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I write as we are awaiting the arrival of a new Secretary of State and looking forward to offering the traditional welcome by the AFSA president and Foreign Service members in the C Street lobby. That lobby, fittingly, also houses the memorial plaques bearing the names of 248 Foreign Service colleagues who died serving our country abroad.

I hope to get a chance to point out those plaques to our new Secretary by way of explaining what we in the Foreign Service do—namely, we typically spend two-thirds of our careers deployed worldwide, including to difficult and dangerous posts. We know that not everyone makes it home. We accept that reality, recognizing that we must take reasonable risks if we are to maintain an enduring American presence in almost every country in the world.

Our enduring presence is the foundation of strong American global leadership, something nine in 10 Americans support. Widespread withdrawal is simply incompatible with strong global leadership. As former NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen put it, “When America retrenches and retreats, it leaves behind a vacuum, and that vacuum is filled by bad guys.”

This must-read edition of the FSJ, which looks at Diplomatic Security on its 100th anniversary, is anchored by former DS Assistant Secretary Greg Starr’s article “Securing Diplomacy for the Next Quarter Century.” I am pleased to see the FSJ pay tribute to the vital role our DS colleagues play in securing diplomacy.

To lead, we must be present; and to be present, we must manage the risks of our overseas deployment.

How do we make sure the U.S. Foreign Service continues to show up where we are needed? One of the most important steps, in my view, is to act and think like a team, to recognize that we are all in this together. That means avoiding the trap of framing decisions in “us versus them” terms—of political officers (like me, for example) complaining that “the RSO won’t let me do my job.”

Of course I need to get out of the embassy compound and engage face-to-face with host-nation counterparts. How else will I assess accurately and forge the partnerships needed to make common cause? But that still leaves plenty of room for input from the RSO team on how to mitigate risk and engage safely. Improvised explosive devices a real problem? Perhaps I can postpone my trip until later in the day, when others will have already traveled my proposed route. Too hard for DS to secure the route to my proposed meeting? Maybe a new meeting site can be arranged.

This kind of dialogue underpins the State Department’s relatively new Vital Presence Validation Process (known as VP2), which requires an annual review of the risks and benefits of maintaining an American presence in the 33 most high-risk, high-threat posts. VP2 produces a clear-eyed written assessment of how the compelling policy reasons for being present stack up against the risks that cannot be reasonably and cost-effectively mitigated.

Although VP2 is a Washington-based process to determine the strategic decision of where to maintain an American presence, the framework can also be highly useful for embassy emergency action committees (EACs) weighing operational and tactical decisions.

Should a specific trip take place? Ask EAC members to both articulate the policy benefits of going ahead and lay out the risks, including reasonable steps that can be taken to mitigate the risks. Report the results of the EAC’s deliberations and decision in a cable. If the risk is high, or the judgment call very difficult, consider seeking Washington guidance.

But, above all, have a dialogue, work as a team. Assume everyone is committed to maintaining the robust Foreign Service presence on which strong American global leadership depends.
Protecting Diplomacy

BY SHAWN DORMAN

From protecting the Secretary of State on travel and in the United States to managing the protection of embassies and other U.S. missions overseas—the people, property and classified material—Diplomatic Security personnel are on the front lines securing and enabling the conduct of diplomacy.

Many inside the Foreign Service community—and most outside it—are unaware of the extent and variety of critical functions carried out by DS, and the particular challenges they face. This month, we feature the people and the ever-evolving role of DS on the occasion of its centennial.

In “Securing Diplomacy for the Next Quarter-Century,” former Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security Greg Starr sums up the critical issues facing Diplomatic Security, and diplomacy more broadly, this way: “If we want to continue protecting our citizens by having a positive influence in a dangerous world, we need to find ways to maintain a meaningful presence in increasingly unstable situations.”

Acting Assistant Secretary for DS Bill Miller, in “DS at 100: A Tradition of Vigilance,” offers a brief history of DS and its mission enabling and protecting diplomacy. And, he explains the difference between DS and DSS, which few people are able to do clearly.

DS personnel are at work in more places around the world than any other U.S. law enforcement agency. In “Law Enforcement as an Instrument of National Power,” DS Agent Ronnie Catipon offers an overview of the many responsibilities of Diplomatic Security at home and abroad.

In “The DS Melting Pot,” Agent RJ Bent Rabetiavahinaty explores the varied pathways to DS and explains how the diversity of cultural background and experience among her colleagues makes DS stronger.

Freelance writer and FS community member Donna Gorman, in “DS: The Road Ahead,” focuses on DS’ growth and increased responsibility since 9/11, and the implications for DS members and their families. She discusses the policy, hiring and training challenges, as well as the bidding puzzles, with a note on the particular difficulties for tandems.

On behalf of the FSJ Editorial Board and staff, I offer special thanks to Vince Crawley, currently of the DS Public Affairs Office, for all his help with photos and with wrangling of article drafts and clearances.

I close with a pitch to AFSA members in the various foreign affairs agencies: Please consider joining the FSJ Editorial Board when spots open up this summer. Volunteer service on the board is fun (really!), and the discussions are always lively and interesting (and we provide good food). See p. 56 for details.

And remember that we are always seeking submissions: features, reflections, speaking-outs, letters and photos for Local Lens. Now more than ever, The Foreign Service Journal must remain a trusted vehicle for discussion of diplomacy and issues of concern to the Foreign Service, whether that relates to work, life or foreign policy. We look forward to hearing from you.

Shawn Dorman is the editor of The Foreign Service Journal.
“Local Solutions” Alive and Well at USAID

The frank exchange of views is invaluable to successful outcomes, and your publication provides a forum for meaningful debate to take place.

Having read the op-ed “Why USAID’s New Approach to Development Assistance Is Stalled” (December, Speaking Out), I offer a counterpoint to Thomas Dichter’s assertions, which broadly characterized the agency’s Local Solutions commitment as having “gained very little traction.”

He also implied that since USAID did not fully achieve the 2015 goal of obligating 30 percent of agency resources through local organizations, the agency has abandoned the idea of country ownership. These points merit clarification and further discussion.

By 2014 USAID had recognized that, by itself, substituting local partners for international ones would not ensure the achievement of locally owned and sustainable results. Consequently, the agency made a deliberate decision to make the 30-percent target aspirational. And, though it is true that USAID did not reach the target, we did make incredible progress.

Funding obligated directly through local systems nearly doubled from 9.7 percent to 18.6 percent from Fiscal Year 2010 to FY2015. If you include indirect funding through cash transfers and multидonor trust fund contributions—other important approaches we use to channel funds through local systems—we came up just three points shy of 30 percent.

In terms of momentum, FY2015 had the highest percentage of funds obligated to date: Missions spent $2.6 billion of their $9.8 billion budgets through local systems. This demonstrates real mission “buy-in” for local ownership.

USAID’s shift to a more holistic and thoughtful approach to engaging local actors became even more concrete in 2014 when it issued the Local Systems Framework, describing an overarching approach to promoting local ownership. To embed and institutionalize this way of working into the agency’s operational policy, in 2016 USAID released “Automated Directives System, Chapter 201,” which elevates local ownership as a key principle underlying the way we do our business.

The agency has started developing tools to help missions analyze the local context and is promoting the use of procurement mechanisms that better facilitate working with local actors. We are also creating incentives within the Foreign Service promotion system to drive home our commitment to the principle of local ownership.

Consequently, we expect to see more programs that respond to local priorities, leverage local resources and involve local actors—including government, civil society and the private sector.

These efforts align with Mr. Dichter’s own 2014 recommendations in “The Capable Partners Learning Agenda on Local Organization Capacity Development.” The executive summary of that document states: “The percent goal … ought to have the freedom to be redefined not in terms of numbers of organizations funded, but numbers of problems tackled that are fundamental challenges in institutional change and country ownership.”

In short, Local Solutions is alive and well at USAID. And while we are well aware of challenges to sustainability—including competing pressures for quick and demonstrable results and the need to ensure the safety of our staff—we remain committed to making progress in this critical area.

Alicia Dinerstein
Director, Office of Strategic and Program Planning
Bureau for Policy, Planning and Learning
U.S. Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C.

NATO Expansion Is Sound

Congratulations on the Russia package in the December issue of the Journal. You provided a wealth of facts, insights and wisdom on the vital issue of how to deal with Russia. If only members of the incoming Trump administration would read and absorb these lessons.

That said, your coverage would have benefited from some perspective from Central and Eastern Europe, particularly on NATO expansion. Poles, Czechs, Hungarians and others who lived under Soviet occupation during the Cold War saw this step not as a provocation, but as essential to guaranteeing their own independence.

They saw no reason why their security concerns should again be sacrificed to those of Russia, as happened decades ago at Yalta. This traditional fear of threats from Russia has only been reinforced by President Putin’s intervention in Ukraine.

Having worked on the issue of NATO expansion in Bucharest, Warsaw and Washington, D.C., in the 1990s, I’m convinced it was a sound and necessary policy. It was successful, too.

NATO membership has brought unaccustomed peace to a dozen new members by making it clear to Moscow that...
these places are free and independent countries, out of bounds, off limits, not grounds for poaching. Good fences make good neighbors.

Richard A. Virden
Senior FSO, retired
Plymouth, Minnesota

Required Reading on Russia

Congratulations on a superb analysis of today’s Russia and the interview with George Shultz in the December issue.

As a target of continuous Soviet disinformation attacks from 1963 to at least 1993, I am sensitive to any effort by Russia to continue those practices. Because they didn’t like what I was reporting as DCM/chargé in Kabul (1980-1981), the Soviets nearly derailed my successful 40-year career by convincing the government of India to declare me persona non grata, just as I was about to take my post as political counselor in New Delhi.

But after reading the articles in the December FSJ—and, in particular, those by Raymond Smith and Louis Sell—I can see that there may be a better approach to dealing with Russia than strict confrontation.

Perhaps the somewhat controversial choices by President-elect Trump for Secretary of State and ambassador to Moscow will find such a path. This FSJ should be required reading for both of them. Good luck!

George G.B. Griffin
Senior FSO, retired
Blue Ridge Summit, Pennsylvania

The Critical Role of IRM Specialists

As a modern-day information management officer (IMO) working to support the Foreign Service and our policy objectives, I greatly enjoyed reading and could certainly relate to Tim Lawson’s excellent article, “Communications Behind the Iron Curtain,” in your December issue.

Not unlike his own challenges facing the Soviets during their dying days, my team and I here at the U.S. mission in Geneva often find ourselves pressured by our own “nuclear reduction” goals and objectives, as the last two years of delegations and visits by the Secretary of State will attest.

I would hope to see more articles and stories like Mr. Lawson’s in The Foreign Service Journal showcasing the important, often critical role the Bureau of Information Resources Management and IRM specialists play in advancing U.S. interests around the world.

Steve Mort
IMO
U.S. Mission Geneva

Professionalism and Dedication Behind the Scenes

As an information management technical specialist (IMTS/T) who previously served in Moscow (2012-2014), I was intrigued by Tim Lawson’s article in the December Journal.

The dedication, effort and sacrifice demonstrated by information resources management (IRM) communicators during the Cold War have rarely been acknowledged outside IRM.

Twenty-five years on, communicators continue to support the global mission of the Foreign Service, often behind the scenes and with little recognition but, hopefully, with the highest level of professionalism and dedication for which our predecessors set the bar.

With the events of the recent period taking place in Moscow and Washington, IRM’s mettle may soon be put to
the test. I thank Mr. Lawson for sharing his story with the rest of the Foreign Service.

*Ben J. Marin*
*IMTS/T*
*U.S. Embassy Yerevan*

**Two Kinds of History**

The October *Foreign Service Journal* carried a story by Ruchir Joshi, a major opinion maker in India (novelist, filmmaker and columnist), describing India’s view of the U.S. election (“How India Sees U.S. Elections”).

It contained this statement: “Democrat or not, Lyndon Johnson was viewed as a mixed bag. The P.L. 480 Food for Peace program received a huge fillip from Kennedy, with Johnson carrying it forward, and the aid received by India in the 1960s was acknowledged with gratitude. At the same time, it was U.S.-donated Patton tanks and Sabre fighter jets that our military faced in the 1965 war with Pakistan.”

There, in one sentence, was what India remembers about the massive economic assistance we rendered in the 1960s, which led to the Green Revolution and Indian agricultural self-sufficiency, the avoidance of massive starvation during the Bihar famine, and a huge flow of capital and technical assistance to support industrial development.

I was reminded of the statement that there are two kinds of history: “dead history” and “living history.” Dead history is what is contained in the museums and libraries. Living history is what people believe happened.

Then I looked at what the USAID website says about aid to India during that period. Here is the entire substantive portion of the statement covering 1951 to 1980:

“USAID’s program has evolved progressively over the decades from emergency provision of food to infrastructure development, capacity building of key Indian institutions, support for the opening of the Indian economy and more. ... In 1960, food aid accounted for 92 percent of the annual assistance budget. In the late 1970s, projects included rural electrification, fertilizer promotion, malaria control, agricultural credit, integrated health and population programs, irrigation schemes and social forestry” (www.usaid.gov/india/history).

Well, if that is the best face our own government can put on those massive efforts, how can I blame Mr. Joshi?

In my book, *Memoirs of an Agent for Change in International Development*, published two years ago, a speech I delivered in Kanpur in August 1966 is included (Annex 3). It describes, in bare outline, the then-current aid program for the year which, in 1966 dollars, came to about $800 million. Surely some of those efforts deserve recognition by the agency I served, if not by the Indian public.

*Ludwig Rudel*
*FS Reserve-2, retired*
*Bethesda, Maryland*

**The Dangers of Senate No. 11**

The controversy developing over the pending bill, Senate No. 11, “Jerusalem Embassy and Recognition Act,” reprises an almost annual joust that centers on relocating the U.S. embassy in Israel to Jerusalem from Tel Aviv.
The 2017 version of the bill contains a proposal to cut in half spending designated for security at embassies worldwide. U.S. diplomats and staff working under threat conditions, wherever they serve, will incur even greater risks if this passes.

The principles that underlie our Middle East policies have been in place since the post-World War I era and the independence of Israel after 1948, and they apply to the status of Jerusalem, at the epicenter of complex local, regional and global fault lines across that part of the world.

The United States has, from the recognition of the independence of the State of Israel, maintained a consistent position on the Jerusalem question and its centrality to the conflicting stances by Israel and the Palestinians as to Jerusalem’s primacy as their capital city.

Certainly, since 1948, there have been efforts to relocate the U.S. embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem as part of the U.S. commitment to the very existence of Israel. Such a move—or even the suggestion that this relocation might be considered in the near term, or even the foreseeable future—runs great risks that would touch a “seismic” zone that extends beyond Jerusalem and our commitment to Israel as a state.

In its basic application, the U.S. stance on Jerusalem that has stood for almost 70 years maintains the principle that the parties to the central dispute must themselves negotiate how Jerusalem can best exist in a crucible of conflict that goes far beyond the narrow focus of the city itself.

Many who have commented on the current simmering of the issue know well the wider implications of the dispute, and the historic political, religious and geographic complexities that make this Gordian knot impossible (at this time, at least) to untie.

The present state of affairs throughout the Middle East (and bordering lands), and the inability of the United Nations and the major powers outside the region to modify the “tectonics” of the issue, require that policies meant to avert slippage in the central fault must remain in place until a modern-day Solomon descends on the scene.

In the meantime, to move our embassy to Jerusalem will only exacerbate the stresses on the fault. Ignoring the inherent potential for disaster in such a decision would be folly, pure and simple.

David Rabadan
FSO, retired
Annandale, Virginia

CORRECTION
In “Notes to the New Administration” in the January-February FSI, the entry by Michelle Dworkin (“Set an Example of Respect for Diversity”) misstated the number of Locally Employed staff supporting USAID overseas. According to the June 2016 USAID Staffing Report, the number is 4,935, not 10,000.
I had the honor to be the minister counselor for economic and commercial affairs at U.S. Embassy Moscow from 1988 to 1991. The December Foreign Service Journal and other coverage of the 25th anniversary of the end of the Soviet Union prompt me to write this letter.

First of all, as head of the embassy’s Economic and Commercial Section (ECON), and having been on the ground during most of the final years of the Soviet Union, I must take issue with Mikhail Gorbachev’s recent scapegoating of the West’s failure to provide expected “vital aid” as a significant factor in the USSR’s downfall (in an interview with the Associated Press on Dec. 12.)

Secondly, I feel obligated to make a few comments on reporting from Embassy Moscow during this critical period of history, as well as on the fire at the embassy in March 1991.

Economic Reform Efforts

Mr. Gorbachev’s conspiratorial assertions that we on the ground were gleefully rubbing our hands as the Soviet Union was unraveling are simply not true. At the U.S. embassy, we obviously were against communism, but were ever mindful that we were dealing with the country possessing the most nuclear weapons in the world. Provoking uncontrollable instability would have been irrational on our part, and dangerous to the United States.

Furthermore, for many years there were sustained efforts by the United States, international financial institutions and many other entities to search for a viable reform path for Gorbachev’s perestroika (restructuring). U.S. Embassy Moscow was part of that economic reform effort, bringing in many top economic and financial experts to render advice.

Ambassador Jack Matlock supported and encouraged our efforts. For example, I initiated the visit of then-Chairman of the Federal Reserve Alan Greenspan for that purpose, and also brought in John Phelan, chairman of the New York Stock Exchange, who led a heavily attended seminar that essentially explained what a stock exchange is.

During this period, however, it was the titanic, cumulative rot and the grotesque inefficiencies of the old Soviet command economy that were most important—and habitually understated in later chronicles. After all, the Soviet economic system was designed first and foremost as a primary instrument for political control—not as a blueprint for constructing, nurturing or modernizing an economy.

Vladimir Lenin believed that it was necessary for the state to control the commanding heights of the economic
system in order to maintain political order. With such foundational rigidities, the issue of economic reform always had profound and risky political implications.

**Underlying Forces at Work**

The dilemma facing Soviet leaders in the last years was clear. The system was dying and shortages were everywhere; economic autarky had even begun to set in. Living standards were falling, and factories became desperate as promised inputs and outputs evaporated.

The economic competition with the West was clearly lost, and the Soviet military and space program only excelled due to excessive, vampire-like skewing of resources to them by a command system, which left the rest of the economy resembling an impoverished, cadaverous third-world country. In other words, Gorbachev had no choice but to attempt reform; but that, in turn, would also loosen the shackles of centralized political control.

Under such dire systemic circumstances and historic internal contradictions, I do not think any kind of additional, last-minute "vital aid" from the West could have created a positive inflection point for the USSR’s future. The cumulative consequences of decades of baked-in structural economic inefficiencies and rigidities created a complex, destabilizing morass and a tsunami of economic and social problems that made Gorbachev’s perestroika, in any format, highly unlikely to succeed.

**Truth-Telling Under Pressure**

This brings me to the second reason for this letter. The dynamic within Embassy Moscow and in Washington during most of my tenure was often that the Economic Section was too aggressive in signaling serious Soviet economic and social-stability-related problems and dangers.

But our section lived amidst the evidence of growing social and economic disarray every day. For years, my trusty small band pushed and prodded, and at times was quite frustrated trying to raise embassy and Washington concerns about growing instability—and not just about the economy. Tom Delare showed great intellectual rigor and courage. Ross Wilson (later ambassador to Turkey) did yeoman’s work for years, as did other economic officers.

The labor upheaval and growing soci-
etal revolt from below were masterfully reported by Michael Gfoeller (later an adviser to General David Petraeus with the rank of ambassador) and Michael Desaro. ECON became the assigned contact point for Boris Yeltsin, and there was no shortage of information from us about growing Russian nationalism.

What most drove our deep concerns was our daily exposure to a nose-diving economy with great centrifugal force that was an enabler if not incubator of separatism, be it in the Baltics, in Russia itself or elsewhere.

I must quickly add, however, that pressure to contain our alerts abated considerably on the arrival in 1990 of Deputy Chief of Mission Jim Collins (later ambassador to Russia). I was also pleased with the embassy’s cable, “Looking into the Abyss...,” sent in mid-1990. Even though it pitched the end of the Soviet Union only as a possibility, not a prediction, it nevertheless reflected some of the deep stability concerns the Economic Section had long been signaling to Washington. I urge historians to seek declassification of the range of Embassy Moscow reporting from all sections during this critical period.

Washington and, somehow, Newsweek—and likely the KGB—were aware that the KGB—and likely the KGB—were aware that the Economic Section had long been warning of the prospect of Soviet collapse. After I returned from Moscow in 1991 to join the Senior Seminar, I requested an appointment with the Director General’s office after having been turned down curtly and successively for many onward assignments, some of which I should have gotten easily.

Frankly, I was looking for a step-up after my performance in Moscow, but instead I was presented with a printed letter requesting my resignation from the Foreign Service, and told bluntly that I had to sign it on the spot.

A Washington-Style Show Trial

When I asked why, I was lectured that my section had done much too much overly pessimistic reporting, including cables on our meetings, and that unnamed senior officials at State and in the White House had been “alarmed” and “embarrassed” by the dire reports, assessments and predictions that ECON had made on prospects for the USSR.

As the person in charge of ECON, I would now be held accountable. In true Soviet fashion, when I demurred on signing the resignation letter, I was told that the only assignment I would be permitted henceforth would be a do-nothing, out-of-agency job (i.e., professional Siberia); that is, until the DG’s office could build a sufficient case to select me out of the Foreign Service.

Resign now, and embarrassment could be avoided, I was told. The only thing missing was a revolver on the desk.

I later successfully rebounded, rerouting my career, but I barely survived this professional purge attempt. And I must say, it remains a very odd feeling to have been officially denounced on Soviet television, only to come home later to face this kind of “show trial” from my own government.

This anecdote not only makes clear where the Economic Section stood on the issue of Soviet stability. It also shines a clear light on the risk of being a messenger of troubling news.

Make no mistake, I deeply respect the Political Section of that period and, of course, Amb. Matlock. I would also point to the remarkable work of people like Thomas Graham (later NSC Russia director) on the Baltics and nationalities,
Throughout the three years I was in charge of the economic, commercial and labor reporting from Moscow, we tried to weigh objectively for Washington each of a long parade of successive economic reform packages.

as well as the work of such colleagues as Tatiana Gloeeller (later ambassador to Kyrgyzstan) on religious issues and tensions, who also complemented our reporting on Yeltsin.

The reason I am compelled to mention this reporting dynamic now is that historians are unlikely to figure any of this out any time soon. So while I am still able, I want to try and see to it that my people, who analyzed events more from economic and social perspectives and less from political vantage points and Kremlinology, receive recognition for basically getting it right from the get-go and throughout this critical period.

The Last Ones Out

Finally, I certainly salute the brave acts of the communications processing unit (CPU) in Moscow and was mesmerized by Tim Lawson’s article, which highlighted the March 1991 embassy fire.

When the fire broke out, I was in a meeting in the executive suite. Deputy Chief of Mission Jim Collins turned to the head of the Administrative Section, Joe Hulings, asking him if it was a drill. When he said that it was not, I ran to my section. As Mr. Lawson describes it, the fire moved very quickly. But, despite smoke and extreme danger, my staff stayed and locked up all their materials and safes before trying to exit the building.

When my group got down to the third floor, the staircase was on fire. As a thick, carpet-like plume of solid black smoke moved toward us up the stairs, I was asked whether we should go back up. I yelled to everyone to take a deep breath and run down the staircase with me, and not go back upstairs.

They followed me down through two flights of stairs on fire, through the dense, punishing smoke, where I finally hit the exit door whose frame was totally aflame. It did not budge; and I thought we were dead. At that moment, Roman Wasilevski, a fine reporting officer—who, fortuitously, was tall—backed up and hit the door again and again until it burst open.

