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Sustaining America’s Global Leadership

BY BARBARA STEPHENSON

As I prepared to write this, the final column of my two-year term as AFSA president, I reviewed all 19 columns published since I took office in July 2015. By the time you read this, the results of the elections for the 2017-2019 AFSA Governing Board and officers will have been announced, and we will know if I will be back in this space writing President’s Views columns for the next two years.

I told you at the outset of my tenure that I would use this column as an accountability tool to report openly and transparently about AFSA’s goals and plans, all funded by you, the more than 16,500 members who voluntarily pay dues to run this organization so we can serve as the Voice of the Foreign Service, your voice.

I reported to you that the AFSA Governing Board would structure its work around three pillars:

Outreach, to tell the proud story of the Foreign Service to the American people so they understand what we do and why it matters to them—and are then ready to champion our vitally important work to help make our country secure and prosperous through sustaining America’s global leadership role.

Inreach, both to gain a nuanced understanding of members’ aspirations and concerns as the basis for our advocacy agenda and to reinforce among members a sophisticated understanding of the unique demands of our service so that members are themselves equipped to be effective advocates.

Workforce planning, the creation of staff capacity so that AFSA can fulfill its role as the Voice of the Foreign Service and generate informed arguments about what choices contribute to the long-term well-being of the Foreign Service as a vital instrument of national security and prosperity.

I am pleased to report that we have made enormous progress in all three areas, and I invite—you read AFSA’s annual report for further details about the work we have undertaken on your behalf.

As we face a proposed 30 percent cut to the foreign affairs budget, along with a major reorganization, I am, while profoundly unsettled about what all this means for America’s global leadership, equally grateful that we at AFSA had the foresight to prepare and mount a credible defense of the Foreign Service as both indispensable to global leadership and the most cost-effective tool in the national security toolkit.

I am more convinced than ever of the vital role the Foreign Service plays in sustaining America’s global leadership role—a role supported by nine in 10 of our fellow Americans. So are other leading voices—from our country’s most respected generals and admirals to business and religious leaders, as well as many members of Congress from both sides of the aisle.

Senator Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs, had this to say about the proposed cuts to the budget for State and USAID: “A 29 percent cut means you really have to withdraw from the world because your presence is compromised. That may be the goal of this budget. It’s not my goal. This guts soft power as we know it.”

Make no mistake about it: what you do matters. In addition to being effective and informed advocates for the Foreign Service, I want to ask you to double down on doing your jobs. For the two-thirds of you who are deployed abroad representing our great nation at 270 American diplomatic posts around the world, please keep our flag flying proudly. Reinforce patterns of cooperation. Encourage partners in your host country to continue to look to the American embassy for leadership and problem solving.

Double down on your contact work. Keep information channels flowing and patterns of security cooperation robust. Pay into the bilateral relationship, building up the metaphorical bank account by reminding your host country what they love about America, whether that’s astronauts or jazz, and of the ties that bind us, whether of shared sacrifice or kinship or history.

And take care of each other.

Remember: America’s global leadership role rests in large measure on your shoulders.

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

Climate Change Diplomacy

BY SHAWN DORMAN

Climate change and shifting weather patterns are not the Tinker Bells of science or of policy. Disbelief, or denial, or a suspension of research will not make melting icecaps, rising sea levels, desertification and floods go away. ...There is change, and it affects human security.

—Ambassador (ret.) Barbara Bodine in her foreword to “New Challenges to Human Security: Environmental Change and Human Mobility,” an April 2017 report by Georgetown University’s Institute for the Study of Diplomacy.

Last fall, some eight months ago, the FSJ Editorial Board selected environmental diplomacy as the focus topic for this July-August issue. The Paris Agreement on climate change had been signed by the United States and all other countries of the world but two, and had entered into force in November 2016. Then-Secretary of State John Kerry was personally involved in the intense all-night negotiations that led to the final accord. It was a great story of diplomatic success and of U.S. global leadership in cooperation with allies and adversaries alike.

Last fall we were not thinking that as we put the issue together the U.S. president would announce that the United States is withdrawing from the Paris Agreement. We did not foresee that environmental diplomacy would become a toxic topic, rather than a natural place for U.S. leadership.

Even with today’s uncertainty, and because of it, we think this month’s focus is timely and a good reminder of diplomacy’s critical role in meeting international challenges.

Few would argue that climate change and environmental challenges more broadly are going away. And we can still hope that the United States government will continue to play a constructive role in bringing people and countries together. U.S. engagement will continue, through the states and cities, through governors and mayors, non-government organizations and U.S. businesses.

We begin with FSO Tim Lattimer’s account of how the United States led the way to the Paris Agreement. Lattimer argues that no matter what this administration’s posture is on the agreement, the climate change challenge will loom larger and larger, affecting vital U.S. interests around the world—and U.S. diplomats must be involved.

In “It’s Not Just about Paris: International Climate Action Today,” former Deputy Special Envoy for Climate Change Karen Florini and public policy professor Ann Florini lay out the many ways that non-U.S. government entities are becoming deeply engaged on climate change, including cities and businesses. The world is moving forward on climate change with or without USG involvement, they argue, and the United States should not leave the table.

FSO Jason Donovan shares the ground-level story of the “Path to PACE,” how the Partnership to Advance Clean Energy, a bilateral agreement between the United States and India, helped create a $4 billion bilateral clean energy market. Then Todd Evans, an energy manager in the Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations, shows how the State Department has adopted solar power in “Solar Overseas: Harnessing the Sun to Power U.S. Embassies.”

Finally, an article from the May 1978 FSJ, “Decade of the Environment,” gives an account of the early U.S. leadership on environmental diplomacy, including the Nixon administration’s 1970 creation of the Environmental Protection Agency and how that inspired other nations to follow with their own national EPAs.

In one of two great features this month, “Making It Work: Conversations with Female Ambassadors,” Leslie Bassett shares excerpts from extensive interviews she did with seven ambassadors. And we asked writer and frequent Journal contributor Donna Gorman for an update on how Foreign Service families are coping with the current hiring freeze. Her “Out in the Cold” describes the crisis for family members and embassies.

In Speaking Out, Ambassador (ret.) Bill Burns shares his remarks from Foreign Affairs Day, his perspective on “The Value and Purpose of American Diplomacy.”

As always, we want to hear from you. Respond to the articles in this issue or raise another topic of interest by sending in your letters and article submissions.

Shaun Dorman is the editor of The Foreign Service Journal.
Reading the FSJ

Congratulations on making the entire archive of FSJ issues available online. This will make a valuable asset easily accessible for academicians and for anyone interested in exploring the history of our profession and our country.

I sincerely hope, however, that you will not follow the example of State Magazine and replace the print edition of the FSJ with an online one.

I used to read State Magazine avidly every month, always wanting to know, even in retirement, what my colleagues were doing to advance our interests at home and abroad. Alas, I have not read a single issue since the magazine abandoned its print edition. The monthly email link goes unopened.

The cold light of my computer is no equal to my comfortable reading chair in our sun room, where I hold each month’s FSJ in my lap, leaning back, not forward, turning the pages as I read in the soft light coming through our windows.

Please stick with print. The Journal is a wonderful magazine. My wife and I look forward to reading it every month.

Charles O. Cecil
Ambassador, retired
Alexandria, Virginia

Global Health Includes Mental Health

I want to thank The Foreign Service Journal for focusing the May 2017 issue on global health diplomacy. Having previously worked at USAID, I read the magazine diligently and was pleased to see global health featured.

I wish, however, that the Journal had noted that May is mental health month. It was a missed opportunity to highlight the fact that mental health issues associated with famine, refugees, natural disasters and communicable diseases are often overlooked.

I hope the Journal will consider publishing a follow-up article on the need to include mental health in our discussions on global health diplomacy. Mental health truly knows no boundaries.

Susan Gurley
Executive Director, Anxiety and Depression Association of America
Silver Spring, Maryland

A Strong Image

The comments by Thomas Hutson in his letter in the May FSJ regarding the cover of the March issue, which focused on diplomatic security, took me aback—more than just a bit.

The “On the Cover” explanation on page 6 of the March FSJ describes the roles of the individuals in the photo, raising questions for me about Mr. Hutson’s characterization of the image as demonstrating “the folly of our cast- trated foreign policy mechanisms.”

The outskirts of Kabul constitute dangerous territory. In the photo are an armed contractor supporting the DS contingent at post, a USAID specialist, the USAID mission director for Afghan- istan and the embassy’s deputy chief of mission. The two women stepping off the helicopter are not identified, but might well be State officers accompanying the group. An eighth person stands behind the security contractor.

Mr. Hutson’s critical, gratuitous and disrespectful comment on the “diplomats” and “development specialists” (his quotation marks) are beneath the standards of the Journal, especially at a time when AFSA is making the case in defense of all members of the U.S.

foreign policy community, especially FSOS from State, USAID and associated organizations—including contractors.

To answer Mr. Hutson’s question—“I wonder whether this image [the cover photo] bothers anyone else?”—I offer a resounding “No!”

A multiagency mission including six men (one with a loaded assault rifle), three women and a third-country helicopter and crew in a rugged landing zone reinforces my pride in what we are trying to accomplish in a very harsh environment. This is a key reality of the Foreign Service mission in 2017.

A more positive approach to the photo might highlight the factors above to sup- port the best in us as a nation seeking to operate in areas where our presence might be controversial, but where our principles require the kind of commit- ment that I would call exceptional.

David Rabadan
FSO, retired
Annandale, Virginia

No Place for Derision

I was shocked that the FSJ chose to publish the letter from Thomas Hutson, “The Wrong Image,” in its May issue. Did the editorial team not consider his mocking reference to female FSOS as “fluttering female officers” or his implication that the lives of female officers in Afghanistan are not worthy of protection?

With sadness I reflect on Anne Smedinghoff, who sacrificed her life engaging in the courageous work of public diplomacy in Afghanistan. Foreign Service women and men continue to put their lives at risk in support of the U.S. mission to Afghanistan, and their efforts should not be disparaged.

I am consoled by the fact that Mr.
Hutson is no longer a part of our Service, but I expect a higher standard from AFSA. Lively discourse and self-criticism are certainly welcome, but please do not allow the FSJ to be a platform for derision and outdated gender stereotypes.

Laura Malenas
FSO
Washington, D.C.

Let’s Talk about Modern Public Diplomacy

I retired as a Senior Foreign Service information officer with the U.S. Information Agency at the end of 1988. I was educated as a journalist and earned a master’s degree in international relations before joining the Foreign Service in 1963.

I was pleased to see the Speaking Out in the May Journal, “Digital Diplomacy: Will State Ever Take the Plunge?” I congratulate Amelia Shaw on her sensitive and thoughtful observations and conclusions. There is no doubt that, to be effective, the tools of modern-day public diplomacy must involve the so-called social media. Digital and/or electronic media would be a more accurate term.

We did not have those tools when I was in the Service, but I see how effective they can be. I would hope, as Ms. Shaw suggests, that State will find a way to make the public diplomacy function more effective through the use of modern methods. Our diplomats, in particular those serving abroad, deserve all the help they can and should get.

Though the atmosphere at the moment is likely not conducive, I also believe that it would be better for PD to be, once again, made independent from the State bureaucracy. In any case, it should have a director who is knowledgeable, if not currently involved with digital media, and personally aware of the complicated nature of communicating with foreign audiences.

Again, I applaud the inspiration Ms. Shaw has provided with her article. I hope that it is just a beginning.

Jon W. Stewart
USIA FSO, retired
Bothell, Washington

Practicing Public Diplomacy

Amelia Shaw makes some good points about embassies’ social media participation in her May Speaking Out. Too many practitioners are “using Facebook as a signboard on which to cut and paste media content created in Washington.”

At FSI, we teach embassy staffers to do better in our information tradecraft and other courses, as well as in multiple courses specifically on social media. Every year, hundreds of FSOs and Locally Employed staff members learn social media strategies, techniques and analytics.

As I work with PD professionals in strategic planning workshops and learn of their products and methods, I think that most of them do take engagement seriously. We talk a lot about capturing audience reaction to the full spectrum of programs to evaluate results.

When Ms. Shaw gets into her first public diplomacy assignment in Vientiane, her production and marketing skills will doubtless improve the Public Affairs Section’s performance.

However, she will also learn that posts, tweets and videos are tools, not the end product of a PAS.

Diplomacy is a different business from journalism.

Joe B. Johnson
FSO, retired
Instructor, Public Diplomacy
Division, FSI
Arlington, Virginia
Two Separate Things

President Donald Trump recently admonished many of our NATO allies for not meeting the target of spending 2 percent or more of GDP on military expenditures.

But the shoe is on the other foot when it comes to economic and social development expenditures (foreign aid). The United States is among the worst in not meeting the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s target of 0.7 percent of GDP for such expenditures.

We are only at 0.17 percent, ranking 20 out of 28 member countries. Our representatives at OECD, including myself some years ago, attempt to justify our poor record partly by stressing that we meet our military obligations. But our friends invariably reply that these are “two separate things.”

Military expenditures represent hard power. Development expenditures, along with diplomacy, are soft power. It is the latter—backed up from time to time by the former—that are the best tools for dealing with the conflicts of our times. The bulk of our politicians and citizenry do not understand that.

Raymond Malley
Senior FSO (State and USAID), retired
Hanover, New Hampshire

CORRECTION

The June Talking Point on the 70th anniversary of the Marshall Plan mistakenly states that Secretary of State George C. Marshall received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1949. He received that award in 1953. We regret the error.
Paris Agreement—
U.S. Withdraws,
the World Reacts

President Donald Trump announced on June 1 that the U.S. would pull out of the Paris Agreement on climate change. The United States’ role in the agreement had been under discussion throughout the president’s recent overseas trip to the Middle East and Europe. From the Vatican, where Pope Francis presented Pres. Trump with a signed copy of a papal encyclical calling for cooperation in combating climate change, to the NATO summit in Brussels, climate change remained at the forefront.

In a speech announcing his decision, Pres. Trump declared that the Paris Agreement was a “bad deal” for the United States and that compliance with “the onerous energy restrictions it has placed on the United States” would cause damage to the U.S. economy.

The reaction from world leaders has been uniformly negative. German, French, and Italian leaders issued a rare joint statement shortly after the president’s announcement, in which they regretted the president’s decision and stated: “We deem the momentum generated in Paris in December 2015 irreversible.”

Describing the Paris Agreement as a “vital instrument for our planet, societies and economies,” European leaders also rejected the president’s suggestion that the agreement could be renegotiated with terms more favorable to the United States.

China and India both took the opportunity to reaffirm their commitment to the Paris Agreement and cooperation with the European Union in economic and technological matters.

Apart from the environmental considerations, there are also concerns that the decision will damage the United States in the eyes of the international community. The United States is now one of only three countries not to be a part of the Paris Agreement (the other two are Nicaragua, who felt the terms did not go far enough, and Syria), and some nations are questioning whether America wishes to retain the United States’ unofficial title as “leader of the free world.”

In the meantime, non-U.S. government actors in the United States—prominent U.S. companies, numerous mayors, the state of California and others—are issuing statements of support for the agreement, and promising to abide by it.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

Business Leaders
Back State Department and USAID

On May 22, 225 business leaders from across the United States joined the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition in sending a letter calling on Secretary of State Rex Tillerson to support a strong budget for U.S. foreign affairs agencies.

Recognizing that 95 percent of the world’s consumers live outside the United States, the letter reminded Sec. Tillerson of the role played by diplomats and development experts in opening up new markets for U.S. exports, strengthening America’s economic interests abroad and supporting jobs within the United States.

“There’s nothing ‘soft’ about what the State Department does and what they can do for American security.”
—Senator Chris Murphy (D-Conn.), in an interview at the Council on Foreign Relations, April 10

“A 29 percent cut [from the State Department’s budget] means you really have to withdraw from the world because your presence is compromised. That may be the goal of this budget. It’s not my goal. This guts soft power as we know it.”
—Senator Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), chair of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, May 23

Heard on the Hill

A FSA continues to see an outpouring of support for the Foreign Service, the Department of State and USAID. Many public figures are stepping forward to defend diplomacy and development as the most cost-effective national security tools. Here are just a few:

“The work that our diplomats do in the field to advance American interests under difficult circumstances is undervalued. I salute members of the State Department because they put their lives on the line.”
—Representative Gregory Meeks (D-N.Y.), at a House Foreign Affairs Committee hearing, May 18

“Strategic investments in diplomacy and development make America safer and more prosperous,” the letter continues. “Our embassies and consulates around the world are essential partners for American businesses to ensure we can compete on a level playing field. Trade promotion programs have helped drive American exports, strengthening America’s economic interests abroad and supporting jobs within the United States.”

Chris Policinski, president and CEO of Land O’Lakes, Inc., a farmer-owned agricultural cooperative, said: “The bang
The Executive Abroad is an interactive map showcasing the history of international travel by presidents and Secretaries of State. Produced by the Digital Scholarship Lab at the University of Richmond, which focuses on research and development of innovative digital humanities projects, the map is part of DSL’s project, American Panorama: An Atlas of United States History. Users can search by the name of a president or Secretary of State to find out where in the world they have visited, and how often visits to that city or country have taken place. By clicking on the various highlighted cities, users can see the meetings that took place during each visit.

“Executive travel represents an important form of soft power, and this map projects its growth during what’s been called the American Century,” the authors of the website state.

—Andrea Philbin, Editorial Intern

Colin Powell Speaks Out on the 2018 Budget

In a May 24 op-ed for The New York Times, former Secretary of State and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell spoke out in opposition to the Trump administration’s 2018 budget proposal to reduce State Department and foreign assistance spending.

The proposed budget would be “internationally irresponsible, distressing our friends, encouraging our enemies and undermining our own economic and national security interests,” Powell said.

Powell spoke from his experience as Secretary, rebuilding the department after a decade of budget cuts that had left it unable to function effectively, and his experience in the military working alongside diplomats and aid workers to strengthen America abroad.

While agreeing that it is necessary to review, reform and strengthen the State Department and USAID, the former Secretary of State said that gutting the foreign affairs budget would, in effect, lower our flag at outposts around the world and make us less safe: Confronting the challenges of the modern world needs more than just a military that is second to none, but also well-resourced, effective and empowered diplomats and aid workers.

If Americans want to keep the reputation the country has built over the years as a beacon of hope to the world, Powell argues, then the conversation has to begin by acknowledging that it can’t be done on the cheap.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

Justice Delayed, Justice Denied?

Five years ago, in the May 2012 Journal (“The Power of Video”), we reported on the international campaign to capture Joseph Kony, one of Africa’s most brutal warlords. Since its 1987 founding, Kony’s Lord’s Resistance Army has forcibly recruited approximately 100,000 children to serve as soldiers or sex workers, killed or maimed hundreds of thousands of people throughout Central Africa, and displaced at least two million others.

We noted that Invisible Children, Inc., a nonprofit founded to raise awareness of

Kony's savagery and pressure the United States to take military action, had released a 30-minute documentary, "Kony 2012." It drew 100 million views in its first week alone, making it the fastest-growing viral video in history up to that point. The group also gathered 3.7 million signatures on a call for international action to end the conflict.

In a September 2013 update ("Kony 2013"), we reported that the Obama administration had deployed 100 U.S. Army Special Forces soldiers to Central Africa, to train local troops and assist in the manhunt. Their efforts effectively reduced the LRA to a shell of its former self and drove Kony into hiding, most likely in South Sudan.

Noting that the State Department was offering a $5 million reward for information leading to Kony's capture, the Talking Points item saw "reason to hope that 2013 will be the year he and his followers finally face justice."

Alas, our optimism proved premature. On April 22, Associated Press reporter Rodney Muhumaza broke the news that Uganda and the United States had called off the manhunt, claiming that the LRA was only a nuisance, not a regional menace.

In a May 9 follow-up, Muhumaza cites a December 2016 United Nations report on sexual violence in conflict, which states that the LRA remains a regional menace: "The Lord's Resistance Army continued its decade-old pattern of abduction, rape, forced marriage, forced impregnation and sexual slavery" in the Central African Republic and has a presence in Congo and South Sudan.

And sure enough, for the first time in five years, on June 7 40 LRA rebels kidnapped 61 civilians in the Tanganyika mining area near Garamba National Park in the DRC's Haut-Uele province. Though the villagers were released unharmed after being forced to transport goods and food the group had looted, an unknown number of them have fled the area. At least one NGO involved in protecting civilians has already suspended work in the province due to insecurity, and others may follow.

—Steven Alan Honley, Contributing Editor

### Annual PDAA Awards Winners Hailed for Creativity and Innovation

The 2017 winners of the 20th annual PDAA awards for excellence in public diplomacy were honored at a May 7 celebration in Washington, D.C.

PDAA is a volunteer, nonprofit organization of current and former State Department, broadcast, academic and private-sector public diplomacy professionals (formerly known as the USIA Alumni Association).
As Director General of the Foreign Service, I have been doing considerable thinking these past months concerning the future role and the ever-increasing responsibilities of the Foreign Service.

...When all possible alternatives are examined one cannot escape the conclusion that the arguments supporting the maintenance of a professional, merit-oriented, highly motivated career system is more valid today than at any time in the history of our nation. The question is really not whether we should continue to opt for a career system, but what new concepts must be employed to meet new demands.

...We should focus our attention to a recruitment system which hires talent from whatever source that may be available to meet the requirements of the moment. The maintenance of a highly professional career corps does not in any way disparage the collateral need for a variety of talent from government sources and elsewhere, bringing a wealth of experience to bear upon our total foreign affairs problem.

In fact, the two concepts are complementary rather than antagonistic. ...In developing this concept of our foreign affairs establishment, one reaches for parallels by way of illustration with some trepidation, for no two situations are sufficiently alike to provide an absolute precedent. There is, however, sufficient similarity to our armed services to warrant a comparison.

...The fact that the career Foreign Service does not wear uniforms or handle visible weapons does not essentially change the facts. Continuing and timely consideration needs to be constantly given to the techniques of recruitment, training, raising of professional standards, together with providing conditions of service and disciplines to be observed and rewards to be granted in recognition.

But the removal of this stiffening in our foreign affairs establishment by muting or weakening the career Foreign Service can only be inimical to the country’s fortunes.


This year’s awardees include Public Affairs Officer Dolores Prin at the U.S. Consulate General in Okinawa, Deputy Public Affairs Officer Justen Thomas at Embassy Havana, Miami Media Hub Director Lydia Barraza, Public Affairs Officer Jay Raman at Embassy Phnom Penh (all of whom are AFSA members) and Educational Adviser Alia Alkhraisha in Dubai.

Dolores Prin redefined how the U.S. consulate reaches out to the Okinawan public, which has long been hostile to the American presence on the island. Her citation read: “For highly innovative and creative initiatives to engage tens of thousands of Okinawans and foster a positive image of America in a challenging environment.”

Award winners Lydia Barraza and Justen Thomas significantly influenced the public narrative in support of normalizing U.S.-Cuban relations. “Their ability to ‘fill the media space’ allowed us to build a consistent narrative on our terms,” Ambassador Jeffrey DeLaurentis said. Their work helped frame messages that reached tens of millions of viewers around the world and led to the relaunch of important State Department programs in the country.

