts of an earlier day. Its initial task was the mediation between royal persons, not states. The diplomatist was a member of the court. He stood at the center of its life: of its gossip, its intrigues, its sycophancy, of the moral corruption which inevitably attends great personal power. He gained, perhaps, in outward glamour from these associations, but he failed to gain in true professional dignity; for what was involved here was too often the interests of a dynasty, and too seldom the interests of a people.

As things began to change, in the past century and a half, as dynastic relationships began to give way to relationships reflecting the interests of entire peoples—diplomacy, for understandable reasons, was slow to change with the times. It long retained the trappings and habits of an earlier epoch. It could hardly do otherwise. It continued to be, by habit and tradition, an expensive profession. It required independent means. It required special breeding and education. These were things for which, until very recently, one had to have had the advantages of birth.

Diplomacy, for this reason, long continued to be the province of what we could call high society; and I think it suffered from this fact. It led a life remote from that of the masses and the people. It attracted the snarks and jealousies that are bound to attach themselves to any social elite. It still had, of course, its somewhat spurious social glamour; but it tended to be associated in the public mind with luxury, with personal ingratiation, with deception and intrigue, with cunning and insincerity. It failed to command wide respect as a calling which had its own integrity and could absorb the best there was in people. And even for those who practiced it, the rather unreal social climate in which it all proceeded tended to obscure rather than to reveal its true distinction and its true possibilities.

I say these things with no disrespect for the men who staffed our diplomatic missions in earlier days. On the contrary, many of these were very able people, some of the ablest we ever had. The advantages of personal security and superior education which they brought to this work often stood them in good stead.

**A Challenging, Difficult Task**

But the excellence of some of these men must not blind us to the weaknesses that affected the Service in the days when I joined it. There was still a hangover from the older assumptions of dynastic diplomacy. It was still assumed that what was most importantly involved was to know and understand, in any given county, only a small group of highly placed and influential individuals. It has taken the events of recent decades to teach us that in the modern age, diplomacy has a task far wider, more difficult, more challenging than this. The conduct of foreign policy rests today on an exercise in understanding, truly staggering in its dimension—understanding not just of the minds of a few monarchs or prime ministers, but understanding of the minds and emotions and necessities of entire peoples.
And not just a few of the peoples at that, but a round hundred of them—peoples in all conceivable stages of progress from the state of primitive man to the greatest complexities of modern industrial society. And what is involved here is all their aspects: social, economic, cultural, as well as political. It is this vast work of cognition and analysis in which the Foreign Service officer participates so prominently and responsibly. And it is in this case, commensurate—I repeat—in its demands on the mind with the task of academic scholarship and science, that I have personally come to see diplomacy’s escape from the triviality and sterility that recently threatened it, and its elevation to one of the really great and challenging callings of mankind.

On the other hand, inspiring as this task may be, we have to recognize that this profession also suffers from certainly inevitable and probably incurable handicaps. The first of these is its congenital remoteness from popular understanding. I doubt that this can ever be fully cured. The external needs of a democratic country are always going to be to some extent in conflict with the internal attitudes and aspirations of its people. To most national societies, the world outside is mainly and normally a nuisance: something that impedes and limits the ability of the people to live the way they would like to live. And the diplomatist cannot help it. His duty is to reflect the realities of this bothersome outside world, whether his fellow-countrymen like it or not.

It is his task, very often, to say the unpleasant things—the things people neither want to hear nor like to believe. The achievements of diplomacy are hard for the public to discern. The position of the diplomatist, on the other hand, is such that he constitutes a ready target for blame when things go wrong. The popular concept of the social habit of diplomacy and the nature of diplomatic life continues to arouse jealousies and resentments.

In the case of our own country this failure of understanding is particularly great. Somehow or other, to many Americans, the idea of residing permanently [abroad] in a profession at the seat of other governments and of trying patiently to understand these governments and to mediate between their minds and ours is repugnant. These people find such an occupation unmanly. They question its necessity. They cannot understand why anyone should want to do it. They suspect that it leads to a weakening of the attachment to traditional American values. They see in it a loss of true American innocence.

This is, of course, a form of provincialism. I think it is declining, as our nation grows in experience and maturity, but we must not expect it to disappear overnight. To some extent, I fear, the professional diplomatist will always remain, in his own country and particularly in this one, a person apart, the bearer of a view of his own country, which, while it does not cause him to love his own country the less, causes him to see it in other ways than his neighbors at home can ever be expected to see it. He is guilty, if you will, of the sin of detachment. In interpreting his fellow-countrymen to others, he will not be able to avoid interpreting them, to some extent, to themselves. And this is something for which they will not readily forgive him, for self-knowledge comes hard.

**A Serving Profession**

For these reasons, diplomacy is always going to consist to some extent of serving people who do not know that they are being served, who do not know that they need to be served, who misunderstand and occasionally abuse the very effort to serve them. This, too, is something to which the younger ones of you will have to accustom yourselves. It adds to the strains of the Service; it does not detract from its dignity. On the contrary. Let us take special pride in the fact that we of this profession serve, not because of, but in spite of many of the popular attitudes by which our work is surrounded. It takes a special love of country to pursue, with love, and faith, and cheerfulness, work for which no parades will ever march, no crowds will cheer, no bands will play.

The second great drawback of the Foreign Service seems to me to be the fact that it so often is, or can so easily become, an unhealthy mode of life—unhealthy in the sheer physical and nervous sense. It does involve, and always will involve an intensity of social entertainment which goes far beyond what the human frame, and particularly the human gastro-intestinal tract, was ever meant to endure. In many instances normal exercise and recreation are hard to find. It is a life of many petty anxieties and frustrations, but of few visible achievements. The
diplomatist lacks the spiritual satisfaction that comes from being able to see in concrete form the results of cultivating one’s own home and one’s own garden. His life, as that of his children, is subject to peculiar forms of insecurity, physical and psychic.

For all these reasons, I think this to be in some respects a dangerous profession. It seems to me that I have seen over the decades an unduly high percentage of older men in this Service who prematurely lost physical and intellectual tone, who became, at best, empty bundles of good manners and, at worst, rousing stuffed shirts. They are not to blame for this. They have eaten one too many a diplomatic dinner. They have pumped one too many a hand. They have exhausted the capacity for spontaneity. Let us not be superior! We all face these dangers—and some of us sooner than we like to think—and it will take our best efforts to avoid them.

If this is really the nature of our profession—if it is really thus isolated, thus misunderstood, thus unhealthy and dangerous—where does one find the rewards, the satisfactions, the compensations that could make it personally worthwhile? Let me volunteer some answers—not complete answers, certainly, but perhaps suggestive.

One looks for these rewards, first of all, in the understanding and respect brought to one’s work by one’s own colleagues—in the sheer professional comradeship they afford. This is true of many professions: it is to the colleague, not to the outsider or the client, that one looks for real appreciation. Ask the doctor, or the lawyer, or the teacher. And it’s precisely because this is so—because the people of our Service have this high degree of dependence on one another—that the Service has a special need of wise and sensitive administrative direction. It is for this reason that it needs a set of administrative and disciplinary rules that take account of its many peculiarities, of administrators who know something of the substance and the subjective sensations of its work, of a reasonable uniformity in the qualifications of membership, of fair and consistent standards in selection and promotion.

It is for this reason that it should never be permitted to become impossibly large and mechanical and impersonal. It is for this reason that it should have personnel and security procedures which do not proceed in watertight compartments, which take as their objective the whole man, not just part of him; which take cognizance of his virtues as well as his weaknesses and make their judgments on the balance of the two; which breed mutual confidence laterally and vertically rather than mutual suspicion; which avoid the evils of anonymity; and which ease, in short, the special burden of insecurity that rests in any case on Foreign Service life instead of adding to it.

The individual officer, too, must make his contribution with a view to creating the only tolerable sort of collegial atmosphere—it is up to him to discipline himself to avoid the petty jealousies, to refuse to listen to the office-intriguer and the trouble-maker, to recognize a responsibility for the morale of those around him, just as he has to draw on them for his own morale. No one, in my opinion, will experience the full satisfactions of this work if he only regards it as a means of personal advancement—only as a means of satisfying personal ambition. Ambition is all right, to a degree. God forbid that anyone should be wholly without it. But in our case, it is not enough.

Curious, Detached and Observant

To find meaning and satisfaction in this work, one must learn, first of all, to enjoy it as a way of life. One must be able to love the great diversity of nature and of human living—to forget one’s self at times, to be curious and detached and observant, to be sensitive to beauty and to tragedy, grateful for the opportunity to see life from many sides, accepting gladly the challenge that the external world presents to the understanding and the capacity for wonder. This is something which the overambitious, self-centered man will never be able to do, because he will never be able to see much beyond himself. It takes modesty, as Sigmund Freud once pointed out, to be clear-sighted.

You must also have, if you are to taste the full satisfactions of this work, a belief in its essential importance and even—if I may use this term—its solemnity. This is, after all, an
endangered, world, endangered in the grimmest sense of that term: a world endangered by the atom, by the phenomenon of overpopulation, by the lack of uniformity in the economic and social advancement of various branches of the human family, with all the tensions that produces. And finally, by the ideological prejudices in the name of which certain great peoples are today ruled. It is to this pattern of dangers that the foreign policies of our country are, in large part, addressed. There is no country whose policies are, from this standpoint, more important. There is no Foreign Service officer whose work and attitudes do not have something to do with the formulation of these policies.

Unless one realizes these things—unless one cares about them—unless one has a real love of life and a belief that there are things worth living for—unless one trembles occasionally for the civilization to which he belongs—unless one can contrive to see his work as related, however modestly, to the problem of saving this civilization—unless one consents, accordingly, to recognize that there are things at stake in his work vastly more important than the comforts or the financial enrichment or the career advancement of any single individual—unless one can do these things, then, my friends, I can give no assurance whatsoever that the strains and drawbacks of the Foreign Service life are ever going to find their compensation.

It takes a special love of country to pursue, with love, and faith, and cheerfulness, work for which no parades will ever march, no crowds will cheer, no bands will play.
Uncovering the Lessons of Vietnam

Efforts in 1975 to capture the lessons of Vietnam as a guide to future policy died in the National Security Council with the seizure of the SS Mayaguez.

BY STEPHEN RANDOLPH

America’s efforts to define the “lessons of Vietnam” started during the war, and have continued ever since, with no apparent progress toward consensus. As the terrible climax of the war arrived in April and May 1975, it seemed a natural moment to capture these lessons as a guide to future policy. Accordingly, Secretary of State and National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger directed the National Security Council staff to formulate the lessons from the war, with input from the Department of State.

Stephen Randolph serves as the historian of the U.S. Department of State. A 1974 graduate of the United States Air Force Academy, he served for 27 years on active duty in the Air Force, retiring as a colonel in 2001. He flew F-4s and F-15s, with a tour in Operation Desert Storm; held senior staff positions on the Joint Staff and the Air Staff; and then joined the faculty at the National Defense University, serving for 15 years before moving to the State Department in 2011. He earned a master’s degree in the history of science from The Johns Hopkins University in 1975 and a doctorate in history from The George Washington University in 2005. He is the author of Powerful and Brutal Weapons: Nixon, Kissinger, and the Easter Offensive (Harvard University Press, 2007).
The drafting task within the State Department fell to David Lambertson, a fourth-tour FSO who had spent three of his first four tours of duty dealing with the war in Indochina. Lambertson served in Saigon in various roles from 1965 to 1968, as spokesman for the American delegation to the Paris Peace Talks from 1971 to 1972, and then returned to the Bureau of East Asian Affairs in Washington (as it was then known). Gradually he moved further into the policy realm, and was deeply engaged in Vietnam policy as congressional support for South Vietnam disintegrated in 1974 and 1975 and as the final North Vietnamese offensive in March and April 1975 ended the war. As he later recalled, “the frailty and the flaws in the Paris Agreement on Vietnam were becoming more and more evident. … It was pretty clear that things were headed down the drain.”

In an Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training interview in 2004, Lambertson recounted: “Within a week of the fall of Saigon, we got a memo from Brent Scowcroft, a Scowcroft-Springsteen memo in which the department was asked to provide the White House a paper on the ‘lessons of Vietnam.’ I became the chief author of that, and I collected a lot of views from people in the bureau. Everybody had things to say. I wrote that memo, Bob Miller cleared it and Phil [Habib] signed it. … It’s a good memo, the sort of thing we might have done well to read carefully before our latest adventure in the Middle East.”

It was indeed a good memo, thoughtful and thorough, covering all the aspects of a strategic estimate and what might be learned from both the achievements and the failures of Vietnam. In it, Lambertson recognized the problems inherent in any attempt to apply lessons learned: “The danger may…be not that we will ignore the lessons of Vietnam, but that we will be tempted to apply them too broadly, in East Asia and around the world. Nonetheless, although not all of them are universally applicable, the lessons of Vietnam are clear, and numerous.”

The paper went to the NSC, where it ran afoul of a staff review by Richard Smyser and Bill Stearman. Their review, forwarded to Kissinger, took issue with the most basic assumption of the State Department draft: that there were useful lessons to be learned from Vietnam. The NSC considered Vietnam “a unique situation, geographically, ethnically, politically, militarily and diplomatically,” summarizing their view that “the war had almost universal effects but did not provide a universal catechism.” The NSC went on to a point-by-point critique of the State Department’s draft, in nearly all cases focusing on the difficulty of applying general precepts in a particular situation. The NSC staff nonetheless went on to offer several guidelines and lessons of their own, and forwarded their own draft to Kissinger.

The action stalled at that point, and nothing was ever forwarded to the White House. The tumult of the Mayaguez incident, involving the seizure of the SS Mayaguez by Khmer Rouge forces, preempted the attention of the entire interagency policy community, and the “lessons learned” process halted there—a circled “OBE” (Overtaken By Events) scrawled across the cover memo.

At about the same time, an apparently unrelated analysis of the Vietnam experience was produced by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That document was published in Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1976, Volume X, Vietnam, January 1973–July 1975. That volume also contains both the State Department memo and the NSC draft for Henry Kissinger that are reproduced in the following pages.

Notably, none of these informed and thoughtful contemporary analyses attribute the loss of South Vietnam to the media, which in the years since seems to have taken on a major role in the nation’s popular memory. All remain well worth reading, despite the passage of four decades and all the hard-won experience gained in the intervening wars.

“It’s a good memo, the sort of thing we might have done well to read carefully before our latest adventure in the Middle East.”

—David Lambertson
“Lessons Learned” from State

From the standpoint of State Department FSOs, the lessons to be learned from the Vietnam experience were numerous and clear.
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To draw meaningful lessons from our Vietnam experience it is essential to bear in mind the climate of the times during which fateful decisions were taken. In 1954 it was widely accepted that we faced a monolithic communist bloc bent on expansion through military means. Indochina was seen with considerable logic in that context, as a primary locus for that expansion and there was a remarkably broad consensus in this country that the United States should combat it. In the early 1960s, America was imbued with an activist, outward-looking spirit, one reflection of which was the notion that American resources and American expertise could solve any problem anywhere. It was only in the late 1960s, when our participation in what was perceived to be an unjust and unwinnable war became objectionable to broad segments of the American people, that our policies outstripped the national consensus and support for them began to wane.

Having been badly burned in Vietnam, the American people now appear to have quite different, and more limited, visions of our proper role in the world and our ability to influence events.
In a sense, a control mechanism has evolved within our society which is likely to prevent for the foreseeable future any repetition of a Vietnam style involvement. The danger may therefore be not that we will ignore the lessons of Vietnam, but that we will be tempted to apply them too broadly, in East Asia and around the world. Nonetheless, although not all of them are universally applicable, the lessons of Vietnam are clear, and numerous:

The Nature of Commitments
• We must keep commitments to individual countries tailored to our degree of interest. This is not to say that the independence and well-being of small countries are of no consequence or concern for the United States—only that such considerations are relatively more consequential in areas where our interests are more directly at issue. Related to this, resources devoted to carrying out our commitments should be proportionate to the intrinsic importance of the commitment itself, or of the interest it reflects.
  • It follows, therefore, that we should commit ourselves only selectively to undertakings likely to involve the expenditure of lives or of massive resources. (Important note: having made commitments, we cannot be selectively reliable in fulfilling them.)
  • Recognizing that constancy in our commitments is important, we should nevertheless avoid confusing constancy with inertia. When circumstances change dramatically, or a commitment clearly becomes unsustainable, we should draw the right conclusions and change our policy accordingly. 1968 was probably a better time to try for a comprehensive political settlement in Vietnam than was 1972. 1973 was a better time to press the GVN [South Vietnamese government] for further realistic political negotiations—particularly since we were in that year deprived by Congress of the ability to enforce the Paris Agreement—than was 1974 or 1975.