Unfortunately, a waterfall of flaming debris from elevator construction prevented us from exiting, and the heat and toxic air was fast overcoming us. At that point, Mike Desaro noticed that if we moved very carefully to the right on a sill, it might just be possible to exit by shimmying between the waterfall of flames and the wall.

Although some of us were burned slightly, we all escaped and went over a wall—that last step, the harrowing ordeal of us getting over the wall and down to safety, was pictured on the front page of The New York Times the next day.

I admire the courage of the CPU team. We did not re-enter as they did, but I am pretty sure it was the members of the Economic Section who were the last ones out.
State’s Dissent Channel Lights Up

A Dissent Channel message responding to President Donald Trump’s Jan. 27 Executive Order, “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States,” was submitted on Jan. 30, reportedly signed by more than 900 State Department officials, primarily Foreign Service officers.

The dissent message is titled, “Alternatives to Closing Doors in Order to Secure Our Borders.” While in draft form, the message was shared among employees at numerous U.S. embassies, and people continued to add their names along the way.

Though Dissent Channel messages can only be signed by current employees, many retired diplomats sought ways to support the dissent message, as well.

The State Department’s Dissent Channel, created in 1971 to give FSOs a way to air disagreement with Vietnam policy at that time, is meant for internal use, a way to foster review and reconsideration of policy within the government.

Dissent is an honored tradition and part of the culture of the U.S. Foreign Service, something that is even included in annual employee reviews. This is because it is the job of diplomats to report on what is happening on the ground, to understand local situations and to use their professional experience to offer reasoned, honest advice to inform policymaking.

Given the number of people signing on to the draft dissent message in such a short time, it is not surprising that it became public (or was intentionally leaked). In connection with the firestorm of public reaction to the executive order (protests at airports across the country) and its chaotic rollout and implementation (implementing agencies left without clear instructions), the draft dissent and the support it was gathering from State employees drew media attention.

Before the message had been officially submitted through the Dissent Channel, the White House was already reacting to it, sending a chill through Foggy Bottom. On Jan. 30, White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer said that those who were dissenting “should either get with the program or they can go.”

Further clarifying, Spicer said: “The president has a very clear vision ... he’s going to put the safety of this country first. If somebody has a problem with that agenda, that does call into question whether they should continue in that post or not.”

Alarmed by the White House response to the dissent message, some members of Congress issued a strongly worded defense of the State Department employees in a letter to the president on Jan. 31. Signed by 22 members of Congress, the letter was issued from the office of House Foreign Affairs Committee Ranking Member Eliot Engel (D-N.Y.).

“For decades, the Dissent Channel has offered diplomats the ability in critical circumstances to express concerns and warnings contrary to administration policies,” the legislators state, and continue with a call to respect the rights of employees to dissent:

“So it’s deeply troubling that your administration isn’t interested in hearing different perspectives, especially those transmitted through the State Department’s revered Dissent Channel. The State Department’s Foreign Affairs Manual prohibits reprisal or disciplinary action against anyone who uses the Dissent Channel. We are requesting your assurances that State Department personnel will not be subject to harassment or retribution if they take advantage of the Dissent Channel or offer policy advice that doesn’t align with White House policy decisions.”

The members of Congress request a response “as soon as possible” that confirms that the administration will respect the law (P.L.96-465) governing the State Department and the treatment of its personnel.

—Shawn Dorman, Editor

Contemporary Quote

“Nuclear rhetoric is now loose and destabilizing. We are more than ever impressed that words matter, words count.”


The press conference was held to announce that the “Doomsday Clock” was being moved 30 seconds closer to “midnight.” The clock is updated annually by the scientists and security experts of the Bulletin, and has only been moved closer once before, in 1953 following hydrogen bomb testing by both the United States and the Soviet Union.

The clock now stands at 2 ½ minutes to midnight.

National Security Leaders Push Back on Trump Immigration Order

The Trump administration’s Jan. 27 executive order on immigration elicited an unprecedented response from the top echelons of U.S. national security
leadership. More than 100 former defense, foreign policy and national security officials—both civilian and military—who served in both the George W. Bush and Barack Obama administrations signed a letter on Jan. 30 urging that President Trump “revisit and rescind this Order.”

The Jan. 27 order imposed a 90-day suspension on visa issuance and entry to the United States for nationals from Iraq, Syria, Sudan, Iran, Somalia, Libya and Yemen pending a review of procedures.

It also suspended the admission of any refugees for 120 days, stopped the acceptance of Syrian refugees indefinitely, capped the total number of refugees for Fiscal Year 2017 at 50,000, suspended the Visa Interview Waiver Program, called for expansion of the Consular Fellows Program and ordered a review of all nonimmigrant visa reciprocity agreements.

“This Order not only jeopardizes tens of thousands of lives, it has caused a crisis right here in America and will do long-term damage to our national security,” the Jan. 30 letter, addressed to Secretary of Homeland Security John F. Kelly, then Acting Attorney General Sally Yates and Acting Secretary of State Thomas A. Shannon, states.

Leading signatories include former Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright, former Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano, former Director of National Intelligence Dennis Blair, former CIA Director Michael Hayden, former Commander of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan and Presidential Special Envoy for the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL, John R. Allen, former Supreme Allied Commander Europe James Stavridis and many other top officials.

The letter explains the rigorous vetting procedures that are subject to continuous review and improvement, noting that not a single major terrorist attack has been perpetrated by travelers from the countries named in the order since 9/11.

Signatories express concern over the order’s apparent lack of vetting by the agencies bound to enforce it (including the State Department), and urge officials in the three agencies to use the discretion given them under the order to mitigate its damage and draw on the insight of department professionals to recommend its revocation.

“A blanket ban of certain countries or classes of people is inhuman, unnecessary and counterproductive from a security standpoint, and beneath the dignity of our great nation,” the letter concludes.

Following the hold put on the order by U.S. District Judge James Robart of Seattle on Feb. 3 and the administration’s appeal of that decision on Feb. 7, many of the letter’s signatories, and others, filed an amicus brief with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. That court upheld the hold on the immigration order on Feb. 10.

The brief argues that the order harms the interests of the United States and that maintaining the hold while the underlying legal issues are adjudicated would not jeopardize national security.

—Susan B. Maitra, Managing Editor

On Jan. 10, Secretary of State John Kerry was joined by four of his predecessors for the ceremonial opening of the U.S. Diplomacy Center, a museum on the history of American diplomacy scheduled to open formally in 2018.

The center was conceived under Madeleine Albright’s tenure as Secretary of State and, at the event, she stated: “Diplomacy is about people. It’s about relationships. We want the Diplomacy Center and Museum to tell the untold stories of diplomacy and the never-heard stories of the people involved.”

Speaking at the event, Hillary Clinton took the opportunity to praise American diplomats and underline the critical importance of diplomacy. “Diplomacy is one of the greatest forces for peace and prosperity and progress the world has ever known,” Clinton stated.

“I am excited about the historic artifacts and the cutting-edge exhibits that will be here to teach and inspire future generations about the work of our country’s diplomats,” she continued. “Students and visitors alike will be able to simulate high-stakes diplomatic negotiation, learn more about resolving disputes in our increas-

Secretary of State John Kerry (at podium) with, from left to right, Under Secretary for Management Pat Kennedy and former Secretaries Hillary Clinton, Colin Powell and Madeleine Albright at the Jan. 10 Diplomacy Center ceremony.
What Are the New FSOs Like?

For the most part, entering junior FSOs have good undergraduate scholastic records. They participated in extracurricular activities, varying from rigorous sports through esoteric poetry readings.

While over half have graduate degrees, two recent entrants did not have a bachelor’s degree. They are preponderantly political science, international affairs, history and government majors. The intake of economic majors is rising slowly.

Diversity of educational background is satisfied by the occasional science, mathematics, physics, engineering and many other majors. Lawyers outnumber ordained ministers.

Over one-third of the entrants have served in the military. About two-thirds have had overseas experience in the Peace Corps, the military, in business and as students or teachers. Almost all states are represented, with the most populous, California and New York, being the largest suppliers.

If a measure of the success of the College Relations Staff is the diversity of colleges represented, it has been eminently successful.

But to most of us, “best” does not mean just an outstanding scholastic record, wide geographic and collegiate distribution, etc. “Best” is a vague, indefinable, unmeasurable quality, the definition of which is not universal.

Hence, each of us evaluates the incoming Junior Foreign Service officer against his definition. For my part, I believe the Foreign Service, in a highly competitive market, is doing very well indeed.

They come to the Service eager to get to work—they are gung-ho. While appreciating the need of some minimal training before going to their first posts, most welcome only that which is orientation or directly related to their first assignment or career advancement (area and language training).

Experience leads me to conclude that six months training before reporting on the job is the saturation point. After that the curve is down. They want to go where the action is. We should get them out of the living room and into the kitchen quickly.

—Alexander A. Davit, FSO Coordinator of Junior Officer Training, in “An Answer to the Question What Are the Entering Junior FSOs Like?” Excerpted from the March 1967 FSJ.

Bid to Relocate U.S. Embassy in Israel

On Jan. 3, Senators Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), Dean Heller (R-Nev.) and Ted Cruz (R-Texas) introduced the Jerusalem Embassy and Recognition Act, a bill recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and requiring the U.S. embassy to be relocated there from its current home in Tel Aviv.

Since the passage of the 1995 Jerusalem Embassy Act, every president—both Republican and Democrat—has waived that requirement, invoking national security considerations.

Former presidents Bill Clinton, George W. Bush and Barack Obama have each cited their belief that congressional resolutions infringe on the authority of the executive branch of the U.S. government to make and implement foreign policy.

One particular concern for the State Department in the current bill is Section 2 (e), which would withhold 50 percent of the amounts appropriated to the department for embassy security, construction and maintenance in 2017 if the move does not take place.

Further, the bill proposes that security, construction and maintenance funds appropriated in 2018 and 2019 should only be released for construction and other costs associated with the establishment of a U.S. embassy in Jerusalem.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

Historic Apology for the State Department’s “Lavender Scare”

In a press statement on Jan. 9, Secretary of State John Kerry issued an historic formal apology on behalf of the Department of State to all lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) government employees who had lost their jobs...
because of their sexual orientation as far back as the 1940s.

Secretary Kerry acknowledged that the “Department of State had discriminated against employees and job applicants on the basis of perceived sexual orientation,” adding that “these actions were wrong then, just as they would be wrong today.”

In November Senator Ben Cardin (D-Md.) had requested that the department apologize to the victims of the so-called “Lavender Scare” during the 1950s, stating: “There is little we can do to undo the hurts and wrongs of the past.

But we can take steps to assure that the lessons of these episodes are learned and remembered, and in so doing make a contribution to assuring that such injustice will never transpire again.”

In early January the Washington, D.C.-based Human Rights Campaign made a similar request. David Stacy, HRC’s government affairs director, welcomed the apology, stating that it “sets the right tone for the State Department as it enters a new and uncertain time in our country under a new administration.”

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

WorldWideWomen, a new website designed to be the “first-ever” global resource center for women, is the product of a social enterprise company dedicated to building a global movement for women’s and girls’ equality through technology, philanthropy and advocacy.

The WorldWideWomen Foundation behind this new resource aims to build various philanthropic efforts to support women and girls, and to advocate legislative changes that improve the civil and human rights of women around the world.

The global platform connects women around the world, providing resources to support women and girls and encouraging collaboration between women to solve issues that affect the global community.

Founder and CEO Maureen Broderick says that the foundation’s goal is for WorldWideWomen “to become the primary source of information and community for women around the world.”

The website currently offers an online global directory of thousands of organizations, programs and services offered exclusively for women. The directory is broken down into categories including education, health and wellness, career resources and women’s rights.

Users can search for global organizations, as well as for groups in their local area. The site also encourages users to submit their own recommendations for female-focused organizations.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

SITE OF THE MONTH: www.worldwidewomen.co
No “Grace Period” for Political Appointees

On Jan. 5, *The New York Times* reported that President Donald Trump’s transition staff issued a blanket edict requiring all politically appointed U.S. ambassadors—without exception—to depart their posts on the day of the inauguration, Jan. 20.

News of the order prompted an unusually public discussion of the American practice of awarding key ambassadorships in exchange for political favors.

Speaking to NPR on Jan. 6, AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson confirmed that it is normal practice for political appointees to leave at the same time as the president who appointed them.

Stephenson added that, when political ambassadors do leave, there’s always a deputy ready to step in. The person is invariably a career diplomat with at least a decade, and very often two decades or more, of experience.

*The Post and Courier* of Charleston, South Carolina, echoed that sentiment in a Jan. 16 editorial, “Don’t Cry for the Ambassadors.” The piece pointed out that “these plum job holders are not professional diplomats, and must rely on Foreign Service officers to run their embassies. Those pros will stay on the job.”

*The Post and Courier* also noted that political appointees are traditionally significant donors to presidential campaigns and suggested that because Pres. Trump did not have any large donors to his campaign (excluding himself), this could be an opportunity to minimize the selection of non-career ambassadors.


DW noted that “some career Foreign Service officers are suggesting Trump make an even bigger break with tradition and curtail the practice of appointing big donors, activists and friends to ambassadorial positions at all.”

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor
January 19, 2017

The Honorable John F. Kerry
Secretary of State
Department of State
Washington DC 20520

Dear Mr. Secretary:

With deep regret, I must resign from my position as a Supervisory Special Agent of the Diplomatic Security Service. I cannot in good conscience serve in the Department of State under the incoming president, a man I believe to be a threat to our constitutional order.

For the last 17 years—the entirety of my professional life—I have been proud to work for the American people as a member of the Foreign Service. Without hesitation, I have done so under presidents of both parties. Whether in Baghdad or Berlin, Washington or now in Kyiv, it has been an honor to carry the Diplomatic Security badge, a symbol of the special trust and confidence reposed in me by our fellow citizens to enforce our laws and defend our country’s values and interests. I love this department, which has been my home, and the extraordinary men and women in it, so many of whom have become like family.

But I take nothing more seriously than my oath to support and defend the Constitution, to bear it true faith and allegiance, to well and faithfully discharge the duties of my office. Throughout my career, these obligations have guided my every action in service of our country. They are what compel me now to resign.

As an American, it is an article of my political faith that our Constitution binds the government and its leaders—and by extension all of us in public service—to guarantee certain unalienable rights: freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, due process and equal protection of the laws, among others. In his words and his deeds, Mr. Trump has demonstrated repeatedly that he little understands and less respects these tenets of our civic creed. He has threatened the independent media. He has called for the imposition of religious tests and the commission of war crimes. He has incited hatred and violence. He has mocked and bullied the most vulnerable among us. He has empowered racists and emboldened bigots. He has made open league with a despot who seeks to harm our national interests. He disregards and distorts the truth for no other apparent purpose than to maintain his followers in a frenzy of confusion and anger. These are not the acts of a liberal democratic leader. They point the way to authoritarianism, the slippery path to tyranny.

TJ Lunardi joined the Foreign Service in 1999 and became a Diplomatic Security special agent in 2002. He has served in Amman, Baghdad, Berlin, London and Kyiv, as well as in the Executive Office of the Secretary of State and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security. At the time of his resignation, his future employment plans were not determined.
I have thus concluded that defending the Constitution and performing the duties of my office in an executive branch under Mr. Trump are incompatible. An honest adherence to my oath dictates that I withhold support from such a man and from the administration he will head. For me this is not a career choice, not something I would desire under normal circumstances. It is among the most difficult and painful decisions of my life. Nonetheless, it is a moral and ethical necessity in the face of someone I judge to be so clearly inimical to the values I have sworn to protect.

Some may counter that the threat posed by Mr. Trump calls for people of conscience to remain in the department, to blunt his excesses, to resist his agenda. This may be a legitimate course for others, but I fear I lack the capacity for such a compromise. Tyranny encroaches when met with silence, and the graveyard of failed democracies is littered with the epitaphs of those who believed collaboration could moderate the evil of authoritarianism. Knowing these lessons, I cannot allow tacit accommodation of Mr. Trump’s administration to make me complicit in his assault on our republic.

It is my fervent hope I will be proven wrong, that Mr. Trump will govern wisely, lawfully and with respect for the Constitution—all of it, and not simply the parts convenient to his purposes. Unless and until he does, however, my place is with those who will oppose him, not those charged to carry out his policies. My oath, my honor and my conscience demand nothing less of me, even if my heart wishes it could be otherwise.

Traveling the world with the Foreign Service, I have been blessed with the opportunity to reflect on how the fragile nation bequeathed by our founders has grown to become a beacon of hope and progress, a bulwark against despotism. I am convinced it is the decency of our citizens, and their willingness to put our ideals ahead of their wants, that has made this country both great and fundamentally good. On the battlefields of Bunker Hill and Bastogne, in the jail cells of Occoquan, on Pettus Bridge and Christopher Street, ordinary citizens have written our extraordinary story through sacrifice and an unwavering faith in our constitutional principles.

The survival of our grand experiment in democracy once again depends on such acts of courage. And so I close with a citizen’s request to my friends and colleagues who remain in the department: Remember and keep always before you the belief in our shared values which inspired you to serve the American people. Whenever you can, rise above the all-consuming daily bureaucratic scrum so that its rigors do not distract from an incremental acceptance of the morally unacceptable. Should the decisive moment come, hear and heed the call of conscience.

Through whatever trials lie ahead, I pray providence will preserve the people and the Constitution of the United States.

Sincerely,
Timothy J. Lunardi
A veteran special agent and leader of Diplomatic Security discusses what it takes to serve the United States overseas today ... and tomorrow.

American diplomats over the next quarter-century will likely continue working in a world of complex security challenges that have no quick, easy fixes. As a result, the State Department and the United States will have to make tough decisions about how we pursue diplomacy and U.S. government programs through overseas engagement.

Serving most recently as assistant secretary of State for Diplomatic Security from 2013 until early 2017, I have spent my career focused on threats to the people who are charged with implementing our nation’s foreign policy. Part of this work has included trying to peer into the future to assess what the world might look like over the next quarter century.

Frankly, I am seeing some ominous warning signs.

We as a nation will remain focused on counterterrorism. But we also face numerous other challenges to global stability, challenges that may include military dimensions but also require diplomacy, interagency initiatives and close working relationships with international partners and nongovernmental groups.

If we want to continue protecting our citizens by having a positive influence in a dangerous world, we need to find ways to maintain a meaningful presence in increasingly unstable situations. Those who answer the call to serve our nation need to know what they’re buying into. The Foreign Service of today is not the Foreign Service of 40, 20 or even 10 years ago.

We will need to keep recruiting and developing the best and most devoted people who can solve myriad diplomatic issues. Security is a responsibility not just for DS agents, but for everyone; and it requires a clear-headed mindset about what it takes to serve the United States overseas.

Terrorism: One Aspect of Wider Security Challenges

For much of the past two decades, global security has been defined in the context of terrorism. We in DS know terrorism. The Bureau of Diplomatic Security was created in 1985 to more comprehensively address terrorism in the wake of the Beirut bombings in the early 1980s.

In our country’s history, there have been numerous acts of terrorism directed against State Department personnel, including the murder of Ambassador John Gordon Mein in Guatemala City in 1968; the bombing of U.S. Embassy Beirut in 1983; the bombing of the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998; and, more recently, the attacks that led to the deaths of Ambassador Chris Stevens and three brave colleagues in Benghazi in 2012 and Anne Smedinghoff in Kabul in 2013. In September 2015, DS dedicated a memorial wall that publicly honors 144 individuals who lost their lives in the line of duty while protecting U.S. diplomats—the majority of them international partners killed in terrorist attacks.

But we cannot attribute the security threats we will continue to face simply to terrorism. Instead, terrorism and militant groups are better understood as extreme responses to a collision of long-term social and economic trends. Yes, terrorism is and will remain an issue. It will focus our diplomatic and military attention at the tactical level, as we work with international partners to fight groups like the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant. They will be defeated. Their fighters almost certainly will be driven from battlefields in Iraq and, ultimately, from Syria. But they won’t be defeated by a massive, unilateral U.S. military invasion. They’ll be defeated through diplomacy, through painstaking bilateral and multinational commitments and counter-commitments. It will be incremental, complex and, in the end, successful.

Historically, every time collective powers smash armies fielded by non-state actors—e.g., the Taliban, Hamas, ISIL—that apparent battlefield victory doesn’t end the problem. It also certainly doesn’t end the grievances that ignited the confrontation in the first place. By definition, non-state actors cannot sign cease-fire agreements and postwar treaties. They do not control a state or society, so they cannot turn the government and security of a state’s population over to a victorious power. Instead, their fighters disperse. Well-trained, well-organized fighters who were once more or less consolidated in one place now scatter into communities and safe havens where they cannot be tracked. Their grievances fester and become more hardened in defeat. They turn to asymmetric warfare, a battlefield on which traditional militaries have a mixed track record.

So terrorism is one aspect of a wider set of challenges that we as a nation face. And in all likelihood we will still be facing these challenges five, 10, 15, 20 years from today, even as the challenges continue to evolve and new, unforeseen risks present themselves.

At the same time, our nation traditionally favors diplomatic engagement ahead of military intervention. That means sending more diplomats directly into high-risk situations, asking new officers and seasoned veterans alike to live and work on the front lines of diplomacy, in situations where institutional structures have collapsed, and societies and communities are in turmoil.

A good example is the 2014 Ebola outbreak in West Africa. In the distant past, U.S. embassies in hot spots may have hunkered down or sent home nonessential personnel. Instead, we reinforced our embassies in West Africa and provided a secure base of operations for an interagency, international response. In Monrovia in the summer of 2014, an influx of personnel meant...
the U.S. embassy suddenly had to establish new office space, and thus reopened the old chancery compound that had been vacated a year earlier.

This work required technical setup by DS security engineering officers. Commercial flights were disrupted even as DS diplomatic couriers had to move critical equipment and diplomatic pouch loads into and throughout the region. The CDC began placing hundreds of health care staff in Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone; and the Department of Defense deployed 3,000 personnel to build medical centers in Liberia. With the help of the United States acting in concert with local authorities and international partners, the world staved off a potential pandemic that, left unchecked, could have had more disastrous consequences.

Other Risks, Other Challenges

Meanwhile, a growing number of seemingly unrelated or loosely related trends are piling up, with pervasive negative consequences for American and global security. For example:

Oil prices: Volatile crude oil prices are well below the average of the past two decades at roughly $50 a barrel in the final weeks of 2016, a 50-percent cut in prices from as recently as 2014. This severely strains the finances and the social structures of oil-producing nations, many of which budget for oil revenue at $70 a barrel. These nations often lack economic diversity and use their petro-earnings as a social lubricant.

Population growth and the youth bulge: Decades of global humanitarian work have had a dramatic impact on world populations. According to United Nations data, infant mortality in 1965 was an appalling 100 out of every 1,000 infants born. Today, thanks to health, sanitation, economic and medical programs, that figure is closer to 37 out of 1,000. Hundreds of millions of people are alive today who, a generation ago, might have died in infancy. This means enormous growth in populations under the age of 25, most of them with extensive access to global information via social media.

Climate change: Regardless of what causes climate change, it places more stress on fragile economies. Throughout human history, people could pack up and move somewhere else if local conditions changed. Our modern nation-state borders are
a major impediment to relocation, and this reduced mobility affects the ability of populations to respond effectively to climate change, natural disasters and manmade disasters.

Poor governance redux: Corrupt leaders and corrosive governance have been with us since the beginning of recorded history. To the extent we see new trends in this age-old human drama, a new breed of authoritarian has emerged who creatively abuses national laws to give the appearance of democratic victory or popular mandate and then, once in power, rewrites laws and dismantles opposition groups to give the impression they are being constitutionally installed—as rulers for life.

Migration: Historically, migration has been a safety valve for regions affected by violence, social upheaval or natural disasters. At the same time, movements of people can cause cultural conflict; for example, the recent influx of Syrians and others has been linked to attacks in Western Europe and other countries previously thought to be “safe.” Now, many countries that have traditionally welcomed refugees are hesitant to admit more, adding to the economic and social turmoil in high-risk regions.

