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Perceptions and Realities

Some of our readers may have been lulled into a false sense of security by the kind words of President Bush, who singled out the men and women of the Foreign Service for special appreciation on the day after his election a year ago, or by the frequent and warm words of respect and encouragement that we have heard from Secretary Baker and his predecessors.

We have no doubt that these messages are sincere, but there is another world out there with different views, even here in Washington. Consider for a minute what the Foreign Service is really like today, in the eyes of other observers:

"I have complaints from time to time about professionals within the State Department, not a complaint about their knowledge of the State Department, but a complaint about their knowledge of America. . . . [For Ambassador in Spain] I would rather have someone who understands our system, what we are all about, what we are trying to do, than have someone who knows all about the State Department but who has relatively little experience in the business of America." Senator Phil Gramm (R-TX)

"Many Foreign Service officers are timid and lack political finesse . . . intelligent and professional . . . but prone to arrogance, cariocism, and a propensity to go native. . . . They maintain an abiding conviction that foreign policy is too important to be shared with the secretary of state, Congress, or the White House." Newsweek, October 30, in an article entitled "A 'Drone Class' of American Diplomacy?"

"There's never been a case of a political ambassador being disloyal to the United States. There have, regrettably, been some cases where some of the State Department people have been disloyal." Senator Rudy Boschwitz (R-MN) on ABC Nightline, July 24.

Don't take all of this to heart, dear reader. Senators Boschwitz and Gramm can be explained if not forgiven; they had been saddled with the unfavorable task of countering Senator Sarbanes' devastating critique of the administration's more egregious ambassadorial nominations. Newsweek didn't bother to consult AFSA—in contrast to most journalists who write about the Foreign Service—and instead relied on nameless rives in the NSC. Newsweek finds us to be both "timid" and "prone to arrogance." Next week another journal will no doubt sagely inform the public that the U.S. Foreign Service is "demure" and "opinionated," or "self-effacing" and "aggressive."

In fact, it isn't easy to generalize about today's corps of 4,000 FSOs, as some who know us better realize. To those who find the Foreign Service "out of touch with America," Elliott Abrams after eight years here replies in The National Interest: "No one can spend time in the Department of State without realizing that it is inhabited by real Americans, from places like Iowa and Colorado. The old Ivy League and East Coast domination is simply gone."

We need, however, to do a better job of getting that message across. For its part, AFSA is giving increased attention to outreach. A promising first step is our International Associates program for U.S. corporations interested in the world market—which ought to be just about all of them if we are going to deal seriously with our staggering trade deficit. We inaugurate the AFSA program November 30 with an ambitious one-day conference in the State Department (see page 67 for details). One of our objectives is to make helping American businessmen compete overseas a Foreign Service priority.

But AFSA alone cannot turn around the public's confused image of the Foreign Service. All senior department officials must find ways to respond to these muddled attacks on career staff. And every Foreign Service employee who talks to a congressman, a home-town newspaper, or Rotary Club helps to bring the perception into better alignment with the reality.

We serve our country well. That isn't arrogance; that's just a fact that ought to be better known and more often acknowledged.
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Letters

Study FSN Impact

To the editor:
In the real world, the U.S. govern¬
ment will require a better educated,
better trained work force at the same
time that it faces a shrinking labor
base. A difficult enough situation, but
even more troubling when you con¬
sider that government pay has stead¬
ily become uncompetitive and the
government's new retirement system
is completely portable (high barrier
to entry, low barrier to exit).
This real-world situation becomes
absolutely frightening when you cou¬
ple it with the "never-never world" of
the Foreign Service, where we pro¬
duce studies like the Thomas Report
and the Bremer Report, which sug¬
gest changing our personnel system
to slow down promotions to prolong
FSO careers. . . . If the Service wants
to attract and retain quality employ¬
ees, it can't slow down promotions at
the same time it is forced to underpay
its employees.
The Thomas and Bremer Reports
publish numbers and recommenda¬
tions without considering our 20,000
Foreign Service national employees
(10,000 direct hire and 10,000 per¬
sonal service contracts). Our senior
officers are expected to manage this
large and valuable human resource.
In addition, we should not forget that
many of our senior FSNs serve in
both professional and middle manage¬
ment roles at our missions abroad.
I'm convinced that recommendations
pertaining to the number and percent¬
age of Senior Foreign Service posi¬
tions which ignore the impact of our
FSN employees on department opera¬
tions are meaningless. Studies that are
conducted in a vacuum certainly have
academic value. However, great care
must be taken before any real-world
action is taken on their results. It is
up to AFSA to drive this point home
to department management.

William Burke
Helsinki, Finland

Alive and Well

To the editor:
The short author information about
my wife [FOREIGN SERVICE JOUR¬
NAL, September 1989] has caused
some of our friends concern and
others amusement. It is misleading,
and I should like to set the record
straight. No matter what the FSJ said
about us, we are both alive and still
married.

Windsor G. Hackler
Honolulu, Hawaii
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Dead Duck Call

The National Interest, Fall 1989
By Elliott Abrams

The Department of State is a dead duck: Americans will always distrust the institution whose very role is, precisely, foreign entanglements. Thus, most of the criticism of the State Department—being rooted in fear, not fact—is generally immune from factual refutation.

Begin with the “social” critique: the Foreign Service is comprised of a haughty elite. . . . No one can spend time in the Department of State without realizing quickly that it is largely inhabited by real Americans, from places like Iowa and Colorado. The old Ivy League and East Coast domination is simply gone.

Then there are the “substantive” criticisms: that State is simply incompetent, or that it seeks a negotiated, diplomatic solution to all problems, avoiding confrontation at all costs. Here it is worthwhile to recall that the Foreign Service is but one of three career national security bureaucracies in Washington, the others being the CIA and the uniformed military. . . . All three bureaucracies have their dunces, although most of them are winnowed out by promotion boards over the years; all three have their geniuses, although the nature of bureaucracy itself all too often forces out idiosyncratic officers, even when the idiosyncrasy is brilliance. Man for man, our diplomats are arguably smarter than our spies or our soldiers, and they certainly write and speak more coherently.

On the front line [of the drug effort] sit Foreign Service officers, risking their lives each day in places like Colombia and Peru. The U.S. ambassador in such countries today is constantly in great peril, as are his wife and children; other embassy staff members may be at even greater risk, for they receive less protection. Some posts are so hazardous that no spouses or children are permitted to live in the country. Yet in Congress, the institutions which reap popularity from the drug issue are the law enforcement agencies like the Drug Enforcement Agency and Customs, not State.

If these criticisms of State are largely invalid, one is more telling: that it lacks expertise about key countries. There is a virtual lack of Mexico experts, for example, despite the enormous importance of Mexico to the United States; and the real expertise about many other countries is slim. The Foreign Service encourages mobility among its officers, and most
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have served in more than one region. No doubt they are the broader for it, but it means they lack the number of years concentrating on Germany or the USSR that they need in order to acquire true depth. What is remarkable about this thinness in country expertise is how little remarked upon it is. The critics appear to be less interested in analysis of serious problems than in easier and more enjoyable attacks on the institution.

And this is precisely the point. The criticisms of State are not founded in real assessments of its performance. The basic problem is not elitism, not incompetence, not avoidance of conflict, or any of the other customary lines of State-bashing. Basically, Americans dislike the State Department because they dislike its mission. It is not that the department performs its mission poorly; it is the very nature of that mission itself. They do not like the constant reminders of interdependence, of inescapable involvement, of entanglement; they do not like the reminders that problems are complex, that other countries' interests must be understood, that we will not always have our way. And this is why State is a dead duck.

Under Pell

The Washington Post, October 10
By Helen Dewar
Splendidly arrayed on a dais in front of a wall-sized map of the world, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was once again trying to pull itself together. In a typical performance for this once-illustrious committee, members were drifting in and out, and Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) was taking hostages from a list of diplomatic nominees while committee chairman Claiborne Pell (D-RI) fretted over the absence of a quorum.

As the committee struggled to complete action on numerous State Department nominations before Congress left town for its August recess,
Helms ... outlined his terms for a deal: He would stop blocking the Bush administration's nominee to head the Foreign Service and the Service's promotion list if Democrats would guarantee swift action on two ambassadorial nominations.

Hours later—hours in which committee members from both parties wandered off, leaving Pell helpless to conduct official business—a deal was finally struck. . . . It was one of the committee's better days.

The genteel, deferential, and often absentminded Pell and the wily, ideologically driven Helms took over the committee in early 1987, and ever since, the committee has fallen on hard times. . . .

Moreover, some observers say, there was more glamour and glory to service on the Foreign Relations Committee when the “U.S. ran the world,” as one of them put it, and the Iron Curtain framed world issues in stark, relatively simple terms. Now, issues seem to be painted more in shades of gray than in black and white, bold moves are discouraged by budgetary and other constraints.

**Policy Reversed**

*The Washington Post, October 17*

A blind man who has been trying to join the State Department since the Ford administration will be given a Foreign Service appointment in a reversal of a policy dating back to the 1700s.

Avraham Rabby was informed of the decision Friday after the State Department notified Congress [at hearings on the Thomas and Bremer Reports held by Representative Sikorski] that it would hire qualified blind people for the career diplomatic service.

Officials attributed the decision to hire the blind to the new director general, Edward J. Perkins . . .

Rabby is a graduate of Oxford University in England with degrees in Spanish and French and has a master's degree in business administration from the University of Chicago.

**Erratum**

Due to an editing error there were typographical inaccuracies in Joanne Thompson's comments as quoted in “Bias Claims” in the October *Clippings* column.
One American car is gaining more and more attention overseas. The world-class Ford Taurus. Clearly, its aerodynamic shape puts it right at home anywhere in the world. But looks alone don't make a world-class sedan. So Ford engineers used a rather ambitious approach when they created Taurus: they identified the features of the world's finest cars, with the goal of meeting or exceeding the best features. We call it the "best-in-class" design philosophy; but you're more likely to call it a resounding success. Because the end result is a car that boasts some exceptional performance features. Like responsive V-6 power, four-wheel independent suspension and power rack-and-pinion steering. They all help make Taurus maneuver beautifully, no matter where in the world you are. And this year, Taurus even offers optional anti-lock brakes and a standard driver-side air bag supplemental restraint system—further proof that this design leader is dedicated to staying a leader. Ford Taurus. Right at home, anywhere in the world.
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The Enigma of Japanese Power.
By Karl van Wolferen,

The Eagle and the Rising Sun: America and Japan in the Twentieth Century.

Reviewed by Ted Kloth

Van Wolferen's new book is easily the most important work on Japanese politics of the last decade and will undoubtedly join Clyde Prestowitz's Trading Places as a book that shapes many Americans' understanding of Japan. The thesis of the book is that Japan is, and historically has been, run by a "system" whose main goal is self-perpetuation. The Japanese, especially Japan's able bureaucrats, are the instruments of the system, but are controlled by, rather than control it. The system is, in van Wolferen's view, inherently undemocratic.

Van Wolferen will have a powerful impact on people interested in Japan. A Dutch journalist, he has used his wealth of experience in Japan to examine how Japan works and to put together a strong if in the end unconvincing argument. He argues that the Japanese system is often difficult to understand and to deal with practically or intellectually because it has no center. No person or group runs Japan. Instead, the system controls the country through a delicate balancing of competing forces, the most powerful of which are bureaucrats, businessmen, and politicians. The press, courts, and opposition parties are lap—not watch—dogs. The chief function of Japanese education is to produce able workers and mothers convinced that their present situation is the best of all possible ones and that the system serves them well, as long as they serve it willingly. The police provide the system with coercive power which it uses—along with more subtle tools—to isolate oremasculate dissent.

Van Wolferen acknowledges that since World War II, the system has been remarkably successful in building Japan into an industrial giant. The result has been an overall improvement in the living standard of the average Japanese, but he argues, because of the drive for industrialization and protectionist policies, the benefits have been less than they should be. The policies are a function of the system's need to preserve itself in the face of the potentially upsetting forces of the modern world, intellectual as well as economic. It is a modern-day equivalent of the closed country policies of the Tokugawa era.
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Books

Van Wolferen says that the system has been able to survive in no small part because of the indulgence of the United States. Americans, partly out of their own interest in creating an anti-Communist, Asian ally and partly out of naive misunderstanding of the system’s nature, have tolerated, even unwittingly fostered, the continuance of the system. Japan’s leaders are unable to bring their country into the modern, interdependent world, except on terms—mercantilist economic policies—which threaten to overturn the open-trading regime on which Japan depends.

Van Wolferen concedes that the Japanese believe the system has delivered economic prosperity and that they can vote freely. But he spurns the idea that Japan is “democratic,” mainly because he rejects the world view shared by so many Japanese: we live on a small island devoid of natural resources and must make certain sacrifices in personal living standards in order to grow in a highly competitive and often hostile world.

Van Wolferen can help us understand Japan better, even if we reject his main thesis. American policymakers must deal with Japan and Japanese world views as they are, not as foreigners wish they were. His book contains many solid observations and usefully reminds us that power relationships as well as the culture make Japan work. He is right that dealing with a Japan where there are no clear “leaders” with whom to cut deals is a challenge for foreign states. But the danger is that those who read just this book alone will come away with only enough appreciation of the fascinating complexities of what makes Japan tick to be considered “armed and dangerous.”

The authors of The Eagle and the Rising Sun are charter members of the “Japan Club” and have written a very good book on U.S.-Japan relations in the late 1980s. Both authors spent many years in Tokyo. The perspective
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of the book reflects their personal experience with not just the economic juggernaut of today, but the aggressive, then defeated, then determined to rebuild stages of Japan's progress through the last four decades.

The book is an excellent, short "brief" on our somewhat troubled relations. Having been active participants in U.S.-Japan affairs, the authors feel strongly that the key is for both sides to better understand one another and to remember that our nations are bound to each other by mutual interests too easily forgotten in the heat generated by our current trade disputes. The authors do not belittle the need for change and adjustment, lest those disputes do serious damage. Nevertheless, these two veterans are clear on where they stand: "While the trade issue is currently in the spotlight, defense is more fundamental to the ultimate health of the alliance." With the strong focus on the problems in U.S.-Japan relations, this book is a particularly timely reminder that we and Japan have an alliance of tremendous importance to our mutual security and well-being.

Modern Chile, 1970-1989.
By Mark Falcoff,

Reviewed by Henry Johnson

Chile caught the attention of the world when Salvador Allende, the first Marxist chief of state freely elected anywhere, was overthrown in an unusually violent military coup in September 1973 and was succeeded by a repressive and authoritarian military regime. Chile's prior reputation for the longest and strongest traditions of democracy and civilian control over the military among Latin American nations further underscored the drama of those events. What happened to Chile's democracy and the role played by the United States are questions that have generated much controversy ever since. Modern Chile is an effort to sort out this unique and complicated story that many in the Foreign Service should find of interest and value. Don't be misled by the title. The book focuses almost entirely on the Allende regime in 1970-73. Only a brief chapter at the end addresses the subsequent period of 1973-89.

Falcoff draws on a wealth of written materials and interviews. He has chosen to organize the book around selected key topics—the election of 1970, the nature of Allende's coalition, his economic policy, agrarian reform, social vs. private property, the copper question, and the U.S. role. This approach is effective in providing both a summary and an analysis of the critical events of the Allende regime. Given the amount of controversy surrounding these events, Falcoff has taken pains to be balanced in his presentation.

In an excellent first chapter, the author demonstrates convincingly that Allende's electoral victory was a political accident and not, as some argue, a result of any sea change in Chile's body politic or because Chile was ripe for revolution due to basic economic or social factors. From that premise he goes on to dispel further myths about why the Allende regime failed. Basic reasons, he argues, were lack of a clear mandate, the fragility of Allende's Popular Unity coalition, and fundamental contradictions inherent in Allende's attempt to bring about revolutionary change within the framework of open and democratic institutions.

A brief final chapter on Pinochet's Chile, 1973-89, serves more as an epilogue to the story about Allende than any bridge to understanding the present and the likely future of Chile. A rather annoying frequency of typos undermines credibility in what otherwise appears to be a carefully researched and developed work.
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Mindsets: The Role of Culture and Perception in International Relations.


Reviewed by John J. Crowley

Borrowing terms from the computer world, Glen Fisher explains in his latest book how we are all "programed" by our respective cultures and so acquire mindsets, which provide a unique, if inadequate, focus on the world beyond our borders. More importantly, he also offers some sound advice on how to break out from the confines of this cultural tunnel vision. As Fisher demonstrates, there are techniques we can use to learn to empathize (but not necessarily sympathize) with foreign viewpoints. We can become wiser foreign affairs practitioners by acquiring a deeper understanding of the motives, attitudes, and perceptions of our non-American counterparts.

A Foreign Service officer for 22 years (including an assignment as dean of area studies at the Foreign Service Institute), Fisher has designed his scientifically based but very down-to-earth guide for those involved in the daily practice of foreign relations. He pays academic analysts their due, but also points out the large gap that usually exists between what the specialists write about and what problems practitioners face on the ground.

Fisher has aimed for practicality even to the extent of providing a comprehensive checklist for use in assessing cross-cultural interaction in international situations. His style is clear, readable, and not burdened with academic jargon. Many of the examples he uses to illustrate his arguments are drawn from his own overseas tours of duty. A better book on this subject for Foreign Service personnel would be hard to find.
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The Price of Empire.
By J. William Fulbright,

Reviewed by Peter F. Spalding

This compilation of essays—well-known philosophy and less well-known biography—provide Senator Fulbright's views on the Cold War, the Vietnam War, the Middle East, our militarized economy, and a plea for the United States to see the world as others see it. While the written eloquence of a George Kennan is lacking, the eloquence of the ideas expressed is not. There is much wisdom here to benefit those of liberal or conservative persuasion, junior officer or seasoned diplomat. It is guaranteed to provoke lively thought and, in some, intense disagreement.

Senator Fulbright has spent a career swimming against the tide of popular sentiment: against mistrust of the Soviet Union; against the Johnson administration's support for the Vietnam War; against increasing arms expenditures; against the pro-Israel policy of his government. However, on one occasion Fulbright's resolve was blown away by the force of Lyndon Johnson's powers of persuasion and flattery and he voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

Perhaps the most topical and thought-provoking essay is on the Cold War. Fulbright writes, "What does appeal to me—and more deeply than I can easily find words to express—is the idea that if we could eliminate the arms race we would have the opportunity to see which of (our) societies does function best." The plea for dialogue and understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States is eloquent and moving.

There are some vignettes in the book which will particularly appeal to Foreign Service personnel. The senator describes the feelers he received from President Kennedy regarding an appointment as secretary of state in 1961. He believes he would not have lasted long—too much the dissenter—but he does conjure up visions of how this appointment could have saved us from the Vietnam agony. Fulbright also takes the Department of State to task on the ABM treaty and has nothing kind to say about Abraham Sofaer's tinkering with that beloved treaty.

The father of the Fulbright scholarship takes the objectives of this program—the erosion of culturally rooted mistrust—as his leitmotif. Senator Fulbright's call for his country to dare to trust the intentions of those who differ from us has in the past fallen on deaf ears. Now that history is on the verge of vindicating him, it is appropriate that we pay heed.
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Intercultural Marriages: Personal Ups and Downs

ELIZABETH LEE

One of the challenges a Foreign Service officer faces is understanding and working with foreigners, but when the foreigner becomes a spouse the challenge may be a 24-hour job. While intercultural marriages in general are subject to a whole litany of difficulties and delights, Foreign Service life adds its own unique burdens and benefits.

The number of foreign-born spouses in the American diplomatic community is estimated at 30-40 percent, and “apparently it’s growing,” says Leena Clarkson, former president of the Foreign Born Spouse group in the American Association of Foreign Service Women (AAFSW). The trend in American society toward later marriages is partly responsible; whereas Foreign Service personnel invariably used to marry first and then go overseas, nowadays many go to their first post single. Also, with more and more American women pursuing careers of their own, there are fewer and fewer willing to follow an FSO husband around the globe. Many women are becoming FSOs themselves. And whereas once male FSOs could not marry non-American women and remain in the Service, the State Department has, since the early 1970s, adopted a more open policy toward cross-cultural unions. A foreign-born spouse is no longer required to become an American citizen, although maintaining foreign citizenship restricts the spouse from high-level security clearance and foreign nationals are still subject to tight security reviews.

But beyond the career impact, how do intercultural couples surmount the many personal strains such unions may create? Naturally, every relationship is unique, but conversation with a sampling of intercultural Foreign Service couples reveals some common experiences among female foreign-born spouses. (No male foreign-born spouses were interviewed.)