The Nature of Allies
• Foremost among the criteria we might henceforth employ in making judgments about our commitments is the indigenous strength and will of our prospective ally—its ability to help itself. Although the Vietnamese government we supported was far more humane than its adversary, it was, in the final analysis, unable to mobilize effectively the support of its people in the face of an implacable, disciplined enemy. Without such support, ultimate defeat was probably inevitable. In our desire to stem North Vietnamese communist expansion, we underestimated this critical factor.
  • In effect, we allowed saving South Vietnam to become more important to us than it was for the South Vietnamese themselves. In the future, we should gauge our support to our allies’ efforts, and their successes. If they cannot do the job, we will be unable to do it for them.
  • We should be fully aware of the fragility of governments which rest, to a significant degree, on the support of the military. This was not the chief cause of South Vietnam’s down-fall—indeed the GVN retained a considerable aura of legitimacy within Vietnam—but the inflexibility and narrowness of judgment of an increasingly isolated leadership in the face of unyielding North Vietnamese pressure played a role in the nation’s ultimate collapse.
  • We consistently allowed the GVN to utilize massive U.S. support as a substitute for solutions to its own internal political problems. We were never willing to force the GVN to face up to this fact.

The Nature of Adversaries
• There are probably few prospective opponents anywhere in the world who will prove to have the determination and single-mindedness of Hanoi. Nevertheless, we consistently underestimated the tenacity and sense of purpose of Hanoi, and overestimated our ability to break its will. We applied our strength without an adequate assessment of our opponent and thus neither achieved success nor deterred his pursuit of his objectives.
  • Nor should we underestimate the ability of revolutionary movements to develop broad and deep-seated popular support in loosely structured, unmodern societies. Most such societies have relatively recent memories of colonialism, or continue to experience various degrees of external exploitation, and are as such susceptible to revolutionary appeals to nationalistic instincts. In Vietnam, we were never able to escape being the inheritors of the French colonization.

We should be fully aware of the fragility of governments which rest, to a significant degree, on the support of the military.
Limitations on Our Ability to Influence Events

- Clearly, Vietnam demonstrated that the effectiveness of modern military technology is severely limited in unconventional conflicts. Neither massive firepower, nor ingenious gimmickry, can insure [sic] success. Their selective use, on a piecemeal basis, adds to their ineffectiveness.
- In addition, if we ever again undertake a direct military involvement in such a conflict, we should guard against shifting from a supportive to a primary role, as we did in Vietnam beginning in 1965.
- Moreover, we should avoid situations such as developed in Vietnam in which the indigenous defending forces became second-class citizens in their own country; as our own military role grew, ARVN’s [the South Vietnamese Army’s] declined, a situation which was not reversed until we began Vietnamization and the withdrawal of our forces.
- We should recognize that large expeditionary forces, by their very nature, will not adapt to the conditions of an unconventional conflict. Instead, the tendency will be to transform an unconventional war to a conventional one, while fundamental political aspects of the conflict are progressively ignored.
- We should admit our own imperfect understanding of the political dynamics of foreign (particularly Asian) societies. In Vietnam we persistently looked at political conditions, and made our judgments from what was basically a Western perspective.
- Since our ability to understand the politics of countries such as Vietnam is limited, it follows that our attempts to manipulate political forces may well fail. We should not assume, as we did in 1963, that we know what is best for a country and proceed, as in the overthrow of [President Ngo Dinh] Diem, to precipitate a situation with unknown and possibly disastrous consequences. Nor should we take the opposite tack—allying ourselves too rigidly with a leadership whose diminishing mandate we may not be able to perceive.

International Aspects of Bilateral Commitments

- We should more realistically assess our ability to maintain international support for difficult undertakings, recognizing at the outset that we may be operating alone, that other governments—because of limited resources, differing political perceptions or divergent national interests—will not support our efforts in any meaningful way. Through strenuous efforts we elicited some tangible support from a few of our friends for our policies in Vietnam but this was not sustained.
- Moreover, we should bear in mind the possibility of undertakings such as Vietnam actively damaging our relations with other allies.
- We should not expect, in the event of another situation like Vietnam, that the major communist powers will help pull our chestnuts out of the fire. At best, our bilateral relationships with the PRC [Peoples Republic of China] and the Soviet Union may encourage a passive response from them—whether things are going well for us (as in 1972), or badly (as in 1975).
- We should expect that the major communist powers will support local subversion and wars of liberation, particularly if they perceive no adverse effect on their relations with us or on their direct interests.

The Management of Commitments

- If we were ever to become involved again in an effort of the magnitude of Vietnam, we could make things somewhat easier for ourselves by improving the ways we attempt to manage our involvement. It can be argued that, in addition to having very little control over what South Vietnam did, we were never in firm control of our own resources, whether military, economic or political. A diffusion of responsibility and control compounded our difficulties.
- We should guard against biased intelligence and analysis to support policy goals, as happened in Vietnam particularly during the height of our involvement. Related to this, we should be wary of “advocacy reporting” from our missions and within the bureaucracy at home. A particularly virulent form of “localitis” affected many capable and dedicated individuals working in or on Vietnam. They were intensely committed to a worthy goal, but personal commitment sometimes blurred judgment.
- We should devise more effective ways of bridging the gap between the expert level and the decision-making level of the government. Cogent judgment was often obscured as informa-
tion and recommendations proceeded upward through the system, because of the pressures for success.

- We should insure [sic] that the political and military aspects of our commitments, and the resources we devote to each, are kept in proper balance. Military considerations will become dominant in policy if that balance is skewed and, as in Vietnam, we may lose sight of the fundamental nature of the conflict and our goals in it.
- We should try to insure [sic] that we do not become locked-in to “firefighting” management techniques. We must improve our ability to anticipate events in any situation of major American involvement, rather than finding ourselves—as we so often did in Vietnam—coping with crises after they had arisen.

Domestic Considerations

- We should recognize that no amount of cajolery can create public support for a foreign undertaking where none already exists. (Thus, our commitments must be related to perceived national interests.) An administration, by active leadership, can only energize latent support.
- Having become involved in a difficult foreign project, we should not attempt to mislead public opinion or the Congress as to its duration or the level of sacrifice it will require. We should not profess to see lights at the ends of tunnels. We should not employ short-term rationales, out of short-term expediency, when in fact much remains to be done.
- We should never assume that inconsistencies in our policies, or foul-ups in their implementation, will go unnoticed by the fourth estate. We will have to live with the fact that mistakes will be exposed (as well as, unfortunately, the fact that any course of action, right or wrong, will be second-guessed).
- We should insure [sic] that Congress is on board not only at the outset of foreign commitments, but at every stage at which any escalation of our commitment or involvement is contemplated. In the absence of congressional support, clearly, commitment beyond a certain level is impossible.
- Consistent with the requirements of military security, our basic policy decisions should be publicly stated and defended.

---
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In National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger’s view, Vietnam offered very few lessons that could be usefully applied elsewhere.

Memorandum 3173-X: The White House, Washington
Secret/Sensitive/Eyes Only
Memorandum For: The President
From: Henry A. Kissinger
Subject: Lessons from Vietnam

Declassified E.O. 12957, Sec. 3.5, NSC Memo, 11/24/98, State Dept Guidelines, by KBH, NARA, Date 2/10/00, Gerald R. Ford Library

At your request, I have prepared some thoughts on the “lessons of Vietnam” for your consideration and for your background information in dealing with further press questions on the subject.

It is remarkable, considering how long the war lasted and how intensely it was reported and commented, that there are really not very many lessons from our experience in Vietnam that can be usefully applied elsewhere despite the obvious temptation to try. Vietnam represented a unique situation, geographically, ethnically, politically, militarily and diplomatically. We should probably be grateful for that and should recognize it for what it is, instead of trying to apply the “lessons of Vietnam” as universally as we once tried to apply the “lessons of Munich.”

The real frustration of Vietnam, in terms of commentary and evaluation, may be that the war had almost universal effects but did not provide a universal catechism.

A frequent temptation of many commentators has been to draw conclusions regarding the tenacity of the American people and the ultimate failure of our will. But I question whether we can accept that conclusion. It was the longest war in American history, the most distant, the least obviously relevant to our nation’s immediate concerns, and yet the American people supported our involvement and its general objectives until the very end. The people made enormous sacrifices. I am convinced that, even at the end, they would have been prepared to support a policy that would have saved South Vietnam if such an option had been available to use.

It must not be forgotten that the decisions of American administrations that involved this nation in the war were generally supported at the time they were taken, and that they
were supported not only among the people at large but among the political elements and among the journalists who later came to oppose the war. The American people generally supported and applauded President Eisenhower for a decision to partition Vietnam and to support an anti-Communist government in the South. The American people, and particularly the American media, supported President Kennedy’s decision to go beyond the restrictions on American involvement that President Eisenhower had set and they also supported his decision to permit American involvement in the removal of President Diem—although the extent of that involvement was not clear at the time.

Many who were later to be labeled as “doves” on Vietnam then insisted that South Vietnam had to be saved and that President Diem’s removal was essential to save it. You, yourself, will remember the strong support that the Tonkin Gulf resolution won on the Hill and the general support for President Johnson’s decision to send troops. President Nixon won an outpouring of support for the decision to withdraw American forces at a gradual pace, as well as for the Paris Peace Agreement.

If one could offer any guidelines for the future about the lessons to be drawn regarding foreign policy, it would be that American political groups will not long remain comfortable in positions that go against their traditional attitudes. The liberal Democrats could not long support a war against a revolutionary movement, no matter how reactionary the domestic tactics of that movement. They had accepted the heavy commitment to Vietnam because of President Kennedy, whom they regarded as their leader, but they withdrew from it under President Johnson.

Focus on Essentials

One clear lesson that can be drawn, however, is the importance of absolute honesty and objectivity in all reporting, within and from the government, as well as from the press. U.S. official reports tended for a long time to be excessively optimistic, with the result that official statements did not make clear to the American people how long and how tough the conflict might turn out to be. After a while the pessimistic reports from journalists began to gain greater credibility because such positive trends as did emerge came too slowly to justify optimistic Washington assessments. In Vietnam, the situation was generally worse than some reported and better than others reported. But the pessimistic reports, even if they were inaccurate, began to look closer to the mark until almost any government statement could be rejected as biased, not only by the opposition but by an increasingly skeptical public.

Vietnam represented a unique situation, geographically, ethnically, politically, militarily, and diplomatically.

Another lesson would be the absolute importance of focusing our own remarks and the public debate on essentials—even if those essentials are not clearly visible every night on the television screen. The Vietnam debate often turned into a fascination with issues that were, at best, peripheral. The “tiger cages” were seen as a symbol of South Vietnamese government oppression, although that government was facing an enemy who had assassinated, tortured, and jailed an infinitely greater number; the “Phoenix” program became a subject of attack although North Vietnamese and Viet Cong tactics were infinitely more brutal.

The My Lai incident tarnished the image of an American army that had generally—though not always—been compassionate in dealing with the civilian population. Even at the end, much of the public discussion focused on President Thieu’s alleged failure to gain political support, but it was the communists who rejected free elections and who brought in their reserve divisions because they did not have popular support. And at home, it was argued that your aid request meant American reinvolvement when nothing was further from your mind. Of equal importance may be a dedication to consistency. When the United States entered the war during the 1960s, it did so with excesses that not only ended the career and the life of an allied leader but that may have done serious damage to the American economy and that poured over half a million soldiers into a country where we never had more than 100,000 who were actually fighting. At the end, the excesses in the other direction made it impossible to get from the Congress only about 2 or 3 percent as much money as it had earlier appropriated every year. When we entered, many did so in the name of morality. But nobody spoke of the morality of consistency, or of this virtue of seeing something through once its cost had been reduced to manageable proportions.

In terms of military tactics, we cannot help but draw the conclusion that our armed forces are not suited to this kind of war. Even the Special Forces who had been designed for it could...
not prevail. This was partly because of the nature of the conflict. It was both a revolutionary war fought at knife-point during the night within the villages. It was also a main force war in which technology could make a genuine difference. Both sides had trouble devising tactics that would be suitable for each type of warfare. But we and the South Vietnamese had more difficulty with this than the other side. We also had trouble with excesses here: when we made it “our war,” we would not let the South Vietnamese fight it; when it again became “their war,” we would not help them fight it. Ironically, we prepared the South Vietnamese for main force warfare after 1954 (anticipating another Korean-type attack), and they faced a political war; they had prepared themselves for political warfare after 1973, only to be faced with a main force invasion 20 years after it had been expected.

Domestic Political Attacks

Our diplomacy also suffered in the process, and it may take us some time to bring things back to balance. We often found that the United States could not sustain a diplomatic position for more than a few weeks or months before it came under attack from the same political elements that had often advocated that very position. We ended up negotiating with ourselves, constantly offering concession after concession while the North Vietnamese changed nothing in the diplomatic objectives and very little in their diplomatic positions. It was only in secret diplomacy that we could hold anything approaching a genuine dialogue, and even then the North Vietnamese could keep us under constant public pressure. Our diplomacy often degenerated into frantic efforts to find formulas that would evoke momentary support and would gloss over obvious differences between ourselves and the North Vietnamese. The legacy of this remains to haunt us, making it difficult for us to sustain a diplomatic position for any length of time, no matter how obdurate the enemy, without becoming subject to domestic attack.

In the end, we must ask ourselves whether it was all worth it, or at least what benefits we did gain. I believe the benefits were many, though they have long been ignored, and I fear that we will only now begin to realize how much we need to shore up our positions elsewhere once our position in Vietnam is lost. We may be compelled to support other situations much more strongly in order to repair the damage and to take tougher stands in order to make others believe in us again.

I have always believed, as have many observers, that our decision to save South Vietnam in 1965 prevented Indonesia from falling to communism and probably preserved the American presence in Asia. This not only means that we kept our troops. It also means that we kept our economic presence as well as our political influence, and that our friends—including Japan—did not feel that they had to provide for their own defense. When we consider the impact of what is now happening, it is worth remembering how much greater the impact would have been 10 years ago when the communist movement was still widely regarded as a monolith destined to engulf us all.

Therefore, in our public statements I believe [that] we can honorably avoid self-flagellation and that we should not characterize our role in the conflict as a disgraceful disaster. I believe our efforts, militarily, diplomatically and politically, were not in vain. We paid a high price, but we gained 10 years of time and we changed what then appeared to be an overwhelming momentum. I do not believe our soldiers or our people need to be ashamed.
Glen Beck once called me an “enemy of the state,” and “not a patriot.” He did this on CNN during prime time, before his descent into the fringes of apocalyptic Internet television, in reference to a single phrase from a 30-minute interview I did on Al-Jazeera (in Arabic) in October 2006. My concession that “there was U.S. arrogance and stupidity in Iraq” briefly but intensely caught the attention of the media and blogosphere.

Beck was joined in his outrage by Michelle Malkin, the New York Post, National Review and assorted bloggers, all participants in what Middle East scholar Marc Lynch called “the Fernandez Stupidstorm.” Lynch, one of the few Westerners who actually watched and understood the entire interview, was an informed defender, as was Robert Satloff of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, writing in the Weekly Standard. My hometown newspaper, the Miami Herald, also came to my defense.

I received a dozen calls from total strangers telling me that I “should go back to Mexico (or Venezuela or Mecca or Tehran)” or congratulating me for “coming out against the war/sticking it to the Man.” Some good came out of the notoriety, too: I reconnected with an old Army buddy and with a good friend from high school.

And a leading Egyptian magazine, Rose al-Youssef, produced a puff piece on “The Fate of the Man Who Told the Truth.”

Yet except for a few foreign policy cognoscenti and Middle East scholars, almost no one knew actually what they were talking about. Both the right and the left were wrong. I had neither come
out against the war, nor broken new ground in what was one out of more than a hundred sentences I uttered.

“Mistakes Have Been Made”

Unknown to Beck and most people, the phrase wasn’t even mine. I had cribbed it from remarks that U.S. Ambassador to Iraq Zalmay Khalilzad had delivered a few weeks before my Al-Jazeera appearance. Speaking on Oct. 5, 2006, in Baquba, Amb. Khalilzad had admitted that “mistakes have been made over the past few years. There have been times when U.S. officials have behaved arrogantly and were not receptive to advice from local leaders.”

Ironically, Zal made his remarks in English, but they were mostly reported in Arabic. Mine were in Arabic, but were posted by Reuters in English. I had read about the ambassador’s remarks on the front page of the leading pan-Arab daily, Al-Hayyat, in an article titled “Khalilzad: Arrogance and Stupidity by U.S. in Iraq.” The article went on to say that he had been referring to American incompetence in the reconstruction of Iraq.

One of the ambassador’s speechwriters contacted me after the uproar over my interview, noting that “in his remarks at the opening of the Baquba [Provincial Reconstruction Team office] a few weeks ago, he said that some U.S. officials had made arrogant and foolish mistakes during the occupation of Iraq. This is not only stating the obvious, but is a prerequisite to regaining some semblance of credibility with Iraqi and regional audiences.”