Award recipient Jay Raman’s initiatives to implement strategic cultural heritage preservation programs significantly contributed to U.S.-Cambodian relations because of the high importance that government places on its cultural heritage as a source of pride and as an engine for economic growth, wrote Deputy Chief of Mission Julie Chung.

Education Adviser Alia Alkhraisha organized and participated in more than 60 major outreach events on behalf of EducationUSA in Dubai, reaching an audience of more than 38,000 students, educators and university representatives.

As a result, for the first time the United States can do educational outreach in UAE public schools. Alkhraisha’s example is now being used by other EducationUSA centers across the 19 countries in the region.

For full coverage of the PDAA awards and a complete list of award winners since 1993, visit www.publicdiplomacy.org.

—Susan B. Maitra, Managing Editor
The Value and Purpose of American Diplomacy

BY WILLIAM J. BURNS

At a moment when international order is under severe strain, power is fragmenting and great-power rivalry has returned, the values and purpose at the core of the American idea matter more than ever.

Year after year for more than a half-century, we’ve come together on the first Friday in May. We’ve come together during Republican and Democratic administrations, during times of war and peace, and during moments of promise and moments of reckoning. We’ve come together to mourn after gut-wrenching loss and hardship and heartache. We’ve come together to celebrate diplomatic triumphs, as well as those less heralded examples of good professionals wading through risk and difficulty to make our imperfect world a little less threatening.

We’ve come together to honor those who came before us, and to remind ourselves of our obligation to new generations of diplomats. And we’ve come together at moments of growth and revitalization, as well as moments of austerity and bureaucratic consolidation, and even amputation.

We come together this year at an undeniably difficult moment—a time of domestic upheaval and global disorder, and a time of deep doubt about the value and purpose of American diplomacy. After more than 15 years of war in Iraq and Afghanistan, and almost a decade removed from the Great Recession, Americans feel a profound sense of insecurity about their future and fatigue about engagement with the world. Baffled and battered by the dislocating forces of globalization, the sense of identity that has long animated us as a nation is fraying. Fed a narrative of carnage and chaos at home, and of decline and danger abroad, Americans wonder whether we can—and whether we even should—continue to play a leadership role on an endlessly complicated international landscape. …

I am still close enough to my time in government to understand vividly what Secretary of State Rex Tillerson and everyone in this department wake up to every morning—challenges that are relentless and choices that have to be made under unforgiving time pressures and with inevitably incomplete information. I have immense respect for what they must cope with, and for the professionalism and decency that they bring to the task. I miss the people I served with, and the unique fulfillment of public service; but I must admit that my nostalgia is under control for yet another meeting in the White House Situation Room to debate the tortured policy possibilities of North Korea or Syria, or to worry about the next big global health or humanitarian crisis. Ours is a hard business.

But I worry, really worry, that we’re about to make diplomacy a lot harder. Thirty percent budget cuts, substantial reductions in both the Foreign and Civil Services, disruptive fantasies about deep states and the particularly pernicious
practice of questioning the loyalty of individual career public servants because they worked in the previous administration are troubling phenomena. And I fear they reflect dismissiveness about the role of diplomacy and diplomats that is not only regrettable, but deeply counterproductive.

What we’re risking—despite the fine and capable people at the top of this administration’s national security team and the truly heroic efforts of our career colleagues under extremely tough circumstances—is the hollowing out of the ideas, initiative and institutions on which American leadership and international order rest.

American Leadership and International Order

The idea of America has been at the heart of our success in the world for 70 years. For all our imperfections, we have embodied political and economic openness, respect for human dignity and a sense of possibility. The power of our example has mattered more than the power of our preaching, and enlightened self-interest has driven our strategy.

But what we see bubbling to the surface at this moment of uncertainty is far more focus on “self” than “enlightened”—a nasty brew of mercantilism, unilateralism and unreconstructed nationalism. At a moment when international order is under severe strain, power is fragmenting and great-power rivalry has returned, the values and purpose at the core of the American idea matter more than ever.

American initiative—the willingness and ability to mobilize others to deal with shared problems—is another crucial asset at risk. From regional challenges to wider global dilemmas such as climate change, U.S. leadership has been critical to the unprecedented peace and prosperity of the post-World War II era. Of course … we got a lot wrong and made our share of serious mistakes. And, of course, we need to make significant adjustments in a world in which the United States is no longer dominant but still pre-eminent.

But too many people in today’s Washington seem to see the United States as a hostage to the very international order it created. Alliances are millstones, multilateral arrangements such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership and NAFTA are constraints rather than opportunities, and the United Nations and other international bodies are distractions, if not irrelevant. We’re Gulliver, in their view, and it’s time to break the bonds of the Lilliputians.

That is more than just an attitude, and more than just a new articulation of a recurring isolationist instinct in U.S. politics. It’s already proving corrosive, by creating a trade vacuum in Asia that China is eagerly filling; threatening to squander hard-won gains in our own hemisphere and Africa; and unnerving European allies by indulging populist nationalists and encouraging more Brexits.

At the same time, we risk the decay of institutions that translate American ideas and initiative into action. By continuing to rely so heavily on hard power, we continue to reinforce a calamitous pattern in which we have often inverted the roles of force and diplomacy. Force becomes our tool of first resort, with diplomacy its under-resourced enabler, rather than diplomacy enabled by the vast potential of the American military, as well as our rich array of economic, development and soft-power capabilities.

Of course we have to substantially reform domestic and international agencies. No one is more familiar with—or been more frustrated by—the imperfections and inefficiencies of this department than we are. Substantial streamlining is long overdue. And it’s about time that we took effective aim at the ballooning of seventh-floor staff, the endless layering of bureaucracy, the bottomless clearance pages, and the proliferation of special envoys and offices. And I haven’t even mentioned travel orders and other byzantine administrative processes, a form of self-flagellation that we are especially adept at in this department.

But reform ought to be motivated by an interest in strengthening American diplomacy, not sidelining it. Long delays in filling bureau and embassy leadership posts eviscerate morale and undermine our capacity to promote our interests, defend our policies and ensure the safety and security of American citizens. And draconian reductions in assistance programs are penny-wise but pound-foolish.

Our foreign aid barely makes a dent in the federal budget, but gutting it guarantees the kind of state failures and conflicts that often drag in the U.S. military, at far greater cost in blood and treasure.
also of the men and women in uniform and throughout our intelligence agencies who have seen firsthand the indispensable role the U.S. Agency for International Development and other development agencies play in preventing and mitigating crisis and conflict.

What the Moment Demands of Us

We need to guard against those illusions. We shouldn’t want to find ourselves a few years down the road with hollow institutions. Now is not the time to hunker down and wait for the world’s troubles to pass. We can either try to shape an international landscape that addresses the ills upending societies and regions and protects our values and interests, or watch as it is shaped for us by other powers and other players with starkly different visions for the century unfolding before us.

Now more than ever, we need American diplomacy to open markets, expand exports overseas and ensure a level and high-quality playing field for American companies. We need to enhance—not roll back—cooperation to combat terrorists, reduce nuclear weapons and prevent their proliferation, and ease the economic troubles and unresolved conflicts on which violent extremists feed.

Now more than ever, we need American diplomacy to support the rule of law and advance a wider agenda of better global health, better opportunities for women, better prospects for food and water security, and better possibilities for dealing effectively with climate and energy challenges.

Now more than ever, we need American diplomacy to tend partnerships, alliances and coalitions. They are what set us apart from lonelier powers like China and Russia. We need to help write new rules of the road to maximize the promise of technological innovation while mitigating its risks. And we need to pursue tough-minded engagement with our adversaries—a mark of American strength and confidence, not weakness.

Now more than ever, we need to recruit and invest in the talent and patriotism of young Americans eager for the opportunity to serve their country as diplomats and development professionals. Turning them away today will prove to be a devastating self-inflicted wound from which it will take decades to recover.

And now more than ever, all of us have a role to play in making the case for American diplomacy—not just to admire the problem or carp from the sidelines, or worse yet, as I already find myself doing, boring those still laboring in the department with stories of how things worked when giants walked the earth.

We need to be a source of ideas and initiative and encouragement, and sometimes honest concerns, as well as active and committed advocates for the profession and the department to which we and our families dedicated so much of our lives.

I am often reminded these days of Winston Churchill’s saying that the thing he liked best about Americans was that they always did the right thing in the end—they just liked to exhaust all the alternatives first. While I worry a lot that we will spend inordinate amounts of time over the next few years exhausting all the alternatives first. While I worry a lot that we can still get this right, and still ensure the priority for American diplomacy that our country needs, that this moment in history requires. And I will always remain deeply proud to have shared with all of you the remarkable experience of being an American diplomat.
AN EXISTENTIAL THREAT
That Demands Greater FS Engagement

For more than 25 years, negotiators have worked around the world to meet the climate change crisis. The need to deepen this work will only increase, and greater FS engagement is essential.

BY TIM LATTIMER

T

hough it was slow to unfold, the emerging crisis posed perhaps the gravest potential threat ever to human civilization. It menaced human health, economic development, social cohesion and the security of nations around the world. The only way out was to pull together a cooperative effort involving the entire global community. This meant undertaking the most complex, painstaking diplomatic process in history, with far-reaching implications. Are we talking about an impending attack by space aliens? No. Thermonuclear war? Nyet. Viral pandemic? Nope. Climate change? Yes, absolutely.

Climate change is one of the gravest dangers facing the world today, with profound implications for the future of all humanity. Notwithstanding the specious denials put forward by self-styled “experts” and the seeds of doubt sown by fossil fuel–funded think-tanks and pundits, the weight of scientific evidence shows that the burning of fossil fuels and other human activities are already driving significant changes to Earth’s climate. As a result, overall global average temperature has risen by about 0.85 degrees Celsius (about 1.5 degrees Fahrenheit) since the dawn of industrialization in the late 1800s.

While no increase is deemed safe, an increase of 1.5 to 2 degrees Celsius is widely viewed as the upper limit of what we might tolerate. Beyond that, we would likely face greater risks of catastrophic impacts. If left unchecked, this planet—still our only home—is on track to experience a global temperature rise of 4 degrees Celsius or more by 2100. Regardless of the Trump administration’s posture on the Paris Agreement, FSOs will have to contend—for better or worse—with the very real and enduring challenges and opportunities posed by climate change. These issues will long remain central to U.S. security and economic interests and will likewise remain of great interest to our partners around the world. We ignore them at our peril.

We are already seeing the effects of this change. Without a decisive shift to low-carbon energy sources, the impact will be even more devastating, threatening the very existence of some nations. Among other things, climate change brings:

• Increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events (e.g., prolonged droughts, killer heat waves and intense episodes of rain or snow);

• Changes in water patterns or flows, undermining agricultural production and food security;

• A rise in sea level, inundating coastal communities, destroying infrastructure, salinating sources of fresh water and submerging low-lying islands and prompting mass migrations;

• Ocean warming and acidification, which will destroy coral...
reefs, weaken marine food chains and threaten the food security of the billion or so people who depend on the sea for most of their protein;

- Spread of diseases (e.g., dengue fever, West Nile virus and Lyme disease) to previously untouched areas; and
- Mass extinctions of species, with one in six species at risk of disappearing in this century, thus tearing apart the interdependent web of life that sustains us all.

As a consequence of potential climate-related social upheaval and economic disruption, successive secretaries of Defense, both Republicans and Democrats, have stressed that climate change poses serious security risks. Most recently, this past March, Defense Secretary James Mattis said that “climate change is a challenge that requires a broader, whole-of-government response.” Private-sector executives and local authorities are also increasingly focused on taking prudent steps to avoid or minimize their exposure to the risks posed by climate change. Why? Because it is clearly in their business and community interests to mitigate risks and seize the opportunities presented by the emerging clean energy economy.

In 1988, amid a growing body of scientific evidence and media hype about climate change, the United Nations created the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to provide authoritative scientific and economic analyses, thereby laying the groundwork for eventual negotiation of an international climate agreement. Ever since, the U.S. State Department and American diplomacy have often led the way in meeting this challenge.

For more than 25 years, climate change negotiators across the globe have worked to bridge deep divides among virtually all of the world’s countries to reach consensus decisions with far-reaching implications for how economies are structured and how we will maintain a habitable planet. While Civil Service experts have done most of the heavy lifting on U.S. negotiating teams, career Foreign Service officers also play a vital role in the field, engaging with counterparts from around the world to cultivate relationships, build trust and explore possible compromises to overcome seemingly impossible differences.

A Global Response, Born in the USA

Climate change is much more than an environmental issue. It is fundamentally about how our economies are powered, i.e., the energy sources we use to drive economic expansion and job creation. In essence, international climate negotiations have been a “design and build” process, restructuring 21st-century economies so that we can move beyond fossil fuel-based development to low-carbon or zero-carbon development. No one country can solve the global challenge that is climate change, but the United States has an outsized role in finding a solution, both substantively and symbolically. Much of the world looks to the United States for leadership, not simply because of our political, military and economic might, but because of the historic responsibility we have as the largest historic emitter of greenhouse gases.

The State Department started laying the official U.S. government groundwork for climate negotiations in 1988. At that time, the Bureau of Oceans and International Scientific and Environmental Affairs (OES) moved Daniel Reifsnyder, a career civil servant, from its bilateral scientific cooperation office to lead a new office, the Office of Global Change (OES/EGC). Stephanie
Kinney, then a mid-level FSO, joined the office in 1989. In August 1990, State pulled in Robert Reinstein, a veteran trade negotiator from the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative with a strong science and energy background, installing him as the OES deputy assistant secretary for environment. The OES Bureau’s first climate negotiating team—the trio of Reinstein, Reifsnyder and Kinney—enlisted the support of a career lawyer in State’s Office of the Legal Adviser, Sue Biniaz.

In June 1990, President George H.W. Bush surprised everyone—including the State Department—by announcing that the United States would host the first round of negotiations for a United Nations climate agreement in February 1991. With little time, no money and no venue, the small OES team scrambled to pull together an event in Chantilly, Virginia, that would host hundreds of diplomats and scientists from around the world.

From the beginning, developing country negotiators argued that climate change was a problem caused by industrialized nations, and that developing countries would be the primary victims. They maintained that it would be unfair for developing countries to forego the fossil-fuel driven lifestyles enjoyed in the United States, Europe, Japan and other developed nations. And, in what ultimately became history’s greatest shakedown, developing countries sought to condition their support for climate action on receiving, technology and capacity building from developed countries.


European countries continued to resist emission targets for themselves, arguing that it would be unfair to expect them to give up economic growth and poverty reduction because of a global problem that was not of their own making.

Faced with growing economic competition from rising powers like China and India, many Americans feared that higher (clean) energy costs would put the United States at a severe economic disadvantage to rivals having no emission limits. In July 1997, six months before the conclusion of the Kyoto negotiations, the U.S. Senate adopted the Byrd-Hagel Resolution by a vote of 95-0, expressing Senate opposition to any agreement that would harm the U.S. economy and that did not require emission limits for developing countries. Developing countries did not budge, despite the efforts of then-Vice President Al Gore in Kyoto.

Faced with the unhappy choice between blowing up a deal or going along with it in hopes of later overcoming domestic opposition, the United States went along with UNFCCC adoption of the Kyoto Protocol, which imposed specific GHG reduction targets only on “Annex 1” (developed) countries to be achieved by 2008-2012. During its final three years, the Clinton White House never sent the Kyoto Protocol forward for Senate advice and consent.

In April 2001, President George W. Bush announced that he would not seek the Kyoto Protocol’s ratification, effectively pulling the plug on a deal that had in any case been dead on arrival in the United States three years earlier. This move angered much of the world, prompting blowback in other arenas. Still, Russia’s ratification of the protocol in October 2004 put it into force in 2005; it was a clever move by Vladimir Putin that was less about combating climate change and more about isolating the United States. Despite real U.S. progress on climate and emission reductions in the ensuing years, much of the world saw the United States as the so-called “Annex I” countries.

The Kyoto Protocol: DOA in the USA

By the mid-1990s, the realization that rising global emissions would blow past the convention’s initial goal—returning greenhouse gas emissions to their 1990s levels by the end of the decade—prompted calls from the European Union and others for stronger action. Developing countries continued to resist emission targets for themselves, arguing that it would be unfair to expect them to give up economic growth and poverty reduction because of a global problem that was not of their own making.

Faced with growing economic competition from rising powers like China and India, many Americans feared that higher (clean) energy costs would put the United States at a severe economic disadvantage to rivals having no emission limits. In July 1997, six months before the conclusion of the Kyoto negotiations, the U.S. Senate adopted the Byrd-Hagel Resolution by a vote of 95-0, expressing Senate opposition to any agreement that would harm the U.S. economy and that did not require emission limits for developing countries. Developing countries did not budge, despite the efforts of then-Vice President Al Gore in Kyoto.

Faced with the unhappy choice between blowing up a deal or going along with it in hopes of later overcoming domestic opposition, the United States went along with UNFCCC adoption of the Kyoto Protocol, which imposed specific GHG reduction targets only on “Annex 1” (developed) countries to be achieved by 2008-2012. During its final three years, the Clinton White House never sent the Kyoto Protocol forward for Senate advice and consent.

In April 2001, President George W. Bush announced that he would not seek the Kyoto Protocol’s ratification, effectively pulling the plug on a deal that had in any case been dead on arrival in the United States three years earlier. This move angered much of the world, prompting blowback in other arenas. Still, Russia’s ratification of the protocol in October 2004 put it into force in 2005; it was a clever move by Vladimir Putin that was less about combating climate change and more about isolating the United States. Despite real U.S. progress on climate and emission reductions in the ensuing years, much of the world saw the United States as
a “deadbeat dad”—the top historic carbon polluter ducking its obligations.

**Quest for a Deal “Applicable to All”**

When President Barack Obama took office in January 2009 UNFCCC negotiators faced the looming expiration of the Kyoto Protocol’s 2008-2012 commitment period. The chaotic December 2009 climate negotiations in Copenhagen, dubbed a failure by many, actually brought into bold relief a fundamental truth: putting the onus for action only on developed countries was no longer viable. Even if all developed countries met their ambitious targets, we would still be endangered by unchecked developing country GHG emissions, particularly driven by major emitters like China and India.

Cobbled together by Pres. Obama and other heads of state in a last-ditch effort to salvage the Conference of the Parties, the brief “Copenhagen Accord” reset the foundations for international climate diplomacy. It was the first-ever agreement calling on both developed and developing countries to articulate GHG emission targets for 2020, removing the first bricks from the “firewall” that previously shielded developing countries from setting quantified goals. In so doing, Copenhagen set the stage for the effort to develop a new deal by 2015 for the post-2020 period.

Given domestic U.S. politics, we had to have an agreement that, among other things, was “applicable to all” and that strengthened long-term ambition, ensured transparency with regular reporting and review, and was based on country-determined (“bottom-up”) targets and timetables rather than “top-down” ones imposed by others à la Kyoto. Led by then-Special Envoy for Climate Change Todd Stern, the State Department’s team composed primarily of career civil servants carefully crafted a new “pledge and review” approach that ultimately became the basis for the Paris Agreement. Stern relied heavily on two career civil servants—Office of the Legal Adviser’s lawyer Sue Biniaz and Office of Global Change Director Trigg Talley, whom Stern later tapped as his deputy special envoy.

The State Department climate team felt the impact when long-time climate champion and then-Senator John Kerry took the reins at State in 2013. Secretary of State Kerry elevated climate to the top of our diplomatic agenda, issuing his first department-wide policy memo focused on climate and including the issue as a regular fixture in his public statements. He and Pres. Obama pressed the U.S. agenda routinely in bilateral calls and meetings, as well as multilateral fora. Likewise, other top Obama administration officials lent their strong support on climate issues, including Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack, EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy and Science Advisor to the President Dr. John Holdren, among others.

Several years of outreach and bargaining set the stage for the closing run-up to Paris. At the 2014 U.N. climate negotiations in Lima, UNFCCC parties chose State Department Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environment Daniel Reifsnyder to co-chair the committee charged with drafting the Paris Agreement. Thanks to his long history with the UNFCCC dating from its first days, Reifsnyder offered much more than his negotiating skills and his credibility as a fair arbiter. He also brought to bear his encyclopedic knowledge of climate issues and the extended tribe of UNFCCC players from around the world. With little fanfare, Reifsnyder teamed with his Algerian co-chair, Ahmed Djoghlaf, also a veteran climate negotiator, to shepherd the fractious parties through an intense succession of negotiations throughout 2015. In reconciling the incredibly diverse interests of nearly 200 parties, they developed a balanced package that
ministers picked up to hammer out the final Paris Agreement.

Remarkably, Sec. Kerry participated actively throughout most of the final two-week Paris conference, huddling with the U.S. negotiating team, prodding other ministers and intervening from the floor at critical junctures during round-the-clock negotiations over the final text. Such strong and sustained political firepower from Pres. Obama and Sec. Kerry on down gave a huge lift to rank-and-file negotiators, particularly during the final stages of the UNFCCC’s relentless series of meetings heading into and at Paris.

The Role of the Foreign Service

Historically, State’s career civil servants have been the core of the U.S. government’s climate team supporting politically appointed lead negotiators. Their expertise encompasses multilateral negotiations as well as the many dimensions of climate such as clean energy, forestry and land use, adaptation and climate finance. Their creativity and skill in developing and implementing climate assistance programs led directly to fostering positive impact on the ground with developing countries, thereby building the goodwill and mutual understanding.

AN ESTH OFFICER’S TRICKS OF THE TRADE

Environment, Science, Technology & Health (ESTH) jobs offer great opportunities for our best FSOs to shine. You need not be a scientist or a physician to tackle these issues. You already have the requisite intellectual and communications skills to be an FSO. Here are some tips on how to be an effective ESTH officer, and maybe also have some fun along the way.

Connect your ESTH work to broader U.S. government and mission goals (e.g., security, prosperity and democracy). Help your front office see the links between ESTH issues and other priorities. You may also find synergies where you least expect them (e.g., your Mil Group or Narcotics Affairs Section might have assets that can help in combating illegal wildlife traffickers, not just the usual suspects). And pay attention to what top U.S. government leaders are saying and doing. You can bet that host country ministers and other counterparts do the same.

Get out and meet people in their own habitat. Find out their priorities and what they think. Calling on counterparts is about more than expanding your “contacts.” It is about building relationships and trust. Go to their place, and ask about their views and priorities. This helps you learn about what is really going on and enables you to provide better-informed reporting to Washington. Building trust quietly with counterparts puts deposits in the “emotional bank account” that you may later need to draw on when the chips are down.

Look for ways that U.S. interests might intersect with those of your counterparts. Demonstrating genuine attentiveness to their concerns, not just those of the United States, can open up possibilities for closer cooperation and win/win outcomes.

Be entrepreneurial. Yes, budgets are tight. But you can still exploit opportunities to harness and showcase American know-how. For example, pay attention to country clearance requests. You may discover an impending visit of a U.S. expert or a routine port call by American research vessels that could open up greater opportunities for official engagements or public outreach.

