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Pulling America’s Diplomats from the Field

BY BARBARA STEPHENSON

For all of us in the Foreign Service who have hoped that our fellow Americans might one day understand and value our work, I begin with the reminder that the state of the Foreign Service and diplomacy is now front-page news. Let’s take a moment to savor that bump in recognition before I move on to the bad news, the reason why the Foreign Service has become newsworthy.

Just as no one thinks much about the oxygen in the air until the rock rolls shut at the cave entrance, so no one gave much thought to the vital work of the Foreign Service in maintaining America’s global leadership until it was in danger. In the face of sweeping cuts, our fellow Americans are now alarmed about the consequences of pulling America’s diplomats from the field.

It started with the administration’s proposed 32 percent cut to the Fiscal Year 2018 foreign affairs budget, which would translate into an 8 percent cut of personnel at State and USAID. Although Congress rejected such deep cuts as tantamount to a “doctrine of retreat,” the personnel cuts continue apace, as though Congress had actually enacted a budget slashed by a third.

There remains confusion on this point: How can staffing cuts be proceeding when Congress rejected the budget cuts? The bottom line is that staffing cuts continue. In fact, by some reports, progress toward meeting the goal of cutting 1,982 Foreign Service and Civil Service officers and specialists from State’s rolls is running ahead of schedule, even with Congress blocking the planned buy-out.

We see this downward trend most clearly in the sheer decline in Foreign Service numbers. The number of Foreign Service officers at State fell by 236 between March and December 2017 (from 8,176 to 7,940). With the hiring freeze still in place at State (though lifted across the rest of the government), we expect the size of the FSO corps to be even smaller when the Bureau of Human Resources releases the next quarterly figures March 31.

Entry-level hiring remains at the lowest level since the end of the Cold War, with just 101 new officers scheduled for hiring in 2018, down from 370 in 2016. We see the loss also at USAID, where the number of FSOs serving today—1,685—is well below USAID’s authorized strength of 1,850.

The higher an FSO rose in the competitive promotion system, the more likely that officer is to no longer be on the Foreign Service team at State. Of the six officers with the rank of Career Ambassador in December 2016 only two remain. When Tom Shannon departs, State’s four-star ranks will be down to just one.

To replenish the CA ranks, our institution will look to the seriously depleted Career Minister ranks, which stood at 33 in December 2016 and have fallen to 18 today, for a decline of 45 percent. The ranks of Minister Counselor, our two-stars, had fallen from 470 in December 2016 to 373 a year later, for a decline of more than 20 percent. These numbers will continue to fall through the months to come.

One burning question: Will management restore promotion numbers to normal levels, or repeat last year’s unprecedented cuts?

A restoration of healthy promotion numbers is critical for the strength of the Foreign Service as an institution, designed to grow officers over the years by promoting the top performers in an orderly flow up the ranks. It is also critical for mid-level officers, who see their path to leadership blocked by the dramatic reduction in promotion numbers. For example, as promotions into the Senior FS were cut by more than half, the ranks of FS-1s swelled, which in turn dims promotion prospects for FS-2s.

America must field an all-star Foreign Service team to deliver wins around the world. Annual spending on core diplomacy, at $5 billion, has already fallen by 25 percent since 2008. (For scale, the defense budget is about $700 billion.) Cutting diplomacy is not about balancing the budget.

The National Security Strategy says “We must upgrade diplomatic capability” to cope with escalating threats, so it’s hard to argue that cutting diplomacy is about achieving our national security strategy.

So what is the argument for pulling America’s diplomats from the field and forfeiting the game to our adversaries?

Ambassador Barbara Stephenson is the president of the American Foreign Service Association.
Launching the FSJ Centennial

BY SHAWN DORMAN

As we go to press with this issue celebrating the start of The Foreign Service Journal’s centennial year, I am thinking about the editor 100 years from now looking back on this edition. I hope she can gain a sense of the times from each issue of the magazine, as we can today looking back. And I hope she is at her post in a powerful AFSA headquarters, compiling bright voices from a strong Foreign Service.

Poking around in the incredible archives of a century of Journals for highlights to share in this issue and during the coming months, I am pulled in; I can feel history come alive through the commentary, the letters, the photos and ads.

In another 100 years, what will people make of the challenging time for diplomacy we find ourselves in today? As I write, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson has just been fired by presidential tweet. His under secretary for public affairs released a statement about that firing, and was himself fired just hours later.

The headlines today, March 15, include stories about new evidence of efforts to “clean house” at State of those suspected of being “disloyal” to the Donald J. Trump administration. Representatives Elijah Cummings (D-Md.) and Eliot Engel (D-N.Y.) sent a letter to the White House and the Deputy Secretary of State requesting information about reports of political attacks on career employees at State. Rumors have swirled for months about why one after another senior-level diplomat has walked or been pushed out the door.

Is the U.S. Foreign Service as misunderstood as that? Its foundation is the oath diplomats take to the Constitution and a commitment to serve the United States through the administration in power. That’s what career diplomats do, making loyalty testing an alien concept.

In the Journal Timeline, we have pulled fascinating excerpts from each decade that offer glimpses of the rich legacy of diplomacy. Frequent contributor and unofficial Foreign Service historian Harry Kopp leads the focus with the surprisingly lively story of the Journal’s first 100 years. Steve Dujack and Steve Honley share their stories of steering the Journal through the 1980s and the 2000s.

I started reading the Journal a quarter-century ago, when I joined the Foreign Service and AFSA in 1993. At my first post, Bishkek—where mail came only when we drove over the mountains to Kazakhstan to pick it up, email was just getting going (and all our messages were routed through the Kyrgyz president’s server!), and a call home cost $3/minute—the Journal was a lifeline. It was a connection to home, to Washington, to friends and colleagues around the world, and to the issues that concern us all.

Of course, we now have virtually unlimited options for connecting. But I would argue that the purpose and utility of the Journal endures—in both hard copy form that arrives by old-fashioned mail or pouch, and digital form that is sharable and can boost engagement. A bridge between history and the present, it tells the story of our Foreign Service.

Most magazines do not last, and almost none make it to 100. Please join the FSJ Centennial Celebration by sending us a note to fill in the blank regarding your connection to the Journal: The Journal is ____. Or send a photo of yourself (or a friend or family member) reading the Journal wherever you are—the more distant from D.C., the better! Send submissions to journal@afsa.org.

Shawn Dorman is the editor of The Foreign Service Journal.
Appreciation for Creative Thinking

I really enjoyed Rob Kirk’s article “Applying Behavioral Economics to the State Department” in the January-February Journal.

Kudos to the author for his serious and thoughtful insights into reform. Kudos to AFSA for printing the article, and to the Department of State as an organization in which creative thinking can still be appreciated.

I hope management is paying attention to some of these very good ideas. I recall receiving a notice on a travel voucher that I had “overclaimed approximately 15 miles” on a 300-mile road trip. I detoured around a traffic accident, thereby saving approximately an hour of time.

I could have gone back and forth with the voucher examiner, but the few dollars difference was definitely not worth my—or the Department of State’s—time.

I don’t know what the procedure is now, but at the time, employees were being told to record actual mileage for each trip—in itself a waste of time if the department was already capturing mileage using online mapping resources.

Carol Stricker
FSO, retired
Arlington, Virginia

Refine and Revamp Two Systems

Rob Kirk’s “Applying Behavioral Economics to the State Department” (January-February) makes many valid and interesting points. Some, though, conflate disparate principles or are impractical, most notably the proposal to “dual-use” Employee Evaluation Reports for bidding and assignments.

EERs and bidding are distinct and separate instruments. Employee performance reviews are designed to determine an employee’s future capacity to be entrusted with greater responsibilities irrespective of a next posting.

We’ve gotten into bad habits by overfocusing on competencies—skills and knowledge—instead of integration and the capacity to succeed when dealing with greater complexity in people, policy and programs in both internal and external environments.

Assignment decisions are different: they are designed to ascertain a good/better/best fit among candidates bidding on a given position in a specific cycle, and draw from a substantially smaller competition group than promotion decisions do.

If EERs are a time sink now, imagine what they would be like if that assessment information were not only subject to negotiation between rater, reviewer and employee but would also be publicly available to bureaus. The integrity, validity and usefulness of both instruments would suffer.

The answer is not to have one document serve two purposes, but to refine and revamp the two distinct systems.

The first step would be to adopt a state-of-the-art performance management system (now increasingly used in the private sector) that incorporates frequent rater/employee conversations, taps into multidirectional input while minimizing unnecessary narrative, and asks salient questions about projected future capacity.

Such a system would require a new IT architecture and would, if private sector experience is a guide, considerably compress the amount of time spent in writing the EER and in Selection Board processing—the latter to perhaps as little as three to four weeks—while enhancing its value.

Separately, overhauling the bidding and assignment systems—in part by adopting the planned Talent Map (and eliminating multiple bidding seasons and streamlining the types, numbers and scale of differentials)—and imposing greater Service discipline could reduce that time sink, as well.

Each system could share common elements but would be tailored to specific requirements. HR had moved forward on both initiatives, but that was superseded by the “Redesign.” So it is unclear when they can be fully funded and implemented.

More broadly, any future models, behavioral or otherwise, must account for unique FS circumstances when it comes to individual needs and corporate requirements and goals.

The department must avoid the chimera of free market/controlled economy dichotomy models. Rather, it should be relentlessly focused on outcomes that cut clutter and complexity, reduce rigidities and identify, adopt, adapt and apply simple, clear and direct systems and processes that strengthen institutional capacity.

This requires strong leadership in the department and AFSA and collaboration between them; and employees and other stakeholders must be thoroughly integrated into change management. The current climate of budget pain, workforce reductions and a focus on process efficiencies suggests that those necessary structural and systemic changes are not immediately on the horizon.

Yet these changes are both necessary and doable, and should be priorities for both the department and AFSA. The Service has precious little time to undertake
Deficiencies in U.S. Crisis Response

I write in reference to Jim Bever’s article on Ebola preparedness in Ghana (January-February) and earlier articles by Jimmy Kolker, Nancy Powell and Gwen Tolbert (May 2017) discussing how the State Department organized to combat Ebola globally. Elsewhere, there was lots of press coverage of U.S. military assistance in Liberia.

While all of these reports are accurate, all of the activities described came after the fact, and the reports gloss over deficiencies in the U.S. government response.

The Ebola crisis was well underway in Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea by mid-summer 2014. (I was chargé d’affaires in Freetown in August and September 2014.) Surrounding nations, including Ghana, stuck their heads in the sand, isolated their neighbors and did not provide assistance. The U.S. government was also way behind the curve. The Ebola response group for Sierra Leone in the department was headed by an intern!

Moreover, the U.S. military would not even answer the phone until instructed to do so by President Barack Obama in mid-September 2014. By the time military personnel arrived in Liberia several weeks later, the crisis was beginning to subside, and even then they were hesitant to engage. U.S. troops never made it to Freetown.

USAID was slow to react in Sierra Leone, as well. It had no presence there, so there was no local ability to gear up. We requested a USAID DART team in early August and waited several weeks for them to deploy. When the team arrived in September, they had access to funds and were able to procure desperately needed supplies including body bags, gloves, antibiotics, space suits, etc.

Thankfully the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention was in Sierra Leone and in the region in numbers. It was CDC expertise that saved the day.

Experts understood the disease and how it spread. They helped set up quarantine and treatment wards, as well as laboratories. They taught public health control measures, established a hot line and counseled health officials—both local and international—on mechanisms to control the spread of the scourge.

Back in Washington later in the fall, the department organized itself to cope with Ebola, but the horse was long gone from the barn.

Happily, lessons were learned, and we are, hopefully, better prepared for the next round.

Robert E. Gribbin
Ambassador, retired
Springfield, Virginia

Retirement Ready

Here’s a note to congratulate The Foreign Service Journal for wisdom and foresight, and to tell you how happy I was for all future FS employees when reading the superb article by Donna Gorman, “Are You Retirement Ready?” (January-February), which encourages you to prepare for retirement from your first day on the job to your last.

I found the section “Going Beyond 20” especially important. I do not agree with Thomas Cymer: You may get a higher-paying private sector job, but usually not lower-cost rent, utilities, etc.

The last section, “Take Action,” rounded out the points beautifully, mak-
ing you think of what state you want to be in after retirement.

I hope you will enclose this exceptional article or something similar in the welcoming package of every new FS employee—foremost secretaries (now FS specialists).

If I’d had this information when I joined in 1973, I certainly would have had a larger pension than I now have.

The advice truly reveals a caring, soul-reaching Foreign Service. Makes me even more proud to have been a member. Kudos to the author!

Catherine I. Postupack
FSO, retired
Tamaqua, Pennsylvania

On Foreign Development Aid: Tom Dichter Responds

I am writing in response to the critical discussions of my November critique of development assistance by Desaix “Terry” Myers and Raymond Malley in the March Letters-Plus.

Mr. Myers says I do not define what I mean by foreign aid. Perhaps I failed by not being explicit enough. I thought my repeated use of the term “development,” along with the data on some of the agencies that work in that sphere, would make clear that I refer exclusively to aid for development and thus not for diplomacy, national security, disaster relief, military sales, etc.

Mr. Myers claims that “constant reinvention” undertaken by USAID, the World Bank and others is evidence that the aid establishment does listen to its critics. But the reinvention Meyers notes amounts to a dumbing down of development aid in response to the public and Congress.

It is, indeed, these political pressures that, as both Mr. Myers and Mr. Malley admit, give us the short-termism, the lack of local ownership, the overwrought focus on indicators and log-frame templates, and the heavy emphasis on relieving extreme poverty (which PT. Bauer, whom I quote in the piece, reminds us is “altogether different” than development).

Instead my article focuses on 40 years of criticism by people with development aid experience who are thoughtful about it. And what they’ve said has not been listened to—that, among other criticisms, aid for development has become a self-perpetuating industry; that it pretty much ignores political, cultural and social structural complexity; and especially Bauer’s historically demonstrable point that “foreign aid is patently not necessary to emerge from poverty.”

Myers and Malley seem to ignore the central point in my piece: the development aid industry cannot face Bauer’s critique because if it did, it would have to commit to a reduced future for itself: a less central role, less money and fewer jobs. My discussion of the growing numbers of stakeholders and their addiction to lucrative aid contracts serves as evidence of that self-interest.

Thomas Dichter
Washington, D.C.

Parents of Special Needs Kids Want to Serve

I would like to comment on the March Speaking Out, “Families with Special Needs Kids Need Support,” by Kathi Silva. I am an FSO with two special needs children. In my experience, which began 20 years ago, there was zero help from MED or HR. Though I asked both for assistance in identifying any post where I could go overseas, I got no answer from either.

When I pressed the issue, HR suggested I convert to the Civil Service. When I opted not to do that, but filled vacant Foreign Service positions at the State Department in Washington, D.C., I was warned by the Director General in writing that I would be fired if I did not go overseas. So I volunteered for a position overseas and went alone.

Sounds like very little has changed, sadly, to assist Foreign Service personnel with special needs children.

Robert Ward
FSO
Washington, D.C.

An Unfortunate Pairing

I want to point out the distasteful juxtaposition in the March Journal of a cover article on sexual harassment in the Foreign Service (#StateToo: Ending Harassment at the State Department, by Ambassador (ret.) Leslie Bassett) and the back page ad for liability insurance in case one is ever accused of “gender discrimination.”

I’m going to assume this was an unfortunate coincidence, because it’s a bad look for both AFSA and the advertiser if it isn’t.

Beth Milton
FSO
Foreign Service Institute

Correction

The name of the co-founder and current CEO of the employment agency Serving Talent, quoted in the March article, “Still Waiting: Family Member Employment Today,” was misspelled. The correct name is Marcelle Yeager. We regret the error.
A MESSAGE FROM THE HILL

Standing Up for Diplomacy

BY SENATORS CHRIS VAN HOLLEN AND DAN SULLIVAN

The global challenges confronting the United States are evolving and growing. Roiling conflicts in the Middle East, Africa and Southeast Asia have led to refugee crises across borders; terrorist networks have expanded their reach into the information space; and North Korea’s rapidly developing nuclear program has tested the security of our regional alliances. Russia’s election meddling has sharpened societal divisions in the United States and Europe.

In this unpredictable environment, diplomacy—vigorously, tirelessly, and optimistically—is an absolute imperative. Recognizing this critical need, and the need for broader discussion in the Senate, the two of us undertook a bipartisan initiative to form the Senate Foreign Service Caucus in the spring of last year.

Congressional caucuses are typically formed as a way for members with like-minded interests to come together to support a common cause or constituency and advance specific policy priorities. In the Senate, caucuses for every branch of the military—U.S. Air Force, U.S. Navy, U.S. Army and the U.S. Marine Corps—have been around for years and have formed a broad, bipartisan base of supportive senators. Noticeably, however, the Senate had not formed an equivalent caucus for the men and women of the U.S. Foreign Service.

Like the Armed Services, whose members defend this country in uniform, the Foreign Service is comprised of professionals who serve the elected leaders of our country regardless of party and who sacrifice—alongside their families—to advance American interests abroad. This mission underscores the purpose of the Senate Foreign Service Caucus and the bipartisan view that the State Department must remain at the forefront of American engagement around the world.

Since its founding last year, twenty-one senators have come together from both sides of the aisle, and all committees, in caucus meetings with Deputy Secretary of State John Sullivan and Under Secretary of State Tom Shannon, to engage in active and open dialogue, focusing on the critical role the Foreign Service plays in our national security and foreign policy. As we progress into 2018, we remain committed to continuing that engagement with the State Department.

In these discussions we all acknowledg—

Senator Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.) is a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the son of a Foreign Service officer. Senator Dan Sullivan (R-Alaska) is a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and a former assistant secretary of State for economic, energy and business affairs under Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice.

Deputy Secretary of State John Sullivan is flanked by Senator Chris Van Hollen, at right, and Senator Dan Sullivan in a meeting of the Senate Foreign Service Caucus on Dec. 20, 2017.
In the face of proposed cuts, the Senate Appropriations Committee chose instead to make key investments in American diplomacy, development and national security.

edge that the public debate about America’s role in the world shifts from administration to administration in ways that can have a significant impact on the work of the Foreign Service. While Republicans and Democrats may disagree on some of the contours of our foreign policy, there are moments of clarity when big issues—like fully funding the State Department—come into focus and bipartisan resolve turns to action to ensure America maintains its leadership in the world.

Given our unique backgrounds in foreign policy, we both feel strongly about the crucial role our State Department must continue to play. We have listened closely as our nation’s military leaders emphasized the importance of the State Department and its diplomatic mission to the Defense Department. Secretary of Defense James Mattis summarized it best in his now famous admonition to legislators: “If you don’t fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition ultimately.”

And last September the Senate Appropriations Committee voted unanimously in favor of a bill appropriating more than $51 billion for the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development. In the face of proposed cuts that would amount to one-third of the budget for these critical agencies, the Senate Appropriations Committee chose instead to make key investments in American diplomacy, development and national security.

In the report accompanying that legislation, the senators stated: “Defense alone does not provide for American strength and resolve abroad. Battlefield technology and firepower cannot replace diplomacy and development.”

That is why the Senate also bolstered assistance to our trans-Atlantic partners, particularly those on Russia’s front line. We provided comprehensive funding for global health programs that help prevent the spread of disease. We supported refugees, disaster assistance and efforts to counter violent extremism. Our message could not have been clearer: we believe a strong State Department is critical for the security and prosperity of our nation.

Although our politics at home can sometimes seem divided, in its constitutional role in U.S. international relations, the Senate has been steadfast as one of the strongest champions for democracy and human rights abroad. As an institution, we have historically held the view that promoting human rights, democracy and the rule of law is not only consistent with universal values but also serves our long-term security and economic interests.

As our colleague Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.) said last May: “Our values are our strength and greatest treasure. We are distinguished from other countries because we are not made from a land or tribe or particular race or creed, but from an ideal that liberty is the inalienable right of mankind and in accord with nature and nature’s Creator.”

We commend our Foreign Service for not only promoting these values and ideals, but for supporting others in achieving them. Our diplomats are the finest in the world. We in the Senate are tremendously grateful for your service and your sacrifice. You have our enduring support in the pursuit of our common goal: a better America in a better world.

On Dec. 20, 2017, the Senate Foreign Service Caucus held a roundtable discussion with Deputy Secretary of State John Sullivan on the international affairs budget.
**The Ongoing Push to Slash State’s Budget ... and the Pushback**

With its FY 2019 budget proposal, the administration is once again trying to push through large cuts of 30 percent to the State Department and USAID. No clear justification, or any justification, has been given for such drastic cuts.

And once again, there are members of Congress and military leaders speaking out against the cuts and in support of strong budgets for diplomacy and development.

On Feb. 11, a group of 151 retired three- and four-star officers from across all branches of the military sent a letter to congressional leaders urging that they fight to fund the State Department. “As you and your colleagues look ahead to the federal budget for Fiscal Year 2019, the world has not grown any safer since many of us wrote a similar letter to you last year,” they note in this year’s letter.

“Today’s crises do not have military solutions alone,” the letter says, “yet America’s essential civilian national security agencies—the State Department, USAID, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Peace Corps and other development agencies—faced a significant cut last year. Many senior leadership positions remain unfilled, undercutting America’s global influence.

“We call on you to ensure our nation also has the civilian resources necessary to protect our national security, compete against our adversaries, and create opportunities around the world.” The letter was signed by, among others, former chiefs of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Special Operations.

Rep. Eliot Engel (D-N.Y.), ranking member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, released a statement on Feb. 12 calling the proposed cuts “a gift to countries like Russia and China who are already filling the void left by America’s diminishing role in the world.”

Fortunately, he continued, “it is Congress—not the president—that has power of the purse, and I urge my colleagues to join me in ensuring that like last year, these draconian cuts are dead on arrival to Capitol Hill.”

In a Feb. 23 article in The Hill, Ambassador (ret.) Ronald Neumann and Senior FSO (ret.) Alexander Karagiannis urged Secretary of State Rex Tillerson to “provide real answers.” The authors dispute State’s claim that the Foreign Service is not shrinking under Tillerson’s tenure.

They point out that the department’s employment numbers include “low-level visa examiners” who, by regulation, cannot join the regular Foreign Service. “This is like saying that the Army has fired generals and replaced the numbers with privates, so the Army is still the same,” say Neumann and Karagiannis.

The battle over funding appears poised to drag on for some time. Diplomats at

**50 Years Ago**

**The Resurrection of NATO**

A mericans who work in international organizations are subject to a rather specialized affliction. They have to get used to reading every week or two that their organization is dead. I noticed this in the years I spent working on the United Nations; and when I arrived in Paris two years ago, I found the death of NATO was also being widely and prematurely reported. ... The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been around long enough so that everybody thinks he knows about it. But the trouble is, what is known seems often to be badly out of date. ... All in all, it’s an exhilarating time for an American to be working in Europe, and in the North Atlantic Alliance. For NATO has not only moved, bag and baggage, from Paris to Brussels; NATO has also moved from peacekeeping to peacemaking, from the management of a cold war to the management of a continuous peace.

—Ambassador Harlan Cleveland, “The Resurrection of NATO.”

April 1968 FSJ.
Attempting to track journalistic freedom in one country is itself a daunting task, but Reporters Without Borders (RSF) does that globally. RSF ranks each country by the freedom extended to the fourth estate and displays these rankings on a colorful, interactive, map.

RSF, an independent nongovernmental organization founded 30 years ago and based in Paris, has been compiling the World Press Freedom Index annually since 2002.

The index is meant to be a snapshot of media freedom based on various aspects including pluralism, independence of the media, quality of legislative framework and safety of journalists in each country.

Norway tops the recently released 2017 list with a freedom score of 7.60, indicating the highest amount of journalistic freedom in the world. By contrast, Eritrea and North Korea sit at the bottom of the list, with scores of 84.24 and 84.98 respectively.

The United States is in 43rd place on the list of 180. “Despite the bleak outlook under Trump, it bears repeating that his predecessor left behind a flimsy legacy for press freedom and access to information,” RSF notes.

The Obama administration prosecuted more “leakers” than any previous administration. “To this day,” RSF states, “American journalists are still not protected by a federal ‘shield law’ guaranteeing their right to protect their sources and other confidential work-related information.”

With foreign sections, bureaus in 10 cities and 130 correspondents internationally, the RSF tracks and advocates for freedom of the press around the world.

Human Rights Report

Missing Language on Women’s Rights?

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights turns 70 in December. Since the late 1970s, the State Department has been required to submit an annual report to Congress—Country Reports on Human Rights Practices—documenting “internationally recognized individual, civil, political and worker rights” as set forth in the Universal Declaration and other international agreements.

On Feb. 21, Politico reported that a top aide to the Secretary of State ordered drafters of the 2017 Human Rights Report to remove language discussing women’s reproductive rights and discrimination.

The directive, which came just days before the report was to be released, calls for removing passages that describe family planning, including access to contraceptives and abortion, according to Politico. It also orders that the section detailing racial, ethnic and sexual discrimination be pared down.

Further, the “Reproductive Rights” subsection is expected to be changed to “Coercion in Population Control.” Coercive measures to control family planning, such as forced abortions, are still expected to be tracked in the new report.

Sen. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, called the department’s decision “appalling,” adding that he is alarmed at the “alleged efforts to water down or delete critical sections.”