While I fully concur with that sentiment, I also still agree with what one smart senior official told me at the time: “You got caught; Zal didn’t. He got away with it. And no one in this building is going to make things worse by dragging him down to cover for you.” But I also treasure another message, from one of our most distinguished ambassadors, who wrote “whatever it cost you at home, out here your candor won credibility both for you and for the U.S., and cost the U.S. nothing.”

Overhauling Public Diplomacy

My presence on Arab-language media had been the culmination of a challenge that has bedeviled public diplomacy officers ever since the U.S. Information Agency’s consolidation into the State Department, back in October 1999. The role of PD officers in the field was clear, and so was the work of functional PD bureaus in the R family—Public Affairs, Educational and Cultural Affairs, and International Information Programs. But PD offices in geographic bureaus—the direct descendants of what had been USIA area offices—had struggled for relevance. All too often a PD office director would be reduced to touting an exchange program or performing artist’s tour to bored bureau leadership more interested in the latest political developments occurring in the field.

When I took over the PD shop in the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs in June 2005, I confronted the same challenge. The first thing we did was consolidate all bureau PD functions in one office, NEA’s Office of Press and Public Diplomacy. Previously there had been an Iraq PD office, an NEA Press office and the PD office. I also secured a promise that NEA/PPD would one day move into Main State (which was finally fulfilled in 2013, long after I left NEA). My job was to be office director, supporting PD offices in 18 countries, not an Arabic-language spokesman; but I wound up wearing both hats.

I was aided in my work by dramatic media developments in the region that policymakers considered extremely important. The years after 9/11 coincided with the flowering of Arabic-language broadcast media. This was the heyday of Qatari-controlled Al-Jazeera and its rival, Saudi-funded Al-Arabiya, as well as the

Ironically, Zal [Zalmay Khalilzad] made his remarks in English, but they were mostly reported in Arabic. Mine were in Arabic, but were posted by Reuters in English.
U.S. government’s star-crossed effort to compete in that space, Al-Hurra. Satellite channels proliferated. After the war, Iraq alone had dozens of them. There were broadcasters and talk shows of every sort, hungry for content and viewers.

Under the able leadership of Frank Finver, we constructed a little cell to try to provide official voices who could speak to these audiences. We were empowered by the vision and insight of Under Secretary Karen Hughes, a controversial figure who did a far better job than she has been given credit for. Hughes had been forced to take a group of journalists along for her first visit to the region, a “listening tour,” and the coverage had been brutal.

But it was Hughes who, despite understandable uneasiness from the Public Affairs Bureau, encouraged PD officers to speak out more frequently, especially on broadcast television. She also pushed through the first of the regional media hubs, in Dubai; set up a rapid response unit; worked to realign PD positions overseas to reflect new realities; and funded the first practical workshops in Arabic to prepare FSOs to speak live on television.

Engaging Middle East Audiences

Meanwhile, our modest operation in NEA flourished. While our goal was to get the most senior department officials on the air, it usually fell to me to fill in when they begged off at the last moment. Satellite broadcasters wanted content and were eager for American guests, especially anyone who could engage audiences in Arabic, without filters or delays for translation. From 2005 to 2007, I carried out 71 percent of all NEA press appearances (426, most in Arabic), often subbing at the last moment for others.

We aimed to engage almost everyone in the region: local stations, Arab regime media and the Arabic service of Qol Israel, Islamist stations and the lively Lebanese stations tied to a particular party or confession (we did avoid stations connected to terrorist groups like Hamas and Hezbollah, and Iraqi insurgent groups, of course). But priority was given to the most popular stations: Al-Jazeera, Al-Arabiya and BBC Arabic Radio. Several years later, while serving as chargé d’affaires in Sudan, I was greeted at the Kalma Internally Displaced Persons Camp in Darfur by enthusiastic young refugees who claimed to have listened to me on BBC Arabic for years.

By far the most challenging of all venues were the shows featuring hourlong debates on Al-Jazeera. Ghassan Ben Jeddou’s “Open Dialogue” program (on which my notorious October 2006 interview occurred) from Beirut; Syrian Faisal al-Qassem’s “The Opposite Direction,” which often descended into shouting matches; and the more sedate “From Washington” program, hosted by Abderrahim Foukara from the station’s studios on K Street, were the most-watched programs on the most-watched channel in the Arab world.

I was not the first diplomat to venture into such forbidding terrain, to be sure. Veteran Arab-American PD officer Nabeel Khoury had begun doing those interviews at the beginning of the 2003 Iraq War. But I believe I was the first official American non-native speaker to go on the debate shows and operate entirely in Arabic. Imagine going on live on “Crossfire” or “McLaughlin Group” in a language not your own, to debate a native speaker on the most contentious issue of the day! It was both exhilarating and terrifying.

Although I often had little time to prepare for “standups” (brief interviews on a breaking news item, usually done standing up and often at the mezzanine of the C Street entrance in the department), I usually had at least a few hours to prepare for the talk shows. I would take the latest press guidance and translate it...
by hand (the better to learn the vocabulary). Since the guidance was never long enough, I would glean whatever I could find from presidential remarks, from the Secretary of State and from senior officials, to supplement my talking points. The challenge came from the fact that the material was neither specific nor convincing enough for a fast-paced, dynamic media environment. You had to make your point quickly, or you would soon find yourself in uncharted territory.

After the Storm

The "Fernandez Stupidstorm" had a happy ending. Within 24 hours of the news breaking, I wrote up the usual, insincere "I mis-spoke" statement for release by PA and moved on. I took off a few days from press work and then returned to the fray. One Arab media wag joked upon my return that "Fernandez has now been liberated from Guantanamo after his recent misdeed."

I was fortunate in the strong and constant support I received from Karen Hughes and from the NEA front office. The fact that we had been fully transparent with them all along about the scope of the challenge we faced, the risk involved and the volume and quality of our work, helped. It also helped that when senior officials looked at the full transcript prepared after the fact by the Open Source Center, they could see that I had defended rather than attacked the Bush administration. If I had truly wanted to denounce them, I would have used more of my allotted time to do so.

While others may draw different conclusions, the lessons I learned in those days, both before and during my brush with fame, have served me well in two tours as a chief of mission (in Sudan and Equatorial Guinea) and in my just-concluded stint as director of the Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications, a unique and worthy effort to conduct media outreach differently. Those lessons are:

• Be bold and unafraid in your dealings with the press.
• Document everything you do.
• Make sure to let your superiors know what you are doing and that it is difficult and inherently risky—before something bad happens.
• And, most important of all, don’t worry too much; enjoy your work and the people you interact with along the way.
FS KNOW-HOW

The Big Downsizing

Retirement Lessons

Here are some lessons learned on the retirement transition from a member of the Foreign Service who’s been there recently.

BY EILEEN MALLOY

For my family, 2014 was the year of the big downsizing. For me, it was the perfect storm. I spent it helping to dispose of my father’s 80-year accumulation of art and artifacts; clearing my aunt’s beloved home of a lifetime of books, papers and knickknacks; and moving my own household from Virginia to Washington state—all while working part-time for the Office of the Inspector General as a WAE team leader.

Want to guess which of these three big tasks was the most difficult, time-consuming and expensive? My personal move, of course. It was the first time I had to move household effects at my own expense since joining the Foreign Service in 1978.

Eileen Malloy retired from the Senior Foreign Service in 2008 after a 30-year career and continues to work as an inspection team leader for the Office of the Inspector General. She served as ambassador to Kyrgyzstan from 1994 to 1997.

We are all set to go. When the moving van arrives, you will be glad you took the time to downsize.
It was an arduous process and a serious learning experience for me. Here are some of the insights I gained and a list of pointers that may be helpful to others undertaking this transition.

**So Much Stuff**

Why do Foreign Service members accumulate so much paper? Why do we have such an accretion of unusual artifacts? When did we buy so many duplicates of the same household items? These are the questions I grappled with as I sorted through my things.

**Paper.** When you work for the State Department you attract paper files like lint in a multiple-pet household. Travel vouchers, decades of personnel actions, annual evaluations lauding your superior abilities, letters of appreciation, newspaper articles and references you swore you needed to consult but never did—they’re all accumulating down in those file boxes stashed in the attic or basement or self-storage locker.

**Souvenirs, artifacts, treasures.** You can tell an FSO’s first post of assignment by looking around his or her home. The majority of decorative items tend to be accumulated during one’s first overseas tour. After that there is a geometric decline in acquisition. As one progresses in one’s career, the “gifts” begin to accumulate. U.S. government ethics rules preclude acceptance of gifts from foreign governments unless they are under a certain dollar value, so we are not talking about pricey items here. For those of us who have served in less wealthy countries, such gifts are usually handmade items reflecting local culture, often inscribed by the giver with the recipient’s name, which makes them hard to re-gift.

Survival equipment for overseas duty in countries lacking a Wal-Mart. I held on to all the items I normally shipped in our air freight to use during that indeterminate period of time spent waiting for our household effects shipment to arrive. My logic was that these would be ideal for starter kitchens when the kids set out on their own, but it turns out that kids heading off to college prefer IKEA to Mom’s basement trove of vintage utensils and appliances.

As a result, my aging 220-volt appliances were collecting dust in the basement, right next to the home-canning jars and boiling pots we had needed in Central Asia. Then there were the four pairs of felt-lined boots, dozens of parkas and wool coats, and fur hats and coats I had acquired during multiple tours in Moscow.

**Start Downsizing Now!**

If you neglected to take advantage within the stipulated timeframe of the State Department relocation funding to move your household effects to your retirement home (see 14 FAM 584.2-2 for more info on this benefit) like I did, you need to start downsizing now. I gave myself a full year to accomplish this process and still ended up moving things to Washington state that I should have jettisoned back in Virginia.

Why does it take this long? You could just lock the door, walk away with a suitcase and have the junk man haul it all away. But you would run the risk of identity fraud from all those old documents with your Social Security number blowing around the landfill, or have trouble claiming capital improvements on your personal residence because you no longer have the receipts to prove you made those investments. Or you may need to produce receipts for official travel when audited by the bureau that funded the trip or by the Office of the Inspector General.

**Have the Right Tools**

To downsize in a thoughtful manner, you will need the right tools. Here is what I recommend:

- A computer with sufficient storage space to hold scanned copies of those documents you need to retain
- A back-up electronic storage system to protect your e-files should your computer crash or be stolen
- A scanner connected to your computer
- A cross-cut shredder to deal with paper with sensitive personal information
- A magnifying glass for reading those old documents
• A sturdy paper file box for those documents that need to be retained in original paper form (deeds, for example).

Go Green

To downsize in an environmentally responsible manner, you need to keep as many of your extraneous household effects as possible out of the landfills. This means taking time to find places to sell, give away, donate or recycle what you no longer need. Look beyond Goodwill or the Salvation Army; you will find that there are many nongovernmental organizations interested in your ephemera.

I donated a carload of artifacts from my career to the U.S. Diplomacy Center Foundation (diplomacy.state.gov). Another carload went to the Associates of the American Foreign Service Worldwide, for their annual Bookfair at the State Department.

If your 220-volt appliances are in good working order, find a new FSO out at the Foreign Service Institute who can use them on their first tour overseas. Remember how pressed financially you were when you first started in the Service?

We also used Freecycle (www.freecycle.org) to give away items we did not plan to take with us to our retirement home. Remember all those old record albums stored in boxes in the basement? The good news is that generation Y has rediscovered the beauty of high fidelity, and records are coming back into demand. As with all things, the rarity and the condition of the album will determine its value. The local record resale shop was quite excited to see my Paul McCartney album, issued only in the USSR in the late 1980s.

Items of Value

If you have valuable collector’s items you wish to sell, think through whether you want to take the time and effort to market them online (e.g., via Ebay or Amazon) or whether you want to use an auction or consignment house. We used auction houses to sell my father’s collections of bronzes, paintings, firearms and other antiques. One auction house, Cowan’s, was particularly helpful.

If the items have value, a good auction house will readily accept them for inclusion in their next catalog or for online sales in small batches. Ask around to find out which firms and consignment shops have been used by people you trust. Make sure you clarify what the auction house or consignment charges for their services before you turn over items to them for sale.

Especially valuable items will bring in more money if handled by a dealer or a specialized auction house, because they are more apt to know collectors who have an interest in such items. You would be wise to get estimates from several different dealers on your high-value items.

How do you find out whether your treasures are really as valuable as you think they are? The easy way is to look up the item on Ebay or Amazon. This will tell you the value of similar items being offered. But beware—this does not mean that anyone is actually paying that price. Still, it should give you an idea of what is collectible and what is just not worth your time and effort to sell.

Sadly, for those of us who love fine china and crystal, there is not much interest in sets of traditional china among the younger generations. Families today have no space to store grandmother’s china service for 12, nor do they care to use china that cannot be washed in a dishwasher. Select a few pieces you think you will actually use in your retirement home, and then consign or donate the remaining china service.

Deciding What to Keep

So how do you decide what to keep and what to shed? Obviously a very personal decision, it is also constrained by the location and size of your retirement home. Let’s assume you know where you will be moving and have a firm idea of the kind of housing you will occupy (e.g., single-family home or condo). That will give you an idea of what you can accommodate. In addition, I found that a good rule of thumb is to assume that it will cost you a dollar to move each pound of your household effects.

We decided to leave behind much of our furniture; it was worn after so many moves in and out of storage, and the style did not seem to fit with the Pacific Northwest. There is virtually no market these days for old, dark wood furniture (called “brown furniture” in the trade), so consider donating it to a charitable organization. The bright side of the cheap prices in vintage
furniture is that you can buy replacements at your new location for a song. We picked up a mahogany dining table with two extensions and eight carved chairs for less than what it would have cost to ship my old table and chairs across the country. We have had fun trolling through consignment and antique shops to select replacement pieces for our new home.

Don’t think you can manage to do this culling on your own? Look for a senior real estate specialist in your local yellow pages or online. These people provide counseling and advice to people relocating into retirement homes. Or you can read up on the topic: one book that looks useful is Bruce Nemovitz’s Moving in the Right Direction (Book Publisher’s Network, 2006).

The Sorting Process

Sorting through those mountains of paper can be daunting. Do not succumb to the temptation to ship it with the idea of using that free time you think you will have in retirement to sort through it. First of all, those files are heavy (remember, $1 per pound); second, you will not have room in your retirement home to store all that paper. I worked through a couple of files each evening while the family watched TV. I set up two boxes: one for material to shred and the other for retention. It was easy to leaf through the files and separate the dross from the gold.

This is how I decided what to keep, what to toss and where to toss it:

• If it is related to your work at State, learn the rules on what must be retained and for how long. If you must keep it, decide if you can retain a scanned copy and dispose of the paper copy. For example, I scan the first page of travel vouchers so I have proof the voucher was filed, and then shred the actual voucher. If the travel was recent, I retain the original receipts.

• If it is a personal document, decide whether you will need it in the future for tax or insurance purposes. If so, will a scan suffice or do you need the original? If it is not needed, shred it.

• If the document is related to your family history, you may consider keeping a scanned copy for your relatives. If it is something unusual, you may wish to retain the original.

• When in doubt, always shred receipts. Remember that old receipts had the full credit card number printed on them, and many checks and old State personnel documents have your SSN on them somewhere.

Photographic Memories

Those of you who travel lean may only have a few snapshots of your favorite people and places. Of course you will take all those with you. Shutterbugs like me, however, have thousands of digital images stored on our computer and boxes of old negatives waiting to be scanned. I also have photos and negatives going back to 1902, which were taken by my grandfather and father. Most of you will be somewhere in the middle in terms of the volume of video and photo holdings. Here’s how I would suggest you approach downsizing:

• Do a survey to identify exactly what you have and what form it is in, then sit down with your family to decide what kinds of images should be saved. Even if you have been diligent about photo albums, and you already have all your best pictures in those, odds are that your retirement residence will not have sufficient space to store them all.

• Explore digital scanning of your negatives and photos. Once that is done, you can select your favorite photos and use them to decorate your new home. It is easy to create collages or to touch up a faded image. Make sure that you have a good back-up storage system for your photos so that you do not lose them in the event of a computer malfunction. (We store a separate hard drive with a backup of our computer files in a safe deposit box.)

• If you have photos that document Foreign Service life or international events or people of note, consider offering them to the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training (www.adst.org) for use in the oral history program. ADST will accept relevant photos provided they are already scanned into JPEG format and are accompanied by a brief description of the photo’s content (who, what, where, when). You also can offer such photos to the U.S. Diplomacy Center, which is collecting photos relevant to diplomatic history.

• Create boxes of family photos for relatives (kids and grandkids, in particular) to explore. My grandchildren love to see pictures of their mother when she was a child. I let them take any of these pictures they wish to have because I have them all in digital form. My cousins were very happy to find pictures of long-forgotten family gatherings showing their parents (my aunts and uncles) back in the 1950s. I gave away about half of my old photos this way.