Donor fatigue: Nations and international organizations find themselves increasingly unable to keep up with historically high levels of instability. The United Nations Refugee Agency, UNHCR, reports that at the end of 2015 there were 65.3 million displaced people around the world, more than ever before and well exceeding the numbers of refugees following World War II. What that number means is that today one out of every 113 people on the planet is seeking asylum.

All of this adds up to a youthful, impatient world, increasingly aware of and active in global and regional social media, but with uncertain economic opportunities and decreasing options for relocation in search of better opportunities. People in countries that are politically and economically unstable or moribund are much less willing to participate in social structures. They can’t get jobs. Even if there are elections, they won’t vote because they don’t have faith in the outcome.

Tough, cynical extremists know how and where to recruit potential terrorists. They have a message that sells well to people who think they’ve run out of options. When you’re on the social brink, terrorism can sound exciting, even romantic. You no longer feel powerless. You can take action to change the world.

Over the past six-plus decades, our nation and our allies have invested heavily in global democracy. But what we are finding is that, without an underpinning of economic stability, democracy can be “a mile wide and an inch deep.”

All these factors suggest that we are likely to see terrorism and extremism directed increasingly against both “hard” and “soft” targets in more and more locations, affecting countries and regions with high levels of instability.

Managing Risk for an Indispensable Nation

The United States, as former Secretary of State John Kerry has repeatedly said, has been “the indispensable nation.” But that indispensability means we also are perhaps the world’s most scrutinized nation. The rest of the world is watching us. They watch for a combination of reasons—they watch for our leadership, watch to see if we live up to our values and promises, watch for our mistakes and missteps, watch for clues about our true intentions and future actions, and they watch because the United States is, in so many spheres, too important to ignore. Unfortunately, some are watching to study our weaknesses and vulnerabilities.

An indispensable nation is one that is crucial and vital. That is why we are working across the globe today. And this includes being proactive—establishing and keeping a visible diplomatic presence—in some of the world’s most dangerous places. Contrary to the stereotype of past generations, today’s diplomats are anything but risk-averse.

Think about what it means to be a diplomat today. As of the summer of 2016, our diplomats were conducting the nation’s business at 24 posts where not all family members were authorized to be. Nineteen of these posts had authorized departure for family members and nonessential staff, and three have...
completely suspended operations. Traditionally, we have had no more than eight to 10 posts out of normal status at any one time.

The 2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review stated that the goal vis-à-vis security is to “institutionalize policy to encourage innovation while managing risk … risk is inevitable. Guided by foreign policy objectives, we will encourage embassies to err on the side of engagement and experimentation, rather than risk avoidance.” In conjunction with the QDDR, in March 2015 the State Department also published a new Risk Management Policy (2 FAM 030) with the message that department employees and leaders cannot afford to avoid risk. Instead, we must proactively manage risk in pursuit of U.S. foreign policy objectives.

Protecting embassy and consulate personnel under chief-of-mission authority is a top priority for each ambassador, the regional security office and every person at post. The balance is to make reasonable choices on a daily basis to mitigate risk, while facilitating essential mission engagement, especially in dangerous environments.

During the past two years, the State Department has made a number of changes in security policy and programs to help U.S. personnel overseas perform their jobs and remain safe. These changes have contributed to an already-robust infrastructure of security policies, programs and procedures centered on the Emergency Action Committee at posts. The interagency approach

We are likely to see terrorism and extremism directed increasingly against both “hard” and “soft” targets in more and more locations, affecting countries and regions with high levels of instability.
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Adapting for an Uncertain Future

Internally, DS has been addressing these emerging and evolving trends. We have implemented the recommendations from the Benghazi Accountability Review Board and have taken a hard look at adopting best practices from across the spectrum of missions. In 2012, we created a High Threat Programs directorate to manage our high-risk posts, ensuring our most dangerous posts receive the focused attention they need. Our recently adopted deliberate planning process (DPP) codifies the way we prepare for our missions, such as providing security for the U.S. delegation to the 2015 Global Entrepreneurship Summit in Nairobi, an event that took place at a high-threat, high-risk post 250 miles from the Somali border. Supporting this presidential-level summit was the most comprehensive overseas deployment DS had ever undertaken, and was necessary to advance U.S. foreign policy goals.

The Vital Presence Validation Process (known as VP2), instituted in 2014, involves a full-scope examination of a high-threat, high-risk post. In this process the compelling national security and policy reasons for a U.S. government presence, the threats to post personnel and facilities, and the measures being taken to mitigate the risk are all spelled out; and an assessment is made as to whether the remaining risk is acceptable. VP2 and other mechanisms constitute “shared accountability” among DS, the regional bureaus and other interagency stakeholders in the risk management process.

But the issue of protecting American diplomacy is much broader than DS, broader than the State Department and even broader than the U.S. government. After 15 years of almost constant warfare in Iraq and Afghanistan, our Department of State budgets are mostly flat and our Defense Department also faces budget constraints and deep readiness issues, even as the threats and security risks continue to evolve. At the same time, as I noted earlier, the United States has been an indispensable nation. Our presence is increasingly important at a growing number of high-threat posts around the world.

DS is the most widely represented U.S. law enforcement and security organization overseas, with more than 2,000 special agents, 220 engineers, 160 security technicians, 100 diplomatic couriers and thousands of domestic and foreign national support personnel. As the law enforcement and security arm of the Department of State, we bear the responsibility of protecting the men and women of the Foreign Service and other chief-of-mission personnel and their families. However, at our overseas posts, risk is not just the business of Diplomatic Security; it is a shared responsibility for all.

Therefore, we in DS are working to help the entire Foreign Service evolve into a force in which all diplomats, as well as their family members, are trained in hard security skills essential to operate in today’s world. This transformation in security consciousness includes breaking ground and building, by 2019, a $400-million State Department training center, the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center, at Fort Pickett, Virginia, about 35 miles southwest of Richmond. FASTC will consolidate training now conducted at 11 different sites and focuses not only on hard-skills preparation for our most dangerous locations, but also on basic skills for all diplomats in the event danger strikes anywhere in the world—be it Baghdad, Bamako, Beijing, Berlin, Boston or Brussels.

However, as Diplomatic Security continues to be tasked with new missions and new requirements, the State Department is rapidly reaching the point where we can no longer do more with less. Leadership within the department, within Congress and across the executive branch increasingly—and rightly—demands more from our diplomats, including protecting them as they engage in a dangerous world on behalf of the American people. This requires a delicate but necessary balance between resources to conduct foreign policy and resources to provide a safe and secure environment for the conduct of that foreign policy.

Diplomatic Security is undertaking in-depth discussions and making hard decisions on how best to support our nation’s necessary engagement in an unstable world. But these discussions need to expand beyond DS. We, as a nation, have to make challenging, tough decisions. With a finite level of resources, we

It is essential that we give our people the resources, preparation and backing to handle the crises of tomorrow and the years ahead.
have to set priorities and make difficult trade-offs in determining where and how our diplomats should engage.

For example, if you look at a map of our diplomatic posts, Western and Central Europe are peppered with dozens upon dozens of embassies, consulates general and consulates. These are important nations, vital relationships. Many of these nations are strong allies with centuries of diplomatic and cultural ties to our nation. But the questions we face include: Do we continue to engage with our closest friends at the expense of scaling back our engagement with more distant, less stable nations? Or do we cut back our presence among close friends to increase our engagement in more difficult places? Our long-term partners are, of course, the ones who traditionally stand with us as we engage together in the world’s most difficult places. There are no easy answers.

It is human nature to get caught up in the crisis du jour. But at the strategic level, it is essential that we give our people the resources, preparation and backing to handle the crises of tomorrow and the years ahead.

DS is the most widely represented U.S. law enforcement and security organization overseas.

Even as we resolve today’s emergencies, new problems are emerging. And the factors I’ve outlined above almost guarantee that we will face even more dangers to diplomacy in the years ahead. This is not because we as a nation are failing or could do better, but just the opposite. As we work in more and more high-threat, high-risk locations, not only are we active participants in global affairs, but we remain, and hope to remain, indispensable. Because in the global community, global security means American security.
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The Diplomatic Security Service has evolved to safeguard American diplomacy and U.S. interests abroad.

Just over a century ago, in 1916, then-U.S. Secretary of State Robert Lansing created the Department of State’s first security office in recognition of the fact that the United States was transforming into a global power during the World War I era. Secretary Lansing referred to his security team as the Secret Intelligence Bureau, a lofty name for a single Foreign Service officer overseeing a handful of federal investigators on loan from the U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Post Office Department.

The new office’s mission was to prepare classified security reports and investigate covert activities within the United States such as espionage, passport fraud and sabotage of U.S. industry and transportation by the European powers then engaged in World War I.

In early 1917, as the United States prepared to enter the war, Congress granted the State Department legal authority to hire its own federal agents. Secretary Lansing then took the next step toward creating a security service: he appointed the department’s first chief special agent, a former Secret Service investigator named Joseph M. Nye.

Over the following decades, those earliest beginnings—a handful of investigators primarily based in New York—evolved into the Diplomatic Security Service.

DSS Today

Today, DSS is an integral part of the State Department, serving as its security and law enforcement arm. The men and women of DSS facilitate our work not only in Washington, D.C., and New York City, but in 29 other U.S. cities and at 275 U.S. diplomatic missions worldwide. DS personnel include more than 2,000 special agents, 220 security engineering officers, 160 security technical specialists, 100 diplomatic couriers, 120 Navy Seabees, 1,000 uniformed protective officers and guards, and more than 37,000 foreign guard and surveillance detection personnel.

We protect people, property and information. We are members of the Foreign Service, and we take seriously the fact that we live and work with those we enable and protect. DSS special agents, security engineers, diplomatic couriers and others risk their lives everyday to protect and support our Nation’s diplomatic missions.

Senior Foreign Service Officer Bill A. Miller was appointed principal deputy assistant secretary for Diplomatic Security and director of the Diplomatic Security Service in April 2014, following an assignment as deputy assistant secretary for high-threat posts in the Bureau of Diplomatic Security. On Jan. 20, he became acting assistant secretary for Diplomatic Security, upon the departure of Greg Starr.

A member of the DSS since 1987, Miller has also served in Cairo, Baghdad, Islamabad, Jerusalem and Manila. Prior to joining the Foreign Service as a DSS special agent, Miller served as a U.S. Marine infantry officer. He was honored as the 2004 Diplomatic Security Service Employee of the Year for his service in Iraq. Miller is a recipient of the Department of State’s Award for Valor, several Superior Honor Awards, the Department of Defense Joint Civilian Service Commendation Award and the Marine Security Guard Battalion’s award as RSO of the Year.
Meeting Evolving Needs

Over the past decade and a half, DSS has protected American diplomacy in increasingly challenging environments. We have supported frontline diplomacy in Iraq and Afghanistan, responded to the upheavals of the Arab Spring, coordinated multiple evacuations, and experienced scores of attacks on our embassies and missions—far too many of them deadly. Since the 9/11 terror attacks, there have been more than 290 significant attacks against U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel. In that time, more than 90 security professionals—Americans and our foreign partners—have lost their lives protecting American diplomats.

Every U.S. diplomatic mission in the world operates under a security program designed and maintained by the Diplomatic Security Service. DS personnel protect the Secretary of State wherever he or she may be, as well as foreign ministers and other high-ranking dignitaries visiting the United States. We also protect American athletes at international sporting events. We investigate passport and visa fraud and monitor insider threats and cybersecurity, as well as cyber infrastructure.

As DS meets the evolving security needs of the Department of State, the challenge of finding and vetting high-caliber personnel also increases. Each year, DS investigators conduct more than 30,000 background security clearance investigations for U.S. government employees.

In addition to state-of-the-art training for our own DS personnel to be leaders in their fields, every year we also train thousands of other members of the U.S. Foreign Service. As we have learned over past decades, and continue to learn, security is not just the responsibility of a few elite special agents. Soon every member of the Foreign Service heading overseas will receive some level of DS training. Recent attacks in the United States and Europe drive home the fact that even locations traditionally thought “safe” carry an inherent level of risk in the modern world of globally connected extremist groups.

Not that many years ago, being a DSS special agent meant wearing a suit and earpiece while discreetly carrying a weapon. But times and threats change. Today DSS operates on tactical, operational and strategic levels that were unimaginable a generation ago.

Tactically, we’re located at U.S. embassies and missions around the world; in our domestic field offices, resident offices and headquarters; and as liaisons across federal agencies. Operationally, we have a presence within FBI field offices, joint counterterrorism task forces, the National Counterterrorism Center, Department of Defense geographic combatant command headquarters, the
Joint Interagency Task Force and Special Operations Command. At the strategic level, we have a presence in and regular interaction with the National Security Council, FBI headquarters, the Joint Staff and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Maintaining Security Partnerships

Over the decades, we have developed security partnerships across the Defense Department, throughout federal agencies and, significantly, with literally hundreds of international organizations and foreign governments. Not just office calls, these are deep, multigenerational relationships around the globe, where DSS special agents and subject-matter experts work side by side with counterparts, rolling up their sleeves and doing the tough, critical business of security.

Using the latest advances in technology, including personnel emergency tracking devices, remote monitoring of U.S. diplomatic facilities and other communications systems, the DS Com-

In this photo taken during the early 1960s, Director of Security John Reilly (right) holds the cavity resonator listening device found a decade earlier inside a carved wooden image of the Great Seal of the United States that had been presented by Soviet officials to the U.S. ambassador to the USSR in 1948. An unidentified special agent points to where the bug had been placed in the carving. Joseph Bezjian, an Office of Security technical officer, discovered the bug with the aid of Ambassador George Kennan in 1952.

DS or DSS?

The U.S. Department of State has had a security office, including special agents, for more than a century. The Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS) and the Diplomatic Security Service (DSS) however, were both created in 1985 and codified under U.S. law in the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986.

Ever since, there has been significant overlap and confusion about the difference between DS and DSS.

In the simplest terms, a Senate-confirmed assistant secretary of State heads the State Department’s Bureau of Diplomatic Security. The bureau is responsible for overseeing State Department law enforcement, security and protection programs abroad and at home. DS also works with policymakers on diplomatic security matters, including responding to queries from Congress.

DSS, by comparison, is the day-to-day law enforcement and security operation within DS. Under the 1986 omnibus law, DSS must be headed by a career Senior Foreign Service or Senior Executive Service officer with demonstrated experience in security, law enforcement and public administration. The director of DSS also serves as principal deputy assistant secretary of State for DS, and is responsible for recruiting and overseeing the State Department’s special agents, security engineering officers, security technical specialists, diplomatic couriers and numerous other security professionals and support personnel.

In other words, DS promotes the mission, while DSS are the people who carry out that mission.

As the law enforcement and security arm of the U.S. Department of State, DS is responsible for providing a safe and secure environment for the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. As a federal law enforcement organization, DSS implements the State Department’s worldwide law enforcement and protective security mission.

In common usage, and in the conduct of diplomacy, there is no hard and clear line separating the two. Trying to define the boundaries of that line has, over the past three decades, led to many animated and passionate discussions among Diplomatic Security professionals and our numerous federal and international partners. We are all proud members of DS.

—B.A.M.
mand Center is a critical component during the planning and execution of national security missions overseas. The Command Center serves as the conduit of information to the bureau, enabling it to make timely and well-informed decisions.

We also have long recognized that those who target the United States overseas do not focus exclusively on the U.S. government. American businesses and private-sector groups also work in dangerous environments. For more than three decades, Diplomatic Security’s Overseas Security Advisory Council has worked closely around the globe with the U.S. private sector—companies, non-governmental groups, faith-based organizations and academics—on real-time threat reporting, sharing information and in-depth security assessments.

Although there is no way to definitively know what threats we might face, from what actors, or even where such attacks might unfold, DS is prepared to be at the forefront of protecting Americans and American interests wherever they are challenged, just as we have done for the past century.

Special agents monitor world events and overseas security from inside the Diplomatic Security Command Center in April 2014. Today the Command Center is a 24/7/365 facility with the ability to electronically monitor all U.S. diplomatic facilities around the globe.
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LAW ENFORCEMENT AS AN INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POWER

BY RONNIE S. CATIPON

More widely represented across the globe than any other U.S. law enforcement agency, Diplomatic Security is uniquely placed to safeguard American diplomacy.

Over the last century, as the world changed so have the threats that challenge the United States’ enduring national interests: safeguarding and promoting global security, economic prosperity and democracy.

The United States uses diplomatic, information, military and economic (DIME) instruments of national power to counter threats to these interests. As new threats emerged, so have new instruments of national power. The Department of Defense has acknowledged three new instruments—financial, intelligence and law enforcement—and added them to the paradigm, now termed DIME-FIL. The State Department’s Bureau of Diplomatic Security plays a considerable enabling role within the law enforcement instrument, particularly overseas. Indeed, it is arguably one of the most effective and important law enforcement agencies at the nation’s disposal.

Each agency brings its own “comparative advantage” to support the law enforcement instrument of national power. For example, no federal law enforcement agency is better at investigating threats to the homeland than the Federal Bureau of Investigation, while the U.S. Secret Service is the premier protective agency in the world. And the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration is a model for domestic and international counternarcotics operations. Individually and collectively, these and other U.S. law enforcement agencies make powerful contributions to protecting the United States’ enduring interests.

Yet no other U.S. federal law enforcement agency is more widely represented across the globe than DS. With almost 1,000 federal agents deployed at U.S. embassies, consulates, missions, U.S. combatant commands and international organizations, the bureau’s ability to globally project its influence—either through its own means in support of other U.S. federal, state and local law enforcement agencies; or through its vast network of host government law enforcement and security partners—is unmatched in the U.S. law enforcement community. This is DS’s comparative advantage, and the value-added it brings to the law enforcement instrument of national power.

Because many of the current and anticipated future threats...
to U.S. interests originate from abroad, DS is uniquely positioned to help counter and disrupt them more effectively than any other U.S. law enforcement agency.

**Overseas Criminal Investigations**

For the past 20 years, DS special agents assigned abroad have also served as deputy or assistant regional security officers for investigations. Funded by the department’s Bureau of Consular Affairs and embedded with their consular colleagues, these dedicated criminal investigators, serving side by side with local criminal fraud investigators (CFIs), advance our interests by protecting the integrity of U.S. passports and visas; supporting criminal investigations by other U.S. federal, state and local law enforcement agencies; and serving as liaisons to foreign law enforcement partners.

DS has one of the largest and, arguably, most active, effective and influential global criminal investigation and liaison programs within the U.S. federal law enforcement system. Its agents are assigned to more than 100 embassies and consulates. It also assigns agents to domestic field offices, interagency joint terrorism task forces (JTTFs) and other U.S. federal law enforcement agencies and centers; the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) in Washington, D.C., and in Lyon, France; and, since 2015, the European Police Agency (EUROPOL) in The Hague. Of particular note, capitalizing on the bureau’s global reach and unique relationship within the department, DS agents are key members of EUROPOL task forces established to defeat terrorist transit in Europe through visa and passport fraud investigations.

**Counterterrorism Work**

The Anti-Terrorism Assistance program is another DS capability unique to the U.S. federal law enforcement community. The bureau provides civilian police-to-police training programs to enhance the anti-terrorism capabilities of our foreign police partners, and has trained more than 100,000 students since its inception in 1983.

Recently, ATA expanded to offer direct training of foreign-partner explosive detection K9 teams at the DS Canine Validation Center in Virginia, one of the leading U.S. government explosive detection training centers in the country. Another
recent initiative is ATA’s Special Program for Embassy Augmentation and Response, which improves host governments’ capabilities to provide direct security support to U.S. diplomatic missions. In addition, because DS is the U.S. government’s subject-matter expert when it comes to civilian police-to-police anti-terrorism training programs, DOD is seeking closer collaboration with the bureau on training civilian foreign police agencies.

The bureau’s Rewards for Justice program is another example of the vital contribution DS makes to the U.S. government’s efforts to combat and defeat global terrorism, and illustrates how law enforcement is used as an instrument of national power. RFJ’s overall direction and actions are personally authorized by the Secretary of State. Since its establishment in 1984, the program has disbursed more than $125 million to at least 80 individuals in return for vital information that not only prevented or successfully resolved acts of international terrorism, but brought to justice some of the world’s most notorious terrorists.

RFJ continues to strengthen relationships among the State Department, interagency partners and the National Security Council. Further, RFJ works directly with strategic and operational units of the Defense Department and the interagency community, giving DS a unique opportunity to support broader counterterrorism goals.

Protecting People

Terrorists use hostages to influence U.S. policy and intimidate the general public. Recent events, including the capture and execution of U.S. citizens by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and the subsequent broadcast of videos of these atrocities on social media, have refocused U.S. efforts to counter this long-time threat. In June 2015 President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13696 and Presidential Policy Directive 30 to establish the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell, the Hostage Response Group and the position of the Special Presidential Envoy for Hostage Affairs.

In response, DS expanded its worldwide Personnel Recovery program, which trains U.S. government personnel assigned abroad to prevent and respond to a hostage incident, or any other incident which results in a U.S. citizen being separated from “friendly forces.” DS is fully integrated into both the policy and operational aspects of the U.S. government’s Personnel Recovery effort; its deputy assistant secretary for threat investigations and analysis is a Hostage Response Group member.

Of course, the bureau’s central mission is to foster a safe and secure environment for U.S. diplomatic activities. To accomplish this, DS special agents, security engineering officers and technical specialists, couriers, Marine security guards and local staff—supported by a cadre of Civil Service and contractor personnel—manage a host of programs. Though most of these programs are not new, the resources and technologies they now employ are.

They include:
- Biometrics and polygraphs to conduct local background investigations;
- The $400-million Foreign Affairs Security Training Center under construction at Fort Pickett, Virginia, which will carry out more consolidated and comprehensive training of civilian foreign affairs personnel assigned overseas;
- Armored vehicles with improved communications and countermeasures;
- Tactical operations centers tied to global personal tracking and locating technologies;
- A refocusing of the Marine security guard mission from the protection of classified information to the protection of mission personnel;
- The Marine Security Augmentation Unit, established to provide increased tactical capability to the MSG’s revised mission; and
- The multibillion-dollar Worldwide Protective Service contract vehicles, which facilitate enhanced static and movement security at our most critical overseas posts.

Private-Public Sector Cooperation

The Overseas Security Advisory Council sets DS apart from other federal law enforcement agencies and, arguably, all other U.S. government entities. With more than 30 years of service to
the private sector, OSAC is the U.S. government’s premier private-sector partnership institution to promote security cooperation and coordination between the government and American private-sector interests worldwide. Based in Washington, D.C., and chaired by DS, OSAC has more than 4,500 constituents, including U.S. companies, educational institutions, faith-based institutions and nongovernmental organizations. It also operates 151 country councils around the world, five regional councils and seven sector-specific working groups.

OSAC is well-established and highly regarded; its constituents share information and best practices to promote security for American companies and citizens living and working abroad. Both through its leadership within OSAC and its global network, DS is the federal agency best equipped to help Americans abroad prepare for and respond to current and emerging threats.

Law Enforcement, Security and Military Coordination

DS coordinates all U.S. law enforcement and security activities at such international events as the Olympics (including the Paralympics and Special Olympics) and the World Cup, and is the senior U.S. government security liaison to each host government. Senior DS agents are already actively planning for and coordinating U.S. government law enforcement and security support for the 2018 Winter Olympics in South Korea and the 2018 World Cup in Russia. During each event, working alongside their local counterparts, DS agents and personnel protect U.S. athletes, VIP delegations and venues, and operate an in-country, 24/7, joint operations center for the interagency community.