State Department Spokeswoman Heather Nauert responded to questions about the report by noting that the changes “will sharpen the focus of the report on abuses of internationally recognized human rights and the most egregious issues.” She said that the way the department “presents the report’s material has changed from time to time,” insisting that “this year we are better focusing some sections for clarity.”

But another State Department official told Politico that “this sends a clear signal that women’s reproductive rights are not a priority for this administration, and that it’s not even a rights violation we must or should report on.”

On Feb. 26, a letter from 165 human rights, health and development organizations was sent to Secretary Rex Tillerson “to raise our deep concern about news that the State Department’s annual Human Rights Report will no longer highlight the full range of abuses and human rights violations experienced most especially by women, girls, LGBTQI people, and other marginalized peoples around the world.”

The letter calls on the Secretary to “uphold the credibility of this important human rights tool” and calls on him to intervene and reverse course.

Site of the Month: Reporters Without Borders

Posts across the globe continue to do their jobs in support of U.S. foreign policy objectives even as they await news on the fate of their department.
Ordinary Citizens Supporting the Foreign Service

As a former Foreign Service officer who lives in London, Carol Madison Graham knows a bit about the mission of the U.S. State Department. When proposed cuts to the Foreign Service were announced in 2017, she saw members of Congress, academics and military personnel reacting negatively, and publicly. But she didn’t see a response from ordinary Americans like herself.

Graham realized that while many expats rely on services provided at their embassies—especially consular services—few knew how to express their thoughts about the Foreign Service in a way that would be heard by their representatives back home, or by the diplomats themselves. So, along with a few other London-based expats, she decided to launch a new organization in January called 1(800)Home.

Most of the founders are long-term expats, many of whom first went abroad as college students and, as Graham explains, “we understand that when misfortune and tragedy occur far from home, we need our Foreign Service.”

1(800)Home began as a non-partisan Facebook page, where expats and others could band together in support of the work that the Foreign Service does, and expanded to include in-person meetings.

The group held a reception at which Ron Packowitz, head of American Citizen Services at U.S. Embassy London, spoke about the burden of responsibility carried by consular officers who must inform families in the States when a loved one dies overseas, ensure fair treatment of Americans in foreign prisons and help in child abduction cases. 1(800)Home has already expanded into Greece and Australia, and is looking to start chapters in other countries, as well.

On their website, www.1-800Home.org, the group explains American consular functions (in particular, American Citizen Services), and provides links to information, such as travel alerts and social media sites, available on the State Department’s website.

According to Graham, more than nine million Americans live outside of the United States, with some 67 million travelling abroad in 2016 alone. “Americans abroad have been the missing part of the equation in speaking out for our consuls and our embassies,” she says. “As ordinary citizens, we are proud to stand with members of Congress, military leaders, education leaders and our fellow Americans in support of a strong Foreign Service.”

This edition of Talking Points was compiled by Donna Gorman, Shawn Dorman, Theo Horn and Susan Maitra.
Don’t Downgrade Diplomacy

This administration has routinely denigrated the responsibilities of our diplomatic and development corps and deemed them low priorities for American foreign policy. …

Of 163 total Senate-confirmed positions to the State Department and USAID, the Trump administration has failed to fulfill its duties to nominate individuals for 65 of those positions. This problem is further compounded by the poor management, dangerous political guidance and arbitrary hiring freeze at the State Department, which has prompted an alarming exodus of seasoned diplomats from the government, weakening our ability to promote our interests. If we do not have voices present to speak, no nation can listen to us, and America’s diplomatic and development institutions and critical personnel cannot become an afterthought to the Trump administration.

We cannot continue to allow the pulpits where we preach American values to remain vacant. President Trump must understand American leadership can only occur if American leaders are present on the international stage. Prioritizing diplomatic nominations only when there are sudden crises is not a strategy and not in the national security interest of the United States.

—Senator Bob Menendez (D-N.J.), ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a March 11 statement.

We Will Act Again on the Budget

A strong, bipartisan coalition in Congress has already acted once to stop deep cuts to the State Department and Agency for International Development that would have undermined our national security. This year, we will act again.

As I’ve said, diplomacy helps keep America strong and our troops out of combat. Our country faces urgent threats from North Korea, Iran and terrorists around the world. Programs that are vital to our national interests should be prioritized.

—Representative Ed Royce (R-Calif.), chair of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in a Feb. 12 statement on President Trump’s proposed FY 2019 international affairs budget.

An Irreplaceable Component

I firmly believe that strong investments in diplomatic and development programs are an irreplaceable component of our national security. In fact, our most senior military commanders have told us this “soft power” helps prevent the need for military intervention and facilitates operational success when military action is necessary.

That is why I am once again disappointed by the severe cuts proposed in the president’s Fiscal Year 2019 budget for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs. … We will certainly review this budget proposal, but ultimately Congress has the responsibility to equip our leaders with both the authority and resources needed to advance our national security interests.

—Representative Hal Rogers (R-Ky.) in a Feb. 12 press statement on President Trump’s proposed budget for FY 2019.

Frontline Civilians

Every day, diplomats work to advance the interests of the United States often at embassies and consulates in the most dangerous pockets of the world. They risk their lives to be our nation’s frontline civilians, and are faced with having to adapt to changing technologies that often come with security risks—including location-tracking consumer devices that reveal movements around the world.

That’s why we introduced the Protecting Diplomats from Surveillance Through Consumer Devices Act, which requires the State Department to account for these devices in the security policies of U.S. embassies and consulates worldwide. As lawmakers, we have a moral responsibility to take all necessary steps to ensure these brave diplomats and development workers have the protections they deserve.

—Representative Michael McCaul (R-Texas) and Rep. Joaquin Castro (D-Texas), from a Feb. 12 press release.
Respect, Trust and Partnership: Keeping Diplomacy on Course in Troubling Times

BY TED OSIUS

When John Kerry swore me in as U.S. ambassador to Vietnam in 2014, I said it was a “dream come true” to be able to serve as America’s representative in a country I have loved for more than two decades.

A three-year tour as ambassador in Hanoi was the high point of my 30-year career in the Foreign Service and the honor of a lifetime. The high-water mark of that tour was hosting President Barack Obama during a history-making visit to Vietnam. In Ho Chi Minh City one million people turned out to welcome him, and I knew we had done something right.

I am deeply grateful to the Foreign Service, not only for the privilege and joy of three decades of adventures (mostly in Asia), but also for my family. Thirteen-and-a-half years ago I met my future spouse in a business meeting of GLIFAA (formerly Gays and Lesbians in Foreign Affairs Agencies), an employee affinity group. By extension the Foreign Service gave us our 4-year-old son and 3-year-old daughter.

A diplomatic career also allowed me the great privilege of serving something bigger than myself: the United States of America. So it was with mixed emotions that I decided in 2017 to resign and join a number of other senior Foreign Service officers headed for the exit. While each of us has a different reason for departing, many of my friends and former colleagues are deeply worried about the policy direction of the current administration, as am I. I fear that some policies are diminishing America’s role in the world, and decided that I could not in good conscience implement them.

Many of us who were determined to strengthen America’s role in Asia considered that abandoning the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement was a self-inflicted wound. America left the playing field to those who do not share our values, and left American jobs there, too. Others grieved the U.S. abdication of responsibility regarding climate change, especially in a year marked by multiple storms so immense that they are supposed to happen only once in 500 years. A large number of colleagues voiced their dissent regarding the so-called “Muslim travel ban,” abhorrent in a country whose true strength derives from its diversity. What happened to the nation that welcomed “your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free”?

Closer to Home

And then the outrages came even closer to home. I was asked to press the government in Hanoi to receive from the United States more than 8,000 people, most of whom had fled South Vietnam on boats and through the jungle in the years immediately following the war.

The majority targeted for deportation—sometimes for minor infractions—were war refugees who had sided with the United States, whose loyalty was to the flag of a nation that no longer exists. And they were to be “returned” decades later to a nation ruled by a communist regime with which they had never reconciled. I feared many would become human rights cases, and our government would be culpable.

I assessed that this repulsive policy would destroy our chances of success in pursuing President Donald Trump’s other goals for relations with Vietnam: reducing the trade deficit, strengthening military relations and coping with regional threats to peace such as those emanating from North Korea. I voiced my objections, was instructed to remain silent, and decided there was an ethical line that I could not cross if I wished to retain my integrity. I concluded that I could better serve my country from outside government, by helping to build a new, innovative university in Vietnam.

At a ceremony in the Treaty Room at State, with a portrait of Thomas Jefferson looking on, I had the opportunity to
Real, powerful partnership comes when you build trust. And you build trust by finding where interests converge, and then doing things together.

reflect on three decades of service, behind me the flags of countries where I had served as a junior-, mid-level and senior officer. My spouse, an African American man, stood at my side. Our children, Mexican-American, rode on our shoulders while Deputy Assistant Secretary Constance Dierman acknowledged the sacrifice of service, including the sacrifices that families make. My mentor of 26 years, Ambassador (ret.) Cameron Hume, presented a U.S. flag to my spouse.

I reminded the mentors, mentees, colleagues, friends and family members attending of what another departing diplomat, Tom Countryman, said at his retirement: “We [must be] firm in our principles, steadfast in our ideals, and tireless in our determination to uphold our oath—to ‘defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.’”

Now more than ever. The challenges to the Foreign Service, and to our democracy, are existential. Some who remain at State feel besieged and demoralized. Yet I urge those Foreign Service officers who believe in making a difference to remain, if possible, because it is still a privilege to serve our country. I continue to believe the experienced diplomat’s language, regional expertise and deep understanding of a global challenge will pay off, and give that individual the chance to change a bit of history.

The Power of Respect
For those who choose to remain and who love diplomacy as I do, I offer a few thoughts on what can be done to best serve the United States, even in difficult times. I learned in my last three posts—India, Indonesia and Vietnam—about the power of respect, trust and partnership. The United States casts a long shadow, and when we show respect it has a big impact. Showing respect means figuring out what is really, truly important to our partners and taking that seriously. It costs America almost nothing and gets us almost everything.

Showing respect builds trust. Real, powerful partnership comes when you build trust. And you build trust by finding where interests converge, and then doing things together. The diplomat’s job is to find those shared interests and make them the bases of our actions. All those cables, all that contact work, the outreach—all of it should lead to action.

Here are three examples:

India. India’s nuclear tests put it outside the nonproliferation regime. A real partnership was only possible if we ended the ostracism. So the United States showed respect and built trust by pursuing a civil-nuclear initiative with India.

Indonesia. Indonesian special forces committed atrocities during the Suharto regime, so we didn’t engage them. A real partnership was only possible if we showed respect and built trust with Indonesia by re-engaging with the special forces, while respecting international human rights norms.

Vietnam. The war left massive scars. A real partnership was only possible if we dealt honestly with the past. We showed respect and built trust with Vietnam by pursuing the fullest-possible accounting of those lost, removing unexploded ordnance and cleaning up dioxin. And we were honest and respectful about even our most profound differences over human rights.

Building a Partnership
When I first visited Vietnam in 1996, the year after we normalized diplomatic relations, our countries could hardly envision a partnership. The past was a heavy burden, and the differences in our political systems were irreconcilable. But Vietnam had, and still has, leaders who are committed to finding where interests converge and then doing things together. And the United States had leaders like Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.), former Secretary of State John Kerry and, later, President Obama, who were also committed to our comprehensive partnership.

So, together, our two countries deepened trade and security and people-to-people ties. During my tour as ambassador, we prepared for not one, but two presidential visits to Vietnam, as well as visits to the United States by Vietnam’s General Secretary Nguyen Phu Trong and Prime Minister Nguyen Xuan Phuc.

Building trust wasn’t easy, because we had to keep earning it. We had to do what we said we’d do. For example, we promised the Vietnamese people we would continue cleaning up dioxin, also
known as Agent Orange, left from the war. Because the process for cleaning up dioxin is very expensive, it took three years to find the resources to remediate the largest, worst hot spot. That we are proceeding is a result of determined, persistent leadership spanning several administrations. And by keeping our promise, we strengthen trust, to the benefit of Vietnam, the United States and the world.

Respect and trust are not zero-sum, nor are they transactional. They involve relationships, not just money and power. Military dominance alone won’t build the strong alliances and partnerships that we need in the Indo-Pacific region.

Those partnerships provide real, tangible benefits to the United States. Strong partnerships with India, Indonesia and Vietnam create jobs for Americans, contribute to regional stability and help us address global challenges to human health, the environment and international security.

When we commit to these partnerships—and I have seen this again and again—we facilitate commercial deals worth hundreds of billions of dollars and boost educational exchange, creating or supporting hundreds of thousands of jobs in the United States. We form security partnerships with countries that share our interest in open sea lanes and upholding international law. We create a more prosperous and safer America.

Don’t Give Up

Before leaving post, I urged my embassy colleagues not to give up. Even if as ambassador (and therefore the president’s personal representative) I could not in good conscience implement certain policies, I thought my younger colleagues might face a different choice. Early in my career, I had considered leaving State when, serving on the Korea desk, I disagreed strongly with the administration’s approach to North Korea. But I held on, believing that the pendulum would swing again and that I could do more good by remaining with the department than by quitting. There have been many difficult periods for the Foreign Service, and we have ridden through the ups and downs.

Now, from the perspective of a former FSO, I offer the following suggestions to those who continue to pursue diplomacy:

- As long as you can remain true to your beliefs and ethics, don’t give up. We’ve been through tough cycles before. This will end.
- Develop language and regional expertise. It continues to matter.
- Show respect in ways large and small. It matters when a representative of the United States—no matter what rank—shows respect.
- Build trust by engaging with counterparts in endeavors that are of mutual interest.
- Build partnerships based on respect, as they are essential for America’s future and will enable us to recover when the clouds pass.
- Keep relationships going. Those who argue that only interests matter, and that relationships don’t, have been proven wrong by history before and will be proven wrong again.

When the United States shows respect and builds trust, we build relationships that benefit enduring shared interests. After 30 years in Asia, I know that is the only way to make America even greater.
The Foreign Service Journal’s first hundred years is a lively story of the development of an engaging and authoritative professional magazine, by and for the practitioners of American diplomacy.

BY HARRY KOPP

“Wen a diplomat wants to talk,” wrote novelist John Le Carré, “the first thing he thinks of is food.” No wonder then that The Foreign Service Journal got its start in a restaurant, the long-gone Cushman’s at 14th and F Streets Northwest, where the American Consular Association held its monthly meetings. The association, established in 1918 for social and professional purposes, had struggled to put out an occasional newsletter, of which no copies survive. A happy stroke of nepotism, however, led in March 1919 to the first printed American Consular Bulletin, edited and published in New York “with the cooperation of the American Consular Association” by the brother of an active-duty consul and association member.
The ACA and its publication were intended to foster esprit de corps and seriousness of purpose in a Service that was rapidly becoming professional. In 32 pages a month, the Bulletin published important texts (e.g., the economic clauses of the Treaty of Versailles), opinion pieces (“Why We Must Reform Our Diplomatic Service”), commercial information (foreign markets for American-made candy), technical advice on consular matters (how to handle advance payment of wages to seamen) and information on pending legislation, congressional debates and personnel actions. Revenue came from subscriptions at $1.50 per year, with additional income from advertising—the Liberty Bread Slicer, which could cut 26,100 slices in a day, often bought a page.

The State Department found the idea of an independent publication deeply unsettling and insisted on prepublication review of every issue.

With his signature on the Foreign Service Act (also known as the Rogers Act) on May 24, 1924, President Calvin Coolidge merged the consular and diplomatic services into a new Foreign Service of the United States. The American Consular Association and its Bulletin promptly adapted, becoming the American Foreign Service Association and the American Foreign Service Journal, first published under that title in October 1924. The transition was seamless, although monthly meetings moved from Cushman’s to a larger room at Rauscher’s on Connecticut Avenue.

The transformation brought immediate changes. Perhaps because the diplomatic service was smaller (128 diplomatic officers to 518 consular officers) and more deeply rooted in patronage, the new Journal, now edited and published in Washington, was less earnest and more chatty than the Bulletin. The change was clear from the statement of purpose that appeared below the masthead in the first issue:

The main purpose of the Journal will be inspirational and not educational. ... Photographs, the light touch in the narration of experience, and personal items will be constantly desired. Propaganda and articles of a tendentious nature, especially such as might be aimed to influence legislative, executive or administrative action with respect to the Foreign Service or the Department of State, are rigidly excluded from its columns.

“Greater Frankness”

The early Journal was a cross between National Geographic and today’s State Magazine. It carried travelogues, photographs of exotic places and people, sketches of life in the field, odd bits of history and lists of personnel appointments, transfers, promotions, retirements, weddings, births and deaths. So anodyne was it that the department gave up its demand for prior review.
The State Department found the idea of an independent publication deeply unsettling and insisted on prepublication review of every issue.

Readers seem to have found the Journal boring. In October 1929, five years into its run, the Journal noted a decision by AFSA’s Executive Committee (the predecessor of today’s Governing Board) to take the publication in a different direction, toward “greater frankness” in discussing “problems and difficulties that may confront the Service.” For the first time, the Journal hired a full-time editor, a retired consular officer. The statement of purpose disappeared.

An opinion piece, published in December 1929 and signed by the chairman of the association’s executive committee, confirmed the change. After several years of budget cuts, Dana Munro wrote, many Service members “are profoundly discouraged … about the future of the Service,” as shown by “the appalling number of recent resignations.” Munro, who considered the despairing mood seriously overblown, urged Service members to contribute to a “frank and full discussion” of the problems of the Service “in the privacy of the Journal’s columns.”

Despite Munro’s appeal, echoed occasionally in plaintive letters to the editor, the next few years saw little in the way of debate about active issues confronting the Service. According to Smith Simpson’s account of the Journal’s first 60 years (November 1984 FSJ), signed articles in the early years came almost exclusively from members of the old consular service. “Diplomats virtually boycott the Journal,” he wrote, blaming their attitude on “their dislike of the Rogers Act [the Foreign Service Act of 1924] and anything associated with it.” Nevertheless, the historian Hugh de Santis, in a book excerpt published in the Journal in 1979, said the Journal, despite its “breezy, gossip-style format … reinforced organizational cohesion” and helped “to cement the diplomat’s professional identity.”

Henry Stimson, who took office as President Herbert Hoover’s Secretary of State in March 1929, was more intense and demanding than his predecessor, and the Journal’s tone took on some of Stimson’s seriousness. The number of articles on the work of the department and its diplomats increased, and coverage of social trivia diminished. Stimson persuaded the president and Congress to raise salaries and allowances for the Service and authorized an increase in hiring.

Depression and War
But the respite was short-lived. As the Great Depression deepened, President Herbert Hoover and Congress put together an austerity budget in 1932 that imposed deep cuts across the government, including in the department and the Service. The Journal accepted austerity as inevitable, as politically it no doubt was; but bitterness was evident in a sarcastic item hidden like a want-ad in the September 1932 Journal: “WANTED: A nice poorhouse, with all modern conveniences, where a Foreign Service officer can spend his 30-day furlough without pay.”
The Service, by and large, had little sympathy with the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration that took office in March 1933. The Service at the time was, indeed, as it was later called, pale, male and Yale. Photographs of all 683 Foreign Service officers published in the Journal in November 1936 showed 681 white men and two white women. A table published in June 1940, when there were 850 FSOs, identified 211 (25 percent) as graduates of Harvard, Yale or Princeton. An FSO, writing to the Journal in 1954, commented: “Anyone who knows the Service also knows that in the main it is composed of very conservative and cautious men and that during the 20 years of the Democratic administration it never contained more than a handful who were personally in sympathy with the social objectives and attitudes of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.”

In 1937 Selden Chapin, who would later design much of the structure of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, contributed a two-part article proposing major changes in the operation and administration of the Foreign Service and its personnel, with the goal of promoting greater training and specialization among officers. Chapin’s articles in the November and December issues received the Journal’s support in an “Editors’ Column” (which in mid-1937 became a regular Journal feature), but neither Secretary of State Cordell Hull nor the White House showed interest in the topic. The White House found it easier to ignore the Service than to take on the task of reforming it.

Discussions of Foreign Service reform faded from the Journal’s pages. In 1939, the closure of the separate foreign agricultural and commercial services led to the transfer of more than a hundred outsiders into the Foreign Service at the Department of State. The Journal published the names of the newly commissioned officers, but otherwise said not a word.

Throughout the 1930s, neither AFSA nor the Journal would have described itself as the voice of the Foreign Service. That role belonged, without question, to the Department of State. The Journal published, almost always without comment, full texts or summaries of statements by department officials on matters affecting the Service, particularly legislation, appropriations and allowances. The Journal also reprinted a good deal of third-party content—editorials and articles from various U.S. newspapers and magazines, and speeches by notable figures—generally favorable to the Service and complimentary of its performance. Except in these official documents and third-party pieces, matters of foreign policy were almost never broached, at least not until the outbreak of war in Europe in September 1939. Discussions of fascism or communism were limited to book reviews, of which there were many.

The war pushed civilian diplomacy to the side. Aging under a hiring freeze and unable to operate in combat zones, the Foreign Service spent the war years in a kind of hibernation and the Journal in an editorial torpor (coverage of posts in Latin America, where diplomatic routine was largely maintained, was never again so intense). Only issues of personnel and institutional reform seemed to generate excitement.

**Peace and Persecution**

In March 1944 the Journal woke up its audience with a contest that offered a donated top prize of $500 (about $7,000 today) for the best essay by an active-duty officer on the topic “Suggestions for Improving the Foreign Service and Its Administration to Meet Its War and Post-War Responsibilities.” (George V. Allen, then a vice consul but later National Security Adviser to President Ronald Reagan, had won a similar but even more lucrative contest in 1935.) Thirty officers—an extraordinary number—submitted essays to a panel of judges that included two serving members of Congress and Under Secretary of State Joseph Grew, the highest-ranking career Foreign Service officer at the time. The winning essay, by James Orr Denby, appeared in the February 1945 Journal (see excerpt...
Throughout the 1930s, neither AFSA nor the Journal would have described itself as the voice of the Foreign Service.

The essays were a source of creative thinking in development of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, which provided career status and better pay for Foreign Service staff (today’s specialists), opened a path to career status for the temporary hires of the wartime Foreign Service Auxiliary and created the framework for rapid expansion of the Service, to 8,000 members in 1950.

Passage of the 1946 Act was a high point for the Foreign Service, which for a brief moment had the attention and support of both Congress and the White House. But signs of trouble were already evident. Attacks on Foreign Service officers in China as communist sympathizers had begun in 1945 and would soon metastasize. By 1950 Senator Joe McCarthy (R-Wis.) had charged that the State Department was “infested with communists.” Between 1945 and 1953, hundreds of State Department employees were fired as security risks, as John W. Ford recalled in a November 1980 FSJ article, “The McCarthy Years Inside the Department of State.”

Members of the Foreign Service felt constant pressure to ensure that their reporting from the field validated official thinking, or at least posed no challenge to it. The Journal courageously addressed the issue in July 1951, in an unsigned editorial titled “Career vs. Conscience.” The FSO, the Journal wrote, “finds that a calling which has claimed his abiding loyalty, and his unexpressed but deep devotion to his country, is being assailed and degraded by irresponsible demagogues. ... The choice is before him. Shall he remain in the Service, resolved to report only what will harmonize with the temper of the times? Shall he report honestly and fearlessly... knowing the dangers of honesty and the risk to his career and his reputation? Or shall he resign?”

That editorial was a high point. Two years later, the editorial page carried a “declaration of purposes and principles” approved by AFSA and its board of directors that was so bland and bromidic that its authors called it no more than “an initial step in formulating a forthright and vigorous expression of what the Service stands for.” What the Foreign Service stands for has been addressed over and over again in the pages of the FSJ ever since, with mixed results.

After the declaration, the threat of politically directed reporting received far less attention in the Journal than the threat of “amalgamation,” the term used to describe the merger, proposed by a series of blue-ribbon commissions, of the department’s Civil Service and Foreign Service employees into a single personnel system. In its April 1951 editorial, “The Directive to Unify,” the Journal offered limp support for the idea—so long as its implementation was “gradual” and “partial” and did not coerce employees into “careers which did not appeal to them.”

When the department brought some 1,400 civil servants into the Foreign Service in 1954, the AFSA board, at the department’s request, refused to allow the Journal to publish negative comments and instructed the editors to turn over to the department any letters it received that expressed “anxieties” about
the program. The AFSA board, which consulted closely with the department’s management, extended its control over editorial content throughout the decade, requiring the *Journal* to consult before publishing “material of major importance.”

**Dissent and Change**

In the early 1960s, the *Journal*, like the country, pushed back against censorious conformity. “The Foreign Service has special reason to be thankful,” said an April 1961 editorial, “for President Kennedy’s statement ... that the new administration ‘recognizes the value of daring and dissent’ among public servants. ... To our readers, we say: Speak up!”

Speak up they did, softly at first, and then with force and volume. In 1963 AFSA set up a Committee on Public Relations and became far more transparent. The *Journal* began to publish detailed news about the association, including full or summarized minutes of meetings of the board of directors, as a regular feature. AFSA’s president, Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs U. Alexis Johnson, placed a “Dear Colleague” letter, the predecessor of today’s “President’s Views” column, in the *Journal*’s March 1966 edition. Articles on current topics in foreign affairs and diplomatic practice began to appear with greater frequency—in January 1965, for example, the *Journal* carried a long and thoughtful piece, “Vietnam: The War That Is Not a War,” along with a story on the aftermath of a Vietcong raid on a village in the Mekong Delta and a report on USIA’s field work in Laos.