Let It Go!

You cannot save every item documenting your life. The key is to retain only the most important ones and find a good home for all the others. That is why you need a full year to accomplish downsizing. You will find that you will need to examine the same collection more than once, each time winnowing out a few more items.

Believe me: The day that moving van pulls up to your door, you will be glad you took the time to downsize.
Assignment Restrictions Programs: A Discussion on Reform

More than 50 colleagues packed into an overflowing room on May 21 to learn about and offer feedback on the Department of State’s assignment restriction and pass-through programs, which govern how and when an employee’s security clearance may be restricted to preclude them from serving in certain countries or working on certain issues.

These programs are driven by the department’s interest in protecting employees from potential undue foreign influence. However, their execution often has undesirable effects on the lives and careers of Foreign Service employees (see the November 2014 AFSA News).

The event—sponsored by the American Foreign Service Association, the Asian-Americans in Foreign Affairs Association and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—came on the heels of an exclusive May 13 briefing on the same issue for the Diversity Governance Council and Deputy Secretaries of State Antony Blinken and Heather Higginbottom.

This second gathering brought together representatives from the Bureaus of Diplomatic Security and Human Resources, the Office of Personnel Management’s Diversity and Outreach Office and the White House Initiative on Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders.

AFSA State Vice President Matthew Asada, EEOC Associate Director Dexter Brooks and AAFAA President Tom Wong led the conversation.

While all three supported DS’s ability to apply heightened security screening, they urged that improvements be made to the current system (e.g., creating robust appeal mechanisms and making information regarding the basis for restriction decisions available to employees). The three expressed a willingness to work with the department to find constructive solutions.

Foreign Service attendees of diverse national origin spoke up about the lack of transparency in the process. Many said the department never bothered to notify them of their preclusion. Further, obtaining the reasons for assignment restrictions is challenging because DS policy requires employees to submit Freedom of Information Act requests to release their information.

For some, the event represented their first opportunity to speak directly with DS and HR representatives. One officer said she found out she was not able to serve at post the very day she was supposed to fly out. Another reported that he underwent extensive training, only to be held at the Foreign Service Institute without explanation for over a year and then told he was no longer eligible to serve in his assigned country. A third explained how, due to her changed marital status, she was barred from serving.

Continued on page 83
Farewell as State Vice President

When I began my term as AFSA vice president, a colleague asked me to explain some basic facts on what AFSA is, whom it represents and how it works. From that conversation, it became clear that raising awareness of the association among its own membership (not to mention Congress and other partners) would need to be a priority.

Now, as I complete my term two years later, I want to reflect on those basic—yet critical—questions, and specifically on the people of AFSA, the policies it advocates and the programs it runs.

People: AFSA is underpinned by a long history of democratic union governance (See the November 2013 AFSA News).

A professional association and union with 16,500 dues-paying members, AFSA is led by an elected Governing Board comprised of active-duty and retired Foreign Service members. The board sets policy, approves the budget and selects an executive director who manages the association’s 36-person professional staff.

The president chairs the Governing Board and authorizes AFSA post representatives, elected by members at post, to interact with post management on employees’ behalf. The vice presidents negotiate with agency management; in my case, I engaged with the Department of State. The president and vice presidents are full-time Foreign Service members detailed to AFSA.

One measure of an organization’s health is the number of members running for board positions or serving as post representatives. In my four years on the Governing Board, AFSA has seen an increase in the number and diversity of members running for election or applying for board vacancies. This trend is indicative of increased member awareness and a growing interest in making AFSA service part of one’s career.

Policies: Last year, AFSA celebrated 90 years as a professional association, and this year marks its 42nd as a union. Although members of the Service, per the Foreign Service Act, are unable to strike, the most important tool at AFSA’s disposal is the right to collectively bargain.

AFSA regularly exercises this right on policies and practices affecting performance management (e.g., core and procedural precepts), public speaking and social media, and danger pay, among others.

In instances when we are unable to reach agreement with management, or feel it has violated a negotiated labor agreement, we may take the issue to the impasse panel or appeal to the Foreign Service Grievance Board. Such was the case with 2013 and 2014 Meritorious Service Increases, 2014 Overseas Comparability Pay collection payments and the department’s improper implementation of a post policy without AFSA consent.

In addition, we recommended and saw through new appointments to the Foreign Service Impasse Disputes Panel and the Foreign Service Grievance Board during my term.

We are developing a new Foreign Service Institute course to better educate the department’s leaders, managers and employees about FS labor relations. And we ensured that the department transmitted AFSA’s “State of the Foreign Service Workforce” Section 326 report to Congress for the first time in 15 years (see the June AFSA News).

I am especially proud of the organization’s work on diversity, including starting a discussion on reform of the assignment restriction and pass-through programs. Our proposal to introduce an independent appeals mechanism would ensure that all members of the Service have an equal opportunity to serve.

Programs: AFSA serves its members from multiple locations. Most professional staff sit at AFSA headquarters; however, the 10-person labor management office is at Main State. Two staff members work out of USAID.

In the last two years, we’ve hosted numerous events from these locations, including breakfasts for chiefs of mission, a mid-term members’ meeting, skill-code themed lunchtime conversations and holiday receptions.

We connected virtually through webinars with post representatives and skill-code cohorts, and launched a new website to better interact with all of our members. Finally, we visited members in the field, domestically and overseas, to hear their concerns directly.

Today, increased member interest in AFSA is enhancing the Foreign Service experience around the world. It has been an honor to serve as your vice president these last two years and as a member of the board for the last four. Thank you for your support as we worked to make the department a better, safer and more rewarding place to serve.

I look forward to continuing my involvement and affiliation with AFSA—our voice for the Foreign Service.
Government Change: An Oxymoron?

Last July, I wrote a column highlighting the disparity in benefits received by State Department and USAID Foreign Service officers (see the July 2014 AFSA News). The article served as a powerful catalyst leading to the creation of several working groups focused on closing the gaps. Although an excellent start, I am dismayed by the lack of progress on establishing a functioning temporary-duty housing program for USAID employees in the United States (similar to what is available to State FSOs).

This glaring inequity should not persist! I’ve heard of horrific hardships borne by USAID colleagues forced to wait months before being reimbursed for thousands of dollars’ worth of TDY lodging costs. These stories have only strengthened my resolve to see this benefit come to fruition.

If USAID wants to keep the FS cadre in whom it has invested, addressing the fundamental concerns with working condition inequalities and other drivers of low morale must be a top priority. We do not want to lose momentum with the change of leadership, and I personally want to see a hot fire lit under the temporary-duty lodging situation.

My private-sector friends can’t understand why it takes so long to enact wanted changes. One theory is that senior political leadership in government agencies turns over more frequently than in the private sector. The kind of disruption this turnover causes in agency priorities is usually only seen in hostile takeovers in the private sector context.

The main goal of many political appointees is to promote the policies of the administration or change the policies of the previous administration, or both. Few focus on organizational management issues, often because they lack management know-how, will not be in government long or desire to concentrate on high-profile policy issues. Furthermore, spending time on improving working conditions for the federal workforce yields low political support in many districts—a clear incentive to ignore the problems.

Employee engagement is a major challenge for the federal government. I was saddened to learn from last year’s Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey that overall job satisfaction among federal employees was at its lowest since the survey began in 2004, and that USAID was voted 19th out of the 25 best medium-sized federal agencies in which to work.

This placement is an absolute travesty in my mind, as USAID employees are—by nature—altruistic, brilliant and dedicated to USAID’s mission, one that should yield great personal satisfaction.

Unfortunately, USAID FSOs have endured a series of morale-crushing episodes, including reductions in performance awards, promotion opportunities and training; a threatened government shutdown; last year’s “promo-gate” (see the December 2014 AFSA News); and a lack of transparency in assignments. And when USAID FSOs, in the face of such challenges, find themselves also battling poor leadership, non-inclusive decision-making and the appearance of disinterest in securing equitable benefits, their dedication can only last so long.

Agency leadership is the most important factor in effecting change. I believe Acting Administrator Alfonso Lenhardt will be a strong ally in the days ahead. His distinctive military and ambassadorial background means he understands better than most that today’s officers are less inclined to execute orders without question; they care about being involved in the creation of departmental strategies and want to understand their implications.

Management occasionally inquires about what “low-hanging fruit” to tackle first, for many issues are cross-cutting and complex. My response from now on will be that USAID should demonstrate appreciation for its employees by prioritizing their concerns and engaging those who would be affected by any change. These basic gestures would go a long way, if done genuinely.

Meanwhile, I intend to light that hot fire under the TDY housing program and help make it a reality. Stay tuned, and thank you for all of your support as we blaze this new trail together.
Views and opinions expressed in this column are solely those of the AFSA FAS VP.
Contact: mark.petry@fas.usda.gov or (202) 720-2502

Formula for Success?

The Foreign Agricultural Service and its officers have undergone a strenuous few years. While most remain hopeful for the future, challenges abound.

Thankfully, FAS weathered the storm of sequestration and is now seeing both a rebound in financial resources and a passing of the self-defeating “more with less” mantra. However, FAS members still face uncertainty in several areas.

The most basic of these is organizational in nature. It remains to be seen how the Department of Agriculture will act on the 2014 congressional provision mandating the establishment of an under secretary for trade and foreign affairs and how that position might affect FAS.

In addition, the proposed organizational tinkering with the agency under the term “Refresh” gives pause to those of us who lived through the not-so-successful reorganization of 2006.

Uncertainty is one of the main contributing factors to low overall morale in FAS, as measured by the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. To the credit of the current leadership, FAS has engaged the Partnership for Public Service to try to diagnose the problems and involve all employees in solutions.

However, the question remains whether Foreign Service issues can command attention in an agency in which FSOs are numerically smaller than both the Civil Service and Schedule B employee categories.

The second key area of concern is FSO demographics—primarily the impact of retirements. While FAS recently made a significant change when it opened up its officer intake system to allow outside candidates to compete for those positions, years of very low intake in the early 2000s and the high numbers of recent retirements have put great stress on the system.

For example, FAS now has fewer FO-1 officers than positions at that grade overseas, and 40 percent fewer FO-1 officers than in 2006. This demographic reality puts stress on employees at all grades, including pushing more than 35 percent of all officers into stretch positions.

Put simply, neither the absolute number of officers nor the number of officers necessary at each grade is keeping pace with retirements. Worryingly, the problems won’t ebb soon, for 50 percent of all FAS FSOs will be eligible for retirement within five years.

In the long term, proper management of the intake system has the potential to dramatically increase the FAS FSO pool and ameliorate the demographic crisis. However, in the short run, demographics suggest that officers will continue to face pressing demands for which answering the call is largely not rewarded.

AFSA’s task in this time of transition is threefold: work with management to advance long-term staffing plans that rectify the demographic crisis; seek recognition and advancement of an officer corps working effectively at higher levels of responsibility; and ensure that resources remain sufficient for FAS to serve its overseas mission.

Only by increasing the focus on employees and adequate staffing can the agency succeed in promoting U.S. agriculture overseas.

Implementing the 2015 QDDR

Now that the 2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review has been released, the American Foreign Service Association is focused on understanding better how the strategic priorities and proposed set of reforms will be implemented, and how these changes will affect AFSA members.

AFSA was in the audience when Deputy Secretary for Management and Resources Heather Higginbottom and Special Representative for the QDDR Tom Perriello held a May 12 town hall meeting on how the QDDR team proposes to improve risk management.

AFSA State Vice President Matthew Asada asks a question at the town hall meeting on how the QDDR team proposes to improve risk management.

AFSA/MARIA C. LIVINGSTON

The 88-page report has been criticized for being weak on details, and the town hall discussion did not reveal much more.

Participants had barely enough time to touch on a handful of matters during the hourlong session, ranging from how to take advantage of the pilot sabbatical and how the data hub will make knowledge sharing more convenient, to understanding how the department will...
The Big Issue

Foreign Service retirees are fortunate. We enjoyed fascinating and adventurous careers. Our contribution to public service and our nation’s prestige and honor is undeniable. If the clock could be turned back, I suspect most of us would do it all again.

In general, Foreign Service retirees receive fair pension and insurance benefits earned during sustained careers in challenging and often dangerous environments. As embedded in the Foreign Service Act of 1980, we may retire with full pensions earlier and with fewer mandatory federal years on the job than our Civil Service colleagues.

Quirks in the system such as the negative impact of overseas service on pension calculations have mostly been ironed out (e.g., virtual locality pay). Compared to the retirement benefits we receive, issues of specific concern to FS retirees such as a transparent re-employment system seem less critical.

Meanwhile, benefits for retirees continue to come under threat. This is a much larger issue that goes beyond the Foreign Service. AFSA is one of many federal employee associations fighting the good fight, for example, against the move to a chained consumer price index that would reduce defined pension benefits significantly over time.

AFSA will continue to battle efforts to scissor away benefits in the name of deficit reduction. One such effort is the recent attack on the annuity supplement. I am confident the political sway of current retirees and retiree organizations will prevent wholesale erosion of present benefit levels. But AFSA and its membership must remain vigilant.

Sadly, however, benefits for future retirees, specifically our active-duty colleagues and future hires, are being atrophied. This is especially true in an era of pay freezes or minimal salary increases. New members of the Foreign Service now contribute almost four times the amount we did for their pensions. Proposals to make employee health insurance contributions “post-tax” and force the Thrift Savings Plan’s G Fund into income irrelevance must be taken seriously.

AFSA, and especially its retiree members, can and should advocate strongly on behalf of tomorrow’s beneficiaries. They are the ones truly getting hurt. If we do not stand up for them, who will? Because of Hatch Act rules, the active-duty Foreign Service cannot easily speak out. We can.

Call or write to your senators and representatives. Urge them to oppose budget resolutions that target federal employees, the Foreign Service and FS retirees. In particular, tell them to quit targeting millennials who are just now entering public service. These actions serve to dissuade the best and brightest from joining up or staying on. Insist that Congress can and should find ways to craft its budgets other than on the backs of the federal workforce.

In the lead up to the review’s release, AFSA submitted seven thought papers to the QDDR team on priority issues, such as professional development, security and technology.

Though not all of AFSA’s suggestions were incorporated, critical provisions did make it in, including those addressing the need for better management and mitigation of physical risk; more effectively address risk management in increasingly dangerous environments.

In the lead up to the review’s release, AFSA submitted seven thought papers to the QDDR team on priority issues, such as professional development, security and technology.

Though not all of AFSA’s suggestions were incorporated, critical provisions did make it in, including those addressing the need for better management and mitigation of physical risk; increased investment in a skilled and diverse workforce; enhanced economic leadership in each bureau; and extended leave without pay.

The May 12 event was the first in a planned series of engagements on the 2015 QDDR. AFSA will continue to seek answers and contribute to the QDDR team’s implementation efforts.

—Maria C. Livingston, Associate Editor
Foreign Affairs Day Turns 50

Each May, the State Department, the American Foreign Service Association and other organizations team up to hold Foreign Affairs Day. And each year, hundreds of Foreign Service alumni return to Foggy Bottom to participate in the day’s homecoming activities.

This year, the May 1 event marked 50 years since the first Foreign Affairs Day—long known as Foreign Service Day—was organized to recognize and appreciate the dedication of America’s diplomatic professionals.

Secretary of State John Kerry, en route to Sri Lanka at the time, recorded opening remarks thanking the brave members of the Foreign Service “who spend their careers trying to ensure that our country does the right thing for other people in other parts of the world in a smart way.”

The day’s agenda included policy seminars with senior officials, an open house with AFSA and other Foreign Service support organizations, an official luncheon in the department’s Benjamin Franklin Diplomatic Reception Room and the annual AFSA Merit Awards Reception.

AFSA Memorial Wall
The AFSA Memorial Ceremony, during which the names of Rayda Nadal and David Collins were added to the AFSA memorial plaque. Under Secretary of State for Management Patrick Kennedy (right) read the names as they were unveiled.

AFSA Coordinator for Special Awards and Outreach Perri Green welcomes the parents of David Collins. From left: AFSA Secretary Angela Dickey, Green, Janice Collins and Bernard Collins.

Following the ceremony, Under Secretary Kennedy (right) meets with the parents of Rayda Nadal, Jimmy (left) and Rayda Nadal (center).

AFSA President Robert J. Silverman (left) opens the 83rd AFSA Memorial Ceremony, during which the names of Rayda Nadal and David Collins were added to the AFSA memorial plaque. Under Secretary of State for Management Patrick Kennedy (right) read the names as they were unveiled.

Lagos-based David Collins drowned on April 28, 2014, after being overtaken by a powerful undertow during an embassy outing to the beach.

In his remarks at the ceremony, AFSA President Robert J. Silverman offered his condolences: “To the family and friends of David and Rayda, I express our deepest sympathy for their losses and our enduring gratitude for their service. ... They and their work will be remembered by us and will continue to inspire us as we pass daily by this wall dedicated to them and our other fallen colleagues.”