DOD recognizes law enforcement as an instrument of national power, and translates that support into action by maintaining embedded liaisons from federal law enforcement agencies, including DS, at various combatant command headquarters. Assigned to the office of the State Department’s political adviser to the combatant commander, DS liaison agents provide an important link to the global RSO network and, through them, to host-government law enforcement and security contacts with whom RSOs and their Locally Employed national investigators are closely tied.

DS liaison agents are a much-valued law enforcement resource for our military colleagues. The timely insights RSOs share with combatant commands—through the DS liaison agents—have been critical in shaping and enabling military support operations.

Policy Development

Another important measure of the emergence of law enforcement as an instrument of national power is the involvement of U.S. federal law enforcement agencies, including DS, in...
national security policy development. As already noted, DS is a key policy and operational leader within the U.S. government’s personnel recovery program. The bureau is also a voting member of the National Explosive Detection Canine Advisory Board, which establishes policies and standards for explosives detection K9 programs at the federal, state and local levels. In addition, DS is a voting member of the State Department’s Aviation Governing Board, which determines policy and oversees State’s air wing, the largest non-military air fleet operated by the U.S. government. All of these roles have emerged over the past 10 years.

The strongest measure, however, of DS’s emerging role in policy development and value to the nation’s leadership is illustrated by the White House itself. In 2014, at the request of the NSC, DS detailed a special agent to the council as a director for counterterrorism, to manage the overseas threat portfolio on behalf of the national security adviser and the president. This agent helps shape interagency policy as a direct link between the White House and State, to ensure that our national leaders are fully informed of security-related issues involving our diplomatic facilities and threats to all Americans overseas, both public and private.

DS quickly established itself as an important and respected voice at the table. “What does the RSO think?” is now a question commonly asked at senior levels of the federal government when major policy decisions are formulated.

**How Does It All Work?**

Thus far, I have summarized various programs and initiatives, and explained how they individually support and enable national security goals and objectives. But some readers may be asking how these DS programs and initiatives are mutually supportive. In particular, how do they collectively advance key U.S. national security goals abroad? Consider the following real-life example.

In July 2015, Kenya hosted the Global Entrepreneurship Summit, which Pres. Obama attended along with thousands of other participants. The summit was an important component of the Obama administration’s economic policy, so, just six months prior to its opening, the White House tasked DS with leading the coordination of all U.S. law enforcement and security activities with our Kenyan partners.

Given the limited availability of host-government resources, time constraints and threat conditions, it was an enormous undertaking. Using its deliberative planning process and drawing on considerable organizational experience derived from supporting large international events such as the Olympics, DS began the complex process of identifying and tasking capabilities from each bureau directorate to identify solutions and manage risk for the event.

Operationally, this included many things. DS Anti-Terrorism Assistance personnel deployed prior to the summit to provide Kenyan colleagues in-country training (including the Special Program for Embassy Augmentation and Response). The DS liaison agent to the U.S. Africa Command and DS Personnel Recovery program managers developed a robust personnel recovery capability specific to this event with their U.S. military counterparts. In addition, the Marine Security Augmentation Unit was deployed, and DS set up an around-the-clock interagency tactical operations center.

At the strategic level, the Rewards for Justice program targeted the leadership of the al-Shabaab jihadist terrorist group...
based in East Africa, and the Overseas Security Advisory Council coordinated security guidance and information to the U.S. private sector. Finally, at the policy level, the DS agent detailed to the National Security Council played a critical role coordinating DS and National Security Council efforts.

The 2015 Global Entrepreneurship Summit was a success on many levels for many reasons. For DS, facilitating a safe and secure summit to realize a U.S. national security objective had been the priority mission. The summit’s success was a powerful reminder of DS’s capability to operate effectively overseas, and demonstrated that law enforcement is a key instrument of national power, equal to the diplomatic, informational, military, economic, financial and intelligence components.

The Evolution of DS Continues

Law enforcement—in particular, DS—is a key instrument for the U.S. government. Its global presence, close ties to foreign law enforcement and security partners, and support for U.S. government activities worldwide all clearly illustrate its vital...
national-level and operational security programs to protect U.S. government personnel assigned abroad; direct counsel to U.S. policymakers; and other initiatives and programs, DS has matured into one of the nation’s premier law enforcement agencies and a recognized leader in overseas security operations. DS will continue to faithfully protect U.S. citizens and interests at home and abroad for many generations to come, upholding the same tradition of vigilance it has so admirably demonstrated over the past century.

The overall DS mission now also includes helping protect the homeland.

role in enabling and protecting our national interests overseas.

DS personnel will always be proud members of the Foreign Service, and will continue to provide a safe and secure environment for the conduct of U.S. diplomacy. Yet as the law enforcement instrument continues to develop and mature, so will DS. The overall DS mission now also includes helping protect the homeland.

Through its global network of personnel, including dedicated criminal investigators; worldwide partnership with the U.S. private sector; support for U.S. counterterrorism efforts; national-level and operational security programs to protect U.S. government personnel assigned abroad; direct counsel to U.S. policymakers; and other initiatives and programs, DS has matured into one of the nation’s premier law enforcement agencies and a recognized leader in overseas security operations. DS will continue to faithfully protect U.S. citizens and interests at home and abroad for many generations to come, upholding the same tradition of vigilance it has so admirably demonstrated over the past century.

---

The overall DS mission now also includes helping protect the homeland.

---

The Global Challenges Foundation recently launched A New Shape Prize, a global prize competition of US$5 million for ideas on remodeling global governance in the 21st century. The competition is looking for new models of worldwide cooperation to tackle serious global threats – from climate change to political violence to extreme poverty and pandemics.

Registration for the New Shape prize is now open. Entrants must register by March 30 and will have until September 2017 to submit their idea. You can enter as an individual or within a team, pulling together cross-discipline expertise and creating ‘shapemaker coalitions’ to form your submissions. So far more than 8,000 people from 167 countries have signed up and we’re looking for even greater participation from experts and practitioners from around the world.

Find out more about the New Shape prize on our website, [www.globalchallenges.org](http://www.globalchallenges.org), where you’ll also find registration details and our assessment criteria.
The diversity of cultural backgrounds, experiences and language skills among DS ranks is a key to the bureau’s success in safeguarding U.S. diplomacy around the world.

In the U.S. law enforcement community, Diplomatic Security has a reputation for being a bit of a melting pot. Unlike other law enforcement agencies that hire for a narrowly defined skill set, DS needs and attracts people from a variety of backgrounds. Given the enormity of the DS mission—to provide a safe and secure environment for the conduct of U.S. foreign policy—as well as the geographic range of its responsibilities, DS special agents cannot easily be categorized. Although DS attracts large numbers of applicants with law enforcement or military backgrounds, agents come from diverse cultural backgrounds and bring a wide range of experience.

DS special agents must be truly dedicated to the job, and to their country. Therefore, one of the requirements is to hold U.S. citizenship. Within DS ranks, there are numerous agents who are immigrants or children of immigrants. Their multicultural backgrounds contribute to making DS a stronger, more dynamic organization. At the same time, the DS career path allows them to best utilize their rich cultural backgrounds, experiences and foreign language skills on a daily basis.

DS agent immigrants, or children of immigrants, came to the United States by many routes, and for many reasons. Some came as refugees; some were adopted by American families; some sought better opportunities. In other cases, their parents bravely made the sacrifices of immigrating in order to give their children a better life.

**DS Stories**

In May 1982, at the age of 15, Tony Hornik-Tran escaped from Vietnam, accompanied by his brother. The two sailed to the Philippines on a fishing boat. There he spent 11 months in refugee camps, finally making it to the United States, where he was adopted by an American family. In the span of just two decades, he went from being a refugee to a DS special agent and diplomat.

Brianna May was adopted from Colombia when she was 8 months old. Her father, then a DS agent, was serving there during the Pablo Escobar period. He and his wife were one of the first families to adopt a child from Colombia. May explains that both the U.S. ambassador and his wife were very involved in her adoption process. The ambassador’s wife even accompanied May’s parents to the orphanage to pick her up. “I thought the ambassador’s wife was actually my grandmother,” May says, because she was in all of the adoption-day photos.

In 1949, Christopher Gu’s maternal grandfather, who worked for a British shipping company, was at sea when the communists assumed control of China. Unable to return home, he eventually made it to New York City and began working in the restaurant business. In the 1970s, Gu’s grandfather and a few fellow ship-
mates opened the first Chinese restaurant in midtown Manhattan. It was he who petitioned for his grandson to leave Shanghai and immigrate to the United States. On May 4, 1983, Gu and his family started their new life in a small studio apartment in Elmhurst, New York. Gu still remembers how astonished he was back then by the abundance and choice offered in American grocery stores. In China, staples such as oil, salt and cooking oil were rationed, and eggs were only consumed on special occasions. Gu wasn’t accustomed to escalators, indoor plumbing or the luxury of hot tap water, either.

Pete Kapoukakis is the child of Greek immigrants. His father was a barber in Athens before he and his wife decided to journey to America to open their own business in the late 1960s. Neither of his parents spoke any English, nor did they have much money. They understood they would face significant obstacles, but were not deterred. They worked long hours and, eventually, their perseverance paid off. “They learned English, saved enough money to start a business, bought a house, had kids, sent them to college, helped plan two weddings, had grandkids and eventually retired to Florida—pretty much the American dream,” Kapoukakis recalls in an interview with the author.

Diverse Paths to DS

Agents from all backgrounds have amazing stories to tell about their pathway to joining DS, but for immigrants, or children of immigrants, the stories are especially remarkable.

Christian Poulsen, born and raised in Denmark, was working at U.S. Embassy The Hague as an independent contractor. Intended to last three weeks, the assignment was converted into a program manager position that lasted two years. Poulsen’s DS colleagues noted his exceptional performance and strongly encouraged him to join DS. Poulsen discovered that in order to apply, he would need to acquire his undergraduate degree and convert his U.S. permanent residency into U.S. citizenship. Given the age restriction of 37 for applicants, Poulsen had just 2.5 years to accomplish these tasks.

During that time, he earned a degree (with honors), became a U.S. citizen, applied to DS and was hired. It was all worth it, Poulsen says, because his DS career offers him opportunities to “be a force for high safety and security standards for fellow Americans abroad.” He views DS as a “unique and incomparable agency,” where opportunities for personal and professional growth, meaningful impact and challenge are widely available.

In 1982, at the age of 19, Miguel Eversley emigrated from Panama to New York City and became a U.S. citizen six years later while serving in the U.S. Army. After fulfilling his obligation to the military, Eversley wanted to continue in public service; he joined the Washington, D.C., police department. While responding to a violent robbery, he encountered an Hispanic couple traumatized by the event. Eversley immediately switched to his native tongue, Spanish, which reassured and calmed them.

Afterward, to express their gratitude, the couple invited Eversley to their home for dinner. It was there that he met Foreign Service Officer Daniel Santos Jr., who happened to be the son of a famous Puerto Rican balladeer adored by the Eversley family. Santos described his career and sparked Eversley’s interest in

Christian Poulsen (seated at right) eats lunch with colleagues at one of the Afghan Public Protection Force regional training centers in Afghanistan.
Foreign Service life. By joining DS, Eversley discovered, he could continue his law enforcement career as a diplomat—the perfect combination for him.

**A Multiplicity of Skills**

Given the vast demands of the job, DS agents must come equipped with a variety of skills to be successful. During my own tenure with DS, I have often noted, and at times been envious of, the skills that DS agent immigrants or children of immigrants innately possess.

Eversley believes that his experience growing up poor in a developing country is advantageous when working in challenging overseas locations. “Little of what I experienced in Cameroon, Senegal, Nicaragua, Equatorial Guinea or any other of the developing countries where I served was surprising,” he says. “Having dinner at a Foreign Service National’s home, sitting on a cinder block while holding a plate and having a conversation was not new to me. Walking into a poor, crime-ridden neighborhood while conducting investigations does not make me uncomfortable. I feel camaraderie and kinship with people living in these conditions because I grew up the same way. This makes my work easier because I can gain the trust of those who are likely to provide information that could be beneficial to the embassy.”

Strong interpersonal skills are a hallmark of many DS agents, and especially agents with multicultural backgrounds.

Poulsen recalls that while he was working in Afghanistan, one of his local contacts was hospitalized. Having spent time gaining
an understanding of Afghan etiquette in business and personal relationships, and recognizing the importance of his relationship with this person, he visited his contact in the hospital and brought him the requisite fruit basket, which further solidified their relationship. These efforts proved beneficial in many subsequent interactions, specifically when Poulsen leveraged his relationship to avoid a hasty, unanticipated effort on the part of the Afghan government to deport U.S. government personnel. Poulsen’s personal approach to diplomacy and many of his accomplishments reflect traditional Danish qualities, but his work ethic and ambition are all-American.

Sometimes the examples set forth by one’s parents are as significant as personal experience. Kapoukakis credits his parents’ determination and resourcefulness with showing him that he could overcome anything with a positive mindset, hard work and tenacity. “I grew up with living, breathing examples of two people who didn’t take no for an answer; two people who came to the United States with nothing, made something of themselves and became contributors to the society that gave them the opportunity to succeed,” he says. “That taught me a lot about how to approach and overcome challenges.” For Kapoukakis, the prevailing mindset while facing adversity growing up was “we’ll figure it out.” He’s carried those lessons with him through his two decades of public service.

Many of us aspire to be polyglots, yet struggle to pass the Foreign Service Institute’s language exams. But for many DS agents, understanding multiple languages is the norm. In addition to English, Special Agent Hornik-Tran speaks six languages: fluent Vietnamese, good Chinese and decent Slovak, as well as French, Portuguese and Tagalog. Likewise, Teji Thiara, the child of Indian immigrants, grew up speaking English and her parents’ native tongue, Punjabi. She later picked up Hindi while attending boarding school in India. As the child of farmers in northern California, Thiara grew up hearing and speaking Spanish. Add a few overseas tours, and she solidified her Spanish and also picked up a little Czech.

Themistocles (Themi) Karavites played a crucial role in security operations for the U.S. Olympic team at the 2004 Athens Olympics. As an assistant regional security officer in Athens, he served as one of four regional security coordinators and the protective detail lead for all U.S. delegations. He is frequently selected to serve on Greek protective details because of his language abilities. This language ability, combined with his Greek heritage and cultural expertise, paid unexpected dividends during his tour in Belgrade, where Karavites discovered that several of the RSO’s primary police contacts had previously served in Greece and also spoke Greek. Because of the Serbian
affinity for Greek culture and similarity in religions, Karavites gained immediate acceptance there, fostering much closer and personal relationships in all of his interactions. His work in Serbia is an exceptional example of cooperation between the RSO and his or her host-nation counterparts.

A Common Theme

A common theme among all of these agents is their call to public service. For Hornik-Tran, the seeds of service were planted by the international organization workers who helped him in the refugee camps. He was deeply moved by their generosity, commitment and dedication, and he promised himself that he, too, would someday serve others. DS afforded him the opportunity to fulfill that dream. “Working for DS has allowed me to have an awesome opportunity to travel around the world, meet interesting people and, last but not least, exchange my success story as a former refugee from Vietnam who achieved the American dream,” says Tran.

May, who grew up living the FS life, explained that in her childhood, she was always surrounded by members of the Foreign Service. She considers many of them her extended family, and says they shaped her life, direction and career choice. May was drawn to join DS ranks, deciding to follow in her father’s footsteps to serve as a DS agent. May hopes one day to be assigned to Colombia, where she can fulfill her lifelong goal of adopting a child from the orphanage from which she was adopted.

After joining the Marine Corps Reserves during his junior year of high school, Christopher Gu’s heartfelt dedication to the United States grew, as did his desire to serve. Fortuitously, his reserve unit included an active DS agent, Pat Moore, who told him about the Bureau of Diplomatic Security. In China, being

Agents from all backgrounds have amazing stories to tell about their pathway to joining DS, but for immigrants, or children of immigrants, the stories are especially remarkable.
a law enforcement officer is considered prestigious, and Gu describes how when he joined the Foreign Service as a DS agent, his parents were “immensely proud”—despite the fact that living away from one’s aging parents was contrary to Chinese tradition.

Gu recalls that while waiting in China for his immigration paperwork to be processed, his classmates learned of his departure plans and accused him of betraying his country. In the United States Gu is labeled “Chinese-American”; in China, he would no longer be viewed as 100-percent Chinese either. Although culturally he sees himself somewhere in the middle, his dedication to the United States and its ideals is unquestionable. “The greatest thing about the United States is our diversity,” he says. “We can either use it to unite us or allow it to divide us.” This holds true within DS, as well.

Finally, on a personal note, my husband is originally from Madagascar and has since become a naturalized U.S. citizen, making our daughter the child of an immigrant as well as a diplo-kid. At the age of 5, her passport bears stamps from eight countries (some multiple times), she’s been exposed to four languages and her adaptability far exceeds her years. I hope that someday she, too, will answer the call to serve her country and, selfishly perhaps, I hope that she, too, will proudly carry the DS badge.
The rapid growth in size and responsibilities at DS has brought challenges in terms of policy, personnel and training. Here is an inside look at some of the issues.

“The complexities of our job are exponentially greater now than when I started,” Miller explains. So are the expectations. Over the past three decades, DS has grown in terms of size and budget, developing along the way into a premier global security force with a complex and evolving mission.

Such rapid growth brings challenges in terms of policy, personnel and training. And while it’s difficult to find consensus within DS on how best to solve these issues, all agree on the basic mission: to continue to move confidently in conventional diplomatic circles while preparing agents to succeed in the smoke and haze that follows a terrorist attack, political coup or natural disaster anywhere in the world.

A Global Outlook

“I helped evacuate American citizens from our embassy in Beijing after protests were forcibly put down in Tiananmen Square in 1989,” says Kurt Rice, the deputy assistant secretary (DAS) for threat, investigations and analysis. Back then, if a place got too dangerous, “we simply closed the post and pulled everyone out,” he says. “But that way of working fundamentally changed after 9/11.” Today DS has to safeguard diplomatic efforts in such posts. This has caused tension between DS agents, with their perceived desire to shut operations down in dangerous places, and Foreign Service officers who need to go out into a dangerous world to get their work done.

“It’s easy to protect everyone if you always say no to everything,” says Rice, but he insists DS doesn’t say no as often as people think. DS is sometimes “painted as the folks who say...”

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 DS agent, she has lived in Amman, Moscow, Yerevan, Almaty, Beijing and, currently, Washington, D.C.
“No,” he acknowledges. But that isn’t accurate; that kind of thinking “doesn’t come from DS,” Rice says. He adds: “There have been many times when we said ‘Yes, we can continue to operate here’—but we’ve been stopped.” Rice’s statement is echoed by other senior DS personnel who advocate the need to assume reasonable, informed risk, but only with the understanding that the risk must be acknowledged, shared and taken in the best interests of the U.S. government.

And risk is now everywhere. Instead of focusing their efforts on a few regions around the world, DS now takes a global perspective to battling terror. “Gone are the days of going to Europe to serve in a sleepy post,” says Jim Eisenhut, currently the assistant special agent in charge at the Miami Field Office. “Anything can happen, and it can happen anywhere, and it can happen quickly.”

Pete Dinoia, the regional security officer in Ankara, agrees. “We’re not regionally focused anymore. In the past it was thought that certain areas caused challenges, but we have global challenges now,” he says. “And the department has a presence in places where years ago they didn’t.” DS is unique, Dinoia explains: “There are other law enforcement agencies that do the same type of thing we do, but not in the same places or under the same conditions.” As one agent has noted, no other law enforcement agency would want DS’s mission, which essentially amounts to protecting U.S. interests in an environment where foreign governments and hostile actors dictate the operating conditions.

Risk is now everywhere. Instead of focusing their efforts on a few regions around the world, DS now takes a global perspective to battling terror.
A s DS adapts to the need for more temporary duty assignments (TDYs) to tough places, morale among family members has taken a hit. More agents are reporting that they like their jobs, but their families are struggling. Go on any DS message board, and you’ll see spouses who are worried about how to tell their children that yet another unaccompanied tour is coming their way. You’ll hear from spouses who are trying to manage households in far-flung locations while their employee spouse has disappeared on yet another TDY with no clear end date. And, of course, you’ll hear about the special hell that is DS bidding.

For tandem couples, the challenges of trying to keep a family together can be even worse. “DS has tried to make it work for us,” says one agent and mother of two. “But somebody has to raise the kids. Somebody has to be there.”

“It’s going to work early on,” she continues, but “it’s difficult down the road.” For the first eight years of her career, she says, “things were easy.” But as the couple advanced in their careers, it became harder to find posts where they could serve together. And because they have small children, they are facing multiple years apart as they separately complete the requirement to serve at unaccompanied posts.

It used to be that agents were required to do an unaccompanied tour once per career, but now it’s once a decade, and the math works against tandems: “That’s four years apart during our career,” she says. “My generation of agents didn’t sign up for that level of hard-core, high-threat work. What’s the plan for families left behind?”

“If you’re a tandem,” she says, “expect to sacrifice. The question for us now is, how deep is that sacrifice going to be?”

The long-term separations take a toll on marriages, so she’s not “shocked and horrified” when people split up. “What does this separation do to the quality of relationships?” she asks. “Separating made us stronger,” she adds. “But it can be a death sentence.” She wouldn’t have been able to move up the DS ladder without the support of her agent husband, whom she calls her “biggest cheerleader,” but she thinks she’s an outlier: “If we can make it work, we’ll be the exception, not the rule.”

Together since high school, Jim and Shannon Eisenhut have been part of DS for more than a decade. They are currently posted in Miami, but they plan to move to Baghdad—for the second time this decade—in 2017. Jim thinks the key to success as a tandem is flexibility. “Your career path isn’t as simple,” he says, because of the multiple approval processes you have to go through to try to get assigned together.

“We don’t have kids, but it’s still challenging,” says Shannon. “We just want to be together, and because of that our options are extremely limited.”

Twice the Hardship: Tandem Couples

“We don’t have kids, but it’s still challenging,” says Shannon. “We just want to be together, and because of that our options are extremely limited.”
Evolving Environments

DAS Rice says half-jokingly that if he were to apply for a job with DS today, “they wouldn’t hire me.” When Rice joined DS 30 years ago, a typical agent class was made up of “about one-third former military, one-third former police officers and one-third people like me, who came out of grad school.” DS now hires a larger percentage of people with military experience; and, while that isn’t a bad thing, Rice wants to maintain the diversity of experience that has made DS strong historically. The department focuses on hiring a workforce that looks culturally diverse; but Rice argues that for DS intellectual diversity is equally important: “I want the best brain regardless of the husk they wear.” He believes that the strength of DS lies in the fact that its personnel come from a broad range of backgrounds.

Like the rest of the State Department, DS seeks smart, flexible employees. But because their role within State is different, their best employees are different, too. Regional security officers work within an environment that is constantly evolving, depending on the changing threats at any given post, and Rice says a good RSO is capable of solving problems in a way that is “diametrically opposed to the regular Foreign Service.” The State Department typically makes decisions on a consensus basis, but in an emergency situation, “we don’t have time to reach agreement. We take action.” A successful officer knows when to make a decision independently and when to strive for consensus.

The ability to lead is of vital importance. DS Agent and Assignments Officer Greg Batman says assignment panels look for people with a track record of leadership, and agents are taught leadership skills from the beginning of their careers: “Even in basic agent school, we’re looking for ways to get that message across.” When they arrive at post, he explains, assistant RSOS are often put in charge of a guard force of more than 100 members or a team of local national investigators. And “if we’re going to put people in leadership positions, we need to train them how to lead,” he says. Some agents argue that even more training is necessary earlier in their career, noting that mandatory leadership training required by the department doesn’t start until the FS-3 level. While many in DS do well with the “learn by doing” approach, it can overwhelm a first- or second-time ARSO.