Make friends with your Public Affairs Section. ESTH issues often offer a bright spot in what might otherwise be difficult bilateral relations. Turn those pro forma scientific exchanges, document signings, ribbon-cuttings and the like into opportunities to drive ESTH-oriented public diplomacy messages.

If you’re in a separate ESTH unit, be sure to form a tight team with your Econ, FCS and FAS colleagues. You’ll likely find common interests—e.g., promoting the export of U.S. goods and services in clean technology or U.S. know-how in sustainable agriculture.

Rely on and support your Locally Employed staff. They can be your secret weapon in advancing U.S. interests and avoiding pitfalls. Not only do they have the institutional memory, but they may also know the technical or contextual issues better than you do. They may also be well-connected to their home country’s officials and thought leaders.

—Tim Lattimer
needed to resolve difficult negotiating issues and set the table for ministerial-level decisions.

At the same time, however, FSOs have played an important role throughout the course of the climate change effort. Doing the bread-and-butter work of career diplomats, they built relationships with a cross-section of host country colleagues, advocated forcefully for U.S. interests and positions, reported insightfully on the domestic needs and pressures affecting a country’s negotiating positions, and alerted Washington to changing circumstances that might open the way for closer cooperation (or require greater effort).

This better enabled the special envoy for climate change and his team to engage in the meticulous task of building common cause with traditional and new allies, as well as to head off possible deal-breakers from players with ideological or economic motivations to prolong an international stalemate. It also helped Washington optimize the strategic use of foreign assistance, as the special envoy and his team designed and implemented highly effective bilateral and multilateral cooperation under the umbrella of the “Global Climate Change Initiative.”

Nonetheless, in an international negotiations process with such far-reaching implications, the relative absence of FSOs remains a problem. “I [was] the only FSO involved in what turned out to be one of the biggest issues and negotiations of the decade,” Stephanie Kinney said, recalling her work in the 1990s in her 2010 interview for the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training’s Foreign Affairs Oral History Project.

Nearly a quarter-century later, I was one of only two FSOs who were part of the core delegation in Paris in 2015. We can, and we must, do better.

Perhaps few FSOs have taken part in U.S. climate diplomacy over the past quarter-century because they view climate as too “technical” or strictly the domain of “tree huggers.” Or maybe it’s because the State Department and Foreign Service culture remain stuck in a 20th-century mindset, which holds who the real power (and promotion) rests strictly with State’s regional bureaus.

Whatever the reasons, the climate change challenge will loom larger and larger going forward, affecting vital U.S. interests around the world. Recognizing the importance of having more FSOs play a more active, leading role in this fight, then-Secretary Kerry made “mitigating and adapting to climate change” a key strategic priority in the 2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. Among other things, the QDDR called for State and USAID to strengthen climate diplomacy and development; strengthen staff understanding of and engagement in climate issues; integrate climate change into all of our diplomacy and development efforts; designate critical countries for in-depth climate engagement; and expand climate and clean energy diplomacy beyond capitals.

We cannot wish the climate threat away. The need for FSOs to step up on climate remains ever more vital. OES leadership is cognizant of this need, and their efforts to open up greater opportunities for FSOs on these issues deserve strong support from the entire FS community.

We see the greatest progress when we have a deep bench involving people on all levels and of all skill sets, from chiefs of mission to political, economic and public diplomacy FSOs engaged on an issue. It is long past time that the department align its FSO recruitment, training and incentives to create a stronger cadre of FSOs who are eager and fully prepared to play more active roles in the fight to keep Earth habitable. Implementing the 2015 QDDR would be a good and important step in that direction.
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There is a great breadth and depth of official and unofficial activity around the world aimed at meeting the climate change challenge.

BY KAREN FLORINI & ANN FLORINI

The world no longer waits for U.S. leadership on climate. In 2014, astute U.S. diplomacy helped foster a U.S.-China joint announcement that in turn made possible the breakthrough Paris Agreement in 2015. But with that agreement now in force, businesses and cities already deeply engaged and evidence of climate impact more compelling by the day, U.S. disengagement is unlikely to leave a leadership void for long. Already the European Union is stepping into the role of China’s chief dance partner on climate, leaving the United States on the sidelines of a projected multitrillion-dollar market for climate-friendly solutions.

Indeed, in the run-up to the Trump administration’s June 1 announcement that it would withdraw from the Paris Agreement—an announcement replete with gross mischaracterizations of the agreement’s actual provisions—businesses from Exxon to General Mills to Intel called for the United States to remain a party to the agreement. They did so not least because they believe their ability to compete effectively in global markets will be undercut by Washington’s abandonment of its seat at the climate-policy table.

Climate change is also increasingly seen as a security issue. In its 2015 report, National Security Implications of Climate-Related Risks and a Changing Climate, the Department of Defense identified climate change as “an urgent and growing threat to our national security, contributing to increased natural disasters, refugee flows and conflicts over basic resources such as food and water.” Moreover, Defense noted that these impacts “are already occurring, and the scope, scale and intensity of these impacts are projected to increase,” aggravating “existing problems ... that threaten domestic stability in a number of countries.”

Although the Paris Agreement has drawn the lion’s share of recent international climate headlines, it is far from the only forum in which Americans can, and do, address climate issues. A glorious profusion of state, non-state and hybrid entities in the United States and elsewhere is demonstrating impressive ingenuity in relevant policy and technology. But this abundance of loosely connected actors and initiatives makes it difficult to understand how many fronts exist in the battle against catastrophic climate change. To help reduce the confusion, this article offers a tentative taxonomy. For context, some basics of
the climate issue and of the Paris Agreement itself are first briefly summarized.

The Climate Science Context and the Paris Agreement

Despite occasional claims to the contrary, the physical science underlying concerns about climate change is well established. Carbon dioxide traps heat (i.e., energy) in the atmosphere, a physical property readily measured through spectroscopic analysis. Fossil fuels and organic materials such as wood release carbon dioxide when combusted, increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide levels and trapping more energy in the atmosphere. This results not only in higher global average surface temperatures; it also, in effect, puts weather on steroids, with impacts that include more-intense droughts and deluges. In addition, as higher temperatures trigger thermal expansion of water and melting of land-based glaciers and ice sheets, average sea levels rise.

How big will these impacts be and how fast will they come? Will they be modest and slow enough that most societies can adapt (despite disproportionate consequences for some locales and the poor)? Or will big changes come swiftly, with wrenching consequences that destabilize entire regions and eventually the world economy? The answer depends primarily on how much more carbon pollution is loaded into the atmosphere. Beyond that, the complexity of the planet’s climate system makes precise answers impossible, at least for now, so projections of temperature increases and impacts are best expressed as probability ranges rather than a single point. The higher but all-too-plausible ends of those ranges paint a picture of brutal temperature swings, massive droughts and resulting food insecurity, and rising sea levels that devastate coastal cities around the globe.

Nor is it plausible to wait and see whether impacts approach intolerable levels, and only then start reducing emissions. Excess carbon dioxide persists in the atmosphere for centuries and some tipping points, such as large-scale melting of polar ice sheets and carbon-rich Arctic permafrost, would be essentially irreversible, so impacts would intensify for many years even after emissions were curtailed. Socioeconomic factors also make turn-on-a-dime responses infeasible: Reconfiguring the world’s fossil-fueled infrastructure for energy, transport and industry is the work of decades, as is upgrading energy efficiency in billions of energy-consuming buildings and appliances. (While some researchers are exploring “geoengineering”—artificial manipulation of the earth’s climate—to rapidly deflect warming, its practicability remains unclear, to say nothing of its potential unintended consequences.) And the argument that our descendants will be rich enough to readily adapt to the consequences of a changing climate ignores the very real possibility that severe climate change will itself derail future economic growth.

The good news is that the cost of low-carbon energy, particularly renewables, has plummeted over the last decade, spurring increased deployment. Globally, renewables now account for the majority of new electric-power generating capacity. The bad news? Fossil fuels today still provide more than 85 percent of the world’s total energy supply. Dramatic emission reductions require not only that existing infrastructure be reconfigured, but also that new development take a low-carbon pathway.

Growing recognition of the urgent need for climate action prompted enough countries to join the Paris Agreement by October 2016 to reach its entry-into-force threshold—55 countries representing 55 percent of global emissions—with near-unprecedented speed, even as the world was experiencing the hottest year on record for the third year in a row. (In September 2016, President Barack Obama used a combination of inherent presidential authority and authority conferred by legislation and treaty to enter into the Paris Agreement, designating it an executive agreement not requiring Senate advice and consent.)

Though by no means perfect, the Paris Agreement constitutes a major step forward. It articulates a global goal of keeping temperature increases to “well below” two degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels (with efforts to limit warming to 1.5 degrees), a target initially proposed by scientists as avoiding the worst effects of climate change.

Contrary to the assertions President Donald Trump made when announcing the U.S. withdrawal, the Paris Agreement neither dictates a U.S. emissions target nor imposes financial contributions; targets are nationally determined, and contributions are voluntarily decided by each country.
neither dictates a U.S. emissions target nor imposes financial contributions; targets are nationally determined, and contributions are voluntarily decided by each country. Rather, the agreement’s legally binding elements essentially involve submitting an updated national target on a five-year cycle—a target that is entirely self-determined, and for which there is no penalty if exceeded—and continuing to provide information that the United States already makes public. Indeed, the agreement extends emission-reporting requirements to developing countries (with flexibility for those that need it in light of their capacity), eliminating a prior disparity on information sharing.

But though the targets are not legally binding, they can provide useful signals to other countries and to investors, inventors and entrepreneurs. And many countries are acting to provide such signals. Singapore, a country whose economy depends significantly on oil refining and trading, announced in February that, as of 2019, it will institute Southeast Asia’s first carbon tax on the country’s largest emitters. Over the past year, India has added twice as much renewables capacity as coal capacity. Even Saudi Arabia, the world’s top exporter of crude oil, launched the first stage of a planned $50 billion renewable-energy procurement program in early 2017.

One of the more unusual features of the Paris Agreement (or more accurately, its accompanying Decision) is its emphasis on the role of non-state actors: the private sector, subnational governments, environmental and development advocacy groups, the faith community, trade unions, labor, youth groups, academia and civil society writ large. Among other provisions, the Decision calls for a high-level event featuring non-state actors at each annual climate negotiations conference through 2020.

In addition, to help strengthen synergies among these groups, the Decision provides that a “champion” will be appointed each year by the nation that is taking up the presidency of the annual climate negotiations. Each champion serves for two years, overlapping for a year with the champion appointed in the prior year. At the 2016 climate negotiations, the inaugural champions (from France and Morocco) launched the Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action to provide a “consistent and structured approach” for advancing the work of non-state actors. In May 2017, the current champions (from Morocco and Fiji) issued additional details of the structured approach.

**Climate Action Beyond the Paris Agreement: A Taxonomy**

The Paris Agreement is the central element of international action on climate, but there are innumerable others. Some of these elements are associated with the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, under which the Paris Agreement was adopted, but state and non-state actors alike are engaged on climate issues in ways that go far beyond the Paris provisions. Indeed, the variety of state, non-state and hybrid entities engaging on climate issues is cause for both hope and confusion. To help dispel the latter, we offer the following somewhat idiosyncratic taxonomy to map the various kinds of activities now underway, with some illustrative but far from comprehensive examples.

New examples are already arising in the United States in the wake of Pres. Trump’s Paris withdrawal announcement, such as the United States Climate Alliance comprising U.S. states that aim to reduce emissions consistent with the national target that had been previously announced by Pres. Obama. As of this writing, 12 states accounting for more than a quarter of the U.S. population and nearly a third of its GDP had joined this alliance.

The taxonomy described below has three main branches: (1) Paris Agreement “Relatives”—entities that are mentioned in or that are explicitly focused on implementation of the Paris Agreement; (2) Non-Paris Multilateral Initiatives, some of which also involve non-state actors; and (3) Non-State Actor Initiatives in the private sector, in the subnational government sector or in civil society (some of these initiatives involve national governments, as well). Examples from each of the main branches and sub-branches follow.

**Paris Agreement “Relatives”**

**Clean Technology Center & Network.** CTC&N, the operational arm of the UNFCCC Technology Mechanism, promotes the “accelerated transfer of environmentally sound technologies for low-carbon and climate-resilient development” in response to specific requests from developing countries for advice on technologies, capacity building and policy, legal and regulatory matters.

**NDC Partnership.** Launched at the 2016 UNFCCC climate conference in Marrakech, the partnership is chaired by Morocco
and Germany. It is a coalition of developing and developed countries and international institutions working together to help developing countries achieve their climate objectives. In particular, the partnership aims to help countries navigate the “vast, fragmented array” of technical and financial support through its knowledge products such as the NDC Funding and Initiatives Navigator database and the NDC Toolbox Navigator.

**Green Climate Fund.** Although launched under the auspices of the UNFCCC, the GCF operates as an independent organization with a separate board comprised of 12 developed and 12 developing nations and its own secretariat in South Korea. The GCF is intended to be a principal mechanism for providing developing countries with support for low-carbon, climate-resilient development and adaptation. To date, 43 countries have pledged more than $10 billion, including $3 billion from the United States, of which $1 billion has been paid. GCF uses multiple financial instruments, including grants, concessional loans, debt, equity and guarantees, and has a dedicated private-sector facility.

### Non-Paris Multilateral Initiatives

**Formal Agreements.** Two other climate-relevant international agreements were successfully negotiated in the months following adoption of the Paris Agreement but independent of it:

**Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol.** Adopted in October 2016, the amendment provides for a global phase-down of certain hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), which are chemicals used chiefly in refrigeration and air conditioning as substitutes for ozone-depleting substances. These HFCs are extremely potent heat-trapping gases (up to several thousand times more powerful than carbon dioxide). Implementation of the amendment will prevent more than 0.5 degrees Celsius of warming this century, a significant contribution toward the Paris Agreement’s goal of holding warming to less than 2 degrees.

**Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation.** CORSIA was adopted in October 2016 by the International Civil Aviation Organization to avoid post-2020 growth in carbon dioxide emissions from international civilian flights that depart from one country and arrive in another. CORSIA is the first...
international agreement to limit the total emissions of an entire global industry sector.

Additional Forums. In addition to formal multilateral negotiations, processes such as the annual G-20 and G-7 gatherings have often addressed climate and energy topics, as have regional groups such as the Arctic Council (the eight countries having territory within the Arctic Circle). Specialized entities also focus on particular topics. Examples include:

Clean Energy Ministerial. CEM is a minister-level forum composed primarily of large emitters (among them the United States, China, India, Russia, Japan and Indonesia, as well as several European and Nordic nations). CEM’s 24 member countries account for 75 percent of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions and for about 90 percent of global clean energy investments. CEM hosts an annual forum for ministers, and sponsors technical programs on key topics such as highly efficient appliances and lighting, smart grids and low-carbon cooling, many of which involve the private sector as well as governments.

Climate and Clean Air Coalition to Reduce Short-Lived Climate Pollutants. Although carbon dioxide is the principal greenhouse gas, other substances also contribute significantly to climate disruption. Of these, several are more potent but less persistent than carbon dioxide, most notably methane, black carbon (soot) and some HFCs. CCAC—a hybrid of more than 50 countries and more than 50 nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations—operates seven sectoral programs and several cross-cutting programs aimed at reducing emissions of these substances.


Non-State Actor Initiatives

As with the prior sections, the following examples are not comprehensive. Rather, they are illustrative of the range of climate-based activities organized by non-state actors. Many more are listed in the Non-State Actor Zone for Climate Action (climateaction.unfccc.int), a database outlining more than 12,000 commitments by businesses, subnational governments and other non-state actors to reduce emissions.

Private Sector Initiatives

Breakthrough Energy Coalition. Announced at the 2015 Paris climate negotiations, the coalition was formed by Bill Gates and other wealthy investors to deploy “patient and flexible” capital for new energy technologies. The coalition launched a Breakthrough Energy Ventures Fund of more than $1 billion in 2016 to increase the speed and scale at which promising energy developments are brought from the lab to the marketplace, through long-term investments with the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least half a gigaton (one billion tons).

Oil/Gas Climate Initiative. Led by the CEOs of 10 companies that jointly produce 20 percent of the world’s oil and gas, the initiative organizes collaboration on action to reduce the sector’s greenhouse gas emissions.

Walmart. In April 2017, the world’s biggest retailer launched an initiative to work with its suppliers to cut a gigaton of emissions by 2030. The company has also pledged to reduce its own direct emissions by 18 percent by 2025.

Subnational Government Initiatives

Under2 MOU. Known formally as the Subnational Global Climate Leadership Memorandum of Understanding, the Under2 MOU provides that signatories will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80 to 95 percent from 1990 levels, or limit their emissions to two tons per capita annually, by 2050. A total of 170 jurisdictions from 33 countries have signed or endorsed the MOU, representing 16 percent of the global population and 37 percent of the global economy.

C40 Climate Leadership Group. A network of more than 80 megacities and innovator cities, C40 emphasizes urban action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Its member cities are home
to more than 600 million people representing one quarter of the global economy.

**Civil Society Initiatives**

A prodigious array of civil society organizations, from academic consortia and think tanks to activist NGOs, engages on climate issues. For many, climate is a primary or exclusive focus, while for others it is part of a broader environmental, development or faith-based agenda. Such groups also vary considerably in their geographic scope: some are active locally, others at the provincial/state level, still others nationally or globally.

Most are involved in formal or informal coalitions, or are themselves coalitions of groups, such as **We Mean Business** (comprised of business-facing NGOs that work directly with companies and investors), the **Climate Action Network** (an umbrella group of more than 1,000 environmental NGOs from around the globe, with formal regional networks in multiple locations) and **Galvanizing the Groundswell of Climate Actions** (a convener of dialogues among various cohorts of non-state actors, including academics, businesses, cities and non-governmental groups).

These initiatives also vary widely in resources, from shoestring operations to well-established organizations with multimillion-dollar annual operating budgets. Increasingly, organizations founded in developed countries have launched branches or sister organizations in developing nations, particularly those with substantial emissions.

**What’s Next on Climate Change?**

The world is moving forward on climate change, with or without U.S. government involvement. Given the realities of a warming climate, the United States will not be able to avoid the issue for long. Even prolonged inaction is not going to change what the rest of the world does. Indeed, the U.S. announcement is already stimulating action by our own businesses, cities and states. But it will leave the federal government without a seat at a very big table.

Rather than leading, the United States will be scrambling to catch up from a withdrawal decision that ignored the Paris Agreement’s actual terms and that has demonstrably undermined U.S. credibility internationally, as the world proceeds without us to create the low-carbon economy of the 21st century.
A foreign affairs practitioner offers a ground-level guide to changing the world, one clean energy market at a time.

BY JASON DONOVAN

Imagine just about every reader of The Foreign Service Journal has a personal conception of diplomacy. Over 18 years in the Foreign Service, I’ve come to see it as a process that begins with respecting the aspirations of nations on their own terms, visualizes where they could go in partnership with the United States and then mobilizes them toward realizing that vision. To illustrate this process, I’d like to offer an example from the Economic Section of Embassy New Delhi, where from 2009 to 2012 I was responsible for the bilateral energy portfolio.

India has 1.3 billion people, some 400 million of whom lack any source of electricity. Hundreds of millions more have only sporadic access to energy. In 2009 the country’s objective was first and foremost to increase energy production and access, and only secondarily to maximize energy efficiency and clean energy use. Could India leapfrog over the dirtiest forms of energy to meet a significant part of its vast energy needs using clean sources?

From the United States’ vantage point, clean energy represented one of the new Obama administration’s top three policy priorities. The idea was to push the envelope in developing cost-effective clean energy, while capitalizing on the boom in natural gas as a bridge fuel from more- to less-polluting forms of power generation. Could Washington’s pursuit of a clean energy economy also help secure low-carbon, sustainable economic growth for partners like India?

To chart the confluence of these distinct aspirations and catalyze efforts to realize them, in 2009 New Delhi and Washington worked together to create the Partnership to Advance Clean Energy. Over the past eight years, PACE has helped create a $4 billion bilateral clean energy market and facilitated multifaceted cooperation in developing clean energy and fighting climate change.

Establishing Ground Rules for Collaboration

Within the broader context of the ongoing U.S.-India strategic dialogue, Embassy New Delhi worked closely with host-country contacts to design a framework for cooperation on clean energy and climate change. While that framework built on a number of existing, small-scale technical assistance projects, it also reflected the new administration’s call for a far more ambitious clean energy agenda.

With that in mind, we negotiated a bilateral memorandum of understanding that became one of five pillars of the overall U.S.-
India strategic dialogue—and marked the formal policy adoption of PACE.

As many previous contributors to this magazine have pointed out, official visits represent a fruitful mechanism through which to bring policy ideas over the finish line. This is most clearly visible at the head-of-state level, but the same benefits can flow from trips by Cabinet officials and high-ranking civil servants. During President Barack Obama’s first months in office, senior officials from the Department of Energy, National Security Council, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Export-Import Bank and the Trade Development Agency all traveled to New Delhi to probe the potential for bilateral clean energy collaboration. Some senior Indian officials reciprocated those visits, of course.

That outreach paved the way for the November 2009 trip to Washington by Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh—the first state visit of the Obama administration—and Pres. Obama’s first visit to India a year later. Embassy New Delhi, Washington interagency stakeholders and our Indian counterparts used these visits as action-forcing events to deepen the high-level commitment on both sides to make the Partnership to Advance Clean Energy a reality.

A Big Enough Sandbox for Everyone

From the outset, the NSC played a pivotal role, endorsing the PACE concept and using its convening power to bring together all U.S. government stakeholders. In relatively short order, a dozen U.S. agencies and departments joined the initiative. Through this process, we learned to frame our objectives broadly enough to allow many different organizations to help realize a deliberately ambitious agenda. It was critical for diverse participants each to be able to add unique value, be mutually supportive and avoid wasting time with turf battles.

Over countless conference calls between Washington and New Delhi, we became one U.S. team working to shape PACE and a coherent strategy for its implementation. Through iterative conversations, we identified the resources and expertise that each stakeholder organization could bring to the table. We used the time in between calls to socialize prospective commitments within our respective organizations and with our Indian counterparts, reality-checking our aspirations and inevitably recalibrating as we went.

Converting the political will behind PACE into meaningful, wide-scale dissemination of clean energy technology also meant creating an enabling environment for clean energy markets to develop. That, in turn, required extensive technical training and capacity building, regulatory policy development, collabora-

tive research and financial investments both small and large. In short, the vision and the brand of PACE needed to be many things to many different players, since the figurative, as well as literal, buy-in required myriad champions.

While government agencies were the primary drivers of the initiative, the Indian-American diaspora—tech-savvy and well represented in science and engineering-intensive businesses and academic organizations—helped mobilize additional Indian support.

Setting the PACE

As we implemented PACE, we identified three distinct lines of effort within the broader initiative: research and development, deployment and financing. The organization with the strongest core competency and track record of work in each focus area naturally took the lead in that line of effort and brought along partner organizations.