Demands for changes in the management of the Service and its treatment by the department took on growing importance, with the *Journal* serving as a primary link between reformers in Washington and Service members in the field.

The pace of change accelerated as the decade advanced. In 1967 a slate of reformers—the “Young Turks,” led by Lannon Walker and Charlie Bray—won every seat on AFSA’s board of directors. The reformers deliberately ran a stealth campaign, rallying support in missions around the world through private communications, without using the *Journal*. As soon as they had won, however, they turned to the *Journal* to promote...
Passage of the 1946 Act was a high point for the Foreign Service. But signs of trouble were already evident. Attacks on FSOs in China as communist sympathizers had begun...

their program—a program of institutional change, developed in great detail, that would recognize the professionalism of the career Foreign Service and raise the level of responsibility entrusted to it. With a grant from John D. Rockefeller III, they had the Journal publish their proposals in a 128-page report called “Toward a Modern Diplomacy” (November 1969 FSJ, Part Two).

The ambitious reforms that they proposed never came to pass, but the drafting of the manifesto (as the report came to be called) engaged scores of Foreign Service officers in rigorous thinking about the Service as an institution, a profession and a career. As these officers considered their situation, they became less deferential and more adversarial. The idea that members of the Foreign Service were labor and the upper levels of the department were management moved from the periphery toward the center of thinking of AFSA’s officers and directors. In editorials like “A Professional Association” (November 1970), the Journal offered full-throated support for recognition of AFSA as the exclusive labor-management representative—the union—for members of the Foreign Service. The Journal distributed ballots for the many elections that addressed the issue and celebrated AFSA’s victories in its pages.

The Journal and the Union

The collective bargaining agreements between AFSA and the Department of State that followed unionization in 1974 gave AFSA access to State’s communications systems for certain messages on union business, reducing the association’s reliance on the Journal to communicate with its membership around the world. At the same time, the Journal’s “AFSA News” section, which had been just a page or two, grew in scope and took on an identity of its own.

Beginning in September 1975, the Journal’s editors felt it wise to inform readers: “While the Editorial Board of the Journal is responsible for its general content, statements concerning the policy and administration of AFSA as employee representative … on the editorial page and in the AFSA News, and all communications relating to these, are the responsibility of the AFSA Governing Board.”

In the run-up to passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, the Journal’s role was subdued. There were no essay contests or efforts to engage the readership in development of new Foreign Service structures, as there had been during the drafting of the Act of 1946. Newly empowered to speak for the Service, AFSA instead met directly with its constituents in Washington and used its own channels to survey its members in the field.

The changing nature of AFSA’s relationship with its members, and with management in the Department of State and other agencies, brought changes in the Journal, as well. The Journal began to shift the balance in its content, leaving AFSA’s union issues to the AFSA News section and devoting more attention to such topics as professionalism, diplomatic history and practice, dissent, diplomacy and the military, security and terrorism, the role of the Service in policy formation and the unfortunate popular image of the career diplomat.

Discussions of these and similar perennial questions filled the pages of the Journal in the 1980s and 1990s. Active-duty and retired members of the Foreign Service contributed most of the material, but civil servants, academics, journalists and politicians wrote for the magazine, as well. “The Journal took on a more journalistic tone,” said Managing Editor Nancy Johnson in “A Stroll Through 75 Years of the Journal” in the May 1994 FSJ.

Defending the Profession

A reader of the Journal during those years would have been struck by its introspection and defensiveness. Most issues, it seemed, carried some material deploring the sorry state of the Service, suggesting improvements in the institution and appealing for measures to repair the lack of funding, the lack of training and especially the lack of understanding of its work, its efforts and its character by Congress and the public at large. The Journal defended professionalism and the career principle with a wealth of anecdote, but it preached only to the converted: circulation in 1989 averaged about 11,200 per issue, including copies sent to more than 9,200 members of AFSA. Readership outside the Service itself was small, and outside the foreign affairs community it was essentially nil.

At least five editorials defending the professionalism of
career practitioners appeared in the 1980s, as well as a cover story (April 1982) and a long—and to this reader, fairly timid—essay by Ambassador Nathaniel Davis (March 1980). Three articles in 1986, by Ambassadors David Newsom, John Mar- esca and Leon Poullada, discussed the cultivation of leadership and expertise in the Service, with a generally pessimistic conclusion. AFSA President Perry Shankle worried in November 1987 that due to budget cuts, “we must fear for the very survival of our profession.” In March 1989 Newsom, a former under secretary for political affairs, felt it necessary to ask, “Are Diplomats Patriotic?”

In time this gloomy cycle ran its course. In January 1990, on the occasion of the bicentennial of the Department of State, the Journal published a special supplement meant “to increase public understanding and support” and “contribute to the sense of common purpose and dedication among those Americans who devote their lives to the diplomatic profession.” A richly illustrated 32-page AFSA booklet designed to reach an audience beyond subscribers to the Journal, “American Diplomacy and the Foreign Service,” was relentlessly upbeat. By May 1991, in the wake of the Persian Gulf War, AFSA President Ted Wilkinson’s column, “The State of the Service,” spoke of “higher morale.”

Focus

In the 1990s the Journal began to identify a theme or “focus” for each issue, a topic treated in at least two and usually three or four articles. Initially, matters of foreign policy dominated the coverage: U.S.-Japan, Central America and Cuba, U.S.-Russia, trade policy, human rights and foreign aid were focus topics in 1991 and 1992. As the decade wore on, although issues of foreign policy continued to receive attention, professional and career issues again grew in importance: Focus topics included doing less with less, Foreign Service training, ethics and statecraft, retirement, reorganization, dissent, integration of the U.S. Information Agency into the State Department, diplomacy and the military, dealing with Congress and the Foreign Service as a career.

In particular, the Journal gave great attention to the efforts of Senator Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) to reorganize the Department of State and reshape the Foreign Service. Helms was a narrow-minded conservative with a sure grasp of the power that Senate traditions provided to individual members. When the 1994 elections gave the Republicans control of the Senate, Helms replaced Senator Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), a former Foreign Service officer, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The change was a shock to the system. Helms used his position to block Senate consideration of dozens of career nominees thought to support policies that he and his hardline staff opposed. The department never figured out how to deal with him.

The Journal found him fascinating. Helms was the subject of two cover caricatures, one in October 1981 and another in May 1995. His name appeared in 67 of 117 issues during the 1990s. He was the subject of eight different articles, three editorials and scores of letters to the editor (including one he

In 2001, when the AFSA Governing Board (led by Adair’s successor, John K. Naland) directed the Journal to survey its readership, a strong majority of respondents wanted the magazine to devote more space to “professional/personnel/lifestyle issues.” The board instructed the Journal to follow that guidance.

The AFSA board also told the Journal to cut expenses. AFSA’s accounting showed losses for the Journal rising from around $60,000 in 1994 to $220,000 in 2000. (AFSA’s accounting gave the Journal no budget-line credit for the portion of members’ dues that paid for their subscriptions, inflating a deficit that may not have existed at all.) By mid-2001, Journal editor Bob Guldin, Karen Krebsbach’s successor, had resigned. AFSA moved the Journal’s associate editor, former Foreign Service Officer Steven Alan Honley, into the top spot.

Honley remained as editor until 2014. Early on, he made changes to freshen the publication and strengthen its engagement with its readers. He wrote an occasional “letter from the editor” to solicit contributions and feedback, and he published a calendar of topics on which the Journal intended to focus a year in advance. He used online surveys to track and generate reader interest—a survey on best and worst posts elicited 1,300 responses.

Senior Editor Susan Maitra and Associate Editor and former FSO Shawn Dorman became frequent contributors to the Journal, and Honley wrote often for its pages himself. Dorman produced in-depth articles looking at issues of the day, soliciting input from the active-duty Service and thus capturing views not otherwise obvious. The topics included reform at State, Iraq War service (one of which was reprinted in The Washington Post) and transformational diplomacy.

Honley experimented with new features like a personal finance column that responded to questions from readers; and when that flagged, he broadened it to “FS Know-How,” publishing readers’ thoughts about dealing with a range of issues peculiar to Foreign Service life. The “Clippings” section, which published excerpts of interest from the general press (as the Journal had done from its earliest days), became Cybernotes, to bring in material found on the internet. He also introduced...
“FS Heritage,” a space for occasional reader-driven vignettes from the Service’s past. (According to the March 2015 FSJ, Fiorello LaGuardia was a consul in Fiume. Who knew?)

The Journal’s balance of content shifted perceptibly to conform more closely to readers’ interests. Not that foreign policy issues were neglected—several issues each year were devoted to a region or country (e.g., India, China, Russia, the Arab Spring, the Euro Zone, Latin America) or to a general topic (e.g., global energy, climate change, political Islam). Notably, the March issue in every year from 2004 through 2008 dealt with Iraq and its consequences for both American policy and

the Foreign Service. The Iraq War coverage won the Journal praise from the Columbia Journalism Review in 2007.

During the 2000s the Journal tried to strike a balance in its foreign affairs coverage between articles by active or retired members of the Service and outside experts and notables. The latter included former U.S. presidents Jimmy Carter and George H. W. Bush, former Secretary of State George P. Shultz (twice) and Secretary of State Colin Powell. In 2012 the Journal underwent a redesign, the first major change in layout and typeface since 1994. The redesign offered more flexibility in the design and cover images and gave the Journal a contemporary look.
In 2015 the AFSA Governing Board affirmed the Journal’s editorial independence.

The Journal Today

Shawn Dorman was selected for the editor-in-chief position in late 2013, when Steve Honley stepped down, taking up the post in January 2014. She expanded the occasional letter from the editor into a monthly feature aiming to frame each issue, especially the focus theme of the month. The Journal has continued to take on sensitive topics of concern to its members. With the demise of the Secretary’s Open Forum (born in 1967, abandoned and left for dead around 2002), the Journal in many cases serves as the only space for public discussion within the Service of such issues as expeditionary diplomacy (September 2011), managing risk and security after Benghazi (May 2015) or the militarization of diplomacy (June 2017).

In Dorman’s words, the Journal “aims to shine a light where light is needed.” The Journal, she says, “occupies a unique space as the publication that puts a Foreign Service and diplomacy lens on the issues of the day.” She sees the magazine as a vehicle for sparking discussion and debate about the role of diplomacy and development, and, when possible, advancing the conversation inside and outside the Service.

In 2015 the AFSA Governing Board affirmed the Journal’s editorial independence, although no serious disagreements have emerged since then to put the proposition to the test. On the contrary: if AFSA is the voice of the Foreign Service, the Journal has been its megaphone. AFSA President Barbara Stephenson used her December 2017 “President’s Views” column to call attention to the erosion of the senior ranks of the Foreign Service and to ask, “Where is the mandate to pull the Foreign Service team from the field and forfeit the game to our adversaries?”

The column, released before its official publication, was widely read and quoted, revealing a depth of congressional and public support for diplomacy and the career Foreign Service that few knew or believed existed. Representative Tim Walz (D-Minn.) cited it in a piece he wrote for the January-February 2018 Journal, “Dear Foreign Service: We’ve Got Your Back.” Walz’s message was the first of a planned series from members of Congress, whose bylines had been almost wholly absent from the Journal since 2000. In March, Senator Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) offered his “Message from the Hill,” calling for a national conversation about the role of the United States in the world.

In 2017 AFSA completed the digitization of the Journal’s back issues, from March 1919 on, all of which are now available in a searchable archive at www.afsa.org/fsj-archive. Making this trove accessible to researchers, policy professionals and the public will help to dispel the widespread ignorance and misunderstanding of the U.S. Foreign Service and what it does. But Foreign Service people should take a word of warning from the writer of this article: Poking around in the archive will stir the sediment of memory in ways that are informative, revelatory, provocative and habit-forming.

Today The Foreign Service Journal has a print circulation of about 18,000 copies, and a digital edition, acces-
A word of warning: poking around in the archive will stir the sediment of memory in ways that are informative, revelatory, provocative and habit-forming.

Coda
A century is a long, long run for a magazine. Collier’s didn’t make it, nor did Life, McCall’s or The Saturday Evening Post. The Foreign Service Journal, however, remains what its consular progenitors wanted it to be: a source of group cohesion and spirit, a guide to best practices, intellectual stimulation and debate, and a beacon of excellence and professionalism across the Foreign Service.

The Journal faces the challenges that afflict many print periodicals: high costs, a scramble for advertising revenue, and conflict between an internet that demands speed and a product that demands deliberation. The Journal is fortunate, however, to have readers who care about and contribute to its content. If the readership stays engaged, the Journal will be with us into the 22nd century.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS DAY
The Annual Homecoming for Foreign Service and State Department Civil Service Retirees
★ May 4, 2018 ★

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

To RSVP, please email foreignaffairsday@state.gov with your full name, retirement date, street address, email address and phone number.
As the Cold War lurched to an end and the Foreign Service Act of 1980 came into force, new challenges emerged and the Journal’s profile got a refreshing boost.

BY STEPHEN R. DUJACK

My tenure at AFSA started in 1981, just six weeks after the Foreign Service hostages held in Iran returned home, and ended a few months before the collapse of communism and ultimate dissolution of the Soviet Union. So I barely missed the two most important events affecting American foreign relations in that decade. But my seven years at the helm of The Foreign Service Journal occurred during the last gasps of the Cold War, what New York Times columnist Ross Douthat called “the Armageddon-haunted 1980s.” The face-off in Europe threatened to push the world to the nuclear brink. Meanwhile, the Middle East was an ongoing powder keg. And North-South issues were emerging to crowd ever-worsening East-West issues on the world stage.
Not coincidentally, it was a period of huge challenges to the diplomatic profession and to foreign affairs professionals personally.

For the former, there were antagonists like Senator Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), a ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee and later its chair. Helms was always a thorn in the side of the State Department as he sought to impose his worldview on diplomatic officials and, with his “mini-State” on his staff, the foreign policy they carried out. At the same time, President Ronald Reagan was naming an alarming number of political appointees to ambassadorial posts and several unqualified people to key positions at the State Department.

The threat to personnel was multifold. It included, importantly, terrorism. The embassy in Beirut was twice car-bombed, with massive loss of life. Assassinations of American officials happened in other venues. The memorial plaque in the C Street Lobby of the Truman Building began to fill rapidly. There was also the onset of AIDS, the deadly and little-understood disease that threatened the “worldwide availability” of infected employees and thus the whole notion of foreign service.

It was a time when women were first cementing their gains in the workplace, fracturing the age-old paradigm wherein the uncompensated wife was rated on an annual basis alongside her Foreign Service husband. Now the woman was often the diplomat, or she had an independent profession. Dual careers and the challenges of raising children overseas were leading many families to simply refuse to move. Finally, the new Foreign Service Act of 1980 and the “up or out” system it created for senior officers was being implemented, to the benefit of diplomacy generally but also the consternation of many.

Seldom before was there a greater need for a professional magazine to offer guidance and an arena for robust debate of the issues confronting America’s diplomats.

A Great Opportunity

The AFSA search committee had made it clear to me that they expected real improvement in the Journal. They wanted an active-duty-focused magazine guided by a peer-reviewing board made up of representatives of each of the foreign affairs agencies, as well as expert public members. The FSJ Editorial Board drafted bylaws to codify these changes, putting in term limits to keep the membership fresh. An important innovation was to have a liaison officer; we put a member of the Governing Board on the Editorial Board so he or she could keep the big board informed as necessary.

I realized during the transition that the Journal had a great opportunity to become a true professional magazine for America’s diplomatic employees. That meant content that dealt with Foreign Service issues—including important articles on foreign relations, but written for a professional audience, as well as articles that addressed the unique aspects of overseas careers and lifestyles. I convinced the Governing Board to budget an assistant by promising an increase in ad revenues, and Frances G. Burwell, who held a master’s degree in international relations from Oxford, came on board to act as articles editor and chief salesperson. She made a critical

Stephen R. Dujack was editor of The Foreign Service Journal from 1981 to 1988. He has been editor of the Environmental Law Institute’s magazine, The Environmental Forum, since 1990.
A MASSIVE LEAK

At the height of the Cold War, a top official at State caused a leak of extremely sensitive material, classified above Top Secret. It was distributed far and wide—to nearly every country in the world. ...How do I know? I was the agent of that massive leak.

Thus begins Stephen Dujack’s gripping account, in the June 29, 2016, edition of Politico, of an incident that occurred 30 years ago, during his tenure at the helm of the FSJ.

It had to do with the February 1987 Journal, which carried a “cover story” interview with Under Secretary of State for Management Ronald I. Spiers, the fourth-ranked officer in the department and former ambassador to Turkey.

In connection with the interview, Dujack visited Spiers’ office on the State Department’s seventh floor to take photos, then chose the best for the cover. Ten thousand copies of the FSJ were sent to AFSA members around the world, to offices in Foggy Bottom, to the diplomatic corps and the foreign affairs community in Washington, D.C., and to Capitol Hill.

When an aide to then-Senator Jesse Helms saw the Journal, he recognized a document partially visible on Spiers’ desk as a copy of the highly classified National Intelligence Daily and called the State Department’s Bureau of Diplomatic Security.

That’s when the real fun began—including a press frenzy that saw the story and millions of copies of the incriminating FSJ cover circulate around the country and the world.

The FSJ editor had committed no crime; he should not have been allowed in the room with the document unsecured. Though testing determined that no information could be gleaned from the photo, Mr. Spiers was reprimanded for the “infraction.”

—Susan B. Maitra

difference in our editorial content and in our finances, more than paying her way in both contexts.

Fran and I reorganized the magazine with columns up front covering various beats important to diplomatic employees, followed by a series of Foreign Service-focused features. Finally, we preserved the remarkable overseas experiences that were the mainstay of the old FSJ by running a single such piece per issue at the back of the book, with a special layout and illustration.

Then we proceeded to secure a bunch of articles that cemented the new identity of the magazine. President Reagan had pulled out of the Law of the Sea Treaty that spring, and by coincidence a week earlier we had received a manuscript on the accord. We also obtained an article on the law governing outer space resources, which Reagan would soon threaten to militarize via his Star Wars missile defense program. In both cases, we were ahead of the curve.

No More Cover-ups

Until then, the Journal’s covers had been artwork by Foreign Service employees or their spouses. Sometimes these depicted overseas scenes, many of them charming and by a fine hand; but, even so, they were unrelated to the content of the magazine. And sometimes they were neither topical nor good art. Never was this disconnect clearer than in the April 1981 Journal.

Just weeks after the Iran hostages returned, my predecessor secured a coveted interview with Bruce Laingen, who had been the chargé d’affaires in Tehran, for the April issue. Laingen also gave the Journal a watercolor he had done while in captivity. It showed his view from the room where he had been held prisoner. He had smuggled it out of the country when the hostages were released by taping it to his thigh. Incredibly, this historically important and well-executed painting ran on an inside page in black and white, while the cover
AFSA wanted an active-duty-focused magazine guided by a peer-reviewing board made up of representatives of each of the foreign affairs agencies, as well as expert public members.

was taken up by a color folk art rendition of the Garden of Eden, with papier-mâché figurines of Adam and Eve showing prominent pubic hair.

We took a different approach. Beginning with the July/August 1981 edition and our sea and space articles, we sought covers that advertised the contents of the issue. For that issue, the journal obtained from NASA one of the most famous photographs in history: the watery blue Earth rising above a barren moonscape taken by the Apollo 8 astronauts. Below that, in bold type, was the header: “The Sea, the Moon, and U.S. Foreign Policy” (see p. 35).

That cover announced via tone and content that the magazine was a professional policy magazine now.

The journal then secured an interview with Sigvard Eklund, the little-known Swedish diplomat who had guided the International Atomic Energy Agency for 20 years. Just days later, the Israeli Air Force sent a bunch of bombers to take out Saddam Hussein’s nuclear power plant under construction at Tuwaitha. The Israelis feared it would be used to produce weapons-grade plutonium. The raid made a mockery of Eklund’s mission to promote nuclear power while ensuring that nations using reac-
tors were not diverting materials to manufacturing atomic warheads in contravention of the Nonproliferation Treaty.

The Journal’s 4,000-word scoop—a taped interview with the reclusive agency head that included detailed discussions of the safeguards system meant to shield against proliferation—ran in the September 1981 issue. Through some creative sleuthing, we secured a contraband color picture of the Iraqi facility that had been snuck out of the country before the Israelis reduced the reactor to rubble. Once again, the Journal had a striking and important photo on the cover (see p. 36) and an article that was both topical and of intense interest to foreign affairs professionals: the functioning of an international agency in the news with an ambitious and challenging diplomatic mandate.

These articles weren’t isolated points of light. That same September issue also contained an important essay on State’s diminishing role versus that of the National Security Council by former ambassador and Cabinet secretary Elliott Richardson, and an article on state-sponsored terrorism by none other than head Iran hostage, Ambassador Bruce Laingen.

We also printed covers by nationally known illustrators to feature our content, especially via humorous art. My favorite was a sketch by the New Yorker’s Henry Martin of a diplomat in tails meeting a penguin. The mirror twins were used to showcase an article on Antarctica in the February 1983 FSJ. For the September 1983 cover, the syndicated editorial cartoonist Henry Payne highlighted an article on ensuring ambassadorial quality by painting three identical pin-striped diplomats coming down an assembly line followed by an unnoticed Bozo the Clown. Former Ambassador James Spain joked on seeing that cover that he wasn’t sure the ratio shouldn’t be closer to 1:1.

“Ambassador Klunk” and Beyond

In the winter of 1982, I got a phone call from Malcolm Toon, a retired FSO who had been ambassador to the Soviet Union. With AFSA, he was concerned about the number and qualifications of political appointees named to ambassadorial posts. Fran and I interviewed him. Ambassador Toon referred to several appointees as “Mr. Klunks” and called out specific non-career ambassadors with further epithets, especially his successor in Moscow.

When the “Ambassador Klunk” article (April 1982 FSJ) hit the streets, it got huge play in the media. We submitted the story to the Society of National Association Publications’ annual contest with a ream of press clippings, and it received the gold award for outstanding article of the year at SNAP’s membership convention in June 1983.

A week later, the AFSA Governing Board was considering a Journal expense request. After it was approved, I showed board members the award plaque. The announcement prompted a hearty cheer from the room. Following the meeting, a State representative, who went on to have a distinguished career in the Middle East, pulled me aside and said that I should

We sought covers that advertised the contents of the issue … and announced via tone and content that the magazine was a professional policy magazine now.
have announced the award first and only then asked the board to consider my expense request. In other words, I had committed a tactical blunder. So much for my thinking that acting honorably would have strategic value in future requests.

Our first years were a success editorially in repositioning the magazine. They were also the beginnings of real financial success, as we brought costs down sharply while dramatically increasing revenues from ad sales and a significantly larger membership attracted to the revamped magazine.

There was surprising resistance on occasion. One anecdote suffices to illustrate the point, but it was replicated in its illogic numerous times. In 1981 the association was spending $100,000 a year on manufacturing the Journal, a considerable sum. I secured a bid from Dartmouth Printing Company that would allow a savings of 30 percent. Then, however, our executive director complained to the Governing Board that we would now have to mail by first-class postage those dozen or so copies that needed to be sent out each month to new members who signed up after the labels were finalized. The current printer sent them out at the cheaper second-class rate. As I figured it, the amount at issue was about $10 per month. And for this, some were willing to forego an annual savings of $30,000. I prevailed in the end, but it was bothersome that it was even a contest.

Mind you, the Governing Board wasn’t necessarily picking on the magazine staff, as it ran the day-to-day operations of the entire association. For instance, the board placed a cap of $25 on individual expenses the director was empowered to approve. So when the toilet in the men’s room in the E Street offices clogged up, the director proceeded to seek bids from competent plumbers. But I could not wait till the next board meeting. I went next door to People’s Drugstore (now CVS) and bought a plunger for $4.95, came back, freed the toilet and was reimbursed out of petty cash. I had beaten the system.

That was the mundane, but there was also the exciting. One thing I enjoyed about running the Journal was the opportunity to meet and work with leading officials in government, including members of Congress of both parties and top people in the foreign affairs agencies. The highest official I met was Vice President George H.W. Bush, who had been invited to AFSA headquarters on short notice to address the Overseas Writers Club during a luncheon at the Foreign Service Club. The director was on leave, and I found myself named chargé. So I was the one who dealt with the Secret Service in planning the event. Now that more than three decades have passed, I can reveal that we agreed to secure the nuclear football in the vacant director’s office.

On the day of the event, after meeting the aide with the launch
Membership increased by 60 percent, advertising revenue more than doubled, and the press picked up our articles on an almost monthly basis.

codes and locking her in the designated room, I was standing by the service door that opens onto 21st Street as journalists were coming through a metal detector in the E Street entrance. Suddenly the service door burst open and in walked the vice president. I was the first person he saw, and he strode right up to me, shook my hand and said how pleased he was to meet me. I was speechless. A few minutes later an officer of the writers group said some dignitary had failed to show, and so would I mind sitting next to Bush? There was an empty seat behind the head table, and my new friend George the vice president was waving me over. The veep was being criticized at the time for not eating broccoli, so I had a chance for a scoop. Then the missing person suddenly showed up, and I was spared the opportunity.