While partners of lasting intercultural marriages speak glowingly of the enrichment it has brought them, they also can reel off a list of problems. Author Dugan Romano has laid out the ups and downs in her book Intercultural Marriages: Promises and Pitfalls. While the difficulties are to be expected, Romano said she’s found that spouses in closed communities such as the Foreign Service tend to lock away their problems from public view, afraid that admitting them could damage their spouse’s career. When asked about possible troubles, they smile and answer “everything is fine,” though they may be suffering inside.

Keeping problems bottled up can only make matters worse, Romano counsels. She suggests joining a support group, such as AAFSW, to make contact with other people in the same situation and experience the relief of finding “you’re not alone.” One thing she herself learned after joining a support group in Italy, where she lived for 17 years with her Italian husband, was that many problems one encounters in an intercultural marriage can be traced to nationality rather than personality. By keeping this in mind, irreconcilable differences can become surmountable obstacles.

This technique helps especially with communication, a major pitfall in most intercultural relationships. “Learning to communicate in the other person’s style” is the most important factor in this type of marriage, Romano says, as many cultures have distinct do’s and don’ts that transcend personal traits. This doesn’t necessarily mean understanding the other’s language, but rather the emotions and expectations behind it.

Leena, who is Finnish, and her FSO husband John had to learn something from each other to communicate successfully. “He had a hard time expressing negative feelings,” Leena recalls of their early years together, “and I had a hard time expressing positive feelings.” They realize now the difference is cultural, not individual, and after almost 19 years of marriage can joke about it, but Leena says seriously, “It took us a long time to learn how to talk.”

“It’s not a question of language, it’s a question of thinking differently,” explains Nadine Soriano. She gives an example of how she and her FSO husband Jim react differently in a stressful situation, such as the illness of a relative. Nadine, exhibiting her Lebanese heritage, becomes extremely agitated and emotional, while “Jim, the American pragmatic,” remains outwardly calm. In the beginning she was offended at his cool response, while he couldn’t comprehend her hysteria. Nadine outlines their compromise: “I’m trying to be less emotional, and he’s trying to be more human in his approach.”

Patricia Webbink, a psychologist who counsels bi-cultural couples, stresses the importance of “non-verbal communication,” such as tone of voice, gestures, and eye contact. It’s important to understand the cultural differences behind non-verbal as well
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as verbal communication, she emphasized: don't interpret a partner's reaction in terms of how "you would be feeling if you reacted that way."

Even if one masters such understanding, bi-cultural couples have to accept that each may never completely understand the other's state of mind. USIA officer Robert Peterson and his Japanese wife Kyoko are aware, he says with a tinge of regret, that "we never will be able to fully appreciate the other's feelings." Though they may accomplish an intellectual understanding of the other's language, culture, and traditions, emotional empathy will remain an elusive goal. Even when the couple shares an event that on the surface would seem intellectual, their thoughts are widely divergent. Robert conjures up images of old-time players such as Babe Ruth and Ty Cobb; then his mind wanders to such American traditions as picnics, office teams, and the Fourth of July. Kyoko thinks of old-time players such as Oh Sadahareu and Nagashima, then drifts off to memories of college, where in Japan baseball plays an important role. Both agree it's harder when they assume they're experiencing the same thing.

Of course, communication is an even greater obstacle when there is minimal shared language. One benefit of Foreign Service life is that since the couple usually meets while the American-born spouse is serving in the foreign-born spouse's native country, he or she has at least a working knowledge of the other's language. Also, by nature of the job, an FSO learns the culture as well. "The more you learn about another culture, the more you appreciate it," Leena emphasizes. Before John joined the Foreign Service, the two lived in Finland for 11 years. That gave John time to get acquainted with Finnish culture, and now she's getting her turn at American life.

Vicky Simons, who is Colombian, and her FSO husband Paul also benefited from such a situation. They met while he was serving in Colombia, and since he lived there he's familiar with her national background, such as the importance of birthdays. He knows now that Vicky is used to a big celebration, and friends and family give a small gift, at least a flower, along with a card or a call. But his family doesn't know that, and when she received only a signed card from them—in keeping with American tradition—she couldn't help but feel disappointed.

Which leads to another problem intercultural couples face: the in-laws. While in-laws have been reviled for ages, the problem is exacerbated when they are from another culture. The extended family usually has a hard time understanding what the other's culture is all about. If the family is not supportive, it can break the marriage apart.

In such a situation—separation or divorce—the foreign-born spouse in the Foreign Service faces an especially hard time. Having by necessity adopted many American ways and cut connections to one's native country, it is difficult for a divorced foreign-born spouse to return. All those interviewed agreed that any hard time become harder for the foreign-born spouse because there is no "home" to go to and no family to fall back on.

Another stress on intercultural marriages is personal growth. American men sometimes marry foreign nationals from countries where the gender roles are similar to those found in the United States 30 or 40 years ago, and consciously or unconsciously, they expect their spouse to maintain that dependent role during the marriage. But often the woman, upon entering the American community, acquires new ideas that can upset the status quo.

Re-entering the United States can also lead to disillusionment for some foreign nationals who marry Foreign Service officers in the belief that they are important dignitaries who command attention and respect. When the couple is posted to the United States and the FSO becomes another American among millions, a cog in the bureaucratic wheel, the romantic luster may fade.

Dr. Webbink also raises the specter of prejudice. Caucasian Foreign Service personnel who marry a non-Caucasian may have to deal with minority issues for the first time, not necessarily in the Foreign Service community but in a wider social scene. The problem does not arise in the foreign-born spouse's native country, but upon returning to the United States can spring up suddenly and cause a painful readjustment of long-held beliefs and assumptions.

The list of pitfalls goes on and on. In addition to those already mentioned, author Romano adds politics, religion, money, sex, friends, food, social class, place of residence, values, time, and ethnocentrism. Some areas may seem minor and are found in any marriage adjustment, but piled one on the other can break the bond.

In Romano's view, raising children is one of the thorniest issues. "When children arrive, buried beliefs resurface," she writes. From infancy to adulthood, decisions are made that can pit one spouse's cultural background against the other's. While these differences may have been resolved between the couple, the introduction of a child can upset the balance. If the differences haven't been worked out to begin with, the child may become the scarred battleground.
Many of those interviewed have remained childless, and express relief at not having to tackle the issue. Some with children, such as FSO John Maisto and his Philippine wife Nini, have overcome the challenge. Nini believes her family is extremely fortunate in that John was posted to Manila when their children were old enough to understand Philippine culture. They learned the language and traditions of her native country, so, although they consider themselves American, they’re proud of their Philippine heritage, she says.

“It’s important,” Nini adds, “to keep ethnic characteristics,” not to turn one’s back on the past. But for bi-cultural couples in the Foreign Service, blending the two cultures in a balanced way may be the most difficult task. The problem in this case is not personal but professional: fulfilling representational duties. There have been grumblings in the Foreign Service community about some foreign-born spouses who are ignorant of American ways and are unwilling, or unable, to learn them adequately enough to handle their representational role. There are complaints that many foreign-born spouses don’t attend parties, school meetings, and other social functions that bind the mission into a cohesive community. The same problem may occur when Foreign Service personnel marry an American-born partner with a different social background, but because people generally marry someone with similar education and interests, this happens far less frequently.

George Vest, former director general of the Foreign Service, says “it’s a matter of the individual;” some foreign-born spouses are wonderful at fulfilling the representational demands on the Foreign Service over-
People

seas, others disastrous. He says the same of American-born spouses. The problem was greatly eased in 1970, "when we declared that spouses are entitled to a life of their own," he says. However, it's still seen as more advantageous for the Foreign Service employee, and the Foreign Service in general, for the foreign-born spouse to assume an "American" identity, and this can be extremely stressful on the one who gives up old ways.

Given a successful blend of the two cultures, many see the foreign-born spouse as an asset rather than a hindrance. Robert Peterson says his wife Kyoko "smoothed the way in establishing certain contacts" while he was posted in Mauritius. Not only was her culture similar to that of the host country, but her work teaching *iki bana* (Japanese flower arrangement) gave her an entree to the local community that surpassed professional limitations. Robert says proudly that people would remark, "Oh, you're married to the Japanese woman who does *iki bana*". He feels it was an enormous aid in his work.

Vicky Simons believes she could be a huge help to her husband at a Spanish-speaking post because her language and cultural background would open up avenues for him that otherwise wouldn't be accessible. And Nadine Soriano is helping her husband through his Arabic language training as he prepares for his next post in Baghdad.

As Anne Kauzlarich, president of AAFSW points out, foreign-born spouses can be very advantageous for the U.S. government through person-to-person rather than government-to-government understanding. Also, she says, the whole Foreign Service community can learn much from foreign-born spouses, both in Washington and abroad. The initial aim of AAFSW's foreign-born-spouse group was for American-born spouses to help the foreign-born ones, but now there is a more equal exchange of information. "It's not just a one-way street," Kauzlarich emphasizes.

She does recognize difficulties for foreign-born spouses in the Foreign Service: they often are plagued by uncertainty and rootlessness, wondering "Who am I? Am I doing what I'm supposed to be doing? Am I representing America properly? Where is home?" And the newer the foreign-born spouse is to the game, the harder the questions are to answer.

But Kauzlarich, and many others, feel the Foreign Service community is perhaps more understanding than a non-diplomatic setting. "We're all in the same boat, we're all here for the same purpose," she stresses. "We try to look for the common denomina-
tor. We’re citizens of the world.”

Rita Siebenaler, a licensed clinical social worker with the State Department’s Employee Consultation Service, believes that intercultural couples can have much more in common than two American-born partners of different backgrounds. In this vein, Robert and Kyoko Peterson joke that his Midwest home town is more foreign to the Foreign Service scene than Japan.

Siebenaler also downplays the difficulties children can introduce to a cross-cultural marriage. She believes the only real problem they raise is the issue of bilingualism: if, when and how to teach the child the foreign-born spouse’s native language. And she doesn’t share Romano’s fear that a child may become a battleground in a cultural war. She stresses the potential for incredible richness with two different cultures to draw on. Children learn that there is “no one way to do things,” and thus their world is vastly expanded.

And Romano herself, after coming up with a lengthy list of pitfalls, is an optimist after all. “There is no doubt that intercultural marriages take more effort than other marriages because there are so many more elements to be blended,” she warns, but in the same breath adds that Foreign Service people have “the right psychological equipment” to deal with the challenge.

While those interviewed seem to have their own formula for success, everyone agrees that the path is much smoother the more each knows about the others religion, values, and goals. Also, there is such a thing as love.
Roosevelt displayed an almost contemptuous indifference to the State Department and the Foreign Service. He considered career diplomats "fossilized bureaucrats," frivolous dilettantes, and reactionaries. According to one careerist, Roosevelt believed that the road to minister or ambassador could be traveled by anyone who remained loyal to the Service, offended no one, and exercised a reasonable degree of sobriety at public functions. . . . Roosevelt continued to save the most important European posts—London, Paris, Rome, Berlin—as political plums for worthy campaign contributors and political friends, a practice careerists feared would destroy the Service. And the professionals he did appoint had little role to play in the conduct of foreign affairs, since he preferred to rely on hand-picked emissaries to deal with important foreign-policy questions. "[Roosevelt] had little or no understanding for a disciplined hierarchical organization," George Kennan explained. "He had a highly personal view of diplomacy, imported from his domestic political triumphs. His approach to foreign policy was basically histrionic, with the American political public as his audience. Foreign Service officers were of little use to him in this respect." As demoralized as they were, it is not surprising that a number of diplomats quit the service. However, the overwhelming majority did not leave. . . . In a way, noted one careerist, Foreign Service officers secretly enjoyed their martyrdom, and rather derived a masochistic pleasure from it.

"The Social Organization of the Diplomatic Community," 1924-39, by Hugh De Santis

In truth the Service has never made up its collective mind about the proper role of dissent and open discussion. On one hand, we are dedicated to the proposition that we are loyal servants of constituted authority. This principle is never seriously attacked. On the other, we feel that as career officers, we know, or should know, more than anyone else about how the Service should be run, and that we have a duty to indicate the path to those charged with making decisions. In controversial and important matters it comes down in the final analysis to a judgment as to where the dividing line lies between constructive comment and obstructionism. We have resolved the dilemma by dissenting only on trivia, or in such cautious terms that our dissent is all but inaudible. This accomplishes nothing. by William E. Knight

In a way, noted one careerist, Foreign Service officers secretly enjoyed their martyrdom, and rather derived a masochistic pleasure from it.

"The Social Organization of the Diplomatic Community," 1924-39, by Hugh De Santis
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On November 8, 1988, as the first public action as president-elect, George Bush named James A. Baker III his secretary of state. In the year since then, Baker has begun to put his brand on the State Department. It is much too early to deal with the substance of Baker’s tenure at the State Department—the successes and failures of this administration’s foreign policy—but there has been enough time to identify his methods, his style. This article, based on several interviews with him, interviews with the people around him, and several long trips aboard his plane, is my impression of that style. Obviously, the personal view of a reporter who has covered seven secretaries of state is not the FOREIGN SERVICE JOURNAL’s, its editorial board’s (of which I am a member), or the American Foreign Service Association’s. It is mine alone.

Try thinking of secretaries of state as vehicles: George Shultz is a bulldozer, powerful, unyielding, and functioning best in a straight line; Alexander Haig is an army surplus jeep with a folding windshield and a tendency to turn upside-down.

James A. Baker III, if reborn as a vehicle, might come back as one of those four-wheel-drive, cherry-red, gentrified pick-up trucks, country on the inside with chrome wheel-covers, a rollbar and dual exhausts. Baker’s style is to be tough and useful, with a certain flair, deflecting attention toward the boss. There is no doubt about who is at the wheel of this particular pickup truck. Baker is the president’s man in the State Department. He flatly denies having any presidential ambitions of his own.

Controlled, intelligent and smooth, Baker exudes a “good ol’ boy” style that is frequently used with effect on the important but ancillary members of the visible and invisible government in Washington—diplomats, members of Congress, political contributors, and journalists.

Note, for example, the way he deftly used western-style barnyard humor in a toast to Soviet foreign minister Eduard Shevardnadze when they were together in Wyoming in September. (Even the site of that meeting, pristine, rustic Jackson Hole at the height of its autumnal colors, was calculatedly chosen by Baker to establish good vibrations for the Soviet-American ministerial meeting, which was, in fact, a brilliant success.) At the conclusion of their two days of talks, Baker gave the Soviet minister a pair of high-heeled cowboy boots and told him:

“There is something about the buffalo on the range and about horses and cattle at ranches; wherever they go they seem to leave things behind. Now you know why westerners wear cowboy boots. They’re not just for sartorial effect, they serve a practical purpose. They help folks out here negotiate their way around some very difficult ground sometimes.”

Then he brought home the point to Shevardnadze, a protegé of Mikhail Gorbachev’s, who had just witnessed the purging of five conservative members of the...
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Poliburo. “I think that in our line of work, a person might have to watch where he steps and keep his feet firmly planted on the ground as well. So it occurred to me that some cowboy boots might come in handy for you in Moscow.”

Shevardnadze, like Baker a political survivor and thoughtful pragmatist, grinned hugely at the political metaphor by Baker, who had just cemented a useful friendship.

The Wyoming encounter also gave a close-up look at Baker’s negotiating technique, an amalgamation of lessons learned as Houston lawyer, political campaign manager, White House chief of staff, and secretary of the treasury (where he engineered the massive Tax Reform of 1986, a fiscal upheaval intended to begin the process of removing political favoritism from the tax codes).

George Shultz, as a negotiator, bull-dozed his partners, either grinding them down or, occasionally, running out of diesel fuel when his opponent turned out to be too nimble. Baker’s method, as demonstrated in the talks with the Soviets and Congress, is to set a goal, do his homework, wait for the moment, move swiftly at the critical time, and then nail the coonskin to the wall.

One case in point is when he essentially removed Nicaragua from the American domestic political agenda by surrendering to Congress on military aid for the contras, but putting the monkey on the back of Capitol Hill to guarantee the Sandinistas’ performance on moving toward democratic institutions, as promised. In a neat example of political jujitsu, he made the congressional Democrats certify that the Sandinistas behave, otherwise the iron fist will be required. The theory was—and it appears to have some basis in fact—that this intra-governmental deal will have a cautionary effect on the Sandinistas, who have a sharp understanding of what is happening in Washington. But the deal occurred only after Baker spent some 50 hours schmoozing, knocking on doors and wheeling and dealing with key committee chairmen on the arrangements. Baker himself believes the issue still has a high emotional potential, but Nicaragua abruptly dropped off the front pages after his deal was put together.

Another illustration of the Baker technique came when the Soviets, in advance of the Wyoming meeting, hinted, but did not say explicitely, that they might be willing to drop their long-held insistence that there could be no deal to cut offensive nuclear long-range weapons until the United States abandons its plans for advanced testing and possible deployment of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

In a long session about strategic arms in the lodge overlooking Jackson Lake, Baker questioned Shevardnadze closely on the issue. The Soviet foreign minister, according to U.S. officials present, stated flatly that the Soviet government had “dropped the linkage between SDI and completing a START agreement.” Baker homed in. “You would complete and implement a (strategic arms) treaty without an agreement on space and defense?”

Shevardnadze responded “yes.” But at a session for reporters after the Baker-Shevardnadze exchange, the Soviet spokesman did not mention the break-through, a possibly ominous hint that the Soviets were going to backslide to their previous position.
Baker and his team took the precaution of drafting a carefully worded statement that would be read by a senior American official, a “background” briefing for reporters later that evening, but only if the subject came up. It did indirectly, when a reporter asked a general question on the space and defense talks. The reporters in the large room were electrified when the senior official (a former reporter himself) read the bombshell that the Soviets had made one of the most significant bargaining concessions in recent memory, the very issue that had caused the 1986 Reykjavik Reagan-Gorbachev summit to collapse.

By going public with the Soviet concession, Baker, as he later put it, “pocketed delinkage,” nailing Shevardnadze’s shoes to the floor in much the same way that a political campaign manager—which is what Baker used to be—might leak to a reporter the news of an endorsement from an uncommitted political figure, thereby making sure there would be no second thoughts.

The Baker touch, characteristic of his years at the White House, was having the carefully calculated statement on “background,” no attribution permitted in the news stories written about the revelation, so the Soviets couldn’t directly contradict or blame the official. It amounted to an exquisitely timed plant of a crucial piece of information in the press (including Soviet publications) in a way that deftly suited Baker’s tactical goals and U.S. national interests.

It’s a special style of operating in Washington and Baker, at the White House, became its maestro. He didn’t invent the technique; neither did Johann Sebastian Bach discover the fugue. Baker has a reputation as the master of the planted news story. Baker says he pleads “not guilty” to the charge of leaking, but he didn’t mention those people who worked for him and sometimes spoke for him behind the cloak of anonymity.

Baker’s successor at the White House, Donald Regan, noted that it was Baker who shrewdly perceived there was no hope of the Reagan conservatives converting liberal reporters into partisans, so he turned them into collaborators by appealing to their professional self-esteem by giving them inside stories.

Regan wrote, “they (the favored reporters) seemed to imagine that what they were doing in accepting handouts of sensitive information was a form of investigative reporting in which the suspects provided the evidence against themselves.”

In moving to the State Department, Baker has ended the practice of high-level leaking. He says that “the ship of state is not leaking from the top,” which appears to be true.

A trait demonstrated by Baker is that he knows when to cut his losses. In February a series of news stories, apparently fed by Democrats on Capitol Hill, suggested that it was a serious conflict of interest for Baker to have a large holding of stock in Chemical Bank—a large lender to Third World clients—when he plays an important role in setting U.S. policy toward Third World debtors. Never mind that the issue was never brought up in his confirmation hearings, nor was it ever raised when he played an even more pivotal Third World debt role as secretary of the treasury. The point was that it was becoming a political issue with a life of its own, so in the middle of a trip to all the NATO capitals in February, he simply announced that he was selling all his common stock and so were members of his immediate family. End of the news stories, end of the firestorm.

It should not have been surprising to the professional Foreign Service (but apparently was) that a large percentage of the Baker-Bush choices for early ambassadorial posts were prominent advocates of the free market system, wealthy contributors to the Bush presidential campaign who might have been otherwise unqualified for the business of running an embassy or dealing with a foreign government. Baker argues that this administration is doing better than in the past on the question of career vs. political ambassadorial appointees, and will do even better in the coming years (when the 1988 political obligations will have been paid).

Some of the early ambassadorial choices were so embarrassingly deficient that the administration reversed a 1983 agreement with the American Foreign Service Association and ordered that the “Certifications of Demonstrated Competence” of the appointees be kept secret. AFSA brought suit in a U.S. Federal Court, and successfully made the certificates public.