Immediately preceding the ceremony, AFSA hosted an intimate breakfast for the Collins and Nadal families in solemn appreciation of their sacrifices.

Rayda Nadal, a Foreign Ser-
vice specialist, died on May 26, 2014, from injuries suffered during a gas explosion in her Moscow apartment. (See the May AFSA News for their profiles.)

AFSA Merit Awards Reception

AFSA concluded the day by hosting an afternoon reception and award ceremony to honor its nearly two dozen art and academic merit award winners for the 2014-2015 school year. The winners competed for the monetary prizes among a highly competitive pool of Foreign Service high school seniors whose parents are active-duty or retired AFSA members. (See pp. 77-80 for a full write-up on the program and this year’s winners.)

The reception was well attended by merit award donors, locally based winners and past award recipients, parents, volunteer award panel judges and Foreign Service retirees. It was also a positive way to end this year’s Foreign Affairs Day. Surely anyone in attendance could not help but think that some of these promising young members of today’s Foreign Service family will soon be among tomorrow’s foreign affairs practitioners.

—Maria C. Livingston, Associate Editor

AFSA National High School Essay Contest Winner

Thomas Keller,
Episcopal School of Dallas
Dallas, Texas

Runner-Up
Anuj Krishnamurthy,
The Lawrenceville School
Monmouth Junction, New Jersey


2015 AFSA Award Winners

Ambassador William C. Harrop
Lifetime Contributions to American Diplomacy

Constructive Dissent Awards

Thomas M. Duffy
Christian A. Herter Award for a Senior Foreign Service Officer

Samuel Kotis
William R. Rivkin Award for a Mid-Level FSO

Amelia Shaw
W. Averell Harriman Award for an Entry-Level FSO

Jeffrey Bing
F. Allen “Tex” Harris Award for a Foreign Service Specialist

Exemplary Performance Awards

Mary Beth Bechtel
Avis Bohlen Award for a Foreign Service Family Member

Julia Harrison
Nelson B. Delavan Award for a Foreign Service Office Management Specialist

Alexei Trofim
M. Juanita Guess Award for a Community Liaison Officer

Andrew Young
Joshua Baker (runner-up)
Mark Palmer Award for the Advancement of Democracy

Charlee Doom
AFSA Post Representative of the Year Award

Ambassador Andrew Winter
AFSA Achievement and Contributions to the Association Award

Full coverage of AFSA’s June 9 awards ceremony, profiles of the winners and related articles will appear in the September issue of The Foreign Service Journal.
PDC: Ethics, Professionalism and Speaking Truth to Power

In 2012, the AFSA Governing Board established the Committee on the Foreign Service Profession and Ethics in an effort to “enhance the professional nature of the Foreign Service, both for specialists and officers, across the spectrum of foreign affairs agencies.”

The PEC’s main goal is to create a clear set of institutional values and a shared culture within the Foreign Service (See www.bit.ly/1CfnhyW).

PEC Initiatives

Since its creation, the PEC has embarked on a number of ambitious projects. One of its first, in 2013, involved partnering with the Institute for Global Ethics to conduct a survey of values within the Foreign Service. The survey found overwhelming support (70 percent of survey respondents) for developing a code of ethics for the Service.

In 2014 the PEC submitted a paper, approved by the AFSA Governing Board and titled “A Professional Education for a Professional Foreign Service,” to the Department of State’s Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review team for consideration in drafting the 2015 QDDR report.

The paper recommended the creation of a career-long education program for both generalists and specialists to support a deeper understanding of ever-evolving policies, increased management know-how and professional leadership.

Currently, the PEC is drafting a professional code of conduct to formally articulate the ethical values of the Foreign Service. The committee hopes

Continued on page 85

USAID Honors Fallen Hero

On May 5, the family of the late John Alfred Nuhn honored his memory at a ceremony held at the headquarters of the United States Agency for International Development in Washington, D.C. Nuhn died on October 23, 1964, at the age of 45 from injuries sustained in a car collision while serving as deputy assistant director for finance at USAID in Bangkok.

USAID Counselor Susan Reichle presided over the ceremony, and Associate Administrator Eric Postel offered remarks honoring Nuhn’s commitment to expanding opportunity for all and ending extreme poverty around the world.

AFSA President Robert J. Silverman, AFSA USAID Vice President Sharon Wayne and

USAID’s Memorial Wall was created 10 years ago to remember colleagues who have died while serving the United States.

Nuhn’s family and senior USAID and State representatives pay their respects during the memorial ceremony. From left: daughter-in-law Shirley Nuhn, sons John and Thomas Nuhn, USAID Associate Administrator Eric Postel and Director General of the Foreign Service Arnold Chacón.

formally recognized. Mrs. Nuhn passed away in 2004, and it was the couple’s eldest son, John Nuhn, who persevered in having a tile with his father’s name placed on USAID’s memorial wall.

Nuhn worked for the Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Navy before joining USAID’s predecessor, the U.S. Operations Mission, in 1954. His time with USAID included tours in Greece and Thailand. He is survived by his eight children and their families.

—Maria C. Livingston, Associate Editor
Presenting the 2015 AFSA Merit Award Winners

On May 1, the American Foreign Service Association held its annual merit awards ceremony to announce the recipients of the 2015 AFSA Merit Awards.

This year, AFSA awarded $45,250 to 22 high school seniors—all of whom are children of Foreign Service employees—for their outstanding achievements in academics, the arts and community service. Each winner received $2,500, and honorable mentions received $750 to $1,000 each. Of the 22 winners, 18 have parents employed with the Department of State, three with the U.S. Agency for International Development and one with the Foreign Commercial Service. (See pp. 78-79 for a complete list of the winners.)

Aaron Hilton was chosen as this year’s art merit winner for his compelling ballet performances. The art honorable mention recipients—Sterling Butler, Colin Evans and Ellen Rank—won for their submissions in visual arts, music and creative writing, respectively. Their award-winning artwork can be seen at www.afsa.org/scholar.

The newly established Linda K. Fitzgerald Community Service Memorial Award was presented to Salma Badeh for her work mentoring with the Make a Difference Foundation in India and her volunteer service at a senior care facility and a library in Arlington, Texas.

Students applying for an academic merit award were evaluated using the following criteria: grade point average; standardized test scores; high-level coursework; a Foreign Service-themed essay; student activities; and special circumstances, if any.

In addition to the academic merit and honorable mention winners, one essay was selected for the “Best Essay” award. This year’s “Best Essay” winner was Selena Everitt. (See p. 80 to read her essay, “Where Am I From?”)

All art merit award applicants submitted work in one of the following categories: visual arts, musical arts, performing arts or creative writing. Each applicant was evaluated on the quality and creativity of the artwork, dedication to their artistic pursuit and an essay.

The AFSA Scholarship Program would like to recognize and thank the 24 judges who volunteered to serve on our review panels, and the 12 individuals and organizations that have contributed merit award scholarships to the program. These special named awards are bestowed on students who received the highest scores from the judges. They include the John and Priscilla Becker Family Award; the Turner C. Cameron Jr. Memorial Award; two CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield Federal Employee Program Awards; the Embassy Risk Management Award; the Linda K. Fitzgerald Memorial Community Service Award; the John C. and Nancy S. Leary Memorial Award; two Joanna and Robert Martin Awards; and the Donald S. Spigler Memorial and Maria Giuseppa Spigler Award.

In addition to this year’s merit awards, AFSA will confer more than $218,000 in need-based financial aid scholarships ranging from $3,000 to $5,000 on 62 undergraduate students for the 2015-2016 academic year. Recipients will be announced in August.

—Jonathan Crawford, Scholarship Senior Associate

The AFSA Scholarship Fund’s endowment now stands at more than $7 million, all of which comes from generous donors. No AFSA member dues go toward the Scholarship Fund, yet this extremely robust, beneficial program has disbursed more than $4 million to 2,200 children of Foreign Service members over the last 25 years.

For more information on the merit award program, applying for this benefit of AFSA membership or contributing to the AFSA Scholarship Fund, visit www.afsa.org/scholar or contact Lori Dec at dec@afsa.org or (202) 944-5504.
AFSA Merit Award Winners

1. **Di Li Aeschliman** – daughter of Reed J. Aeschliman (USAID) and Po Li Aeschliman; graduated from the International School of Manila in Manila, the Philippines; attending Washington and Lee University, majoring in economics.

2. **Ruediger Braich** – son of Kirninder P. Braich (State) and Andrea Braich; graduated from the American School of Warsaw in Warsaw, Poland; attending Stanford University, majoring in chemistry.

3. **Tristan Froats** – son of Daniel T. Froats (State) and Silvia T. Froats; graduated from McLean High School in McLean, Virginia; attending Virginia Tech, majoring in engineering. Recognized as the John and Priscilla Becker Family Scholar.

4. **Vanessa Hernandez** – daughter of Sally Sternal (State) and Mauricio R. Hernandez; graduated from the Overseas School of Colombo in Colombo, Sri Lanka; attending the University of Pennsylvania, majoring in economics.

5. **Aaron Hilton** – son of Olivia P. Hilton (State) and Robert B. Hilton (State); graduated from Professional Children’s School in New York City, New York; attending Princeton University, majoring in political science. Recognized as the Embassy Risk Management Scholar and the art merit award winner for his ballet performance.

6. **Noa Jett** – daughter of Ambassador Dennis Jett (State) and Lynda Schuster; graduated from the Winchester Thurston School in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; attending the University of Pennsylvania with an undecided major. Recognized as the Joanna and Robert Martin Scholar.

7. **Daniel Kostelancik** – son of David Kostelancik (State) and Patricia Kostelancik; graduated from Langley High School in McLean, Virginia; attending Northwestern University, majoring in engineering. Recognized as the Donald S. Spigler Memorial and Maria Giuseppa Spigler Scholar.

8. **Roberto Medrano** – son of Roberto M. Medrano (State) and Ursula B. Medrano; graduated from the American School of Dubai in Dubai, United Arab Emirates; attending the Georgia Institute of Technology, majoring in engineering. Recognized as the John C. and Nancy S. Leary Memorial Scholar.

9. **Jacob Murri** – son of W. Marc Murri (State) and Amy Murri; graduated from the Anglo-American School of Moscow in Moscow, Russia; attending Brigham Young University, majoring in physics. Recognized as the Turner C. Cameron Jr. Memorial Scholar.

10. **James Rigassio** – son of James C. Rigassio (FCS) and Mim E. Rigassio; graduated from the American International School of Guangzhou in Guangzhou, China; attending the University of California-Berkeley, majoring in economics.

11. **Adriana Rogers** – daughter of Cynthia B. Rogers (USAID) and Tom N. Rogers; graduated from Cairo American College in Cairo, Egypt; attending Lewis & Clark College, majoring in engineering.
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12. Erik Enstrom Schofer – son of Karen L. Enstrom (State) and Andrew J. Schofer (State); graduated from the American International School in Vienna, Austria; attending Georgetown University, majoring in political science. Recognized as the CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield Federal Employee Program Scholar.

13. Eleni Smitham – daughter of Thomas D. Smitham (State) and Alexandra Maduros; graduated from Walt Whitman High School in Bethesda, Maryland; attending Haverford College with an undecided major. Recognized as the CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield Federal Employee Program Scholar.

14. Claire Youn – daughter of Meg Hawley-Young (State) and Andrew R. Young (State); graduated from the Seoul Foreign School in Seoul, South Korea; attending Yale University, majoring in political science. Recognized as the Joanna and Robert Martin Scholar.

15. Selena Everitt – daughter of Ann Marie Everitt (State) and Richard J. Everitt (State); graduated from the American Embassy School in New Delhi, India; attending Florida International University, majoring in business.

16. Salma Badeh – daughter of Mohamed Badeh Farah (State) and Lul A. Abdalle; graduated from Mansfield Frontier High School in Mansfield, Texas; attending the University of Texas at Arlington, majoring in biology.

Art Merit Award Winner
Aaron Hilton – see the “AFSA Academic Merit Award Winners” listing.

Academic Merit Award Honorable Mention Winners
Katarina Djilas Holtzapple – daughter of Rick A. Holtzapple (State) and Tanja Djilas Holtzapple; graduated from the American School of Paris in Paris, France; attending the University of New York-Abu Dhabi with an undecided major.

Noah Martini – son of Erik E. Martini (State) and Alicia D. Martini (State Civil Service); graduated from the American International School Vienna in Vienna, Austria; attending the University of Virginia, majoring in economics.

Art Merit Award Honorable Mention Winners
Sterling Butler – son of Alexious Butler (USAID); graduated from Idyllwild Arts Academy in Idyllwild, California; attending University of the Arts-London, majoring in fashion design.

Colin Evans – son of Mark R. Evans (State) and Kristen S. Evans; graduated from Yorktown High School in Arlington, Virginia; attending Northwestern University, majoring in literature.

Ellen Rank – daughter of David H. Rank (State) and Mary Rank; graduated from George C. Marshall High School in Falls Church, Virginia; attending Virginia Commonwealth University, majoring in cinema.
Where Am I From?

BY SELENA EVERITT

“Where do you live?”
“I live in India.”
“No, where are you from? I mean, where were you born?”
“I was born in Abu Dhabi.”
The reaction is confused looks and more questions.
“Where are you from then?”
That is a complicated question.

Being a Foreign Service child has allowed me to grow up around the world and has offered me many different perspectives.

While in Romania, I was quite disturbed by the fact that my mother and I were the only women wearing tops at the waterpark. This was a huge culture shock to 7-year-old me. Having to change slippers depending upon which room of the house I was in required a cultural understanding on my part. Romania taught me patience.

The majority of Jordan’s population is Muslim; because of this, Jordan is very conservative. It was hard for me to adjust. I had to cover my legs and shoulders and stomach. Walking around alone was not allowed. Talking about politics or negatively of the king was forbidden. Losing some of my independence was a struggle. I had to learn to respect the culture even when I did not agree with it. Once I got past this, I could appreciate Jordan. The history and culture are rich, the architecture is amazing, and the food, oh the food, is to die for. After swim practice I would buy shawarma for three dollars on the side of the street. Jordan taught me respect.

India is the most unique place I have lived. There are wild monkeys that destroy our garden once a week. I have been stuck in traffic behind an elephant and next to a cow. I have seen people using the sidewalk as a bathroom. This is all unheard of in the States, but here it’s daily life. The poverty is heart-wrenching. India’s wealth comes from its culture. Despite the poverty many live in, they are very resilient. India has an incredible atmosphere because its people strive to make things work. It is humbling to see. India taught me humility.

This lifestyle gave me the opportunity to develop as a global person. Each place has contributed to who I am. I could not give up a place without giving up a part of myself. So, where am I from? I guess I’m from everywhere.
AFSA ON THE HILL

Workforce Diversity: A Driver for Effective Advocacy

Not too long ago, I read an article on how a diverse workforce spurs economic growth. The author argued that employees with different backgrounds help companies market more effectively to diverse segments of the population.

For a business, building a diverse workforce is a financially savvy move. For an organization like the American Foreign Service Association, it is the key to a successful advocacy strategy.

Our goal is simple: to leverage Foreign Service diversity to demonstrate that foreign affairs agencies are representative of the entire country, not just a select few.

AFSA strives to educate lawmakers and staffers about their constituents’ contributions to American diplomacy. We explain how diverse workforce perspectives have improved the way U.S. diplomats understand and address regional and religious conflicts, promote U.S. exports and business interests abroad and foster security and stability through development and cooperation.

By highlighting the many ways in which our diverse members are forging innovative and effective foreign policy solutions, we foster an understanding of how investments in the Foreign Service are really investments in America.

At the end of the day, our most effective advocacy is telling your stories.

—Javier Cuebas,
Director of Advocacy

On June 10, AFSA met with Senator Ben Cardin (D-Md.), ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. From left: AFSA Director of Advocacy Javier Cuebas, AFSA Retiree VP Larry Cohen, Sen. Cardin, AFSA President Robert J. Silverman, AFSA USAID VP Sharon Wayne and AFSA FCS VP Steve Morrison.

Thousands Join AFSA’s Online Discussion Board

Only a few months after the March launch of the American Foreign Service Association’s online discussion board, AFSA Community, the platform has grown to include more than 11,000 users (with nearly 300 written contributions so far).

A 2014 membership survey revealed a large demand for new and innovative ways to get involved. AFSA Community is the association’s response to that call, with great potential to expand and become a dynamic medium through which AFSA members across the world can exchange advice, network and discuss topics around American diplomacy.

The inaugural discussion forum, “AFSA 2015 Governing Board Election and Bylaw Amendment,” allowed members to stay up to date with election news, read candidate statements and submit questions and comments directly to Governing Board hopefuls.

After the election in June, AFSA converted the discussion to the “AFSA Open Forum” to spur conversations on broader Foreign Service issues. Members may suggest discussion topics; and, if needed, separate forums may be created.