Where We Stand

But for the most part, we concentrated on publishing the best content we could, and we were rewarded for doing so. Membership increased by 60 percent, advertising revenue more than doubled, and the press picked up our articles on an almost monthly basis.

It became routine for the national media to use our magazine to showcase issues of concern to the Foreign Service. When AFSA’s U.S. Information Agency contingent raised in our pages charges of political interference by agency management, it was network TV news. When a Journal poll conducted by Fran showed diplomats’ concern about terrorism, it was widely reported via broadcast and print outlets. An entire episode of William F. Buckley’s PBS series “Firing Line” was devoted to a column I wrote on professionalism in the ambassadorial corps and its discontents, “Galbraith & Guts” (April 1985 FSJ).

The Toon interview alone generated 200 clippings and several network TV reports, plus a star turn for the former ambassador on the “Today Show.” Our change in mission to be a higher-profile professional magazine was significant enough to be noted by the Federal Times, which said in a 1983 editorial that the Journal “frequently includes provocative, first-class essays—particularly since Stephen R. Dujack has been its editor.” Forgive me for tooting my own horn here, but we were clearly on the right track.

This state of editorial success and impact proceeded for six mostly happy years. The interval was not without untoward incident or other bumps in the road that brevity commands I omit, but the Journal continued its steady progress as a needed beacon during a critical period for diplomacy and for diplomats personally and professionally, and was duly recognized time and again.

During that period, the same faction had won the AFSA presidency and the key vice presidential posts on the Governing Board in each annual union election. I had served under a total of six presidents, but there was nonetheless constancy in board management.

Then, in the summer of 1987, I came face to face with one of the challenges implicit in AFSA’s unique structure as a combined trade union and professional association run by a board of individuals elected every year. A new and different bunch was voted in. Shortly after the transition, I had a conversation with the new president, Perry Shankle. He queried me about the Editorial Board. “Do we get to replace them?” he asked. I explained that members were elected for fixed terms. He instead forced the Editorial Board to accept him as the liaison officer.
Shankle began to dominate the Editorial Board, raising outrageous concerns and criticizing articles that it was clear he had not read. He also seemed immune to the fact that by putting himself on the Editorial Board, he became accountable as president to the membership for articles whose opinions he could otherwise wave off as the editors’ responsibility. A series of conflicts ultimately led to a joint meeting of the Governing Board and the Editorial Board on April 7, 1988, insisted upon by the president.

The majority of the Governing Board members disagreed with him. They liked the magazine. A lot. So the big board voted overwhelmingly to preserve the functioning of a professional magazine run by professional staff, knowledgeable journalists who would work with an expert Editorial Board to choose articles based on their merit and appeal to a diplomatic audience through peer review, not political considerations.

But the next day Shankle called me and asked for the end dates of the Editorial Board members’ terms. Seven years earlier we had put in our new term-limit provision, allowing for terms up to three years (although most members rotated overseas before completing their terms). By coincidence, several members’ terms would end in the coming months—five, in fact. He would get to name their replacements.

Exactly one week later I was named director of communications of the Worldwatch Institute. I have been an environmental editor ever since. My experience at the helm of the *Journal* gave me a wealth of knowledge of how the world works—and how association governance works—that has proven invaluable in my career since. I am grateful to AFSA for the opportunity and to the Foreign Service professionals for writing for us.

In my farewell column in the *Journal*, I praised the Foreign Service membership for its contributions to the cause of peace, development and human harmony—I could never make the sacrifices required of them, I acknowledged, and saluted their patriotism. And I saluted the Foreign Service for recognizing that a publication that promotes robust debate and reader service as "the magazine for professionals in foreign affairs" best aids the interests of America’s diplomats and the nation they represent.
Steering a dynamic and adventurous professional magazine involves challenges as well as accomplishments.

By Steven Alan Honley

When the Journal editor invited me to reflect on my tenure (2001-2014) as editor-in-chief of The Foreign Service Journal for this issue, I was delighted to accept. After all, who doesn’t enjoy rehashing past triumphs?

With the help of a true dream team—Shawn Dorman, Susan Maitra and Ed Miltenberger, all of whom are still on the job, I hasten to note—along with dedicated Editorial Board volunteers and other AFSA staff, the magazine became an adventurous, thoroughly professional publication by time I stepped down.
When I took over, we were proofreading, marking up and couriering actual blueline pages to our printer, then located in New Hampshire, each month. (And yes, that process was every bit as tedious and inefficient as it sounds.) Now production is done online, with a printer in Richmond, Virginia. As a result, even though the typical issue of the FSJ is at least a third longer than it was back in 2001, it is far less cumbersome to publish it.

Early in my tenure, I expanded the practice of penning Letters from the Editor, and introduced or revamped several departments and features that are still around: Talking Points (originally Clippings, then Cybernotes), FS Know-How (initially known as FS Finances), FS Heritage and In Their Own Write.

I also pioneered the use of the AFSAnet listserv to invite Foreign Service members to share their experiences with various policies and career challenges, as well as responses to wars, terrorist attacks, natural disasters and other international events. Compilations of those contributions quickly became, and remain, a cornerstone of FSJ coverage.

And, during my tenure we gave the Journal an entirely new and updated look, undertaking a wholesale redesign of the magazine in 2011 after nearly two decades.

While I could go on (and on...) about those accomplishments, I thought it would be more useful to describe some of the challenges, both internal and external, I faced as editor, and how I met them. However, because the statute of limitations is not quite up yet, where necessary I will withhold names to protect the guilty—and myself.

First, allow me to set the stage briefly.

In the Beginning

I’ve been a dues-paying AFSA member for nearly a third of a century now, ever since joining the State Department in January 1985 with the 25th A-100 class. Part of a massive hiring surge, my class of 52 Foreign Service officers was one of the largest since the Vietnam War era.

Beyond dutifully voting in Governing Board elections, I must confess that I wasn’t an active AFSA member during my 12-year career. I read the Journal, of course (though I tended to save up issues for vacations), but I never submitted anything for publication, not even a letter.

Shortly after I was tenured in 1989, the Berlin Wall came down and the Cold War entered its final phase. But the much-vaunted “peace dividend” did not accrue to the foreign affairs agencies. Instead, by the end of the 1990s congressional critics like Senator Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) had succeeded in disbanding the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the U.S. Information Agency, and folding their functions into the State Department. Adding insult to the injury of a mounting workload, State, along with the U.S. Agency for International Development, Foreign Commercial
In all our coverage of the so-called “War on Terror,” we strove to strike an appropriate balance between being supportive and skeptical.

Service, Foreign Agricultural Service and International Broadcasting Bureau, faced severe budget cutbacks and unrelenting pressure to “do more with less.”

That adverse climate was not the primary impetus for my own decision to leave the Service to pursue a career in music and writing, but it certainly made the decision easier.

Soon after I left State in August 1997, a dear friend and A-100 colleague who was on the FSJ Editorial Board at the time, Mitchell Cohn, approached me to write a short-fuse article on consular fraud when the original author was unable to fulfill the contract.

That came out well enough that Bob Guldin, my predecessor as editor-in-chief, commissioned me to write several more articles on various subjects, and then hired me as associate editor in April 1999.

Though only a half-time position, the job nonetheless gave me a taste for greater responsibilities, such as putting together several focus sections; interviewing each year’s winner of AFSA’s recently instituted Award for Lifetime Contributions to American Diplomacy for a lengthy profile; and lining up and writing book reviews, one of the most enjoyable perks of my time at the magazine.

When I succeeded Bob as editor-in-chief on July 1, 2001, my appointment was on an interim basis. But on Nov. 1 of that year, I took over officially and occupied the position for more than 12 years—a span second only to that of the legendary Shirley Newhall, FSJ editor from 1968 to 1981.

Soon after the Bush administration launched the invasion of Iraq in March 2003, we gave three FSOs who resigned in protest—John Brown, John Brady Kiesling and Ann Wright—space to explain their reasoning. That energized debate in our letters.

War Reporting and Expeditionary Diplomacy

The 9/11 attacks occurred barely two months into my editorship. Despite our lead time as a monthly magazine, and the massive uncertainty we were all facing in the aftermath of the attacks, the November 2001 issue featured a compilation of AFSA members’ reactions and policy recommendations.

The December 2001 FSJ offered a second installment, along with a meaty focus section devoted to “Shedding Light on Sept. 11.” Apart from the regrettable caricature of a glowering terrorist on the cover, I believe we did exactly that.

To cite just one example: “The Taliban-Bin Laden-ISI Connection” by retired FSO Arnie Schifferdecker (December 2001) set the stage for our ongoing coverage of the Afghanistan War by explaining authoritatively how al-Qaida was able to use that country so effectively as a base of operations.

In the process, it also showcased the expertise and perspective that have always been among the Foreign Service’s fortes.

In all our coverage of the so-called “War on Terror,” we strove to strike an appropriate balance between being supportive and skeptical. There was no template to follow, of course, and I’m sure we ran some articles, letters and Speaking Out columns that were either too gung-ho about, or too harshly critical of, the George W. Bush administration’s foreign policy. But I remain proud of our overall record.
section about professional responsibility in the face of directives with which one fundamentally disagrees: Is it more principled to stay on the job and try to steer policy in the right direction, or resign from the Foreign Service so you can speak out publicly?

Iraq was far from the first controversy to stir such arguments, of course. Nor, as we are seeing today, was it the last. But wherever you come down on any of those particular challenges, I trust we can all agree that it is vital for the Journal to be a forum for discussing them without fear or favor.

The Foreign Service community was hopeful that Secretary of State Colin Powell’s Diplomatic Readiness Initiative would revitalize the Foreign Service after a decade of neglect, and worse. With the end of the Cold War, legislators had come to believe that wholesale cutbacks in the international relations budget were appropriate. DRI did indeed repair a lot of that institutional damage, as did Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton’s Diplomacy 3.0 program later, and our coverage highlighted those encouraging developments in the midst of so much angst about the future.

Unfortunately, the “Iraq tax”—the evocative shorthand for Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice’s policy of pulling resources from overseas posts and Washington bureaus to support the growing U.S. presence in the Middle East—and her championing of “transformational diplomacy” undid much of that progress. Nor did it help that resentment within the Foreign Service of such ill-conceived policies, which the FSJ faithfully reported, fueled perceptions of disloyalty—which we also covered. But short of turning into a cheer-
leader for the administration, I don’t see any other way we could have handled such fraught issues.

**Getting It from Both Sides**

In 2000 the AFSA Governing Board updated the FSJ Editorial Board’s bylaws (now called “guidelines”) to specify that the magazine’s primary mission was to publicize and promote the American Foreign Service Association’s many activities on behalf of its members and to bring them “news you can use.” The Journal was also tasked with continuing to publish reporting, analysis and commentary about the Foreign Service and foreign affairs, with a goal of maintaining a roughly 50/50 ratio between those two broad purposes.

There was little doubt that the former goal outweighed the latter as far as AFSA management was concerned. But it was not at all clear, at least to me, just how much leeway AFSA members had to use the FSJ to criticize Governing Board decisions—until a test case presented itself.

Back in the spring of 2001, while I was still associate editor, an FSO submitted a Speaking Out column that denounced AFSA for working with Gays and Lesbians in Foreign Affairs Agencies to overturn discriminatory practices at the State Department and other foreign affairs agencies. The FSJ Editorial Board reluctantly approved the column for publication, with the proviso that a response from GLIFAA run alongside it.

I suspect GLIFAA would have jumped at the chance to weigh in anyway, but the fact that I was a founding member, and had served as its president from 1996 to 1997, clinched the deal. The resulting point-counterpoint in the September 2001 issue, my first as interim editor, inspired a series of letters from readers over the next several months.

Most of the writers praised AFSA for standing by GLIFAA, but several sided with the complainant and took us to task for commissioning a companion piece, rather than leaving it up to someone to respond in a later issue. (Looking back, I have to agree that the optics of doing it the way we did were not great, but I don’t see anything unethical about it.) Still others lambasted us for publishing the original Speaking Out column criticizing AFSA in the first place.

That pattern would repeat itself over the next dozen years of my editorship just about every time we ran any submission on a hot-button issue. But it was well worth it to uphold the Journal’s proud tradition of letting members have their say, no matter how many people disagree viscerally with the viewpoint expressed.

**The Bird Imbroglio**

That principle received perhaps its most severe test (during my tenure, at least) in June 2002, when we published a feature titled “Arab-Americans in Israel: What ‘Special Relationship’?” Its author was Jerri Bird, president and founder of Partners for Peace, a nongovernmental organization formed to educate the American public about key issues in the effort to secure peace and justice between Palestinians and Israelis. She was also the wife of FSO Eugene Bird, who, like his wife, was a Middle East specialist.

Although Editorial Board members agreed the manuscript needed careful editing to remove the most incendiary lan-
language, they voted overwhelmingly to publish it. Ironically, Jerri Bird fought me every step of the way on the edits, and threatened more than once to pull the piece—a bluff I happily called, since I could foresee the firestorm the article would generate. But she eventually admitted that the piece really was more effective in its slightly toned-down form.

I don’t know how State found out her article was in our pipeline, but that spring the Bureau for Near Eastern Affairs formally requested that AFSA drop it. When that didn’t work, the NEA front office summoned me to a meeting to “discuss” the matter further. I no longer remember the deputy assistant secretary’s name, but he solemnly warned AFSA Executive Director Susan Reardon and yours truly that the situation in the region was so volatile that any criticism of Israel could have grave consequences—up to and including war. (Yes, he really said that.)

We agreed that such an outcome would indeed be unfortunate, but pointed out that, though critical of Israel, our interlocutor had not stated anything in the article that was untrue. We therefore published it in June 2002 as planned.

That was a proud moment. But in the immortal words of Clare Boothe Luce that I love to quote: “No good deed goes unpunished.” Over the summer, the pro-Israel organization HonestReporting organized a massive campaign that sent hundreds of vituperative letters, emails, faxes and phone calls...
my way. (I shudder to imagine the volume of the protest had social media existed back then.)

To top it off, I got a death threat on my answering machine from someone calling himself a “defender of Israel,” which we immediately passed on to the Bureau of Diplomatic Security. There was nothing DS could do, of course, but I still felt better that they knew about it.

Though I did not disclose that threat to our readers, I did publish HonestReporting’s form letter critique (unfair as it was) in September 2002, along with reactions to the article from Foreign Service folks. Most of the people who wrote us over the next several months were broadly supportive of our decision to publish Bird’s article, but several AFSA members excoriated us for it. Others attacked us for acknowledging the very existence of opposition to her perspective.

**Awards and Demerits**

 Appropriately, the focus of the June 2002 issue that included Bird’s article was a topic near and dear to my heart: celebrating dissent in the Foreign Service. Each year during my tenure, we devoted more pages to promoting AFSA’s dissent awards program (which celebrates its 50th anniversary this year) and gave the nomination process more prominent coverage, both in AFSA News and in the “white pages.” (The performance awards tend to draw plenty of nominations on their own.)

Unfortunately, such efforts were not enough to overcome what I saw as a seismic shift within the Foreign Service culture away from dissent that began about that time. I’ll spare you my theories about why that happened (you’re welcome!), but the general trend line is undeniable: Fewer and fewer FS members have been nominating colleagues in each of the four dissent award categories. As a result, in some years only one or two people have received dissent awards at the annual ceremony. I can’t say whether that situation has improved since I stepped down, but I would be pleasantly surprised if it has. [Editor’s note: In 2014 and 2015, all four dissent awards were given; in 2016, only one; and in 2017, three.]

Lamentably, AFSA’s Awards and Plaques Committee refused even to consider the possibility that it needed to change its approach to promoting the program. Instead, its leadership mounted increasingly personal attacks on me and my FSJ colleagues, alleging that “the Journal” was deliberately sabotaging the dissent awards for some unknown reason I still cannot imagine.

When I got wind that the chair of that committee was lobbying the Governing Board to fire me, I asked to see the AFSA president to defend our record. I documented the fact that we were already doing nearly everything our critics demanded to promote the dissent awards and encourage AFSA members to nominate colleagues or themselves. (I did balk at putting the dissent winners’ photos on the cover, since I didn’t think our members wanted their professional magazine to resemble a high school yearbook.)

I had even calculated how many pages of each issue we had devoted to coverage of the awards program for the past five years (quite a few), and presented those figures.

None of that mattered. The AFSA president simply told me that I needed to do whatever it took to address the Awards and Plaques Committee’s concerns. That moment was the first time in nearly a decade that I thought seriously about resigning, but my native stubbornness kicked in, and I decided to stay the course. As a last resort, I drew on the negotiating skills I had supposedly acquired during my Foreign Service days to arrange a summit between the Editorial Board chair and the Awards and Plaques Committee. That meeting didn’t really resolve anything, but the campaign to oust me lost steam afterward.
Not too long after I left the editorship on my own terms in 2014, the Governing Board finally did something many of us had been urging for years, which was to enforce term limits on AFSA committees (a practice the FSJ Editorial Board had instituted way back in the 1980s). As a result, the entrenched critics on the Awards and Plaques Committee finally lost their stranglehold on that fiefdom.

And yes, just in case you’re wondering, that news brought me considerable satisfaction.

Thanks for the Memories

Speaking of satisfaction: Now that I’ve dished enough dirt in this article to fill several buckets, I want to end by underscoring just how grateful I am to AFSA for trusting me to shape and steer The Foreign Service Journal for more than a decade.

As with any job, some days (and months and years) were better than others. And, particularly toward the end of my tenure, I frequently had to remind myself that what I was doing really was worth the angst and long hours.

As I put it in my valedictory Letter from the Editor in the January-February 2014 FSJ: “I have relished the opportunity this job has afforded me to promote discussion and debate of issues related to foreign affairs and the Foreign Service, an institution I’ve been privileged to be associated with in various capacities for nearly 30 years.”

Here’s to the Journal’s next century!
1919 ~ 1930

FSJ March 1919
American Consular Association News: Foreword
This, the first printed bulletin of the American Consular Association, is the result of a feeling on the part of many consular officers that there should be some organ by which information of interest to the Service might be disseminated—an organ which would provide a medium for the exchange of ideas looking to the improvement of the service as well as news of the activities of particular officers.

–Unsigned

FSJ June 1921
The Rogers Act
... Immediately upon the meeting of Congress in special session, April 11th, Representative John Jacob Rogers of Massachusetts introduced a bill (H.R.17) "for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes." The chief features of the bill ... are these: Diplomatic and Consular Services combined in a "Foreign Service of the United States." Appointment of Ministers to grades and classes, and not to posts. Appointment of "Foreign Service pupils." Cumulative leave and payment of travel expenses on home leave under certain conditions. "Representation allowances" for Ambassadors and Ministers. Post allowances for Foreign Service officers of all grades. Age and disability retirement; contributory pension system. All representatives or agents of the United States Government abroad to be under the Department of State and merged with the diplomatic mission in the country of their functioning.

–Unsigned

FSJ September 1921
The Way In: A Recent Recruit in the Consular Ranks Tells of the Rough and Rugged Road to Entry
"Twelve-twenty, can you tell me any of the changes wrought in Italy by the Treaty of Versailles?" ... We all sat very rigid until the candidate addressed piped up. "I don’t think I can say, sir"—this in a very small voice. "Can’t you tell me something about the northern boundary?" Another heartbreaking silence. "No, sir; I’m afraid I can’t." "Twelve-twenty-one, what do you understand the War Finance Corporation to be?" And so on. ... The questions were matters of national and international interest ... and above all were designed to show the general ability of a man to say a few words about any subject under the sun. ... Each one of us was asked but one question.

–Unsigned

These FSJ excerpts were compiled by Publications Coordinator Dmitry Filipoff and Managing Editor Susan B. Maitra.
FSJ July 1924

**Mr. Carr Surveys the Rogers Bill**

The stability of the career and the permanence of its personnel have been assured. All the vulnerable features of the old regime have been replaced by solid barriers against meddling and uncertainty. A young officer just entering the Service will find that he is offered a course of invaluable instruction before entering upon his permanent duties, but that at the same time he will be on probation and his every act and qualification open to the severest scrutiny with respect to his personal fitness.

—Wilbur Carr, assistant secretary of State

FSJ October 1924

**A New Name:**

*The American Foreign Service Journal*

FSJ October 1930

**American Foreign Service as an Instrument of World Peace**

The members of the Foreign Service of the United States have, for many years, acted as American outposts of peace in all parts of the world. The mission of these men is to promote the international understanding which leads to confidence and friendship and permits nations, however different their traditions and ideals may be, to deal intelligently with each other. ... Few Americans realize the immense value of these officers in maintaining peace.

—Hon. Frank B. Kellogg, former Secretary of State

FSJ April 1933

**Memorial Tablet, Department of State**

The Memorial Tablet erected by members of the American Foreign Service Association in honor of the diplomatic and consular officers who while on active duty lost their lives under tragic or heroic circumstances was unveiled on Friday morning, March 3, at 10 o’clock, by the Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State and honorary president of the American Foreign Service Association.

—Unsigned

FSJ January 1934

**We Recognize the Soviet Union**

“Moscow, December 11, 1933

“Secretary of State, Washington

“Arrived. Will present credentials Wednesday noon. Bullitt”

The above telegram, the first the Department of State has received from any American official in Russia since the dark days when our relations with that country were severed, explains itself. ...

—Walter A. Foote

FSJ January 1936

**The Utility of a Trained and Permanent Foreign Service**

The one department of the Government most urgently demanding a continuing policy is that charged with executing the nation’s foreign policy. Although cabinets and Governments may change, the foreign problems of a nation transcend the platforms of political parties, for issues between neighboring nations continue regardless of changes in the complexion of the officials in power at home. Sudden change of diplomatic and consular personnel does more than merely wreck the careers of the persons involved—it wrecks the policy of the nation, rendering it vacillating, uncertain, and unsuccessful.

—George Allen, vice consul

FSJ November 1937

**The American Foreign Service: An Outline Appraisal 13 Years after the Rogers Act**

While in the first years after the Rogers Act all but the malcontents of the Service were greatly pleased with the step forward that had been taken, and while during the depression the Service in unshaken loyalty realized that further improvements were inopportune, in more recent years there has been noticeable a growing spirit of criticism among the members of the Service who feel the need of new legislation and regulations to remedy certain failings of the Service and to cover certain deficiencies in the provisions of the original Rogers Bill.

—Seldin Chapin, FSO
**FSJ April 1939**

**The Lima Conference**

The Eighth International Conference of American States which met at Lima during December 1938 must be viewed against the background of world conditions in order to make a fair appraisal of its accomplishments. While fortunately the American Republics have been spared from the direct impact of tragic events in other parts of the world during recent years, those events inevitably have had a powerful influence upon the nations of this hemisphere.

—George H. Butler, Department of State

---

**FSJ March 1940**

**The Administration of the Neutrality Act**

Not only was the Department faced with the task of immediately preparing and promulgating varied and numerous regulations, but it also found itself flooded with a torrent of inquiries requesting immediate and definitive interpretations of the new law and regulations. Can airplanes purchased by a belligerent government be flown to Canada? Can goods be shipped on an American vessel to Bilbao for trans-shipment to France without transfer of title? Can Washington banks buy sight drafts on banks in belligerent nations presented by the embassies of those nations in Washington to cover their normal running expenses?

—Charles Yost, assistant chief, Division of Controls

---

**FSJ January 1942**

**Army Air Corps Boeing B-17 Flying Fortresses over New York City**

---

**FSJ May 1942**

**Metamorphosis of the Foreign Service**

If anything were needed to hasten the metamorphosis of the Foreign Service into an organization adapted to the needs of war, our entry into the conflict provided the final impetus. ...Whatever the conditions it may have to face, the Foreign Service by training and qualification is quickly able to meet the challenge. With the United States a full-fledged belligerent, the constructive diplomacy of peace has vanished, the everyday concerns of consular routine have yielded in importance to the new demands growing out of the emergency. Everywhere our officers are mastering hitherto unfamiliar subjects—priorities, allocation, foreign activities correlation, proclaimed lists...The emphasis today is on matters in the economic sphere, a sphere that develops progressively as the struggle deepens.

—Editor’s Column

---

**FSJ July 1942**

**America Through Axis Eye**

The attempts to belittle the United States generally fall into three categories: (1) disparagement of our morale, (2) emphasis of our “incompetence,” and (3) insistence on our desire to grow rich from the war. Most prominent is the first.

—Henry S. Villard, Department of State

---

**FSJ May 1943**

**The Problem of Relief Abroad**

The question of providing a measure of relief and facilities for rehabilitation to suffering populations liberated from Axis control already is a real and pressing problem in North Africa and it may be anticipated that this problem will be multiplied a hundred-fold as the liberating armies of the United Nations deal final blows to the Axis on the Continents of Europe and Asia and in the Islands of the Western Pacific. The problem confronting the world when the fighting ends area by area will be one of appalling magnitude.

—Herbert H. Lehman, director of foreign relief and rehabilitation operations

---

**FSJ June 1945**

**The United Nations Conference on International Organization**

Opening a new chapter in man’s historic struggle to keep the peace, delegates from forty-six countries to the United Nations Conference on International Organization foregathered in plenary session on April 25, 1945, in San Francisco’s magnificent Opera House—itself a memorial to the dead of World War I.