The Department of Energy led the clean energy research and development effort, which we nicknamed PACE-R. The U.S. Agency for International Development and Embassy New Delhi led efforts to supply the policy and technical assistance necessary to create an enabling environment for rapid and widespread clean energy deployment: PACE-D. In addition, OPIC, ExIm Bank and TDA collaborated to set up a Clean Energy Finance Center focused on the specific challenges associated with clean energy finance. All the while, each of these subgroups remained open to including new partners, and leveraged their pooled resources to bring others together in turn.

The example of PACE-R is illustrative. Led by the Department of Energy, which oversees the tremendous expertise resident in multiple national energy laboratories, the PACE-R team came
up with an innovative competitive model to spur public-private cooperation. DOE pledged $25 million over five years to fund three consortia with the best proposals to advance breakthroughs in solar energy, biofuels and energy-efficient buildings. The Indian Ministry of Science and Technology matched the U.S. investment.

Because consortia had to commit their own financial resources (equal to the combined public bilateral commitment), they attracted labs and academic institutions working with companies seeking to commercialize cutting-edge innovations within a relatively short timeframe. All told, the $25 million contribution of each government leveraged a three-part, $100-million collaborative research program involving scores of organizations and companies from both countries.

As this competition got underway, a nongovernmental organization (NGO) approached Embassy New Delhi to voice concern that the expertise of Indian environmental organizations was not sufficiently included. The NGO was prepared to go public with its condemnation; but instead, we enlisted its aid to spread the word about the funding opportunity. That ultimately induced many more Indian stakeholders to sign on as consortium partners.

A remarkable 27 consortia competed for the awards. While we could only fund three of the groups, the remaining 24 built up relationships with one another that did not exist before.

Four years later, U.S. and Indian officials announced they would extend the existing consortia for another five years and launch a new, fourth consortium to focus on smart grid and energy storage technology. This willingness not only to keep the program going, but also to expand investment in cooperative clean energy R&D reflects the durability of the collaborative model PACE created.

**Diplomacy in Action**

The success of the R&D prong is perhaps even more apparent in the proliferation of finance and deployment initiatives of PACE. Since its inception, multiple new finance mechanisms have been initiated to complement the original Clean Energy Finance Center. These include a finance coordination hub, a finance task force, and investment facilities for everything from large-scale power purchase agreements to smaller-scale financing to improve energy access, rooftop solar uptake and rural micro-grid development.

For its part, the PACE-D team helped develop the regulatory frameworks, skilled labor pool and business models needed to scale up rooftop solar projects and promoted adoption of energy-efficient building standards, since much of India’s infrastructure has yet to be built. India has since deployed some 230 million energy-efficient lights and is setting global lighting test standards. This extensive joint engagement has enabled emerging American clean energy companies to expand their markets, while contributing to a shared clean-energy mission.

It is no accident that the same U.S. company that installed India’s first grid-connected commercial solar power plant has now installed about one gigawatt of solar capacity (comparable to that of a
coal or nuclear power plant). It has mounted solar panels on more than 700 rooftops in India. Similarly, an American startup company furnishing off-grid electricity to rural villages was one of the early recipients of PACE financing, and now supplies some 200,000 people in 300 villages with electricity, where they previously had none.

The ambitious scope of PACE has unleashed a wide range of parallel and follow-on initiatives, involving government at all levels, international financial institutions, NGOs, labs, universities and businesses. So it is understandable that political support for PACE remains strong in India, even following its change of government in 2014. Prime Minister Narendra Modi, who previously served as chief minister of Gujarat, a state that is one of India’s most advanced solar power producers, recently announced he would increase his country’s renewable energy target to 175 gigawatts by 2022, 100 gigawatts of it solar.

While always aspiring to something broader, the PACE diplomatic initiative helped realize a vision of two countries together creating a vibrant, growing and sustainable clean energy economy. Much remains to be done, both in India and in many other parts of the world, but it is fair to say PACE has gotten off to a good start and has a truly bright future.
Solar power systems, once a rarity at diplomatic facilities overseas, have become more commonplace in the past decade. Once in use at only a handful of posts, solar power systems are now installed at 20 posts worldwide, with another 26 systems on the way.

Construction is nearing completion on systems in Nouakchott, Valletta, London, Port-au-Prince and Belmopan. Additional systems are funded, under design or have started construction in Curaçao, Harare, N’Djamena, Bridgetown, Nuevo Laredo, Phnom Penh, Mexico City, Colombo, Beirut, Matamoros, Niamey and Hyderabad.

The increase has much to do with the long-term savings we achieve through these investments. Over the years, we have identified four important components to achieving success.

To ensure a global return on investment in this technology, the first key is to install the equipment in areas known for their irradiance—essentially, sun and clear skies (see Figure 1). The second consideration is the local cost for municipally supplied electricity coupled with the reliability of the local grid. The third key is having the physical space available on the ground, over parking areas or on a roof that is not shaded by surrounding vegetation or structures.

The final and most important factor in the equation for success is the interest and commitment of the local community, along with the ability to perform maintenance on the installation locally. While these arrays are not complicated by moving parts, they do require regular monitoring, cleaning and, sometimes, part replacement.

Sunny Skies

The first key is dictated by geography. Figure 1 shows how much sun energy reaches the earth. If your post is in a bright and clear location, then let’s go ahead and talk about keys two, three and four. If you’re also paying a lot for electricity and you have a staff parking lot that could use a cover or an empty lot that isn’t planned for, then your post is probably a good candidate for a solar power system. But if you live in a dark location, your power is cheap and reliable, and you don’t have a square meter that isn’t covered or planned for, then you’re probably better off continuing to get your juice from the grid. (Sorry, Reykjavik.)

Cost of Power

The second key requires a careful look at your utility bill. Installation and system costs have come down steadily and considerably, making the payback on investment much more likely even in locations with lower electricity rates. At the start of
the program in 2005, it was common to pay $10 to $12 per installed watt of solar power—including panels, inverters, wiring, installation and computer systems. At that price—two to three times higher than average U.S. electricity costs—systems were only financially profitable in locations where the host government provided a subsidy, where reliance on expensive diesel generation was high—about $0.60 per kilowatt hour per year (kWh)—or where local utility-provided electricity costs were more than approximately $0.30/kWh.

Our most recent systems are being designed and built closer to $3 to $5 per installed watt, thanks to advances

---

**Bring on the Solar: A How-To**

*If you’re interested in bringing solar to your post, where do you start? Is there training available for local maintenance staff who might be put in charge of such a system?*

If you’re in a sunny location and paying more than $0.15 per kilowatt-hour for electricity, or rely on diesel generators for your electricity, reach out to OBO and we can see if solar power makes sense for you.


*What about solar for housing? Is the State Department considering adding solar to overseas housing?*

OBO makes renewable energy investments with the expectation of a positive return on that investment. In fact, the law (10 CFR 436) requires our return-on-investment (ROI) to be greater than 3 percent. Even in the best of cases, it takes a solar power project seven to 10 years to meet that ROI requirement.

Given those financial constraints, two things complicate our ability to invest in renewable energy at our overseas housing. First, although there are exceptions to this, our residences often pay a lower unit cost for electricity than our office buildings. So the value of a renewable energy system at a residence is often lower than it would be just down the street at our embassy or consulate.

Second, our housing supply is largely leased. We can’t justify the cost of installing a solar power system that will take 12 years to meet our financial requirements at a location that is only leased for five or 10 years.

That being said, we are beginning to see cases where it does make financial sense to install renewable energy systems at housing that we own overseas. Chief-of-mission residences, deputy chief-of-mission residences and staff diplomatic residences are all starting to be evaluated for renewable energy deployment. The housing complex in Port-au-Prince, which is nearing completion, will include solar power.

—Todd Evans

---
Some posts have areas where nothing can be built—here the array can be mounted on the ground, which is the least expensive option.

Arrays can be mounted on building roofs, but this complicates long-term maintenance of both the system and the roof.

**Local Support and Regular Checkups**

For the most part, these systems need little care or feeding as they passively lower the cost of your electricity bill. Dust will build up, but is often washed away naturally by rain. If not, then cleaning can improve productivity; but the cleaning may cost more than the increased productivity. Calculate the benefit before you bring out the hose.

A general weekly observation tour is recommended to make

---

in technology and falling component prices, such as the silicon used to fabricate the crystalline panels. Current department-owned systems are estimated to generate electricity for as low as $0.10 to $0.15/kWh, making the systems cost effective for posts paying higher than $0.15/kWh for power. The lower cost allows for broader worldwide deployment and greater energy independence and security for our missions.

**Location**

The third key is locating a place on government-owned property to install the array: size matters as much as unobstructed sunshine. Canopies over staff parking lots are prime candidates for solar arrays. Staff parking lots are typically not candidates for future building projects, and even with the added cost of building a structure to support the array, the extra benefits of shading vehicles, ease of accessible maintenance and possible rainwater capture make them preferred sites. Some posts have areas where nothing can be built—here the array can be mounted on the ground, which is the least expensive option.

Arrays can be mounted on building roofs, but this complicates long-term maintenance of both the system and the roof.

---

Figure 2. The State Department’s Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations is installing solar and wind power technologies around the world. The three dark blue dots shown on this map represent installed wind turbines. The orange dots represent installed solar systems, and the gold dots are solar systems under construction or being planned. The size of the dot indicates the relative size of the system—larger dots, larger systems; smaller dots, smaller systems.
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sure all the wiring is neat and tidy, and none of the solar panels themselves are damaged. In West Africa, for example, panels have to be checked frequently because birds often pick up rocks or crustaceans and drop them on the panels. A few posts, such as Geneva and Managua, have contracts in place to have a specialist keep an eye on the equipment and perform preventive maintenance.

Visual inspections aren’t always enough—the best way to tell if something’s up is by looking at the system output. All of OBO’s systems are equipped with a computer that tracks and shows their production. Every system gets weaker with age, but if you’re seeing a dramatic drop in production, it may be a sign that something like an individual solar panel or piece of electrical equipment has failed.

Critical Components

When people look at a solar power system, they generally look at the solar panels themselves and assume there’s some wiring voodoo that converts all of that sweet sunshine into electricity for our use. The biggest part of that “voodoo” is the inverter. These boxes turn the direct current electricity the solar panels generate into alternating current electricity. After the panels themselves, these boxes are the second place maintenance staff should look when they suspect a failure.

Solar panels generally carry a 25-year power production warranty. Productivity varies, but even at the end of their life, you can expect them to generate 85 percent of the electricity that they did when they were new. Inverters, on the other hand, have a much shorter life. Inverters on systems built in the mid- to late-2000s have warranties of about 10 years. As the technology has improved in recent years, though, it is becoming more common to see inverters with 15- to 20-year warranties.

Mid-Life and End-of-Life

As these systems age, facilities staff should regularly check that everything continues to operate effectively. When the system reaches 25 years of use, there are a few choices to consider. Do we leave the panels in place and continue to harvest what power is possible? Or should we invest in a new system that is more efficient and potentially less expensive than the one it is replacing? We’ll find out together as these systems start to reach the end of their useful and productive lives.
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Decade of the Environment

BY FITZHUGH GREEN

There is just one fragile spaceship Earth, and ... if we are to survive, we must all take a world view.


Eight years ago, America’s virgin environmental movement willingly entered the embrace of big government. One offspring of this union was internationalization. Our president laid down a policy to encourage other nations to fight against pollution. ... How has the movement fared since President Richard Nixon signed the National Environmental Policy Act in 1970 and entitled this the “Decade of the Environment”?

At Home and Abroad

Many battles have been waged domestically between the polluters and the new federal control agency set up on Dec. 2, 1970—the Environmental Protection Agency. Additional laws have been passed, and enforced or tested in the courts. The environmental war zone was widened by the Arab oil embargo and fuel shortage, and the resultant fight to seek relief from strict control measures. Nuclear energy has been considered and rejected as the perfect oil-gas substitute. Nearly 30 billion federal dollars have been earmarked for improving the quality of rivers, lakes and offshore waters. Yet we now discover that our globally renowned safe drinking water is threatened by chlorine, the very substance that is supposed to purify it.

The air we must breathe has improved somewhat with the implementation of the 1970 Clean Air Act, despite some relaxation of the automobile emission regulations. But both air and water and living creatures, including man, are menaced by the entry into the market of hundreds of freshly manufactured and inadequately examined toxic chemicals every month.

So there are wins and losses on the home front as President Carter wipes the packing grease off his new administrative machinery. The incumbents have smoothly grabbed the baton. They have made no major innovations so far, but they are busily building on the already registered gains in clean air and water and grappling bravely with the ever-increasing legions of carcinogens.

Overseas the United States assumed an early leadership starting in 1971 as its fledgling EPA began to meet, plan, negotiate and swap information with dozens of other countries just waking up to the eco-peril. Only Sweden (in 1967) had already formed a national EPA. This country and Great Britain set theirs up in 1970. As of now there are approximately 50 federal pollution agencies to be found on the five continents. Also, a clutch of multinational organizations are busily establishing pollutant measurement criteria and control guidelines among their members.

The magnificent results of the United Nations Conference on Human Environment at Stockholm in 1972 are still felt. That autumn the U.N. General Assembly formed another specialized agency and named it the United National Environmental Program. Headquartered in Nairobi, UNEP is largely an environmental monitoring activity but it can and does focus world attention on major pollution problems. ...

The conviction that all nations are enmeshed in the planet’s deteriorating atmospheric and oceanic system has also evoked quite a response from other major multinational organizations—NATO, for one. It was Daniel Moynihan’s idea to reorient the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to the ecological concerns of its members. This new departure for NATO began slowly. ...

---

Fitzhugh Green was with Life magazine in New York before coming to Washington to work for the Federal Trade Commission and the U.S. Information Agency. He then served on the Hill as adviser on foreign affairs and oceanography to Senator Claiborne Pell and ran for Congress in 1970. After serving as associate administrator for the Environmental Protection Agency for six years, Mr. Green authored A Change in the Weather (see the January 1978 FSJ). He also served as a psywar consultant at American University and is now [May 1978] working on a book on propaganda and doing consulting work on the environment.
NATO’s environmental projects have included comparative studies of city air pollution and of industrial effluents into a river shared by two countries, experiments in low-powered autos, conservation, earthquakes, and geothermal energy. Its program is known to participants as CCMS—the Committee on Challenges of Modern Society.

On balance I believe these big programs, as well as many others handled routinely by EPA and the State Department, were worth the taxpayers’ investment. These activities have resulted in considerable publicity each step of the way. They directly involved thousands of foreigners. …When American and overseas environmental experts share their know-how on the spot, the effect can be immediate. For example in a 1976 meeting between Japanese and American experts held at the State Department in Washington, our people acquired disposal information on PCBs (polychlorinatedbiphenyls) that could be copied directly and promptly.

**An International Movement**

Although the Americans are leading in post-Stockholm care of the environment, the movement is prospering in many countries. Indeed, a majority of both developed and developing nations have rapidly established legislative, scientific, political and administrative safeguards over the dwindling supplies of usable air, water and soil. During an almost flash-fire reaction to the “ecology revolution,” nations have come to a growing planetary consensus on the following axioms.

- It is more practical to industrialize with built-in ecological safeguards at the beginning than to install retrofit machinery to clean up the mess later, as we are having to do in the United States.
- Some corrective steps are expensive, such as stack-gas scrubbers to scour the outflows from fossil-fueled power plants; sewage treatment works; or devices to purify automobile exhausts. (Expense has already slowed the abatement of pollution in many poorer countries.)
- The chronic fuel shortage may retard advances in environmental control, but the need to conserve energy goes hand in hand with good ecological stewardship. New energy enterprises like offshore drilling, extraction of oil from shale, or strip mining of coal can be done with minimal disruption of natural surroundings.
- Since the earth has but one reservoir of air, water and soil, man must strive to save it in concert with his fellows—through bilateral and multilateral cooperation in research, interchange of technology, and setting mutually satisfactory standards of environmental quality. This last point is a reminder that no nation wants to have another nation’s standards jammed down its throat. This doesn’t rule out the possibility that one nation may voluntarily choose another’s criteria. The Japanese, for example, have incorporated word for word the automobile provisions of the United States Clean Air Act of 1970.
- Finally, many countries now embrace the “polluter pays” principle as the fairest way to fund the repair of ravaged environment. This principle has been promoted by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which includes 24 industrialized nations, but not the Soviet Union or China. …

This summarizes the thinking of political leaders supported by the scientists and engineers of EPAs everywhere. The politicians inevitably keep leaving the public stage, but the technical people keep their act going for the duration of their careers; in the brief seven years we have been dealing with foreign EPAs we have found this to be true in all countries. So the relationships that blossom at the professional level are the important ones (not those among the summit types) for they will form the basis for enduring cooperation. Without them, nations would be hobbled in the difficult and complex arrangements that must be made in the years ahead.

**LDCs Get on Board**

Looked at globally and nationally in this spring of 1978, the environmental movement shows some new color and form, particularly in the less developed countries. The euphoria which followed Stockholm was sadly diminished by the energy shortage which has acted, as World Bank President Robert McNamara predicted, as a dangerous brake on industrial development in the needy nations.

Nevertheless, a solid interest has grown up in the LDCs because they are realizing at last that environmentalism means concern for basic human needs such as potable water, breathable air, livable land space—all of which can be ruined by industrial pollution. This is a big change in attitude since the pre-Stockholm days when many LDCs feared that the fad for pollution reduction was a repetitious device of the “have” nations to inhibit the growth of the “have-nots.”

UNEP has encouraged this new view of the LDCs by stressing their programs above others in its worldwide budget.

Another cheery note to keep the LDCs in the ranks of enthusiastic environmentalists has been an increased U.N. focus on more sophisticated and broader environmental issues. This has been signaled by the 1976 U.N. conference of human settlements called “Habitat.” Habitat spawned a pledge that member states should somehow provide a glass of clean drinking water for every human being from 1990 on; in turn the U.N. Water Conference of 1977 examined practical schemes to bring this dream to reality. The U.N. Conference on Desertification and increasing studies about defor-
estation are still further steps in the right direction. Along with the heightened interest of LDCs, USAID is now playing an ever bigger role in the environment. Now all projects with significant environmental effects are evaluated before approval.

In 1971, we in EPA discussed with the State Department how we could make a cabal of the “good guy” agencies, including the Peace Corps, AID and EPA—the agencies whose mission is to help people. At that time we were unable to bring off this group effort, but now the new administration appears to be moving more successfully in this direction.

One of the promising plans is to internationalize the new Toxic Substances Control Act by negotiating agreements on marketing and testing overseas—this is necessary to prevent the growth of pollution havens for these poisons, places where they might be legal once they’re outlawed in the United States.

Another forward motion is the effort to seek conservation of living marine resources to be agreed to under the Antarctic Treaty signed some years ago. Still another plus is the State Department’s own policy of drafting environmental impact-type statements on important treaties such as the Antarctic Convention and the Panama treaties.

Barbara Blum, deputy administrator of EPA, reports proudly that the administration has sent its first “environmental” ambassador, Rodney Kennedy-Minot, to serve in Sweden. He was a noted conservationist, she explains, before he became a diplomat. Mrs. Blum also cited her intention to work with the State Department toward an increased awareness of environmental issues in U.S. embassies abroad. This is a task that began in 1971, and it is encouraging to see it continued ...

In summary, the “Decade of the Environment” has proved faithful to its name. Environmental issues are still enmeshed in our private and commercial life at home as well as our diplomatic and economic involvements abroad. We can see as a nation and as a species that ultimate, tidy control of our environment and man’s industrial effluvia is still being fought for vigorously, and with increasing effectiveness.
Making It Work: Conversations with Female Ambassadors

Seven female ambassadors candidly discuss the challenges and successes of building both careers and families.

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED BY LESLIE BASSETT

During a recent virtual ambassadors’ roundtable, initiated by the group Women Ambassadors Serving America, seven female envoys agreed to share their experiences building both their careers and their families, and the specific successes and challenges they encountered along the way. We recognize that male colleagues face similar challenges and hope the excerpts from these interviews are insightful for all.

Amb. Leslie Bassett: Tell us about a time when your professional and family responsibilities came into conflict.

Amb. Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley: Our toughest time was during my three years as principal officer in Saudi Arabia. Our daughter was 6 and our son was 9. In addition to the many cultural challenges, my family was evacuated twice before being prohibited from returning to post. The three-year tour kept us apart for 18 months. We had to decide whether I should curtail, or separate the family. I was warned by a colleague that such separations had ended his marriage and I should consider my decision carefully. Fear of stalling my career and confidence in our relationship led my husband and me to decide we could manage the separation—and to underestimate the impact on our children.

We had early affirmation of the decision as I learned shortly after that I was being nominated as an ambassador based on my performance in Saudi. Nonetheless, our son was angry for years about the separation, and we’ve all had some therapy to deal with the fallout.

Amb. Nina Hachigian: While I am generally decisive, decisions that weigh family against career priorities take longer and feel more wrenching. As an ambassador, I do have some control over my schedule, and that helps. It was the worst when I was at the National Security Council, working crazy long hours, and couldn’t even talk on the phone with my husband without constant interruption. He had moved to D.C. for me, and our marriage was tested by that experience.

Amb. Deborah Malac: Parenting from thousands of miles away is a particular challenge. Although I felt competent at my job most of the time, I often did not feel so confident when it came to parenting and the things I thought I “should” be doing. Particularly when I was working in Washington when my chil-

Leslie Bassett retired recently from the Senior Foreign Service. She is a former U.S. ambassador to Paraguay. Amb. Bassett has also served as deputy chief of mission at the U.S. embassies in Manila, Mexico City and Gaborone. She compiled these interviews in her informal role as coordinator of Women Ambassadors Serving America at the State Department.
For women officers it was often much worse. The stigma of leaving the office to pick up children was heavy. In the days before Diplotots, it was common for women officers to be treated as less serious about their work. Amb. Jennifer Zimdahl Galt recounted a similar experience.

Amb. Jennifer Zimdahl Galt: I was faced with the choice of staying at a post with a toxic work environment or curtailing my career. After many lengthy family discussions, I chose to curtail. It was the first time in my career that I could not get along with a supervisor, in this case the ambassador. I had not been his choice for the position, and he resented my presence from day one and made no effort to pretend otherwise. Our conflict had nothing to do with our respective genders—my predecessor had been a woman with whom he got along famously. During our family discussions, it also came out that neither of my children was altogether happy with the school, so while they weren’t happy to move three years in a row, they didn’t mind leaving the school. Somehow things always work out.

LB: Have you ever been subject to harassment or discrimination; and, if so, how did you handle it?

Amb. Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley: Sexual harassment, yes. My generation was taught to be careful of male egos (and power), so I generally did the usual and laughed it off, avoided the person where I could or made excuses to reject the advances. There was one occasion in the department when a boss touched me and I told him if he did it again, I’d knock the s--- out of him. He did not repeat it, but he did try to get me to curtail from the position.