If you haven’t already, AFSA asks that you please sign up for this new member benefit by logging into the members-only area of the AFSA website and clicking on “AFSA Community” in the blue navigation tab at the top of the page. (You must have a personal email address stored in your user profile to access the AFSA Community. Email addresses ending in “.gov” do not work.)

Once you have logged into the AFSA Community page, join the “AFSA Open Forum” discussion to get started.

Each user is required to agree to a basic set of guidelines for participation, in order to preserve a safe environment that encourages civil, fruitful dialogue.

Please send questions and comments to member@afsa.org, with “AFSA Community” in the subject line.

—Natalie Cheung,
Member Services Representative
AFSA Members Named Sammie Finalists

AFSA congratulates members Edward J. Ramotowski and Natasha M. de Marcken on being named among the finalists for a “Sammie,” the Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medal.

The Sammies recognize the significant accomplishments of federal employees, who, in the words of the award itself, “make our country better, healthier and stronger.” In both cases, the contributions have benefited not just Americans, but many people beyond our borders.

As deputy assistant secretary for visa services, Mr. Ramotowski and his consular affairs team have significantly streamlined the application process, increasing the issuance of tourist and student travel visas by more than 50 percent between 2010 and 2014.

He and his team reduced the average wait time for in-person interviews with consular officers from 15 days to six. Their work has contributed substantially to increased tourism and the expansion of American educational services, boosting U.S. economic activity and creating jobs.

As director of the Office of Education for the U.S. Agency for International Development, Ms. de Marcken was painfully aware that while many more children are entering primary schools in developing countries, too many of them are still unable to read even after four years of schooling.

Ms. de Marcken pinpointed early learning as the most critical, and reshaped the strategy to prioritize foundational reading skills for the roughly 30 million students served through USAID’s educational programs. She has led the way in guiding donors and countries to have a measurable effect on student learning.

As the voice of the Foreign Service, AFSA takes great pride when its members are recognized for the significance of their accomplishments in advancing important national priorities. Please join us in congratulating Mr. Ramotowski and Ms. de Marcken.

—Todd Thurwachter, Retiree Counselor

AFSA Website Gets a Facelift

On June 4, the American Foreign Service Association was pleased to unveil its newly redesigned website at www.afsa.org. The new site has been completely revamped to offer users enhanced organization, more intuitive browsing and a streamlined look.

Here are three things you’ll love about our new site:

1. Faster loading times and responsive design (i.e., it is accessible and easy to view on all platforms ranging from desktops to mobile phones).

2. Seamless integration with AFSA’s e-commerce platform and secure online transactions for anything from starting or renewing a membership to making purchases and donations.

3. More social sharing features, including one-click sharing from any of our webpages. Simply click on the icons that hover on the right side of the screen to send that page to your social media channel of choice or email it to a friend or colleague.

And don’t worry, all the content you are accustomed to—The Foreign Service Journal, scholarships information, our blogs list, etc.—is still there, just with a fresh new look that is more user-friendly than ever.

With more than a million views each year, the website represents one of AFSA’s main outreach tools. Our goal is to provide users with a quality online experience each time they visit our site. We hope you enjoy the new design, and invite your comments and feedback.

—Ásgeir Sigfusson, Director of New Media
not just in her spouse’s country of origin, but in an entire region of the world. Several Foreign Service members submitted similarly disconcerting written accounts.

Employees welcomed the opportunity to hear directly from Douglas Quiram, director of the Office of Personnel Security and Suitability, and Gary Vogt, chief of the DS adjudications division that administers the assignment restriction program.

The two explained the need for assignment restrictions in light of national security interests. According to Vogt, 204 decisions to restrict assignments were made last year and 12 previous restrictions were lifted. Only seven restriction recommendations were never approved in the first place.

Brooks thanked DS for their participation. He noted that EEOC constantly revisits how it thinks about civil rights, as cases have become increasingly complicated since the days of overt segregation.

“We have systems that are embedded into processes that hamper opportunity,” Brooks said. “It takes a real educated, analytical approach and an openness to looking at those processes to actually facilitate what we call civil rights in this new millennium.”

Meeting participants agreed on the need for reform, though its exact nature remains an open question. AFSA has prepared guidance for members who find they are subject to assignment restrictions (see www.bit.ly/1SrNNyn) and will continue working to increase the programs’ clarity, transparency and accountability.

——Lindsey Botts, Labor Management Executive Assistant
AFSA Scholarship Fund Benefits from Member Generosity

This spring, the AFSA Scholarship Fund received two sizable memorial bequests and a generous donation to support need-based awards for college-bound Foreign Service students.

Susan Lowe Modi and Sorab Modi Memorial Financial Aid Scholarship. In 1988, Mr. Sorab Modi established an AFSA scholarship in memory of his late wife, United States Information Agency Foreign Service Officer Susan Lowe Modi. Ms. Modi joined the Foreign Service in 1968 and served in Seoul, Mumbai, Rome and Genoa. While posted in Washington, D.C., she was a member of the AFSA Scholarship Committee. Mr. Modi—born and raised in India—was a prolific writer and lecturer on classical music. He passed away in Washington, D.C., on Feb. 13.

Ruth Nay and Victor H. Skiles Memorial Financial Aid Scholarship. In 2012, Mrs. Ruth Nay Skiles established an AFSA scholarship in her own name and that of her late husband Victor H. Skiles. Mr. Skiles began his Foreign Service career with a State Department assignment to Greece in 1948. The couple met during his next posting in Washington, D.C., and married in 1958. Mr. Skiles eventually joined USAID, and retired in 1978 following tours in Israel, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan and Italy. The Skiles were active in their church and enjoyed golfing and gardening. Mrs. Skiles passed away in Williamsburg, Virginia, on July 24, 2014.

Rozanne (Roz) L. Ridgway Financial Aid Scholarship. In 2009, Ambassador Roz Ridgway established a five-year AFSA scholarship in support of Foreign Service youth. Her 32-year career included serving as ambassador to the German Democratic Republic and Finland, ambassador-at-large for oceans and fisheries affairs, and counselor of the department. Since retiring in 1989, Amb. Ridgway has served on the boards of many corporate and foreign affairs-related organizations. This year, Emerson Electric provided supplemental funding to the Ridgway Scholarship—now in its third year—as a thank you for her service on its board of trustees.

—Lori Dec, Scholarship Director

AFSA Vietnam Tribute Reunites, Raises Foreign Service Profile

The American Foreign Service Association recently paid homage to the more than 600 members of the Foreign Service whose service in Vietnam during the 1960s and 1970s illustrates the institution’s rich history of dedication and sacrifice.

The Foreign Service Journal kicked off the monthlong tribute with its largest focus section ever, titled “40 Years after the Fall of Saigon: The Foreign Service in Vietnam,” featuring narratives by Foreign Service Vietnam veterans.

AFSA’s May 8 screening of the American Experience’s “Last Days in Vietnam” documentary drew more than 150 people to the State Department’s Marshall Auditorium.

AFSA’s tribute not only succeeded in raising the profile of an entire generation of Foreign Service officers whose careers were indelibly shaped by events in Vietnam during the 1960s and 1970s, but it also provided the occasion for a very special reunion.

On seeing the documentary, resettled refugee Tue Phamdo recognized Joseph (Joe) McBride as the FSO who had helped him and his family escape Vietnam in 1975. Ambassador (ret.) Parker Borg was able to connect Phamdo to McBride. Both Borg and McBride were contributing authors in the April FSJ (see “Mobilizing for South Vietnam’s Last Days” and “Saigon Sayonara”). The group celebrated their reunion with a dinner in Silver Spring.

—Thomas Garofalo, Communications Intern
the code, once adopted, will instill a sense of pride in Foreign Service officers and provide a behavioral prototype for professional integrity in the daily work of FSOs.

Expert Speakers Forum

Most recently, the PEC sponsored a May 20 talk at AFSA headquarters by Terry Newell, “Speaking Truth to Power,” as part of its ongoing Expert Speakers Forum. A retiree with more than 40 years in the federal government, and author of the book, To Serve with Honor: Doing the Right Thing in Government (see review on page 91), Newell led an engaging two-hour session involving case studies, group discussion and practical tips on how to speak out to those in power without losing one’s job.

While acknowledging the difficulties inherent in speaking truth to power, Newell emphasized that the act can be as simple as presenting alternative solutions that others may not have considered. It is not always necessary or even effective to issue ultimatums or threaten resignation.

Practical strategies entail striving to understand the point of view of all involved in a morally questionable situation, seeking advice from multiple sources, preparing for all potential rationalizations, being willing to compromise and planning for the next steps if the dissent is successful.

Encourage Debate and Dissent

Newell urged those in positions of leadership to encourage debate and dissenting opinions among their staff. To that end, he suggested restructuring meetings, creating clear channels for dissent and reserving opinions until hearing from employees first.

Newell then opened the floor to a lively discussion of the pitfalls of self-censorship and how to deal with competing points of view on what is ethical.

One seasoned Foreign Service officer encouraged younger audience members to use tools such as survey data to support their cause.

The PEC established the Expert Speakers Forum “to bring experts on professionalism and leadership, ethics, government effectiveness, and the diplomatic art and practice to AFSA members.” By providing insight into the many different strategies available for speaking truth to power, Newell left the audience better equipped to handle ethical quandaries in the Foreign Service workplace.

The PEC would like to hear from you. Please contact AFSA Professional Issues and Policy Adviser Janice Weiner at weiner@afsa.org.

—Shannon Mizzi, Editorial Intern
RESULTS OF AFSA’S 2015-2017 GOVERNING BOARD ELECTION AND BYLAW AMENDMENT

The AFSA Committee on Elections is pleased to announce the results of the 2015-2017 AFSA Governing Board election and bylaw amendment. A total of 4,034 valid ballots were received (3,011 online and 1,023 paper). The following AFSA members have been elected:

**Board Officer Positions**
- **President:** Barbara Stephenson
- **Treasurer:** Charles “Chuck” Ford
- **Secretary:** William “Bill” Haugh
- **State Vice President:** Angie Bryan
- **USAID Vice President:** Sharon Wayne
- **FCS Vice President:** Steve Morrison
- **FAS Vice President:** Mark Petry
- **Retiree Vice President:** Tom Boyatt

**Board Constituency Representatives**

**State Representatives:** Lawrence Casselle, John Dinkelman, Eric Geelan, Josh Glazeroff, Margaret “Nini” Hawthorne, Philip G. Laidlaw, Peter Neisuler, Erin O’Connor, Leah Pease, Samuel Thielman, Patricia Wingerter

**USAID Representatives:** Jeff Cochrane, Lorraine Sherman

**FCS Representative:** William Kutson

**FAS Representative:** Corey Pickelsimer

**IBB Representative:** To be determined in accordance with the AFSA Bylaws.

**APHIS Representative:** Mark Prescott

**Retiree Representatives:** Patricia Butenis, Dean Haas, John Limbert, Alphonse F. La Porta

**Bylaw Amendment**

The proposal to amend the bylaws to reduce the size of the AFSA Governing Board from 29 to 19 members—effective in the 2017 election cycle—was adopted in accordance with Article IX, Section 2 of the AFSA Bylaws, which requires affirmative votes of not less than two-thirds of the valid votes received.

- **Total Votes Cast:** 3,720
- **Yes/Approve:** 3,216 (86%)
- **No/Do Not Approve:** 504 (14%)

Congratulations to all those who were elected, and to those who demonstrated their dedication to AFSA by declaring as candidates.

AMBASSADOR JOHNNY YOUNG TO DELIVER ADAIR LECTURE

Ambassador Johnny Young will deliver the 9th annual Adair Memorial Lecture on U.S. Diplomacy on Wednesday, Sept. 2, at 3 p.m. at American University’s Kaye Memorial Chapel.

The public is welcome to attend this special event, which traditionally kicks off the fall semester at A.U.’s School of International Service.

A career Foreign Service officer from 1967 to 2004, Johnny Young was ambassador to Sierra Leone, Togo, Bahrain and Slovenia. His other assignments included Madagascar, Guinea, Kenya, Qatar, Barbados, Jordan, the Netherlands and Washington, D.C.

After retiring from the Foreign Service, Amb. Young became a private consultant, contractor and lecturer. He was appointed executive director of the Migration and Refugee Services Division of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops in 2004, a position he held until retiring in February.

The Adair Lecture series is the result of a partnership between AFSA and A.U.’s School of International Service. The Marshall P. Adair Family has generously created a perpetual endowment to sustain the series, named in honor of their parents, Caroline and Ambassador Charles Adair.
IN MEMORY

Harry A. Cahill, 85, a retired Foreign Service officer, died on April 8 at a hospital in Falls Church, Va., from injuries sustained in a fall at his home.

Mr. Cahill was born on Jan. 10, 1930, in New York City, and graduated from Manhattan College in 1951. He served in the U.S. Army for three years before joining the Foreign Service in 1956. He later earned his M.S. from The George Washington University in 1972.

During a 34-year career, Mr. Cahill served as political officer in Warsaw (1962-1964), economic officer in Belgrade (1965-1968) and economic-commercial officer in Montevideo (1968-1971), where his tour coincided with the Tupamaro urban terrorist campaign. He was detailed to the Industrial College of the Armed Forces in 1971, and then to the Department of Commerce (1972-1974), where he worked on programs for the Voice of America.


He closed out his diplomatic career from 1988 to 1990 at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, as minister-counselor for economic affairs and acting deputy representative on the U.N. Economic and Social Council.

Following retirement, he remained a senior consultant with the State Department. He was fluent in nine languages and authored a book on U.S.-China trade, The China Trade and U.S. Tariffs (University of Chicago Press, 1973). During the 1990s, Mr. Cahill served in Bosnia and Herzegovina as an election supervisor with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and as refugee affairs coordinator at Embassy Sarajevo.

He also served as a consultant to the U.S. Department of Defense for Iraq and Afghanistan, directed the Indo-American Chamber of Commerce and taught international business management at Pepperdine University.

He was a member of Our Lady of Good Counsel Catholic Church in Vienna, Va., and past president of the philanthropic Hinduja Foundation. Mr. Cahill was also a member of the AFSA Governing Board.

Mr. Cahill is survived by his beloved wife of 58 years, Angelica; children, Alan Cahill, Daniel Cahill (Beth), Sylvia Cahill, Irene Cahill (Julie Landrio), Madeleine Gabriele (Vince) and Steven Cahill (Claudia); and grandchildren, Ashley, Dylan, Cole, Alexander, Matthew and Brady.

Memorial contributions may be made in his name to Doctors Without Borders.

George F. Jones, 79, a retired FSO and former ambassador to Guyana, died on April 20 in Fairfax, Va., of a heart attack.

Mr. Jones was born in San Angelo, Texas, and raised in Washington, D.C., and Austin, Texas, where he graduated from Austin High School in 1951. He received an A.B. (magna cum laude) from Wabash College in 1955, an honorary Doctor of Laws degree in 2000 and master’s degrees from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in 1956 and Stanford University in 1967. He graduated from the National War College in 1978, where he received the U.S. Army Association prize for “excellence in research and writing.”

After working briefly for the International Cooperation Administration (now USAID), Mr. Jones entered the Foreign Service in 1956. During a career that spanned almost 50 years, he served as a specialist in Latin American affairs.

He was assigned to Quito in 1958 and, in 1960, married Maria Rosario Correa there. Postings followed to Accra and Caracas. He served at State as desk officer for Venezuela and Colombia from 1967 to 1971, when he was assigned to the U.S. Mission to the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna as a political adviser.


In 1992, President George H.W. Bush appointed Mr. Jones U.S. ambassador to the Republic of Guyana. He worked closely with former President Jimmy Carter in support of free and fair elections there, which resulted in Guyana’s first transfer of power from an incumbent to an opposition party.

Ambassador Jones was twice the senior adviser on Latin American affairs to the U.S. delegation to the U.N. General Assembly in New York, and was a member of the U.S. government delegation to the funeral of Guyana’s President Cheddi Jagan in March 1997.

After retiring from the Foreign Service in 1995, Amb. Jones became a specialist in support for democratic election processes and election observation. From 1996 to 1999, he was director of programs for the Americas at the International Foundation for Election Systems, and from 2000 to 2005 he was director of Democracy and Governance Programs for Development Associates, Inc.

He chaired international observer missions to elections in Paraguay (1996), Honduras (1997) and Guyana (1997), and was a member of observer missions to Ecuador, Haiti, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Puerto Rico and Venezuela. He was senior technical adviser to the Guyana Elections Commission during the 2001 national elections.

Amb. Jones was active in AFSA and
served on the Governing Board for five years, including two terms as retiree vice president. He also served for four years on the Editorial Board of The Foreign Service Journal and as chair of the AFSA Elections Committee.

He received the State Department’s Superior Honor Award in 1989 for “persistance, dedication and courage in promotion of the national interests of the United States” in Chile.