---

**FSJ October 1945**

**The Berlin Conference**

While historians are able to cite parallels for practically anything, they will find it hard to point to a meeting in past history equal either in importance or in dramatic setting to that which President Truman had with Prime Ministers Churchill and Attlee and Marshal Stalin from July 16 to August 1 at Potsdam (officially designated as “The Berlin Conference”). The scene of the Conference was amid the shattered ruins of the capital of the defeated enemy. Three powerful allies met to decide the treatment to be accorded the enemy peoples and to discuss means of continuing in peace the collaboration which had been maintained so successfully during war. Every human being in the world had a stake in the success of the meeting.

—George Allen, deputy director of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs
**FSJ September 1946**

**How the Legislation Developed**

It is probably difficult for those who have not been closely associated with a similar venture to understand how much work is involved in the drafting of a law as extensive as is the Foreign Service Act of 1946. ... The drafters of the Bill believed that experience had demonstrated that a career Service is the best means of ensuring proper conduct of our foreign relations. On the other hand, it must be realized that the desirability of having a career Foreign Service has been seriously under question in recent years. The drafters of the new legislation sought to reconcile these viewpoints.

—Julian F. Harrington, deputy director of the Office of the Foreign Service

---

**FSJ May 1949**

**Signing the North Atlantic Pact**

President Harry S. Truman and Vice President Barkley look on as Secretary of State Dean Acheson signs the North Atlantic Pact. John W. Foley Jr., of the Legal Adviser’s office, is at Mr. Acheson’s left.

---

**FSJ October 1949**

**Some Thoughts on Service Morale**

That the Director-General of the Foreign Service should not be consulted about legislation intimately affecting the Service is almost incredible. [Months earlier the administrative offices of the Service had been summarily merged with those of the State Department.—Ed.] ... No officer who has served in the Department in the last year or two can be unaware of the numerous rumors which have been circulating regarding the intentions of certain high officials towards the Service. The situation has certainly now gone so far that a full and frank airing of the reasons for discontent is now necessary.

—Philip H. Bagby, former FSO, first of a two-part discussion

---

**FSJ November 1951**

**The National Interest of the United States**

It is not an expression of national selfishness to say that our first duty, as a nation, is to ourselves. It is an expression of self-respect. A nation which is meeting its own problems, and meeting them honestly and creditably, is not apt to be a problem to its neighbors. And, strangely enough, having figured out what it wants to do about itself, it will find that it has suddenly and mysteriously acquired criteria, which it did not have before, for knowing what to do about its relations with others.

—George F. Kennan, FSO on extended leave

---

**FSJ August 1950**

**War Comes to Korea**

All was serene on June 18th when, with the party accompanying Mr. John Foster Dulles, I visited the 38th Parallel north of the town of Uijongbu and some 38 miles north of Seoul. ... Sunday, a week later, dawned dully. The pelting rain would bring satisfaction to the hearts of Korea’s rice farmers. Warrant Officer William B. Lynch of the Military Attaché’s Office interrupted breakfast that morning to lean across the table and give me in quiet tones the startling news that without warning at 4:00 that morning on the Ongjin peninsula a heavy artillery barrage had been opened by the North Korean Communists upon the defensive forces of the Korean Republic below the 38th Parallel.

—Arthur B. Emmons III, FSO
FSJ May 1952

**The Soldier and the Diplomat**

At the beginning of World War II most civilians concerned with foreign relations were ignorant, not only of the strategic conceptions of military men, but of almost everything else of a practical nature connected with military operations. By the same token the organization and aims of the Department of State in foreign affairs seemed an utter mystery to the vast majority of officers and men in our armed services. That fabric was ripped wide open for the first time in American history by attaching political advisers to military headquarters. In their personal contact with the military staffs they imparted whatever information and advice they could about American political objectives.

—Robert D. Murphy, ambassador

FSJ January 1953

**The Meaning of the Ruling in the Vincent Case for the National Interest and the Foreign Service**

No group of government servants is more convinced of the need for vigilant security procedures than the Foreign Service. Yet the Loyalty Review Board’s letter to the Secretary in the Vincent case, reprinted below, is causing bewilderment and misgiving in our ranks. It is disturbing not only because it recommends dismissal for a veteran officer who had already been cleared by the Department’s Loyalty Security Board, but because it implies doctrines which would prevent the Service from doing its full duty. …If officers stationed in China in the 1940s suggested the possibility that the Chinese Communists might prove too strong for Chiang Kai-Shek, was this reason enough to doubt their loyalty? What about our representatives in Korea? Could a man be pilloried because he warned of the growing strength of the Communists in North Korea at the time we considered withdrawing troops from South Korea?

—AFSA Board of Directors

FSJ July 1954

**The Path Ahead**

Just as the Journal went to press, the report of the Secretary’s Public Committee on Personnel, better known as the Wriston Committee, was made public, together with an endorsement by the Secretary of the two key recommendations made by the Committee. …The pages of the Journal are open to Service-wide discussion of the report. There will inevitably be differences of opinion over some of the Committee’s recommendations but there are two matters on which we believe the Service will be unanimous. One is the Service’s appreciation for the determination shown by the Secretary and General Smith to strengthen the Service. The other is the whole-hearted support which will be given by the Service to whatever program the Secretary decides to carry out.

—Editorial

FSJ June 1955

**American Diplomacy at Work**

As American Ambassador to Italy, I have been in—deep in—the Foreign Policy business itself. And today this is the view I hold to most strongly: If America is to prevent World War III, we must have not only a sound foreign policy, we must also have a sound Foreign Service. …Today, the field of diplomacy has broadened to cover every phase, every aspect, every activity of human society. Modern diplomacy has to concern itself with all of these things and many more. Why? Because in these days of the interdependence of nations, all these aspects of the life of a nation affect the relationships between nations.

—Ambassador Clare Boothe Luce
Are Efficiency Reports Lousy?

“...The principal value of an efficiency report is in giving the Department a line on the guy who wrote it.” Homer M. Byington, probably the best Chief of Personnel the Service ever had, made that crack to our class in the Foreign Service School back in 1933. I never fully appreciated how true it was until I served on the Selection Boards last fall. If it were not for the increased bulk, it might be a good idea to include an extra copy of each efficiency report an officer writes in his own performance folder. ...Each member of our Board probably read between three and four thousand, and I can recall only a handful which, taken by themselves, gave a really good picture of the officer rated. ...Perhaps another eight percent are pretty good, but the remaining ninety percent are vague, superficial and inadequate.

—Theodore C. Achilles, ambassador

Contacts with the Soviets

Some 38 American technical, academic, cultural, sports and entertainment groups have gone to the Soviet Union, while some 33 similar Soviet groups have come to this country. ...What impression of this country does the Soviet visitor carry away? The majority of delegation members are of high caliber as individuals, and are quite aware that what they see in the United States, both material and spiritual, tends to contradict the distortions of the anti-American propaganda at home. Others are naive and highly indoctrinated.

—Frederick T. Merrill, FSO

The Great Period of the Foreign Service

We have had some new ideas in the last year in foreign policy; some new approaches have been made. We want them to come out of the State Department with more speed. What opportunities do we have to improve our policies abroad? How, for example, can we make the Alliance for Progress more effective? We are waiting for you to come forward, because we want you to know that I regard the Office of the Presidency and the White House, and the Secretary of State and the Department, as part of one chain, not separate but united, and committed to the maintenance of an effective foreign policy for the United States of America. Therefore, in the final analysis, it depends on you. That is why I believe this is the best period to be a Foreign Service officer. That is why I believe that the best talent that we have should come into the Foreign Service, because you today—even more than any other branch of government—are in the front line in every country of the World.

—President John F. Kennedy, from a talk delivered to 1,000 members at AFSA’s Foreign Service Club on May 31, the first time that a U.S. president addressed AFSA

AID’s First Year

The past year has seen the analysis and articulation of development thinking, programing, and implementation carried to the point where we are looked to by all countries as the pioneers in this field. ...Now we are engaged in a creative effort to devise long range assistance strategies for a dozen countries, a task long overdue and promising of dramatic rewards.

—Frank M. Coffin, USAID deputy administrator (1961-1964)

Vietnam: The War That Is Not a War

The headlines of the war in Vietnam have in recent months emphasized the internal struggle for leadership of the Government of South Vietnam. Buddhists vs. Catholics, civilians vs. military, sect vs. party seem to be the key struggles. Yet the Vietnam imbroglio is much deeper and historically more involved than these headlines imply. It is essentially a struggle for men’s minds and loyalties, a chapter in the confusing battle between a Communist-led “war of national liberation” and a Western-supported nationalist war of independence. How did Vietnam get where it is today? How did the war that is not a war get started? Who is fighting against whom? and why? How is the United States involved in this struggle?

—Robert S. Smith, FSO, member of the FSJ Editorial Board

A Foreign Service Training Corps?—The Wrong Problem

Attempting to meet all training needs at the beginning of a career is an impossible task. ...Let us stop worrying about a mythical ideal education until we are better able to determine how good junior officers become good senior officers. Once we can offer an exciting future, plus firm patterns of career development, then those interested in the Foreign Service will take responsibility for their own education and those with the necessary academic training will be more motivated toward such careers.

—John D. Stempel, FSO, response in a series discussing training

Viet Cong Propaganda Abroad

To supply this vast market for pro-Viet Cong materials requires large-scale production by Hanoi and its southern creation, the National Liberation Front. Published and captured documents and the radio broadcasts of Hanoi and the Front describe this effort. These communist sources prescribe the major themes for overseas stress—the “immorality” of the American intervention in a “civil” war; the “democratic,” “nationalist” and “neutralist” aims of the Viet Cong; the inevitability of a communist victory; the corruption and unresponsiveness of the Saigon government.

—Chester A. Bain
wisdom to a more searching, critical appraisal of the interaction between our external aid and the dynamics of change and growth in a developing nation. This effort to broaden the perspective on our aid programs embraces the dimension of political development which the Title IX legislation seeks to isolate for special consideration.

–Congressman Donald M. Fraser (D-Minn.), author of Title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act

With the passage of time, then, we came to see an activist world policy as a moral and practical necessity, sanctified by success, and essentially unlimited by any particular level of available resources. On this national consensus rested several decades of hyperactive American assertion of world leadership. It led to alliances with 43 countries. It led to the creation in foreign lands of 143 American military bases. It led to the consistent allocation of at least 40 percent of our federal budget to national security purposes. It led to the application of American military force in Korea, Lebanon, the Dominican Republic, Laos, and Vietnam. It led to our sending economic assistance to 111 countries, and military assistance to at least 79. It is now clear that time has overtaken this consensus.

–Marshall Wright, FSO

The Vietnam war has caused more soul-searching on the part of career Foreign Service officer—and especially the younger ones—than any comparable international event in the history of American diplomacy. There have been a number of little discussed and unpublicized resignations from the Foreign Service because of our policy in Vietnam. …During fiscal year 1968, 266 officers resigned; 80 percent of them were younger officers.

–Dino J. Caterini, FSO

The United States is not likely to choose deliberately to follow a disastrous course of protectionism, isolation and self-indulgence, but it could be swept onto such a course. This will not happen if we are vigorous in attacking our domestic problems of productivity while being equally realistic concerning what we can negotiate abroad. If we are too hardnosed and use unacceptable methods, however, we shall fail in our negotiations.

–Willis C. Armstrong, retired FSO

The Military As a Modernizing Force

The United States is not likely to choose deliberately to follow a disastrous course of protectionism, isolation and self-indulgence, but it could be swept onto such a course. This will not happen if we are vigorous in attacking our domestic problems of productivity while being equally realistic concerning what we can negotiate abroad. If we are too hardnosed and use unacceptable methods, however, we shall fail in our negotiations.
Although there are frequent assurances that “responsible” dissent is encouraged in the Foreign Service, the impression conveyed to many of those who at some time in their careers consider swimming against the Policy tide is often quite different. …Despite these doubts, it is at least encouraging that the shameful wasting of the country’s most knowledgeable China specialists during the McCarthy era is still fresh in the American conscience. The fact that many of their views have proved to be accurate after all makes the episode all the more significant. Yet if we learned the lesson of our failures in China, how is it possible that we made similar mistakes in Vietnam scarcely 15 years later?

—William R. Lenderking, FSO

From the press viewpoint, information is too closely held in the State Department. The middle level officials who used to be knowledgeable sources during the Rusk administration have lost their considerable utility. The Secretary’s lieutenants are difficult to reach, and often reluctant to discuss unless specifically authorized. The Secretary, himself, has not seen fit to hold regular background briefings in Washington although he has performed quite regularly at public press conferences. But press conferences are a limited mode of communication because the world is listening in, the Congress is listening, the public is listening.

—Nicholas Daniloff, correspondent

This is not the first time, as the historical record makes clear, that withdrawal from Korea has posed major problems for American policymakers and it is unlikely to be the last. Ironically, withdrawal from Korea is not, as widely believed, a new policy objective but is as old as the Korean problem itself—and as controversial.

—John Barry Kotch
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Portraits of former Secretaries of State adorn the department’s reception rooms and faded photographs of their ambassadorial colleagues form “rogues galleries” in embassies around the world. But except for such notables as Nathaniel Hawthorn and Townsend Harris, the lives and professional experience of hundreds of lower-ranking officials, especially those who served the United States in the last century, have been largely neglected. One of these was John Black, a Scot, who was the first representative of the United States in the island of Ceylon, now called Sri Lanka.

—Christopher Van Hollen, FSO
Evacuation from N’Djamena

Early on the morning of Friday, March 21, 1980, sometime before 4 a.m., a sharp burst of rifle fire in the street before the American ambassador’s residence in N’Djamena, Chad, woke the residents inside. At a distance, gunfire crackled in other sections of the sleeping town. The shots were more numerous than usual, and they persisted.

–Patricia B. Norland, a Foreign Service wife and mother of three

Freedom

The return of the hostages did something wonderful for our country, and perhaps for the world too. Americans of every background and political philosophy were brought together by the determination to reject Iran’s gross violation of international law. We all shared the suffering of the hostages as Iran extended its crime day after day. …Honest people will differ on the complexities surrounding the seizure, detention and eventual release of the hostages.

–AFSA Editorial

America Overcommitted

Today the United States runs the risk—as it did in the 1960s—of defining its vital interests so broadly that it may again be unable or unwilling to defend all of them if put to the test. Just as the Kennedy and Johnson administrations concluded that all of Asia might go communist if the United States did not prevent the collapse of South Vietnam, so the Carter and Reagan administrations seem to have concluded that the whole non-communist world could be brought to its knees if the Soviet Union gains strong political influence in the Persian Gulf. In neither case are dire consequences inevitable.

–Donald E. Neuchterlein, professor of international affairs, Federal Executive Institute, Charlottesville, Va.

Restarting START

The issue of nuclear weapons is at the center of the U.S.-Soviet relationship, and an agreement resulting in substantial reductions would have far reaching political effects. The Reagan administration should therefore introduce a new proposal on START. In designing a negotiable proposal, the Reagan administration may first need to reconsider some of the assumptions underlying current nuclear weapons policy.

–David Linebaugh, former FSO and deputy director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and Alexander Peters

Accepting Nuclear Weapons

NATO’s central military problem is that it has opted out of the Nuclear Age, while the Soviets have unhesitatingly accepted it. Neither Americans nor Europeans have been willing to contemplate nuclear weapons seriously as warfighting instruments. The Soviets always have. This fundamental doctrinal disparity has placed the alliance in an untenable position regarding realistically defending itself. The West’s dilemma is that it will have to change its views and accept nuclear weapons to survive, but it believes it cannot survive by accepting them.

–Sam Cohen, weapons analyst and Pentagon consultant who invented the neutron bomb

USIA: Dynamo or Dinosaur

USIA, as the centerpiece of the U.S. public diplomacy effort, must maintain its effectiveness in a world where advances in communications technology now allow immense quantities of information to reach many more millions of people throughout the world in less time than ever before. If the agency is to achieve this goal, the concept of its mission and the way it is pursued may well have to be re-evaluated.

–Representative Dante B. Fascell (D-Fla.), chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and chairman of the HOFA from 1984 to 1993

Coping with the Non-Aligned

A new U.S. approach to the non-aligned should begin by accepting that the movement is here to stay and avoid creating any pretexts for preserving its current anti-Western character. The consistency and tone of any new U.S. approach will be as important as agendas and the contents of proposals. It should stress not the divisions, but instead points of convergence between the United States and the non-aligned. Both are committed to survival of independent states in a pluralistic environment, a perspective fundamentally inconsistent with the Soviet world view.

–Richard Jackson, FSO
One who looks no further than the contemporary outside of the Foreign Service Journal thinks of it simply as a magazine, a mere appurtenance of the Service. But one who carefully examines its insides over its 60-year span is impressed by how much more it is than that. It is not only a vehicle of thought with respect to U.S. foreign relations, and, more particularly, overseas experience, but a means of expressing professional perspectives.

—Smith Simpson, a retired FSO and the author of Anatomy of the State Department and The Crisis in American Diplomacy

The hijacking of TWA Flight 847 brought home a stark reality of the 1980s. We are engaged in a war with international terrorism that promises to be longer, bloodier, and more difficult than anyone predicted. Over the past few years a number of western leaders, including French President Mitterand, British Prime Minister Thatcher, and President Reagan, have publicly declared war on terrorism in the wake of murderous attacks on their own institutions and citizens.

—Howard R. Simpson, retired FSO

As for the question of professionalism, it is essential that we create a Bureau of Diplomatic Security that has a highly professional cadre of security officers. By professional, I mean well-trained, well-equipped, adequately financed to do what needs to be done. One of the problems has been that during the last twenty years SY has been given additional functions without really being given the structure, training, or resources to take them on. I think that the Inman panel proposals will correct that.

—Robert Lamb, as coordinator for diplomatic security, is responsible for designing the $4.2 billion plan to safeguard embassies and missions mandated by the Advisory Panel on Overseas Security (the Inman panel) in the wake of the 1983 Beirut bombings

It is clear, however, that within these Russian terms lies the potential renaissance of a powerful nation-state and the metamorphosis of the political organization that has held power for 70 years. Neither word is an empty slogan, a bluff, though we have yet to see the general secretary’s full hand. Far beyond the borders of the Soviet Union, the unfolding of perestroika and glasnost may affect the whole Eastern bloc. On the other hand, if the reforms implicit in these terms are not realized, then both perestroika and glasnost could be harbingers of political entropy, with egregious consequences for the Soviet people as a weakening superpower senses its own peril.

—Daniel L. Nelson, professor of political science at the University of Kentucky and the author of books on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe
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**The Making of a Defector**
A former Sandinista major's story sheds new light on the Nicaraguan regime and the controversy over the Contras.

—George Gedda, Associated Press State Department correspondent

FSJ May 1989

**The Unaccepted Challenge**

What can be done to improve human rights reporting? First, human rights officers need training. The State Department offers courses in political tradecraft, economic reporting, and labor affairs, but it offers nothing to prepare human rights officers for their jobs. Such training need not be elaborate, but it should familiarize officers with the problems they will face in the field (case studies would be the best way to do this); bring officers up-to-date on human rights legislation; and put officers in contact with the various human rights organizations and other interested parties—especially congressional staff.

—Tom Shannon, FSO

FSJ June 1989

**Court Orders End to Sex Discrimination**

After 13 years in litigation, a sex discrimination suit brought against the Department of State [Palmer v. Baker, filed in 1976 by former FSO Alison Palmer] has tentatively been settled in a manner that could change the fate of up to 600 female Foreign Service officers and will certainly alter the entrance examination for many women—and men—seeking to join.

—Elizabeth Lee Fitzgerald, a freelance writer

1990 ~ 1999

FSJ October 1990

**Diplomacy and the Environment**

FSJ July 1991

**The Diplomatic Mistake That Made Yugoslavia**

Many decades of Serb-Croat disquietude have brought the Yugoslav nation to a decisive crossroads: their choice is either to continue as best they can, seeking illusive solutions, such as reconstitution as a confederate union, or simply to make a clean break with the past and separate. Without a negotiated and peaceful separation now, the universally feared vision for the future is continued strife and eventual civil war.

—Stephen N. Sestanovich, FSO

FSJ February 1992

**Post Cold War Intelligence: The State Department’s Role**

FSJ June 1992

**Lowering the Nuclear Threshold: The Specter of North Korea**

If the United States and other concerned governments conclude that North Korea is attempting to evade its commitments under the NPT or its pledges to South Korea not to acquire either nuclear weapons or reprocessing facilities, a decision will confront the world community more daunting by far than last year’s decision to drive Iraq out of Kuwait. ...But if South Korea appeared in danger of being overrun, would the United States resort to tactical nuclear weapons? That is hardly the vision of a New World Order that President Bush had in mind in the afterglow of Desert Storm. But that is a real-world specter, which must be confronted and thought through.

—William Beecher, journalist and former acting assistant secretary of Defense

FSJ October 1992

**Democratization and U.S. Policy: Principle and Pragmatism**

In the last year alone, democracies and democratization movements have suffered setbacks in Haiti, Algeria, Peru, Thailand, and the former Soviet republic of Georgia. Washington’s handling of these specific challenges shows that, although we are clearly taking the issue more seriously across the board than we might have a decade ago, the U.S. response has varied widely, showing little global consistency of policy application.

—Michael Sterner, FSO
The coming of a new administration in Washington inevitably raises concerns in the Foreign Service; the advent of the Clinton administration is no exception. ... For foreign policy generally, a new decision-making process has been created, centered in the White House, reflecting the president’s interests and the multidimensional nature of today’s problems. ... Conscious of over-sized State representations in policy committees in past administrations, the new team will limit State attendance to the relevant assistant secretary, one other officer and a rapporteur. Transition planners believed that the effectiveness of the department in the new policy process would be enhanced by streamlining the structure.

—David D. Newsom, retired FSO and former under secretary for political affairs

Helping Russia Reform

In a myriad of small ways, the Clinton administration has an opportunity to try and convince the Russian leaders and people that America is, indeed, a good neighbor, and would like to help Russia become, in [Russia’s ambassador to Washington, Vladimir] Lukin’s words, “an integral member of the democratic community.” Cooperative relations should not be postulated, however, on Russia’s becoming in our lifetime a western-style democracy. We should be content to watch the yeast of democracy and freedom work slowly, in its Russian way.

—Thompson R. Buchanan, retired FSO and Russia specialist

U.S. Policy Toward Africa

What about those African countries that are suffering from political blockages and cannot move ahead at this time? Should the United States ignore them until such time as they join the mainstream? In terms of development assistance and trade and investment promotion, the answer is yes. Scarce resources have to be utilized only where there is a decent possibility of achieving positive results. However, there is another dimension of national security policy that needs to be considered when we look at that part of Africa that is stagnating, unstable and dangerous.

As the only superpower and as the world’s most vibrant democracy, the United States is condemned to be a leader in maintaining barriers against world disorder.

—Herman J. Cohen, retired FSO and former assistant secretary of State for African affairs

Negotiating the Information Speedway

Mental health services are available to all agencies’ employees and their families in the overseas community as a recognized component of the medical program. Psychiatrists are assigned to geographic bureaus with regional responsibilities. ... Medical supports are changing, and other benefits are threatened. Personnel cuts mean high workloads and fewer people to do the work. Changes have been so sudden that families who committed themselves to the lifestyle under one model find themselves living under another. A very realistic anxiety arises.

—Virginia L. Foley, FS spouse and former mental health coordinator at Embassy Lima

Dissent in the Foreign Service

To be truly useful and needed, the [Dissent] Channel should not become a vent for the employees’ discharge of hot air. It shouldn’t become the sole possession of those who can’t see the forest for the trees, for the intellectually self-righteous, or for those swept along by the strong emotional currents produced during highly visible crises. Accordingly, proper use of the dissent channel requires intellectual honesty and objectivity; it also requires that bosses apply similar standards to themselves. They should presume the dissenter is acting in good faith and in the service of his country and should respond promptly and directly to the issues raised.

—Hume Horan, Career Minister and diplomat in residence at Howard University in Washington, D.C.
A sense of humor is generally considered a desirable trait and it used to be one of the qualities rated on Foreign Service fitness reports. Particularly at posts where life is difficult, a sense of humor, and specifically a willingness not to take oneself too seriously—which may mean a willingness not to get too worked up about local government inefficiency or unresponsiveness—is often essential to establishing a rapport with someone who expects the new diplomat to be a pain in the fundament, like some of his diplomatic colleagues.

–Richard B. Parker, retired FSO and former ambassador

Now a new reorganization is under way. The remarkable and virtually unprecedented thing about today’s USIA-State Department consolidation is that it’s proceeding without a serious study of the issues or the feasibility of integration and, so far, without spirited debate. With the Cold War over and the new Information Age expanding worldwide, there is no question that the role of information, education and cultural programs has changed in today’s more complex world.

–Mark B. Lewis and Eugene Rosenfeld, retired FSOs

While Congress and the Foreign Service have never been buddies, their historically tense relationship has become more adversarial in recent years, with Congress putting the foreign affairs agencies through the wringer with deep budget cuts, forced consolidation of agencies and employee layoffs. Why such a clash? A large part of the reason is that Congress and the Foreign Service have differing world views. The Foreign Service focuses on how foreign governments and international organizations can help or harm U.S. national interests, while Congress looks to the interests of supporters and constituents at home. Both are legitimate views and both need to be integrated into United States foreign policy.