In Baker’s first year, a time when the confirmation process was painfully slow, he operated at the State Department with a White House model of organization, in which the traditional formal bureaucracy was generally ignored or downgraded in favor of a trusted inner circle of advisers and confidants. There came to be two State Depart-
The inner circle is enlarged to include some who do not understand how to pronounce "fiscal" or the name of the current president of Iran but there should be no doubt in anybody's mind that she knows exactly what Baker is thinking, and reflects that precisely.

The common denominator of those who were in that circle when he arrived at the State Department and those who are now working their way into the enlarged version of that informal committee is intelligence, a willingness to work long hours, a proven loyalty to Baker, and, by extension, to the president. The corollary of that trust by Baker is the resentment felt by those who are left out and feel that they are somehow regarded as disloyal, or less loyal, an assertion that Baker denies.

In keeping with his style, Baker has ordered a reduction in the large security detail that Shultz used, including abolishing the presidential-sized convoys for traveling around town. He has deliberately cut down on international travel and, with it, the commotion that an American secretary of state causes when he arrives in a foreign capital.

In particular—and in a sharp break with his predecessors—he has decided that a high-profile trip to the Middle East is useless in the current Arab-Israeli deadlock, with all the news coverage simply raising expectations that cannot be met. Given the strength of the Israeli lobby in the United States, that is another way of saying that Baker wants to remove the Middle East question from the domestic political agenda, something that will not be welcomed in Israel and which will be a radical change from his predecessors at the State Department.

Baker's strength seems to be that he understands instinctively what works but also has a sense of what is right. He also has a close friend in the Oval Office who shares the same general philosophy of operation, which includes Tallyrand's advice to a young diplomat, "Surtout, pas trop de zele." (Above all, not too much zeal).

So far, with some glitches, things have gone well with Baker at the State Department. The problems will arise later, when things begin to fail, or—in his own terms—are perceived to be failing. Then the words of the anonymous philosopher will be remembered: "the thing about pragmatism is that it doesn't always work."
This is the text of an interview with James A. Baker III, secretary of state, done in his office on the seventh floor of the State Department on October 13, 1989. It has been slightly edited for clarity.

Q Some professionals believe that during your tenure, there have come to be two State Departments—one, the inner circle of your trusted associates and the other the rest of the department. How would you respond to that?

A Well, I don't believe that is at all the case. I don't think it is warranted by the facts when you consider the very top of the ladder, in the form of the deputy secretary of state (Lawrence Eagleburger), who spent 27 years as a Foreign Service professional. Moving to the under secretary of security assistance, Reg Bartholomew, whom I knew in my capacity as chief of staff at the White House when he was our very courageous ambassador in Lebanon, to the three out of five regional assistant secretaries who happen to be Foreign Service professionals; to Stapleton Roy, our executive secretary, to any number of our functional assistant secretaries. . . . These are every bit as much a part of my inner circle as the three or four political associates I brought into the department.

Q These people who make the criticism believe that the regional assistant secretaries don't have the timely, meaningful access to you which they felt they had in previous administrations.

A Well, let me tell you what they have. I can't judge previous administrations, but if you look at that phone over there you'll find there are PL's (Personal Lines) to each and every assistant secretary, whether it is functional or regional, direct PL lines from my phone to theirs. I phone them directly on many, many occasions. Each and every one of them attends our every-morning staff meetings.

(A Baker staff aide interjects that in the previous administration this was not the case, that the regional assistant secretaries attended such meetings only once a week. In the current administration that amounts to 15 to 18 attendees at the daily staff meetings).
The meeting runs from 20 minutes to 40 minutes, but every day we have this meeting with the career professionals and the political appointees, from assistant secretary and above. Let me say one other thing. They all have direct access to me whenever they want it. All they have to do is call. Any assistant secretary or the equivalent has the right to come and see me at any time. That's the practice I followed at Treasury and that's the practice I follow here. I do ask that the paper move through the under secretaries. . . . I would argue that we have substantially rationalized the paper flow. In the first month I was here everything was coming helter-skelter, almost, from every different direction. . . . Due to the nature of the confirmation process, the fact that the ethics and all the paperwork takes a lot longer time, it was a while—even though we were ahead of any other department in the Bush administration—before we got the people who were going to serve this administration in place. It's quite natural people who were going to be moving on or phasing out are going to be resistant to change and will not appreciate a successor administration.

**Q** You pledged that this administration will have a 67 percent proportion of ambassadors. When will that happen?

**A** As you and I sit here today and speak, we just made it. We have indeed increased the number of career ambassadors from the numbers we inherited. (Note: A paper prepared by Baker's staff shows that of the 141 overseas ambassadorial posts, 93 are career and 48 are non-career.)

**Q** Going beyond the numbers is the concept of loyalty. Chase Untermeyer (White House director of personnel), USIA Director Bruce Gelb, and Secretary of Commerce Robert Mosbacher recently said the Bush administration wants to choose its officials with the idea of loyalty in mind. They say that an excellent way to demonstrate that loyalty is give money in a presidential campaign. Is that a philosophy you would agree with?
I don't think loyalty depends on whether you contribute money. The first public announcement the president-elect made was my appointment as secretary of state, during the course of which he made his strong commitment to defend the Foreign Service. That was the morning after his election. Therefore, there should not be in the minds of anyone any doubt about whether or not he or I question the loyalty of the Foreign Service. We do not. We have no questions about loyalty and I don't define loyalty—if I may say so as someone who has participated in the political process—by the size of your checkbook. At the same time I also don't think that people who support the political process and support candidates for the presidency of the United States should therefore be disqualified.

Q: How does the process work now on ambassadorial appointments?

A: We have a committee that is chaired by Larry Eagleburger and has a number of career people on it, including the director general of the Foreign Service who make recommendations to me for career ambassadors. Recommendations for political appointments come from the White House and are not considered by that committee.

Q: How are the posts divided up (between political and career)?

A: The posts are divided up for the year. We have asked people who were political appointees for the Reagan administration to leave and we have appointed Bush political appointees. We have re-appointed every single career ambassador who was serving—87 or something like that—and have said we want them to serve their full three-year term. Some political posts have been converted to career, which has permitted us to move from roughly 60 percent career to roughly 67 percent. The net effect is that we will have a number of posts coming up in 1990, but for the most part they will be career. We have made the political appointments. They will be for three years, just like the career tours of duty are. In 1990, all the posts except for two will be career and will be replaced by career people.

Q: Nevertheless, as a result of some statements by administration officials, some professionals believe they are perceived to be somehow less loyal.

A: Not by the secretary of state or the president, and I don't think the secretary of commerce or the White House chief of personnel are in the chain of authority with respect to the Foreign Service.

Q: Does the presence of the Felix Bloch case make any difference to you or those around you in terms of loyalty?

A: No. None whatsoever. I think that it's significant this is the first suggestion that there might be some problem since 1956, I think it is, and that is a rather spectacular record. I don't see how that could raise a question in the minds of any rational person about the Foreign Service.

Q: To what extent do you think a secretary of state, or those around him, should read the opinion polls?

A: As a general proposition, you cannot have a successful foreign policy that does not have a substantial base of domestic political support and it's important that everyone recognize that. That doesn't mean political support in the context of electioneering or campaign politics. But our whole system of government is political in the governmental sense, not in the electioneering sense.

Q: How do you, as secretary of state, judge that?

A: I think you have to judge by whether or not you are able to marshal the support you need in Congress for a particular foreign policy and, frankly, by whether you are able to marshal the support of the American people. One of the problems we had in the Reagan administration was in marshaling the requisite public support for our Central American policy. . . . The Congress is driven by public attitudes, remember that. The public views are very important in determining how a particular congressman is going to vote.

Q: Do you think you have succeeded in removing Central America, particularly Nicaragua, from the domestic political agenda as a contentious issue?
I think there are still strong emotions on both sides of that issue. I think a lot is going to depend on whether the Sandinistas are going to permit fair and free elections.

Some people describe your style as more “presidential.”

I don’t know what they mean by that. I did spend four years in the White House as chief of staff to the president of the United States, but I also spent three and a half years as secretary of the treasury and I don’t think my management style differed. I think it’s the same here.

What changes do you see that are yet to be made at the State Department?

Well, we’ve made some and I think for the most part they are succeeding. I don’t contemplate any major changes that have not been discussed or announced. I think pretty much what you see now is what you get.

How about changes in the way the State Department interacts with the rest of the national security machine?

I hope not. I think that our interaction has been very good. By virtue of the fact those who are serving in the important national security posts have worked together in other capacities in the past means that we are able to serve the president. That hasn’t been possible in the past. That redounds to the benefit of the foreign policy and national security interests of the United States.

I wanted to ask you about your relations with the press. Some, including Alexander Haig, have suggested that the first Reagan administration was a government by leaks, and suggested you were doing some of the leaking. How do you plead?

I plead not guilty. I can’t speak for everybody around me, but I will say that leaks are endemic to government. They frustrate me here in the department, but I’ve been in government for nine years and I’ve learned to live with them. I don’t know of any way to prevent them. I would argue very strongly to you that the ship of state is not leaking from the top over here at the State Department.

What are your marching orders, for example, to a desk officer who gets a call from a reporter like me who wants to find out the background and context of a foreign policy issue, and is not looking for secrets, but wants to improve his understanding?

In my three incarnations, White House, Treasury and State, I think you’ll find that there’s always been a policy of open access. Nobody has ever been ordered not to talk to the press. Nobody is ever constrained. Of course, they’re expected not to talk to the press about classified information. Once the president has made a decision, I expect the people in this department to go along and support that decision. Once the commander in chief has made a decision, that’s it, as far as I’m concerned, whether we’re on the winning side of that decision or the losing side. That’s pretty much my philosophy. Everybody is free to talk to the press in this department, as far as I’m concerned. There’s no restraints, other than those imposed with respect to classified information.

Final question. A lot of people, some in the journalistic community, have suggested you would like to be president. Would you?

No. Absolutely not. I have absolutely no plans to run for president.
All of us are familiar with the cliche about the fruits of victory being sown in defeat. It is an expression of that truism that human beings, as well as entire nations, are capable of learning from their mistakes, of applying the lessons of defeat to their next rendezvous with destiny.

We Americans, however, tend to be much less aware of the dangers inherent in success. We are a confident and optimistic people, and in our approach to international affairs, we tend to focus on the challenges of the moment and pay little heed to the long run, and to the need to prepare for an ever changing world. We won two great victories earlier in this century over the forces of aggression and totalitarianism. But on each occasion, we neglected, during the course of the conflict, to look very far beyond the struggle at hand and the prospect of victory and to address the fact that our victories themselves would change the world and present us with a new set of problems, challenges, and responsibilities.

To be fair, the United States did learn one important lesson following the bitter experience of the period between the first and second world wars, and that was the need for an active American role and the acceptance of American responsibility in the preservation of international peace and stability. But now, for the third time in this century, we risk becoming victims of our own success. For we are hearing it said that the remorseless political, ideological, and military competition between the United States and the Soviet Union known as the Cold War is now coming to an end. We are also hearing it said that this is a war which is ending largely on our terms.

While much of the debate on this subject is premature, it is indisputable that we are entering a new era in international relations, an era which is largely the product of our successful post-war policies. Now is not the time, however, for us to be patting ourselves on the back. Complacency over our success is no substitute for hard-nosed thinking about the new order of foreign policy challenges that awaits us in the coming years. We are entering uncharted waters, and we are going to require a compass different from the one which has thus far guided us safely through the second half of the 20th century.

But first, let me indulge in a bit of complacency of my own. History will record that the United States, while not anticipating the Cold War, fully met the challenges and the responsibilities as a global power which it thrust upon us. What did we accomplish? First, we helped save Western Europe from economic ruin and perhaps permanent decline, laying the groundwork for the continent’s startling strength and
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prosperity today. Second, we took the lead in establishing a number of multilateral institutions which permitted, for the first time in history, the rational management of an interdependent free market world economy. Third, we welcomed our former enemies, West Germany and Japan, into the fold of democratic Western nations, burying the enmities of the past and rendering war between and among ourselves permanently unthinkable. And fourth, we, together with our allies in NATO, stood firm against Soviet expansion in Europe and globally.

These were no small accomplishments. It is not easy for a democracy to maintain the steadiness of purpose and the popular consensus essential to a successful and coherent foreign policy. The difficulty of our task was compounded by the fact that we were but one of a coalition of democracies, and that we faced a formidable adversary whose messianic zeal was matched only by its seemingly limitless ability to ignore the needs of its own people and devote vast resources toward acquiring the instruments of intimidation and aggression. We succeeded because we and our allies agreed that the threat we faced in common was imminent and real, and because the peoples of the West were willing to bear the sacrifices necessary to meet that threat.

Our success speaks for itself. The West today is stronger collectively than at any time since World War II. We are prosperous and we are secure. We are confident of our purpose and of the validity—and universality—of our democratic ideals. On the other side, communism as a philosophy of government and as a guide to economics is in disarray. Today, communism is the refuge of despot and oligarchs who cling desperately to power but who know they are condemned by history. From Eastern Europe to Nicaragua, and from Ethiopia to Cuba, Communist economies are recognized failures. The history of the last ten years is an almost unblemished record of movement toward market-oriented reforms the world over and of the victory of democratic forces over dictatorships of the left and the right.

I would like deliberately to provoke reflection on the fundamentally different set of challenges the United States is going to face in the international arena as we move into the next century. What we have to understand is that the bipolar world of the post-war era, in which the United States and the Soviet Union dominated world events and set the agenda for their respective alliances, is over. We are now moving into, or I should say back into—for such has been the nature of international affairs since time immemorial—a world in which power and influence is diffused among a multiplicity of states.

Obviously, this development has been welcomed in the West insofar as it reflects a decline in Soviet economic power and the process of political decay which now seems endemic to Eastern Europe. But let us not fool ourselves. If it is true that we have emerged victorious from the Cold War, then
The United States will remain for long into the next century the only power—or at least willing—to think in global terms.

We, like the Soviets behind us, have crossed the finish line very much out of breath. Both we and the Soviets are faced with a frankly diminished capacity to influence events and promote our respective interests throughout the world on the scale to which we have become accustomed.

This is not to say that the United States and the Soviet Union will cease to be the world’s only true superpowers, or that the Soviets will not represent the principal threat to Western security interests for the foreseeable future. Nor is the multipolar world into which we are moving necessarily going to be a safer place than the Cold War era from which we are emerging, given the existence and indeed the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. For all its risks and uncertainties, the Cold War was characterized by a remarkably stable and predictable set of relations among the great powers. A look at the history books will tell us that we cannot say as much about the period leading from the birth of the European nation-states up through the outbreak of World War II.

We live, in a time of transition, one of risks and opportunities. There is the prospect before us that the East Bloc countries will at last join the family of democratic nations, and that the developing countries will enjoy the fruits of progress by embracing market-oriented reforms. But there is also the danger that change in the East will prove too destabilizing to be sustained, and that the nations of the Third World will be crushed by the weight of debt and decay, leading to instability on a broad scale.

Our ability to meet the challenges in East-West and North-South relations will depend substantially on how well the major Western industrial nations manage the transition to a new set of relations and a new distribution of responsibilities among themselves. Clearly, the balance of power among the United States, Western Europe, and Japan has shifted over the last decade. We can do something about our trade and budget deficits, but we can do nothing to alter the fundamental fact that we are no longer going to be able to get our way in international affairs as we once did. How we adjust to this fact, and how our Western partners adjust to their new-found independence and responsibilities, will determine whether the stable international framework the United States did so much to foster in the post-war period will continue to function for the benefit of all, or whether we will slip back toward the dark days of autarky, unilateralism, and protectionism which proved so damaging to the West in the 1920s and 1930s.

The shift in the balance of power among the leading Western countries does not mean the United States must abandon its leadership role. On the contrary, the United States will remain for long into the next century the only power—or at least willing—to think in global terms and to fashion policies in the overall political, economic, and security interests of the West. We have not always done this well, nor have we necessarily done so for selfless reasons, but the fact remains that none of our Western partners has the global reach or the disposition to take the lead in safeguarding and expanding the institutional mechanisms which are vital to the preservation of international economic and political stability. Our capacity to play this role may have been diminished, but the need for us to do so has not.

For the United States to continue to play this role, however, will increasingly require a recognition by our Western democratic partners that with increased wealth and influence come increased responsibilities. For example, the West Europeans, as they move toward the creation of a single internal market as of January 1993, will have to ensure a continued open trade relationship with the United States, if we are going to avoid a protectionist spiral and a consequent deterioration in the transatlantic relationship. Similarly, the Japanese are going to have to accept the fact that they cannot afford to pursue unilateral advantage to the detriment of the overall stability of the international system. In this respect, it is incumbent on both the United States and the West Europeans to find institutional means of bringing the Japanese into a closer consultative relationship on a broad range of political as well as economic issues, so that they can play the creative and positive international role which is rightfully and necessarily theirs.

The problems of adjustment which we in the West face pale in comparison to those facing the Soviets today. The Soviet Union is going through what can only be described as a crisis of massive proportions. Mikhail Gorbachev has had the wisdom to understand that radical change is necessary to save his country from permanent decline. This is not the first time, however, that the Kremlin has engineered an ideological retreat in order to stimulate national recovery.
Lenin first did so with his market-oriented New Economic Plan in the 1920s, and Stalin submerged ideology in favor of Russian nationalism during the Great Patriotic War against Nazi Germany. We need to keep this history in mind, as well as the fact that Gorbachev is no anti-Communist, and that he intends to make the Soviet Union as strong as he possibly can.

Nevertheless, it is true that the changes introduced by Gorbachev offer the first realistic hope for a transformation in the nature of the Soviet system and for a qualitative improvement in East-West relations. As President Bush has argued, we have a historic opportunity now to end the post-war division of Europe on terms which reflect our democratic principles. This is because Mr. Gorbachev apparently has understood that his country will not be able to compete economically unless resources are shifted away from the military, and that the Soviet Union will not be able to enter the post-industrial age unless it opens its society to the outside world and establishes relations with the West on a normal footing. It is for these reasons that he has made hopeful pronouncements on arms reductions, and has slowed the overseas adventurism which did so much to galvanize Western solidarity in the early 1980s.

And herein lies a danger to Western interests: that with a perception growing among the Western public that the Soviet threat has diminished, there will be a tendency for the member states of the NATO alliance to compete in expanding their relations with the East. Already, we are hearing it said that we need to take measures to ensure the success of Gorbachev’s reforms. This, however, is not the task of American foreign policy, nor should it be that of our Western partners. Our task, after all, is to devise policies which will serve our interests whether Mr. Gorbachev succeeds or fails. And our common goal ought to be the maintenance of the security consensus which has served the West so well over the past 40 years until the process of democratic reform in the East has truly become irreversible.

This will be easier said than done. If the Western tendency toward unilateralism on trade matters is matched in the field of security relations with the East Bloc, the Soviets may be able to play NATO members off against each other, and obtain trade and arms control concessions without undertaking the kind of systemic reforms which alone can make for a stable and confident relationship between East and West.

Obviously, it is in the Europeans’ interest to avoid bankrolling merely cosmetic Soviet reforms or to reach arms control agreements which undermine NATO’s ability to deter aggression. After all, the Europeans are condemned by geography to live in the shadow of Soviet military power whether or not the Soviet Union in the long run changes as much as all of us hope. And while the United States’ commitment to NATO will remain secure, it is increasingly incumbent upon our European allies—particularly as they unify their economies—to assume greater responsibility for their own defense and to establish a more equitable division of labor within the alliance that reflects the relative strength of our economies.

There is an additional reason why the Europeans will have to become more responsible for managing their own interests. We are now discovering that the process of reform in the Soviet Bloc and the relaxation of Soviet control over Eastern Europe are bringing long-suppressed ethnic antagonisms and national rivalries to the surface, and putting the German question back on the international agenda. While American policy can have a steadying influence in dealing with these questions, it is ultimately the Europeans themselves who have the principal political stake in making the transition to a new and undivided Europe a peaceful and orderly one. Moreover, the cooperative and multilateral approach which has made for a
The dangers which exist can be turned into opportunities

prosperous and secure Western Europe in the post-war period will be key to overcoming the inherent instability and unpredictability of the multipolar era into which the whole of Europe is now entering.

The United States will also face a new set of challenges over the next decade in its relations with the developing world. Here, too, the post-war struggle between liberal democracy and Communist or statist ideologies for the hearts and minds of the peoples of the Third World appears to be moving in ways favorable to the West. But we should be realistic about the underlying meaning of the trend toward democracy and the movement toward free market reforms that we are witnessing today throughout much of the developing world. The fact is that the trend is against incumbent governments everywhere, of all political stripes—governments which are overwhelmed by the problems of overpopulation, unemployment, and stagnant economic growth.