Amb. Jones is survived by his wife, Maria, of Fairfax, Va.; three sons: George F. Jones III of Baltimore, Md.; Robert A. Jones of Quito, Ecuador; and Dr. Michael A. Jones-Correa of Ithaca, N.Y.; a daughter, Mary Louise Blanton of Yorktown, Va.; and seven grandchildren.

Barbara Sommer Kelly, 92, wife of the late FSO James William Kelly, died on Dec. 16, 2014, in Portland, Ore.

Mrs. Kelly was born and raised in Portsmouth, Ohio. She earned degrees in business administration and English at the College of Mount St. Joseph. She served in the U.S. Coast Guard Women’s Reserve during World War II.

After the war, she worked for the Department of State as a foreign affairs officer for the U.N. Mission, where she met her husband, Jim. The couple spent 14 years overseas, with posts in Copenhagen, Dublin, Rome, Karachi and Kabul.

During this period, Mrs. Kelly was a member of the American Women’s Clubs, sometimes as president. She worked to raise money for local charities and to sponsor cultural exchanges.

In 1972, the family returned stateside and settled in Northern Virginia. Mrs. Kelly eventually moved to Portland to spend time with her sons and grandchildren.

Mrs. Kelly enjoyed life and spending time with family and friends. Her family remembers that, having raised four boys while travelling the world, she always had a story to share, spiked with her wry sense of humor. A self-proclaimed “news junkie,” her day was incomplete without a proper, printed newspaper. Overseas, that newspaper was usually the International Herald Tribune; more recently, it was the New York Times.

Mrs. Kelly was predeceased by her husband, Jim, and her sister, Ruth Hughes.

She is survived by her four children: Christopher Kelly, his wife, Mary, and their two children, Nicholas and Gabrielle; Brendan Kelly; Timothy Kelly, his wife, Cynthia, and their two children, James and Elaine; and Kieran Kelly; and her brother, John Kelly.

Baudouin (Butch) F. de Marcken, 74, a retired USAID FSO, died on April 12 in Babbitt, Minn.

Mr. de Marcken was born on Oct. 21, 1940, in Louvain, Belgium, as a U.S. citizen. He was the youngest of nine children of Alix de Kerchove d’Exarde and Gustave Richard Theodore de Marcken. He spent his early childhood during World War II in Belgium and moved to the United States at the age of 13. He moved first to Brule, Wis., then joined his family in 1953 at their home, Stonehouse, outside Lakeville, Conn.

Mr. de Marcken earned a B.S. in government in 1962 from Colby College and an M.A. in political science in 1964 from the University of Michigan. After graduation, he became one of the first U.S. Peace Corps Volunteers. He served from 1964 to 1967 in Sarawak, Malaysia, where he worked as a teacher in the jungle towns of Saratok and Belaga.

There he met his wife, Gail, a fellow Peace Corps Volunteer from Minnesota.


For years, Mr. de Marcken managed programs for the U.S. Agency for International Development. From 1983 to 1987, he was the regional liaison officer in Burkina Faso, responsible for coordinating U.S. food assistance, disaster relief and rehabilitation programs.

From 1988 to 1989, he was mission director in Madagascar. From 1990 to 1991, he was deputy director in the Democratic Republic of Congo, and oversaw the restructuring of USAID’s programs in light of a deepening political and economic crisis.

In 1992, Mr. de Marcken traveled to Russia as part of Operation Provide Hope, a U.S. effort to provide humanitarian assistance to the newly independent states after the fall of the Soviet Union. From 1993 to 1994, he covered Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania as USAID’s representative to the Baltics.

After his retirement, as his health permitted, Mr. de Marcken continued to serve his community, first in Latvia with an organization that supported street children. He and Mrs. de Marcken eventually moved home to Minnesota, where he volunteered with the North St. Louis County chapter of Habitat for Humanity and as a tutor for students at the Northeast Range School in Babbitt.

Family and friends recall Mr. de Marcken as a generous man who changed the lives of many people. They will miss his Belgian accent, his offbeat sense of humor and the smell of his pipe.

Mr. de Marcken is survived by his wife of 46 years, Gail; three children: Carl de Marcken and his wife, Marina Meilapredoviciu, and their daughter, Nina de
Leonardo “Nard” Neher, 92, a retired FSO and former ambassador, died on May 11.

Mr. Neher was born in 1922 in Central Ohio. His father was a minister in the Church of the Brethren and an artist; his mother was one of the few women college graduates of her day. Growing up, Mr. Neher experienced the Great Depression, which at one point threatened his family with eviction and homelessness. The mortgage protection provisions of the “New Deal” saved the family home.

As a young man, Mr. Neher tried to join several military branches, including the Royal Air Force during the Battle of Britain, but was denied due to his vision problems. Eventually he was drafted and assigned to a communications battalion that made its way through French Africa to Italy, where he served in the occupation authority until after the war ended. This experience fed his lifelong wanderlust.

Under the GI Bill, Mr. Neher earned a B.A. in French from Bowling Green State University and a master’s degree in economics from the University of Chicago. He entered the Foreign Service in 1954 and was posted to Ankara as a consular officer.

Postings followed in Algeria as an economic and political officer, in South Vietnam and Syria as a commercial officer, as arms policy officer in the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, in Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo) as a principal officer, in Chad as deputy chief of mission, and in the Dominican Republic as counselor for political affairs. He also worked as an assistant for plans and policies with the Environmental Protection Agency, as staff director of the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service and as director of the Office of Analysis for Africa.

On June 18, 1984, President Ronald Reagan nominated him to be U.S. ambassador to Upper Volta (now Burkina Faso), where he served until 1987. During his career, Amb. Neher taught himself French, Spanish and Italian, along with workable Turkish, Arabic, Swahili and Lingala.

Amb. Neher was accompanied on all his postings by his wife, the former Christine Enos, and their children. The family enjoyed exploring their country of residence. One particularly memorable outing involved a trip up the Nile River. Mrs. Neher passed away in 1996.

In retirement, Amb. Neher traveled and volunteered with Kathy Welde, his partner of 17 years.

His passion for learning lasted throughout his life. Even in his last days, Amb. Neher avidly consumed "The New Yorker", "The Atlantic", "The Foreign Service Journal", The Economist and several newspapers and books on topics ranging from history to French slang and physics. He also enjoyed hosting friends, garden club members and family in his three-story Capitol Hill townhouse.

Amb. Neher was predeceased by his wife, Christine, and his daughter Patricia. He is survived by three children: Lisa, Dan and Jim; and six grandchildren.

Cecil S. “Cy” Richardson, 88, a retired Foreign Service officer, died on April 1 in hospice care in Virginia.

Mr. Richardson was born in 1926 in New York City, where he was raised. During World War II, he served in Europe with the 17th and 82nd Air Force Divisions. In the winter of 1946-1947, he volunteered for Task Force Frigid in Alaska, testing personnel and equipment under Arctic conditions. He also served as a reservist during the Korean War. Following military service, he graduated from Queens College in 1953, and worked as a social worker.

In 1956, Mr. Richardson joined the Foreign Service. An economic officer, his postings included Dakar, Saigon, Lagos, Niamey, Paris, Accra, Brussels, Quito, Tehran, Lima and Nassau. In November 1979, while away on leave from his post in Tehran, he escaped capture when the embassy was seized.

After retiring in 1991, he and his wife, the former Pearl Rachlin, traveled widely. They frequented Washington-area art galleries and museums, as well as attending many concerts and theatrical productions.

Mr. Richardson was predeceased by his wife, Pearl, who died in 2012. He is survived by his niece, Shelly Ann Scott of Toronto, Canada; and cousins, Lillian Brown and Delores Cowan of Bowie, Md.

Memorial donations may be made in Mr. Richardson’s name to Cleveland and Woodley Park Village, Box 11231, Washington DC 20008, or to www.clevelandwoodleyparkvillage.org/donate.
reporter and later a political advisor to the Third Marine Amphibious Force in Da Nang and Japan (1969-1975).

They later served in Tokyo (1984) and Okinawa (1985-1988), where he was consul general. They served in Seoul twice, from 1978 to 1982, and again from 1994 to 1996.

In addition to Washington, D.C., where Mr. Richardson was director of Korean Affairs from 1988 to 1990, the couple spent three years in Colorado Springs while Mr. Richardson was a Japanese language instructor at the Air Force Academy and later political advisor to the commander of the Air Force Space Command.

Mr. Richardson was an accomplished linguist, fluent in Vietnamese, Korean, Japanese and Spanish. Toward the end of his career, he was in line to be the first U.S. chargé d'affaires in Pyongyang, had political developments permitted the establishment of diplomatic relations.

Mr. Richardson retired from the Foreign Service in 1997, and he and Mrs. Richardson returned to Colorado Springs, making frequent trips to the ranch in northwest Nebraska where he grew up. He loved the blue skies and the broad spaces of the Pine Ridge country and the beautiful homestead of his childhood.

In retirement, Mr. Richardson served for nearly seven years on a part-time basis as the American representative in North Korea to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, a multinational entity created to implement the 1994 Agreed Framework between North Korea and the United States, the Republic of Korea, Japan and the European community.

During his time with KEDO, Mr. Richardson traveled to North Korea more than 15 times (and Mrs. Richardson once) and cumulatively spent more than two years in that country under difficult conditions, using his fluent Japanese and Korean to deal both with the North Koreans and with the United States’ ROK and Japanese partners. While the Agreed Framework ultimately failed, Mr. Richardson’s contributions to the effort were significant.

During that period, he also edited and published the autobiography of his mother, Polly. Moving Out (Bison Books, 2002) chronicles his mother’s life in western Nebraska and beyond.

Friends and family remember Mr. Richardson as an iconoclast and free spirit, and someone who was quick to see illogic and contradictions and never feared pointing them out.

Mr. Richardson was predeceased by his parents and younger brother, Charles, who died in childhood. He is survived by his wife of 52 years, Sharon; his sons, Levi and Luke; his grandsons, William and Charles; his brother, William; and a number of nieces and nephews.

Leonard G. Shurtleff, 74, a retired FSO and former ambassador to the Republic of the Congo, died in Gainesville, Fla., on Jan. 22, of heart failure.

Mr. Shurtleff was born in Boston, Mass., on June 4, 1940. He graduated from Haverhill High School in 1958 and was a member of the National Honor Society. In 1962, he earned a bachelor’s degree (cum laude) in history and government from Tufts University and later attended graduate school at the University of Chicago.

Mr. Shurtleff joined the Foreign Service in 1962. Postings throughout his 33-year career included Caracas, Freetown, Douala, Nouakchott, Bogota, Monrovia, Brazzaville and Washington, D.C.

In 1967 he married Christine Morrissette, a Foreign Service officer (with postings in Tunis and Abidjan) and past president of the Association of American Foreign Service Women (now known as the Associates of the American Foreign Service Worldwide, or AAFSW).

While serving in Douala, Mr. Shurtleff was first on the scene at Embassy Malabo in Equatorial Guinea to take charge following the murder of an FSO by a colleague. In Monrovia, he was chargé d’affaires when Samuel Doe took power in a bloody coup.

In 1987, President Ronald Reagan appointed him U.S. ambassador to the Republic of the Congo. In Brazzaville, where he served until 1990, Ambassador Shurtleff hosted negotiations that resulted in the Brazzaville Protocol, bringing peace to Angola.

Amb. Shurtleff also served at the Department of State in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, in the Bureau of African Affairs as deputy executive director and director for regional affairs, and as deputy assistant secretary in the Office of the Under Secretary for Management.

Amb. Shurtleff received the Meritorious and Superior Honor Awards, the Equal Opportunity Award and the Wilbur J. Carr Award. He was also commended for his mentoring of junior officers.

Following retirement in 1995, Amb. Shurtleff served as honorary vice president of the Western Front Association and was president of the association’s United States branch (World War One Historical Association). He wrote and lectured on diplomatic, political and economic issues relating to World War I, traveling to seminars all over the United States and to European battlefields.

He was a member and local president of the Sons of the American Revolution, as well as a member of Gainesville’s Masonic Lodge, the Order of DeMolay, Sojourners, Alpha Tau Omega fraternity, AFSA and DACOR.

Amb. Shurtleff is survived by his wife of 47 years, Christine Morrissette Shurtleff of Gainesville.
Read and Practice the Wisdom

To Serve with Honor: Doing the Right Thing in Government
Terry Newell, Loftlands Press, 2015, $12.95, paperback, 256 pages.
Reviewed By Robert Dry

Every member of the Foreign Service should buy, read and re-read Terry Newell’s impressive and highly accessible new book, To Serve with Honor: Doing the Right Thing in Government. And they should apply the wisdom in its pages to advance the honor and ethics of our Service.

This book homes in on ethical issues confronted every day by government employees, whether in the Civil Service, the armed forces or the Foreign Service. Other books address ethics in government; none, I’ll wager, is as timely or practical as this one.

Terry Newell spent 40 years in the Air Force, the Department of Education and the Federal Executive Institute in Charlottesville, Virginia. He also served as FEI’s dean of faculty for the four-week, interagency program, “Leadership for a Democratic Society.” He is a master of ethics in government.

This book is not about compliance ethics, on which each year the department requires us to watch a video replete with laws and regulations. Rather, it concerns aspirational, values-based conduct; constructive dissent, speaking up and speaking truth to power; and ethical leadership—the ingredients essential to renewing honor in government.

Compliance ethics, Newell clarifies, tell us what is clearly wrong. More difficult to discern is how to make the right decision when faced with conflicting right choices.

The book is not designed solely for those entering government or moving up the ladder. The author also emphasizes how managers and leaders can foster an ethical climate for responsible government to thrive.

Newell succeeds by highlighting real-world examples. From the first page, he introduces the reader to the consequences of failed or faulty governmental action. He describes how the Federal Emergency Management Agency bought thousands of trailers in 2005 for the displaced in Hurricane Katrina’s aftermath. Before long, the agency received complaints about noxious chemicals in the trailers. To its credit the agency invested a lack of individual moral courage combined with an organizational culture that gave only lip service to ethics.

Not all of the case studies are negative. In fact, a number of positive examples of leadership and ethical conduct are drawn from State Department and Foreign Service experience.

Newell lauds the character of George C. Marshall. Both as Army Chief of Staff and as Secretary of State, he spoke truth to power regardless of personal consequences. When called to testify in Congress, Marshall spoke plainly and forthrightly. Spin was not part of his vocabulary. He was one of those rare leaders who was disappointed in his staff when they did not question his decisions.

In another case, Newell praises the moral courage displayed by U.S. Vice Consul Hiram Bingham in issuing visas and passports to Jews in Marseille as Vichy authorities began rounding them up in 1940. The State Department didn’t want to upset its relations with the new French government at the time and sent Bingham “out of the action,” first to Portugal and then to Argentina. There, at the end of the war, he reported that the country was harboring Nazi war criminals. When the department failed to investigate, Bingham resigned in protest.

In 2002, AFSA and Secretary of State
Colin Powell righted the longstanding wrong by presenting Bingham’s family with a “Special Posthumous Award for Constructive Dissent” for Hiram Bingham IV at the AFSA Awards Ceremony in June. Newell credits the department and AFSA for their support of constructive dissent.

While *To Serve with Honor* is worth reading for the cases it presents, it is most useful in offering practical ways in which individuals and organizations can improve ethical conduct. For example, Chapter 7 is devoted to how an organization can create a positive ethos. In it, the author provides guidelines for those who lead by example:

- Take ethical issues seriously.
- Speak to employees about ethical guidelines.
- Discuss ethical dilemmas with employees when the organization or team is facing a tough decision.
- Clearly express expectations concerning ethical behavior.
- Model ethical behavior in personal actions and decisions.
- Send consistent messages about the importance of behaving ethically.

In short, Newell makes the case for personal and organizational ethical conduct in government. Through examples, illustrations and practical guidance he equips the reader with the wherewithal to do an ever-better job of making ethical decisions and creating an enduring ethical environment. Without these things, government will not succeed.

This book generated in me a pride in service that I all too often take for granted. I recommend it without reservation.

Retired FSO Robert Dry is the interim chair of AFSA’s Committee on the Foreign Service Profession and Ethics.
PROFESSIONAL TAX RETURN PREPARATION

Arthur A. Granberg, EA, ATA, ATP, has more than 40 years of experience in public tax practice. Our Associates include EAs & CPAs. Our rate is $110 per hour; most FS returns take just 3-4 hours. Located near Ballston Mall and metro station.