–Marguerite Cooper, retired FSO

In 1978, Congress mandated the creation of independent, agency-specific inspectors general to provide a means of identifying and addressing problems in agency economy, efficiency and effectiveness, as well as to prevent and detect fraud and abuse. The 1978 law also specified that IGs had two masters: the agency head and Congress….No agency, institution, or career service is above human frailties; larcenous behavior has been found even among those who see themselves as the best and brightest. However, IGs are not infallible either; and they are under pressure from their primary client to find $500 hammers and comparable fodder for press releases. Twenty years later, it is time to ask, “Who is guarding the guardians?”

–Daniel W. Fisk, former senior Republican staff member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee
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Ask a diplomat from any country what the major international problems of the 21st century will be, and he or she will most likely focus on “soft” diplomatic issues: economic and commercial interests, environmental protection and the wise use of scarce natural resources, international crime, terrorism and human rights. Although these issues are important, this emphasis minimizes diplomats’ need to learn more about how diplomacy and the use of force are linked, and how to make that linkage work well.

—Howard K. Walker, retired FSO and former ambassador

In the aftermath of the tragic embassy bombings in Nairobi and Dar Es Salaam, AFSA has been working to bring this message to the administration, the Congress and the American people. Our central theme is: Never Again. Many of us remember how much more attention we gave security issues following the 1983 embassy bombing in Beirut. …As memories of Beirut faded, interest in security wanted. So did funding. Federal spending caps forced us to forgo security so we could respond to other urgent needs. …In doing so we shortchanged our security program. One recent example: Last March, the administration took $5 million of the $23.7 million appropriated for embassy security upgrades is fiscal 1998 and shifted it to telecommunications.

—Dan Geisler, president of AFSA

All policy disputes over disaster relief issues involve the same fundamental questions: First, will the moral imperative play a large or more peripheral role in the formulation of American foreign policy, compared to more hard-nosed definitions of national interest? Second, should the United States rely on international institutions to carry out disaster responses rather than bilateral relief programs? The realist school of foreign policy rigorously applied would subordinate U.S. government disaster relief to a narrower definition of vital national interests. Military intervention under this policy would only be used as an option if the disaster, left unchecked, would adversely affect those interests.

—Andrew Natsios, senior fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace and former director of the U.S. Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance

Hacktivism brings the methods of guerrilla theater and graffiti to cyberspace. It can be conducted by individuals acting alone or, as is often the case, in groups and coalitions. It can exhibit elements of art and theater. It can even be humorous. But it is not benign, and it threatens U.S. embassy computers and diplomatic missions. It can compromise sensitive or classified information and sabotage or disrupt operations. At the very least, it can be an embarrassment to those attacked and erode public confidence in the U.S. government.

—Dorothy E. Denning, professor of computer science at Georgetown University
Are State Employees Ready for Reform?

One indicator that many State employees—both Civil and Foreign Service—are ready to support change is “SOS for DOS: A Call for Action.” SOS for DOS is a loose-knit group that circulated a petition calling for “the leadership needed to undertake a long-term, bipartisan effort to modernize and strengthen the Department of State.” More than 1,600 State employees and retirees signed the letter, which was presented to Secretary of State Colin Powell on Feb. 2.

—Shawn Dorman, AFSA News editor

The Taliban-Bin Laden-ISI Connection

In hindsight, these arrangements among the Taliban, Pakistan and bin Laden were a perfect fit: the ISI was using its Afghan connection to wage a Pakistani guerrilla war in Kashmir against India. In return, the Taliban gained volunteers from Pakistani madrassas, as well as weapons and ammunition, in their quest to extend their obscurantist Islamic beliefs over all of Afghanistan. And bin Laden’s al-Qaeda network had quietly gained a base to train its forces for cowardly attacks against peaceful civilians in my country: a deadly collaboration, meticulously planned and executed with elegant timing and simplicity.

—Arnie Schifferdecker, FSO retired

The DRI Rides to the Rescue

The State Department work force that welcomed Secretary Powell on Jan. 20, 2001, had huge gaps in its ranks, with bureaucratic Band-Aids trying (and largely failing) to cover them up despite valiant efforts to “do more with less.” Facing inadequate budgets through most of the 1990s, State had not been able to hire enough personnel to make up for attrition, even as it stretched to open several dozen new posts, from Asmara to Yerevan. ...In 2001 we had a deficit of over 400 mid-level generalists, and were also short over 300 mid-level Foreign Service specialists. In Washington, we had over 600 vacant Civil Service positions.

—Niels Marquardt, FSO and special coordinator for diplomatic readiness at the State Department

China’s Economic Growth: Source of Disorder?

Not surprisingly, China’s rapid rise has also raised concerns about its ramifications for the region and the rest of the world. In 2004 alone, China’s foreign trade grew by about 35 percent, reaching $1.15 trillion in combined two-way trade. The U.S. takes about 21 percent of China’s exports, and runs a large trade deficit with China. The PRC was the second-largest recipient (after the United States) of foreign direct investment, attracting a total of over $60 billion last year.

—Robert Wang, FSO and economic minister-counselor in Beijing

Onward and Upward?—The FS Specialist Career Development Program

FSJ April 2004

The Holy Land: Can Peace Be Rescued?

The Israeli-Palestinian struggle over the Holy Land, which has attracted more obsessive attention and defied a solution longer than any major conflict of the past century, is the story of two victims. ...A U.S. peace initiative, with a firm commitment by the president, that sponsored new negotiations based on solutions already proposed by Israelis and Palestinians could have a dramatic effect on the politics and psychology of both sides.

—Philip C. Wilcox Jr., retired FSO and president of the Foundation for Middle East Peace
Duty at Iraq PRTs represents a new reality for the Foreign Service. Diplomats are accustomed to danger and hardship, but they are not soldiers. So it is not an unreasonable question to ask what role (if any) the Foreign Service should have in active war zones. The PRTs are the administration’s answer to that question. But how they operate, what they try to accomplish and what they actually can accomplish is an evolving story—and one that is not the same for each PRT.

In trying to tease out the reality for the Foreign Service behind the rhetoric concerning the PRTs, the Journal cast a wide net.

—Shawn Dorman, a former FSO, is associate editor of the FSJ and editor of AFSA’s book, Inside a U.S. Embassy

Support for Unaccompanied Assignments
The face of the Foreign Service has changed profoundly since the 9/11 attacks: Most current members can expect at least one unaccompanied assignment during their career, generally lasting a year or longer. In 2001, the number of unaccompanied, or partially accompanied, Foreign Service positions was about 200; now there are over 900.

—Bridget Roddy, State Department Family Liaison Office

Reshaping Ag Diplomacy
In the face of a budget shortfall, the Foreign Agricultural Service is expected not only to carry out its traditional mission of export promotion but to assume new responsibilities in the realms of national security, climate change and global food security. At the same time, a Congress and new administration increasingly preoccupied with domestic headaches, coupled with a stalled Doha Round, hint at a weakening of support for the liberalization philosophy that has underpinned trade policy for three-quarters of a century. Will FAS survive?

—Allan Mustard, FSO with the Foreign Agricultural Service

The “Reform” of Foreign Service Reform
The need to redefine the diplomatic mission and organize accordingly has driven a debate that began in the late 1940s and continues today. The first phase of that process revolved around managing the bipolar world of the Cold War and endured from 1946 until 1991. The current iteration of the debate centers on managing a multipolar, globalized set of state and non-state actors (from the Little Sisters of the Poor to al-Qaida) and coping with insidious threats ranging from pandemics to nuclear terrorism.

—Thomas D. Boyatt, retired FSO, former ambassador and now chair of the American Academy of Diplomacy’s “Foreign Affairs Budget for the Future” project

An Arab Spring Primer
The Arab Spring has shown the limits of American power in the Middle East. No longer does the United States have the prestige and resources to dominate Middle East affairs to the degree it has done ever since the British withdrew from east of Suez in 1971.

—Allen Keiswetter, retired FSO and scholar at the Middle East Institute
**FSJ November 2012**

**Speaking Out: Psst! Hey, Buddy, Wanna Buy an Ambassadorship?**
The selling of ambassadorships is just too lucrative, and election bids too expensive, for this source of campaign funds to be given up. .... While speaking out won’t end the practice of pay-to-play ambassadorships, it is still worth doing to underline two key points: Diplomacy is a profession, and Foreign Service officers are, in most cases, the most skilled practitioners of that profession.

—Dennis Jett, retired FSO and former ambassador

---

**FSJ December 2012**

**Beyond the Fortress Embassy**

In a move that has surprised and pleased critics, including this author, the State Department’s Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations has recently announced a sweeping “Design Excellence” initiative that embraces all elements of embassy construction—from location to architect selection, design engineering and building technology, sustainability and long-term maintenance needs. The new program sees innovation as an opportunity to enhance security, still the top priority. It is the State Department’s first major statement of design policy since 1954.

—Jane C. Loeffler, architectural historian and author of *The Architecture of Diplomacy: Building America’s Embassies*

---

**FSJ October 2014**

**The New Specialists**

Specialists have always been, well, specialized. But in recent years, under the dual drivers of terrorism and technology, their job descriptions have evolved rapidly. And yet, the more some things change, the more others stay the same. A lack of understanding about what, exactly, specialists do has plagued the Foreign Service for the past half-century. ...And that brings us to the elephant in the room: the rumored animosity between generalists and specialists. Is it a reality or a myth?

—Francesca Kelly, freelance writer, former AFSA News editor, FS spouse

---

**FSJ March 2015**

**The Road Back to Tehran: Bugs, Ghosts and Ghostbusters**

No enmity is forever. It took decades, but the U.S. established diplomatic relations with the USSR and China after their revolutions when it was in both sides’ interest to do so....When we do send people back [to Tehran], and when Iranian diplomatic personnel appear in Washington, teams of “ghostbusters” who know how to deal with the phantoms of the past should be present.

—John Limbert, retired FSO and former ambassador who served as the first-ever deputy assistant secretary of State for Iran from 2009 to 2010

---

**FSJ December 2015**

**Soft Power, High Impact**

One of U.S. foreign policy’s groundbreaking soft power initiatives is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year: the U.S. Department of State’s International Visitor Leadership Program. Though it is not widely known and operates quietly, with a current budget of $90 million, the impact of the IVLP is significant. The program has helped launch the careers of many world leaders, as well as civic leaders, while strengthening ties with our allies and advancing U.S. interests.

—Robert Zimmerman, FSO

---

**FSJ June 2016**

**A U.S. Policy Priority: Combating Corruption**

There is no sugarcoating the challenge before us—corruption is widespread, influencing quiet, day-to-day interactions, as well as high-level transactions and processes. And it is notoriously difficult to root out. Any effective campaign against corruption must be conducted not only from the top down, but also from the bottom up—not necessarily a natural modus operandi for the State Department.

—William R. Brownfield, Senior FSO, assistant secretary of State for international narcotics and law enforcement affairs

---

**FSJ December 2016**

**Understanding Russian Foreign Policy Today**

The Russian people, giddy from the collapse of the corrupt, oppressive regime under which they had labored for generations, hungered for a normal relationship with the rest of the world and believed that the result would be quick and dramatic improvement in their lives. In 1992 I wrote that these expectations could not be met, and that a period of disillusionment would inevitably follow. The policy challenge for both the West and Russia was to manage that period of disillusionment so that it would lead to a more mature and well-grounded relationship, and limit the likelihood of a Russian turn toward autarky and hostility.

—Raymond Smith, retired FSO and author of the 1990 cable from U.S. Embassy Moscow, “Looking into the Abyss: The Possible Collapse of the Soviet Union and What We Should Be Doing About It”
Leveraging Health Investments for U.S. Diplomacy

Most State Department FSOs have only a glancing acquaintance with health. ... U.S. government-led health efforts have saved and improved millions of lives, and changed the very course of the AIDS pandemic—yet may not initially appear to fall within the direct purview of a chief of mission. Where is the room for a COM to lead? And how can health programs advance our broader agenda?

—Mark Storella, Senior FSO and deputy assistant secretary for the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration

An Existential Threat That Demands Greater FS Engagement

The State Department started laying the official U.S. government groundwork for climate negotiations in 1988. ... Historically, State’s career civil servants have been the core of the U.S. government’s climate team. ... It is long past time that the department align its FSO recruitment, training and incentives to create a stronger cadre of FSOs who are eager and fully prepared to play more active roles in the fight to keep Earth habitable.

—Tim Lattimer, FSO

The President's Views: Time to Ask Why

Congress rejected drastic cuts to State and USAID funding. The Senate labeled the proposed cuts a “doctrine of retreat” and directed that appropriated funds “shall support” staffing State at not less than Sept. 30, 2016, levels. ... Given this clear congressional intent, we have to ask: Why such a focus on slashing staffing at State? Why such a focus on decapitating leadership? How do these actions serve the stated agenda of making the State Department stronger?

—Barbara Stephenson, ambassador and AFSA president
My Kingdom for a Door: When **Multitasking Goes Awry**

Office Management Specialists multitask perpetually, with masses of detail and constant interruption. A healthy dose of humor keeps inevitable mishaps and all the rest in perspective.

**BY MARSHA PHILIPAK-CHAMBERS**

One morning early in my Foreign Service career, when the deputy chief of mission walked through the door, I greeted him with a heartfelt, “Good morning, sir! How was the reception last night?” He paused, briefcase in hand, before replying cheerfully: “Actually, when I arrived at Frank’s apartment, he met me at the door in his pajamas. It turns out the reception is next week.”

I stammered and stuttered, “Oh, my God, I’m so sorry! I have no idea how that happened, but I promise it will never happen again!” I was close to tears. “Oh, it’s OK,” he warmly reassured me. “Frank and his wife invited me in, and we had a nice cup of tea and a good talk at the kitchen table.”

I pictured a man in a bathrobe and a five o’clock shadow, his wife in curlers, and my stomach turned. But because, like nearly all my bosses, this DCM was kind, he saw, and helped me see, the humor in the mishap. Still, I remember feeling unsettled and nervous for weeks afterward, sure that I was bound to do something really stupid—like booking rival Russian mafiosi to

---
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arrive at the embassy at the same time. I envisioned them riding up in the elevator together, backed into opposite corners, guns drawn.

Fallibility plagues us all, of course. But for OMSes, who constantly multitask in microscopic detail, “oopses” are exponentially more likely. Add constant interruptions to the stew, and you have a recipe for disaster.

EERs? Eek!

Symptoms of multitask-itis include saying, “Bye! Love you!” to a boss just before hanging up the phone. A recent OMS poll happily indicates that I’m not the only one who occasionally mistakes the boss for the spouse or offspring when distracted. We love our bosses, don’t misunderstand, but not with quite that familiarity. Rather than being startled by it, the boss should simply return the sentiment with “I love you, too!” to avoid embarrassment. It’s the kind thing to do, and your OMS won’t remember it past the next phone call anyway.

One might assume that eventually one would get better at this, and one does to an extent—at least we learn when not to even try to get anything done, like during Employee Evaluation Report season.

Over the years I’ve developed a system for presenting ambassadors with the information they need to write an employee’s reviewing statement. I take great pride in anticipating my principals’ needs with neat little employee packets that are comprehensive and uniform. Preparing these materials makes me feel smart and efficient. I am a true Girl Friday, a right hand, a veritable genius.

Unfortunately, while I’m putting the packets together, I’m also fielding scores of emails and phone calls with requests like, “Can you push my statement forward?” “I’m good with it; can you just paste it in?” or “The panel wants me to insert a comma after ‘approachable’—can you do it?”

And while I’m feverishly, frustratingly, working in the GEMS system to comply, I’m also talking to people who come to my desk, putting appointments on the ambassador’s calendar, answering non-EER-related phone calls, running to the outer door to fetch something from someone—and hopping up every time I hear cries of “Marsha!” from the ambassador’s office because her screen is frozen, or GEMS won’t load.

Inevitably, at some point the ambassador summons me again and, with a puzzled look on her face, asks why James’s rating statement is in Chris’s EER. It takes a moment for me to recall that because the DCM OMS was busy making the DCM’s employee statement fit in its box, I had jumped in to help keep things moving by pasting Chris’ and James’ new, abbreviated versions into the appropriate boxes (which, by the way, I am convinced shrink with use). God only knows what interruptions occurred while I was doing so, but they ended up swapped. Too frazzled to feel shame, I simply say with a heavy sigh, “It was a test to see if you were paying attention, and you passed.”

As I mentioned earlier, I’ve truly been blessed with bosses who have a sense of humor.
“Bad for My Organism”

Your OMS corps isn’t inept. We are just acutely doorless, exposed to constant interruptions. There are days when we want to shout, “Go away! I have to get this done!”—but, of course, we do not. We love our colleagues and I’m pretty sure they love us, though I sometimes feel it’s rather in the way a village loves its idiot.

As an ambassador’s executive assistant, my job is to put her day together before she arrives and stay until she leaves, which is often late due to receptions or dinners in town. While that makes for long days, it also gives me time to catch up on tasks that require sustained focus—pretty much anything that requires reading or writing.

Even when an officer or section’s schedule is relatively light, office management specialists still have to anticipate and prepare for what is coming up. And we can’t do that if tasks are “sitting on our heads,” as one of my Botswanan colleagues used to say. No, attempting to operate that way would be “bad for my organism,” as a Ukrainian friend once put it.

I learned a long time ago that it’s good for my organism to come in very early. When I arrive in the morning, the guards are just lining up for their morning brief. Upon entering the building, I greet the Marine at Post One and struggle to open the 12,000-pound door without dislocating a shoulder. The aroma of bacon greets me, and I am compelled in my sleep-walking state into the cafeteria. The helpful staff understand that I cannot yet form a sentence other than “Good morning,” so they know just to hand my well-done bacon to me. As my brain starts to wake up, I slide my briefcase and bacon down to the cashier, order lunch and pay (because I know how hard it will be later to make it back to the cafeteria).

Once upstairs, I put my cell phone in the box and try to open another six-ton door without dislocating a shoulder or, more critically, dropping my bacon. After entering the code—the right one, mind you, from the innumerable combinations and codes we OMSes have swimming about in our heads—I make my way down the hallway to the door of the front office, where I must come to a complete halt. I set down the briefcase and the bacon and reach inside the briefcase for my reading glasses so I can see the microscopic lines of the spin dial. (Muscle memory is useless here. If I leave my glasses at home, it begins a sequence of events so ugly that I’d be better off turning around and going back to bed.)

After at least two tries on the spin dial, I open the door and launch myself inside to quickly silence the beeping of the alarm by putting in yet another code. The reading glasses are still on—there’s no time to take them off and put them back on before I have to see the alarm panel—so attempting to move quickly is “bad for my organism.” Because anything further than two feet from my face is a visual mystery, I invariably clip my leg on the edge of the DCM OMS’ desk and yelp, which assists with the waking-up process.

OMS Heaven

I then go back out the door, fetch briefcase and bacon, and move to my desk where I set everything down, including myself, and breathe for a minute. I have approximately one hour to prepare for the onslaught of the day. Because, like me, the computer is multitasking while trying to wake up, I throw my card into the reader while I make my tea. This gives the device time to yawn, stretch and do a bit of yoga. If Washington has pushed out a patch or upgraded something or other, then I must patiently wait until 8:30 when an Information Resources Management colleague can cajole or threaten my computer into behaving.

On days when the system likes me, and the tea and bacon are working their magic, I’m prepared to greet the ambassador with the full spectrum of my vast knowledge. By the time she arrives, I have ironed out every detail of her day, prepared myself to answer any question she might have, printed the calendar far into the future for the country team, or whatever meeting happens to be that morning, and have compiled a list of decisions I need her to make.
I am most pleased with myself, basking in the glow of my efficiency—until I review the printed, far-into-the-future calendar and see that I have put an event on the right day but the wrong month. At times like this, I dream of a career selling vegetables on the square of some small Midwestern town.

At some posts, like my previous one, Kyiv, OMSes dream of a place where the day actually ends. But here in Bridgetown the day not only ends, but it does so early, leaving just the ambassador, DCM and a smattering of section or agency heads. For those of us with no door but a huge “to do” list, the resulting drop in the volume of phone calls, emails and visitors is heaven. We can complete entire thoughts and tasks—efficiently making travel arrangements, writing evaluations for subordinates, creating better knowledge management organizational systems and answering any emails that require more than a sentence.

Staying after hours is not overtime abuse, but time away from our personal lives that OMSes willingly sacrifice because we have integrity and take our work seriously—particularly if there is a project looming that requires several hours of concentration. Like most department personnel, we will do whatever it takes to get the job done—and can only see it through when we’re not multitasking.

“Where Is Oleg Taking Me?”

Office management specialists aren’t the only employees to suffer from multitask-itis. During a crisis, multitasking can get completely out of control, the inbox fraught with peril. On one occasion, while serving at a post in crisis where we got hundreds of emails in a non-stop, 24-hour work day, I received a five-word email from my ambassador: “Where is Oleg taking me?” Copied to all staff at post, as well as to the task force and Eastern European desk back in Washington, it was an urgent, if somewhat broad, cry for help.

Confident that Oleg, his driver, was not kidnapping the ambassador, I called the political officer who was already at the location to find out what the ambassador might be referring to. The political officer confirmed that the meeting location had changed on short notice, and pointed out that he had emailed me with that information. Sure enough, amidst the drop-ins, the phone calls and the blizzard of emails with subject lines that shed little to no light on their content, I had not picked out that particular one; but the ambassador, frantically reading emails in the car, of course had.

Assuming that the ambassador had not leaned forward from the back seat to inform Oleg of this new destination because he was dealing with his own multitasking frenzy, I dealt with the
situation quickly with a few phone calls and then sat back and tried to breathe.

Having seen the “Where is Oleg taking me?” email (who didn’t?) and heard my end of the corrective phone calls, the DCM, also a member of the multitask-itis sufferers support group, sauntered out of his office with a wry smile on his face. “So … what’s the deal, Marsha?” he asked, leaning casually on his OMS’ counter. “Where is Oleg taking him?” His jovial sarcasm served as a flotation device for a drowning woman, especially since I received emails for the rest of the day from concerned people in Washington asking who Oleg was, where he was taking the ambassador, and what it all meant. I suppose they thought it was some kind of code, like “The eagle has landed.”

Late that evening, when it was quieter and I could focus, I made a list of “rules of engagement” for passing critical or urgent emails to the front office: updated subject lines that specified the action, using caps to signify action, and for whom, etc. But forever after, “Where is Oleg taking me?” was synonymous with too many emails and too much multitasking in our crisis-ridden front office.

Multitasking on the Homefront

OMSes are so conditioned to interruptions and task-jumping that fractured thinking doesn’t end at the office door. When doing my Saturday chores at home, I’ll start to do something upstairs, get halfway up and realize I forgot to bring a needed item with me. Then, when back downstairs to get it, I’ll see something else that needs doing—and immediately forget what I came downstairs for in the first place. Rinse and repeat.

We even do it in our sleep. I’ve awakened so many times in the middle of the night, suddenly recalling a detail I missed or something I need to do, that I keep a pad and pen on my nightstand. At least in Barbados, I’m finally getting good REM sleep. In crisis posts, or those that are simply very busy, REM sleep is a distant dream, so to speak.

Fractured thoughts from too much multitasking cause good OMSes to do things like email the entire embassy to hold the mayo on their lunch order, call the ambassador “hon,” forget the name of one or more of their children, or forget which country they’re currently serving in or what year it is.

The moral of these tales is this: Please employ patience and humor when your OMS makes a mistake. After all, even computers lock up when they’re trying to process too many details at once.

At least your OMS will occasionally tell you she loves you. When was the last time you heard that from your computer?
AFSA President Asks Retirees to Speak Up for the Foreign Service

In January, AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson was invited to speak to the membership of two large Foreign Service groups in the D.C. area.

At both events Amb. Stephenson shared her concerns for the future of the Foreign Service given the substantial loss of senior leadership over the past year and the lack of hiring at the entry level.

“This year State will bring on just 101 new officers, including our Pickering and Rangel Fellows,” she told the audience. “Even in the bad old days of the 1990s, 110 new officers in a year was the lowest we ever got.”

The hiring freeze of the 1990s caused problems a decade later, when seasoned leadership was needed, but not always available, for Iraq and Afghanistan, Amb. Stephenson said. But there was a strategic argument being made at the time for cutting funding for diplomacy.

“In the 1990s,” she explained, “we’d won the Cold War.” That’s why some strategists believed we could afford to shrink our diplomatic corps. But, she emphasized, “there is no similar strategic argument today.”

Amb. Stephenson reflected on the new National Security Strategy, which “makes it clear that threats have not declined” and speaks to the indispensable role played by American diplomacy and development to confront these threats. What then, she asked, is the strategic argument being made today for cutting funding for diplomacy?

Amb. Stephenson said AFSA has worked through Congressional Budget Justifications to track the actual size of the budget for core diplomatic capability, which has declined over the past decade. Each dollar spent on core diplomacy in 2008 was, by 2016, reduced to 76 cents (in nominal, non-inflation-adjusted terms).

Amb. Stephenson outlined the work AFSA has been doing with lawmakers to stop that slide. She offered a ray of hope, pointing to the bipartisan support shown for the Foreign Service on Capitol Hill, as well as the dedicated work of retired members of the Foreign Service.