With DS mandating paramilitary training for all of its agents regardless of their assignment, the skill sets of agents will necessarily broaden and change. Some people aren’t happy with this direction, expressing concern that the paramilitary aspect of DS may become predominant. When she started 10 years ago, one agent notes, “I didn’t recognize the militaristic aspect of this career.” While she believes in the importance of this training, she thinks DS needs to do more to support its staff as the demands on them grow. “We’re seeing more temporary assignments to high-threat posts making us more paramilitary,” she says. “But the military has a strong support system for families. If that’s where we’re going, we need to have an equally strong support system.”

Another agent agrees that the militarization of the organization is important, but difficult for agents to manage. “I think DS does an exceptional job of training and preparing us for the multiple roles we have abroad,” she says. Still, she adds, “no matter how much you train me, my 5-foot self will never be ready for combat. I didn’t sign up to be part of a paramilitary organization, and I feel I have a different set of skills that would be of value to this agency elsewhere, not just in places like Iraq.”

So how does DS train people so they can move from places like Iraq to more traditional embassy settings, and back again?

Building a Better Agent

Everyone who has been through the 11-week Advanced Tactics and Leadership Skills training course—which all agents, from the most junior to DS seniors, are now required to take—agrees that the training is an excellent primer for what to do in an emergency. ATLAS replaced and expanded the two-week-long high-threat training courses that were previously required.
only for those going to danger posts. With threats rolling in across the globe, even in places that used to be considered safe, the training has become a necessary addition to the DS toolkit.

RSO Dinoia says the training helps prepare people for the wide variety of roles they’ll play throughout their career: “We are specialists, but we need to break that down further than just ‘DS vs. FSO.’ We specialize for short periods of time for a particular assignment, but we have the ability to switch to a different challenge at the next place. What you do in Baghdad or Kabul will be different from what you do in other places. That core training prepares you.” Batman agrees, explaining that a new agent, first posted to Baghdad, might think it’s okay to show up next in Europe and head to the country team meeting with a gun strapped to his belt. He or she has to be taught that different posts require different roles.

Of course, before you can take the ATLAS course, you have to be hired—and it’s become harder than ever to make it through the selection process. One senior DS agent says the bureau is actively recruiting a more diverse group of people than in past years; and while the organization may be moving in a more militarized direction, it isn’t necessarily seeking former military personnel to fill the ranks. The current group of DS seniors is almost entirely made up of white men, he says, but that’s because “when these folks came on, that’s almost exclusively who applied.” In the next few years, he says, you’ll see the results

Some people express concern that the paramilitary aspect of DS may become predominant.
When most people think of Diplomatic Security, they think of federal agents with their guns and badges, or of the regional security officers they meet overseas. But of the 50,000 employees of the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, only about 2,100 are special agents. DS also employs more than 220 engineers and 100 diplomatic couriers, as well as 160 security technicians, 1,000 uniformed officers, 850 civil servants and more than 37,000 Locally Employed guards. DS even counts more than 100 Seabees—members of the U.S. Naval Construction Forces—among its staff.

Overseas, says Kurt Rice, the deputy assistant secretary for threat, investigations and analysis, a security office at a large embassy needs all of these people to be successful. Together, he says, a good team can work as “an orchestra for calm” in an emergency. In the United States, analysts and other civil servants are a critical piece of the puzzle, without which DS simply couldn’t function.

One analyst who has been with DS for the past decade says the “new DS” recognizes and respects the importance of his role. “The analytical role was less important back when the bureau only focused on guns, guards and gates,” he says. His role is to provide actionable intelligence to both DS leadership at headquarters and RSOs in the field. Using his analysis, “informed RSOs can take chances. They are more likely to be successful because of the work we do.” Because of his work, “FSOs can go out from behind the walls and do their jobs.”

“One civil servant in the bureau has a role to play,” the analyst continues. “It all goes to serving greater DS.” Without couriers to move classified pouches from post to post, for example, embassies would cease to function. “Pouches are more than just papers,” he points out. He also singles out Seabees, who maintain and repair security systems at embassies overseas, and employees of the Bureau of Overseas Building Operations, who work closely with DS to ensure that new buildings meet all security standards. “DS couldn’t exist without all of these different people,” he states.

One Seabee, a former employee of Diplomatic Security’s Office of Security Technology, praises the training and resources DS gave him. “ST has some of the most sophisticated security and countermeasure systems available today,” he says, and provides “top-tier training to its engineers and technical specialists.” The biggest difficulties he faced while in his position at one of the largest embassies overseas, he says, arose because of the sheer size of the RSO office. At a large post, he says, not everyone who works for the RSO shares the same office space; this can create a “sense of disconnect” that a good RSO will work to overcome. He applauds the work done at the DS Command Center in Northern Virginia, saying that their employees “provide information and support that allows informed decision-making” at post.

Seabees. Engineers. Office managers. Locally Employed staff. Making sure all of these people are on the same page is critical to keeping DS on task across the globe. Every employee at headquarters and throughout the various field offices knows who they are supporting around the world. And each one of them fills an important role within the bureau.

—D.S.G.
agonizing. Says one agent who is currently on his third overseas tour, “This is the first year of the ‘new shortened bidding season.’ Yeah, right. The department apparently forgot to tell the DS seniors, because it seems to be business as usual on the bidding front.”

Kurt Rice has an explanation: Foreign Service officers “are writers. They talk to people.” They can do that at any post, whereas “specialists have to bring specific backgrounds to each post. We have to put people in who have the right skills. We need to put people where they can flourish.” Greg Batman agrees that DS leadership considers “where the need is, and where the person fits.”

Batman thinks people need to look at “realistic bidding and the overall numbers.” There are “a finite number of jobs for people at the FS-3 level,” he says, and the process itself takes bidders out of DS. To become an RSO, for example, you have to lobby with the regional bureau. “You go outside of DS,” explains Batman. “If they’re bidding on RSO jobs, we have to wait for that regional input.”

What holds the process up, explains Batman, is this: “Everyone is bidding on the same 10 positions. We had more than 60 bidders for Oslo, Skopje, Sydney. That’s not hard to fill.” But at some point, he adds, “you have to go to African posts, Moscow, headquarters. Right now we have over 30 jobs in Baghdad alone. We have jobs with a service need to fill, but we can’t make people bid on them.”

Spend a few minutes talking to a DS employee or spouse about the job, and you’ll most likely get an earful about bidding.
Bill Miller believes part of the problem is the sheer number of bidders at the middle levels. “Do the math,” he says. “Our top 10 bid positions at the FS-3 level had 548 bids. That’s an average of 54 bids on each job. For every one person who is excited about their assignment, 53 will be upset.”

“Ten years ago, you put in a list and you got an assignment,” says Batman, whereas now potential bidders need to sell themselves to prospective offices. “The expectation is you’re making the calls, engaging with these offices. The reality is there are a lot of great agents. You need to contact those offices and tell them why you’re the best person for the job.”

When agents complain that they believed they’d spend the majority of their career overseas, DAS Rice corrects them. When he came on in the late 1980s, he says, “we never did get overseas.” Back then, there was a five-year rule before you could serve overseas. “We used to have more RSO jobs for our size. Now it’s way harder to be an RSO. You probably have to do multiple ARSO tours.” His advice to frustrated bidders: “There’s only one rule in the Foreign Service: needs of service. Sometimes you will benefit, sometimes you will not. Bloom where you’re planted, be flexible and work to make yourself into a commodity.”

Changing Times

“Bloom where you’re planted” is good advice not just for bidders, but for everyone under the umbrella of the Diplomatic Security Service. As they move into an increasingly uncertain and dangerous future, DS agents have to be prepared to change with the mission.

Flexibility, creativity and intense training are required of anyone who wants to stay in the bureau. The people who have survived and thrived as DS has taken on broader, more complex responsibilities are excited about the challenges they see ahead, even as they remain pragmatic about the struggles they’ll be forced to endure, both personally and professionally, to stay afloat.
The New Russia: A Conversation

AFSA headquarters was packed on Dec. 2, for a moderated conversation on “Russia: 25 Years after the Fall of the USSR,” the focus of December’s FSJ.


The conversation was moderated by Eric Green, a member of the FSJ Editorial Board and a career Foreign Service officer who has served in Moscow and is currently director of the Office of Russian Affairs.

Continued on page 63
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AFSA ELECTION: IMPORTANT DATES

The 2017 AFSA election for AFSA officers and constituency representatives is under way!

Meet the Candidates: A list of candidates for the 2017 AFSA election is available from the AFSA website, www.afsa.org/2017candidates. AFSA members are also encouraged to visit the AFSA Community to participate in an online discussion with candidates in the 2017 AFSA Governing Board Election & Bylaw Amendments discussion thread.

Campaign Literature: Candidates’ statements will be posted on the AFSA website on April 3. The year, for the first time, candidates have also been invited to submit campaign videos, which will be available through the AFSA website.

Please note that campaigning through employer email by any member is prohibited (with the exception of three pre-approved candidate email blasts).

Town Hall Meeting: A town hall meeting will take place on April 4 at 12 p.m. at the AFSA headquarters building, 2101 E St. NW Washington D.C. 20037. The event will be taped and made available via the AFSA YouTube channel.

Please ensure that AFSA has your current mailing address and personal email address on record. If you have any questions about the election, please contact the Committee on Elections, election@afsa.org.
Unconscious Bias: Share Your Thoughts With AFSA

In conjunction with Women’s History Month and International Women’s Day, and on the heels of Black History Month, I want to bring an issue to the attention of our membership and ask whether you’d like AFSA to pursue it.

The issue? Unconscious bias, stereotypes about certain groups of people that individuals form without being aware that they are doing so.

While often discussed in the press with regard to gender, unconscious bias actually affects a much wider range of colleagues, particularly those with ethnic names that might lead to assumptions about the employee’s race, religion or other attributes.

In the Foreign Service context, the most addressable risk posed by unconscious bias is that members of promotion panels might unwittingly apply it when they see names on evaluations. For example, research shows that memos circulated under a “typical” African-American name tend to be perceived as having more errors than when the same memos are circulated under a “typical” Caucasian name.

Promotion panels shouldn’t make assumptions, positive or negative, when they read evaluations, but some impressions can be unintentional and thus difficult to avoid.

The more I learned about this issue, the more concerned I became that the use of names in evaluations is a needless vulnerability.

One AFSA member put together a comprehensive paper on the topic, outlining studies of unconscious bias in various industries.

The paper also addresses common arguments against removing names from evaluations.

It concludes: “Using ‘the employee’ in place of names is a relatively easy fix to a thorny problem (and has the side benefit of meaning that both Tim and Abdulrahman have equal characters/lines free to discuss their actual skills).”

The results overwhelmingly convinced not only me, but also other members of the AFSA Governing Board, that name- and gender-free evaluations would greatly reduce the possibility of unconscious bias playing a real or even a perceived role in the promotion process, leaving employees less worried and more able to focus on their actual jobs.

We decided that this issue merits consultation with our members and, depending on your response, action from us in the shape of a formal proposal to the department. If you would like to see the entire paper, please email me at bryana@state.gov.

I encourage you to read more about unconscious bias, discuss it with your colleagues, think about it and write to me before April at bryana@state.gov with the subject line “Unconscious Bias” to let me know whether you would like us to pursue the issue with the department and ask them to stop including names and gender-identifying pronouns in Employee Evaluation Reports.

We’re happy to receive “yes” or “no” emails if you’re in a rush, but we’re equally delighted to receive longer emails with more detailed thoughts.

We are well aware that such a change would involve some hard work and the commitment of department resources, but we don’t think that either of those excuses justifies non-action if we determine that it’s the right thing to do.

As the aforementioned paper notes: “Possible solutions could include software that removes names or asking the employees to make the changes in their own files. At the very least, we should start with a revised policy in the next EER cycle, so that five years down the line, files will all have the identifying information omitted with almost no cost.”

Let us hear your thoughts. As an organization which describes itself as “the Voice of the Foreign Service,” we want to ensure that we’re fighting not only for what will strengthen the Foreign Service, but also for the issues that truly matter to our members.

One final note: Choosing to pursue this issue would not take time away from AFSA’s important legislative advocacy efforts—those are run out of AFSA headquarters by the AFSA president and the Professional Policy Issues staff.

As AFSA State VP, I focus on labor-management issues, which require negotiation with the department. Saying “yes” to this initiative would in no way imply saying “no” to or otherwise affecting our ongoing efforts on Capitol Hill.
Recommendations from Four Generations of Leaders

New administration transition periods provide an opportunity to reflect on what the new administration should understand as it moves forward on implementing the U.S. government’s foreign assistance program. Thomas Adams’ January FSJ article, “Foreign Assistance, Time to Sharpen a Vital Diplomatic Tool,” was an excellent piece on this topic.

The USAID Alumni Association is also a great source of knowledge. UAA’s 2016 Annual General Meeting, held in October at the Center for Global Development, featured a panel of previous USAID Administrators offering guidance to the new administration.


A blog post from the Center for Global Development highlights four recommendations for the new administration and the next USAID Administrator from these experienced leaders.

1. Review congressional directives and presidential initiatives. Gayle Smith discussed the need for the next administration to review existing directives and initiatives for consolidation or elimination before adding new ones. A 2016 CGD policy brief, “The White House and the World: Practical Proposals on Global Development for the Next U.S. President” calls for a full review of the agency that accounts for presidential initiatives and a commissioned report on existing congressional directives. Old directives and initiatives can be constraints to fundamental reform and adaptation at USAID.

2. Get USAID a seat at the policy table. Several administrators asserted that USAID needs to have a seat at the policy table, perhaps by including the Administrator in the Cabinet, so the agency can communicate the development perspective to others.

Atwood stated: “If you don’t have a voice at those tables, you’re going to see your own development initiatives undercut.”

Smith agreed, adding that other agencies are often eager for USAID’s input because of its expertise in development.

The CGD proposes: (1) the next president should provide USAID with budgetary and policy primacy over areas in which the agency demonstrates efficacy and focus; (2) the State Department’s Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance Resources should be moved back under the USAID Administrator.

3. Lead the interagency process without dominating. Smith said: “It’s leadership of all the various parts of government that have a role to play. That means working with other agencies and learning how to do that.”

Fore highlighted USAID’s expertise in bringing together partners for initiatives such as public-private partnerships.

USAID is also working to expand partnerships through its Local Solutions initiative and has increased the proportion of funds that flow through local partners.

CGD argues that working with other agencies is especially critical during the presidential transition.

4. Spend as much time on the inside as the outside. The next USAID Administrator needs to spend time and resources improving USAID’s internal capacity, human resources, procurement, hiring and data management.

McPherson said getting the agency working well “should be a stated, up-front” priority. Smith, who initiated a strategy to transform human resources, added that the next Administrator needs to pick up the baton to ensure continuity on these issues.

CGD recommends that internal weaknesses at USAID must be addressed, especially hiring procedures. USAID should focus on hiring for specific skill sets and providing more funds for staff preparation and training.

Further suggestions by the panel included:

• Take time to understand how USAID projects work and the history of USAID’s successes and failures.

• Listen to staff to benefit from their field experience and insights and to assess staffing needs.

• Focus on the balance between field missions and headquarters, decentralizing as much as possible.

• Develop a strong policy staff that links development objectives to broad U.S. foreign policy objectives.

• Improve information management to build on the knowledge base and to improve communications with field staff, partners and congressional staff and members.

USAID currently has bipartisan support in Congress, as reflected in the passage of legislation such as Power Africa and Feed the Future. USAID FSOs drive American foreign policy toward its objectives of global peace, stability and prosperity.

A responsibility as noble and monumental as this requires and deserves thorough discussion and support throughout the transition.
Best Foot Forward

Foreign Service officers in the Foreign Agricultural Service are too modest. We have failed to fully recognize the role of economic diplomacy in the broader foreign affairs context and to capitalize on opportunities to increase that role in the wider foreign affairs community.

Although FAS is vitally important as a lifeline between our constituents and Congress, we also stubbornly resist the urge to go beyond the protected bubble of the D.C.-based agriculture community. Why do we expend so little effort on going directly to our stakeholders to explain the importance of the Foreign Service and our work for the American people?

The change in administration gives us the perfect opportunity to rethink this and directly engage with our stakeholders, including farmers, ranchers and the industries that facilitate agricultural trade. This is a prime opportunity for us in two clear ways.

First, the entire electorate is now engaged on the subject of the cost and benefits of trade. Though most producers understand how the value of their food products is increased by the addition of foreign demand, I believe that rural non-farm workers and the general public don’t see the link between that added value and the economic health of their communities.

Second, people have expressed their concern about the size of government and the value it brings. Studies have repeatedly shown that one dollar invested by the U.S. government in market access or marketing of agricultural exports yields many multiples in economic activity that ripple across the economy.

This is our chance to educate the public about the work FAS does and why it benefits them. I feel that FAS FSOs have an obligation to spend more time inside the United States, sharing our experiences about how our work improves lives and is a good investment that needs to be sustained.

Even though our friends in the Foreign Commercial Service have domestic offices and FAS does not, the reason they are much more effective in this regard is because they view direct interaction with stakeholders as an essential activity.

Blaming FAS management for not making this a priority or not pushing FSOs to the forefront is missing the point; it is up to FAS FSOs to change our culture, to make stakeholder interactions a priority for our time and resources.

We have a positive role to play in the ongoing national discussion about the benefits of agricultural trade and how it can be done better; we should waste no time in telling America our stories.

AFSA WINS REINSTATEMENT OF FCS TO RETIREMENT PROGRAM

In December, AFSA’s Labor Management team successfully reversed a decision by the Foreign Commercial Service barring FCS Foreign Service officers from participation in the Foreign Service Institute’s Retirement Program.

In 2016, the FCS unilaterally eliminated participation in the Job Search Program for eligible FCS FSOs. The program prepares those planning to retire for life after the Foreign Service. Given the rigors of the up or out system established in the Foreign Service Act, members of the Foreign Service routinely face the stark reality of separation well before they might choose to leave the Service, so the elimination of this helpful transition program was particularly unwelcome. In response, AFSA filed an implementation dispute against the FCS in September.

In changing this condition of employment without providing AFSA notice and affording the union an opportunity to bargain over such a change, AFSA argued, the agency violated AFSA’s collective bargaining agreement and the agency’s past practice of permitting participation for eligible FSOs.

For decades prior to the sudden change, FCS had provided Foreign Service employees eligible for retirement within five years the opportunity to participate in the program. As FCS mandatory retirements due to age will more than double in the 2018-2020 timeframe versus the prior three years (2015-2017), the opportunity to attend these sessions becomes all the more important.

The dispute was settled when FCS agreed to negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding with AFSA. The MOU provides that all Foreign Service employees may participate in the program, including those otherwise-eligible FS employees who had been denied participation prior to the filing of the implementation dispute.

—Colleen Fallon-Lenaghan, Labor Management Counselor
When Your Security Clearance Is Suspended

“In accordance with U.S. governmentwide standards set forth in Executive Orders 10490 and 12968, Governmentwide Adjudicative Guidelines and Department of State regulations, the Office of Personnel Security and Suitability (DS/SI/PSS) has determined that your continued access to classified information is not clearly consistent with the interests of national security. Your Top Secret security clearance is suspended pending the vetting of a DS investigation.”

When you started your Foreign Service career, you never imagined that you would receive a notification like that. Unfortunately, misconduct or allegations of misconduct both inside and outside of work hours could lead to such a letter.

As noted in 3 FAM 4376, “because of the uniqueness of the Foreign Service, employees are considered to be on duty 24 hours a day and must observe especially high standards of conduct during and after working hours and when on leave or in travel status.”

In AFSA’s experience, the most common reasons for suspended clearances are failure to report foreign contacts, lack of candor during investigations conducted by Diplomatic Security and the Office of the Inspector General, illegal behavior or behavior which could make one vulnerable to coercion (e.g., frequenting prostitutes, affairs that have not been disclosed to the employee’s spouse), failure to pay taxes, and a pattern of rules violations.

The Waiting Game

What happens next? The short answer is—you wait. Individuals with a suspended security clearance have no grievance or appeal rights from the suspension decision, because it is considered an “interim measure” and not an “adverse action.”

Historically, those individuals with suspended clearances remain in pay status, and the department generally places them in a DG overcomplement status and/or assigns them to positions that do not require access to classified information. With the December 2016 passage of the FY17 State Authorization Act which includes language in Section 415 allowing “suspension without duties” for those with suspended security clearances, this practice may change.

The Act permits, but does not require, the Secretary of State to place a member of the Service in a “temporary status without duties” when the member’s security clearance is suspended. When read in conjunction with the Administrative Leave Act of 2016, this Act does not appear to significantly change the existing practice.

However, to date AFSA has not heard from the Department regarding its interpretation.

If your security clearance is revoked, you will be given notice of the reasons for the revocation and the opportunity to respond. If the assistant secretary for Diplomatic Security upholds the revocation, you can appeal that decision to the Department of State’s Security Appeals Panel. Note: all foreign affairs agencies have similar appeal procedures.

How long do you have to wait for the review of your case to be completed? The short answer is—it depends.

AFSA has seen cases range from six months to, in one extreme case, nine years. Based on cases seen by AFSA’s Labor Management Office in the last five years, the average suspension lasts 21 months.

What is happening during those 21 months? Several things.

Whether it is a decision to suspend, revoke or reinstate an employee’s clearance, DS has a seven-layer internal process for reviewing and clearing on a recommendation to the director of DS. This internal process includes reviews by the DS/SI/PSS and Legal (L/M/DS).

If, following the review, a determination is made to recommend suspension or revocation of the employee’s clearance, the decision must be made by the senior coordinator for security infrastructure (DS/SI) and approved by the director of DS. If the recommendation is approved by the director, the employee is notified of the suspension or revocation.

Due Process Rights

While there are no grievance or appeal rights from a decision to suspend their security clearance, employees do still have procedural due process rights, albeit limited, should their security clearance be revoked.

These include the right to representation; the right to request a copy of the investigatory file, as permitted by national security and other applicable law; the right to refute or rebut the department’s case for the revocation decision; and the right to appeal any adverse decision to the Security Appeal Panel.

If you are advised that your security clearance has been revoked or is under review, we strongly urge you to contact AFSA as soon as possible, so that the Labor Management team can help you navigate the process. Contact information is available on the AFSA website; www.afsa.org/member-guidance.

—Raeka Safai, Esq., Deputy General Counsel

NOTES FROM LABOR MANAGEMENT
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Raeka Safai
AFSA Treasurer’s 2016 Report: Poised to Take Advantage of New Opportunities

I am pleased to report that the American Foreign Service Association is in excellent financial health. As we advance our work in 2017, our strong financial position allows us to take advantage of new opportunities while also responding to serious challenges to our core mission as the “Voice of the Foreign Service.”

This report provides a financial overview and describes innovative initiatives included in the 2017 budget process to enhance our fundraising, communication and outreach programs to garner greater public awareness and support for the Foreign Service.

Over the course of 2016 we expanded our very strong membership base while initiating a process to strategically realign resources to advance the overarching strategic vision established by our president, Ambassador Barbara Stephens, and the Governing Board.

We ended 2016 with 16,571 members, up from 16,446 in 2015. This represents 78 percent of our potential membership in terms of eligible members of the Foreign Service from the various foreign affairs agencies. As a result of our strong membership base, we are able to sustain a staff of 32 professionals supported by an operating budget of $4.5 million.

Flexibility and Heightened Security

To protect our organization from unforeseen risks, we maintain a reserve fund of $2.9 million that is dedicated to the protection of obligations assumed in our operating budget together with unanticipated capital maintenance expenditures. Industry best practice for a union or professional association like AFSA is to maintain an amount roughly equal to six months of operating expenses in reserve. In our case, we allocate a slightly higher amount because we also seek to shelter our investments from market turbulence.

Our Scholarship Fund, a 501(c)(3) entity, currently totals $8 million. Funds are restricted and can only be used for scholarships, with a certain percentage of gains withdrawn each year to fund our Scholarship program. Last year AFSA disbursed $253,500 in 156 scholarships awarded to 89 students.