On another occasion it happened at the National Security Council. Initially I parried the advance from a senior member of the Foreign Service.
Ambassador Amy Hyatt

Amy Hyatt is U.S. ambassador to the Republic of Palau. She is a career Foreign Service officer of 31 years, who previously served as deputy chief of mission in Helsinki, consul general in Melbourne, management counselor in Cairo, and diplomat-in-residence at Arizona State University. Other postings include Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, Prague, Norway and Washington, D.C. Prior to entering the Foreign Service, she was a litigation attorney in San Francisco. She has three children.

Her mantra: Great leaders have a strong moral compass. They know how to do the right thing, even as others falter or succumb to temptation.

Ambassador Laura Dogu

Laura Dogu was confirmed as the U.S. ambassador to Nicaragua in August 2015. She is a consular-coned officer and career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister Counselor. From 2012 through 2015, she served as deputy chief of mission at U.S. Embassy Mexico City. Amb. Dogu has received both the department’s Award for Outstanding Deputy Chief of Mission and the Barbara M. Watson Award for Consular Excellence. She is married and has two sons, both in college.

Congress, but when he continued to call me I reported to the NSC’s executive secretary that it was happening, and told him that if I had to do violence to repel it, I would. I was letting him know beforehand, I said, because I did not expect to lose my job as a result. After a moment of shocked silence, he said “Thanks for letting me know.” And the member stopped calling me.

LB: In an average month, how many meetings do you attend

I think the most important thing is to be prepared, so you can speak authoritatively and there is no question that you are on top of your brief.

—Amb. Jennifer Zimdahl Galt

Amb. Jennifer Zimdahl Galt: Throughout my career, I have been the only woman or one of the only women in the room at virtually every meeting. Some of this may have to do with the fact that I’ve served much of my career in the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, where societies continue to be male-dominated. But the same has been true of country teams at posts where I’ve served. The largest number of women I’ve ever had on a country team was three out of 12. I’ve never served with a female principal officer or ambassador.

I think the most important thing is to be prepared, so you can speak authoritatively and there is no question that you are on top of your brief. It’s also important to dress professionally, which in my book means wearing a suit at all times. Half of speaking or presenting in a meeting or at country team is listening—being sure to listen carefully to what others have to say so that you’re not repeating, but rather amplifying and adding value with your remarks.

Amb. Laura Dogu: I am frequently the only woman in meetings outside the office with the host country, and when I have control over the guest list, I insist that we include at least 30 percent women, if not more. When dealing with the press, I always make sure to respond to questions from women, despite male reporters often speaking over the top of them. In our internal meetings, it is less frequent that I am the only woman in the room unless I am dealing with law enforcement. At my last large post, I was the only woman among about 20 men in most meetings. I found I had to be forceful when speaking up, but after the first few times, people treated me like everyone else.

Amb. Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley: In most meetings over the years, I was the only minority at the table and that continues to be the case. I am often one of only two or three women. After 30 years, it is still not easy. I have to fight my own insecurity, as well as any unspoken, even unconscious, bias against the value of my contributions. The recognition of my performance and potential that
came from reaching my goal of being an ambassador, however, has given me the space to feel like I don’t always have to know the answer. I have brilliant staff to help me get it right.

LB: Can you share a formative experience (professional or otherwise) that helped shape your leadership vision and/or style?

Amb. Erica Barks-Ruggles: When I was a teenager, I was a newspaper carrier, and the district manager passed me over for a more junior (male) carrier for an important regional job that would have given me a pay raise. My parents supported my protest to the top management of the newspaper. I demanded fair treatment and the raise I would have gotten had I not been discriminated against (the district manager admitted that the only reason I did not get the job was because I was a “girl”). I got the raise. That taught me to demand equal treatment, not to settle for being passed over, and to always raise your hand and ask for the promotion/better job/tougher assignment. Nobody was going to give it to me just because I deserved it.

Amb. Jennifer Zimdahl Galt: Serving as principal officer in Guangzhou, overseeing a consulate general that more than doubled in size during my tenure. Because I did not have a deputy and the bureau didn’t support the creation of one, I was chief cook and bottle washer. Leading a team of more than 500, including 65 first- and second-tour officers, taught me more about management, security and personnel than I had learned in the first 25 years of my career. I loved every minute of it and would do it again in a heartbeat.

Ambassador Nina Hachigian
Nina Hachigian, a political appointee, was sworn in as the second resident U.S. ambassador to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations in September 2014 and served through January 2017. During her tenure, the United States and ASEAN became strategic partners. Previously, Amb. Hachigian was a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress and served as director of the RAND Center for Asia Pacific Policy. From 1998 to 1999, she was on the staff of the National Security Council under President Bill Clinton. She is the editor of Debating China: The U.S. - China Relationship in Ten Conversations and co-author of The Next American Century: How the U.S. Can Thrive as Other Powers Rise. Amb. Hachigian holds a bachelor’s degree from Yale University and a law degree from Stanford University. She is married with two children.

Her advice for younger women: Take a risk!

Ambassador Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley
Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley served as U.S. ambassador to Malta from 2012 to 2016. A career member of the Senior Foreign Service, Amb. Abercrombie-Winstanley previously served as principal officer in Jeddah. She has also served overseas in Iraq, Israel, Egypt and Indonesia. In Washington, D.C., she served as foreign policy adviser at U.S. Cyber Command, deputy assistant secretary for counterterrorism and at the National Security Council. She holds a master’s degree from Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. Amb. Abercrombie-Winstanley is married and has a son and a daughter.

Her mantra: I wish I’d known I pretty much knew as much as my colleagues and to voice my ideas more.

While serving as U.S. ambassador to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, Nina Hachigian visited all 10 ASEAN countries, and took this selfie along the way.
Amb. Laura Dogu: When Mary Ryan was the assistant secretary in consular affairs and I was the visa chief in the Middle East during 9/11, Mary sent a message saying she was forced to share the names of the officers who had issued visas to the hijackers. She continued by saying that people should not worry because they did nothing wrong and she would not let anything happen to them. In the end, the only person to lose her job was Mary Ryan. She led by example. She believed successes belonged to her team but all their failures were hers.

LB: What has been the single biggest factor in your success? What was your most difficult obstacle?

Amb. Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley: I do not give up. I’ve been fired twice, though once I refused to go and was able to turn the situation around. I have found low expectations of me as a minority to be a bigger obstacle than low expectations of me as a woman, though they both remain in good supply in the State Department. I struggle against frustration at the lack of seriousness about increasing diversity in the department’s senior levels. We have to be held accountable for the results.

Amb. Deborah Malac: I was raised believing that if you work hard and always do your best, recognition will come. This is not, perhaps, the best approach to take in an organization that forces people to be shameless self-promoters in order to find the next assignment or to get that next promotion. Nonetheless, it has paid off for me. I have continued to bring my best every day and to look for new and interesting opportunities and assignments that take me out of my comfort zone, and offer an opportunity to learn something new or to develop a new skill.
Results of AFSA’s 2017-2019 Governing Board Election and Bylaw Amendments

The AFSA Committee on Elections is pleased to announce the results of the 2017-2019 AFSA Governing Board election and bylaw amendments. A total of 4,130 valid ballots were received (3,152 online and 978 paper). The following AFSA members have been elected:

**Board Officer Positions**
- **President:** Ambassador Barbara Stephenson*
- **Treasurer:** Ambassador Tony Wayne*
- **Secretary:** Ambassador Tom Boyatt*
- **State Vice President:** Ken Kero-Mentz*
- **USAID Vice President:** Ann Posner
- **FCS Vice President:** Daniel T. Crocker*
- **FAS Vice President:** Kimberly Sawatzki
- **Retiree Vice President:** John K. Naland

Bylaw Amendments
The Governing Board proposed three bylaw amendments to be voted on during the 2017 AFSA election cycle. According to Article IX, Section 2 of the AFSA bylaws, for the amendments to pass, affirmative votes of not less than two-thirds of the valid votes received are required. Having met these criteria, the three amendments to the bylaws are adopted.

1) On the amendment to make the Awards and Plaques Committee a permanent standing committee:
- **Total Votes Cast:** 3,879
- **Yes/Approve:** 3,446 (89%)
- **No/Do Not Approve:** 433 (11%)

2) On the amendment to change the current residency requirement for serving on the AFSA Governing Board to a participation requirement:
- **Total Votes Cast:** 3,907
- **Yes/Approve:** 3,575 (92%)
- **No/Do Not Approve:** 332 (8%)

3) On the amendment to require that active-duty members presenting themselves as candidates for AFSA President or Vice President hold a security clearance:
- **Total Votes Cast:** 3,946
- **Yes/Approve:** 2,817 (71%)
- **No/Do Not Approve:** 1,129 (29%)

Questions regarding the results should be referred to the AFSA Committee on Elections at election@afsa.org

Congratulations to all those who were elected, and to those who demonstrated their dedication to AFSA by declaring as candidates. The new Governing Board will be sworn in on July 15.

**Board Constituency Representatives**
- **State Representatives:**
  - Anne Coleman-Honn *
  - Tricia Wingerter *
  - Josh Glazeroff *
  - Lawrence W. K. Casselle *
  - Martin McDowell *
- **USAID Representatives:** To be determined according to the AFSA bylaws
- **FCS Representative:** Matthew Hilgendorf
- **FAS Representative:** Thom Wright
- **IBB Representative:** Steven L. Herman
- **APHIS Representative:** John J. Hurley
- **Retiree Representatives:**
  - Ambassador Alphonse F. La Porta *
  - Philip A. Shull *

*Member of the Strong Diplomacy slate.

---

**Calendar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>Independence Day: AFSA Offices Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5</td>
<td>12:13 p.m. AFSA Governing Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7</td>
<td>12:13 p.m. AFSA/Public Diplomacy Council: “Voice of America and World War II”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10</td>
<td>12:13 p.m. AFSA at Minnesota Farm Fest Redwood Falls, Minn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>2017-2019 Governing Board Takes Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19</td>
<td>First Meeting of the 2017-2019 AFSA Governing Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1-3</td>
<td>AFSA at Minnesota Farm Fest Redwood Falls, Minn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7</td>
<td>12:13 p.m. AFSA/Public Diplomacy Council: “Public Diplomacy at the State Level”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9</td>
<td>10 a.m. – 3:30 p.m. AFSA/Smithsonian Associates: “Inside the World of Diplomacy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 16</td>
<td>12:13 p.m. AFSA Governing Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 4</td>
<td>Labor Day: AFSA Offices Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8</td>
<td>7:05 p.m. The Second Annual Foreign Service Night at Nationals Park: Nationals vs. Phillies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I Couldn’t Have Done It Without You

As my term of office draws to a close, I have been thinking about the colleagues who took time out of their jobs to help me better understand various issues. The State Department Vice President negotiates on behalf of all State Department Foreign Service employees, regardless of whether they’re FSOs or specialists, married or single, parents or not, and so on.

As a never-married non-parent who is not a minority, I had to get up to speed quickly on a wide variety of issues and remember to think through the possible implications of each issue for all our members, not just a few subsets. In doing so, I relied heavily on several colleagues whom I’d like to thank here.

First, Anne Coleman-Honn of Balancing Act— frankly, the group’s entire leadership. Anne and her colleagues consistently did the heavy lifting for me when it came to drafting proposals to improve conditions for new parents without disadvantaging other employees, and they repeatedly impressed me with how quickly they came up with articulate input when I asked for their perspective.

I remain horrified and embarrassed by how antiquated the department’s policies are when it comes to parental leave and related benefits, but having colleagues like the leaders of Balancing Act gives me confidence that the fight will not end with my departure.

Along similar lines, Mark Evans, head of the recently formed employee organization Foreign Service Families With Disabilities Alliance. Transferring from post to post is challenging for any Foreign Service family with children, but exponentially more so when one or more of those children have special needs. Mark founded an organization to unite employees facing those challenges and has served as an effective advocate for their concerns, educating me and being a real partner when brainstorming the best way forward.

I’m also grateful to Regina Jun and Kerri Hannan of GLIFAA, who were invaluable in helping me troubleshoot on certain issues. Mary Ellen Tsekos-Velez and Charlotte Nuanes of the recently formed employee organization Working In Tandem did the same when it came to tandem issues.

Chris Le of the Asian American Foreign Affairs Association was a close partner in AFSA’s work on assignment restrictions, as well as our efforts to reduce unconscious bias.

Speaking of unconscious bias, I would be severely remiss if I did not acknowledge Jennifer Harris Baxter, who not only helped open my eyes to the issue, but who then volunteered a significant amount of her personal time to drafting an in-depth paper on the topic. As a result, hundreds of colleagues around the world began discussing the issue and considering possible implications for the Foreign Service.

On the AFSA Governing Board, retired colleagues Bill Haugh and Dean Haas both filled in for me when I missed three months of work after emergency open heart surgery. They didn’t get paid for doing so, but they treated it like their own job.

Lawrence Casselle walked me through several issues involving the Bureau of Diplomatic Security; Susan Danewitz displayed extraordinary patience when helping me understand information resource management issues and Tricia Wingerter did a phenomenal job of representing office management specialists’ interests and concerns.

Jason Donovan was my go-to person when it came to achieving the right tone in messages to the field, and also stepped in for me on a negotiation.

I had to get up to speed quickly on a wide variety of issues and remember to think through the possible implications of each issue for all our members.

I cannot end this message without also acknowledging the AFSA staff who gave me a crash course in labor law and saved me from stumbling on multiple occasions. General Counsel Sharon Papp and Deputy GC Raeka Safai were at my side through every negotiation, providing crucial advice and wording that enabled us to protect our members’ rights and interests.

Labor-management attorneys and advisers Zlatana Badrich, Neera Parikh, Colleen Fallon-Lenaghan, Jason Snyder, James Yorke and Patrick Bradley not only handled the bulk of member inquiries and cases, but also helped me scour proposed policies for potential problems. Executive Assistant Jaya Duvvuri made sure nothing fell through the cracks, including my energy level.

Without question, the very best part of my day every day for the last two years has been getting to work with such incredible people who genuinely enjoy helping our members.

Thank you, all.
USAID VP VOICE | BY SHARON WAYNE

The Future of Foreign Assistance

This is my last column as USAID VP, so I want to begin by expressing my deepest admiration to my fellow USAID FSOs for their focused dedication to the agency’s honorable and challenging mission around the globe.

USAID’s duty to help end extreme poverty and promote resilient, democratic societies worldwide, while advancing U.S. security and prosperity, is one we can all stand proudly behind.

As I ponder the next phase of my life and what will make it most meaningful, I have been considering what it is that makes a person, an organization, or even a country, great. Looking beyond oneself and giving for the betterment of others comes up as an almost universal distinguishing quality of greatness.

When an individual or an organization is fondly remembered, it is often for unselfish acts that improve the lives of those around them. For example, when a business starts contributing positively to the community, not only does the neighborhood benefit, but the business gains an improved standing.

It is no wonder that recognizing the value of foreign assistance in our global community, Congress enacted the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

This act established a single agency, USAID, to be responsible for administering aid to foreign countries and managing assistance overseas. The act reads: “To promote the foreign policy, security and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic development and internal and external security, and for other purposes.”

Acknowledging the responsibility of the greatest nation in the world, the act went on to say that the United States should take the lead, in concert with other nations, to mobilize such resources from public and private sources.

USAID programs focus on problems so monumental that they cannot be resolved without interagency and international cooperation. The 2014 Ebola outbreak illustrates the importance of improving health systems in Africa to reduce the risk of a disease outbreak that could easily lead to a global pandemic. It also demonstrated USAID’s great strength in mobilizing resources, as temporary clinics were set up all over the affected area.

Another example is the Power Africa initiative, for which USAID and other agencies have mobilized $43 billion, most of it private capital. In Latin America, USAID has leveraged five dollars for every one dollar invested.

USAID takes great pride in its role combating issues that drive extremism, including insecurity, injustice, hopelessness and lack of opportunity. In our global community, USAID works to stabilize countries and bring hope that their citizens can build a satisfying life in their home country.

There is much uncertainty in the air as the U.S. government reviews USAID for efficiencies. An updated review of USAID programs and initiatives is welcome and wise. Such a review would not be complete, however, if it did not consider the intent of USAID’s founding legislation that the agency be staffed and resourced as the country’s lead development agency, consolidating all foreign assistance under its aegis.

For years, USAID has been understaffed, misunderstood and undersupported.

According to surveys such as the Kaiser Family Foundation polls, many Americans believe that the United States spends as much as 25 percent of the federal budget on foreign aid, more than Social Security or Medicare. When

The benefits to the United States from foreign development assistance must not be undervalued.

Views and opinions expressed in this column are solely those of the AFSA USAID VP. Contact: swayne@usaid.gov or (202) 712-3631.
Looking Forward

In my final VP column, I want to look ahead to the Foreign Agricultural Service that I hope to see in 10 years.

I believe that FAS has a bright future representing the Department of Agriculture and the U.S. government on important global issues—not only food trade, but also land use, food security and climate. I think that we must do better at imagining and embracing our potential, rather than focusing on what we are against.

One of our best assets is our tight-knit community. To sustain ourselves as a healthy workplace, we need to keep our small-town feel. I strongly believe that our FAS Foreign Service community will not thrive without the willingness to pitch in and selflessly give our time or assistance when our friends and colleagues need help or must change plans unexpectedly. We can not and should not expect to always be immediately rewarded, but our community remembers and is willing to extend a hand to those who have done their part in the past.

While we are currently vexed by poor personnel decisions made in the past, I feel that we can move past them. Experienced officers who take up the challenges caused by past leadership decisions will deserve the right to lead our ranks and to shape excellent new officers, who will undoubtedly have to take difficult stretch assignments.

During this time, the real challenge will be to exhibit leadership in an agency already dangerously close to being overwhelmed by the Civil Service.

We must sharpen our mission focus. Technology and evolving cooperator dynamics are quickly changing the types of services that we need to provide. We must be vigilant in ensuring that we are serving our constituents in the best way possible. We should continue to fine-tune our unique combination of inherently government functions with the value-added market services that benefit our industry and make us unique.

Our first opportunity is apparent. Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Perdue recently announced his intention to follow the congressional recommendation to reorganize USDA to include a trade under secretary. At its best, a forceful person in this position can bring USDA a greater focus on trade and greater voice inside the agency as a whole.

While most aspects of this are out of our control, it is a great chance to show our value and influence the future of our agency.

Moving forward together as one community, FAS will remain a great place to work and serve our country.

AFSA Governing Board Meeting, May 3, 2017

April Minutes: On behalf of the Minutes Approval Committee, Retiree Representative Ambassador (ret.) John Limbert set forth the minutes of the April 5 Governing Board meeting. There were no amendments from the board.

Scholarship Donors: The Governing Board reviewed a proposed Memorandum of Understanding for new scholarship donors. State Representative Ramon Escobar moved that the MOU be returned to the Executive Committee for further review. The motion was approved.

Position Description: State Vice President Angie Bryan moved that the Governing Board approve the revised position description for the State vice president to include supervision of the AFSA general counsel and Labor Management staff. The motion was approved.

Retiree Coordinator: Retiree Vice President Ambassador (ret.) Tom Boyatt moved that the Governing Board approve the creation of a new Retiree Outreach Coordinator position. The motion was approved.

Committee on Elections: Committee member Curt Whitaker gave a report on the AFSA election cycle to date.

Outreach to Agricultural Communities: FAS Vice President Mark Petry gave a report on the steps AFSA is taking to reach out to agricultural communities and inform them of the work the Foreign Service does and how it affects them.
Assignment Restrictions: An Update

An assignment restriction can be placed on any Foreign Service employee’s security clearance by the Bureau of Diplomatic Security to prevent targeting and harassment by foreign intelligence services and to lessen foreign influence and/or foreign preference security concerns.

For example, DS might impose such a restriction in a case where an employee and/or his or her family members are citizens or dual citizens of another country or have substantial financial interests in that country. The assignment restriction would prevent the employee from serving in that country.

While AFSA recognizes that assignment restrictions can be a useful tool to protect U.S. national security interests, we have pushed for greater transparency in how assignment restriction determinations are made, as well as for the introduction of an appeals process for the initial assignment restriction determination.

Last September, AFSA and DS completed negotiations on revisions to the Foreign Affairs Manual, specifically 12 FAM 233.5 (Personnel Security), which included new provisions regarding assignment restrictions procedures. The revised regulations were issued on Oct. 21, 2016.

AFSA successfully pushed for two changes in the regulations: access for employees to the information/grounds for imposition of the assignment restriction (specifically, the adjudicative analysis), and creation of an appeals process for employees who wish to challenge the initial decision to impose a restriction.

Under the revised regulations, within 30 days of receiving a decision from the director of the Office of Personnel Security and Suitability to impose an assignment restriction, employees may request a review of the decision by the director of the Diplomatic Security Service.

On Feb. 22, AFSA and the Asian-American Foreign Affairs Association co-sponsored a well-attended panel discussion where officials from the DS PSS office answered questions from employees regarding the new assignment restriction provisions.

Since publication of the regulations, AFSA has received many questions from employees. Some submitted a request for reconsideration prior to the FAM provisions taking effect, and are wondering if they can still obtain the adjudicative analysis.

Others who filed a request for reconsideration and have already received a decision prior to the FAM provisions taking effect are wondering whether they can still request the adjudicative analysis. Still others have not yet filed a request for reconsideration, but received an assignment restriction more than 30 days ago and are concerned that they have missed a deadline under the new regulations.

AFSA reached out to the director of PSS, and he has confirmed that adjudicative analysis requests from employees who have already filed for reconsideration, as well as those who have already received a reconsideration decision, will be honored.

Employees who received a restriction before the the revised FAM was published, but who had not filed a request for reconsideration, will not be subject to the 30-day timeline specified in the FAM and may request the adjudicative analysis.

Employees in this situation should be aware, however, that their request will trigger the 30-day deadline for an appeal submission.

Recently, AFSA met with PSS to discuss those cases where an assignment restriction was imposed after a recent security clearance update, even though an assignment restriction had not been imposed at the time of the employee’s initial security clearance adjudication (i.e., at the time they were hired).

Of particular concern are cases in which the restriction was imposed after the employee had been selected for his or her next assignment, but before departing for post. Barring a successful appeal (which can take several months), the employee would be forced to break the assignment, with fewer assignment opportunities remaining late in the cycle. PSS assured AFSA that it is giving top priority to these types of appeals.

—Colleen Fallon-Lenaghan Esq., Labor Management Counselor
AFSA Outreach—Our Successes So Far

As this Governing Board’s two-year tenure draws to a close, we’d like to highlight one of this board’s highest priorities—outreach—and review the progress we’ve made in telling the story of the Foreign Service to the American public.

The 50 States Outreach Initiative, under the banner of the Fund for American Diplomacy, continues to bring the story of the Foreign Service to the public and give our fellow citizens the opportunity to connect with U.S. diplomats and gain an understanding of the work they do.

AFSA’s outreach efforts capitalize on results of recent polling that show nine in 10 Americans support strong American global leadership. We know this leadership depends on maintaining a strong, professional career Foreign Service. We also know that diplomacy and development are cost-effective tools for maintaining America’s leadership in the world.