Many FS retirees have been active in local and national efforts to make the American people aware of the importance of diplomacy in maintaining U.S. global leadership, which nine in 10 Americans support.

Amb. Stephenson asked attendees to “be a part of the conversation” about the future of the Foreign Service by learning the hiring and budget numbers and being able to defend them to friends, colleagues and journalists. She also noted that many retirees make the effort to call their representatives on the Hill to convey both their concerns and their praise when deserved.

The audience at FARNOVA.

Amb. Barbora Stephenson speaks at DACOR.
You Called?

These are tough times, let’s be honest. And in times of uncertainty, anxiety escalates. Increasingly, folks come to AFSA not just to get answers, but to get reassurance, or at least be heard. It’s what we’re here for, after all.

When members come to us because the department’s policies or procedures are affecting them, I get involved. To raise engagement on an issue, I’ll often send a note to my counterpart in the department. He knows his stuff, which makes my life easier.

We also meet with the Director General’s office about twice a month to discuss a host of issues, mostly big ones like the proposed buyout, the “employee-driven” Redesign (now redesigned into the “Impact Initiative”) or eligible family member (EFM) employment. It gives me an opportunity to share your concerns directly with those who can help.

Over the past few months, we’ve been working on a host of important issues that folks have brought to us. Recent hot-button issues include the need for additional leadership courses at FSI (PT 207), the new tax law (and its impact on Permanent Change of Station costs) and sexual harassment issues.

We raised these issues with the department and, as a result, FSI is looking at ways to add more leadership classes; the department issued a notice indicating that employees will not be taxed on PCS costs; and the Office of Civil Rights expressed interest in starting an open dialogue with employees about sexual harassment.

Over the past year, hundreds of members have shared concerns about the eligible family member hiring freeze and, more recently, changes to the Expanded Professional Associates Program.

We met with HR to dig deeper into the EFM employment issue. While precise details of the thaw remain elusive, bureaus now have more flexibility in determining their needs and moving to fill them. To right this ship will take a while, unfortunately, and tempers are already short.

The proposal to “enhance” the EPAP has been significantly revised, in part based on our submissions and advocacy. For instance, those who have successfully completed 12 months in the program will be grandfathered, eligibility requirements have softened and flexibility in reviewing qualifications has been increased.

We’ve also heard from a number of members with concerns about the Zika virus and pregnancy. Recently, we were informed by a member that the department refused to authorize a medevac until the pregnancy was confirmed by an ultrasound, which is typically conducted at about 16 weeks, yet researchers have consistently highlighted the first trimester as the most dangerous for infections involving the Zika virus.

We sent a letter to the department asking that they “seek to minimize the risk to expectant mothers to the maximum extent possible,” especially when the potential consequences are so dire. The department’s response indicated that it will authorize medical travel, lodging and per diem from the day a person tests positive for pregnancy.

Finally, we heard from a member who attended a discussion at FSI at which language instructors said they’ve noticed a change in their students returning from high-threat, high-stress postings—anxiety levels are up, tempers high and attention spans short.

We sent a letter to the department asking FSI to examine this phenomenon further to determine if additional resources should be provided to instructors and students.

Sometimes I wonder if our work is getting us anywhere or if we’re just spinning our wheels. Are our voices being heard?

These aren’t even the topline issues we’re working on, like intake of new FS members, pushing for improved promotion numbers and fighting for those harmed by the department’s unilateral decision to slash those eligible to receive meritorious step increases from 2014 to 2016.

But these issues are critical to many of us—to expectant parents, language students and anyone concerned about the way our colleagues are treated when placed in harm’s way.

There are days when I leave work feeling a bit crestfallen. I watch as my colleagues trudge toward the Metro, catch a bus or grab a bike, and see similar expressions on the faces of many. Sometimes I wonder if our work is getting us anywhere or if we’re just spinning our wheels. Are our voices being heard?

But one of the best parts of my job is responding to concerns that people send our way, especially those that affect many of our members. It’s what we mean when we say that AFSA is your voice with the department. And we’re happy to help.
Commercial Service Promotes Economic Security

The concept of economic security lies at the heart of the Trump administration’s National Security Strategy. Economic security appears to be at the heart of China’s strategy, as well—not only in Asia, but also increasingly in Africa and Latin America. According to New York University Stern School Professor Pankaj Ghemawat, the U.S. share of Africa’s infrastructure market is 1 percent, while China’s is 38 percent.

But China is not alone. According to the Wall Street Journal, 40 percent of all arms sales in Latin America between 2001 and 2013 were from one country: Russia. And according to CNN Money, Brazilian construction giant Odebrecht paid an estimated $800 million in bribes to win public sector contracts throughout Latin America between 2001 and 2015. The ensuing scandal has ensnared several Latin American former presidents.

How might the Trump administration counter such examples to advance U.S. economic interests? Fortunately, the tools already exist. But they need to be strengthened. U.S. companies tell us consistently that what they want, above all, is a transparent and level playing field on which to compete.

What U.S. companies want, above all, is a transparent and level playing field on which to compete.

This process works—which makes it hard to explain why the administration has called for closing 35 Commercial Service posts overseas instead of expanding our footprint to help more U.S. companies win these contracts. Advocacy casework has grown by 300 percent in the last six years and resulted in $42 billion in U.S. export sales to foreign governments last year. If the administration is truly interested in pursuing economic security for all Americans, it should work to expand the work the Commercial Service does.

AFSA at HBCU Conference

AFSA staff member Christine Miele talks with attendees at the State Department’s Historically Black Colleges and Universities Conference. Miele explains AFSA’s role in promoting and protecting the Foreign Service on Feb. 16.
Continuing the Journey

During two terms as AFSA president and one term as AFSA State VP, I wrote 66 columns for The Foreign Service Journal. While most naturally dealt with personnel or professional issues facing the Foreign Service, the column that prompted the most favorable feedback was philosophical.

Titled “The Journey,” that September 2008 column observed that many Foreign Service members are “always becoming but never being” because they focus on securing the next promotion or assignment rather than on making the most of where they are now.

Instead, I encouraged viewing the Foreign Service as “a journey rather than a destination” by focusing on the unique and varied day-by-day experiences that our extraordinary career has to offer.

As a recent retiree, my philosophy about this new chapter of my Foreign Service journey so far draws more heavily on research than it does on my own experience. During my research, I came across a concept that I think other retirees might find interesting.

A study of populations around the world with the longest life expectancies found one such group in Okinawa. While they, of course, live healthy lifestyles (e.g., regular exercise, good nutrition), one key to their longevity is a concept they call ikigai.

That Japanese word roughly translates as “a reason for being,” but a more down-to-earth translation is “reason for getting up in the morning.”

What is your reason for getting up in the morning? During our working years, it probably included elements such as “to do a job I love” and “to earn money to support my family/myself.” But after we stop working 60-hour weeks of paid employment, we need to find a new ikigai to motivate and energize ourselves.

Researchers suggest finding your ikigai by answering these questions: What do you love? What are you good at? What does the world need from you? For pre-retirees, there is a fourth question: What can you get paid for? Ikigai may well include a combination of activities. Common examples for retirees are visiting grandchildren, caring for family members, volunteering, part-time paid work, travel, hobbies, sports and creative expression.

Whatever the case, what we choose to do needs to be sufficient to impart a sense of purpose that will help us persevere in the face of any obstacles encountered during this capstone chapter of our lives.

Here’s hoping that you find your ikigai and live long and prosperous!

AFSA Adds Two Names to Memorial Wall

The annual memorial ceremony on Foreign Service Day is an important occasion to pause and remember our fallen colleagues.

This year AFSA has the sad duty of adding the names of two members of the Foreign Service who died in the line of duty overseas to the marble plaques in the C Street lobby of the Department of State, bringing the total to 250:

• Michael Andrew Cameron Jordan suffered a fatal heart attack on Dec. 18, 2016, in Juba, South Sudan.
• Selena Nelson-Salcedo died suddenly due to pregnancy complications on June 4, 2017, in Bratislava, Slovakia.

We invite you to join the family members and friends of Andy and Selena in honoring their service during this ceremony, which is tentatively scheduled for 4:15 p.m. on Friday, May 4.

For the second year in a row, AFSA is organizing a moment of silence at embassies and consulates around the world, encouraging members of the Foreign Service community to pause at noon local time to remember our fallen colleagues and reflect on the dangers that are inherent in choosing to work in challenging places around the world, protecting and serving America’s people, interests and values.
The Ongoing Battle of the Budget

When I last wrote, we expected that one of two things would happen with the Fiscal Year 2018 budget. Either the caps set by the Budget Control Act of 2011 would not be lifted, and the final budget would be a compromise between the Senate and House cuts; or the caps would be lifted, and there would be money available to increase our budget.

Indeed, you could feel a change in the air on the Hill. Members and staff moved from being proud of having reduced the administration’s cuts to starting to talk about fully funding the foreign affairs account.

On Feb. 9, congressional leaders agreed to lift caps on both defense and non-defense spending for FY 2018. However, the agreement also included a line cutting funding for Overseas Contingency Operations by nearly $9 billion. Because OCO made up approximately a third of State’s overall budget last year, this cut would have a dramatic impact unless the money is restored to our base. We are thus poised between the potential for great news or for significant cuts to the FY 2018 budget.

As I write, congressional leadership has not yet decided the total amount each agency will receive; once they do, appropriators will be able to finish the FY 2018 budget. They would like to do so before the continuing resolution expires on March 23, but another continuing resolution might be necessary.

Meanwhile, the administration has released its FY 2019 budget request. Despite the fact that Congress rejected the FY 2018 proposed cuts as a “doctrine of retreat,” the administration proposed cuts nearly as large for FY 2019. We expect hearings on that budget request in late March, as this issue goes to press.

Distinct from appropriations, authorization bills spell out the vision and policies to be financed. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed an FY 2018 authorizations bill, which has not reached the floor of the Senate.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee then started to write its own bill, based on the Senate bill. Action there has paused, even as talks start about an FY 2019 bill. The long-term goal of many on the Hill is to make the State authorizations bill as comprehensive and effective as the defense authorizations bill.

Most encouraging to us are the expressions of support we are seeing. In last month’s Foreign Service Journal, you read a terrific article by Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) calling for a national conversation about the U.S. role in the world. On p. 13 of this issue, you’ll see a piece co-written by Senators Dan Sullivan (R-Alaska) and Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.) explaining why they formed the Senate Foreign Service Caucus.

Meanwhile, 1,215 veterans and 151 retired flag officers have already written congressional leaders to oppose the cuts the president has proposed in the FY 2019 budget. Friends like these give us hope that, over the long run, we will emerge from these years of crisis with a renewed vision for U.S. leadership and a clear understanding of the importance of diplomacy and development.

—Mary Daly, Director of Advocacy and Speechwriting
On Dec. 22, 2017, President Donald Trump signed the final version of House Resolution 1 (known as H.R. 1), which amends various sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Also known as the Tax Cut and Jobs Act of 2017, the 185-page law makes several changes to the tax provisions summarized in the AFSA 2017 Tax Guide, published in the January-February Foreign Service Journal, two of which will immediately affect AFSA members whose taxes are due this month. The remaining amendments, which generally take effect in 2018 (for filing in April 2019), center on a reduction in the corporate income tax rate and repatriating foreign profits currently sheltered from tax overseas.

The new tax law makes wide-ranging changes that will affect both individuals and businesses, with many changes to the individual tax laws sun-setting in 2026. For the individual taxpayer, the new law cuts the marginal tax rates, consolidates the personal exemption with the standard deduction, eliminates some deductions while increasing others and effectively eliminates the individual mandate of the Affordable Care Act. The net effect of the changes can reasonably be expected to emphasize private-sector investment and require increased public-sector efficiency.

This article summarizes those portions of the tax law that are most significant generally, as well as those that are most important to the Foreign Service community. A particular emphasis will be placed on changes to the provisions reviewed in the AFSA 2017 Tax Guide. The article simplifies the most significant portions of the new law. There is no substitute for reading the statutes themselves and retaining the services of a tax professional before applying the new rules in an income tax return. It is also important to note that changes to the law and its interpretation (possibly even corrective legislation) should be expected as its effects and meaning become clear over the year.

Changes That Take Effect Immediately

Amendments to some of the laws we summarized in the AFSA 2017 Tax Guide have already taken effect. Filers need to be aware that these changes must be accounted for in their 2017 tax returns due in April 2018.

• 7.5 percent floor for medical and dental expenses, applicable to 2017 taxes (filed in April 2018)

The amended tax law allows taxpayers who itemize to deduct medical expenses to the extent they exceed 7.5 percent of the adjusted gross income (AGI). Without the amendments, this floor would have increased to 10 percent for 2017 taxes (filed in April 2018). The 7.5 percent floor will remain in effect for 2018 (filed in April 2019).

• Estate tax planning, gifts and retirement contributions

The new law also increases the lifetime gift and estate exclusion to the first $10 million ($11.2 million adjusted for inflation) gifted or bequeathed in 2018. It is important to understand that gift and estate taxes are connected. The use of this exemption on one’s taxable lifetime gifts reduces the total exemption allowed for bequests at death. Any unused portion of one’s lifetime exemption may be transferred to a surviving spouse with a portability election on the decedent’s final tax return. If gifts of less than $15,000 per person per year ($30,000 for joint gifts split between spouses) or gifts otherwise exempt from the gift tax regime (such as gifts between spouses) are the only gifts made during a taxpayer’s life, the surviving spouse may then exclude up to $22.4 million from the federal gift and estate tax.

Changes to Tax Laws Applicable to the 2018 Tax Year (filed in April 2019)

The amendments to some of the laws we summarized in the AFSA 2017 Tax Guide will not affect members’ tax returns until they file 2018 taxes in April 2019.

Individual Taxes

H.R. 1 made significant changes to individual income tax provisions, most of which sunset at the end of 2025 as a condition of budget reconciliation rules that were required to pass the law with fewer than 60 votes in the Senate. The reduction in each marginal tax rate and increase in the dollar limits for each corresponding income bracket were chief among those changes. The number of tax brackets remains the same despite significant political debate about consolidating some (see chart). The long-term capital gains rates of 0 percent, 15 percent and 20 percent, and their associated income brackets, were not changed other than to adjust for inflation.

New Tax Brackets for 2018

• Increased standard deduction and eliminated personal exemption

H.R. 1 effectively combined the personal exemption ($4,050 in 2017) with an increased standard deduction for
a single tax benefit of $12,000 in 2018 ($24,000 married filing jointly). This simplification should be considered along with the new brackets, increased child tax credit (increasing to $2,000 for each child, with a non-refundable deduction of $500 for non-child dependents in 2018), and suspension of miscellaneous itemized deductions to fairly gauge the effect of the new law on one’s tax return.

• **Suspension of miscellaneous itemized deductions**

H.R. 1 suspends miscellaneous itemized deductions until the end of 2025. This broad deduction previously allowed itemizers to deduct unreimbursed employee expenses (business liability insurance premiums, depreciation of a personal computer used to produce income, dues to professional societies, educator expenses and much more); tax preparation fees; and “other expenses,” including appraisal fees for casualty losses and charitable contributions, hobby expenses to the extent of hobby income, investment fees and expenses, safe deposit box rentals and more. Members of the Foreign Service who itemized deductions in 2017 should consult a tax professional about other options for deducting expenses incurred for home leave, unreimbursed representational expenses and unreimbursed moving expenses in 2018. The 2016 version of IRS Publication 529 contains a more inclusive list of expenses taxpayers may have once deducted as miscellaneous itemized deductions but that should not be deducted again until after 2025.

Several members have expressed concern that some reimbursed or employer-paid employee expenses (like Permanent Change of Station moving expenses) might become taxable with the suspension of the IRC Section 217 deduction for moving expenses paid by an employer. However, H.R 1 did not touch the IRC Section 912 exclusion for civilian officers and employees for “allowances or otherwise (but not amounts received as post differentials)” paid by the Secretary under the Foreign Service Act. Such allowances include department payments (and reimbursements) of
Changes to the law and its interpretation (possibly even corrective legislation) should be expected as its effects and meaning become clear over the year.

costs and expenses incurred for:
(1) Travel to and from post;
(2) Authorized or required home leave;
(3) Family members to accompany a member on temporary duty;
(4) Representational travel within the host country to which a member is assigned;
(5) Obtaining necessary medical care for an illness, injury or medical condition while abroad under certain circumstances;
(6) R&R travel of family members;
(7) Removal of family members, furniture and household and personal effects (including automobiles) from post where there is imminent danger;
(8) Trips by a member of the Service, and members of his or her family, for purposes of family visitation in certain situations;
(9) Transporting the furniture, household and personal effects of a member of the Service (and of his or her family) to successive posts of duty and, on separation of a member from the Service, to the place where the member will reside;
(10) Packing and unpacking, transporting to and from a place of storage, and storing the furniture and household and personal effects of a member of the Service (and of his or her family);
(11) Transporting, for or on behalf of a member of the Service, a privately owned motor vehicle under certain conditions;
(12) Travel and relocation of members of the Service, and members of their families, assigned to or within the United States and some territories;
(13) A round-trip to post each year for each child who is under 21; and
(14) Several other expenses.
AFSA recommends reading IRC Section 912 in its entirety for full details on each of these expenses, which have been simplified here.
AFSA requested additional input from Charleston General Financial Services on this issue. Based on an unofficial opinion from the IRS, CGFS confirms that all travel authorized under Section 901 of the Foreign Service Act, which includes Permanent Change of Station (PCS), R&R, emergency visitation travel, medevacs, etc., is exempt from taxation under the terms of IRC Section 912.
There were no changes to the exclusion of lodging benefits furnished to employees for the convenience of the employer despite an earlier House proposal to limit this benefit.

• Deduction for state and local taxes capped at $10,000
A new $10,000 limit ($5,000 married filing separately, not indexed for inflation) on the deduction for state and local taxes is one of the more controversial elements of H.R. 1. Prior to the amendment, which expires at the end of 2025, there was no aggregate limit to the deduction allowed for state, local and foreign real property taxes; state and local personal property taxes; state, local and foreign income taxes; and state and local sales taxes (in lieu of income taxes). Foreign real property taxes may no longer be deducted, though foreign income tax is still deductible. Foreign value added taxes (VAT) have never been deductible under this provision.

• Home mortgage interest deduction
Somewhat unexpectedly, the new law reins in the deduction for home mortgage interest. For all acquisition indebtedness incurred after Dec. 15, 2017, a taxpayer may only deduct the mortgage interest on up to $750,000 of acquisition debt ($350,000 married filing separately). The interest on home equity loans is no longer deductible.
Both the House and Senate versions of H.R. 1 would have extended the amount of time homeowners had to own and occupy their principal residences to exclude up to $250,000 ($500,000 married filing jointly), but the conference committee dropped the change.
No changes were made to the definition of a residence that qualifies for the home mortgage interest deduction. The mortgage interest deduction may be applied to a principal residence and up to one other residence that is also used by a taxpayer as a residence during the year.

• 1031s apply to domestic real estate only
The new law places new limits on Section 1031 like-kind exchanges. Only exchanges of like-kind real property held for the production of income may be traded without recognizing gain. Property within the United States may not be exchanged for property in another country. The new rules apply beginning in 2018, but exchanges already underway are grandfathered in with transition rules.

Other Changes to Tax Law Applicable to the 2018 Tax Year (filed in April 2019)
Below we highlight other changes to the Internal Revenue Code that will affect fewer Foreign Service members but which are nevertheless important to keep in mind for financial decisions in 2018 and beyond. As always, we encourage readers to consult a tax professional for more details on their specific situation.
**Business Taxes**

Cuts for businesses were central to the new law. Among these, the C corporation income tax rate was reduced from 35 percent to a 21 percent flat tax, which does not sunset like most changes to the individual tax laws. Few members of the Foreign Service community operate small businesses as C corporations, but this cut may affect future business structuring choices. Those with smaller taxable incomes should note that the 15 percent corporate tax bracket for corporations with less than $50,000 of taxable income has been eliminated.

More germane to all business owners, the tax cut permits “bonus” depreciation of capital assets subject to wear and tear (e.g., vehicles, computers and office equipment) of up to 100 percent in the first year. In other words, businesses can write off the entire cost of depreciable assets they acquire the same year they are purchased. Note that this property must be used by a trade or business or held for the production of income. This rule will fully phase out by the end of 2026.

A third high-priority business tax cut includes a deduction of up to 20 percent of “combined qualifying business income” for businesses that are not corporations and that own an interest in some kinds of pass-through entities like partnerships, S corporations and sole proprietorships. This concept is highly complex and includes many limits. It appears that businesses with large amounts of real estate held in a C corporation and those operating like merchants (as opposed to rendering professional services such as legal advice) will benefit most from this. In any case, this incentive is further complicated by additional layers of complex definitions. You should retain a tax professional for assistance claiming this deduction if you believe you may be able to benefit from it.

Briefly, some amendments act to increase corporate tax liability to balance loss of revenue from the above cuts. The most relevant of these include reduced deductibility of business entertainment expenses and limiting net carryover losses to 80 percent of taxable income. Net business interest expense deductions are also capped at 30 percent of adjusted taxable income.

**Individual Taxes**

- **Alimony/spousal support no longer deductible by payor**
  Payments of alimony (also known as spousal support or separate maintenance) have been deductible to the payor and included in the income of the recipient since the 1950s. The tax cut eliminates the deduction for payors and the requirement that recipients of such payments include them in their taxable income. This provision applies only to divorces entered into and modifications of support beginning in 2019.

**H.R. 1 did not touch the IRC Section 912 exclusion for civilian officers and employees for “allowances or otherwise (but not amounts received as post differentials)” paid by the Secretary under the Foreign Service Act.**

- **529 Funds for elementary and secondary education**
  Up to $10,000 of a taxpayer’s 529 plan may now be used to pay for elementary and secondary education. Funds may be used for private and religious education as well as public options.

- **Some charitable contributions deductible up to 60 percent**
  The tax cut increases the percent by which charitable donations to public charities and private foundations are deductible, from 50 percent to 60 percent of a taxpayer’s “contribution base,” which is often the same as AGI.

**Some Proposed Changes Were Not Made**

Earlier versions of H.R. 1 included modifications of many tax laws that did not make it to the president’s desk. Reducing the number of marginal tax brackets, capping the exclusion for employer-provided housing and modifying the ownership requirements for excluding the gain on the sale of a principal residence are among the rejected proposals already summarized above. In addition, the $250 deduction for educator expenses and the $5,250 exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance for employees and their dependents were not touched by the new law.

**Conclusion**

The Tax Cut and Jobs Act of 2017 is a broad, detailed set of amendments to the existing Internal Revenue Code. It accomplishes much for businesses and individuals, the net effect of which, as estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation, will be to increase the Gross Domestic Product by about 0.7 percent over a 10-year budget window. That growth is expected to soften the blow to federal revenue, which is forecast to decrease by $1 trillion over the same period.

Although each individual and corporate taxpayer will see different results based on their particular circumstances, members of the Foreign Service community will generally benefit from the lower marginal brackets, increased standard deduction, increased child tax credit and reduced need to itemize. Retirees’ deductions for medical expenses over the 7.5 percent AGI floor have been preserved a bit
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AFSA Outreach Specialist Allan Saunders (right) speaks with an attendee at the 2018 Global Ties U.S. National Meeting held from Feb. 7-10.

Global Ties works with the U.S. Department of State to bring future leaders from around the world to participate in a professional development program sponsored and funded by the Office of International Visitors, part of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

AFSA participated in the conference to promote our publications and outreach programs, particularly the Speakers Bureau and the National High School Essay Contest.

Based on an unofficial opinion from the IRS, CGFS confirms that all travel authorized under Section 901 of the Foreign Service Act is exempt from taxation.

longer. Conversely, those looking to finance an expensive new home, live in high-tax states, and who had previously claimed a large number of miscellaneous itemized deductions may see little or no actual tax cut. Ultimately, the new law is intended to incentivize private-sector growth and investment and set the stage for a leaner public sector.

Circular 230 Notice: Pursuant to U.S. Treasury Department Regulations, all tax advice herein is not intended or written to be used, and may not be used, for the purposes of avoiding tax-related penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or promoting, marketing or recommending advice on any tax-related matters addressed herein. ■

Sam Schmitt is licensed to practice law in Virginia and before the United States Tax Court. His past practice has been in the areas of estate planning, family law and federal employment. Sam will accompany his wife, a consular officer, to Guangzhou later this year. They have previously been posted in Vilnius and Washington, D.C.

AFSA Meets with Global Ties Participants

In honor of our centennial year celebration, please send us a note about what the Journal has meant to you. Email us at journal@afsa.org with your answer to this: “The Foreign Service Journal is ___.“ (Please be nice. After all, it’s our birthday.) Or send a photo of yourself (or a friend or family member) reading the Journal wherever you are—the more distant from D.C., the better. ■

The Foreign Service Journal Is...

The Foreign Service Journal is turning 100!

Not many magazines last that long. Life didn’t. Neither did The Saturday Evening Post. The reason the Journal has lasted is because of you, our readers and our community. The Journal stays strong as “the independent voice of the Foreign Service” because you write for it, you read it and you join in the conversation.
AFSA Seeks Award Nominations

Each year, the American Foreign Service Association honors members of the Foreign Service community whose contributions and leadership stand out.