Finally, in terms of our balance sheet, we own our headquarters building at 21st and E Street debt-free.

Combined, this level of reserves and real estate ownership provide AFSA with a substantial benefit. For example, when AFSA renovated its headquarters a decade ago, it was able to reduce costs by utilizing funds from the operating reserve and also by taking out a loan from the Scholarship Fund.

Late last year we were able to pay off this loan.

By paying off this below-market loan two years early, we carved out important new room for priority activities in our operating budget over the last quarter of 2016 that can continue to be funded on an annual basis starting in 2017.

These achievements are important in that they allow us to dedicate more money to priority activities while minimizing costs to our membership; dues were not increased in 2016 and were only increased by 1.5 percent in 2017.

The diversity and depth of our assets provide AFSA with enormous flexibility and heightened security in these uncertain financial and political times.

A Significant Decision for Future Growth

The most significant decision with regard to finances taken for 2017, however, was the creation for the first time of separate operating budgets for our two 501(3)(c) entities; the aforementioned Scholarship Fund and the Fund for American Diplomacy.

No additional resources were allocated for the Scholarship Fund, but the Governing Board established an independent budget for the program for the first time. The fund now has important new transparency as to income and expenses, as well as insight into the management of the various scholarships granted annually. This year, with the help of outside experts, AFSA will be identifying and implementing established best practices for scholarship funds like ours. The aim is to enhance the efficiency and quality of how we run this program, which is greatly valued by our members.

The Fund for American Diplomacy (known as the FAD) was established on Oct. 22, 1954, as an arm of AFSA to educate the public on the role of American diplomacy and engage in consistent and wide-ranging public outreach to further that goal. Despite its creation more than 60 years ago, the FAD had never been given a budget and distinct management structure. Addressing those deficiencies has now made the FAD an ideal vehicle to enhance our revenue through development efforts both short- and long-term. It also provides the structure to form strategic partnerships to advance the cause of heightened public awareness of the importance of diplomacy, development and the U.S. Foreign Service. As a result, member dues can be directed mainly to core activities such as labor-management and services for members.
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For 2017, the Governing Board has injected $100,000 of funds from the operating reserve into the initial FAD budget, with the objective of jump-starting a larger and more focused set of activities to achieve the FAD mission. This new budget, with its potential to expand our fundraising totals, is vital to our ability to both build out and sustain our program and mission to serve as the “Voice of the Foreign Service.” Success will be measured by the impact we have on advancing the understanding of the American public and key stakeholders of the importance of diplomacy and development, and the Foreign Service’s role in its conduct.

Our strong financial position entering 2017 allows us to continue our long-standing work in support of workforce planning and the union, while opening up new programs and services that advance the mission of our professional association.

In conclusion, the table above shows key data and indicators that capture our current financial situation numerically. To provide context, I also have included data that covers five-year periods since 2000. I believe this history is important in that it creates an awareness of our financial health and a sense of gratitude to prior boards and AFSA leaders for their careful stewardship of the resources of the growing AFSA membership.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve as your Treasurer in this 2013-2017 timeframe. Best wishes for a happy, healthy and peaceful 2017.

—Ambassador (ret.) Charles Ford, AFSA Treasurer

AFSA DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>10,755</td>
<td>13,303</td>
<td>15,438</td>
<td>16,446</td>
<td>16,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget</td>
<td>$2,757,589</td>
<td>$3,471,200</td>
<td>$4,000,187</td>
<td>$4,359,386</td>
<td>$4,464,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserve</td>
<td>$407,111</td>
<td>$1,695,471</td>
<td>$2,933,839</td>
<td>$3,271,799</td>
<td>$2,944,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Reserve</td>
<td>$4,581,392</td>
<td>$4,359,903</td>
<td>$4,465,238</td>
<td>$6,696,108</td>
<td>$8,195,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The Full-time equivalent)

The New Russia

Continued from page 57

people attended the event.

Beginning the discussion, Mr. Sell recalled the moment he received the call from the Kremlin announcing the resignation of Mikhail Gorbachev, then-president of the Soviet Union, and the “moment of euphoria” at the end of the Cold War.

He discussed the use of intelligence gathering to analyze Russian media, the Soviet governing system, and also addressed the expansion of NATO into former Soviet republics after the fall of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Sell spoke about the role played by radio in the collapse of the Soviet Union, noting that the BBC and Voice of America broadcasts were extremely influential, with approximately 50 percent of the Russian population tuning in to Radio Liberty during the Cold War era.

Considering the merits of studying Russia and U.S.-Russia relations, Mr. Sell said that he is “a deep believer in specialization.” He recommended that Foreign Service officers focus on language training and that senior officials live “outside the bubble,” engaging with the local people at their post.

An engaging Q&A session followed, in which Mr. Sell answered questions on a variety of topics, including his opinion of Boris Yeltsin, the role of the Politburo and the importance of so called cyber-warfare.

Concluding the event, Mr. Sell was asked if he had any advice for the incoming administration. “The first challenge is nuclear,” he said, noting that Russia still has a huge nuclear arsenal. Secondly, he advised, “Don’t obsess over Russia: it is not the most dangerous threat facing the United States today.”

Check the calendar or sign up for email alerts to receive information about the next moderated conversation with FSJ authors.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor
This year, AFSA celebrates the 90th anniversary of its scholarship program.

The first AFSA scholarship was established in 1926 by Elizabeth Harriman in honor of her son, Oliver Bishop Harriman, a Foreign Service officer who died while serving overseas. Since that time, AFSA has bestowed more than $5 million in college aid on more than 3,000 students.

The AFSA Scholarship Fund has now grown to $8.1 million dollars, thanks to the generous donations of hundreds of individuals and organizations who have established annual and perpetual scholarships. AFSA particularly thanks DACOR for their annual scholarships, which are administered by the AFSA Scholarship Program.

Every March, the Scholarship Committee receives financial aid applications from Foreign Service dependents who are full-time students. The committee reviews all applications and, taking into account a number of factors (including family income and assets), selects the financial aid scholarship recipients.

Awards range from $3,000 to $5,000 each. Since AFSA scholarships differ in size, smaller ones are bundled together to make larger awards, while some of the larger ones are broken into several smaller awards. Students make one application; the Scholarship Committee matches students to the appropriate scholarships, in accordance with any special instruction or restrictions on each scholarship.

Recipients receive biographical information about their award donors, and submit thank-you letters and photos to the donor or their family. In this way, AFSA seeks to strengthen the connections within the Foreign Service, between generations, and to foster a sense of community among its members.

For the 2016-2017 school year, 67 undergraduate students received 134 named financial aid scholarship awards totaling $208,000.

On the following pages the AFSA Financial Aid Scholarship recipients for the 2016-2017 academic year are listed, along with the named AFSA scholarships they received. The program is run under the oversight of the AFSA Scholarship Committee and the AFSA Governing Board.

AFSA also confers a number of merit award scholarships, which are open to graduating high school seniors. Information about the 2016-2017 merit award recipients will appear in a future issue of AFSA News.

For more information about AFSA Financial Aid and Merit Award Scholarships, please visit www.afsa.org/scholar or contact Lori Dec, AFSA Scholarship Director, at (202) 944 5504 or dec@afsa.org.

**Marilyn Holmes Annual Memorial Scholarship**

Ambassador H. Allen Holmes, with assistance from friends and colleagues, has established the annual Marilyn Holmes Memorial Financial Aid Scholarship in tribute to his wife, who passed away in May 2016. It will be awarded in the 2017-2018 school year.

Marilyn Holmes was an award-winning documentary producer for the U.S. State Department. She was recognized with the Secretary of State’s Distinguished Public Service Award for her innovative television news programs designed to keep employees informed on the latest diplomatic developments.

In 1980, Mrs. Holmes was named director of the State Department’s Family Liaison Office. One of her major achievements in this role was negotiating reciprocal work agreements with foreign governments to allow Foreign Service spouses to work in their countries.

**It is organizations like yours that inspire young adults like me to reach our goals in life.**

—Najee Agu, Junior, Old Dominion University

**Financial Aid Scholars**

1. **Najee Agu**—recipient of the Edith K. and Wilbur J. Carr Memorial Scholarship and the Gertrude Stewart Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Old Dominion University.

2. **Brenden Aguasvivas**—recipient of the Colonel Richard R. Hallock Memorial Scholarship and the Dorothy Osborne and Theodore Xanthaky Memorial Scholarship. He is attending St. Louis University.
3. Anandan Amirthanayagam—recipient of the Linda K. Fitzgerald Memorial Scholarship and the John Campbell White Scholarship. He is attending Brown University.

4. Adriana Arancibia Tejada—recipient of the Turner C. Cameron Jr. Memorial Scholarship and the John M. and Anna B. Steeves Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Manhattan School of Music.

5. Sagal Badeh—recipient of the Elbert G. and Naomi M. Mathews Memorial Scholarship and the Omar Sykes Memorial Scholarship. She is attending West Coast University.

6. Tess Bliss—recipient of the Brockman C. and Marcia Martin Moore Memorial Scholarship and the Naomi Pekmezian Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Virginia Commonwealth University.

7. Jacqueline Burdan—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Heyward G. Hill Memorial Scholarship. She is attending John Cabot University, Italy.

8. Jeffrey Carlson—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Heyward G. Hill Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Wheaton College.

9. Sarah Carlson—recipient of the James Bolard More Memorial Scholarship and the George Shultz Scholarship. She is attending Wheaton College.

10. Allison Childers—recipient of the Norton Bell Scholarship and the Suzanne Marie Collins Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Liberty University.

11. Dylan Childers—recipient of the William Benton Memorial Scholarship and the Robert and Evelyn Curtis Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Liberty University.

12. Kirsten Christensen—recipient of the Linda K. Fitzgerald Memorial Scholarship and the Rozanne L. (Roz) Ridgway Scholarship. She is attending Florida State University.

13. Kobe Collins—recipient of the Fallen Diplomats in Libya Scholarship and the Harry A. Havens Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Colorado State University.

14. Laila Covington—recipient of the Gertrude Stewart Memorial Scholarship and the Dorothy Osborne and Theodore Xanthaky Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Northern Virginia Community College.

15. Clarissa Crawford—recipient of the Marc Grossman and Mildred Patterson Scholarship and the Edith K. and Wilbur J. Carr Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Erasmus University, Rotterdam.

16. Randall Crawford—recipient of the John and Hope Rogers Bastek Memorial Scholarship, the Louis C. Boocher Memorial Scholarship and the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Harriet C. Thurgood Memorial Scholarship. He is attending the University of Hawaii.

17. Winston Crawford—recipient of the Philip C. Habib Memorial Scholarship and the

Thank you so much for making my college costs more affordable with this scholarship. I would not be where I am today without generous donors like you.
—Stephen Feldmayer, Junior, West Chester University

Elbert G. and Naomi M. Mathews Perpetual Memorial Scholarship
Elbert G. Mathews, accompanied by his wife, Naomi M. Mathews, served for 37 years in the Foreign Service in five countries on three continents. He was U.S. ambassador to Liberia in 1959 and U.S. ambassador to Nigeria from 1964 to 1969. Naomi Mathews served as the AAFSW president from 1970 to 1972 and participated in AAFSW’s oral history program. The Mathews’ estate established this scholarship in 2002. The couple had no children of their own, but many who knew them were not surprised by their generous gift to promote the education of Foreign Service children.
Gertrude Stewart Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Colorado State University.

18. Dillon Cummings—recipient of the Edith K. and Wilbur J. Carr Memorial Scholarship, the John Foster Dulles Memorial Scholarship and the Ernest V. Siracusa Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Colorado State University.

19. Kristina Cummings—recipient of the Elizabeth M. and William E. Cole Memorial Scholarship and the Dorothy Osborne and Theodore Xanthaky Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Concordia University, Canada.

20. Lisa Curbow—recipient of the Anthony G. Freeman Memorial Scholarship and the Dorothy Osborne and Theodore Xanthaky Memorial Scholarship. She is attending the University of Central Florida.

21. Alexander Dougherty—recipient of the Linda K. Fitzgerald Memorial Scholarship, the Harriet Winsar Isom Scholarship and the Dorothy Osborne and Theodore Xanthaky Memorial Scholarship. He is attending the University of California, Davis.

22. Stephen Feldmayer—recipient of the Louis C. and Valeria Hebert Memorial Scholarship and the Kiang Fund for Excellence Scholarship. He is attending West Chester University.

23. Justin Green—recipient of the Terence Flannery Annual Memorial Scholarship and the Lawsuit over the Movie “Missing” Scholarship. He is attending Richard Bland College.

24. Cierra Hackler—recipient of the Elbert G. and Naomi M. Mathews Memorial Scholarship and the Elizabeth N. Landeau Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Molloy College.

25. Rhea Hanks—recipient of the William Leonhart Memorial Scholarship and the Elbert G. and Naomi M. Mathews Memorial Scholarship. She is attending the University of Oklahoma.

26. Sophie Hannah—recipient of the Linda K. Fitzgerald Memorial Scholarship and the Horace J. and Evelyn K. Nickles Memorial Scholarship. She is attending James Madison University.

27. Erin Harris—recipient of the Rose Marie Asch Scholarship, the Dalton V. Killion Memorial Scholarship and the Gertrude Stewart Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Bowdoin College.

28. Raina Haynes-Klaver—recipient of the George and Mattie Newman Memorial Scholarship and the C. Montagu and Francis M. Pigott Memorial Scholarship. She

Joshua Lane-Holman McMackle Memorial Scholarship
Ms. Tracy McMackle, a Foreign Service officer with the Foreign Agricultural Service, established this scholarship in memory of her son, Joshua. Joshua was tragically shot in the final weeks of his freshman year at Texas Southern University, passing away in 2010. Joshua was born in 1991 in Belgium, and spent the majority of his life living abroad in Bonn, Berlin, Moscow and Tokyo. He began attending Randolph-Macon Academy in his final two years of high school, where he learned to fly and played on the varsity basketball team. Being a “third culture kid,” he found it easier to say he was from his father’s home state of Virginia, earning him the nickname “VA.”

In 2015, his mother was able to accrue the funds to bring this tribute to fruition. She says: “It gives me comfort to know that Joshua’s name will live on, and that this memorial scholarship will be helping others.”

[AFSA’s] generosity helps students like me achieve our goals and pursue our interests in international affairs.
—Benjamin Murphy Pineda, Sophomore, Santa Barbara City College
is attending San Jose State University.

29. Abigail Hill—recipient of the Louis C. and Valeria Hebert Memorial Scholarship and Elbert G. and Naomi M. Mathews Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Mount Holyoke College.

30. William Holtrop—recipient of the Linda K. Fitzgerald Memorial Scholarship and the George and Mattie Newman Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Calvin College.

31. Luke Howlett—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Heyward G. Hill Memorial Scholarship. He is attending St. Lawrence University.

32. John Huyett—recipient of the Linda K. Fitzgerald Memorial Scholarship and the Oliver Bishop Harriman Memorial Scholarship. He is attending the University of Nicosia, Cyprus.

33. Liam Kierans—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Heyward G. Hill Memorial Scholarship. He is attending the College of William & Mary.

34. Christopher Martinez—recipient of the David D. Newsom Memorial Scholarship, the Martin G. Patterson Memorial Scholarship and the Lowell C. Pinkerton Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Tecnologico de Monterrey, Mexico.

35. Allison May—recipient of the Harriet P. Culley Memorial Scholarship, the Victor H. Skiles Memorial and Ruth Nay Skiles Scholarship, and the Sheldon Whitehouse Memorial Scholarship. She is attending George Mason University.

36. Connor McKinney—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Virginia Thurgood Bingham Memorial Scholarship. He is attending the University of California, Berkeley.

37. Kieran McKinney—recipient of the Linda K. Fitzgerald Memorial Scholarship and the Louis C. and Valeria Hebert Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Virginia Tech University.

38. Daniel Murphy Pineda—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Heyward G. Hill Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Santa Barbara City College.

39. Benjamin Murphy Pineda—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Heyward G. Hill Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Santa Barbara City College.

40. Jacob Murri—recipient of the Louis C. and Valeria Hebert Memorial Scholarship and the Elbert G. and Prabhi G. Kavaler Memorial Financial Aid Scholarship

Prabhi G. Kavalner Memorial Financial Aid Scholarship

Prabhi Kavalner was one of 11 U.S. citizens killed in the terrorist bombing of the U.S. embassy in Nairobi on Aug. 7, 1998. She and her husband, had arrived in Kenya less than three weeks before the bombing and were at work at the embassy when the bomb exploded. Prabhi Kavalner was killed instantly and was buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

Born in India, Mrs. Kavalner chose a second tour in Africa with her husband so they could introduce their young daughters to the exotic life offered by the Foreign Service. The couple had served in Pakistan, the Philippines, Israel, Paris and Nairobi (1990-1992). Howard Kavalner established an AFSA perpetual scholarship in his wife’s name in October 1998.
Naomi M. Mathews Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Brigham Young University.

41. Ashton Omdahl—recipient of the Joshua Lane Holman McMackle Memorial Scholarship and the Clara C. and Everett K. Melby Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Brigham Young University.

42. Iryna Onasenko—recipient of the Elbert G. and Naomi M. Mathews Memorial Scholarship and the Brockman C. and Marcia Martin Moore Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Clark University.

43. Sarah Patton—recipient of the Gertrude Stewart Memorial Scholarship and the Dorothy Osborne and Theodore Xanthaky Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Selkirk College, Canada.

44. Aidan Pazan—recipient of the Betty Carp Memorial Scholarship, the Linda K. Fitzgerald Memorial Scholarship, and the Dorothy Osborne and Theodore Xanthaky Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Ohio University.

45. Ansley Pearson—recipient of the Brockman C. and Marcia Martin Moore Memorial Scholarship and the Christopher and Eliza Van Hollen Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Clark University.

46. Isaac Pearson—recipient of the C. Edward Dillery Memorial Scholarship and the Linda K. Fitzgerald Memorial Scholarship. He is attending James Madison University.

47. Alana Perera—recipient of the Louis C. and Valeria Hebert Memorial Scholarship and the Brockman C. and Marcia Martin Moore Memorial Scholarship. She is attending California State University, Northridge.

48. Rebecca Post—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Heyward G. Hill Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Virginia Tech University.

49. Tatiana Ravelomanana—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Virginia Thurgood Bingham Memorial Scholarship, DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Harriet C. Thurgood Memorial Scholarship, and the Arthur B. Emmons Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Liberty University.

50. Connor Rhodes—recipient of the Adolph Dubs Memorial Scholarship, the Francesca Bufano Lapinski Memorial Scholarship and the Gertrude Stewart Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Virginia Commonwealth University.

51. Andrea Salazar—recipient of the Louis C. and Valeria Hebert Memorial Scholarship and the Douglas Keene Memorial/Sharon Papp Scholarship. She is attending George Mason University.

52. Eduardo Salazar—recipient of the Elbert G. and Naomi M. Mathews Memorial Scholarship and the Brockman C. and Marcia Martin Moore Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Trinity University.

53. Enrique Saunders—recipient of the Louis C. and Valeria Hebert Memorial Scholarship and the Brockman C. and Marcia Martin Moore Memorial Scholarship. He is attending the University of Reading, United Kingdom.

54. Kathleen Saunders—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Heyward G. Hill Memorial Scholarship. She is attending the University of New Mexico.

55. Amelia Smith—recipient of the Brockman C. and Marcia Martin Moore Memorial Scholarship and the George and Mattie Newman Memorial Scholarship. She is attending the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

56. Avery Smith—recipient of the George and Mattie Newman Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Oberlin College.

57. Madeline Strandemo—recipient of the John and Alice Hubler Annual Scholarship. She is attending the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

This financial aid will not only help my family and me pay for my education, but it will also motivate me to do well in all my classes and succeed in the future.

—Daniel Murphy Pineda, Sophomore, Santa Barbara City College

Recipients of the 2016-2017 AFSA Financial Aid Scholarships. See numbered list for the name of each recipient, their school and the named award they received.
This fund allows me to worry less about my finances and focus on my studies and goals.
—Kathleen Saunders, Junior, University of New Mexico

58. Katherine Sweeney—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Harriet C. Thurgood Memorial Scholarship. She is attending the University of Virginia.

59. Tylere Twitty—recipient of the Albert E. and Dorothy Carter Memorial Scholarship, the Walter K. Schwinn Memorial Scholarship and the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Harriet C. Thurgood Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Brigham Young University.

60. Antigone Valen—recipient of the Barbara Bell Black Memorial Scholarship, the Janet K. and Charles C. Stelle Memorial Scholarship and the John C. Whitehead Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Princeton University.

61. Jackson Valen—recipient of the Louise Holscher Memorial Scholarship and the George and Mattie Newman Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Bates College.

62. Arianna Volciak—recipient of the DACOR Bacon House Foundation/Virginia Thurgood Bingham Memorial Scholarship. She is attending Marymount University.

63. Jordan Walker—recipient of the Brockman C. and Marcia Martin Moore Memorial Scholarship and the George and Mattie Newman Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Loyola Marymount University.

64. Pearl Wilcock—recipient of the Brockman C. and Marcia Martin Moore Memorial Scholarship and the William P. and Adele Langston Rogers Memorial Scholarship. She is attending the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

65. Evangeline Wilton—recipient of the Susan Lowe Modi Memorial Scholarship, the George and Mattie Newman Memorial Scholarship and the Jacq Bachman Siracusa Scholarship. She is attending Saint Michael’s College.

66. Daniel Wolff—recipient of the Louis C. and Valeria Hebert Memorial Scholarship, the Prabhi G. Kavaler Memorial Scholarship, the Elbert G. and Naomi M. Mathews Memorial Scholarship and the Dorothy Osborne and Theodore Xanthaky Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Columbia International University.

67. Jonathan Wolff—recipient of the Louis C. and Valeria Hebert Memorial Scholarship and the Brockman C. and Marcia Martin Moore Memorial Scholarship. He is attending Hillsdale College.
AFSA Encourages Retiree Outreach

On Nov. 9, AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson attended a meeting with the Foreign Service Group of Austin, Texas. Led by former FSOs John Wood and Joe McLean, the group is composed of retired Foreign Service officers and family members, as well as academics and business people who have spent significant time outside the United States.

Opening the meeting, Amb. Stephenson thanked the group for their work in reaching out to the public and telling the story of the Foreign Service to those who are not aware what members of the Foreign Service do.

She also noted that retirees are a vital lifeline for AFSA, not only in telling the story of the Foreign Service but also in sharing with AFSA how people in their communities see the Foreign Service.

“We depend on you,” she said, “to keep us up to speed on how the Foreign Service is seen outside the D.C. Beltway, how foreign affairs issues are playing with the American public, how we at AFSA can better serve our members and, most importantly, how the Foreign Service can better serve the American people.”

Discussing the recent U.S. presidential election, Amb. Stephenson spoke about AFSA’s engagement with congressional members on both sides of the aisle, and reiterated the commitment of members of the Foreign Service to provide the best advice to the new president and Secretary of State. “Our obligations remain the same from administration to administration, from Congress to Congress,” she stated.

In closing, Amb. Stephenson encouraged the Foreign Service Group to continue their great work in reaching out to their families, neighbors and broader communities, to share their expertise but also to humanize a profession which is frequently misunderstood and can seem distant and abstract.

She congratulated them on the engagement of their membership and their impressive schedule of activities, including bimonthly luncheons with prestigious speakers.

The group then held a question and discussion session, reviewing topics such as the development of a domestic constituency, the foreign policy challenges facing the United States today and the challenges for the Foreign Service in this new world.

—Gemma Dvorak, Associate Editor

Calling All Retirees!

AFSA’s recently launched 50-state outreach strategy aims at improving recognition of and support for the Foreign Service among the general public, and we are looking to engage with you!