Clearly, many of the problems of the developing nations are of their own making. But if they are willing to undertake the necessary reforms, we in the West must respond with creative approaches to the debt problem and with a level of investment which many of these countries formerly shunned but now urgently solicit. If we should fail to respond adequately to the debt crisis, we may find the trend toward democracy in the developing world to be short-lived. We may also find that some of the fragile nation-states of the Third World will collapse into their ethnic or regional components, while those who are well-armed may seek external solutions to their internal problems. And we may find instability in the developing world brought to the very doorstep of the West, both in Europe and the United States.

Finally, there is a further host of problems we are going to face as we move into the next century which will exceed the ability of the United States or any single nation to resolve, and which will, therefore, require a collective approach. These include the problems of weapons proliferation, international drug-trafficking, terrorism, and the imperiled state of the world environment. These are problems which do not respect borders and for which national or strictly unilateral solutions do not exist.

If Mikhail Gorbachev is sincere when he says that we have to set aside our ideological differences and military competition in order to address the fundamental threats to the survival of the planet, he will find in the United States a ready partner. But most of the problems to which I refer—problems which are likely to dominate the international agenda in coming years—do not lend themselves to solution in a strictly East-West framework. Take, for example, the problems of pollution and weapons proliferation. We in the industrialized world now find ourselves in the awkward position of asking the developing nations to eschew methods of economic development which we ourselves practiced in the not-too-distant past, and which account in part for our current prosperity. Similarly, we are asking many of these same nations to forego the production of weapons which we ourselves possess, and which contribute to our security in a dangerous and unpredictable world.

Clearly, East-West cooperation will be fundamental to resolving many of the underlying political and regional tensions which are at the root of transnational problems such as terrorism and weapons proliferation. The challenge of eradicating drug-trafficking and eliminating the threat to the world environment, in particular, are international in scope and will require the cooperative efforts of those nations wealthy enough to mobilize the necessary resources.

I have not intended to paint a bleak picture of the type of international environment that awaits us in the next decade and into the next century. The period of transition through which we are now passing can be managed successfully if we but understand the fact that we are facing a different set of challenges from those to which we have become accustomed over the past 40 years. We are militarily strong today. We are strong economically. And we are on the verge of seeing our democratic values triumph in places which would hardly have been imaginable only a few years ago. But the positive and indeed revolutionary changes which are sweeping the world today are reversible, and they cannot be sustained by the efforts of the United States alone. They can, however, be sustained, and the dangers which exist turned into opportunities, if the Western democracies renew their commitment to a collective and cooperative approach to the major issues which confront the world. And this will require American leadership of the highest order.
"The U.S.-Japan relationship is the most important bilateral relationship in the world, bar none."

Ambassador Mike Mansfield made the above statement so often and it has been quoted so many times that it has become part of our collective political consciousness. Mansfield's observation is not merely a good slogan; it is true. However, that relationship is in serious trouble today. The two nations are on a collision course, headed for a continuing series of confrontations on trade, foreign investment, technology transfer, foreign aid, industrial competition, defense, and a number of other issues. Both countries want to avoid the impending battles, but neither seems to know how.

The debate that took place in Congress and the media this year over the administration's proposal to transfer F-16 technology to Japan to form the basis of a new Japanese aircraft called the FSX shook the foundations of the relationship. It was also emblematic of the larger troubles that the relationship faces. The intensity and breadth of the opposition took proponents (and even critics) of the deal by surprise. Never before had a proposal to transfer defense technology to an ally come under such widespread scrutiny.

At least temporarily, the dust is settling. The administration won close floor votes in Congress in May and again in September which permit the program to go forward. However, the debate, as painful as it was, should not be allowed to die down before the United States faces up to its full implications. The many legitimate questions about the nature and future of the U.S.-Japan relationship raised during the FSX controversy have not been dealt with satisfactorily by our policy process. If they are not faced squarely now, they will lie in wait only to erupt again during the next controversy. It is unfair both to ourselves and to the Japanese not to address the underlying problems.

A New National Effort

The United States must make a new effort on the national level to formulate a coherent
The objective of today's Team B should be to take a critical look at our relationship with Japan.

Policy toward Japan, one that covers the many facets of the relationship, will be uniformly implemented by the various elements of the U.S. government, and will not leave the Japanese guessing what demand the Americans are going to make next.

President Bush, drawing on a concept that he courageously introduced when he headed the CIA, should set up a national “Team B" approach on Japan, that is, a specially constituted, action-oriented policy team of alternative thinkers tasked to redefine U.S. policy toward our most important partnership.

When President Bush originally spearheaded the Team B concept, the task was to rethink our analysis of the Soviet strategic threat. There are significant parallels between the situation that existed with regard to our thinking about the Soviet Union then and that which exists today about Japan. For 25 years a single point of view had dominated U.S. thinking about Soviet intentions and objectives in strategic forces. A coalition of scientists and government officials had come to the conclusion that since nuclear war was unwinnable, no rational actor would build up its nuclear arsenal beyond the point of deterrence. The Soviets, however, began with a different set of assumptions and reached a different set of conclusions, which they also acted upon by expanding their strategic forces beyond the point of mere deterrence.

In spite of accumulating evidence to the contrary, the deterrence coalition controlled our policy process rigidly. They shut out alternative points of view and ostracized their opponents. All the while, they maintained a special dialogue with their counterparts in the Soviet Union, who were quick to reassure them about Soviet behavior seemingly inconsistent with the Americans’ beliefs. In point of fact, the Soviets were manipulating them.

Team B itself grew out of an increasing concern on the part of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) that the National Intelligence Estimates it was receiving from the CIA drew incorrect conclusions from the available data and misread Soviet intentions. When George Bush took over the CIA, he changed the way business was being done by agreeing to the PFIAB's suggestion to get an alternative view of Soviet capabilities and intentions, and by setting up Team B in June 1976.

Team B sat only for about three months, yet its report broke the hold of the deterrence coalition on the policy process and brought new thinking to bear on the Soviets. Its opponents were not banished forever and the debate continues to this day, as is appropriate in a free society. The very existence of Team B created a political firestorm, with allegations that PFIAB and others were manipulating the intelligence process for their own political purposes. In the end, however, the methodology of having Team B challenge the prevailing thinking came to be generally accepted as a valid analytical approach.

The objective of today's Team B should be to take a critical look at our relationship with Japan. Unlike its predecessor, which was limited to reviewing intelligence thinking alone, it requires a broader mandate. It needs to root around in all the government agencies that have significant business with Japan, and to focus not merely on the policy (or lack of it) but also the process by which a particular agency arrives at policy. Team B's goal should be not just to develop an integrated game plan for dealing with the Japanese across the board, but also to ensure that a credible and effective policy formulation process on Japan is created in the U.S. government.

Only a broadly based effort like Team B can extricate us from the current policy muddle, caused in no small degree by the fact that U.S. thinking about Japan in general and the U.S. government's policy process in particular is carefully guarded by a coalition of Japan experts whose ideas have held sway for most of the post-war period. This collection of Japan insiders is known colloquially as the “Chrysanthemum Club" (after the floral symbol of the Japanese imperial household) or “Japan Club," because they are generally in the position of being defenders of Japanese points of view and policies. The formulation of an alternative and comprehensive set of policies by Team B will break the hold that the Chrysanthemum Club has had on U.S. government thinking about Japan and provide the president and other senior policymakers, who inherited the present situation, with much needed alternatives to our current ineffective policies.

When Japan was an impoverished and decimated country struggling to recover from the devastating effects of World War II, there may have been a legitimate rationale for some special treatment. However, the policymakers of the time constructed a totally artificial environment in which Japan
could recover and grow. The problem today is that the conditions that necessitated special treatment have long since gone. The post-war period is at a close, both with the emergence of Japan as an economic superpower and the recoalescence of Western Europe. U.S. post-war foreign policy has proved very successful. Now it is time for a new set of policies which respond to the current realities. But both the Japanese and the Chrysanthemum Club have grown so used to operating within the confines of the special environment that they are not even cognizant of its artificiality, a situation which has led to unrealistic analyses and expectations.

The FSX Deal

The Japanese and Chrysanthemum Club’s perceptions of FSX are a case in point. The heat generated by the deal caught the Japanese by surprise and stung them deeply. The Japanese are clearly unhappy over the FSX debate and feel betrayed by the Chrysanthemum Club, which they perceive as having mishandled the FSX process. They had been assured that once the government-to-government Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on FSX was signed, it would sail through Congress. (The FSX program had to be reviewed by the Congress since it surpassed certain statutory thresholds for overseas arms sales.) The MOU was, after all, a long, tedious, and technical document. It also was classified (at the Japanese government’s request). So there were few people who could examine the deal closely. There was, therefore, little likelihood that the Congress or the press would pay much attention.

However, the Chrysanthemum Club, which up until the congressional notification process had skillfully defused tensions associated with the deal, misread the situation entirely. They had assumed that they would be able to handle the program strictly in their own channels, as they had so many other deals in the past. It was a fair assumption based on past experience, but, much to their chagrin, it proved dead wrong.

A small number of senators had paid attention. Troubled by what they saw when briefed on the progress of the MOU negotiations, this small circle set off the alarm inside Congress. As details of the congressional concern became public, many in the media also suggested that the Japanese refusal to buy outright a superior American fighter once again flouted free trade principles and that the transfer of F-16 technology was a massive giveaway.

Politicians, reporters, editorial writers, and public interest and industry groups feared that the FSX was a critical element in the long-standing Japanese government/industry plan to form a viable Japanese aircraft industry that would be a formidable competitor against the world-leading U.S. aerospace industry (our one remaining high-tech industry that generates trade surpluses in its sector). Intransigence on the part of Japanese government and industry during the FSX negotiations and constant backpedaling by the U.S. government only heightened the onlookers’ suspicions.

Another key element was the fact that the FSX deal was taking place against a backdrop of Japan’s intractable trade surpluses with the U.S. and of increasing Japanese inroads into the U.S. economy. (One startling example: the Japanese are now buying an estimated 40 percent of the start-up ventures in Silicon Valley.) Ultimately, the FSX deal fed into a galloping sense of uneasiness in this country about Japanese capabilities and intentions.

Thus it was that FSX generated a national debate, one that was generally confined to the terms of the deal but which also spilled over into questioning the fundamental terms of the Japan-U.S. relationship. While its proponents had claimed that FSX would open a new era of defense industrial cooperation between the two countries, and its detractors saw it as the latest in a series of giveaways of critical technologies, the FSX became more than either had bargained for: it became a watershed in relations between the United States and Japan.

Actually that description may prove too large a claim, because right now it is only a half truth. FSX has certainly changed the way Japan will handle and approach the United States in the future, but it seems hardly to have changed the general outlook in Washington. The Departments of Commerce and Defense have agreed to cooperate in some narrow areas in defense-related MOUs, but that is it. Unfortunately, the problems associated with FSX aren’t limited to the defense aerospace sector alone. And as long as the Chrysanthemum Club continues to skew the policy process in our government and paid Japanese lobbyists and academics-for-hire continue to influence disproportionately the treatment of Japan in the public realm, the United States will continue
Confusion, not cohesion, appears to be the hallmark of U.S. policy toward Japan.

The response to FSX in Japan is predictable: Japanese officials do not intend to be put in such a position again. In their thinking and planning, Japanese government and industry are seeking to better anticipate potential U.S. opposition and neutralize it before proceeding. For example, they apparently intend to reduce further their 40-year dependence on the Pentagon wherever possible, alleging that the United States is an unreliable partner. Keidanren, the powerful Japanese industrial federation, has publicly advocated, on behalf of its defense manufacturing sector, a significant increase in the defense R&D budget. (However, this position merely accelerates the push for independence already existing, but with the added benefit of being able to blame it on the FSX.) The former close comraderie between the Department of Defense and the Japan Defense Agency—in part the result of years of one way technology transfers—has been replaced by frostiness. In addition, Japan has strengthened its resolve not to bend in the face of U.S. pressure as new MOUs are negotiated. Consequently, unless U.S. officials and industry organize to respond to the new challenge, it will be even more difficult to conclude equitable arrangements than it was with the FSX.

**U.S. Policy Disarray**

On the U.S. side in the post-FSX era, however, there is disarray in policy, not just in terms of the defense relationship, but across the board. Confusion, not cohesion, appears to be the hallmark of U.S. policy toward Japan. Commerce Secretary Robert Mosbacher, one of the few in the administration who is trying to address the policy vacuum, seems to be shut down by the de facto alliance between the free-traders and Chrysanthemum Club every time he suggests a new initiative. U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills took a soft line on a recent trip to Tokyo, puzzling everyone—the Japanese, the media, and other U.S. officials—about the current U.S. approach to trade problems and access to the Japanese market. In spite of cooperation pledged in the wake of FSX, Defense and Commerce bureaucrats continue to fight over a range of issues. The little-known, Treasury Department-led Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S. (CFIUS) rushes through dozens of approvals of foreign takeovers of some of our best assets with few guidelines and seemingly no second thoughts.

Thus not only are we not hard at work on a credible new way to approach the Japanese, few in government, academia, or the media see the need for one. The widespread view is that the executive branch does not have a major problem with the Japanese, but only with the legislative branch. Many believe that the FSX controversy was generated by domestic political considerations on the Hill and by a few trade hawks who oppose growing Japanese economic power.

However, such a conclusion is not only wrong but dangerous. While Washington is absorbed by literally hundreds of foreign policy issues, the Japanese are evolving and implementing new long-term strategies for dealing with the United States. They plan while we are distracted. We need new and more successful ways of dealing with Japan across the board if a cooperative relationship is to survive in tact.

The policies which have guided U.S.-Japan relations since the end of the war have been shown by the persistent trade deficits and giveaways like the FSX to be bankrupt and incapable of application to changing circumstances. For example, while the U.S. trade deficit with Europe dropped significantly with the devaluation of the dollar over the last three years, the trade deficit with Japan remained steady. This phenomenon has led some analysts on Capitol Hill and elsewhere to conclude that market forces are essentially irrelevant to the U.S.-Japan trade problem. However, rather than replace worn out policies with new ones, the Chrysanthemum Club doggedly continues down the same old path.

**The Unfortunate Alliance**

"The U.S. must learn to grow lesser as Japan grows greater." This quote from a Chrysanthemum Club member encapsulates the defeatist philosophy at the heart of their approach to the U.S.-Japan problem. Chrysanthemum Club members seem to see their function not as representing U.S. interests but as balancing the competing demands of both sides. For them a smooth relationship with Japan is an end in itself. In an age of Japanese ascendency, they resignedly view their role as one of trying to manage America's decline, to make increasing Japanese control of the U.S. economy as painless
The Club is aided in its mission by an unholy alliance with the free-traders. Both somehow fail to see the trail from predatory Japanese policies, to lost markets, to destroyed industries, to large outflows of wealth in the form of trade deficits, and finally to the resultant decline of American power and influence. They are not troubled because they see a global economy as a good, and the nation-state as an atavistic political and economic organism. They may not articulate their world view in quite these terms, but it is implicit in their handling of U.S.-Japan relations.

An additional problem is the hubris that exists in the country today about the U.S. position in the world and in history. The hubris stems from the fact that so many refuse to even consider whether America is in a state of decline and, therefore, lack the will and conviction to ensure continued U.S. economic and technological leadership. The reaction to Paul Kennedy's provocative book The Rise and Fall of Great Powers was telling in this regard. Although Kennedy's thesis may be faulted for being overly deterministic (i.e. that great powers cannot reverse their ultimate falls through corrective actions), the reaction of many in the policy community was simply denial: it can't be happening to us, we're America.

It is a curious misfortune that the United States has been so rich for so long, and thus so used to being rich, that the connection between money and power eludes so many Americans today. Instead, they believe that America's strength comes solely from its moral vision and the freedom and openness of American society. The implicit thinking is that when a country has moral vision, it will command attention regardless of its relative position and wealth. Unfortunately, money, not moral vision, is at the root of power in international politics. We didn't defeat Japan and Germany in World War II because we had superior morality on our side (which we did), but because we had a far superior industrial plant, which was able to sustain our effort until we were victorious.

Today, while we are transferring our wealth to the Japanese and others at an unprecedented rate, neither the Chrysanthemum Club, the free-traders, nor others see much of a problem. In spite of the rise of Japan, they believe we Americans will retain world leadership because we have the superior moral vision and experience to apply to world problems. However, we will allow the Japanese to supply a lot of the cash to solve the problems. (No wonder the Japanese chafe.)

Many in Britain also thought this way earlier in this century as their American cousins rose to world power status. But it didn't work then, with two countries that had many common points of view and cultural similarities; and it certainly won't work now with the very dissimilar American and Japanese cultures. If the United States can't maintain the lead through its economic and technical might, then we'd better get ready to live with the Japanese agenda, which is quite different from our own.

Toward a Real Policy

What is needed right now, today, is a national effort to come to grips with this defeatist viewpoint and the larger Japan problem. We must counter the inordinate influence that various entrenched groups have over policy toward Japan and bring in fresh ideas and new policies. Efforts of individuals or think tanks toward this end are an essential part of the process but are not enough. A more sustained and serious national effort must be undertaken. This is what Team B would be all about.

Since the conventional wisdom on Japan holds sway in many executive branch bureaucracies and to a large extent in academia and the media, to staff Team B the president should draw solely on those with alternative points of view both within the government (although there aren't many) and without, particularly including the so-called trade hawks. Their instructions should be to rethink radically our relationship with Japan and to come up with a comprehensive set of proposals for dealing with the allegedly intractable problems with the Japanese. The goal should be to settle these problems in a way that secures long-term U.S. national interests, even if the relationship has to be redefined to do so.

After Team B's recommendations are developed, then let a debate ensue. The Chrysanthemum Club and the free-traders can have their cut at the proposals at that time. Putting members of either group on the B panel would subvert its mission and defeat its very purpose. It is important that Team B not be run under the auspices of the National Security Council or any other government agency. Team B must be independent of the existing bureaucratic struc-
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This debate is about our national future and the future of our relationship with Japan.

The current system, which is so heavily influenced by stale thinking about Japan, and report through its leadership directly to the president. The president alone can act on this issue. Only he can allow Team B to get inside the various government agencies and examine their thinking in detail. In addition, it is appropriate that the president himself act to counter the growing sense of national frustration with this issue. Polls have shown for some time that the American people feel very uneasy about encroaching Japanese dominance. And while it would be unwise to make foreign policy in response to opinion polls, nevertheless they are a useful barometer of what is on the mind of the American people. Furthermore, there can be no doubt that the Japan question is going to play an increasing role in our presidential and congressional election process.

Japan’s Reaction

None of this is to assume that, even if the president makes and implements a new foreign policy with respect to Japan, the Japanese are going to be so struck by its logic and forcefulness that a new, harmonious era will emerge. After all, the Japanese have been largely shielded from the give-and-take of international power politics for some time. They are deriving enormous benefit from the status quo. They spend little on defense relative to the size of their GNP, yet are protected by the American umbrella from all harm. Their production/trade machine is generating enormous wealth for Japan, which instead of being used to better the standard of living for the Japanese people is being used to fuel the Japanese government/industry drive for industrial domination of America.

Under the current system, the Japanese can delay opening their markets (while we complain) until they can neutralize any given challenge in a particular market. Where they can’t beat the competition, they buy or coopt it. (For example, Japan can’t grow enough oranges and cattle to be competitive with America’s farmers in the Japanese market. When finally forced to open these markets partially to American products, as they were recently, the solution has been to move on a large scale to buy the American farms producing the products. The net result is that the Japanese markets in effect remain closed and under Japanese control.)

Japanese companies live in corporate paradise now: they have a free trader’s access to the American market and mercantilist protection against foreign competition in their home market. Japanese planners see an even greater day ahead when Japanese industry dominates all the key sectors in the next century as the world technology leader. Would any nation abandon the current system which is producing such well-being, especially in the face of demands from what they see as a corrupt and declining United States trying to bully its former client state into extending its reign as a superpower? It is not likely that the Japanese will acquiesce willingly. Any attempt to implement a newly defined relationship is certainly going to be rough sledding at first. However, if we implement sound policies and the Japanese know we are serious, the end result will be a more solid and realistic partnership.

We need the Team B approach implemented on a national level to begin to achieve an equitable distribution of burdens and benefits with Japan. The current U.S.-Japan relationship was built in an economic and political milieu that does not exist today. It cannot endure on that false foundation. It is time that we realize the stakes in the FSX program were a lot higher than whether Japan could build one military aircraft. This debate, which continues today in another form, is about our national future and the future of our relationship with Japan.

It’s time for a new Team B to formulate effective policies for that future, based on sound strategic concepts, just as President Bush’s original Team B defined new strategic thinking on the Soviet Union. Do we really have to fear the clash of fresh ideas with the old? Must we really behave ourselves so that the noise and heat and light of a free society openly debating critical issues don’t disturb the Japanese the way the FSX debate did?