Thanks to our partnership with the Una Chapman Cox Foundation, AFSA expanded its outreach capacity in March 2016 by adding a part-time position, which has enabled us to grow our Speakers Bureau and establish new strategic and outreach partnerships.

**AFSA Speakers Bureau**

The Speakers Bureau has been integral to AFSA’s outreach and is the single most cost-effective means of reaching audiences around the country. We have successfully mobilized Foreign Service retirees who are enthusiastic about sharing their expertise and experience of life in the Foreign Service.

Beyond satisfying speaker requests for specific programs or events throughout the country, we are impressed by how many of our Speakers Bureau participants have taken it upon themselves to identify speaking opportunities in their communities—for example, with civic and religious groups, high schools and universities.

Besides increasing the number of speakers and engagements during this period, it is critical to prepare our speakers with quality messaging that conveys—in every forum and with every audience—the value of diplomacy and development.

We have begun to develop talking points that are geared to specific audiences, whether they are business leaders, students, farmers or Members of Congress. Speakers can build on these talking points and personalize presentations with their own “war stories,” as well as share their geographic and functional expertise.

Compared with July 2015, when the current Governing Board was sworn in, we have expanded our roster of speakers and nearly doubled the number of events that featured those speakers.

**Strategic and Outreach Partnerships**

AFSA has expanded its network of strategic partners. By working with national organizations that focus on global engagement and have chapters throughout the country—Global Ties U.S., the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition and the World Affairs Councils of America—AFSA’s message can be heard across age groups, political affiliations and regions. In fact, so far this year, our outreach work has brought us to 46 states.
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Our strategic partnership with the U.S. Institute of Peace has allowed the AFSA essay contest to hit record submission numbers for two consecutive years.

AFSA also has a growing network of outreach partners. Among the most promising relationships is the one with 4-H. If resources permit, AFSA’s next goal is to connect with farm and agricultural groups, and 4-H is an excellent entry point for such outreach. Other partners include American University, Delta Phi Epsilon, the National Student Leadership Coalition, Road Scholar, Semester at Sea, Sister Cities International, Smithsonian Associates, the National Model UN, the United Nations Association of the National Capital Area and the USAID Alumni Association.

AFSA provides these organizations with speakers—experienced foreign affairs professionals—to address chapter events or participate in education, mentoring or advisory programs.

We also maintain close relationships with large lifelong-learning organizations such as Osher (at Johns Hopkins University) and Encore, where Foreign Service expertise is in high demand.

AFSA will continue to develop these strategic outreach partnerships in ways that are self-sustaining and help build a constituency that understands the critical role that diplomacy and development play in advancing peace and prosperity in our country.

—Ásgeir Sigfússon, Director of Communications, and Catherine Kannenberg, Outreach Coordinator

Senator Foreign Service Caucus Launched

In late May, AFSA announced the launch of the Senate Foreign Service Caucus, co-chaired by Senators Dan Sullivan (R-Alaska) and Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.).

The caucus, first proposed by Sen. Sullivan, will provide a bipartisan forum for members to discuss the challenges facing those who serve in the U.S. Foreign Service around the world, and to collaborate and develop policy recommendations on how to best support them and the U.S. diplomatic mission abroad.

AFSA has been working closely with Sen. Sullivan’s staff since September to foster and develop the initiative. AFSA President Barbara Stephenson and Ambassador Earl Anthony “Tony” Wayne met with Sen. Sullivan on Jan. 9 to strongly endorse the idea and offer AFSA’s support.

Senator Chris Van Hollen was an early supporter of the initiative and will co-chair the caucus. Sen. Van Hollen is the son of the late Ambassador Christopher Van Hollen, a career FSO, and has long been known as a supporter of the work the Foreign Service does.

Senators Chris Coons (D-Del.) and Michael Bennet (D-Colo.) have also joined the group. Sen. Coons is a prominent voice on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Sen. Bennet’s father was an aide to Ambassador Chester Bowles and later head of USAID during the Carter administration.

This caucus has been launched at a time when members of Congress are more vocal than ever in their support for the Foreign Service and the importance of the work carried out worldwide by our diplomats and development experts.

AFSA looks forward to working with caucus members to highlight and support the work of the U.S. Foreign Service.
99 Years of the FSJ Now at Your Fingertips

On May 11, AFSA hosted a reception to mark the official launch of the FSJ digital archive, covering almost a century of The Foreign Service Journal.

Speaking to the assembled guests, including past and present members of the FSJ Editorial Board and Foreign Service Journal authors, AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson expressed her gratitude to all those who worked so hard to bring the project to fruition.

The Journal archive is a wonderful resource, allowing users to access 99 years of diplomatic history and to see firsthand the critical role played by the career Foreign Service. “The Iran deal, the Paris Agreement—these don’t just happen,” Amb. Stephenson said. “The FSJ pulls back the curtain on diplomacy.”

Making back issues of the Journal available to the public for research and education about diplomacy and the Foreign Service became a priority of the 2015-2017 AFSA Governing Board, which voted to support the long-awaited project.

Introducing the archive at the reception, Foreign Service Journal Editor-in-Chief Shawn Dorman spoke of the importance of accessibility for this primary source material, which is unique in providing a history of U.S. diplomacy through the eyes of its practitioners.

“It is all online and discoverable, a bridge from the past to the future, from generation to generation,” Ms. Dorman said. “We can learn from the past, see what’s been tried before, see how certain issues come around again and again, see how much things change, and how little they change.”

That point was echoed by retired FSO Harry Kopp, an early advocate of the digitization project and author of the book The Voice of the Foreign Service (Foreign Service Books, 2015), a history of AFSA.

Mr. Kopp noted the unique opportunity for readers to experience the history of U.S. diplomacy not only from the present looking back, but also from the time of important events, looking forward.

Articulating the future aims of the Journal, Ms. Dorman quoted former Assistant Secretary of State Wilbur J. Carr, speaking about the Journal and its mission on the occasion of its 10th anniversary in 1929: “By promoting a high idealism and a fine spirit, it can help that organization [AFSA] to render a maximum of public service and attain its proper place in the public estimation.”

We hope that the Journal will continue to inform and inspire a new generation of future diplomats about the importance of the role of the Foreign Service.

The Foreign Service Journal archive is available via the AFSA website, www.afsa.org/fsj-archive.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

2017 Summer Interns Arrive at AFSA

AFSA is happy to welcome our new interns.

• Advertising/Publications: Singapore native Windy Tay attends the University of London, SIM Campus, where she studies international relations.

• Foreign Service Journal: Andrea Philbin joins the FSJ from Virginia Commonwealth University. She is studying for a bachelor’s degree in creative and strategic advertising. Her hometown is Falls Church, Virginia.

• Awards: Sofia Rivera is a senior at Mount Holyoke College, where she studies international relations with a minor in American politics.

• Communications: Nicholas Shevchik is a sophomore at the University of Pennsylvania, where he studies international relations and economics. He is originally from Washington, D.C.

• Executive Office: Originally from Townsend, Delaware, Michael Scott is a senior at Hampton University, studying international relations with a concentration in conflict resolution.

We thank departing interns Matt Mitzel, Theo Horn, James Schiporst, Maggie McMorrow, Benjamin Mooney and Iván Escamilla for their great work this past spring and wish them the best.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor
2017 AFSA AWARD RECIPIENTS AND RUNNERS-UP

Nancy J. Powell
Lifetime Contributions to American Diplomacy

Constructive Dissent Award
Mariju L. Bofill, Cecelia S. Choi, Christina T. Le, and Thomas T. Wong
William R. Rivkin Award for Constructive Dissent by a Mid-Level Officer

Wendy Brafman
William R. Rivkin Award for Constructive Dissent by a Mid-Level Officer

Elzar Camper
F. Allen ‘Tex’ Harris Award for Constructive Dissent by a Foreign Service Specialist

Exemplary Performance Awards
René Gutel
Ambassador Tulinabo Salama Mushindi
Maria Elena Barrón (runner-up)
Mark Palmer Award for the Advancement of Democracy

Diane Corbin
Judith Brown (runner-up)
Nelson B. Delavan Award for Exemplary Performance by an Office Management Specialist

Aubrey Dowd
Michael Murphy (runner-up)
M. Juanita Guess Award for Exemplary Performance by a Community Liaison Officer

Dr. Henry Throop
Avis Bohlen Award for Exemplary Performance by an Eligible Family Member

John S. Wood
Award for Achievements and Contributions to the Association

Full coverage of AFSA’s June 20 awards ceremony, profiles of the winners and related articles will appear in the September issue of The Foreign Service Journal.
Retirees Light Up the Map
For the second year, AFSA encouraged Foreign Service retirees to send letters to the editor of their local newspaper on the occasion of Foreign Service Day in May. AFSA sees this as an opportunity to bring education and understanding of the Foreign Service to our fellow citizens in every corner of the country.

Last year’s pilot project resulted in 15 placements; this year, we far exceeded our expectations with letters from retirees being published in 40 newspapers across 19 states, from Rhode Island to California.

Newspapers such as the Philadelphia Inquirer, San Francisco Chronicle, Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Tulsa World and Providence Journal featured letters from retired diplomats, explaining what the Foreign Service does for the nation and why it’s important to our national security and economic prosperity.

Combined, the 40 papers have a circulation of more than two million. This initiative will continue next year, and we hope to reach even more Americans in 2018.

Speakers Bureau Hits Milestone Seven Months Early!
Thanks to the willingness of AFSA retiree members to share their expertise and volunteer their time, AFSA has already hit its year-end goal for Speakers Bureau membership numbers.

At the beginning of the year, the bureau had 382 members, and we set a goal of 425 members by the end of 2017. To our surprise and delight, we hit our goal on May 17. The Speakers Bureau now has more members than at any time previously.

We plan to focus on increasing speaking engagements for the rest of the year, and will rely on members of the bureau to seek out opportunities in their home towns and make a connection with AFSA.

If you have not yet joined the Speakers Bureau but would like to help AFSA tell the story of the Foreign Service, or if you would like to request a speaker for a school, college or community group, visit www.afsa.org/speaker.

Spotlight on Florida “Super Team” of Retirees
Last month at our annual awards ceremony, AFSA bestowed the award for contributions to the association to John S. Wood, a leader of The Foreign Service Group–Texas in Austin, Texas.

Here we want to highlight a group of Foreign Service retirees in Florida who have risen to the challenge of engaging in local outreach and advocacy—not just for AFSA, but in collaboration with our strategic partners such as Global Ties U.S. and the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition.

Their enthusiasm and efforts have already paid off; it is no accident that our letters-to-the-editor campaign resulted in eight letters published in Florida newspapers!

We want to thank Mike Boorstein, Judy Carson, John Caulfield, Ambassador Harriet Elam-Thomas, Ambassador Samuel Hart, Ambassador James McGee, Donna Oglesby, Jeff and Linda Oleson, Dorothy Watson and Frank Young for their willingness to join us in telling the Foreign Service story across Florida, and we invite other Florida retirees to join these efforts.

Foreign Service Association of Northern California
The Foreign Service Association of Northern California held a well-attended luncheon on May 13 featuring a fascinating presentation on Korea and the United States by retired FSO and former Ambassador to Korea Kathleen Stephens, who is now a Stanford University fellow.

FSANC also elected its new officers and advisory board, including the Honor-
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able Joseph Sullivan as chair-
man, Karl Sprick as treasurer
and Amy Madsen as secre-
tary. Members of the Foreign
Service who are interested
in joining the group should
contact Joe Sullivan at
(925) 954-8294 or
joseph_sullivan@hotmail.com.

—Asgeir Sigfusson,
Director of Communications

AFSA Membership
Even More Valuable
in Retirement

Because many AFSA
members don’t realize that
their membership does not
automatically carry over into
retirement, their member-
ship lapses unintentionally
when they retire. But over the
last few years members have
discovered that AFSA mem-
bership may be even more
valuable in retirement.

AFSA is an indispensable
partner in navigating retire-
ment, staying plugged into
the foreign affairs community
and amplifying the voices
of retirees as they tell the
story of the Foreign Service. In
the last two years, well
over half of AFSA members
in the State Department’s
Job Search Program signed
up for retiree membership
during or immediately after
the course, with a record
79 percent joining from the
August 2016 JSP class.

The JSP teaches that the
first rule of networking is to
stay active in a professional
association. For diplomats,
that’s AFSA, keeping mem-
bers in touch with more than
16,000 colleagues, active
and retired, many of whom
have mastered the transition
to retirement and are happy
to share their insights. The
annual Retiree Directory and
The Foreign Service Journal
keep retirees connected.

Of course, retiree coun-
seling is a big part of AFSA’s
retiree services. With a
wealth of experience, AFSA’s
membership staff can help
with situations unique to the
Foreign Service. They also
arrange a number of work-
shops and presentations
from experts in their fields,
from health services to Thrift
Savings Plans.

AFSA keeps its retiree
members aware of new pro-
fessional developments with
The Foreign Service Journal,
including the powerful new
online digital archive of all 99
years of publication, as well
as the “AFSA Retiree News-
letter” and the media digest,
a popular daily clipping
service of articles on Foreign
Service topics.

AFSA encourages all
retiree members to consider
joining the Speakers Bureau,
which enables us to actively
engage our communities on
the importance of a strong
Foreign Service, no matter
where we live.

The most important rea-
son to continue AFSA mem-
bership in retirement is to
help us educate Americans
on the critical role the For-
eign Service plays in advanc-
ing American interests and
American global leadership.

Our voice is stronger when
we speak together.

—Todd Thurwachter,
Retiree Counselor
iLead Speaker Series Features AFSA President

On April 21, AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson spoke on communication in leadership at the State Department. The event was organized by the department’s Culture of Leadership Initiative (iLead).

iLead is a voluntary group of employees working together to strengthen leadership skills and practice throughout the department. Following its inaugural Leadership Day in December, the group has organized a series of speakers, which began with a discussion on “modeling integrity” given by State Department Transparency Coordinator Janice Jacobs.

Amb. Stephenson’s talk covered the importance of communication in leadership. “Each of us has an obligation to lead from where we are,” she stated, and discussed her experiences as a leader throughout her career. It can be hard to define what leadership is, Amb. Stephenson continued, but it is possible to define what a leader does.

Amb. Stephenson recommended “active listening” as a first step in leading a team, and emphasized the importance of a consistent clear message when engaging with strategic partners. It is also important, she said, to listen to those partners, who may have a different cultural or agency perspective, and to factor these perspectives into the overall vision.

Following her remarks, Amb. Stephenson participated in a question and answer session with the enthusiastic audience.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

AFSA ANNOUNCES NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL ESSAY CONTEST WINNER

Nicholas DeParle
11th grade
Sidwell Friends School
Chevy Chase, Maryland

Nicholas will receive a $2,500 prize, a meeting with the Secretary of State and a tour of the U.S. Institute for Peace, and a full-tuition-paid voyage with Semester at Sea on his enrollment at an accredited university. Coverage of Nicholas’s visit will appear in a future issue of AFSA News.

RUNNER-UP
Manuel E. Feigl
12th grade
Brashier Middle College Charter High School
Simpsonville, South Carolina

Manuel will receive a $1,250 prize and a full scholarship to participate in the International Diplomacy Program of the National Student Leadership Conference, held in Washington, D.C., annually.

Join us for Happy Hours

Since fall 2016, AFSA has hosted several networking happy hours, drawing more than 60 people to each event in the first six months of 2017.

These events offer attendees the opportunity to mingle, share experiences and news, and reconnect with the Washington, D.C., Foreign Service community as they come back from assignments overseas. At right, AFSA members, staff and guests at the June 1 happy hour.

Non-members are welcome to attend future happy hours, where they can learn more about the Foreign Service and the work its members do.

Visit the AFSA website, www.afsa.org/events, for information about upcoming Happy Hours and other interesting events through AFSA.
Out in the Cold:
How the Hiring Freeze Is Affecting Family Member Employment

Employing family members overseas isn’t just good for morale. It makes financial sense too, and helps keep our embassies functioning.

BY DONNA SCARAMASTRA GORMAN

We knew it was coming. But on Jan. 23, when the White House released a memorandum regarding an across-the-board government hiring freeze, the shockwave reverberated throughout the State Department’s community of eligible family members. EFMs typically feel like the smallest, weakest members of State, powerless to make many decisions regarding their own fates. This freeze would take away the last thing over which they could maintain some semblance of control: their job at post.

Hiring Freezes: A History

This isn’t the first hiring freeze the State Department has endured. Back when many of today’s FSOs were still in school, President Jimmy Carter authorized a federal hiring freeze. And President Ronald Reagan famously signed a memorandum ordering a hiring freeze on federal civilian employees as his first official act after his inauguration. The federal pay freeze of 2011, during the Obama administration, continued through 2014. While that freeze didn’t stop hiring, it did, combined with the 16-day government shutdown in October 2013, have a chilling effect on State Department morale and staffing.

The current hiring freeze appears to be the first to have a profoundly negative impact on the well-being of the Foreign Service EFM community. One Foreign Service officer who has worked in multiple human resources offices overseas says he is worried about spouses this time around. “The last freeze, in 2011, actually worked to our advantage for EFMs,” he explains. Because State couldn’t hire FSOs, they resorted to hiring EFMs to fill critical positions. That opened up a world of new jobs within the Expanded Professional Associates Program, as well as other professional-level positions.

But this freeze, he warns, “has the potential to damage EFM job opportunities far into the future.” Jobs that had been previously earmarked for EFMs could now be filled as Locally Employed staff positions, and the LE staff could then occupy those positions for 10 to 20 years, effectively removing those jobs from the pool of available jobs for EFMs permanently. Also, he notes, programs like EPAP, the Consular Adjudicator pro-

Donna Scaramastra Gorman is a freelance writer whose work has appeared in Time Magazine, Newsweek, The Washington Post and The Christian Science Monitor. The spouse of a Diplomatic Security agent, she has lived in Amman, Moscow, Yerevan, Almaty, Beijing and Washington, D.C., where she currently resides.
gram and the Family Member Reserve Corps—all of which have been helping create jobs for qualified family members—will lose momentum as the freeze drags on.

The Freeze Hurts Worldwide Productivity

Of course, this freeze doesn’t just affect individual and family morale. The freeze on EFM hiring has a profound impact on posts worldwide. Family members typically take on jobs that keep posts moving forward. According to statistics compiled by the Family Liaison Office, at the end of 2016 there were 3,501 adult family members employed at missions overseas. (Another 6,688, or 56 percent of EFMs, were unemployed at post, while just 1,652 found work outside of the mission.) These working family members manage mailrooms, staff medical units, ensure that local housing meets security standards and work as security escorts, overseeing infrastructure repairs and maintenance. Without anyone to fill these roles, the work will either go undone, or it will fall to Foreign Service officers themselves to do. FSOs at some posts have already been asked to spend a specified number of hours each week helping out with some of these vital jobs, taking them away from the work they were hired and trained to do.

As the summer transfer season begins, community liaison officers (CLOs) are packing up and leaving post; when they leave, their mission-critical jobs will remain unfilled. A good CLO has multiple roles within a community: not only do they help new families transition to post, but they advise on school issues, help family members with personal or mental health issues, organize community events, work with the regional security office to ensure all family members are accounted for in emergencies, and keep the Front Office apprised of situations that could adversely affect morale at post.

According to Susan Frost, director of the Family Liaison Office, FLO is actively trying to manage the expected reduction in CLO services. “We are looking at what absolutely must be done by our CLOs at post. Safety and security; welcome and orientation; these are the most critical things for us to keep up.”

Some managers worry that without EFM oversight, there may be increased incidents of fraud and theft. In some bureaus, family members constitute 20 to 30 percent of the American workforce. Through their work, they provide oversight and control of embassy resources, ensuring, for example, that unscrupulous contractors don’t skim money from employee association accounts, or making sure that when the embassy buys something like heating oil on the local market, the oil is actually delivered as promised. Without this oversight, gas canisters, building supplies, grocery shipments and even cash can go missing, costing the State Department large sums of money.

Happy Spouses Make Happy Posts

Not everyone wants or needs to work at post. But for those who do, there is nothing more demoralizing than showing up at post and being told nobody needs you. Spouses are typically the backbone of the community: they are the ones who volunteer in the schools, manage the commissaries and welcome the newcomers. When spouses lose interest in community involvement, the entire community suffers.

Many spouses are currently trading stories of arriving at post and being offered a job, only to be turned away because their clearances didn’t come through before the freeze went into effect. These spouses, who expected to begin working, are now stuck in a frustrating holding pattern, waiting to see if something shakes loose in Washington, D.C., in time for them to start. Some are considering leaving post and returning to the United States to find employment in their given fields.

Says one spouse, a second-tour EFM who lost a promised job in Central America when the freeze began, “I think the biggest hit was to my self-esteem. I don’t like being a ‘JEFM’ (Just an EFM). I don’t have kids and since this is a very family-friendly post, everyone else who is not working is involved with kid-related activities. It’s lonely and harder to feel a part of the larger community when you don’t have a job or a purpose at post.”

She says her post’s management team is taking it harder than most of the spouses, “who are used to getting screwed over after the super-long waits for clearances, so we mostly just shrug and try to find other things to do.” But management, she says, is “super worried” about the “huge gaps in a lot of offices” after this summer’s transition.
It’s Hard Out There for a Spouse

If you've been a Foreign Service spouse for any length of time, you know all about resilience and creativity in the face of under-employment. You've been rejected for jobs that you considered beneath you, given your educational background, but wanted anyway. You’ve been told to be happy that “your housing is free” and you don’t “need” to work. You’ve likely spent days prepping for an important reception only to be ignored by most of the guests because you’re nobody important. But even the veteran spouses, the ones who’ve learned to navigate this strange world with smiles on their faces, say they haven’t seen anything this bad before.

One spouse laments the “inconsistent and often contradictory updates and messages” coming out of HR and the front office at her post. Another remarks that she knows of “at least two spouses who are seriously considering going on SMA [separate maintenance allowance] and returning to the States simply to be able to work.” In both cases, she says, “college expenses are a major factor.” Even overseas, where costs can sometimes be lower, it isn’t always easy to make ends meet on one salary.

And it’s even worse in D.C. One FSO who recently returned to the States planned to stay here for the next four years to get his son through high school. But with the freeze in place, his wife can’t find a job in her field, and the family can’t afford to live on one salary in Northern Virginia. They are looking to bid out again as quickly as possible, before they plow through all of their savings.

And it’s even worse in D.C. One FSO who recently returned to the States planned to stay here for the next four years to get his son through high school. But with the freeze in place, his wife can’t find a job in her field, and the family can’t afford to live on one salary in Northern Virginia. They are looking to bid out again as quickly as possible, before they plow through all of their savings. Another spouse, the wife of a D.C.-based DS agent, says she and her husband bought a house after she was hired into a Civil Service job. But the freeze went into effect before her job started, and now the couple is trying to figure out how to make their mortgage payments when half of their expected income has suddenly vanished.

What about Unaccompanied Posts?