We are proud to bestow the only awards honoring constructive dissent in the federal government, having done so since 1968. AFSA also honors outstanding performance. All award recipients will be honored in person at our awards ceremony in October.

We welcome nominations for our four constructive dissent awards:

- The W. Averell Harriman Award for entry-level Foreign Service officers.
- The William R. Rivkin Award for mid-level Foreign Service officers.
- The Christian A. Herter Award for Senior Foreign Service officers.
- The F. Allen 'Tex' Harris Award for Foreign Service specialists.

We also invite nominations for the exemplary performance awards:

- The Nelson B. Delavan Award recognizes a Foreign Service office management specialist who has made a significant contribution to post or office effectiveness and morale beyond the scope of their job responsibilities.
- The M. Juanita Guess Award recognizes a community liaison officer who has demonstrated outstanding leadership, dedication, initiative or imagination in assisting the families of Americans serving at an overseas post.
- The Avis Bohlen Award honors a Foreign Service family member whose volunteer work with the American and foreign communities at post has advanced the interests of the United States.
- The Mark Palmer Award for the Advancement of Democracy is bestowed on a member of the Foreign Service from any of the foreign affairs agencies, especially those at the early- to mid-career level, serving domestically or overseas.

The award recognizes the promotion of American policies focused on advancing democracy, freedom and governance through bold, imaginative and effective efforts during one or more assignments.

Nominations are due by May 25. Visit www.afsa.org/awards for more information, or contact AFSA Awards Coordinator Perri Green at green@afsa.org.
DEPARTMENT APPEALS 2014 MSI CASE

One of the most important things AFSA does is ensure that excellence within the Foreign Service is recognized prominently, publicly and appropriately. When one of the foreign affairs agencies neglects their duty to do so, AFSA calls them out on it and, when necessary, takes action.

That’s why, when the State Department decided in 2014 to only offer meritorious step increases to a portion of those recommended for promotion, AFSA took action. On Dec. 2, 2014, AFSA filed an implementation dispute on behalf of 270 of our members on this matter.

As we told members via AFSA Net in December 2017, the Foreign Service Grievance Board (FSGB) ruled in favor of AFSA. The FSGB ruled that the State Department had improperly denied Meritorious Service Increases to a cadre of FS members who were recommended for promotion by the 2014 Selection Boards but not ultimately promoted. The FSGB’s ruling directed the department to make retroactive payments of the 2014 MSIs, with interest, to these employees.

Unfortunately, on Jan. 8, 2018, the State Department appealed the FSGB’s decision to the Foreign Service Labor Relations Board (FSLRB). The department also requested that the FSGB temporarily stay its order requiring the department to retroactively pay the MSIs, pending a decision from the FSLRB.

AFSA responded to the department’s appeal on Feb. 2. The FSLRB will review the FSGB’s decision and the parties’ submissions to determine whether the FSGB’s decision is deficient.

AFSA will continue to fight to ensure that the excellent work of our members is recognized, and we’ll keep you informed of the FSLRB’s decision.

ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE POLICY

AFSA has been working with the department to clarify the administrative leave policy for Foreign Service members preparing to leave for tours at Priority Staffing Posts. A number of members brought to our attention the fact that, according to the 2018 Iraq Service Recognition Package, the incentive policy of providing 20 administrative leave days to those deploying to Iraq is currently “under review.”

On Feb. 8, the Bureau of Human Resources confirmed that it had not yet received guidance from the Office of Personnel Management regarding any changes to the administrative leave policy. We were informed that PSP administrative leave will not be affected during this cycle because HR would be allowed 270 days to submit a new plan after OPM informs them of any changes to the leave policy.

AFSA will continue to monitor the situation for new developments.

Work Year: Did You Know?

There are 52 weeks in the year and 40 working hours each week. This should add up to 2,080 hours. But actually, there are 2,087 hours in a federal government work year. Why is this?

The figure was changed from 2,080 hours in 1986, and like most changes of this nature, it saved money. However, it is also a logical change. The 2,080-hour method for computing hourly pay was based on a 260-day work year, even though some years contain 261 or 262 work days. Because 26 bi-weekly pay periods cover only 364 days in a calendar year, the end of the payroll year gradually moves away from the end of the calendar year with just 2,080 hours per year. Congress chose instead to use 2,087 work hours per year as the divisor to determine hourly rates. This method does not reflect the actual number of work hours in a calendar year but is more precise than the old method because it represents the average number of work hours over a 28-year perpetual calendar cycle—the time it takes for the calendar to repeat itself.
AFSA Seminar: Retirement Planning Made Easy(er)

On Feb. 7, AFSA Retiree Vice President John Naland led a seminar at AFSA headquarters titled “Retirement Planning: 5 to 10 Years Out,” during which he explained to participants what they can expect to happen in the years leading up to retirement.

A former director of the Office of Retirement at the State Department, Mr. Naland provided a detailed checklist outlining the things prospective retirees need to do and the sites they need to visit to prepare for a successful transition.

As an FS retiree himself, Mr. Naland explained, he understands how busy current FS members are on a day-to-day basis. But, he emphasized, “it’s your retirement, and you need to do your due diligence” to make sure you are ready and to ensure that your retirement years are happy and comfortable.

Mr. Naland talked of the importance of confirming that the beneficiary designations you made when you joined the Foreign Service are still accurate. In cases where the FS member marries, divorces, has a child or is widowed, these designations can and should be changed.

He also recommended signing up for a “My Social Security” account at ssa.gov/myaccount to understand how much money you can expect to receive in retirement. State employees can log onto the Employee Benefits Information System (EBIS)—on the intranet only—to find out what their pension is expected to be. The Thrift Savings Plan website also has calculators that will help you project your income under a variety of scenarios.

Mr. Naland covered topics that need to be taken care of 10 years before retirement, such as taking a retirement planning seminar at FSI and investing in TSP account stock funds that will generate returns outpacing inflation over the long term.

He also covered savvy moves that can be taken in the year immediately prior to retiring, such as raising TSP contributions to reach the annual maximum allowed even if you retire at mid-year.

More than 120 participants registered for the event. A second seminar, on Feb. 22, was added to accommodate the overflow.

A recording of the event is available at www.afsa.org/video. Handouts from the event can be viewed at bit.ly/Retirement-Checklist.

AFSA Welcomes 15th Consular Fellows Class

On Feb. 13, AFSA welcomed 78 members of the 15th Consular Fellows Class for a luncheon at the association’s headquarters building.

AFSA President Ambassador Barbara Stephenson hosted the luncheon. State Vice President Ken Kero-Mentz, FCS Vice President Daniel Crocker and other members of the AFSA Governing Board were on hand to speak with the new Foreign Service members and answer their questions about AFSA and the many ways the association can assist, protect and advocate for them.

At left, Ambassador Stephenson speaks to the class about the functions of AFSA in its dual role as a professional association and labor union. More than 70 percent of the participants chose to join AFSA at the event.
Ampeer Means Home in Any Language

- Brand new fully furnished luxury residences including all utilities. Cable, Wifi, washer dryer and plenty of storage
- Per diem and T&D rates accepted, leases from 30 days to 12 months
- Studios, Lofts and One Bedroom units
- Fitness Center
- Complimentary daily breakfast and evening hors d’oeuvres
- Stuning social spaces and study areas
- Directly across the street from Dupont Circle Metro, catch the shuttle to FSI from Rosslyn Station or main State
- Convenient to groceries, pharmacies, restaurants, shopping parks and the sites of DC

Email us at ampeerdupontforeignservicejournal.suburban@apricelease.info to receive more information on availability. Or call one of our Lifestyle Associates at 855-200-2602.

Ampeer
15 Dupont Circle, NW Washington, DC 20036
www.ampeerridences.com

AFSA Governing Board Meeting, February 21, 2018

Management Committee: It was moved and seconded that the Governing Board grant COO Russ Capps and Vice President Ken Kero-Mentz signing authority for AFSA. The motion was adopted.

Awards and Plaques Committee: The committee provided the board with their recommendation for the recipient of the 2018 Lifetime Contributions to American Diplomacy award. The committee’s recommendation was accepted, and the selected recipient will be announced in a future issue of The Foreign Service Journal.

New Business: It was moved that following the retirement of AFSA USAID Vice President Ann Posner, the Governing Board appoint Jeff Levine to complete her unfinished term. The motion was adopted.

USAID VP RETIRES
AFSA would like to thank outgoing USAID Vice President Ann Posner for her service, both to AFSA and to our country and the USAID mission. Ann retired at the end of March.

The AFSA Governing Board has selected Jeff Levine, a 17-year veteran of USAID, to fill the vacancy. We will publish his biography in an upcoming edition of AFSA News.

Thank you Ann, and welcome Jeff!

ATTENTION FAMILY MEMBERS: DO YOU HAVE A STORY TO TELL?

The Journal is currently accepting submissions for our Family Member Matters column.

Articles should be approximately 700 words on any topic of interest to Foreign Service family members. We will consider both personal essays and researched articles, and we pay $200 upon publication.

Please send your submissions to gorman@afsa.org.
International Day: The American Problem

BY LAURA KEYES ELLSWORTH

When I was 4, my parents brought home silk kimonos from a trip to Japan. It is one of my clearest early memories, as I was awed by the gorgeous silken fabrics, their colors and prints sparking my imagination about what people in that part of the world must look like.

That spark may have been what ignited this Midwestern girl’s desire to travel the world and experience people and places more exotic than anything I could have imagined at the time.

As I grew up, the clothing of foreign lands held increasing fascination for me. From the dirndls and lederhosen worn in German communities north of me in Michigan, to the lap-lap an uncle serving in Papua New Guinea sent me, every piece of clothing helped draw cultural images and interest in my mind.

Even today, as a globe-traveling spouse, one of the first things I do is check out the traditional fabrics of a country. For me, the beautiful embroidery on Ukrainian folk dress, the delicate silks of Thailand, the bold and beautiful color combinations of Africa’s asa oke and kente cloths, and the gorgeous rich saris of India whirl through my head as we plan each international assignment.

This is why I both love and loathe the yearly event faced by Foreign Service families everywhere: International Day. At every post, the school asks families to dress in their national dress and bring in a traditional dish to share.

It is a feast for both the eyes and the stomach, and each year I desperately wrack my brain to come up with something beautifully American to present.

What is traditional American attire? Levi’s and a Gap t-shirt immediately come to mind, but that doesn’t exactly differentiate us from everyone else.

In a quest for answers, my fingers took a trip to Google images, where pictures of cowboys and Native American dress were the main suggestions.

I’m not from what is considered “cowboy country,” so that didn’t feel quite right, and wearing Native American clothing felt like appropriation.

American food offers similar problems. Generally, everybody suggests chocolate chip cookies. These are uniquely American, but it seems we make them constantly, and it’s a good idea to present something savory.

Once I cooked an entire Thanksgiving meal, handing out turkey bites with a little dollop of stuffing and cranberry on top with pumpkin pie on the side. It is definitely the traditional American meal, but it requires a crazy amount of work and doesn’t lend itself to handing things out to hordes of people.

I tried to make shrimp étouffée another time, both to showcase Creole culture and as an excuse to play jazz at our booth—the one truly American form of art we’ve given the world. But if you don’t have experience cooking Creole, it’s not the easiest to get right.

I’ve been threatening for years to stock the table with Coca Cola and Twinkies.

Recently, I discussed this dilemma with a friend. She laughed and said, “I put on a hanbok and contribute food to the Korean table.”

“But you’re a third-generation American, and your husband is German,” I protested.

“Yes,” she agreed, “but coming up with something good for America is too difficult.”

As we talked, I had a “light-bulb moment.” Maybe we had just touched on the ultimate American idea. Maybe this year at my kids’ International Day I’ll dress them in clothes from all our various posts and grab a little bit of food from all the other tables represented and serve them under a sign that says, “American Melting Pot.”

What could be more American than representing the whole world at one table? After all, our outstanding cultural feature seems to be that we’re a blend of everything.

Or maybe I’ll just bake chocolate chip cookies.

Laura Keyes Ellsworth is an EFM married to an economic officer. They are currently serving in Prague where she is editor-in-chief of the magazine of the International Women’s Association of Prague, The Bridge.
Communicating Through Differences

Diversifying Diplomacy: My Journey from Roxbury to Dakar
REVIEWED BY RUTH A. DAVIS

During his short but influential life civil rights leader Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. famously observed: “People fail to get along because they fear each other; they fear each other because they don’t know each other; they don’t know each other because they have not communicated with each other.” This is as true internationally as it is domestically.

Harriet Elam-Thomas spent a brilliant Foreign Service career successfully encouraging communications between the American public and our foreign interlocutors to promote mutual understanding and support for U.S. foreign policy.

She has now written a captivating, inspiring memoir that breathes life into the American dream and skillfully recounts her improbable rise through the diplomatic ranks. She used the arts as a diplomatic tool while proving the value of cultural competency and diversity in U.S. foreign policy.

Diversifying Diplomacy: My Journey from Roxbury to Dakar brings American history alive through the eyes and experience of one who progressed from “the little Elam girl from Roxbury” to Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. It is a wonderful treatise on how American values and traditions, warts and all, shaped her life and contemporaneous U.S. foreign policy.

Named after American abolitionist Harriet Tubman, “the little Elam girl” grew up under the tutelage of wise, determined parents who fled the Old South for Massachusetts during the Great Migration. She was fortunate to have siblings who were highly interested in the arts and who helped to awaken a cultural appreciation in the young Elam-Thomas that would serve as an excellent foundation for public diplomacy work.

She was equally fortunate to participate in the Experiment in International Living’s Student Exchange Program, which planted the seed for her interest in international affairs and foreign languages, beginning with French. She subsequently learned Greek at the age of 42 and Turkish at the age of 47.

There is never a dull moment in Harriet Elam-Thomas’ career, nor in this sometimes humorous page-turner that brings to life her years as an exceptional public affairs officer.

There is never a dull moment in Harriet Elam-Thomas’ career, nor in this sometimes humorous page-turner that brings to life her years as an exceptional public affairs officer.

But wait! She began as a secretary at Embassy Paris, followed by time in the White House during the Nixon administration. Perhaps her dedication to mentoring, her commitment to making the Foreign Service more diverse and her determination to excel were all galvanized by the poor reception she received on entering the Foreign Service as an officer, her degree in international relations from Simmons College notwithstanding.

Determined to prove that excellence knows no color or gender and that she was fully prepared to support the achievement of U.S. foreign policy goals, Elam-Thomas set out on an overseas odyssey beginning as a junior officer in Senegal. She went on to Greece, Turkey, Cyprus and Belgium, before (with a new spouse, Wilfred Thomas) completing her career back in Senegal as U.S. ambassador.

Between postings in Brussels and Dakar, she occupied the highest-ranking Foreign Service position in the United States Information Agency—that of Counselor. She had the complex task of overseeing the merger of USIA into the State Department. Her understanding of the value of public diplomacy and of the State Department’s bureaucracy was invaluable in successfully managing a difficult transition, whose merits are still being debated.

This is not an ordinary memoir in that it focuses as much on the people who had an impact on her life as it does on Elam-Thomas herself. She paints a vivid picture of the influence that world figures like Nelson Mandela had on her decision-making, and the importance in her career of Foreign Service greats such as O. Rudolph Aggrey and Monteagle Stearns, her ambassadors in Senegal and Greece respectively, as well as political appointees such as Alan Blinken, her ambassador in Brussels.

Along the way she met many other interesting personalities, both American and foreign, whose presence in her life helped make her story so compelling. Allan Goodman of the Institute of International Education typifies the former and Melina Mercouri, the Greek minister of culture, occupies a prominent place among the latter.
Now at the University of Central Florida as director of the Diplomacy Program, Harriet Elam-Thomas is educating a new generation of potential Foreign Service officers who can but hope for careers as influential and exciting as her own.

Ambassador (ret.) Ruth A. Davis is chair of the International Women’s Entrepreneurial Challenge. During her Foreign Service career, she served as a consular officer overseas in Zaire, Kenya, Japan, Italy and Spain; as consul general in Barcelona; and as U.S. ambassador to Benin. Among many domestic assignments, she served as Director General of the Foreign Service and director of the Foreign Service Institute, where she established the School of Leadership and Management.

Painful Lessons Learned Slowly

Directorate S: The CIA and America’s Secret Wars in Afghanistan and Pakistan
Reviewed by Eric Green

The critically acclaimed film, “The Post,” presents a flashback to the early 1970s controversy over the Pentagon Papers, a 4,000-page trove of scholarship analyzing the origins and course of the war in Vietnam, where more than 100,000 American GIs were still fighting.

Like the Pentagon Papers, Steve Coll’s *Directorate S* dives deep on nearly every key aspect of the war in Afghanistan from 2001 to 2016, including regional politics, on-the-ground portraits of American soldiers and analysis of the Taliban and al-Qaeda. For a diplomat, soldier, analyst or citizen seeking to make sense of the drip-feed of news from South Asia, it’s hard to imagine a better resource than this book, which raises uncomfortable questions about the purpose and prospects of America’s involvement in Afghanistan.

The book’s title refers to a unit of the Inter-Services Intelligence branch of Pakistan’s military that has come to exemplify the concept of a “deep state,” a shadowy agency that commits all manner of morally dubious actions in the name of protecting national interests.

Coll’s central thesis is that the United States never succeeded in developing an Af-Pak strategy that reconciled ISI’s ambiguous status: providing support for the Afghanistan Taliban while simultaneously partnering with Washington to combat al-Qaida and other terrorist groups. Coll contends that befuddlement over how to deal with ISI reflected Washington’s inability to answer the basic question of whether “Afghanistan’s independence and stability was more important than Pakistan’s stability.”

First, success requires an open-ended time commitment. Second, political, military and diplomatic efforts must align closely. Third, an insurgency enjoying safe haven in a neighboring country is almost impossible to tame without cutting off access to the sanctuary. From 9/11 forward, Coll portrays U.S. officials as relearning these truths repeatedly and imperfectly. In recent years, policy makers have faced the fact that reinventing a policy midway is akin to trying to repair an airplane in flight.

At the interstate level, despite a shared interest in fighting terror, mistrust among Washington, Islamabad and Kabul festered and grew, fueled by geopolitical suspicions, personal sleights and military blunders. While the United States sincerely wanted a stable, successful Afghanistan that would not threaten its neighbors, Pakistan felt compelled to hedge its bets given the record of previous superpower attempts to pacify Afghanistan.

America’s courting of India, capped by a civil-nuclear agreement effectively blessing India’s status as a nuclear power, only reinforced Pakistan’s suspicions.

Coll’s central thesis is that the United States never succeeded in developing an Af-Pak strategy that reconciled ISI’s ambiguous status: providing support for the Afghanistan Taliban while simultaneously partnering with Washington to combat al-Qaida and other terrorist groups.

In his new book about the United States and Vietnam, Max Boot quotes the American counterinsurgency specialist Edward Lansdale as saying: “Perhaps America will never learn the simplicity of fighting a political war.” Counterinsurgency is at best an inexact art form, but over the centuries British, French and American militaries have learned a few lessons.

Meanwhile, from Kabul’s viewpoint, the ISI’s efforts to undermine Afghanistan’s sovereignty—exemplified by support for the Afghan Taliban—were utterly transparent.

Moreover, Kabul felt that the United States’ unwillingness to force Pakistan to change course showed it was complicit, leading to Afghan President Hamid...
Karzai’s ill-tempered accusations that Washington was deliberately bleeding Afghanistan to keep the country beholden to Pakistan.

Confronted with the complexities of South Asia and traumatized by the 9/11 attacks on the U.S. homeland, the United States failed to develop a coherent strategy. Confusion over war aims surfaced from the outset, as policymakers tried to decide whether to limit their objective to defeating al-Qaida or embrace a more ambitious goal of remaking Afghanistan as a reliable, democratic American ally.

Coll reveals that General Tommy Franks, who headed the U.S. Central Command, was distracted during the battle for Tora Bora by a phone call from then-Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld demanding a war plan for Iraq. He laments that “military history is rife with examples of generals and presidents who squander strategic advantage by failing to press a battlefield triumph to its conclusion, undermining their victory. Here was the same story again, involving not only complacency but also inexplicable strategic judgment, fractured decision-making and confusion.”

Coll blames both the George W. Bush and Barack Obama administrations for subsequent missteps. The White House, he writes, “tolerated and even promoted stovepiped, semi-independent campaigns waged simultaneously by different agencies of the American government.” Lethal operations against suspected terrorist targets underscored the costs of this approach.

In Pakistan, the Obama administration doubled down on drone strikes and covert operations while in Afghanistan the number of “strike packages”—of men, helicopters and vehicles to conduct night raids on Taliban leaders—multiplied.

While these tactics undoubtedly removed individuals hostile to the United States from the battlefield, Coll argues that they were undertaken without assessing how the backlash in both countries would undermine strategic objectives. One Afghan summed up the disconnect between U.S. actions and local realities: “We are like rocks here. You kick us, the Taliban kicks us. No one listens.”

Coll acknowledges the intrinsic challenges of dealing with Afghanistan, a war-scarred nation ranked near the bottom of every table of development indicators, yet he may be overly optimistic about the prospects for success even if Washington had managed to produce a policy that simultaneously stabilized Afghanistan and Pakistan and balanced the exigencies of counterterrorism with the longer-term needs of counterinsurgency.

In more than 750 pages, I couldn’t find the word “quagmire.” But it’s difficult to read Coll’s narrative without feeling that each new policy review, strategy or move on the ground only pulls the United States deeper into Afghanistan with no easy exit, let alone victory.

For State Department readers, this book offers a vivid account of how diplomacy has been marginalized over the past two decades and the consequent costs to global stability and our own national security.

FSO Eric Green joined the Foreign Service in 1990 and has also served in the Philippines, Russia, Ukraine, Northern Ireland, Turkey and Iceland. He is currently in language training for an upcoming posting to Warsaw. He is a member of the Foreign Service Journal Editorial Board. The views expressed here are his own and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of State or the U.S. government.
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Those Unlikely Foreign Service Friendships

BY DOROTHY CAMILLE SHEA

There’s a moment when you think: I am so fortunate to know this person. That thought is followed by the realization: I never would have met him or her, let alone become friends, if it weren’t for the Foreign Service, if our lives hadn’t collided when I was posted to (fill in the place).

We’ve all had those moments, right? It’s one of the things I love about the Foreign Service. Here is the story of one such friendship between a diplomat and an artist who became friends by chance.

It was just like in the movies. In a busy restaurant, I did something I’ve never done before or since: I asked the waitress what his drink of choice was and had one sent over. He smiled and toasted me from across the room.

He could have left it at that. I’m sure lots of admirers had made similar gestures to this world-renowned artist over the years. But he came over and joined our table for dessert, intrigued to meet a U.S. diplomat.

Menashe Kadishman is one of Israel’s most famous artists. His sculptures and paintings are sprinkled all over the Holy Land, in multiple museums in Europe, in New York’s Museum of Modern Art and the Hirshhorn Museum in D.C.

I first fell in love with his iconic lambs, which seemed to be in all of Israel’s best galleries, when I was working at U.S. Embassy Tel Aviv, supporting the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

After each day of meetings, I would bang out the day’s cables before trudging back to the King David Hotel. On my way back to the hotel each night, I would stop and look in the window of the adjoining gallery, which showcased the most beguiling paintings of lambs.

I read up on Menashe Kadishman. He’d spent his formative years on a kibbutz as a shepherd, and shepherding became a recurring theme in his work. For an installation at the 1978 Venice Biennale, he famously donned white linen garb, carried a staff and surrounded himself with live sheep.

Later, when his son turned 18 and faced compulsory military service, Menashe was inspired by the Biblical story of Abraham being called upon to sacrifice his son—later a sheep, thanks to God’s mercy. That helped explain the dewy eyes of those lambs! Thousands of sheep paintings now serve as the legacy of his attachment to the metaphor.

Menashe and I stayed in touch for a while after my tour ended, but he didn’t do email or Facebook, and we eventually fell out of touch. In the summer of 2014, though, I returned to the Holy Land—this time to Jerusalem.

One of the first things I did was look up Menashe. We picked up right where we left off. He was more frail, but still painting like gangbusters and regaling visitors with funny stories, filling the room with warmth.

Menashe was 82 years old when he died. He painted right up until the end, and as testament to his generosity, he gave prints of his work to the hospital workers who tended to him during his final days. I was blessed to have befriended this great man. I hold dear our unique and unlikely Foreign Service friendship.
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 localens@afsa.org.

On vacation in Hpa-an, Myanmar, I was taken to a popular tourist area near Mount Zweagbin. As one walks past food and souvenir stands, a large white structure first catches the eye. But just beyond that is a breathtaking view of mountains, a lake and a small island. And on that island is the Kyauk Kalat Pagoda, a Buddhist temple that is carved into a striking limestone formation. While tourists can visit by crossing a long, wooden foot bridge, the pagoda is a functioning temple, with monks meditating and taking donations.

James R. Adams, MSHS, MLS (ASCP), joined the Foreign Service in 2012. He is a regional medical laboratory scientist posted in Jakarta. He took this photograph with a Canon EOS 100D, with settings: EF-S18-55mm f/3.5-5.6, 55mm, f/8, 1/200s, ISO 100.
AFSA’s bestseller introduces students to the world of diplomacy.
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