If we don’t have the foresight and resolve to face this challenge squarely, then we will deserve the second-rate status to which we are rapidly sinking. Let President Bush, who demonstrated leadership and vision in granting the first Team B its charter, establish now a Team B on Japan while we still have the passion and the power to protect America’s sovereignty and national interests and to achieve a balanced relationship with our Japanese partners.
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WILLIAM SIMMLER, JR., 82, of Boynton Beach, FL, died at home April 25. Mr. Simmler, originally from Philadelphia, completed three successful careers in the field of law enforcement. Entering the Philadelphia police force in 1932, he rose to the rank of captain and headed the Detective Bureau. He joined the Naval Reserve prior to World War II, retiring in 1967 as a chief warrant officer. He entered the Foreign Service in 1957 and served as senior U.S. advisor to the Republic of Korea Police Academy in Seoul, followed by duty with the AID program in Saigon, Vietnam. He concluded his career as director of the AID Public Safety Department in Manila.

He is survived by his wife of 55 years, Vera, of Boynton Beach, FL; a daughter, Dale Ransom, of Annapolis, MD; a brother, Jack, of San Francisco, CA; three grandchildren; and four great-grandchildren.

EDWARD A. DOW, JR., 76, who retired in 1970 as chargé d'affaires in Lesotho, died of cancer June 11 at Georgetown University Hospital.

Mr. Dow served in Belgium and Cairo. After studying economics at Princeton University, he served in Paris as an economic officer. In 1949 he was named U.S. representative on the United Nations Commission for Indonesia. Later assignments included posts in New Delhi and Morocco. Dow was born in Omaha, the son of the late FSO Edward A. Dow, Sr.

Survivors include his wife, the former Mary Virginia Burke, 3133 Connecticut Ave., N.W. #514, Washington, D.C., and a sister.

MATILDE ROHMOSER DURLING, 80, died June 22 after a stroke.

For 30 years, from 1935-66, she accompanied her husband, Fred Durling, to posts in Panama, Venezuela, and Spain. They retired to South Carolina in 1962.

Mrs. Durling was a native of Costa Rica. Besides her husband of 61 years, 406 Amberst Rd., Bryans Road, MD, survivors include a son, Fred Jr., of Miami; two daughters, Virginia Arango of Panama and Nora Ott of Bryans Road; a sister and two brothers, all of Panama; seven grandchildren; and 10 great-grandchildren.

RITA ANN MALLEY, 58, wife of retired FSO Raymond C. Malley, died at the Hospice of Northern Virginia in Arlington on June 12.

Mrs. Malley was a director of and teacher at several nursery schools in the Washington, D.C. area and in Pakistan, Zaire, and France, where she accompanied her husband.

She attended Framingham State College and the University of Chicago and graduated from Sr. John the Evangelist. She is survived by her husband, 6224 Loch Raven Dr., Mclean, VA; three sons, Keith, Bruce and Gregory; and two grandchildren.

BONNIE PUGH, wife of Ambassador Robert Pugh, was killed September 22 in the crash of a French airplane in Niger.

Mrs. Pugh, who was born in Los Angeles, accompanied her husband of 34 years on assignments to Ankara, Isfahan, Athens, London, and Beirut, where he served as deputy chief of mission during the bombing of the American embassy and the Marine barracks in 1983. She remained in Beirut throughout her husband's tour. Mr. Pugh was subsequently appointed ambassador to Mauritania, and currently is ambassador to Chad. On the day of the crash Mrs. Pugh was flying from Chad to Washington, D.C. to help make arrangements for her daughter Ann's wedding on Oct. 14.

Mrs. Pugh is survived by her husband Robert; a daughter, Ann; and a son, Malcolm.

DONALD ATWELL, 63, a retired AID senior program officer, died of cancer June 25 in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Atwell was chief of program operations in the Bureau of Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance in Washington when he retired in 1986.

Born in Cairo, Egypt, Mr. Atwell joined the U.S. Army after high school and served in the infantry in France. He was recalled to active duty during the Korean War. He received a B.A. degree from Denison University in 1949 and a Ph.D. from Clark University in 1959.

Mr. Atwell's work with AID began in 1954 when he joined the Foreign Operations Administration. He served in various capacities as a foreign aid program officer in Tunisia, the Cameroon, Zaire, and Algeria. He was recalled to active duty during the Korean War. He received a B.A. degree from Denison University in 1949 and a Ph.D. from Clark University in 1959.

Mr. Atwell's work with AID began in 1954 when he joined the Foreign Operations Administration. He served in various capacities as a foreign aid program officer in Tunisia, the Cameroon, Zaire, and Algeria. He was recalled to active duty during the Korean War. He received a B.A. degree from Denison University in 1949 and a Ph.D. from Clark University in 1959.

Mr. Atwell is survived by his wife, Corrion L. Atwell of 6608 Virginia View Court, Bethesda, MD 20816; three daughters, Margaret Atwell of Arlington, VA, and Jean and Catherine Atwell, both of Bethesda, MD; and a sister, Mrs. Jean Sweitzer, of Honolulu.

WILLIAM M. BLAISDELL, 87, a retired AID economist, died Sept. 6 at Georgetown University Hospital after a heart attack. He lived in Washington, D.C.

Dr. Blaisdell was a native of New York. He was a graduate of Swarthmore College and received a doctorate in economics from Temple University. After wartime service with the War Assets Administration, he joined the Economic Cooperation Administration, which ran the Marshall Plan. He joined AID in 1960, working as an economist in Turkey and Senegal before retiring in 1968.

His wife, Barbara J., died in 1985. Survivors include a son, Barry, of 82 Thornvime Lane, Houston, TX, 77079; a daughter, Christy Blaisdell, both of Houston; and two grandchildren.
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•MULTIPLE LISTING •RENTALS
•RESIDENTIAL SALES •PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

THE UNBEATABLE COMBINATION OF REAL ESTATE EXPERIENCE SINCE 1974 AND 20 YEARS OF ASSOCIATION WITH THE FOREIGN SERVICE ALLOWS US TO BETTER SERVE YOUR REAL ESTATE NEEDS!

Returning to Washington?
WRITE ANNE GOMEZ FOR A FREE WELCOME KIT WITH NO OBLIGATION!

WRITE OR FAX:
DIPLOMAT PROPERTIES, INC.
ATTN: ANNE GOMEZ
3900 N. FAIRFAX DR., SUITE 204
ARLINGTON, VA. 22203
(Near Virginia Square Metro)
(703) 522-5900 (703) 528-0448 FAX: (703) 525-4713

HOUSE KEEPING.
Make sure your Northern Virginia home is kept in good care while you’re away. Our staff has extensive experience with absentee property owners—we understand the personal service that’s necessary to keep your home running smoothly. In fact, we’re sure you’ll find our attention to detail like that of no other property management firm...

Call, FAX or write: Jeff Surdyk
3120 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1010
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
703-641-5910 FAX 703-641-5924

Mark Tracz Real Estate, Inc.

Moving?

Please let AFSA know

If you are being transferred, please include AFSA in your change-of-address notices. Your agency will NOT notify us when you move from one post to another or back to Washington. Send address changes to:

AFSA Membership
2101 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
Tap a world market.

America's diplomats—a global audience of untapped potential

From Oslo to Ouagadougou, the Foreign Service Journal reaches the diplomatic community like no other medium. Our audience of Foreign Service members and their families is spread around the world at more than 250 posts in 134 countries. In most cases, they find themselves isolated from the American goods and services they need. And when posted back to Washington they look for the people whose services will make their next overseas tour easier. No other magazine gives you this entire market—well educated, affluent, select and influential. When you advertise in the Foreign Service Journal, you have the world on tap.
TOUR GUIDES

LARGEST TOUR GUIDE AGENCY in Washington is looking for English speaking and bilingual individuals interested in tour guide training. Should enjoy working with people and must be available for spring training. Hours flexible. Training class will begin in early January. Call 202-628-2842 for interview.

PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

MARKET HOMES PROPERTY MGMT.: Expertise and personal attention to detail are the hallmarks of our established Northern Virginia firm. Call or write for a description of our professional services. References provided. Jim Fahey, 9520 B Lee Highway Fairfax, VA 22031 (703)-691-2006.

WASHINGTON MANAGEMENT SERVICES: Specializing in property management services for the FS community. Residential property management is our only business. Call, write, fax or telex Mary Beth Otto, 1015 Q St. NW, Washington, DC 20009 Tel(202)462-7212, Fax (202)332-0798, Telex 350136 Wash. Mgt.

RENTALS


BACK FOR TRAINING? HOME LEAVE? DC TOUR? We are THE Washington Metro Area Short-Term Rental Specialists. Excellent locations. Wide price range. In Virginia walk to FSI. In DC and Maryland walk to metro. Large selection of furnished and equipped efficiencies, 1-bedrooms, 2-bedroom rooms and some furnished houses. Many welcome pets. For brochures & info: EXECUTIVE HOUSING CONSULTANTS, INC., Short Term Rental, 7315 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 1020 East, Bethesda, MD 20814. (301) 951-4111. Reserve early! Avoid disappointment!

ALEXANDRIA LUXURY HIGH¬RISE APARTMENTS, 1, 2, 3 bedrooms including utilities and many amenities. Short/long term rentals, furnished/unfurnished. The Summit, 260 S. Reynolds, Alexandria, VA 22304.

WILL YOU NEED A FULLY FURNISHED apartment five minutes walk from FSI and Rosslyn subway? We have first class efficiencies, 1 bedrooms and some 2 bedrooms and penthouses in River Place. They are completely furnished including cable TV, telephone, all utilities, linens and parking. Short term leases of 1 to 6 months available. Write Foreign Service Associates, P.O. Box 12855, Arlington, VA 22209-8855. Children welcome. Please send us dates.

EXECUTIVE CLUB ARLING¬TON and OLD TOWN ALEX¬ANDRIA. Immaculate and beautifully furnished apartments with full hotel services. One-two bedrooms, some with dens, all with equipped kitchen. Complimentary shuttle to metro, Rosslyn and Pentagon, Health Club and outdoor pool. Many extras. Rates within your per diem. Shorter or longer terms available. Executive Clubs, 610 Bashford Lane, Alexandria. (703)739-2582, (800)535-2582.

WASHINGTON D.C. APART¬MENTS. Short or long term. Decorator furnished, fully equipped: microwave, cable, phone, pool, spa. Two blocks FSI and Metro, 5 min. State, Georgetown. Photos. (703)522-2588 or write Adrian B.B. Templar, 1021 Arlington Blvd., PH1214, Arlington, VA 22209. Member AFSA.

WARRENTON. Beautiful house available on weekly basis. Five miles from training center. Linens, dishes, microwave, dishwasher, washer/dryer, phone, TV/VCR. 20 minutes as hotel. Call (703)349-9136 or FAX (703) 347-5260 Attention Ed Gogerty.

COME HOME TO GEOR¬GETOWN Your tour is over. Your tenanted townhome on the correct side awaits your arrival. Upper levels, 2 bedroom, 2 bathrooms, also large English Basement apartment with bedroom and bath and garden. Sensibly priced at $425,000. Bonnie B. Foster R.E. (202)-234-7267 2800 Dunbarston St. N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007

WINTERGREEN-VACATION CONDO, 2 bedroom, Fireplace, spectacular view, all amenities. Exclusive resort in Blue Ridge Mountains near Charlottesville. Tennis, golf, pools, skiing etc. Call Mike. (804) 946-5976; Write P.O.Box 771 Amherst, Virginia 24521

TAX RETURNS


AFSA TAX COUNSELING: Problems of Tax and Finance: Never a charge to AFSA members for telephone guidance. R.N. "Bob" Dus-sell (ex-AID) enrolled since 1973 to Tax Practice. At tax work since 1937 and now still in practice solely to assist Foreign Service employees and their families. Also lecture "Taxes" monthly at FSI in Rosslyn, VA. Office located across from Virginia Square Metro Station, 3601 N. Fairfax Dr., Arlington, VA 22201. (703)841-0158.

ATTORNEYS specializing in tax planning and return preparation for the Foreign Service Community available for consultation on the tax implications of investment decisions, business related deductions, separate maintenance allowances, real estate purchases and rentals, home leave deductions, audits, etc. Contact Susan Sanders or Paul Clifford—Clifford, Farha, Stamey, & Sanders, 1606 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20009 (202)667-5111, FAX (202)265-1474.

TAX PREPARATION BY AN ATTORNEY who is a retired Foreign Service officer and is familiar with Foreign Service problems. M. Bruce Harirson, Esquire, Suite E, 307 Maple Ave. West, Vienna, VA 22180. (703)281-2161.

TAX PREPARATION AND AD¬VICE by T.R. McCartney E.A., (ex-FS) and staff. Enrolled to practice before the IRS. Business Data Corp., P.O. Box 1040, Lanham, MD 20706-1040. (301)731-4114.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE

THE MATCHETT CONNEC¬TION makes the significant differ¬ence to easy, complete, profes¬sional, one-stop shopping. We are your connection to gift giving, personal luxuries, electronics, house¬hold and sundry items. What would you expect from 20 years of customer service?—"The Best." For information write: The Matchett Connection, P.O. Box 3340, Amber¬ler, PA 19002. Call (215)542-7054.

AVON Cosmetics, Jewelry, and Gifts—for FREE catalog mailed to you write, or call: Stephanie Y. Hughes, 713 Grandview Drive, Alexandria, VA 22305 (703)856-8522.

CUSTOM HAMILTON EM¬BLEM WRISTWATCH inscribed "Department of State United States of America" around the great seal of the United States. UNIQUE! Goldtone case, stainless back, quartz calendar movement, water resis¬tant, blank leather strap. Price $83.25 includes shipping. Send check or M.O. to: FSO-Retired, L.J. Scioli, 1005 Barbary Road, Reading, PA 19611.

INVESTMENTS


STUDENT SERVICES

SCHOLARSHIPS AVAILABLE. Details: "EARS," Box 1664, Manas¬sas, VA 22110.

EMPLOYMENT

South American specialist, bilingual, MA SAIS, 5 years in Columbia, Peru, 2 years in top D.C. think tank, research, writing. P.O. Box 18304, Washington, DC 20036.
Books


Attorneys/Wills

FORMER FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER NOW PRACTICING LAW in D.C./Maryland, general practice, estate planning, real estate, domestic. Gregory V. Powell, Furey, Doolan & Abell, 8401 Connecticut Ave., PH-I, Chevy Chase, MD 20815. (301)652-6880.

REX R. KRAKAUER, ESQUIRE Providing representation for the special legal problems of Foreign Service Personnel and Staff living abroad. Divorce, Pensions, Real Estate, Wills and other matters. 51 Monroe Street, Suite #1400, Rockville, Maryland 20850. Telephone: (301)294-6100, Fax: (301)738-8802.

Business Opportunities

TRAVEL SECRETS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE. Frustrated travel writer? Share your travel secrets, and earn money doing it! We will collect your special travel experiences and market them to travel publications. Write for free information package to: Travel Secrets of the Foreign Service, 5233 Chevy Chase Parkway, NW, Washington, DC 20015 (202)244-1365.


Video Entertainment

FOREIGN VIDEO TAPE CONVERSIONS PAL/SECAM (European) to NTSC (American) or vice versa. Computerized DIGITAL process with Image Enhancement. Fast service. Reasonable rates. WASHINGTON DC area. GINGER BREAD PRODUCTIONS (703) 450-7722.

FILM TO VIDEOTAPE/Videotape Duplications/Digital Standards Conversions. Transfer your 8mm, Super 8mm and 16mm film to videotape of any format (VHS, Beta, Super VHS, 3/4", 1", Type C) or any video Standard (PAL, Pal-M, Secam, & NTSC). Highest quality duplications and conversions. Free brochure available. Video Labs Corp. 15237 Display Court, Rockville, MD. 20880 (301)-217-0000.

V.H.S. MOVIES-Low Prices. Choose from hundreds of previously viewed popular movies at unbelievable prices. We have a "no questions asked guarantee." Look into our exchange policy. Send $2.00 for list. Vagabond Video, 4600 Woodduck, S.L.C., UT 84117.

Hotels


An Excellent Medium of Exchange

You can reach 20,000 Foreign Service readers each month with a classified in the JOURNAL. For just $1.00 per word you can sell your product or services to a select and influential audience. Just write your message in the space below or on a separate sheet (please specify the category heading you prefer), note the months you want the ad to run, and enclose a check for the first insertion.

Name ...........................................
Billing address .................................
Message ........................................

56 FOREIGN SERVICE JOURNAL
New Board Sets Ambitious Goals:
President’s Overview

Most members of AFSA’s current Board were elected by a comfortable majority this past spring as the “continuity and renewal” slate. Many of us had served on the 1987-89 Board under Perry Shankle’s leadership, and we stood on a record of genuine accomplishment. At the same time, we promised an ambitious agenda of new efforts.

One of our goals is to increase AFSA’s “outreach.” Of course we must constantly tend our political fences on Capitol Hill, and we continue to cultivate key members and staff on both sides of Congress, but beyond that we need to nurture our own grass roots outside Washington. Our legislators need to hear that their other constituents care about the Foreign Service too!

To that end, we developed a new category of dues-paying members called ‘international associates,’ and invited potential members—mostly major U.S. corporations—to a bicentennial conference on November 30. We can’t tell you until it happens how successful this conference will be in broadening our membership, but the response to date has been gratifying. The Council of American Ambassadors (non-career envoys) has decided to co-sponsor; Vice President Quayle, Secretary Yeutter, and Deputy Secretary Eagleburger are among a distinguished group of scheduled speakers.

We also hope to set up an AFSA speakers’ bureau to send more Foreign Service people further afield on minority recruitment missions and other professional foreign affairs career topics.

Part of our outreach involves broadening the clientele of your Foreign Service Club. To maximize use and minimize our support costs for overhead, we have established an additional new membership category for “Embassy Associates.” Foreign embassies in Washington can now purchase group memberships for their personnel that allow access to the club during regular service hours (now including breakfast and cocktails as well as lunch) and for certain other (but not all) special events, such as our lunchtime speaker series on professional issues.

Both as a professional organization and as your exclusive bargaining agent, AFSA has also sought to stimulate positive follow-up to the 1988-89 Thomas Commission study on stability in the Foreign Service career structure and to Jerry Bremer’s parallel effort within State early this year, commissioned by new Under Secretary for Management Ivan Selin. We disputed the Thomas group’s proposals for amendments to the 1980 Foreign Service Act, but we supported both studies on the need for more administrative flexibility in the cone system, and we drew attention to the impact that involuntary retirements in the last three years have had in the top four grades of the service, particularly at the MC and 0-1 levels. Some promising ideas for greater structural flexibility have begun to emerge from new Director General Edward Perkins’ leadership. Our own new State Vice President George Jones and I look forward to working out agreements to implement these ideas, but we remain concerned about the continuing brain drain at the top of the Service and the department’s failure to make better use of those we manage to retain.

We plan to track with equal care the implementation of the Leidel Report proposals for an improved professional environment for secretaries and to encourage the department to carry out a similar study on careers for specialists.

For our AID members, we put our case in support of a full-time AID vice president to acting AID Administrator Edelman in October and hope for a prompt and positive reply. We also have under serious consideration a proposal to challenge AFGE to regain AFSA’s status as exclusive bargaining agent for Foreign Service personnel of USIA next year. Our retirees benefited from the creation of a new vice presidency to look after the needs of this growing constituency (now nearly a third of our membership), and from the appointment of retiring State Vice President Chuck Schmitz to this new AFSA position.

My report to members would be incomplete if I failed to mention the relatively high profile that AFSA took in public debate on ambassadorial qualifications in the last six months. No one, least of all AFSA, should need to remind each successive administration that the costs of using embassies for pure political patronage are high. Yet because it is so central to our interests, AFSA has always been drawn into this debate, sometimes in outright opposition to specific non-career candidates. This year we sought to avoid naming
names, but the White House liaison office's insistence on identifying "Team 100" members (contributors of more than $100,000) in the nominating documents sent to Congress made it clear enough who we were talking about. More on this neuralgic issue follows.

Ted Wilkinson, President

State Department Issues

We expected that 1989, the first year of the Bush administration, would be marked by two traditional Foreign Service issues for new administrations: political appointees as ambassadors and ideas for restructuring the Foreign Service. We were not disappointed, though both issues took directions we had thought unlikely.

On the first, political appointees, we had expected more from a new administration that seemed to place a higher premium on professionalism and perhaps somewhat less on doctrinal orthodoxy. Our expectations seemed justified at first. Career officers were nominated to several key embassy and subcabinet jobs; others already at post were to be left in place until the end of their three-year tours; and we were told that the career to non-career ratio of ambassadorships would be raised back to about two to one from the nadir of three to two which it had sunk a year ago.