The situation is bad enough if you’re preparing to move to a traditional post this summer. But for FSOs getting ready to transfer to an unaccompanied post, some of whom made the decision to do an unaccompanied tour because they knew they could bring their spouses along if the spouses could find work at post, the situation looks even more dire. If you lined up an EFM job, for example, in Baghdad, you would be organizing a packout and getting ready to uproot your family. But now that your promised EFM job has disappeared, can you even go to post with your FSO spouse? One couple lined up a job for the FSO and a job for the spouse before enrolling their children in boarding school and making plans to be away for a year. But as of press time, the spouse has been told not to come to post.

“We’re straddling options at this point,” says the FSO. The couple is scheduled to depart for post this summer, and they decided to “go the boarding school route” for the kids. But then, says the FSO, “the hiring freeze kicked in”—leaving all of their plans up in the air. “At this point, for us, we just need to know so we can make decisions. It’s a whole lot more uncertainty than any of us would choose.”

One long-term spouse currently overseas says “there is absolutely no indication that this administration has any interest in mission staffing, from either a practical or a morale perspective.” She encourages spouses at her post “to be moving to Plan B right now: teleworking, freelancing, working on the local economy or, if those are not possible, obtaining certifications and degrees toward such a time as they will be able to work.”

“I’ve been a Foreign Service spouse for 24 years, and I can’t remember there ever being a freeze like this,” writes a D.C.-based spouse. “It is devastating for families and demoralizing for those blocked out of positions.” She says someone needs to “remind management that hiring spouses saves money!”

Hiring Spouses Saves Money

But HR already knows that hiring spouses makes financial sense. “We need our family members,” says Mike Tulley, director of the Office of Overseas Employment (HR/OE). He notes that hiring an EFM is a cost-effective use of resources at post. Family members, he says, have broad overseas experience and can be up and running quickly in any new job at a new post. And make no mistake: the jobs they do aren’t busywork. EFMs overseas maintain and repair both classified and unclassified computer networks. They dispense medicines and give inoculations. Spouses are typically the backbone of the community: they are the ones who volunteer in the schools, manage the commissaries and welcome the newcomers.
write press releases, manage complex postal operations and oversee construction projects. And they do it all for far less than the cost of a traditional Foreign Service officer.

HR, says Tulley, wants to make sure that the new administration understands the value that EFMs bring to their positions: not only do they cover positions that are hard to fill, but they cost far less to hire, because “they are already at post, so we don’t need to move them, and we don’t need to provide extra allowances for them.” When a Foreign Service officer moves to post, there are associated expenses for housing, plane fare, shipping a car, paying for school and more.

The EFM is already housed, so there are no extra housing costs. Medical services and educational support for spouses and children are covered under the International Cooperative Administration Support Services, or ICASS, shared services platform whether or not the spouse is working. While no one knows the exact cost savings when it comes to hiring a qualified spouse in place of a Foreign Service officer, everyone agrees that it is far less expensive to do that.

Tulley reaffirms HR’s “commitment to spouses,” promising that the bureau is working to keep EFM jobs open so they will be available once the freeze is lifted. The bureau has told posts that they cannot convert Family Member Appointments to Personal Services Agreements: doing so would have allowed posts to hire local staff into positions that have traditionally been held by spouses, but it would have removed those jobs from the job pool for a decade or more.

Many spouses have heard the rumor that if a PSA job is announced, and a spouse applies for it, the entire hiring process for the position will be halted. According to Tulley, the rumor is true, but there is a good reason for this. “We’re freezing jobs when this happens to try to keep them vacant for spouses,” he explains. If no interested spouses come forward, local staff can be hired. But if a spouse applies, the process will shut down in the hope that the job will still be waiting for a qualified spouse once the freeze is lifted.

So should spouses apply for these jobs when they are announced at post, even though doing so will stop the hiring process? Absolutely, says FLO’s Susan Frost. “We are telling people: if you see a job you want and are qualified for, apply.” In the interim, she recommends that spouses stuck in this freeze take a long-term approach. “Ask yourself: is there training I can do? A skill I need? Can I freshen up my résumé so I’m ready when it’s time?”

“There is lots of anxiety and feelings of powerlessness in our communities right now,” says Frost. “It’s the antithesis of resiliency.” There isn’t much FLO can do to make the freeze go away, but she says FLO is working hard to “make sure these issues remain ‘at the boil.’” She adds: “We are listening.”

Meanwhile, spouses are waiting, hoping that the critical role they play at our embassies overseas will soon be recognized and reinstated by department and administration officials.
Donald K. Bandler, 69, a retired Foreign Service officer and former ambassador, died on Feb. 24 in Bethesda, Md., of complications from early-onset Alzheimer’s disease.

Mr. Bandler was born April 19, 1947, in Philadelphia, Pa., to Fred and Estelle Bandler. He grew up in Bala Cynwyd, Pa., with his two younger sisters, Beth and Amy. He graduated from Kenyon College with a B.A. in political science with honors, and also earned a J.D. from George Washington University and an M.A. in liberal arts from St. John’s College.

Mr. Bandler took the Foreign Service exam in 1974 at the U.S. consulate in Kaduna, Nigeria, while teaching at Government Teachers’ College in Bida with his new wife, Jane Goldwin Bandler. He joined the Foreign Service in 1976.

Mr. Bandler was attending night law school at George Washington University, and the State Department allowed him to complete his degree before being posted overseas. After serving in the Bureau of African Affairs (1976-1978), he was detailed to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to direct the ‘Face to Face’ program (1978-1979).

He then did congressional liaison work (1979-1980), and had the exciting experience of traveling with Mohammed Ali on a diplomatic mission to many African countries to encourage them to join Washington in boycotting the 1980 Olympics.

In 1980 Mr. Bandler was posted to Yaoundé as a political officer. He returned to Washington in 1982 to serve as special assistant on the Policy Planning Staff, and went on to the Office of European Security and Political Affairs in the Bureau of European Affairs in 1983, where he served as the coordinator for the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

From 1985 to 1989, Mr. Bandler served as the head of political-military affairs in Paris. Besides the fascinating work, the thrill of becoming fluent in French and spending every vacation visiting all corners of the beautiful country, his third child, Jeffrey, was born in Paris in 1987.

From 1989 to 1993 the Bandler family was posted in Bonn, where Mr. Bandler was minister-counselor for political and legal affairs. He participated in the diplomacy leading to German unification and led the U.S. effort to negotiate a new legal basis for the presence of U.S. forces in Germany. It was a fascinating time to be in Germany, close to the action as the Berlin Wall came tumbling down.

Mr. Bandler participated in the Senior Seminar in 1993. He spoke fondly of the many experiences he had during that year reacquainting himself with America and its diversity. From 1994 to 1995 he was director of Israel and Arab-Israel affairs at State and had an active role in Middle East peace process negotiations that yielded bilateral and multilateral agreements.

Mr. Bandler was deputy chief of mission (DCM) and then chargé d’affaires in Paris from 1995 to 1997, serving under Ambassador Pamela Harriman, who sadly passed away during his second year as DCM.

From 1997 to January 1999, Mr. Bandler was special assistant to the president and senior director on the National Security Council, responsible for U.S. relations with Europe and Canada. From January to May 1999, he was special assistant to the president and counselor to the National Security Advisor for the 42-nation NATO Summit, the largest gathering of world leaders ever held in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Bandler was appointed U.S. ambassador to Cyprus from 1999 to 2002. During his tenure, Ambassador Bandler fell in love with Cyprus and traveled to all corners of the country to photograph its beauty. He held an exhibit of his photos in Cyprus and also published them in book form.

Amb. Bandler retired from the Foreign Service in 2002 and spent the next six years working as a consultant with several international firms, including Kissinger-McLarty Associates in Washington, D.C.

In 2008 he did a six-month stint at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, as a diplomat-in-residence. He donated his collection of Cypriot photographs to the Fisher Museum of Art at USC, where they were exhibited (“Donald Bandler: A Roving Eye on Cyprus”) while he was in residence.

He also had an exhibit at Waverly Gallery in Bethesda, Md., in 2010, and won several prizes for his photography from Montgomery County.

In retirement, Amb. Bandler participated in the Boys to Men national organization, mentoring boys who needed role models and encouragement. He was an active member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the Washington Institute of Foreign Affairs and the American Academy of Diplomacy.

After receiving a diagnosis of early-onset Alzheimer’s disease in 2008, Amb. Bandler became an active advocate with the Alzheimer’s Association. He continued to travel, taking a trip around the world (Hawaii, Japan, Malaysia, China, India, Russia and Portugal) with his wife in 2010. He visited Machu Picchu in 2011.

Amb. Bandler received the State Department’s Superior Honor Award on four occasions, and was awarded the French Legion of Honor in 1998.

Amb. Bandler was very proud of his family. He is survived by his loving wife, Jane Goldwin Bandler; his daughter Lara Hogan (and her husband, Chad) of Los Angeles; his daughter Jillian Parekh (and her husband, Neel) of New York City; and his son Jeffrey of Los Angeles; his grandsons, Jasper, Nikhil and Zion; and his sisters, Beth and Amy and their families.
Donations in his name may be sent to the Alzheimer’s Association (alz.org) or Us Against Alzheimer’s (www.usagainstalzheimers.org)

Richard K. Fox Jr., 91, a retired Foreign Service officer and former ambassador, died in the company of his family on April 9.

Richard Kenneth Fox was born in Cincinnati, Ohio. From 1944 to 1946, he served overseas in the U.S. Navy. He received his bachelor's degree from Indiana University in 1950. He worked for the Urban League in St. Louis, Mo., and St. Paul, Minn., from 1950 to 1956, when he became assistant director of the Minnesota Commission Against Discrimination.

In 1961 Mr. Fox began his career at the Department of State as a special assistant to the deputy assistant secretary of State for personnel. From 1963 to 1965, he was a special assistant to the deputy under secretary of State for administration and the first director of the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity.

In 1965 he was posted to Madrid, serving as a deputy administration officer and then promoted to counselor of administration in 1968. He returned to Washington, D.C., in 1970 to serve as executive director of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, where he was promoted to deputy assistant secretary in 1973.

Mr. Fox was appointed deputy director of personnel for career counseling and assignments in 1974, and then detailed to the interagency Senior Seminar in Foreign Policy for the 1976-1977 academic year.

In 1977 President Jimmy Carter appointed Mr. Fox U.S. ambassador to Trinidad and Tobago, the first FSO to serve in that capacity. His tenure witnessed the continuing recovery of the economy due to rising prices for petroleum, the country's major export. He returned to State in 1979 to serve as the senior deputy inspector general of the Foreign Service.

Ambassador Fox retired in 1984, and the Department of State recognized his service by conferring on him the Wilbur J. Carr Award. As former U.S. Ambassador George Moose recalls, “He was a mentor to so many of us, including me.”

From 1983 to 1997, Amb. Fox served as the vice president and executive director of Meridian House International.

Amb. Fox was actively involved in a range of civic and educational institutions. He served as a member of the D.C. Board of Higher Education; trustee of the University of the District of Columbia and Christ Seminary in St. Louis, Mo.; president of the board of directors of the Wheat Ridge Foundation; president of the Lutheran Human Relations Association of America and the American Foreign Service Protective Association; and adviser to the president of Valparaiso University, where he received an honorary doctor of laws degree in 1983.

He was twice elected to the board of governors of DACOR and to the board of trustees of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation.

Amb. Fox is survived by his daughters, Jeanne Fox Alston; Jane Fox-Johnson (and her husband, Mitchell Johnson); and Helen Fox Fields (and her husband, Gary Fields); and five grandchildren: Kenneth and Kevin Alston and Rachel, Charlene and Briana Fields.

Deane R. Hinton, 94, a retired Foreign Service officer, Career Ambassador and U.S. envoy to five countries, died on March 28 at his home in San Jose, Costa Rica, due to organ failure.

Deane Roesch Hinton was born in Missoula, Mont., on March 12, 1923, the only child of Col. Joe A. Hinton and Doris Roesch. As a child he traveled with his family according to his father's assignments; Col. Hinton served in the U.S. Army in both World War I and World War II (in the 82nd Airborne).

Mr. Hinton also served in World War II as a second lieutenant in the Signals Corps, participating in the Italy campaign. After the war, he completed his bachelor’s degree at the University of Chicago in 1943 and did a year of graduate studies in economics.

Mr. Hinton joined the Foreign Service in 1946. His first assignment, to Damascus as a political officer, was followed by a posting to Mombasa in 1950 as principal officer of the consulate. In 1951 he was detailed to the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University to study economics.

From 1952 to 1956, Mr. Hinton was a financial affairs officer in Paris. He returned to the State Department for two years, and was then assigned to the U.S. Mission to the European Communities in Brussels as a financial officer. He was detailed to the former National War College for the 1961-1962 academic year.

From 1963 to 1966, Mr. Hinton directed the Office of Atlantic Political-Economic Affairs at State.

He was seconded to the U.S. Agency for International Development in 1967, where he directed USAID programs in France, Belgium and Guatemala and then served as USAID mission director and economic counselor in Santiago from 1969 to 1971. He was then detailed to the White House Council on International Economic Policy, where he served from 1971 to 1973.

In 1973 President Richard Nixon appointed Mr. Hinton U.S. ambassador to Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo). When relations soured between Washington and President Mobuto Sese Seko in 1975, Amb. Hinton was declared persona non grata. He returned to Brussels.
as the U.S. representative to the European Union with the rank of ambassador, serving until 1979.

Amb. Hinton served as the assistant secretary of State for economics, energy and business affairs from 1979 to 1981, when he was appointed U.S. ambassador to El Salvador. He sharply criticized the human rights abuses of that government during the next two years.

President Ronald Reagan named him U.S. ambassador to Pakistan in 1983. There, Amb. Hinton worked with Pakistan President Zia ul-Haq to supply the Afghan mujaheddin, who were fighting the Red Army in their homeland.

In 1987 President Reagan designated Ambassador Hinton a Career Ambassador, the highest rank in the U.S. Foreign Service, and named him U.S. ambassador to Costa Rica, where he served until 1989.

In 1990, he was appointed U.S. ambassador to Panama, and worked there to restore the economy and strengthen relations following the ouster of Panama President Manuel Noriega.

Amb. Hinton retired in 1994 after a remarkable 49-year diplomatic career. His memoir, Economics and Diplomacy: A Life in the Foreign Service, a volume in the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training’s Memoirs and Occasional Papers Series, was published in 2015. He was widely considered among the foremost Latin America experts in the State Department.

In retirement, Amb. Hinton lived alternately in the United States (mainly Washington, D.C., and nearby Pennsylvania) and in San Jose, Costa Rica. His first marriage, to Angela Peyraud, ended in divorce. He second wife, Miren de Aretxabala, died in 1979.

Amb. Hinton is survived by his third wife, Patricia Lopez Hinton; 12 children (Deborah Ann Hinton, Christopher Roesch Hinton, Jeffrey Joe Hinton, Joanna Peyraud Hinton, Veronica Jean Hinton, Pedro Arrivillaga, Guillermo Arrivillaga, Miren Arrivillaga de Aretxabala, Maria Louisa Arrivillaga Reglemann, Juan Jose Arrivillaga, Sebastian Asturias Hinton and Deane Patrick Hinton); 13 grandchildren; and five great-grandchildren.

Memorial contributions may be made to the International Rescue Committee.

- Frederick Irving, 95, a retired Foreign Service officer and former ambassador, died on Nov. 13 in Amherst, Mass. Born in Providence, R.I., on May 2, 1921, the sixth child of eastern European immigrants, Mr. Irving worked full time in high school and college to support his family.

On graduation from Brown University in 1943 he joined his four older brothers in the U.S. Army Air Corps, serving as the navigator on a B-24 bomber crew based in Italy. On his 37th mission, the plane was shot down over Hungary. Mr. Irving credited the Tuskegee Airmen with saving his life because they circled the plane until the crew could bail out.

Captured by Hungarian partisans, Mr. Irving was turned over to the German Army and interned at Stalag Luft III, the site of the “Great Escape.” In May 1945 he was liberated by Patton’s Army, two of his brothers among them. He received the Purple Heart and several other military honors for bravery. Mr. Irving maintained that experiencing the horrors of war convinced him to spend his life working to prevent wars.

After recovering at Walter Reed Army Hospital, Mr. Irving earned a master’s degree from Tufts University’s Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and married his high school sweetheart, Dorothy Petrie.

Mr. Irving entered federal service in 1946 as an economist at the Bureau of the Budget under President Harry Truman, whom he credited with teaching him how to communicate clearly and succinctly. He joined the State Department in 1951, serving successively as an administrative management specialist, deputy director for administration in postwar Vienna and executive director for German-Austrian affairs.

He was commissioned into the Foreign Service in 1954. He became deputy executive director of the Bureau of European Affairs in 1956, moving to acting executive director a year later. In 1957 he became director of the Office of the Budget, and two years later was assigned as special assistant to the under secretary of State for economic affairs. He was then detailed to the National War College.

In 1960 Mr. Irving was posted to Wellington as chief of the economic section. He returned to Washington, D.C., in 1962 to serve as deputy executive director of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. Irving’s career at the State Department was characterized by his passionate commitment to equal access to justice, opportunity and respect for all people, regardless of gender, race, religion, nationality or country of residence, and to his active work to make those values real. He created the people-to-people programs within the State Department, which included, among other groundbreaking activities, hosting the first athletic teams from China to visit the U.S.—the famous “Ping Pong Diplomacy.”

In 1965 Mr. Irving was named executive director of the Bureau of European Affairs, and in 1967 he was posted to Vienna as deputy chief of mission. He returned to Washington a year later to serve successively as deputy assistant secretary for operations and deputy assistant secretary of educational and cultural affairs.

President Richard Nixon appointed Mr. Irving U.S. ambassador to Iceland in 1972.
In 1976 President Gerald Ford named him assistant secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, and in 1977 President Jimmy Carter appointed him U.S. ambassador to Jamaica.

Ambassador Irving always acknowledged his wife Dorothy’s critical, if unpaid, role in forging and maintaining personal and professional ties that supported U.S. interests at home and abroad.

Amb. Irving retired from the Foreign Service in 1978 and joined the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

He often spoke to schools and civic organizations about his experience as a prisoner of war, his efforts in the U.S. Foreign Service to promote practical peaceful solutions to disagreements, and the need for all Americans to ensure that the freedoms, justice and prosperity we enjoy are available equally to all people inside and outside U.S. borders.

His memoir, Mr. President, Do You Think I Have Rocks in My Head?—Experiences of Frederick Irving. American Diplomat, was published in 2015. His oral history is archived in the Association of Diplomatic Studies and Training collection, in the Brown and Fletcher alumni magazines, and in the Yiddish Book Center. In 2017 the National War College posthumously awarded Ambassador Irving its first Distinguished Alumnus Award.

Amb. Irving’s beloved wife, Dorothy, predeceased him in 2010. He is survived by three children: Susan, Rick and Barbara; their families; and many treasured friends and admirers.

Rachel Karp, 99, a former Foreign Service officer and the wife of retired FSO Samuel Karp, died in Walnut Creek, Calif., on Jan. 28.

Born Rachel Lou Keil in Genoa Bluff, Iowa, Mrs. Karp graduated from the University of Iowa in 1943 with a degree in hospital dietetics. She joined the Women’s Army Corps the same year and served with General Eisenhower’s headquarters during World War II as a cryptographer in Algiers; she also served in Caserta, Italy. Mrs. Karp was honorably discharged from the Women’s Army Corps in 1946.

After the war, Mrs. Karp joined the U.S. Foreign Service. She was assigned to Athens, where she met her future husband, who was also working at the embassy. With their marriage in 1949, Mrs. Karp resigned from the Foreign Service in compliance with the rules of that time. The couple had four children.

Mrs. Karp served alongside her husband throughout the rest of his Foreign Service career. During the next 30 years, they were posted in Budapest, London (twice), Montreal, Kingston, Ciudad Juarez, La Paz, Panama City, Managua, Hong Kong and Mexico City, as well as Washington, D.C.

Mr. Karp retired in 1978, and the couple moved to San Marcos, Calif., where they lived for 17 years. They relocated to Walnut Creek in 2005.

Mrs. Karp was an avid gardener, reader, cook and bridge player.

She is survived by Samuel Karp, her husband of 68 years; her four children—Daniel, Susan, Larry and Marylou—and their spouses; and many grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

Mr. Karp would welcome hearing from anyone who knew his wife in the Women’s Army Corps or the Foreign Service at any time.

Donor M. Lion, 92, a retired FSO and distinguished Career Minister in the Senior Foreign Service of the U.S. Agency for International Development, died peacefully in McLean, Va., with his wife by his side on April 22.

Mr. Lion was born on May 3, 1924, in New York City, the eldest of three sons. His parents gave him his unusual name because they wanted him to be a giver. He grew up in Brooklyn, N.Y., and graduated from Erasmus Hall High School as president of the senior class. He earned his B. A. and Ph.D. from Harvard University and his M.A. from the University of Buffalo, all in economics.

Mr. Lion’s first foray into U.S. foreign assistance programs was in 1952 in Oslo, where he helped to implement the Marshall Plan. Two years later, he joined the private sector as an economic consultant, spending three years at Robert R. Nathan Associates in Washington, D.C., and five years at Booz Allen Hamilton in Chicago.

In 1962, a former Marshall Plan colleague recruited him to join USAID, fulfilling his parents’ hopes and dreams. He began his career in Brazil in support of the Alliance for Progress, starting out in Rio de Janeiro for two years and then serving for five years in Recife. He was the first person to hold dual roles as director of USAID’s Northeast Brazil Mission and the U.S. embassy’s consul general. Mr. Lion’s mandate was to help develop Brazil’s most impoverished region by providing assistance in education, agriculture, health and infrastructure.

In 1971 he returned to Washington, D.C., to attend the yearlong Senior Seminar. Mr. Lion spent the next five years in several senior positions in Washington in the Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, ultimately rising to the position of acting assistant administrator.

In 1977, Mr. Lion moved to Jamaica, again serving in a dual capacity as USAID mission director and the embassy’s economic counselor. Here he concentrated on economic policy, health, family plan-
ning, education and agriculture.

During the next 10 years (1979-1989), he was the USAID mission director in Guyana, Pakistan and Peru, with a year (1985-1986) in Washington, D.C., as USAID’s chief economist.

Mr. Lion retired from USAID in July 1989 after a distinguished career during which he received numerous awards and accolades.

In retirement Mr. Lion did development consulting work with, for example, the Ministry of Finance in Hungary and the Ministry of Agriculture in the Dominican Republic. He was also an adjunct professor in the Economics Department at American University in Washington, D.C., where he taught a popular seminar on development assistance.

In 1994, the Lion family moved to Bangkok, where his wife, Linda, served as USAID mission director. There Mr. Lion enjoyed assignments with the United Nations Development Program, Thailand’s National Institute for Development Administration and Thammasat University. He also contributed articles on development to the local newspaper.