Tax Matters Associates PC
4420 N. Fairfax Drive, Suite 500
Arlington VA 22203
Tel: (703) 522-3828.
Fax: (703) 522-5726.
Email: aag8866@aol.com

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

Send us your last 3 returns for a free review.
Financial Forecasts, Inc.
Barry B. Demarr, CFP, EA & Bryan F. Demarr, EA
3918 Prosperity Ave #318, Fairfax VA 22031
Tel: (703) 289-1167.
Fax: (703) 289-1178.
Email: finfore@FFITAX.com
Website: www. FFITAX.com

U.S. TAXES FOR EXPATS. Brenner & Elsea-Mandojana, LLC, is a professional services firm that specializes in the tax, financial planning and business advisory needs of U.S. citizens, foreign persons and their businesses. Managing Member Christine Mandojana CPA, CFP®, is the spouse of a Foreign Service officer who specializes in the unique aspects of expat taxation and financial planning, including rental properties. Managing Member Jim Brenner CPA/ABV, CGMA, has over 30 years of diverse experience, is an IRS Certified Acceptance Agent (for persons needing assistance with taxpayer ID numbers) and a QuickBooks ProAdvisor.

Tel: (281) 360-2800.
Fax: (281) 359-6080.
Email: info@globaltaxconsult.com
Website: www.globaltaxconsult.com

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

Email: william@carringtonFP.com
Website: www.CarringtonFP.com


Tel: (703) 743-0272.
Email: David@mytaxcpa.net
Website: www.mytaxcpa.net

IRVING AND COMPANY, CPA: Scott Irving, CPA, has more than 16 years of experience and specializes in Foreign Service family tax preparation and tax planning.

Tel: (202) 257-2318.
Email: info@irvingcom.com
Website: www.irvingcom.com

CANTO SPEECH THERAPY ONLINE. Anywhere in the world!
Long established, well known, widely respected.
Tel: (971) 252-2062.
Email: ask@cantispeechtherapy.com
Website: www.CantoSpeechTherapy.com
TEMPORARY HOUSING

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

CORPORATE APARTMENT SPECIALISTS. Abundant experience with Foreign Service professionals. We work with sliding scales. TDY per diems accepted. We have the locations to best serve you: Foggy Bottom (walking to Main State), Woodley Park, Chevy Chase and several Arlington locations convenient to NFATC. Wi-Fi and all furnishings, houseware, utilities, telephone and cable included. Tel: (703) 979-2830 or (800) 914-2802. Fax: (703) 979-2813. Email: sales@corporateapartments.com Website: www.corporateapartments.com

SHORT-TERM RENTALS • TEMPORARY HOUSING

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

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

SERVING FOREIGN SERVICE PERSONNEL FOR 25 YEARS, ESPECIALLY THOSE WITH PETS. Selection of condos, townhouses and single-family homes accommodate most breeds and sizes. All within a short walk of Metro stations in Arlington. Fully furnished and equipped 1-4 bedrooms, within per diem rates. EXECUTIVE LODGING ALTERNATIVES. Email: Finder5@ix.netcom.com

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

ARLINGTON FLATS. 1-BR, 2-BR, 3-BR and 4-BR flats in 4 beautiful buildings 3 blocks from Ballston or Clarendon Metro. Newly renovated, completely furnished, incl. all utilities/Internet/HDTV w/DVR. Parking, maid service, rental car available. Rates start at $2,750/month. Per diem OK. Min. 30 days. Tel: (571) 235-4289. Email: ClaireWaters826@gmail.com See 2-BR at website: www.dropbox.com/sh/6mkfwnz2ccrubv7/FSM8kHZz

FURNISHED APARTMENTS IN GEORGE TOWN. Luxury 1-BR apartments in an ideal location. 10-minute walk to Dupont Circle Metro, yet within the elegance and charm of Georgetown’s East Village. More than 450 shops and restaurants in one walkable square mile. Jogging/hiking/biking trails just steps from your front door. HDTV, high-speed Internet, w/d and luxury bedding. Weekly housekeeping included. Parking available at no extra charge. No minimum stay. Per diem rates accepted. Tel: (202) 643-1343. Email: FederalFlats@gmail.com Website: www.FederalFlats.com

LUXURY 2-BEDROOM, 2-bath home for rent in the Atrium. 1,600 sq. ft., 2 balconies, fully furnished, with gorgeous view of Georgetown. Walking distance to Rosslyn Metro station and FSI Shuttle stop. Use of swimming pool, tennis court, gym, Internet, cable, maid service and parking included. 1 block to Safeway, restaurants and bike path. Per Diem accepted. No pets or smokers preferred. Tel: (703) 395-8683, (202) 679-0800. Photos available at: retina010@gmail.com

PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

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

REAL ESTATE

DC METRO AREA. Whether you’re buying, selling or leasing, Jack Croddy, a former Senior career FSO, will help you achieve your real estate goals. An expert negotiator, Jack is affiliated with W.C. & A.N. Miller Realtors, a Long & Foster Company and exclusive affiliate of Christie’s Great Estates. Tel: (301) 229-4000, ext. 8345. Cell: (301) 318-3450. Email: arnold.croddy@longandfoster.com
MAIN STATE OR FSI BOUND? For nearly 30 years, I have guided hundreds of Foreign Service clients through the real estate process. Real estate is among the most important financial and life decisions most of us make. You deserve to have the guidance and expertise of a seasoned real estate professional.

Contact Marilyn Cantrell, Associate Broker, licensed in VA and DC. McEnearney Associates
1320 Old Chain Bridge Rd., Ste. 350
McLean VA 22101.
Tel: (703) 864-3916.
Email: Marilyn@MarilynCantrell.com
Website: www.MarilynCantrell.com

LOOKING TO BUY, sell or rent property in Northern Virginia? This former FSFOSO with 15 years of real estate experience understands your needs and can help. References available. David Olinger, GRI Long & Foster, Realtors.

Tel: (914) 483-0803.
Email: david.oolinger@LNF.com
Website: www.davidolinger.lnf.com

RELOCATING TO SARASOTA, FLA.? Good move.
Call Marian Walsh, Realtor and FSO spouse. Berkshire Hathaway Florida Realty
Tel: (941) 483-0803.
Email: florida.walsh@gmail.com

SARASOTA, FLA. PAUL BYRNES, FSO retired, and Loretta Friedman, Coldwell Banker, offer vast real estate experience in assisting diplomats. Enjoy gracious living, no state income tax and an exciting market.
Tel: (941) 377-8181.
Email: byrnesp68@gmail.com (Paul) or lorbfried@gmail.com (Loretta)

FLORIDA’S PARADISE COAST—Naples, Bonita Springs, Estero. Excellent amenities, activities, cultural events in beautiful Southwest Florida. Outstanding home values.
Thomas M. Farley, LLC. Retired SFS. Florida. Outstanding home values.

Email: tomfarley@BHHSFloridaRealty.net
Website: www.tomfarleyBHHSFL.com

AVERY-HESS, REALTORS—Susan Rogers/Realtor, MRP.
Real Estate professional committed to assisting with the unique needs of Foreign Service and Military families, specializing in relocation services. Licensed in VA and MD, with extensive knowledge of the Washington metropolitan area, having lived and worked locally in the region for over 30 years.

Direct Line: (301) 335-7806.
Email: srogers@averyhess.com
Website: susanrogers.averyhess.com

MORTGAGE

FIRST HOME MORTGAGE CORPORATION—Matthew Prehn NMLS #394014.
Sr. Loan Officer with over 24 years of experience. Licensed in VA, MD and DC. Meeting the needs of Foreign Service families in securing financing for their home purchases, loan refinances or renovation loans.

Direct Line: (703) 402-1568.
Email: mprehn@gofirsthome.com
Website: www.mprehn.gofirsthome.com

This is not a guarantee to extend consumer credit. All loans are subject to credit approval & property appraisal. FHMC NMLS ID #71603 (www.nmlsconsumeraccess.org), Equal Housing Lender.

HOME REPAIRS

MOVING TO NORTHERN VIRGINIA? Now is the time to start planning a Spring or Summer move. Let Door2DoorDesigns prepare your home for your arrival. We specialize in working with Foreign Service and military families living abroad. From kitchen/bath remodels to new roofs and everything in between. Trusted and licensed/insured contractors. Many wonderful references.
Contact Nancy Sheehy.
Tel: (703) 244-3843.
Email: Nancy.Sheehy@verizon.net
Website: www.door2doordesigns.com

INTERNATIONAL ADOPTION

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

Adopt Abroad, Inc.
1424 N. 2nd Street, Harrisburg PA 4213 Sonia Ct, Alexandria VA
Tel: (888) 526-4442.
Website: www.adopt-abroad.com

PET TRANSPORTATION

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

Deadline: Five weeks ahead of publication.
Tel: (202) 944-5507.
Fax: (202) 338-2096.
Email: miltenberger@afsa.org
You look like you could use some help.

We’ll do the filing.

No one loves paperwork, but when you're managing rental property it comes with the territory. Luckily, WJD is committed to making record keeping and account transactions easy. Our website is state-of-the-art and is updated every 24 hours. Our commitment to cutting-edge technology means that your account information is secure and available to you whenever you need it. Your profile includes a complete history: all statements, invoices, property inspections with photographs, IRS Form 1099s, and year-end reports. WJD takes the headaches (and the paperwork) out of being a landlord.

Find out more at wjdpm.com or email Director of Operations Maryann Welsh (maryann@wjdpm.com).

WJD Management
Residential property management and leasing specialists serving all of Northern Virginia — and clients around the globe. Property management is our only business.

Sign up at wjdpm.com/wjd-news to get news and updates — or find us on social media!
Who's taking care of your home while you're away?

No one takes care of your home like we do!

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

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

Call us today!
(301) 657-3210

The Meyerson Group, Inc.
6923 Fairfax Road  Bethesda, MD 20814
email: TheMeyersonGroup@aol.com

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

Specializing in
PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

4600-D Lee Highway Arlington, Virginia 22207
(703) 325-7010  (703) 247-3330
E-mail: info@propertyspecialistsinc.com
Web address: propertyspecialistsinc.com
Serving Virginia, Maryland and D.C.

REAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

Serving ALL of Northern Virginia!

2 months FREE for Foreign Service Families
managementpros.com/foreign-service

North America’s LEADER in Leasing & Property Management

Trusted by tens of thousands of property owners nationwide
McEneaney Associates, Inc. Realtors®

PROPRIETARY NORTHERN VIRGINIA AND WASHINGTON, DC METRO AREA SINCE 1986

We manage over 500 individual homes, condos and townhomes in the Washington, DC Metro Area. Our clients entrust us with the care of their home, and we take that responsibility very seriously. Our goal is simple — treat each home as if it were our own.

703.537.3340 | McEneaneyPM.com

RPM offers a proven, full-service property management system for your properties throughout Washington DC. Our team of specialists covers every aspect of property management - marketing, tenant screening, leasing, maintenance, collections, accounting, inspections, and legal compliance - 24 hours a day. Put 25 years of property management experience to work for you while you’re away.

Providing Foreign Service families with GREATER RETURNS with LESS HASSLE.

202-813-9993 • 5540 Connecticut Ave NW
WWW.RPMwashingtondc.com

Created by Foreign Service. Managed by Foreign Service.

Supporting the Foreign Service.

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

McGrath Real Estate Services

Solving Your Real Estate Puzzle.
The **FSJ’s Guide to Property Management**

**FSJ’s Guide to Property Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company/Government</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Name of Company/Government</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Housing Consultants</td>
<td>(202) 361-1730</td>
<td>Executive Housing Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.executivehousing.com">www.executivehousing.com</a></td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Real Estate Advisors</td>
<td>(202) 361-0020</td>
<td>Atlantic Real Estate Advisors</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atlanticrealt.com">www.atlanticrealt.com</a></td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Management Services</td>
<td>(202) 361-0000</td>
<td>Washington Management Services</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wmsdc.com">www.wmsdc.com</a></td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visit the website [www.afsa.org/PropertyManagement.pdf](http://www.afsa.org/PropertyManagement.pdf) for more information.
The End of the British Empire in Aden

BY KATE CARR

Boom! An explosion, then silence. A bazooka shell struck the building next to the hospital in Aden where I had just given birth to my second daughter, Elizabeth.

Now part of Yemen, the city was the capital of a British colony known as the Federation of South Arabia. In March 1965, local militants were already competing to take over after the Brits left, which they did three years later. (Sadly, a half-century later, violence is still Yemen’s best-known attribute.)

To reach Aden, my Foreign Service husband, David, our older daughter, Cynthia, and I had puddle-jumped across the Red Sea in the small plane of a local airline. From its window, I had looked down to see volcanic mountains—sharp, rugged, intensely black and completely bare—thrust directly from the sea around an off-center crater.

On a small, sea-level strip on the north side of the peninsula were the houses and port facilities of this major refueling stop on the lifeline to India. Surrounded by water, Aden receives no cooling desert breezes at night. Nine months of the year, the city is a steam bath at midnight, as well as at high noon.

When we first arrived, the atmosphere was relaxed and happy. Out walking at night, you could see parties on the roofs of all the buildings. It was a magical time filled with tradition.

The beautiful white ships of the P&O steamship company docked to refuel below our dining room window. They were outlined from bow to stern with strings of white lights. The ships, only in port for four hours at a time, came through the Suez Canal on their way to India. Before drawing the drapes at a dinner party, I would look to see if a ship was docked below.

The night before Christmas 1964, militants threw a grenade through a window where a party was in progress, killing a teenage girl home from England. After that, the sound of bombs exploding could be heard each evening. Visiting newspaper correspondents were amazed that we didn’t all run to the windows at each explosion, but we soon knew by the sound exactly where the bomb had gone off.

Although I continued shopping in the port area, I no longer went to the Crater—the center of Aden. In those narrow streets, assassinations were becoming more frequent. I worried about my husband who, as an economic officer, made frequent trips to businesses there.

Despite its troubles, Aden was still a thriving city. One of the most interesting aspects was the number of nationalities that formed the local population. In addition to Arabs, who mostly came from Yemen, local residents included Indians and Jews. Muslim women from Somalia and Christians from Eritrea worked as ayahs, taking care of children.

Shops were open according to the religions of their owners. On Fridays, Arab businesses were closed; on Saturdays, Jewish establishments; and on Sundays, the Indian stores.

During our two years there, we enjoyed many British pastimes, living as normal a life as we could. There were beaches with wire netting to keep sharks out, and we visited them frequently.

Shopping in the Crescent—an emporium that boasted products from the whole world—I often walked around a park with a statue of Queen Victoria seated. I could buy woolens from Scotland and silks from India. I loved the bone china from England and the fascinating clocks. Tourists from the refueling ships snapped up cameras and hi-fis at greatly reduced prices.

Looking back, I feel privileged to have witnessed the last days of the British Empire on that black rock. By the time Aden received its independence in 1967, we had already left. But I read in a magazine that the British moved the statue of Queen Victoria onto a ship, and the last troops marched aboard while the Highland Guard piped the “Stony Shores of Aden,” an old Scotch ballad.
During a recent visit to Petra, the ancient caravan-city in Jordan that was an important crossroads between Arabia, Egypt and Syria-Phoenicia, I came across this scene. The old Bedouin rababa player and his charming grandson were playing music for tourists passing by, and were so caught in the moment and comfortable with their surroundings that they seemed to transcend time.

Petra is one of the world’s most famous archaeological sites, where ancient Eastern traditions blend with Hellenistic architecture. Located between the Dead Sea and the Red Sea, the city is half built, half carved into the rock and surrounded by mountains riddled with passages and gorges.

Alda Kauffeld is a Foreign Service spouse posted in Amman, where she works as the embassy’s EFM residential security coordinator. The Kauffeld family has served in Kenya, Sri Lanka, Ghana and Jordan. She is a professional photographer and winner of the 2009 National Photo Award. She was awarded “Best in Show” by the Art in Embassies “Through Their Eyes” worldwide Defense Department and State Department Photography Contest in 2012.

Please submit your favorite, recent photograph to be considered for Local Lens. Images must be high resolution (at least 300 dpi at 8” x 10”) and must not be in print elsewhere. Please submit a short description of the scene/event, as well as your name, brief biodata and the type of camera used, to locallens@afsa.org.
Should you get a discount for being in the Foreign Service?  
WE THINK SO.

- Discounted rates for Foreign Service Professionals
- Discount if you transfer from another international insurer
- One policy for car, property and transit
- Fast, hassle-free claims handling
- “A” Rated by A. M. Best
- Proud Sponsor of AFSA Academic Scholarship
- Get your quote at embassyrisk.com or +1 540 437 3019

Worldwide coverage | Hometown service

Policy Now Covers  
Evacuation and  
War

Full Replacement  
Cost on Household  
Effects

Proud Member of the Rockingham Group  
Personal Insurance Specialists Since 1869
Worldwide Accident Insurance at Group Rates Exclusively for Foreign Service Members

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

- Guaranteed insurability to age 70, renewable to age 85
- War risk, acts of terrorism at full limit
- Medical evacuation and repatriation
- Available in $50,000 increments up to $500,000 for $1/thousand
- Underwritten by the Chubb Group of Insurance Companies, known for financial strength and exceptional claim service

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