Are you part of a Foreign Service retiree group in your area? Contact AFSA (member@afsa.org), and let us know about your group and its activities. We hope to feature a number of retiree groups in The Foreign Service Journal’s bimonthly “Retiree Corner.”

RENEWING YOUR RETIREE ID CARD

Diplomatic Security issues retiree ID cards that provide limited access to the Harry S Truman building.

State Department retirees are reminded of the two-step process to obtain or renew a retiree ID card/access badge: (1) complete DS-1838 at State’s Office of Retirement at Columbia Plaza (202) 261-8960 and (2) proceed to Diplomatic Security Identification Services at Main State, where you must present two forms of identification, at least one must be a photo ID.

For the complete procedures, visit the AFSA website at www.afsa.org/new-retiree-id-cards. Information about other retiree services offered by AFSA is available at www.afsa.org/retiree.
**FSJ Digital Archive: A Test Run**

In Spring 2017, AFSA will launch the digital archive of 99 years of *The Foreign Service Journal*.

This unique archive contains a century of diplomatic history as seen through the eyes of those who witnessed and shaped it firsthand. On the pages of the *Journal*, members of the Foreign Service have captured major world developments and foreign policy debates.

AFSA regularly receives requests for particular articles or topics from previous editions of the FSJ. Requests range from specific articles from a certain issue, to all articles by a specific author, to all articles on topics as diverse as PTSD and typewriter use in U.S. embassies.

The *Journal* recently received a request from author Merrill King to locate information on Richard Fyfe Boyce, a consular officer who served in Yokohama from 1933 to 1940, and Pieter Irwin Brown, an artist who was commissioned by Boyce to produce images of the consulate in Japan. Boyce was a Foreign Service officer who served in numerous posts from 1920 to 1948 and went on to be a founder of DACOR.

AFSA publications staff were pleased to let Mr. King test out the new archive files and we are pleased to report he did find a few useful articles.

AFSA publications and communications staff are at work getting the files ready to share and be found online.

We hope that the new digital FSJ archive will prove to be an indispensable resource for those conducting primary-source research on U.S. diplomatic history and American foreign policy and for others who simply want to immerse themselves in the rich, lively and deeply consequential experiences of the Foreign Service.

—Dmitry Filipoff, Publications Coordinator
AFSA Governing Board Meeting, December 7, 2016

Welcome: AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson welcomed new USAID Representative Ann Posner.
Consent Agenda: The Governing Board approved the consent agenda items, which were: (1) the Nov. 2 Governing Board meeting minutes; (2) Jenna Bucha’s and William Hansen’s resignations from the Committee on Elections; and (3) Mary Ellen (Meg) Gilroy’s resignation as Chair of the Committee on Elections.
Unconscious Bias: State Vice President Angie Bryan gave a presentation on “Unconscious Bias in the Foreign Service.”
LCAD Award: The Awards and Plaques Committee provided the board with their recommendation for the recipient of the 2017 Lifetime Contributions to American Diplomacy award. The committee’s recommendations were accepted, and the selected recipient will be announced in a future issue of The Foreign Service Journal.
Committee Vacancies: Amb. Barbara Stephenson proposed that a notice be sent to AFSA members soliciting volunteers to fill the vacancies on the Committee on Elections. With no objection, the proposal was approved.

AFSA Governing Board Meeting, January 4, 2017

Consent Agenda: The Governing Board approved the consent agenda items, which were: (1) approval of the Dec. 7 Governing Board meeting minutes.
Committee on Elections: Committee member Mort Dworken gave the report of the committee, which included guidelines on the AFSA election.
State Representative Keith Hanigan moved that the Governing Board ask the Committee on Elections to seek to increase participation of the membership in the upcoming election. The motion passed unanimously.
FCS Representative Suzanne Platt moved that the Governing Board ask the Committee on Elections to seek to increase awareness of and participation in the nomination process. The motion passed unanimously.
The Committee on Elections, in a memo to the Governing Board, recommended that Francis Hall, David McFarland, Peter Molberg, Curtis Whittaker, Susan Wong and Lee Brayman be appointed as members. With no objection, the board accepted the recommendations.
Retiree Representative Ambassador Al La Porta moved that Mort Dworken be appointed as (Acting) Chair of the Committee on Elections. The motion was approved unanimously.
Position Descriptions: On behalf of the Executive Committee, AFSA Treasurer Ambassador Charles Ford moved that the Governing Board position descriptions be amended to show that the president is the chief executive officer of AFSA and has responsibility for supervising the executive director. The motion passed unanimously.
Retiree Vice President Ambassador Thomas Boyatt moved, on behalf of the Executive Committee, that the president’s position description be amended to include the following: “Chief Executive Officer—the President directly supervises the following AFSA staff members: the Executive Director, the Director of Communications, the Director of Professional Policy Issues, and the Special Assistant to the President. This includes setting and adjusting work requirements, monitoring progress and writing employee reviews. The President may interview staff and Governing Board members as necessary to prepare a comprehensive review of the Executive Director. The President will submit the aforementioned staff members’ work requirement statements to the Governing Board or a committee designated by the board twice annually for review and approval.” The motion was approved unanimously.
Amb. Thomas Boyatt, on behalf of the Executive Committee, moved that the Governing Board adopt the proposed position descriptions for President, Secretary, Treasurer, Constituency and Retiree Vice Presidents with immediate effect and for immediate posting on the AFSA website. The motion was approved unanimously.
Awards Committee: USAID Representative Lorraine Sherman moved to appoint Ann Posner to the Awards Committee. The motion was approved unanimously.
IN MEMORY

Bruce Baldwin, 66, the husband of Office Management Specialist (USNATO) Virginia Baldwin, died on March 22, 2016, in Brussels, one of four American victims of terrorist attacks that day at the city’s airport.

Mr. Baldwin had worked for the Department of State as a classified pouch supervisor and Engineering Services Office logistician. In Tbilisi he received a Superior Honor Award for his work as the APO supervisor.

Born and raised in St. Louis, Mo., Mr. Baldwin joined the U.S. Army, serving in Vietnam. After an honorable discharge, he moved to Arizona to work as a guide at the South Rim of the Grand Canyon.

He did extensive hiking and camping in the canyon, much of it on backcountry trails; he rafted the Colorado River and motored his own boat on the stretch of the Colorado between Lake Powell and Lee’s Ferry every chance he got.

Mr. Baldwin’s curiosity and enthusiasm for exploration were boundless, making every outing an adventure, whether climbing on sheer cliffs on the North Rim of the Canyon or jumping into icy streams in the Rockies in the winter.

Banging around on desert back roads in Jordan, exploring remote Caucasus tower ruins, exploring the beauty of Syria or careening around Cairo, he embraced it all.

An exceptionally generous person, he took a strong interest in helping other Foreign Service family members navigate the department’s bureaucracy. He is missed by many.

Robert L. Burns, 90, a retired Foreign Service officer, died on Dec. 24 in Santa Cruz, Calif.

Mr. Burns was born in Oakland, Calif., and grew up in Washington, D.C. He served in the U.S. Navy in the Pacific during World War II and held a reserve commission in naval intelligence. In 1949 he graduated from The George Washington University, where he also pursued graduate studies.

Mr. Burns entered the State Department in 1949 as a member of its first intern program. In 1952 he was assigned to Beirut as acting political adviser to the Secretary of State’s special representative in the Near East for economic-technical assistance.

He returned to Washington, D.C., and in 1954 was named acting officer-in-charge of Israel-Jordan affairs. He received his Foreign Service commission in 1955, and was posted to Jerusalem as a political officer in 1958.

In 1961 Mr. Burns was detailed to the Defense Department, a member of the first State-Defense Exchange Program. He then served as assistant political adviser at the U.S. European Command in Paris, and in 1965 was assigned as political-military officer in Paris.

In 1967 he was named the first political adviser to U.S. Air Forces Europe in Wiesbaden. After an assignment to NATO Affairs in the State Department and graduation from the Senior Seminar in 1972, he served as political counselor at The Hague and later in Wellington. Mr. Burns retired in 1976.

Mr. Burns was a member of the American Foreign Service Association, the Military Officers Association of America and the Sons in Retirement. He also belonged to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion and the U.S.S. LCI Association.

He settled in Santa Cruz in 1997 and, for a period of years, served as an officer of the United Veterans Council of Santa Cruz County.

Mr. Burns’ wife, Ruth, died in 1998. He is survived by a daughter, Roberta Burns of Santa Cruz; three sons, Arthur and Scott, both of Santa Cruz, and Gregory of Cupertino, Calif., and Singapore; and grandsons Grant and Cole Magerum of Santa Cruz.

Contributions in his memory may be made to Hospice of Santa Cruz County, 940 Disc Drive, Scotts Valley CA 95066.

Christian Addison Chapman, 95, a retired Foreign Service officer, died on Nov. 27 at his home in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chapman was born in Paris on Sept. 19, 1921, to a French mother, Marthe, a devout Catholic from a Parisian family of wine merchants, and an American father, Percy, who was a professor of French literature at Princeton University.

His early life unfolded in an apartment at Place de l’Estrapade in Paris. He and his younger brothers, Francois and Antoine, attended the local school, while his parents spent the academic year in Princeton. These were the days before large-scale commercial flight, and the family travelled back and forth to the United States on a large ocean liner.

Eventually, the boys joined their parents; Mr. Chapman attended Princeton Country Day School and Exeter, going on to Princeton University. During one of the Atlantic crossings, on Mr. Chapman’s 15th birthday, his father died of a sudden heart attack.

When World War II broke out, Mr. Chapman and his brother, Francois, volunteered. Before the United States had entered the war, he had signed up with the Free French. Leaving Princeton after his sophomore year, he joined a French squadron under the British Royal Air Force that trained on the Canadian plains. Mr. Chapman, his family recalls, loved flying the Spitfire and remained lifelong friends with several of the French pilots with whom he flew.

The squadron was relocated to the staging area in Southern England for
D-Day. While on a mission later in June 1944, Mr. Chapman’s Spitfire was hit by ground fire. He had to eject, and was taken prisoner.

Following the Allied victory, the captors fled and Mr. Chapman and his comrades traveled to the concentration camp at Bergen-Belsen to help. What he saw there haunted him for the rest of his life. He would always remain aware of the human capacity for evil, his family recalls.

Mr. Chapman was awarded the French Legion of Honor for his service in World War II. Returning to Princeton, he completed his economics degree in 1948.

After some wandering, in 1950 he joined the U.S. Foreign Service, where he especially enjoyed the human relations, the travel and the opportunity to be involved with complex international challenges.

His first posting was to Casablanca, followed by a tour in Beirut, and then one in Tehran as assistant to the U.S. ambassador. At the time, he owned a Jaguar, which he enjoyed driving from Tehran to Beirut. His next posting, in 1957, was to Saigon.

Back in the United States in 1959, following some months in Vientiane, Mr. Chapman married Anita Ioas, whom he had met at a lunch party when they both lived in Saigon. The couple bought a townhouse in Georgetown, where they raised their three children: Catherine, Hillary and Jennifer. The young family moved to different posts in Western Europe—Luxembourg, Paris and Brussels.

Mr. Chapman spent more than two decades working on the Vietnam War and its many complexities, both in Washington, D.C., in the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs and in the field. He was chargé d’affaires in Laos in 1974, when the American effort in Southeast Asia was collapsing. At great personal risk, Mr. Chapman kept the American embassy open and helped manage the crisis when members of the communist Pathet Lao attempted to seize control of U.S. buildings.

Mr. Chapman capped his more than 30-year diplomatic career serving in Paris, his home, with his great friend from youth, Ambassador Arthur Hartman. There, Mr. Chapman relished the cultural and intellectual excitement of the city and especially being near his brother, Tony, and sister-in-law, Joan.

Those were the days of the Iranian revolution and the Tehran hostage crisis in which Embassy Paris was very involved. Mr. Chapman is remembered, among many other things, for assisting persecuted Baha’is from Iran.

There, in 1981, Mr. Chapman survived an assassination attempt by a Lebanese revolutionary group. At the time, he was living in the chargé d’affaires’ residence, which had a subterranean garage where he was to get in and out of his car. Not wanting to trouble the chauffeur to maneuver the car in the small garage, however, Mr. Chapman had the driver wait in front of the house.

One morning, as he walked the 10 feet to the car, a young man approached and began shooting. Mr. Chapman ducked behind the car and was chased around it. Soon the gun was empty, and the gunman ran away and disappeared.

After he retired from the Foreign Service in 1983, Mr. Chapman was asked to serve on special missions to Cyprus and Bosnia. He later led the Washington chapter of the Friends of Vieilles Maisons Françaises, a French-American historical preservation organization.

Art was among Mr. Chapman’s great loves. He bought paintings by the Polish artist Fangor and the American artist, Mark Tobey, whom his wife, Anita, had known in her youth in California. He also enjoyed poetry and Italian Opera.

At the time of his brother Tony’s death, Mr. Chapman began a descent into dementia that stretched over 14 years. Family members recall that he met the many painful moments of physical and mental decline with the same courage with which he had lived.

Survivors include his wife of 56 years, the former Anita Ioas of Washington, D.C.; two daughters, Catherine Chapman-Wong of London, Ontario, and Jennifer Chapman of Washington, D.C.; his son, Hillary Chapman, also of Washington, D.C.; and two grandchildren.

**Thomas Lynn Chittick**, 74, a retired Foreign Service officer, died on Nov. 22, 2016, in Plano, Texas.

Mr. Chittick was born on March 7, 1942, the son of Robert and Lucille Chittick. Raised in Lafayette, Ind., he grew up on a farm with his younger sister, Ginger. Though he learned to drive a tractor quite well, he took greater pride in his academic achievements.

Mr. Chittick graduated from Purdue University with a B.A. in social studies education and was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army. He served in the army for eight years, including two tours in Vietnam and, later, an assignment in Berlin.

There he met the love of his life, Gabrielle Calliebe. The couple married after only a few short months of courtship, and proceeded to build a life together over the next 48 years, trekking the globe with the Foreign Service for much of it.

Shortly after the birth of his son, Béla, in 1975, Mr. Chittick joined the Foreign Service with the Department of State, where he served for the next 20 years. He resigned from active duty with the U.S. Army at that time and joined the Army Reserves.

Mr. Chittick’s first post was Mexico City (1976-1978). The family headed back
to Germany for his second assignment, Düsseldorf (1978-1980). There the couple welcomed the birth of their daughter, Katrin, in 1980 before moving to their next post, Vienna (1980-1984). Seoul was Mr. Chittick’s next post (1984-1986). This was followed by a two-year assignment in Washington, D.C., and in 1988 the family returned again to Mexico, this time Guadalajara, until 1990.

After a one-year assignment in Washington, D.C., Mr. Chittick was posted to Frankfurt (1991-1995), his final assignment. He retired from the Foreign Service in 1995.

Mr. Chittick was honored with several awards and medals for his distinguished service with the State Department and in the U.S. Army, where he retired as a lieutenant colonel.

In retirement, Mr. Chittick did not slow down much. For the next 18 years he taught high school and, later, college history. Though he had many skills, one of his greatest traits was his generosity and willingness to share knowledge with others.

Among his many hobbies was target pistol shooting, collecting old guns and reading spy, terrorism and science fiction novels.

Mr. Chittick is survived by his wife, Gabriele, of Plano; his son, Béla (and his partner, Sara); his daughter, Katrin Powell (and her husband, Erin); his sister, Ginger (and her husband, Louis); and a cousin, Susan Schroeder.

Colette Gaudron Gordon, 86, the wife of retired USAID FSO Charles Gordon, died on Nov. 8, 2016, in Chapel Hill, N.C., of lung cancer.

Mrs. Gordon was born on July 30, 1930, in Reims, France. Her father, Guy Gaudron, was an archaeologist who, at the time of his death, was director of the Provincial Museums of France and an officer of the Légion d’Honneur. Her mother, Madeleine Brunel Gaudron, was the daughter of Auguste Brunel, an officer of the Légion d’Honneur.

The Gaudron family spent summers at the Château de Courcelles in Aubréville, Meuse, and winters in Paris. In 1936, they were obliged to sell the family mansion in Paris, the Hôtel d’Aumont—now the Administrative Tribunal of the City of Paris—when a member of the family died intestate.

After her marriage to FSO Charles Gordon at the Château de Courcelles, Mrs. Gordon accompanied her husband to Bangui, Central African Republic, where he was USAID attaché. The couple then served in Tunisia, Vietnam, Manila (Asian Development Bank), Côte d’Ivoire, Botswana, Burundi, Somalia and Uganda, as well as Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Gordon was well known for her artistic skills and interest in indigenous arts in the countries to which they were assigned. In addition to her own collection of drawings and ceramics, her children share family paintings and drawings by Picasso, Henri Lebasque, Jean Launois and other post-Impressionist French artists, as well as American artist Ian Marshall’s water colors of marine subjects and African landscapes.

Following Mr. Gordon’s retirement in 1990, the couple settled in Chapel Hill, N.C. They made frequent visits to Paris, where they had an apartment, until 2012, when Mrs. Gordon became too ill to travel.

Colette Gordon is survived by her husband, Charles, of Chapel Hill, and their two children, Ian and Louise.

Charles Wakefield (Wakie) Martin, 61, a retired Foreign Service officer and the spouse of retired FSO Paula Sue Thiede, died at his home in Arlington, Va., on Oct. 11, 2016. Mr. Martin had been diagnosed with brain cancer during his last overseas posting, in Belgrade, in August 2013.

Mr. Martin joined the Foreign Service as a management officer in 1996, after accompanying his FSO wife for six years to postings in Panama and Venezuela. On their return to Washington, D.C., he worked as a civil servant in the Bureau of Consular Affairs.

The couple served together in Poland, Pakistan, Italy (twice), Albania and Serbia, choosing postings that would allow them to remain together and always exploring cultural treasures, history and museums.

Mr. Martin took advantage of their time in Rome to learn even more about his avocation for studying and drinking good wines, usually together with fine food and preferably in the company of friends. During their travels, he and Mrs. Martin frequently took cooking courses and enjoyed cooking and entertaining at home, sharing the contents of their wine cellar.

As a management officer, Mr. Martin welcomed the challenge of stretching resources, directing them to do the most good for the most people in support of foreign policy objectives. He was delighted when his staff came up with ideas better than his own, and worked hard to mentor local staff colleagues and entry-level FSOs on his teams. He maintained a good sense of humor and great patience.

Prior to joining the Foreign Service, Mr. Martin satisfied his passion for justice, equality and fairness through his work with the Texas State Employees Union and in the numerous political campaigns in which the couple volunteered.

Mr. Martin also loved art, reading, jazz and classical music, the theater, opera and learning about culture and history.

In addition to his wife, Paula Sue Thiede, and their cats, Vila and Macchiato, Mr. Martin is survived by his mother, Jane...
Martin-Donley of Houston, Texas; his brother and family, William, Linda and Justin Martin of Manvel, Texas; and his sister and family, Nancy, Matthew and Stacy Matula of Atlanta, Ga., San Antonio, Texas, and Houston.

Donations in Mr. Martin’s memory can be made to Planned Parenthood, the American Civil Liberties Union or the National Brain Tumor Society.

**Vernon “Ray” Meininger**, 66, a retired Foreign Service officer and the husband of FSO Laurie Meininger, died unexpectedly on Nov. 4, 2016, in Free-town, Sierra Leone.

Mr. Meininger was born on Aug. 18, 1950, in Wickenburg, Ariz., and grew up in Northern California. He graduated from Piner High School in Santa Rosa, Calif., and volunteered for service in the U.S. Army in 1968, serving in Vietnam.

He received his B.S. in facilities engineering from Pacific Western University. In 1974, Mr. Meininger married Laurie Roethlein.

He worked for several years in hospital administration and facilities management in California, Hawaii and Arizona until 1999, when he and his wife joined the Foreign Service as a tandem couple with the State Department.

Mr. Meininger served abroad in the Marshall Islands, Cameroon, Guyana, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Romania, Iraq and the Central African Republic, managing embassy facilities in those countries.

He retired from the Foreign Service in 2015 after receiving numerous Superior Honor Awards and other recognition for his service. He then accompanied Mrs. Meininger on her assignment to Sierra Leone. There, he was consulting with the United Nations on rehabilitating health care centers that had been devastated by the Ebola outbreak of 2014-2015.

Friends and family members recall that Mr. Meininger made friends wherever he went; always with good cheer, a broad grin, witty humor and kindness. He was a true gentleman and diplomat, and a funny and prolific writer. He lived a life full of love, laughter and adventure, and was never without a handkerchief in his back pocket.

Mr. Meininger enjoyed teaching his craft to local staff, being the community grandpa or playing Santa Claus at embassies, orphanages and hospitals around the world, dispensing hugs and small gifts with a “Ho Ho Ho” and a twinkle in his eye.

He is survived by his wife, Laurie, and her family; their son, Jason, and daughter-in-law, Deven; grandchildren, Jordan and Travis; his mother, Vi Nordman; his brothers Rick, Greg, Gary and Tom Meininger, and their families; and numerous cousins.

**Chester Edward Norris Jr.**, 88, a retired Foreign Service officer of Lamoine, Maine, and Naples, Fla., died on Nov. 15, 2016, in Naples after a brief illness.

Mr. Norris was born on Dec. 1, 1927, in Winterport, Maine. He graduated from Winterport High School and the University of Maine at Orono.

Early in his life Mr. Norris worked alongside his father, brother and uncle in the family businesses including car dealerships, real estate holdings, a small public utility and a construction company.

Mr. Norris joined the Foreign Service in 1968, with guidance from the late Senator Margaret Chase Smith (R-Maine).

His first posting was as commercial attaché to Tel Aviv, where he met his future wife, Ulla. Assignments to Sydney, London, Jeddah, Lagos and the U.S. Mission to the United Nations in New York followed. He was selected to attend the National War College, class of 1976.

In March 1988, President Ronald Reagan appointed Mr. Norris U.S. ambassador to Equatorial Guinea. His tenure there saw the first contracts negotiated between American energy interests and Equatorial Guinea, starting a process that would transform one of the poorest countries in Africa into a major gas and oil producer.

Ambassador Norris retired from the Foreign Service at the end of 1990. He was subsequently approached by Houston-based Walter International to represent it as a consultant in Equatorial Guinea.

This eventually led to Mr. Norris’ third career, working for a succession of oil companies like CMS Nomeco and Marathon Oil. In recognition of his contributions to the energy industry, in 2000 a methanol tanker was christened “Ambassador Norris” in the town of Beppu, Japan.

A man of great wit and humor, Amb. Norris often regaled family and friends with reminiscences of early family life in Maine and adventures abroad, such as driving a motor home from Jeddah to Athens with his wife and a good friend.

Although he traveled the world, he found the most joy in time spent at his home on the coast of Maine, where he watched the deer and the eagles in the company of his wife and his two little Papillons.

For many years Amb. Norris served on the board of the Maine Seacoast Mission, in Bar Harbor, an organization that has served the needy along the coast of Maine for more than 100 years and for which he cared deeply.

Amb. Norris is survived by his wife, Ulla; a brother and sister in Maine; and many nephews and nieces in Sweden and Maine.

Mr. Osterman was born on April 25, 1950, in Indianapolis, Ind., and grew up in Churchville, Pa. As a high school senior he became locally famous for staging a successful raid, in period-appropriate British uniform, during the annual re-enactment of Washington crossing the Delaware River.

As a young man he also developed a long-term passion for do-it-yourself projects and vintage European sports cars, several of which were periodically road-worthy.

In 1972 Mr. Osterman graduated from Hamilton College, where he majored in Asian studies. He traveled extensively in Asia and was fluent in Japanese, Mandarin and Cantonese. He earned a master's degree in international economics from the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies and certification in Japanese at the Stanford University Language Program in Tokyo.

Mr. Osterman joined the Foreign Service in 1977 as an economic officer. He served overseas in Tokyo, and back in Washington worked to develop United States-Japan technical and scientific cooperation.