The surprise was the list of political nominees for some 35 vacant posts that emerged in the early spring. From everything we could learn, a high percentage of these candidates had so few qualifications for their jobs that they were almost sure to run afoul of serious Senate criticism, just as we had warned in our December 1988 letter to the transition team. Although our request for dialogue with the new administration was never taken up, AFSA officers were contacted daily by the media for reactions to the nominations, and we offered op-ed pieces and press releases to ensure that our views were completely and accurately described. We invited the White House director of personnel to explain the new administration's thinking to us, and we offered background material to Senator Sarbanes, who leveled his sights particularly on the ambassadorial issue.

Finally, we even sued the State Department to get copies of the labyrinthine "certificates of competence" written in the department by political employees and sent to the Senate with every nomination.

In the process, we reeducated ourselves about public relations and working with Congress, and the need to do much more of both. Observers said AFSA (together with Trudeau and Herblock, etc.) achieved a level of public indignation on the ambassadorial issue demonstrably higher than at any time during the last 35 years. Unfortunately, the level was just high enough to wing a few candidates; with a few exceptions that may have been related to AFSA's insistence that the nominees get close scrutiny, most of them went off to their designated posts with only slight delays.

Looking ahead, AFSA can only hope that we have demonstrated that nominating a candidate whose sole qualification is the amount of money donated to a political campaign is sufficiently painful that it will not be done as often or as casually as in the recent past.

On restructuring the Foreign Service, the new administration met one study in media res, the "Thomas Commission," established by the 1988 Authorization Act, and generated another of its own, the "Bremer Committee," established by State management to look specifically at the FSO generalist corps. AFSA representatives spoke to both groups, and the Bremer study emerged on May 1 with some energetic proposals, many of which AFSA leadership thought we could support. These proposals were considered in the State Standing Committee and were sent to the field for comment.

In contrast, AFSA leadership was caught completely by surprise by a series of legislative proposals that suddenly emerged in the same time frame by the Thomas Commission. Most were unrelated to the commission's mandate and several would eliminate employee protections in serious grievance cases; one would split AFSA in two. In the July edition of the JOURNAL, we published the first side-by-side comparison of the two studies for our membership.

In October, two House subcommittees held hearings on the reports, and AFSA gave detailed testimony. We supported the Bremer Committee view that needed reforms could be carried out without new legislation, and endorsed the director general's announcement that a new, fifth cone, for multifunctional officers, would be created; the recruitment process would be greatly accelerated; and the comprehensive functional needs study recommended by Thomas and Bremer was already underway. Under Secretary Selin said he preferred to postpone any more sweeping changes in the personnel system until the needs study was completed and the new department leadership could determine in the light of that study whether further reforms were desirable. AFSA has no quarrel with that decision, but believes that changes are needed and should not be indefinitely postponed. We intend to keep on top of management on this issue.

Charles Schmitz, State Vice President

USIA Standing Committee

After a year of dormancy, the USIA Standing Committee was reconstituted in September. Vance Pace was elected in July as USIA vice president, to succeed Jake Jacobsen, who was subsequently appointed ambassador to Guinea-Bissau. Omie Kerr was approved in October by the Governing Board to fill the vacant USIA representative position.

AFSA sponsored two successful programs during the past year. A discussion on the OER process included panel members from three selection boards and will be repeated. Ambassador Lannon Walker spoke to a group of interested USIA officers on the personnel system and recommendations he had for improving it. Now that the Thomas and Bremer commissions have made their reports, AFSA will sponsor a follow-up meeting.

AFSA hosted three JOT classes to lunch at the Foreign Service Club during the last year. These highly successful programs gave new officers a chance to meet the AFSA president and other officers as well as key AFSA staffers.

A major disappointment was the USIA principals' decision...
not to attend AFSA's forthcoming bicentennial conference. The office of the general counsel and the labor management people in personnel ruled it an unfair labor practice to accept such an invitation since AFSA is not the exclusive bargaining agent for USIA. This in spite of the fact that there is no labor management aspect to the conference, which is intended only to increase the private sector's understanding and appreciation of the Foreign Service (and vice versa).

Lynn Sever continued on the Editorial Board of the FOREIGN SERVICE JOURNAL: our thanks to Larry Fuchsberg, who served faithfully before transferring overseas. Bruce Byers completed his work on the election committee with the election of the new board. Karl Fritz has replaced Bill Weinhold on the scholarship committee after Bill was assigned as PAO in Burma. Our thanks to all these busy people who take time from their lives to help AFSA serve you.

Your suggestions, complaints, or comments are welcome. Please write or talk to any of the officers or members of the standing committee.

Finance Committee

The year has been a difficult one with the AFSA Board and staff coping with a budget deficit that is only now becoming manageable, largely as a result of the membership's approval of a dues increase in the June election. The newly elected Finance Committee has acted decisively to meet not only a short-run cash liquidity squeeze, but also the longer term problem of deterioration of the building and equipment. The Finance Committee has continued the previous Board's "stop-loss" procedures to stem the deficit, and also decided on a mortgage refinancing to confront not only the short-term cash flow problem but also problems associated with building/equipment deterioration. With regard to the latter, a restricted fund for building maintenance has been established that will allow for necessary non-routine maintenance and replacement.

For the coming year the committee plans to present a surplus budget, mindful that inflationary pressures will serve to ratchet up the budgets of subsequent years. The committee has supported the Board's outreach efforts, mindful that while these efforts pose some financial risk they also offer a means of broadening AFSA's financial base, not to mention broadening public support for AFSA objectives.

The committee was not pleased with the financial performance of the AFSA Scholarship Fund through 1988. The committee met with the fund's managers and obtained more favorable terms (lower fees and commissions); additionally, we instituted a quarterly monitoring process that will enable us to evaluate objectively the fund's financial management.

The committee expended considerable time and effort on the 1988 AFSA audit. The combined financial statements as of, and for the eighteen months ended, December 31, 1988, are contained on pages 65 and 66 in this issue of the JOURNAL. The auditors were unable to obtain a letter of representation from the former AFSA treasurer. The new treasurer does not believe that the lack of the former treasurer's signature reflects adversely on the financial condition of AFSA. A copy of the full audit report may be obtained from AFSA upon request.

Michael Davila, Treasurer

Legal Affairs

The following summary describes some of the Legal Department's activities over the past year.

Nondisclosure Forms. AFSA and seven members of Congress sued the government, challenging a nondisclosure form which many Foreign Service employees are required to sign. The form, SF 4193 (now 4355), prohibited disclosure of "classifiable" material and prescribed penalties for its disclosure. The form applies to individuals with access to SCI. AFSA took the case to the Supreme Court, which ruled in our favor and vacated the judgment of the district court. The government has modified the form to meet most of our objections. We are working on a settlement of remaining issues with the Department of Justice, including the terms of a notice that will be sent to all signatories of the nondisclosure agreements.

Overseas Option. AFSA sued the State Department for giving us misleading information and denying AFSA the opportunity to negotiate the revocation of its subsidy to the American Foreign Service Protective Association, which resulted in the termination of the Overseas Option health insurance. The case is before the U.S. Court of Appeals, with oral argument scheduled for January 1990. On a parallel track, we challenged the department's action administratively, filing an unfair labor practice charge. The Foreign Service Labor Relations Board made the initial decision not to prosecute the charge, and we appealed that decision to the agency's general counsel. The general counsel ordered that the case be pursued, and we await a trial date.

Rights of Untenured Employees. AFSA moved to intervene in a USIA employee's case currently at the United States Court of Appeals. We requested the opportunity to be heard on two issues: (1) the use of the agency's right to terminate limited appointments without cause as a pretext for discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation where the employee is not subject to compromise; and (2) the limitation of the Grievance Board's jurisdiction to review allegations of improper procedures in revoking an employee's clearance. The court has not ruled on AFSA's participation in the suit.

Ambassadorial Nominee Certificates of Competence. AFSA filed suit against the department to force disclosure of the certificates of competence for ambassadorial nominees which the department had treated as confidential. Just prior to the date State's answer was due in court, we reached a settlement requiring the department to provide AFSA with the certificates of competence in a timely fashion and without an erroneous or misleading classification notification.

Security Clearance Forms. AFSA sued the department over its use of a revised form SF-86 for reinvestigation of employees holding top secret clearances. We challenged many of the form's questions on constitutional grounds. The court
awarded much of the relief we sought and asked the parties to jointly draft an order to be issued by the court. We agree about the substance of the order, but are in dispute over the notice to be provided affected employees. We are trying to settle the matter without further court involvement.

AID’s Assignment of Non-career Appointees to Foreign Service Positions. AFSA filed an institutional grievance against AID, charging them with assigning a non-career employee to a Foreign Service slot in violation of their regulations. We have received notice from AID that they have voided the assignment, thus apparently mooting our case. We are seeking assurances that they will not make such improper assignments in the future.

The FS-1 “Cohort Grievance.” AFSA intervened in the class grievance against the Department of State which is currently before the Grievance Board. AFSA supports the employees’ charge that they were misled concerning their opportunities for promotion and that the department violated the Foreign Service Act of 1980 in the way it implemented the senior threshold window. All parties have filed motions, cross-motions, and two rounds of briefs, and we participated in oral argument on October 18.

Language Incentive and Special Allowances. As reported last year, we continue to await the decision of the Foreign Service Labor Relations Board in our negotiability dispute with the department over AFSA’s proposals to retain incentive overtime hours. Pending a ruling by the FSLR Board, the department has retained these employee benefits.

D.C. Income Tax Lawsuit. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia upheld the constitutionality of the legislation that precludes Foreign Service officers from availing themselves of the long-standing exemption from D.C. income taxation for officers residing in the District but domiciled in another state. The ultimate of legislative relief is not promising, but House Subcommittee Chairman Dymally has at least promised to review the issue with us again and make another effort this year.

Psychological Testing. The department proposed a psychological testing program for Foreign Service personnel assigned to Eastern Bloc countries. The program was to involve oral and written psychological tests administered by M/MED. All Foreign Service employees, their spouses, and any adult dependents were to be tested. AFSA filed charges against the department opposing its implementation of the program and actively lobbied Congress to oppose the program. The department withdrew the proposed program in its entirety.

Post-employment Restrictions. AFSA actively opposed a bill barring all individuals leaving government service from employment with any international organization of which the U.S. is a member for a period of eighteen months. In communications with members of Congress and congressional staffs, AFSA argued that the proposed legislation was counter-productive and stressed the importance of staffing international organizations with people who have developed a sensitivity to U.S. foreign policy objectives. The bill was defeated.

Accountability Review Boards. AFSA charged the department with violating our bargaining rights in convening Accountability Review Boards without proper regulatory guidance. By law, these boards are established to investigate incidents involving injury, loss of life, or destruction of property, including making determinations as to possible breaches of duty on the part of employees. We sought to negotiate formalized regulations governing the operation of these boards. Our charge brought the department to the bargaining table, where we were able to negotiate procedural safeguards for affected employees.

Tandem Couples. AFSA intervened in the grievance of a tandem couple member who was denied shipment of household effects and consumables allowance upon assignment to post. AFSA disputed the department’s position that a member of a tandem couple who travels to post on her spouse’s orders on leave without pay is not entitled to her own shipment of household effects or consumables unless she enters a funded position within 60 days of arrival at post. AFSA and the employee reached a settlement agreement with the department which provides that a tandem employee on leave without pay who is paneled into a funded position will be issued travel orders authorizing appropriate allowances, as long as the position is to be held for more than 12 months.

Revocation of Security Clearances. An increasing number of employees have been notified of the proposed revocation or reduction of their security clearances on the grounds that their security eligibility is not “clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.” AFSA has attempted to ensure that the agency’s regulations are scrupulously followed and that suspension of an employee’s security clearance, under which employees have relatively few rights, is not used as an end run around other forms of disciplinary or personnel action, in which employees would be afforded procedural due process rights.

Polygraph Testing. AFSA negotiated regulations with the department on its polygraph testing program. The program will have an extremely limited scope that would currently include no more than 13 department employees. The regulations authorize polygraph testing under only three specific circumstances, and then not until approval has been granted in each instance at high levels of the department and the employee volunteers to take the exam. The regulations further provide safeguards for the use of the exam’s results.

Proposed Executive Order on Security Clearances. AFSA presented testimony to the House Civil Service Subcommittee opposing a proposed Executive Order that would eliminate the appeals mechanism for individuals denied an initial security clearance or a clearance upgrade. AFSA emphasized our commitment to national security concerns and the imposition of all reasonable measures aimed at safeguarding classified information, balanced against the preservation of individual rights. In response to the overwhelming opposition to the proposed order, the subcommittee sought President Bush’s assurance that the proposed order would not be issued. The administration has not pursued its proposal.

Disciplinary Regulations. The foreign affairs agencies initiated negotiations on proposed sweeping revisions to agency regulations governing disciplinary action. The agencies are attempting to radically expand the grounds on which employees may be subjected to disciplinary action and to limit employees’ procedural rights throughout the disciplinary
process. AFSA is acting to ensure that employees’ rights are not eroded.

In addition to these enumerated activities, the Legal Department devotes its resources to representing individual employees in matters requiring legal action, including investigation by the Bureau of Diplomatic Security and the AID and State Inspector Generals, and providing employees with information relating to federal and state tax issues.

**Member Services**

Some of you may already have become acquainted with the newest additions to AFSA’s Member Services Department: Amy MacEachin and Catherine Schmitz, both of whom began as Member Services Representatives this past summer. Although much of our work continues to focus on the problems of individual employees, a number of issues have arisen over the past year of interest to the membership at large.

**Grievances:** AFSA’s grievance caseload over the past twelve months has remained at levels comparable to the previous year. We represented employees in approximately 200 complaints, grievances, and settlements before the foreign affairs agencies and the Foreign Service Grievance Board. One welcome trend has been an increased willingness by the State Department to initiate settlement discussions, or to respond to settlement proposals made by the grievant. Whenever possible, AFSA encourages such informal settlements, which spare employees the time and effort of the lengthy grievance process. Another positive note: the Grievance Board has almost completed a much-needed project which will establish an indexing system covering all past grievances and related court decisions.

On the down side, the concept of “prescriptive relief”—an integral component of the Foreign Service grievance system—has been attacked from a number of directions in the past year. Prescriptive relief provides a stay of action for employees who are grieving a matter which is pending before the agency or Grievance Board. Such relief is typically granted to employees who are being involuntarily separated from the Service, or to those subject to wrongful disciplinary action or improper garnishment of wages. This stay of action is critical for members of the Foreign Service, particularly in cases of involuntary separation. Eliminating prescriptive relief in a rank-in-person system makes it virtually impossible to make a successful grievant whole again, and wreaks havoc on the lives of employees (and their families) posted overseas.

In consultations with congressmen and staff, AFSA actively opposed Thomas Commission proposals to drastically curtail prescriptive relief and weaken the grievance process in other respects. Nevertheless, the State Department has since decided to take a harder line in utilizing its authority to grant prescriptive relief, particularly with respect to untenured employees. In addition to reducing the percentage of employees to whom it grants prescriptive relief, the department has argued, based on a 1983 U.S. District Court decision, that the Board is not empowered to grant prescriptive relief to any untenured employees. AFSA, while acknowledging that untenured employees are subject to stricter standards with respect to prescriptive relief, has maintained that there are cases in which the Board has the authority to grant such relief. The Grievance Board, in a recent decision, concurred with this view, finding that untenured employees scheduled to leave the Service simply because their limited appointments have expired—as opposed to individuals whose appointments have been terminated by the department under Section 611 of the Foreign Service Act—may be granted prescriptive relief by the Board.

**Group Grievances**: Earlier this year, the Grievance Board decided in favor of a group of employees who had suffered financial hardship while posted overseas due to the department’s failure to adjust their cost of living allowance (COLA) during the 1987 holiday season. The Board determined that the grievants, who had been assisted by AFSA, were entitled to the amount they had lost during the period in which the department had failed to adjust the COLA.

Last year’s report noted that AFSA had assisted a number of Diplomatic Security (DS) agents who had filed grievances arguing that their entry-level salaries had been set in violation of applicable laws and regulations. In response to one of these grievances, the Grievance Board ordered the department to issue a new Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) under which the salaries of all DS employees appointed between August 1, 1985 and June 1, 1988 were to be reevaluated.

Concerns about the equitability of the new SOP and its application prompted a number of DS employees to file a group grievance, which both the department and the Grievance Board found lacking in merit.

**Mission Review Panels**: The State Department has recently enacted a new policy that authorizes the placement of negative comments in the personnel files of review panel chairpersons. These panels are designed to ensure that employee evaluation reports are prepared in accordance with department regulations. AFSA conducted prolonged negotiations with management on this issue, but the department decided to unilaterally implement its own proposal before an agreement could be reached. AFSA subsequently filed an institutional grievance charging the department with negotiating in bad faith, in violation of both the law and our collective bargaining agreement. The grievance was denied at the agency level, but is currently on appeal to the Grievance Board.

**Payroll Problems**: AFSA continues to come across a large number of problems stemming from the department’s Office of the Comptroller (M/COMP). The most common issues are delays in travel voucher reimbursements and the unwarranted garnishment of employee paychecks. M/COMP claims to be cleaning up accounts dating back to 1980, which will hopefully cut down on the percentage of problems resulting from inaccurate record-keeping. In the meantime, AFSA continues to troubleshoot for employees—chasing down delayed checks, attempting to cut through bureaucratic red tape, arranging meetings with M/COMP, etc.

In a related development, information contained in M/COMP’S “Travel Advance Status Report,” released to the public through a Freedom of Information Act request, has been used by a group called “State Department Watch” to harass Foreign Service employees. The information contained
in these reports was seriously outdated and largely inaccurate. As a result, many individuals have received cards demanding payment to square “delinquent” travel accounts which were never in fact delinquent. In addition to investigating whether the department’s release of this information entails a Privacy Act violation, AFSA is pressing management to step up its efforts to improve the accuracy of M/COMP’s record-keeping.

Secretarial Issues: Following a March seminar sponsored by AFSA on the “Changing Role of the Foreign Service Secretary,” the association formed a subcommittee to focus exclusively on secretarial issues. After obtaining considerable input from the field, reviewing management efforts to address the problems affecting Foreign Service secretaries, and initiating discussions with those management officials most directly involved in these efforts, the subcommittee developed a set of goals and a plan of action for achieving them. One element of this plan was a formal proposal which has since been presented to management. The proposal—to which management has not yet provided a definitive response—focuses on the following issues: salaries and other forms of compensation; job titles and responsibilities; training and recruitment; assignments; and career development.

Pouch Service: Several changes over the past year have improved the quality of overseas pouch service. Unclassified mail will soon be sorted automatically in a new mail facility outside of Main State; only classified mail will continue to be handled in the department. In addition, the post office has assigned a zip-code-plus-four number to each overseas post, allowing for greater accuracy in sorting mail and a resulting reduction in delivery time. A computerized label-reading program has also been introduced which should further reduce sorting time. AFSA continues to press management for additional improvements in pouch service, and frequently assists employees who are experiencing post-specific delivery problems.

Chris Bazar, Director of Member Services

Professional Issues

Luncheon Speakers. The speaker luncheons outgrew the library over the past year and brought AFSA members and friends many memorable moments. Chase Untermeyer, the president’s personnel director, defended the administration’s political choices for ambassadorships before a full house in the Foreign Service Club. The press covered this event, an innovation which we will repeat in the future as appropriate.

Departing director general of the Foreign Service George Vest shared his view of the future of the Service. Elliot Richardson spoke on the rewards and frustrations of the Foreign Service from his years of experience working with it, and in the light of the recent report on the public service of the Volcker Commission. Ambassador Bremer and his study group colleagues discussed the conclusions of their report on Foreign Service generalists, and we will schedule future speakers to examine the recommendations of the Bremer group and the Thomas Commission as AFSA takes an active role in reform efforts.

Other meetings discussed the changing role of secretaries, an area in which AFSA is encouraging the department to take bolder steps, and suggestions for reform of our aid programs, including the structure of AID.

A bit of spice was added to the series September 8 when peppy British Member of Parliament Edwina Currie described the British experience of women in politics. Those of you fortunate to attend these luncheons can read about them in AFSA News.

AFSA Awards. The awards were conferred on Foreign Service Day (May 5) in the Dean Acheson Auditorium by members of the Herter, Rivkin, and Harriman families, who have endowed these awards. Ambassador Bruce Laingen, chairman of the AFSA awards committee, read the names of the winners of the Sinclaire Awards for outstanding achievement in hard language study, and a certificate of appreciation was presented to retiring dean of the FSI School of Language Studies Harry Thayer for his support of the Sinclaire Awards program. Thereafter Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger spoke at a luncheon in the Foreign Service Club, honoring the winners. (Nominations for the 1990 awards are due January 31.)