Mr. Lion retired fully in 1996, and actively pursued his passions: vegetable gardening, tournament bridge, ping pong, golf and gourmet cooking. Mrs. Lion retired from USAID in 2002, and the couple spent time with their girls and their families, and enjoyed long trips — to Turkey, Vietnam, Russia, Eastern Europe, Ireland, Egypt, Jordan and Canada.

Family and friends remember Mr. Lion for his trademark bowtie and pipe, fierce intellect, dry sense of humor and his kind, gentle and loving ways. He was admired and respected by his colleagues, especially those whom he mentored over the years. However, the love of his family and their accomplishments were his greatest source of satisfaction, pride and joy.

Mr. Lion was preceded in death by his parents, David and Anna Holstein Lion; his daughter Amy Lion; brothers Paul and Eugene Lion; and former wife, Elizabeth Kennedy Lion.

He is survived by his wife and best friend of 39 years, Linda N. Lion nee Kranetz; daughters Ann Lion (and her husband, Marc Luoma), Kristin Lion Torres (and her husband, Juan Pablo) and Karin Lion (and her partner, Bonnie Levin); granddaughters Sara Coleman Hernandez (and her husband, Phil), Ali Coleman and Mia Lion Torres; sisters-in-law, Barbara Kranetz Green and Jo Lechay Lion; nieces Jaime Green Roberts (and her husband, Jeff), Jenny Lion (and her husband, Steve Matheson) and Angel Lion; and nephew Jason Green (Tovah).

Donations may be made in Mr. Lion’s name to the Louis August Jonas Foundation in New York. In 1930, that foundation established and still operates Camp Rising Sun, an international leadership program for young adults where Mr. Lion spent four very meaningful summers.

Willie A. Whitten Jr., 87, a retired Foreign Service officer, died on April 22 at the Legacy Personal Care Home in Loganville, Ga., following complications from pneumonia.

Mr. Whitten was born and raised in Weir, Miss., the son of Willie Amzie and Velma Elizabeth (Eddleman) Whitten. In his early years, he helped on the family farm. After graduating from Weir High School in 1946, he met his wife, Lucille Stinnett, at her church in Kentucky, where his Uncle Charles served as pastor. The couple married in 1948.

Mr. Whitten attended Mississippi College, graduating in 1951 with a B.A. in sociology. Following his receipt of a B.D. from Southern Seminary in 1954, he served for seven years as the associate director of the Southern Baptist Seminary Extension Department in Nashville, Tenn. In 1966 he earned a doctorate of education degree in adult education from Indiana University.

Mr. Whitten joined the Foreign Service with the State Department in 1963. During a 24-year diplomatic career, he served in Liberia, Tanzania, Afghanistan and parts of Asia. He retired as a commissioned officer from the Foreign Service in 1987, and spent his retirement years in Norcross and Sugar Hill, Ga.

Mr. Whitten was also a former pastor of the First Baptist Church in Richland, Miss. Artifacts from the Whittens’ time in Liberia are in collections at Indiana University and Mississippi College.

Mr. Whitten was an active and beloved member for many years at First Baptist Church of Chamblee, which later became Johns Creek Baptist Church, inspiring others through his service as a deacon and Sunday School teacher.

In retirement, he enjoyed serving as a chaplain for the local chapter of the Good Sam RV Club. His interest in genealogy and photography culminated in the 2000 publication of Beulah and Beyond: A Story of the Beulah Baptist Church and Community in Historical Perspective, 1835-1999, about the people, church, school and land of Choctaw County, Miss.

Mr. Whitten leaves his wife of 68 years, Lucille (Stinnett) Whitten; his son, Warren Allen Whitten; his brother, Rev. Charles William Whitten; grandsons Wade Allen Whitten and Travis Ryan Whitten; granddaughter Casey JoAnne Whitten; and many cousins and close friends.

Contributions may be made to Johns Creek Baptist Church, 6910 McGinnis Ferry Road, Alpharetta GA 30005, or to the W. A. Whitten Sr. Memorial Endowment Fund at Mississippi College (Attn: Barbara Brown King), Box 4005, Clinton MS 39058.
Lessons Worth Learning

Foreign Service: Five Decades on the Frontlines of American Diplomacy
Reviewed By Harry Kopp

James Dobbins’ stellar career began in Vietnam and ended in Afghanistan. His memoir of service spans a period of ebbing, or squandering, of what had seemed in his phrase an “inexhaustible abundance of American power.” It is the story of a career marked by diplomatic successes and darkened in its latter years by frustration.

Dobbins joined the Foreign Service in 1967, after a stint in the Navy. Many of his Foreign Service classmates went into the Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development Support program in Vietnam (known as CORDS), but Dobbins’ Vietnam experience was already behind him—he had served on a carrier in the Gulf of Tonkin—and he went instead to Paris. “If there is a better place to be young, single and gainfully employed,” he writes, “I’ve not found it.”

His career really took off, however, after his marriage to a foreigner forced his return to Washington. He became an assistant to Helmut Sonnenfeldt, counselor to the department and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger’s closest adviser on Eastern Europe.

Sonnenfeldt was the first of many mentors and colleagues whom Dobbins credits for much of his success. Their names—Bob Blackwill, Rick Burt, Mike McClarty, Dennis Ross, Strobe Talbott, Ray Seitz, among others—will resonate with readers of Dobbins’ generation (this reviewer is one) but may be unfamiliar to others.

For these and many more prominent personalities that appear in the narrative, Dobbins provides quick, incisive portraits. Sonnenfeldt was “a more pragmatic and steady version of his chief.” General Vernon Walters, ambassador to Germany during reunification, “had remarkably sharp insights but no capacity to explain how he had arrived at them.”

President Bill Clinton treated his staff “as if we were potential donors and he was running for a third term,” but Vice President Al Gore “treated subordinates curtly and even discourteously. ... He was also the worst public speaker I ever encountered.” These sketches are among the book’s great pleasures.

European affairs occupied Dobbins from his entry into the Service through the collapse of the Soviet Union and its immediate aftermath. Then, through the odd mix of preparation and serendipity that marks so many Foreign Service careers, he took up the diplomacy of nation-building in Somalia, Haiti, the Balkans, Iraq and Afghanistan.

Dobbins rose rapidly in the bureaus of Political-Military and European Affairs, with tours as deputy chief of mission in West Germany and appointment in 1991 as ambassador to the European Union.

When communist rule collapsed, he argued (as he notes Sonnenfeldt might have done) for a U.S. assistance program to link Russia and Eastern Europe to the West in “mutually beneficial dependency.” His paper on the subject provoked no response.

The arrival of the Clinton administration left Dobbins briefly at loose ends—a Pentagon job fell through when the secretary of Defense was fired—but his bureaucratic skills were recognized. He was placed in charge of interagency groups engaged first in arranging the withdrawal of American forces from Somalia, and then in dealing with a refugee and political crisis in Haiti.

Haiti embroiled him in domestic politics. Congressional Republicans were united in opposition to the administration’s policies and constantly on the attack. Representative Dan Burton (R-Ind.) came to believe that Dobbins had lied before his subcommittee in testimony on Haiti, and Senator Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) announced his intention to block Dobbins’ appointment to any position requiring Senate confirmation.

The department, a pushover for congressional bullies, did not defend him.

Dobbins spent several years and a good deal of money rebutting Burton’s charge, eventually winning a grievance and a “sizable financial settlement” from the department. In the Senate, however, he remained unconfirmable. State took him out of consideration for embassies in Argentina and the Philippines, and struck his name from a promotion list that required Senate approval.

With an ambassadorship no longer a possibility, he became a candidate for the special assignments that engaged him in the world’s most difficult trouble spots for much of the rest of his career.

As he had in Somalia and Haiti, Dobbins (with the title of “special adviser to the president and secretary”) coordinated interagency efforts in Bosnia and Kosovo, and was deeply involved in holding allied efforts together, as well. “Critics,” he writes, “refer dismissively to the Kosovo campaign as ‘war by committee,’ as if more unilateral assertion of American preferences would have
yielded a better result. Given that NATO achieved all its original goals and suffered not a single casualty... I regarded the Kosovo campaign as an unqualified success and an unexcelled model of coalition warfare."

In 2002, as the Taliban were driven from Kabul, Secretary of State Colin Powell sent Dobbins as an envoy to the Afghan opposition, to produce from its “various strands” agreement on a new Afghan government. This he did, extracting for a time coherence not only from Pashtun and non-Pashtun elements but from the United Nations, NATO, the CIA, the Pentagon and the White House, as well.

The United States did not sustain its effort, and drew down its forces. The National Security Council considered peacekeeping a failed concept, a belief as unshakable as it was uninformed. “The preceding decade,” Dobbins writes, “had seen successful peacekeeping operations in Bosnia, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, East Timor, Mozambique, Liberia, El Salvador, Namibia, Cambodia, Albania and Macedonia.”

But the George W. Bush administration had lost interest. When the president called for “a Marshall Plan for Afghanistan,” there was “no follow-up, no increase in U.S. assistance, and no effort to galvanize a broader international effort.” Only in his second term, after terrible reversals in Afghanistan and Iraq, did the administration approve a surge in troop levels and embrace nation-building “with all the zeal of a convert.”

Dobbins retired in April 2002 and joined the RAND Corporation. After the death of his wife, however, he returned to State as special representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan. At State in 2013, “I found everyone much younger except the few people I knew, who seemed much older.”

He also found everything much bigger; a staff meeting with Secretary of State John Kerry had more than 100 participants, and his own staff was of similar size. Despite the resources, his job was frustrating and unrewarding. He left, apparently for good, in 2014.

Critics of the State Department often cite an inability to learn from mistakes. Dobbins, reflecting on his career, laments a refusal to learn from success—in nation-building, coalition warfare, democracy promotion and other lately unpopular ideas.

A lack of persistence, he suggests, is fatal to American efforts: “Insanity [is] doing the same thing repeatedly and expecting different results; but in diplomacy, if one does not keep trying to solve intractable problems, there is zero chance of success.” That is a lesson worth learning.

Harry Kopp, a former FSO, was deputy assistant secretary of State for international trade policy in the Carter and Reagan administrations; his foreign assignments included Warsaw and Brasilia. He is the author of Commercial Diplomacy and the National Interest (Academy of Diplomacy, 2004) and The Voice of the Foreign Service: A History of the American Foreign Service Association (FS Books, 2015), and the co-author of Career Diplomacy: Life and Work in the U.S. Foreign Service (Georgetown University Press, 2008, 2011 and 2017).
ATTORNEY WITH OVER 25 YEARS’ successful experience SPECIALIZING FULL-TIME IN FS GRIEVANCES will more than double your chance of winning: 30% of grievants win before the Grievance Board; 85% of my clients win. Only a private attorney can adequately develop and present your case, including necessary regs, arcane legal doctrines, precedents and rules. Call Bridget R. Mugane at: Tel: (301) 596-0175 or (202) 387-4383. Email: fsatty@comcast.net Website: foreignservicelawyer.com Free initial telephone consultation.

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

TAX & FINANCIAL SERVICES

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

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

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

PROFESSIONAL TAX RETURN PREPARATION

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

WE PROVIDE FREE TAX CONSULTATION. Specializing in Foreign Service and overseas tax returns for 30-plus years. Income tax preparation and representation by Enrolled Agents. Electronic filing of tax returns for fast processing. Taxes can be completed via: email, phone or in person. We handle all state filings. Custom comments provided on each return to help keep our clients heading in the right financial direction. TAX TRAX, a financial planning report card, is available. Tax notices and past due returns welcome. Office open year-round. Financial planning available, no product sales, hourly fee. Send us your last 3 returns for a free review. Financial Forecasts, Inc. Barry B. DeMarr, CFP, EA & Bryan F. DeMarr, EA 3918 Prosperity Ave #318, Fairfax VA 22031 Tel: (703) 289-1167. Fax: (703) 289-1178. Email: finfore@FFITAX.com Website: www.FFITAX.com

FINANCIAL PLANNING FOR FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEES WORLDWIDE

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

DENTIST

JOSIE KEAT, DDS — GENERAL & COSMETIC DENTISTRY

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

SENIOR CARE

DEMENTIA/ALZHEIMER’S RESIDENTIAL CARE. State-of-art memory care residence in Guatemala, between Guatemala City and colonial Antigua, in beautiful wooded area. Top-notch security, caring staff, 1/2 to 1/3 the cost of inferior care in USA. 30 minutes from airport, many daily flights under 2.5 hours from Houston, DFW, Atlanta, Miami. Contact retired FSO Sue Patterson: spatters@conexion.com

TEMPORARY HOUSING

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

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS
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@dcluestapartments.com
Website: www.dcguestapartments.com

Tel: (202) 251-9482.
Email: msussman4@gmail.com

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

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

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

Email: sevenfaves@yahoo.com

PERDIEM SUITES FURNISHED APARTMENTS. Luxury fully furnished apartments ready to move in immediately throughout the Washington, D.C., area including Main State and NFATC. We accept government per diem all year round. To learn more about how we can help you with your lodging needs while in D.C., please contact us.
Tel: (703) 732-5972.
Email: scott@perdiemsuites.com
Website: www.perdiemsuites.com

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

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., Peak 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. Peak Management, Inc. is a licensed, full-service real estate broker.
6842 Elm St., Suite 303, McLean VA 22101
Tel: (703) 448-0212.
Email: Erika@Peakeinc.com
Website: www.peakeinc.com

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

Looking to BUY, SELI or RENT REAL ESTATE in NORTHERN VIRGINIA or MARYLAND? Former FSO and Peace Corps Country Director living in NoVA understands your unique needs and can expertly guide you through your real estate experience and transition. Professionalism is just a phone call away. Call Alex for solutions.
Alex Boston, REALTOR, JD, MPA
Long & Foster
6299 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church VA 22044
Tel: (751) 533-9566.
Email: alex@LNF.com
Website: www.alexboston.lnf.com

ARE YOU MAIN STATE OR FSI BOUND? For over 30 years, I have guided hundreds of Foreign Service clients through buying and selling real estate. When making such an important financial and life decision, you deserve to have the guidance and expertise of a seasoned real estate professional.
Contact Marilyn Cantrell, Associate Broker, licensed in VA and DC.
McEnearney Associates
1320 Old Chain Bridge Rd., Ste. 350
McLean VA 22101
Tel: (703) 660-2096.
Email: Marilyn@MarilynCantrell.com
Website: www.MarilynCantrell.com

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

NOVA REAL ESTATE Advocate and Expert. A former FSO and commercial real estate attorney, Liz Lord with Keller Williams Realty works tirelessly to make sure her clients find the right home at the right price. Contact Liz to find your way home! Licensed in VA.

Keller Williams Realty
6820 Elm Street
McLean VA 22101
Tel: (571) 331-9213.
Email: liz@arlvahomes.com
Website: www.arlvahomes.com

WONDERFUL R&R, WEEKEND GETAWAY. 4-season vacation home in Canaan Valley, W.Va., recently reduced for quick sale. 3BR, 2.5 bath in 2-story end unit. Deck plus balcony. Great HOA community amenities include pool, pond, picnic pavilion, playground, tennis courts. Just 3.5 hours from D.C., 10 minutes to THREE ski resorts (2 downhill, 1 cross-country). Nearby attractions include Blackwater Falls, Dolly Sods, Seneca Rocks, Davis-Thomas arts community. 52 Deerfield Village. View on Zillow: http://bit.ly/2oRwguc. Contact Lydia Hambrick.

Tel: (740) 236-0386.
Email: lydiahambrick@sbcglobal.net

MAINE CONDO FOR SALE. 2 Bedroom, 2 Bath, 1,008 sq. ft. condominium overlooking Blue Hill Harbor, Maine, w/314 sq. ft. storage in basement. Within walking distance of village. $213,000. Motivated seller.

Tel: (202) 497-8794.
Email: moscowmarilyn@yahoo.com
Pictures: https://my.matterport.com/show/?m=swDJRCvLRVt

FLORIDA’S PARADISE COAST—Naples, Bonita Springs, Estero. Excellent amenities, activities, cultural events in beautiful Southwest Florida. Outstanding home values. Interested in another area? With an extensive network, I am able to assist statewide or nationwide.

Thomas M. Farley, LLC. Retired SFS.
Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices Florida Realty.
Email: tomfarley@BHHSFloridaRealty.net

INTERNATIONAL ADOPTION

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

Adopt Abroad, Inc.
1424 N. 2nd Street, Harrisburg PA
Tel: (888) 526-4442.
Website: www.adopt-abroad.com

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

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

ART CONSERVATION & RESTORATION
Paper / Photo / Painting
Tel: (703) 488-8626.
Email: evaartconservation@gmail.com


Tel: (202) 944-5507.
Fax: (202) 338-8244.
Email: miltenberger@afsa.org

AD INDEX

When contacting one of our advertisers, kindly mention you saw their advertisement in The Foreign Service Journal.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

AAFSW Art & BookFair / 71
AFSPA Celebrates 75 Years of FSBP / Bind-in
Calling All FS Authors / 31
Foreign Service Night at Nationals Park / Inside Back Cover
FSYF Welcome Back Picnic / 29

CLASIFIED ADS

Classifieds / 72, 73, 74

FINANCIAL, LEGAL AND TAX SERVICES

Carrington Financial Planning / 59
MCG Financial Planning / 57

HOUSING

Attaché Corporate Housing / 57
Corporate Apartment Specialists / 35
Per Diem Suites / 59
Signature Properties / 25
SuiteAmerica / 35

INSURANCE

AFSPA—Dental / 12
AFSPA—Disability / 12
Clements Worldwide / 4
Embassy Risk Management / 19
Federal Employee Defense Services / 11
The Hirshorn Company / Back Cover

MISCELLANEOUS

AFSA Bookstore / 48
DACOR Bacon House / 15
FSJ Archive Now Online / Inside Front Cover
Fund for American Diplomacy / 3
Inside a U.S. Embassy / 40

REAL ESTATE & PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

JACK Realty Group / 77
McEnearney / 77
McGrath Real Estate Services / 76
Meyerson Group, Inc., The / 77
Promax Management Inc. / 75
Property Specialists, Inc. / 75
Washington Management Services / 75
WJD Management / 76

RETIREE LIVING

Senior Living Foundation / 43
REAL ESTATE & PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

WASHINGTON MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Serving the DC metropolitan area since 1983.

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

4405 EAST WEST HIGHWAY  
NUMBER 306  
BETHESDA MD 20814  
PHONE 301 654 1400  
FAX 301 654 1426  
WWW.WMSDC.COM

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

Specializing in  
PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

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

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

PROMAX MANAGEMENT INC.  
Realtors®

Northern Virginia is our neighborhood

Phone: 703.642.5683  
7007 Kilworth Lane • Springfield, VA 22151

Meeting our clients’ needs with a full range of real estate services.  
www.promaxrealtors.com
REAL ESTATE & PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

You’re on the right course... with WJD.

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

Property Management is our only business!
Get to know us at wjdpm.com or email us at information@wjdpm.com.

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

McGrath
REAL ESTATE SERVICES

Providing Property Management & Sales Expertise throughout Northern Virginia
McGrathRealEstate.com
764 Monroe St • Ste 100 • Herndon, VA 20170 • 703.709.2284

Protecting the homes of those who are protecting our Country

Proud Sponsor of:
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.
As we stepped out of our car, we heard the bells. The air was filled with excitement and the smell of homemade Bulgarian banitsa, donuts and grilling meat! There is nothing quite like a Kukeri Festival, and the most famous of all is the Surva Festival of Masquerade Games in Pernik. More than 5,000 performers from all over Bulgaria and a dozen other countries gather together yearly for this colorful, fearsome display of Bulgarian folklore intended to dispel spirits that might otherwise bring loshotiya, or ill fortune, to a community. Their performances and costumes can also win them coveted awards and prizes.

Jenny Cobble is the spouse of Terry Cobble, RSO Sofia. Bulgaria is an amazing place for photographers, she says. There is no other beauty like it! With four seasons, pristine lakes, endless forests, the Black Sea, majestic mountains and striking historical sights to visit, the choices are endless for photography trips. She took this photo with a Nikon D810.
AFSA is pleased to announce the second annual

Foreign Service Night

AT NATIONALS PARK

September 8 @ 7:05 p.m.

WASHINGTON NATIONALS vs. Phillies

Nationals

Visit www.afsa.org/nationals2017 for more information, including how to buy tickets.

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

A Worldwide Insurance Program Designed Specifically for American Foreign Service Members

Without American Foreign Service Professional Liability Insurance, you probably don’t have the coverage you need. The Federal Employees Liability Reform and Tort Compensation Act covers you only if it is decided you were acting within the scope of your employment and it is in the interest of the US government to defend you. While the federal government can choose to defend you for wrongful acts, errors or omissions arising within your service as a US government employee, it may not cover monetary damages. The American Foreign Service Professional Liability Plan provides worldwide coverage with the highest limits available at the lowest cost.

• No deductible
• $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 coverage limits
• Full prior acts coverage, unless you have foreknowledge of any claim
• Four-year discovery period after policy expiration
• Counsel and cost of defense in addition to your coverage limits
• Monetary penalties arising out of any disciplinary proceeding
• A rated carrier

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

For more information or to apply, visit hirshorn.com. Use your mobile device any time for more information or to apply.

HIRSHORN since 1931

American Foreign Service Desk/The Hirshorn Company
14 East Highland Avenue • Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19118
This year, the Foreign Service Benefit Plan (FSBP) celebrates 75 years of providing high quality health insurance — a significant milestone that not many health plans achieve.

The American Foreign Service Protective Association (AFSPA) began sponsoring FSBP in 1942 to provide health coverage to Foreign Service personnel at the Department of State. Over the years, our membership has expanded to those in Civil Service and many other agencies that work internationally. We now proudly cover more than 67,000 lives worldwide.

FSBP’s longevity was made possible by the ongoing support of our loyal members and the hard work of our valued employees. On behalf of the entire AFSPA staff, we want to express our deepest gratitude to the Foreign Service community. You made FSBP the thriving health plan it is today.

We thank you for your commitment and look forward to sharing the celebration of our 75th Anniversary with you all year long.

Here’s to another happy and healthy 75 years!
Significant Dates in the Foreign Service Benefit Plan’s History

1929
The American Foreign Service Protective Association was founded

1942
The Foreign Service Benefit Plan (FSBP) was established

1960
FSBP became a charter member of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program

1996
AFSPA welcomed overseas Department of Defense (DOD) members

1997
FSBP established its first Direct Billing Arrangement with an overseas hospital

2000
FSBP welcomed Stateside DOD members

2001
FSBP welcomed overseas Executive Branch employees and supporting domestic direct hire staff

2002
FSBP added chiropractic benefits

2005
FSBP added massage therapy benefits

2007
FSBP became the first fee-for-service plan to offer a weight management program

2010
FSBP introduced Wellness Incentives which later became Simple Steps to Living Well Together

2016
FSBP earned comprehensive health plan accreditation through the Accreditation Association for Ambulatory Health Care, Inc. (AAAHC)

2017
FSBP celebrates its 75th Anniversary!!!

Thank you for letting us serve you for 75 years.
For more information, visit www.afspa.org/fsbp.