After leaving the State Department, Mr. Osterman studied at Harvard Business School and consulted "outside the Beltway" for numerous companies, including in the film and entertainment industry.

Mr. Osterman’s creative intellect and voracious curiosity also drew him to the finer points of Asian culture, obscurantist organizational psychology, American history and architecture, the banjo, a large German organ and the art of calligraphy. He had great affection for the life and works of Mark Twain, inspired by a questionable genealogical connection.

Family members and friends fondly recall his wry humor, and his gimlet-eyed view of life made him an endearing and wonderfully unpredictable companion. Nothing was ever settled, something was always beginning and everything was a great deal of fun.

Mr. Osterman is survived by his beloved partner, Wendy Cronin of Baltimore, Md.; his mother, Barbara Osterman of Newtown, Pa.; his brothers Dana of Washington Crossing, Pa., Jeff of Pleasantville, N.Y., and Mark of Rochester, N.Y.; his son, Andrew Palmer Osterman (and his wife, Lindsay) of Washington, D.C.; his daughter, Katherine Frances Osterman of Belmont, Mass.; and a granddaughter, Alexandra.

Donations in Mr. Osterman’s name may be sent to the Big Life Foundation (biglife.org).


Mr. Sargent was born in Merrimac, Mass., on June 26, 1931. As family members recall, he always said that as a teenager, he dreamed of a life of adventure.

He graduated from Swampscott High School in 1949 and from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, in 1953. He majored in forestry, serving with the U.S. Forest Service as a "smoke chaser" in Oregon during the summers of his junior and senior years of college.

After college, Mr. Sargent joined the U.S. Army during the Korean War. He was selected for the 902nd Military Intelligence Group, later commanding the 82nd Airborne Division Military Intelligence Detachment.

He served in West Germany from 1957 to 1960 and as a military intelligence adviser in Vietnam from 1962 to 1963. He resigned from the regular army as a captain in 1966 and transitioned his commission to the Army Reserve, where he was promoted to major.

Mr. Sargent joined the U.S. State Department Foreign Service as a security specialist, serving as a bodyguard to Secretaries of State Dean Rusk and William Rogers, as well as visiting heads of government and chiefs of state.


During his tour of duty in Japan, he was promoted to the Senior Foreign Service. In 1996 he retired, and the couple settled in Sarasota, Fla.

Mr. Sargent was very active in retirement. He enjoyed visiting national parks, bicycling, tai chi and iaido, a Japanese sword art. A dedicated volunteer at the Selby Library for more than 15 years, he was an avid reader who pursued the study of history, philosophy and New England family genealogy.

He hiked in several foreign countries, large portions of the Appalachian Trail and in various national parks all over the United States. He climbed Mt. Washington in New Hampshire, Mt. Katahdin in Maine and Mt. Fuji in Japan with his wife, Sharon.

Family and friends remember Mr. Sargent as cheerful and kind. He was known for his charming smile, charismatic personality and wry sense of humor. He was a devoted and loving husband.

Mr. Sargent was very proud of his children and of having served his country in the U.S. Army and the U.S. State Department’s Bureau of Diplomatic Security.

Near the end of his life, when asked how he wanted to be remembered, he said, “As a soldier.”

Mr. Sargent is survived by his loving wife of 31 years, Sharon Murphy Sargent;
his sister, Georgine Sargent; his four children, Walter Sargent III (and his wife, Sandra), Stuart Sargent, Kathleen Kogel (and her husband, Samuel) and Deborah Stitt; and grandchildren, nieces, nephews, brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law.

Donations in Walter Sargent’s name may be made to Tidewell Hospice in Sarasota, Fla.

M. Patricia Wazer, 88, a retired Foreign Service officer, died peacefully on Sept. 30 at her home in Washington, D.C.

Ms. Wazer was born on Aug. 4, 1928, the youngest of nine children, in Forest City, Pa. Because there was no possibility of attending college for a poor girl in the mining country of Pennsylvania, she left immediately after high school to live with her older siblings in Hartford, Conn., where she was expected to be a secretary in a factory.

Quickly realizing that such a life was not for her, she hopped on a cross-country bus, carrying all her possessions in a card-board suitcase, with a friend, Cecilia. After a few months in San Francisco working as phone operators, Ms. Wazer and Cecilia saw an ad for postwar Department of Defense jobs in occupied Japan.

They lied about their age (they were not yet 21) and were soon off on a troop ship to work as clerks in the U.S. hospitals. When they got off the ship, they were sent to different posts—Ms. Wazer ended up at Nagoya Air Base, where she spent the next several years clerking. In the early 1950s Nagoya became very busy as an evacuation base for Korean War casualties.

While in Nagoya, she became friendly with a few State Department employees who convinced her to go back to college. After one semester at the University of Maryland, Ms. Wazer met a State Department recruiter on campus and decided she would work for State for a few years to try to earn the money to return to college.

She received a few weeks of training and was off to work as a clerk in Calcutta. She credits the post-partition British for teaching her proper etiquette, how to formally eat, how to entertain and, sadly, how to smoke. After Calcutta she planned to go back to college, but they offered her Paris, and in her words, “How could a girl say no to Paris?”

After Paris, she returned to Japan, serving as a vice consul. Frustrated that women were not allowed to learn Japanese, she secretly took private, early morning Japanese lessons before work.

She was then assigned to Bucharest, where she was miserable serving in the oppressive environment of the communist country. She contemplated leaving the Foreign Service, and spent the next several months trying to get “PNG’d” (kicked out as persona non grata).

Fortunately, a year later, U.S. Ambassador to Japan Edwin Reischauer was looking for a woman to serve in Tokyo who spoke Japanese, and her friends helped get her called back to Japan.

Ms. Wazer served for the next decade as protocol officer in Tokyo. Each time Washington tried to move her after the normal two-year posting, the current ambassador (Reischauer, Johnson, Meyer, then Ingersoll) would pull some strings to allow her to continue. She spent one of those years as protocol officer for Expo 1970, giving tours of the exhibit to visiting dignitaries, a young Prince Charles among them.

Sadly, in 1972, she had to leave her beloved Japan. Assigned to Korea, she was cold and unhappy enough after eight months to volunteer to serve in a war zone. In 1973, she was assigned to Saigon.

Her assignment there ended with burning passports, papers and money before leaving on a helicopter on April 30, 1975, in Operation Frequent Wind. Once she safely landed on the USS Midway, she dropped the final suitcase of visa and passport stamps into the ocean. The State Department awarded her the Meritorious Service Award in 1975.

After a two-year stint recovering in warm Port-au-Prince in 1977, she returned to Southeast Asia to help establish the Orderly Departure Program to assist refugees resettle from Vietnam. From 1980 to 1984, Ms. Wazer served as consul general in Jakarta.

In September 1984, she was assigned to Beirut. Her arrival was delayed by riots at the airport. As she was getting out of the car at the embassy, a suicide bomber detonated, killing at least 20 people. For her service during the ensuing chaos, Ms. Wazer received the State Department Superior Honor Award in 1985.

That year she returned to Tokyo once more, to serve as consul general, the first woman to serve in this position in Japan. In 1989, she served as the principal officer at the U.S. consulate in Brisbane and, in 1992, she returned to the Orderly Departure Program as program coordinator.

Retirement in 1995 was only a minor pause. Ms. Wazer spent the next 20 years working as a consultant, taking assignments as acting consul general for a month or two in many Southeast Asian countries. Her last service was in 2011, where at the age of 83, she spent many night shifts on the phone using her fluent Japanese to help reunite families after the great Japanese earthquake and tsunami.

Ms. Wazer is survived by her nieces, nephews and countless friends throughout the world.

Donations in her name may be made to Capital Caring (www.capitalcaring.org) or the George Washington Hospital House Calls Program (go.gwu.edu/discovery).
In the same prologue, he uses a phrase beloved of those promoting endless American-Iranian hostility, writing about “Iranian behavior” as though Iranians were some sort of unruly children or animals.

Solomon correctly notes that Obama’s outreach efforts originated in his long Democratic primary campaign against Hillary Clinton in 2008. In those debates Obama declared that, as president, he would engage with America’s adversaries, including Iran. He took harsh criticism for his stance from both Clinton and, during the general election campaign, from Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.), whose position seemed to be that Iran was irredeemably evil. How, his opponents asked, can you engage with those people?

Despite these attacks, Obama won the White House and stuck to his efforts to end more than 30 years of futility with the Islamic Republic. For four years, however, his efforts went nowhere. His quoting Persian poetry (Sa’adi) and his talk of engagement “based on mutual interest and mutual respect” caught the Iranians flat-footed.

Solomon’s work is a timely reminder that wrong-headed ideas and those who propagate them never go away.

Solomon’s choice of language tells us where he stands. In the prologue, for example, he tells us that “President Obama, from his first days in office, pursued an opening to Iran and Supreme Leader Ali Khamene’i with an obsessive commitment” (my emphasis). That, by himself, he could not change 35 years of exchanging threats, insults and accusations. Although he spoke eloquently about the pointless “satisfying purity of indignation,” he found himself working with both Americans and Iranians who did not share his vision and who simply did not know how to change what they had been doing for so long.

They knew well how to bash; many in Washington and Tehran had built their careers on bashing. What no one knew how to do—or what no one had the courage to do—was something different that might send the relationship on a new path that could serve the interests of both sides. In Washington, new ideas were regularly shot down by the fearful ones who occupied what became known as “Dithering Heights.”

What broke the four-year stalemate and set the United States and Iran on the road to nuclear agreement? Solomon credits the economic hardships from new international sanctions imposed on Iran after 2010. He also credits Omani mediation, the new Iranian administration of Hassan Rouhani elected in 2013, and the American concession to allow Iran to enrich uranium on its own soil.

At least as important as the above, however, was the persistence and forbearance of American officials during the sterile exchanges of 2009-2013. When the Iranians haggled endlessly over the time and place of future meetings; when their representatives ran away from meetings with American counterparts; and when their negotiating consisted of long-winded statements of maximalist positions, the
American side did not give up. They practiced the best of diplomacy: they listened, they waited, they remained patient and professional.

Solomon’s very readable account would have benefited from some editing. At one place (p. 6) the author tells us that the 2012 officials’ meeting in Oman was “the first direct meeting between the United States and Iran on the nuclear issue since the revolution in 1979.”

In fact, U.S. Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs William Burns and Iranian National Security Council Chief Ali Jalili had held a bilateral meeting on the same subject three years earlier in Geneva, where they reached an (aborted) agreement about removing Iranian low-enriched uranium and fueling the Tehran University research reactor.

In another place (p. 242) we read, in a passage worthy of Sarah Palin, that in 2011 when Secretary of State John Kerry met Omani Sultan Qabus at the latter’s palace in Muscat, “the vast whitewashed facility overlooked the Persian Gulf’s azure waters.” It didn’t (and doesn’t).

Solomon provides us with a useful guide to a rogue’s gallery of American Iran-bashers. He follows Harold Rhode, Michael Ledeen, Douglas Feith, Larry Franklin and others who continued to beat their anti-Iran chests despite the evidence that their long efforts to paint Iran as the source of all evil were yielding no results except sore chests.

The greatest virtue of the book is that, despite his biases and occasional errors, Solomon remains cautious. He is aware of Americans’ poor record of understanding Iranian events. He acknowledges that well-qualified analysts in and out of government were wrong about the Shah; they were wrong about Iran’s revolution; they were wrong about Khomeini’s direction; and they were wrong about the course of the Islamic Republic.

True scholars admit it when they are wrong. The members of the oblivious group Solomon describes so well, however, could never admit they were wrong about anything—despite the obvious reality that they were. This book is well worth the read just to follow the misadventures of this group.

Solomon’s work is a timely reminder that wrong-headed ideas and those who propagate them never go away. After the efforts of President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry to find a way with Iran better than mutual demonization, the new Trump administration—judging by the statements of its appointees—is apparently on course to revive the thoughtless Iran-bashing that has brought nothing but frustration (and sometimes worse) for 37 years, and will delight the most extreme ideologues in Tehran.

Read Solomon’s book and then, as the Iranian war chant says, amadeh bash (get ready)!}

Where Media and Diplomacy Meet

**The Future of #Diplomacy**


Reviewed By Dennis Jett

Yogi Berra once said, “It’s tough to make predictions, especially about the future.” That is especially true when talking about the impact technological change will have on the practice of diplomacy. Seib’s look at what is to come sees a future where public diplomacy, conducted through digital platforms, will profoundly affect how foreign affairs are conducted.

Traditionalists argue that social media and other technologies are only a different means of delivering the message. A bigger megaphone perhaps, but not a fundamental remaking of how foreign policy is made. Those inclined to see technology as an agent of revolutionary change assert that the way diplomats normally did business is dead, and that nothing will be the same. They struggle to predict what the future will look like, but are convinced it will bear little relation to the past.

Through this book, Philip Seib, a professor of journalism, public diplomacy and international relations at the University of Southern California, steps into the debate and lays out his vision. As Seib states, a central premise of his book is this: “The future of diplomacy is inextricably tied to the future of media.”

One problem with that view is the fact that today’s dominant media platform is tomorrow’s technological dinosaur. Every advance in communications has had implications for diplomacy, whether it was the first trans-Atlantic cable, the fax machine or the internet. And in many cases, the prediction that traditional diplo-
macy was dead accompanied such innovations. These predictions tend to be proven wrong or at least grossly exaggerated.

Recent advances have certainly increased the scope of international relations and brought new actors and influences into the realm of diplomacy. But governments still largely continue to conduct foreign policy in traditional ways that limit broader participation.

In this context, statements like the author’s assertion that “The new diplomacy must include a commitment to provide the public with as much information as possible as soon as possible” seem, at best, optimistic.

Philip Seib sees a future where public diplomacy, conducted through digital platforms, will profoundly affect how foreign affairs are conducted.

Governments will continue to provide the information they want to provide when they want to provide it, and only if it reflects well on the government, even as they try to exploit new technologies. They have to use such technologies, if for no other reason than to contest the arguments of terrorist groups like al-Qaida and ISIS.

Though one should not assume new technologies have more power than they do, Seib on occasion does that. He states, for instance, that “finding a way to offset the predisposition to rely on hard power may be the most significant challenge to public diplomacy in the years ahead.” Public diplomacy is more likely to be used as a tool to sell the idea of military action than as an alternative to it. That is what the Bush administration did in 2003, when it was justifying the invasion of Iraq.

Those efforts were, of course, directed mainly at American public opinion and not at convincing the Iraqi people they needed to be invaded. It would be nice to think that turning the tide of public opinion in another country could avoid war, but it is not realistic to think that is going to be an easy or feasible alternative.

In another part of the book, Seib recommends that all USAID assistance programs be under the under secretary for public diplomacy and public affairs. This seems to assume that the PD benefits of development assistance are so great that all such aid should be run as if that were its main purpose. Such a move would generate more suspicion than acceptance, and there is no more reason to put the PD under secretary in charge than there is for letting that person run consular affairs or military training programs.

The author also talks in terms that indicate a lack of understanding of government operations. He refers to the 250,000 State Department cables made public by WikiLeaks as “emails.”

He notes that President Barack Obama’s use of political-appointee ambassadors, as of December 2014, was 35 percent: much higher than either of his two predecessors at the same stage in their presidencies. That was true at that moment—but it was also meaningless, because political appointees are always front-loaded in any presidential term. The percentage for Obama’s entire second term was 28.5 percent.

Seib is also off the mark when it comes to some of his comments about how other countries use public diplomacy. He offers the following description of Ethiopia: “Today it is no longer a supplicant nation. It is ratcheting up its international involvement, reaching a new level of diplomatic self-sufficiency. Ethiopia’s economy and civil society are still under construction, but its diplomatic efforts create balance between its domestic tasks and its broader ambitions.”

This rosy thumbnail characterization contrasts with the one offered by Freedom House, whose reports describe how autocratic that country’s government is. Ethiopia’s public diplomacy abroad is simply a smokescreen behind which it ratchets up its repression at home.

Seib is also too charitable in his description of the impact of Washington politics. “Partisanship can impair effective diplomacy, but it can also provide essential democratic balance to the mandate under which diplomats work,” he states. The reality is that the toxic, hyperpartisan politics within the Beltway today is much more effective at impairing diplomacy than it is at creating any balance.

Despite these reservations, Seib’s book is an interesting and useful read. He clarifies the differences among digital diplomacy, e-diplomacy and public diplomacy. And he covers a wide range of topics in an extremely well-written book. It won’t be the last word on the question of how diplomacy will be affected by technology; no book on such an elusive and ever-evolving phenomenon could ever claim to be that.

Dennis Jett is a professor of international affairs at Pennsylvania State University. A retired FSO, he served as ambassador to Peru and Mozambique, on the National Security Council and on assignments in Argentina, Israel, Malawi and Liberia. He is the author of three books: Why Peacekeeping Fails, Why American Foreign Policy Fails and American Ambassadors: The Past, Present and Future of America’s Diplomats (all published by Palgrave Macmillan). He is an occasional contributor to the Journal.
LEGAL SERVICES

ATTORNEY WITH OVER 25 YEARS' successful experience SPECIALIZING FULL-TIME IN FS GRIEVANCES will more than double your chance of winning: 30% of grievances 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 (302) 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

Tel: (703) 745-0272.
Email: David@mytaxcpa.net
Website: www.mytaxcpa.net

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

PROFESSIONAL TAX RETURN PREPARATION

Arthur A. Granberg, EA, AFA, ATP, has more than 45 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 501
Arlington VA 22203
Tel: (703) 522-3828.
Fax: (703) 522-5726.
Email: aag8086@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, CPP, 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

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: (979) 2813.
Email: sales@corporateapartments.com
Website: www.corporateapartments.com

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

FULFILLED LUXURY APARTMENTS. Short/long-term. Best locations: Dupont Circle, Georgetown. Utilities included. All price ranges/sizes.
Parking available.
Tel: (202) 251-9482.
Email: msussman4@gmail.com

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

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

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

6842 Elm St., Suite 303, McLean VA 22101
Tel: (703) 448-0212.
Email: Erik@Peakeinc.com
Website: www.peakeinc.com

**REAL ESTATE**

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

**LOOKING to BUY, SELL or RENT REAL ESTATE in NORTHERN VIRGINIA or MARYLAND?** Former FSO and Peace Corps Country Director living in NoVA understands your unique needs and can expertly guide you through your real estate experience and transition. Professionalism is just a phone call away. Call Alex for solutions.
Alex Boston, REALTOR, JD, MBA
Long & Foster
6299 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church VA 22044
Tel: (711) 533-9566.
Email: alex@LnF.com
Website: alexboston.lnf.com

**MAIN STATE OR FSI BOUND?** For nearly 30 years, I have guided hundreds of Foreign Service clients through the real estate process. Real estate is among the most important financial and life decisions most of us make. You deserve to have the guidance and expertise of a seasoned real estate professional.
Contact Marilyn Cantrell, Associate Broker, licensed in VA and DC.
McEnearney Associates
1320 Old Chain Bridge Rd., Ste. 350
McLean VA 22101
Tel: (703) 860-2096.
Email: Marilyn@MarilynCantrell.com
Website: www.MarilynCantrell.com

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

**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

**TUTOR/TEACHING**

**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

**ADAPT A CLASSIC** Tuscan home. Three-story villa built in 1880s with garden and stunning views; situated among olive groves in the quiet countryside between Siena and Florence, less than a half mile from medieval town of Pergine Valdarno. Price: € 290,000 negotiable.
https://yourtuscanhome.wordpress.com

**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 Otars 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

**AFSA Tax Guide**

Read about the latest federal and state tax provisions affecting the Foreign Service in the AFSA NEWS section of The Foreign Service Journal.
ARE YOU PREPARING FOR YOUR NEXT OVERSEAS ASSIGNMENT?

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

BASICALLY, WHAT DOES A PROPERTY MANAGER DO?

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

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

WWW.PEAKEINC.COM

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

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

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

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

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

RESPONSIVENESS & SOUND BUSINESS PRACTICES. We will always be as quick as possible.

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

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

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

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

Definitely a wise move.

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.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE JOURNAL
guide to
EXTENDED STAY HOUSING
Your Go-To Resource!
Find it online at www.afsa.org/extendedstay

WASHINGTON MANAGEMENT SERVICES
ASSET AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT
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
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.
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The Wish Book

BY MICHELE IVY DAVIS

The fat Sears catalog was called “The Wish Book” when I was growing up. It had more than 1,000 pages of the necessities and luxuries of life: everything from bunk beds to bicycles, and from waffle irons to well pumps.

But to my younger sister and me, it was so much more. It was our connection with things American—with ready-made clothes, American styles and trends, and a life that was passing us by half a world away.

After I graduated from elementary school in the 1950s, my Foreign Service family was sent to its first post overseas—Madras, a small seaport town on the southeast coast of India. It was a time of propeller planes and ship travel. Communication with “the States” was by letter or telegram.

In Madras most of our clothes were made by a tailor, because there weren’t any dress shops that sold European-style clothes. Even our shoes were handmade; although after the shoemaker completed a pair of loafers for my sister, Diane, that looked exactly like the picture but made her look like she had clown feet, we gave up on that.

My mother would prop the big catalog on the coffee table, opening to the page that told how to determine clothing sizes. Then she would measure our arms, necks, backs and legs carefully with a tape measure. Finally, she would get out pieces of white paper and a pencil and carefully trace around our stocking feet to send with the shoe order. How it tickled!

After having us try on friends’ clothes of various sizes, recording our latest measurements and relying on her intuition, she would guess how big we would be when the clothes arrived by ship three months later—not an easy task with rapidly growing teens.

Meanwhile, my sister and I would pore over the catalog, picking out first what we needed and then what we would like to have, staying within the boundaries our mother had set. Shipping was expensive, so we had to be careful.

At last the ship would arrive, and the package would be delivered to my father’s office. We were always excited when he brought it home, but he and my mother would whisk it into their bedroom and firmly close the door.

We had to wait impatiently as they removed secret birthday presents and Christmas gifts. Finally they would allow us into the room. On the bed was the wonderful box, packing paper scattered and clothes folded very flat, smashed from their many months’ journey.

We never knew what we were going to get until the box arrived. Sometimes items were out of stock. Sometimes the store substituted something “similar,” although we did not consider the box of clove Life Savers a fair substitution for the fruit-flavored ones Mother had ordered as a treat.

When the style of shoes I had chosen arrived in my sister’s size and hers in mine, I learned that they could also make mistakes.

But things didn’t always go wrong; sometimes when things arrived, they were perfect. In one of those perfect orders, we each got an entire outfit—pedal pushers, knit turtlenecks and pendant necklaces.

Another time I got some low-cut saddle shoes with tiny black buckles on the back of the heels. Some of my friends said that you unbuckled them if you were “available” and buckled them if you were going steady. I wasn’t sure about that, so I just kept them buckled. I wore those shoes until they fell apart.

After a few years overseas, we came back home to department stores, the first shopping malls and all things American. But while we were in India, the Sears-Roebuck catalog was not just a way to acquire necessities, it was our window to our homeland.
Sudanese children jump and run with excitement after the brief downpour that often accompanies a desert sandstorm, or *haboob*, near the camel market in Khartoum, Sudan, one of the hottest major cities in the world. This photo was taken through the window of a fully armored embassy vehicle with a Canon Powershot S5 IS at f/4 and 1/1000 sec.

Catherine Kannenberg, the child of Foreign Service parents, is a former psychology professor and the spouse of a retired career FSO. As a child, spouse and lecturer, she has lived in Venezuela, Ecuador, Germany, Italy, Spain, Turkey, Korea, Morocco, Ghana, Uganda and Sudan. She now works on outreach with AFSA, helping to educate the American public about the value of diplomacy and development.

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

99 YEARS OF DIPLOMATIC HISTORY

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

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

We hope you take advantage of this unparalleled resource.
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