Memorial Plaque. Secretary Baker read a message from President Bush at a solemn ceremony before the AFSA Memorial Plaque on Foreign Service Day honoring those who have lost their lives under heroic or other inspirational circumstances while serving their country abroad under the direction of an ambassador. Six names—a tragically large number—were unveiled as the military color guard presented arms.

Foreign Service Day Brunch. AFSA also welcomed a full house of retirees to the Foreign Service Club for a brunch the day after Foreign Service Day, giving them an opportunity to discuss issues of special interest to retirees with the AFSA leadership and staff, and to meet old friends.

Foreign Service Day 1990. Next year will be the 25th anniversary of Foreign Service Day, and AFSA is working with the department and DACOR to make it a memorable occasion.

Public Employees Roundtable. The coordinator for professional issues is AFSA’s representative to this active coalition of public service associations, which has the mission of enhancing the image and effectiveness of the public service and attracting young people to careers in government.

AFSA’s retired constituency was the Catastrophic Health Care program. Thereafter Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger spoke at a luncheon in the Foreign Service Club, honoring the winners. (Nominations for the 1990 awards are due January 31.)

Retirement Interests

During 1989 the legislative issue dominating the attention of AFSA’s retired constituency was the Catastrophic Health Care expansion of the Medicare program. In particular, the opposition of our Medicare-eligible members was directed at the financing mechanism with its mandatory sliding-scale surtax calculated at 15 percent of one’s 1989 federal income tax, up to an individual maximum of $800 or $1,600 for a couple. Equally objectionable was the obligatory aspect of the catastrophic care coverage, since virtually all Foreign Service retirees already had this protection under their Federal...
Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) policy.

In coalition with a number of public and private employee/retiree organizations, AFSA urged the enactment of legislation which would suspend both the surtax and the introduction of all additional catastrophic care benefits for a year while Congress took a second look at the program. The reaction from the Medicare-eligible population as a whole was so vigorous, however, that in September the House voted to repeal the entire catastrophic care bill while the Senate voted 99-0 to repeal the surtax and delete some of the more costly provisions in the program. At this writing the conflicting House and Senate bills have not yet gone to conference, but it appears likely that at year’s end only a few provisions of the original catastrophic care measure will still be in effect.

There is a general consensus that the FEHB program, now almost 30 years old, is due for a thorough overhaul. AFSA has participated in a number of preliminary hearings looking forward to a complete realignment of the program, and it appears that a number of bills will be introduced in the second session of the 101st Congress in 1990, looking forward to the inauguration of a revised FEHB structure in 1991.

AFSA continues to participate regularly in the department’s pre-retirement seminars while servicing an increasing number of individual requests for advice and assistance on retirement matters from AFSA members.

Robert Beers, Congressional Liaison

AFSA Scholarship Programs

Twenty bright, young Foreign Service dependents received AFSA/AAFSW Merit Awards in the spring of 1989. These awards are given to high school seniors from schools in the United States and abroad in recognition of their outstanding academic records, their leadership qualities, and their extracurricular activities.

This year the awards were raised to $750, and were in honor of Dawn Cuthell, who administered the scholarship programs from 1980-88. The recipients were honored on Foreign Service Day in May when Director General Edward J. Perkins presented a check and certificate to twin sisters Christine and Jennifer Johnson, who represented all the winners. There were also awards of $100 each for honorable mention winners.

The Merit Awards, created by AFSA and the Association of American Foreign Service Women (AAFSW) in 1976, are determined by volunteer review panels from AAFSW, AID, State, USIA, and members of the retired Foreign Service community. Of the 20 winners, 15 graduated from high schools in the United States and five from schools in France, Austria, Italy, the Philippines, and the Dominican Republic. Fourteen winners were dependents of Foreign Service personnel from the State Department, three from AID, two from USIA, and one from the Department of Agriculture. Of the $16,200 distributed in Merit Awards, equal amounts were contributed by AAFSW and AFSA. The Financial Aid scholarships, first offered by AFSA in 1927, are for full-time undergraduate study in U.S. colleges and universities and are determined solely on need. In academic year 1988-89, $101,750 was awarded to 85 dependent children of career Foreign Service personnel. Thirty-five percent of these funds were contributed by the AAFSW. These grants range from $200 to $2,000, depending on need and the amount allowed by individual schools. More than 90 percent of the AFSA scholarship funds distributed in 1988-89 were used for these financial aid grants.

Contributions to the AFSA Scholarship Programs come as memorial donations, contributions with dues, bequests, royalties, and honoraria. The largest donation has come from the AAFSW BOOKFAIR receipts. During this reporting period, Ambassador Jack W. Lydman was chairman of the AFSA Committee on Education. Members included Charles Johnson, AID; Janet Biggs, AAFSW; David Jones, State; David W. Smith, State; and William J. Weinhold, USIA.

Cristin Springet, Scholarship Programs Administrator

Membership Department

AFSA membership has increased steadily over the past year. We have seen a particularly gratifying increase among retirees, due in part to the retiree drive held in September. Currently membership stands as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AID</td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIA</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFSA has instituted two new categories of membership, International and Embassy Associates. International membership will be offered to organizations operating internationally who wish to develop greater ties with the Foreign Service. The Embassy Associates program will be offered to local area embassies wishing to participate in AFSA symposia and selected speaker luncheons. Both programs are designed to increase our outreach to other institutions interested in foreign affairs.

The membership department underwent a brief period of staff transition during the summer months when Janet Schoumacher, formerly a member services representative, became the new membership coordinator. Lisa Schroeder, a student at George Washington University, is currently the membership assistant.

In July, the active and retiree categories of membership voted overwhelmingly to increase membership dues. The increase was the first in five years, and in most categories reflected smaller rises than the consumer-price index.

If you’re not already a member of AFSA, please join us! If you are a member, become more involved in AFSA activities. We value all sections of our membership and need to hear from you.

Janet L. Schoumacher, Membership Coordinator
Communications Department

AFSA Communications produces the FOREIGN SERVICE JOURNAL, which goes to all members, a small number of associate members and subscribers, journalists who request it, and Congress.

The JOURNAL has consistently been tasked with two publishing goals. First, it must give the AFSA membership a sense that it is reflecting the interests and addressing the concerns of the Foreign Service of the United States. Second, it should be relevant to the American public at large, both as a source on what Foreign Service employees are thinking and doing and as a forum for discussion of U.S. foreign relations in general.

To reach these goals in 1989 depended, as in years past, on the active participation of the JOURNAL’s readership, who have contributed opinions and views in the form of letters, book reviews, issue-oriented articles, and fiction and non-fiction stories of Foreign Service life. Under the oversight of the Editorial Board, the JOURNAL’s contents have reflected the tremendous range of topics engaging the Foreign Service community, both active and retired.

Fiscally, the JOURNAL is working to minimize its burden on AFSA resources, with advertising revenues above expectations and expenses under budget to date.

Julia T. Schieken joined the JOURNAL as assistant editor/advertising manager in August; she is motivated to serve our advertisers and to obtain attractive and colorful advertising. Nancy Johnson was promoted to managing editor in January, and she serves as the department’s pivot on getting the magazine from double-spaced typed pages to printed product. Ann Luppi, editor, was fortunate to join AFSA immediately following the conduct of the 1988 reader survey; readers’ comments and overall statistics continue to serve as clear guidelines on what readers want from the JOURNAL. Under the direction of the Editorial Board and the overall guidance of the AFSA Governing Board, and, most importantly, with the continuing input and contributions of JOURNAL readers, there are many interesting editions ahead.

Ann Luppi, Director of Communications

Insurance Programs

Oversight of AFSA’s Group insurance programs has been the responsibility of a Board of Trustees established for that purpose by the Governing Board in 1981. The Trustees determine the scope of the program and contract with insurance companies or administrators as necessary to provide viable and beneficial group insurance plans for our members.

Of particular interest this year is a new plan to provide disability income insurance to members. By joining a large “insurance trust,” AFSA is able to offer this coverage at much lower rates than would otherwise be possible. We are hoping that a substantial number of members will join this program during the charter enrollment period ending December 31, 1989.

During the past year three other AFSA-sponsored programs were providing security and more tangible benefits for many members. Under the personal insurance plan, covering personal property and legal liability for members serving abroad, claims paid during the first nine months of this year exceeded $150,000. Our plan covering accidental death and dismemberment has paid more than $500,000 in claims since 1983, and the in-hospital income plan during the same period has paid over $70,000.

For the future, the trustees are continuing the search for insurance to cover the cost of long-term nursing home and/or custodial care, whether in institutions or one’s own home. Comments and suggestions from members are always welcome.

Hugh W. Wolff
Chairman, Board of Trustees for Insurance Programs

(Note: The AID Standing Committee report is in the November (AFSA News).)
### Combined Balance Sheet

#### December 31, 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>Scholarship and AFSA Funds</th>
<th>AFSA</th>
<th>AFSA Funds</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 50,506</td>
<td>$ 260,803</td>
<td>$ 311,309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>22,352</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22,352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and other net interfund receivable (payable)</td>
<td>22,352</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22,352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest and dividends</td>
<td>10,279</td>
<td>10,279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,279</td>
<td>10,279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>$ 80,837</td>
<td>$ 270,293</td>
<td>$ 351,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketable securities, at cost which approximate market value</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>969,019</td>
<td>969,019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, building and equipment, net of accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>418,003</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>419,203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate receivable (payable), less current portion</td>
<td>(18,032)</td>
<td>18,032</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>$480,808</td>
<td>$1,258,544</td>
<td>$1,739,352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES | | | |
| **Current liabilities:** | | | |
| Accounts payable | $ 8,353 | $ 32 | $ 8,385 |
| Accrued salaries and vacation payable | 21,908 | 577 | 22,485 |
| Other accrued liabilities | 7,958 | — | 7,958 |
| Current portion of mortgage payable | 18,446 | — | 18,446 |
| Deferred revenue | 171,104 | — | 171,104 |
| Mortgage payable, less current portion | 48,276 | — | 48,276 |
| **Total liabilities** | 227,769 | 609 | 228,378 |
| Commitments | | | |
| **Fund balances:** | | | |
| Unrestricted | 204,763 | 288,916 | 493,679 |
| Endowment | — | 195,271 | 195,271 |
| Quasi-endowment | — | 773,748 | 773,748 |
| **Total liabilities** | 204,763 | 1,257,935 | 1,462,698 |
| **Fund balances** | $480,808 | $1,258,544 | $1,739,352 |
## COMBINED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS
for the eighteen months ended December 31, 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scholarship AFSA</th>
<th>AFSA Funds</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash flows from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses over public</td>
<td>(32,430)</td>
<td>(47,096)</td>
<td>(79,526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support and revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to reconcile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expenses over public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support and revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to net cash provided by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>59,224</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>59,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on termination of</td>
<td>11,323</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on sale of securities:</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,999</td>
<td>9,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in assets and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liabilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receivables</td>
<td>(13,713)</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>(12,196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in prepaid</td>
<td>15,612</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affiliate receivables</td>
<td>(7,402)</td>
<td>7,402</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in accounts</td>
<td>(1,883)</td>
<td>(3,633)</td>
<td>(5,516)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>payable and accrued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in deferred</td>
<td>(14,045)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>(29,045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total adjustments</td>
<td>49,116</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>49,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash provided (used)</td>
<td>16,666</td>
<td>(46,541)</td>
<td>(29,855)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by operating activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash flows from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investing activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of equipment</td>
<td>(58,347)</td>
<td>(1,470)</td>
<td>(57,817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash used by</td>
<td>(56,347)</td>
<td>(1,470)</td>
<td>(57,817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investing activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash flows from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financing activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment on debt</td>
<td>(26,007)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(26,007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sale of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of investments</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,511,669</td>
<td>1,511,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,222,147)</td>
<td>(1,222,147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used by financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td>(27,007)</td>
<td>289,622</td>
<td>263,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net increase (decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in cash and cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equivalents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leasing</td>
<td>(65,668)</td>
<td>241,511</td>
<td>175,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>116,174</td>
<td>19,292</td>
<td>135,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at beginning of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 50,506</td>
<td>$ 260,903</td>
<td>$ 311,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at end of the period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental disclosure of cash flow information:
Cash paid during the period for interest: $8,585

## COMBINED STATEMENTS OF SUPPORT, REVENUE,
EXPENSES AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES
for the eighteen months ended December 31, 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scholarship AFSA</th>
<th>AFSA Funds</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public support and</td>
<td>$ 68,488</td>
<td>$ 117,206</td>
<td>$ 185,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues</td>
<td>952,233</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>952,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising sales</td>
<td>206,466</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>206,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>137,558</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>137,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club fees</td>
<td>8,677</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dividends and interest</td>
<td>4,454</td>
<td>126,605</td>
<td>131,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net loss on sale of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investments</td>
<td>(9,999)</td>
<td>(9,999)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>18,077</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>20,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>1,327,465</td>
<td>118,945</td>
<td>1,446,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total public support and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenue</td>
<td>1,395,953</td>
<td>236,151</td>
<td>1,632,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>415,490</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>415,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor relations</td>
<td>372,761</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>372,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative action</td>
<td>95,681</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>95,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>54,015</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>54,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>223,299</td>
<td>223,299</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSA Fund</td>
<td>47,232</td>
<td>47,232</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total program services</td>
<td>938,147</td>
<td>270,521</td>
<td>1,208,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and general</td>
<td>490,236</td>
<td>12,726</td>
<td>502,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>1,428,383</td>
<td>293,247</td>
<td>1,711,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses over public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support and revenue</td>
<td>(32,430)</td>
<td>(47,096)</td>
<td>(79,526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances, beginning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the period</td>
<td>237,193</td>
<td>1,305,031</td>
<td>1,542,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances, end of</td>
<td>$ 204,763</td>
<td>$ 1,257,935</td>
<td>$ 1,462,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AFSA’s Bicentennial Conference

What economic compass will guide us through our next century? If you think you know the answer, take yourself back to 1789 or even to 1889 and ask if you could have predicted America’s current strengths and weaknesses on the world economic scene.

Some may not recall why the United States has a “State” Department, rather than a Foreign Affairs Department. There was so little foreign business 200 years ago that our first Secretary (Jefferson) did not report to his office in New York City until six months after his nomination, and then only reluctantly. Congress decided to give our agency additional “state” duties (since reassigned), such as managing the mint and taking the census.

America’s diplomatic agents soon found a real mission abroad, however. Through the ensuing century they were called on more and more to protect and promote American trade in Europe, Latin America, and eventually Asia. Negotiations focused on treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation. Mahan’s strategy to seek coaling stations worldwide buttressed freedom of the seas for American traders. By 1890, our historian tells us, our consular service had 760 consulates, commercial agencies, and consular agencies—far more than we have today, by any count.

What has happened since to our diplomatic mission in support of trade? A simple answer is that it has been overwhelmed in the host of other functions that our Embassies today have to perform. The Foreign Commercial Service of the Department of Commerce was created ten years ago largely because State, which had managed the account for the previous 40 years, was accused of subordinating commercial matters to other, more glamorous business.

Neglecting trade for more glamorous business is a luxury we can no longer afford, if indeed we ever could. What can we do about it? Our November 30 agenda brings business leaders together with Foreign Service practitioners to attempt to find some of the answers.

In addition to an introduction by the vice president and luncheon statements by Secretary Clayton Yeutter and Deputy Secretary Lawrence Eagleburger, we plan to cover trade challenges in developing, developed, and Communist countries in three parallel panels in the morning. Similarly, parallel panels in the afternoon will address aspects of the U.S. government response. Panel chairmen include Robert Hormats, Frank Carlucci, Victor Palmieri, Harald Malmgren, and C. Fred Bergsten. Senior U.S. government economic policy officials, including Under Secretary Richard McCormack, also plan to take part. The conference will conclude with a plenary presentation on business-government collaboration and an Eighth Floor reception.

AFSA testifies at congressional hearings

Two hearings on the Bremer and Thomas reports on the Foreign Service personnel system were held in October by the International Operations Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, chaired by Representative Dymally (D-CA), and the Civil Service Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee, chaired by Representative Sikorski (D-MN). Under secretary Ivan Selin, Director General Edward Perkins, AFSA President Ted Wilkinson, Ambassador Hume Horan of the Bremer Group, and Graeme Bannerman of the Thomas Commission were among the witnesses. The most significant aspects of the testimony and the congressional questioning were the following points:

- There is strong congressional concern that the department and the Foreign Service should be doing more, and faster, to make the Service fully representative of the American people. A June GAO report, starkly titled, “Minorities and Women are Underrepresented in the Foreign Service,” was frequently cited in congressmen’s questions. There was no partisan division on this issue; the concern, and the admonitions, were strong on both sides of the House. Mr. Selin pointed out that promotion rates for minorities and women were not significantly different from those for white males, but he acknowledged the GAO’s finding that minorities had a tougher time at tenure than whites. (Women, however, were tenured at higher
rates than men.) He and Ambassador Perkins told the subcommittee that this was only one consequence of the department’s failure to do a better job of recruiting, and they promised both a faster recruiting process—appointment in six or seven months instead of the years it is now taking us—and one better targeted on outstanding minority and women candidates. AFSA supported them on both counts. We also welcomed Mr. Selin’s announcement that the department had changed its policy that the blind were by definition unqualified for the Foreign Service and had just offered appointment to a blind applicant who had passed both the written and oral exams.

* There appeared to be little sentiment for changing the Foreign Service Act at this time. Mr. Bannerman was the only witness to say new legislation was needed (as the Thomas Commission had recommended). The department’s and AFSA’s witnesses said the reforms that were needed could be made without changing the Act. Representative Sikorski volunteered the statement that the legislative history of the Act provided a sound basis for including senior FSOs within the bargaining units for the foreign affairs agencies, rather than severing seniors from AFSA’s bargaining functions, as Thomas had recommended. In order to make the 1980 Act work better, Ambassador Perkins also hopes to expedite open assignments by making ambassador and DCM assignments at the outset and “reemphasizing the importance of overseas service by requiring that each officer serve an oversees tour at each grade level.”

* Mr. Selin announced that the department had decided to make the cone system more flexible, first by not requiring new officers to select a cone at the time of appointment, but instead at tenure; and second by creating a new, fifth cone for “multifunctional” officers, which he expected more and more officers to move into. Again, AFSA supported both proposals. Mr. Selin said he wanted to delay any more sweeping reform of the cone system until completion of the functional analysis of the jobs and skills needed by the Service, an analysis recommended by both Thomas and Bremer and already underway.

* Little attention was paid, outside of AFSA’s own testimony, to the problems of the junior and senior thresholds or the selection out of highly qualified officers at the peak of their skills. Nor was anything said by anyone other than AFSA in support of the recommendation of both study groups that the role of central Personnel, in both career development and counseling and in assignments, must be strengthened. Excerpts from Ted Wilkinson’s testimony for AFSA are printed on page 74.

### AFSA calls for ratification of Montreal Protocols

AFSA President Ted Wilkinson has written to Senate Foreign Relations Chairman Pell to express support for the as yet unratified 1975 Montreal Protocols to the the Warsaw Convention, urge hearings, and request to testify. The Montreal Protocols and a related compensation plan would greatly increase the compensation paid in case of the injury or death of an international airline passenger, and speed up payment by reducing the scope for uncertain and time-consuming litigation.

### State Department yields to AFSA lawsuit

On October 2, the department quietly handed over to AFSA 51 “certificates of competence” of the administration’s nominees for U.S. ambassadorships. AFSA had filed suit in the U.S. district court on September 8 to obtain copies of the papers, which the department had refused to provide on grounds that they were confidential.

AFSA stated at the initiation of the lawsuit that it believed the department was abusing the classification of “confidential” to avoid embarrassment because many of the “certificates” demonstrated only too clearly that the nominees lack qualifications for the ambassadorial jobs. The certificates handed over to AFSA on Monday had the word “declassified” punched through the top and bottom of each sheet. After reviewing the certificates, AFSA President Ted Wilkinson observed that the department was understandably embarrassed by having the certificates opened to the public. He noted that some certificates contain explicit references to the nominees’ campaign contributions, although the Foreign Service Act states that money contributions should not be a criterion for ambassadorships.

Others contain exaggerated assertions about the candidates’ qualifications to serve as envoys, with little background evidence to support such claims. Several fall back vaguely on “loyalty” as a criterion for the appointments.

Among numerous errors in the carelessly prepared certificates is the statement that the nominee for Guatemala is “an exceptional candidate for ambassador to Venezuela.”

Release of the certificates occurred just before the Senate voted 79 to 20 to confirm Mr. Zappala as ambassador to Spain, despite the observations by Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD) and others that Mr. Zappala’s qualifications as shown in the certificates were not consistent with requirements in the Foreign Service Act of 1980 for background knowledge of the host country.

Despite delivery of the certificates, AFSA continued to pursue its suit to ensure that proper procedures were established to preclude suppression of this improperly classified information in the future. AFSA has reached an agreement with the department in which the department agrees to release to AFSA certificates generated in the future.
State Standing Committee

George Jones, State Vice President

When I first ventured into a U.S. supermarket this summer after seven years overseas, I wanted to know, “Paper or plastic?” For one wild moment I thought Visa had come to the grocery stores, and I was being asked whether I wanted to pay with a credit card or with the funny green stuff I was learning to carry around again. The checker’s impatience eventually straightened me out. When I got home, of course, my wife told me I had given the wrong answer.

My (as of this writing) first two weeks in AFSA have been a somewhat similar experience. Chuck Schmitz, whose capabilities as a Foreign Service officer I have admired for years, is also a tough act to follow as State vice president. Fortunately, we have had not only a brief overlap, but Chuck’s energy and experience remain available to AFSA as a Governing Board member and as our new vice president for the retired constituency.

I do bring to the job a strong belief in AFSA, in both its manifestations as a professional organization and as a bargaining agent, and in the Foreign Service. In my experience, no country’s diplomatic service comes close to equaling our knowledge, our skills, and our professionalism. Unfortunately, there are a number who exceed us in prestige within their own country and government, and in the benefits, status, and protection from partisan politics that flow from that prestige. As long as the impression remains widespread that the Service is just a job—a job that just about anybody can do, with good will and good intentions—the limited benefits AFSA and the department have won for the Service over the years will be in danger, we will have difficulty recruiting the best of our young people, and we will continue to fill too many of our posts with less than our best. “Career or non-career, experienced or inexperienced” are not casual choices, like paper or plastic. They are choices that affect our national prestige and our national security.

Most of my time in these first two weeks has been devoted to preparing for and attending the two House subcommittee hearings on the Bremer and Thomas reports. Although virtually everything Under Secretary Selin and Director General Perkins had to say was positive, and supported by AFSA President Ted Wilkinson when he appeared before the subcommittees, I was struck by the fact that so little attention was paid, outside of AFSA’s testimony, to the problems of the junior and senior thresholds or the selection out of highly qualified mid- and senior-level officers at the peak of their skills. Nor was anything other than the vaguest lip service paid by anyone other than Ted in support of the recommendation that the role of Central Personnel, in both career development and counseling and in assignments, be strengthened.

This last, in my view, is the single most important reform the Service needs. Central Personnel has virtually ceased to function. Assignments are not made; they are the product of negotiation or happenstance. Careers are not planned; they are lucked into (or out of). Desperately needed specialists are not given the assurance of stable careers, nor are generalists. Secretaries are not adequately paid, or trained, or listened to. Training for all of us, including the most basic of all, language training, has actually decreased 17 percent since FY 1983. The department’s priorities are out of whack. We in AFSA hope to contribute to getting them back on track.

Please let me hear your views, by telegram, letter, or visit, when you’re next in Washington. We’re in Room 3644 N.S., and the State Standing Committee meets every Monday at 12:30. Visitors are more than welcome. I look forward to working with you and for you.

AFSA annual membership meeting

December 7, 1989 4:45 pm
Foreign Service Club
Wine and cheese
Cash bar available

Departing from past practice, we plan to have our annual meeting in the AFSA building in the late afternoon. Share some wine and cheese and learn what AFSA has been doing before and since the 1989 elections and change of officers. AFSA’s Governing Board members and staff will report briefly to you and answer questions. A cash bar will remain open afterwards.

Under AFSA bylaws, members may propose and vote on motions, and recommend a course of action to the Board. Proposed agenda items must be received by AFSA no later than December 1, 1989. To help us in making arrangements, please let us know in advance at 647-8160 if you plan to attend.

Court date scheduled

The U.S. District Court of Appeals has scheduled oral argument for January 1990 in AFSA’s lawsuit contesting the elimination of the AFSPA Overseas Option. AFSA sued the State Department for giving misleading information and denying AFSA the opportunity to negotiate the revocation of its subsidy to the American Foreign Service Protective Association, which resulted in the termination of Overseas Option health insurance. On a parallel track, AFSA challenged the department’s action administratively, filing an unfair labor practice charge. The Foreign Service Labor Relations Board made the initial decision not to prosecute the charge, and we appealed that decision to the agency’s general counsel. The general counsel ordered that the case be pursued, and we await a trial date.
Unqualified ambassadors: AFSA's lessons learned

In early October, by a vote of 79 to 20, the Senate voted to confirm Joseph Zappala as U.S. ambassador to Spain. The vote was not really about Mr. Zappala or Spain; it was about maintaining the last vestige of a 19th century spoils system, a system that parasitizes and weakens the U.S. Foreign Service. In this vote, the spoils system won.

In the Senate, opposition to Mr. Zappala's candidacy was led by Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD). Senator Sarbanes said that, after voting for a number of candidates that he considered not up to snuff last spring, he decided that he “just couldn’t take it anymore.”

What the senator couldn’t take anymore was being asked repeatedly to advise and consent to the appointments of people carrying almost none of the qualifications to be ambassador “extraordinary and plenipotentiary” of the world’s most important country, and absolutely none of the qualifications described in the Foreign Service Act. Although several candidates were available to be test cases in that they had made major contributions to political campaigns and had had no previous involvement in international relations, government service, or the country to which they would be assigned, Mr. Zappala stood out because of the importance of Spain to the United States, because the five most recent U.S. ambassadors there had been career Foreign Service officers, and because Mr. Zappala spoke no Spanish. The case appeared strong on the merits for advising the president not to appoint Mr. Zappala.

Appearances were deceiving. The 79 to 20 vote in the Senate to consent to Mr. Zappala’s nomination was not on the merits of his qualifications. To believe the public rhetoric of the debate is to believe that the “aye” voters were voting for the proposition that the president should be allowed unfettered discretion to appoint anyone he wants as U.S. ambassadors, and that political loyalty and the asserted ability to telephone the president personally (and get through to him) are more important qualifications than all else.

A part of this we bring on ourselves: If it were not for a talented, professional, and loyal Foreign Service, the ambassadorial spoils system would not exist today. No political contributor would want to be an ambassador without efficient subordinates to carry out instructions, to recommend intelligently, to interpret accurately, and to protect from inconvenience and embarrassment. Being an ambassador without capable minions is simply not much fun. But this is a digression—Foreign Service people are too professional and loyal to the Constitution not to do their best to serve anyone who becomes a U.S. ambassador.

The point of importance to the Foreign Service in the ambassadorial debate is that most of our senators do not care enough who our ambassadors are. One reason for their not caring is a compliment to the professionalism of the Foreign Service; the other is a basic insult to our life’s work.

The compliment is that the Foreign Service makes it possible for an absolute neophyte in diplomacy to appear to succeed. The Foreign Service provides the set, the plot, the lines, and the bit players. In short, the Foreign Service can make almost anyone look pretty good as a U.S. ambassador.

The insult is that many senators do not believe that traditional U.S. diplomacy makes much difference in the scheme of things. The belief has two separate roots: 1) diplomacy is marginal to our interests: power, and the willingness to use it, is the only force that counts in international relations; and 2) to the degree that we need to talk to foreign governments about anything important, we can do that capably over the telephone or through special envoys.

The lesson for the Foreign Service in the 1989 ambassadorial debate is this: The U.S. Foreign Service has a tricky, but serious, image problem. Our image is complimentary and insulting. We are coming across as both capable but irrelevant. It is painfully obvious that we need to work on how Americans perceive the Foreign Service. We need a muscular public relations program; not just for ourselves, for the country.

In the meantime, even though we may not win a single Senate floor vote, AFSA has no alternative to opposing ambassadorial nominations based only on political influence, whether purchased outright through campaign contributions or developed over time through political alliance. Indeed, regardless of the popularity of a given president, AFSA’s opposition to his unqualified ambassadorial nominees must continue to be energetic and forthright.

Impasse Foreseen

AFSA foresees the possibility of a bargaining impasse in connection with a number of the department’s proposed changes to its disciplinary regulations. Management is intent on broadening the grounds for indefinite suspension and increasing its latitude in determining probable cause for suspension and disciplinary action. In order to prevent the erosion of employee rights, AFSA has made several counterproposals. Because management has not been receptive to our proposals, a formal impasse may be declared in the near future. We will continue to advise our members on developments.
Department to survey housing in Washington

Since October 1988, FBO has been working on a new housing policy and space standards for U.S. government employees assigned overseas. According to FBO Director Richard Dertadian, the objective of the new policy is "to ensure equity for employees by providing housing comparable to what the employee would occupy in the Washington metropolitan area." A draft was completed in April which, according to FBO, would have resulted in a two percent increase in total overseas space requirements. The staff of the House Committee on Government Operations was briefed. Shortly thereafter, Chairman John Conyers, Jr. (D-Mich.) asked FBO to suspend further work on the proposed policy until the GAO and the OIG could review FBO's methodology. GAO concluded that the methods were subjective and therefore the new standards were not necessarily comparable to housing occupied by State personnel in Washington.

FBO, with senior management approval, decided in October to conduct a survey of such housing. Employees would be randomly selected from a list of all Foreign Service employees in Washington and all Civil Service employees of equivalent grades and skills. Those selected would receive a letter and a questionnaire, which have been shared with AFSA. Replying to the questionnaire would be voluntary. Data provided by those who reply would be used to help determine what is "comparable" housing to housing of employees of the same grade and family size assigned overseas. Some or all of the housing occupied by those participating in the survey would subsequently be measured (from the outside) by a commercial real estate appraisal firm.

Any new set of housing space standards obviously has major implications for Foreign Service employees. AFSA has asked management to inform us of the results of the housing survey and of any subsequent congressional consultations. We will keep members informed.

Professional Issues

British parliamentarian speaks at Ruben Memorial Lunch

by Richard S. Thompson, Coordinator for Professional Issues

Well-educated, articulate, and capable women are poised to enter the British Parliament in large numbers. This was the message of Edwina Currie, Member of Parliament, and in Britain the best-known Conservative politician in the UK after Prime Minister Thatcher. Currie spoke on September 8 at the Janet Ruben Memorial Luncheon held at the Foreign Service Club and co-sponsored by AFSA and the Women's Action Organizations of the Department of State, USIA and AID. AFSA President Ted Wilkinson introduced Mrs. Currie.

Currie urged that the best preparation for a political career is through active participation in local government or trade union politics, and through concern for all the voters not just women. She also noted that women would not get ahead unless they become more assertive and take on leadership roles. Paradoxically, she suggested that the success of Prime Minister Thatcher has led many women to conclude that a woman must have vastly superior ability to succeed in politics, and therefore she is not a role model but rather a confirmation of the problem.

Currie concluded that there is a new feminism now, "a well-educated, well-balanced, articulate and capable bunch who intend to have a good career, financial success, and a home too, and who won't be stopped by out-dated ideas." While predicting larger numbers of women in Parliament—there are currently 45 out of 600 members—Currie stated that it remained to be seen if they would be any better legislators than the men they replace.

Responding to questions, Currie dismissed the idea of a separate "women's party" in the United States, saying that because voters respond to issues, a party based on gender is "doomed to failure." On the issue of child care as a barrier in a woman's career, Currie noted that, as a Conservative, she believes market forces are what impel employers to find ways to provide child care and to permit women a "career break" to have children. She added that domestic help is easier to find in Britain than in the United States. It may be cruel, she asserted, but if a woman can't organize herself to devote time to politics, how can she claim the ability to solve the problems of 80,000 constituents?

AFSA sponsors an annual luncheon and other events in honor of the late Janet E. Ruben, a USIA Foreign Service officer and a member of the AFSA Governing Board.
New USIA representative

Omie Kerr, cultural coordinator for the East Asian Area Office in USIA, oversees official cultural and academic exchange programs between the United States and Asian/Pacific countries. She was a junior officer in Singapore and director of the binational center in Guatemala. In Washington, she also has been a watch officer in USIA’s Operation Center. Prior to joining USIA, Omie taught high school English for a number of years in the United States, Germany, and Mexico. She has a bachelor’s degree in political science from Miami University and a Master’s degree in Teaching English as a Second Language from the University of Arizona. She speaks Spanish and German.

Scholarships

1989 Financial Aid Awards

Cristin Springet, Scholarship Administrator

All Financial Aid grants are given as named scholarships, and this year the Association of American Foreign Service Women has named its awards for two outstanding volunteers: Mary Carson and Marguerite Anderson.

“Mary Carson has worked as a volunteer for BOOKFAIR almost since its inception 29 years ago. In 1988 she was asked to co-direct BOOKFAIR, and her calm efficiency in dealing with the myriad of detail was an essential asset and valued contribution.”

“Marguerite Anderson is a longtime AAFSW volunteer with a particular interest in young people. She was the prime mover in the creation of the now-traditional Holiday Ball. For many years she has been in charge of the foreign language section at BOOKFAIR. In addition, she assumed the task of BOOKFAIR co-director in 1988... a heavy burden carried with skill and good nature.” For the 1989/90 Financial Aid Awards, AAFSW contributed 57 percent of the total amount.

The other named scholarships come from perpetual and annual awards. The perpetual awards are established when donations total $10,000 or more; the annual awards are given when contributions exceed $1,000. For the 1989/90 academic year, the perpetual scholarships are in the following names:

Hope Rogers Bastek • BEIRUT
William Berton • Robert Woods Bliss
David K.E. Bruce • Betty Carp
Wilbur J. Carr • Selden Chapin
DACOR • Adolph Dubs
John Foster Dulles • Arthur B. Emmons
Howard Fyne • Oliver Bishop Harriman
Landreth M. Harrison • Harry A. Havens
Julius C. Holmes • Charles B. Homer
Robert E. & Florence L. Macauley
Marcia Martin Moore • PARIS
Jefferson Patterson
C. Montagu & Frances M. Pigott
Lowell C. Pinkerton
George & Helena Shultz
Ernest V. Siracusa
Jacq Bachman Siracusa • Clark W. Slade
Charles C. & Jane K. Stelle

We are pleased to announce that for the 1989/90 academic year, we have awarded 76 scholarships to dependents of Foreign Service personnel representing the five foreign affairs agencies. Twenty-seven states are represented with the highest number going to schools in Virginia. Fifty-seven percent are attending private schools and 43 percent, state colleges and universities. Sixteen, or 21 percent, of the students expect to pursue careers in foreign languages, international relations, or political science.
Congressional activities

Rick Weiss
Congressional Liaison

In October, congressional authorizing and appropriation committees met in conference to reach compromises and decisions on the Department of State and USIA budgets. While it appears that the foreign affairs agencies will be able to squeak by without having to threaten personnel cuts, the results of Congress's final action are a disappointing outcome to a budget year that began with a considerably more auspicious OMB request.

The Smith and Hollings appropriations subcommittee conference met October 19 and agreed to final funding levels. In the administrative salaries and expenses section, the conference agreement includes $1,741,239,000 and transfers of $51,152,000 from the FBO account to salaries and expenses. The conference agreement “also reflects $12 million in anticipated gains in foreign currency purchases above the rates in the budget estimates.”

The 1990 appropriation legislation provides $16,465,000 for continued modernization of the telecommunications network (DOSTIN), $5 million for purchase of computers at the Beltsville Information Management Center, $14 million for the second year construction costs of the foreign affairs training center, and $4 million for the continuation of the machine-readable visa project. Finally, the conference agreed to fund the Office of Security Oversight in the Inspector General's office at the $2,328,000 level.

The appropriations conference agreed to fund the following capital projects in the FBO account: $88,484,000 for construction of a new embassy in Bangkok; $11,400,000 for a new embassy in Papua, New Guinea; $20 million for security construction projects in other agencies; and $9,300,000 for security supervision expenses at ongoing construction projects.

According to State Department officials, the S&F account is very tight, but they believe they will be able to squeeze through 1990. The biggest budget loser in the appropriation conference was contributions to international organizations and contributions for international peace-keeping activities, with $90 million cut from the Senate-passed levels.

USIA was disappointed that the conference reduced the appropriation level of the Senate-passed bill by $10 million to $638,569,000. The conference agreement includes $171,224,000 for VOA; $32,800,000 for television and film services; and $36,720,000 for other S&E. Finally, the appropriation conference, in the general provisions to the legislation, provided that the House and Senate Foreign Relations Committee have until November 30 to secure final passage of their authorization bill. Until the end of November, State and USIA funding is at the rate available for FY 1989 or at the rate passed by the Senate in H.R. 2991 (the appropriation bill). The House and Senate foreign relations committees have scheduled the initial meeting of their conference on the State authorization bill for FY 90 and 91 for October 26. As for the AID appropriation, a conference to reconcile Senate and House bills is to be scheduled shortly. Once again, it appears that there will be no AID

New staff

We welcome Julia T. Schielen (top) as the FOREIGN SERVICE JOURNAL's new assistant editor and advertising manager. Julia attended Virginia Commonwealth University and has worked at Sculpture magazine.

Other new staff members are Monique Copeland, the executive assistant at AFSA's State office, and Champa Jarmul, the administrative assistant at the AFSA building.

Contact reporting rules strengthened

Effective no later than November 15, 1989, all U.S. government employees under the jurisdiction of the chief of mission at a post abroad will be subject to a stricter policy regarding reporting of contacts and fraternization with foreign nationals. The new policy is based upon a National Security Decision Directive (NSDD-197), issued by the National Security Council in 1985. The major changes instituted by the new policy include an increase in the list of countries in which contact with nationals must be reported, a prohibition of “intimate” relationships with nationals of countries on the list, a new requirement that employees report suspicious contacts with all foreign nationals rather than only contacts with nationals of countries on the list, and creation of a uniform briefing form that all employees must sign, stating that the employee has read and understands the new policy.

Although AFSA supports responsible and rational procedures to safeguard the national security, we believe that absolute prohibition of any intimate relationships with nationals of countries on the established list is unreasonably rigid and difficult if not impossible to enforce.

The department agreed to consider our concerns prior to implementation of the policy.
AFSA Testimony to Hill Committee

The following remarks are excerpted from AFSA President Ted Wilkinson's statement on the Thomas Commission and Bremer Committee reports, introduced at time of testimony to the House Subcommittees on Civil Service and International Operations on October 17, 1989. (Full text available on request).

Implementation of Common Recommendations: Our constituents are largely active duty Foreign Service personnel whose interests would be adversely affected by radical change without adequate provisions for transition. But we do believe that many of the recommendations proposed by Thomas and Bremer represent earnest efforts to deal with real problems, and that management must either adopt them, in some modified form or come up with solutions of its own.

Workforce Requirements: The department has a clearly defined position structure, but the Bremer Report urges that it be reviewed and redefined as workload requirements evolve. The Thomas Commission stresses the need for long-range personnel planning. In AFSA's view, both annual reviews and long-range projections are essential for developing and validating the "stability" of the Foreign Service career. Yet the department apparently still has no plans to implement either of these important recommendations.

One impediment to making projections has clearly been the difficulty of forecasting future workforce requirements. How could one have predicted 20 years ago, for instance, the need for narcotics personnel? We think this difficulty can be overcome by making one simple, broad assumption about growth requirements. An increasingly interdependent global community has led to an increase of about 30 percent in State's Foreign Service officer corps in the last 25 years. Projecting the same trend into the future would mean only one percent growth per year. Congress should encourage the State Department to proceed with personnel needs projections studies based on this premise. This would allow development of flow-through rates, hiring to accord more precisely with projected needs, and career projections which could truly be more "stable . . ."

Tenure: Both reports propose a longer period of assessment before granting tenure to junior officers, and making the threshold more stringent (Only 4 percent are currently not tenured.) Bremer would select our 15 percent at this point, while Thomas would grant tenure only to the extent of vacancies and needed skills at mid-levels. Many of AFSA's junior officer members have expressed concerns about both lengthening tenure and tightening the threshold, and we do not see any reason to increase arbitrarily the time the junior officers must spend in untenured status. We do believe renewing should be seen as a more meaningful threshold than it now is, and would propose the gradual phasing in of stricter qualitative criteria . . .

Cone system: There is much criticism within the Service that the present system of four cones in State (political, economic, consular and administrative) is too rigid in two senses. First, officers assigned to cones at entry have no real understanding of their job requirements, and career prospects, yet they have great difficulty later switching to other cones. Others do not wish to change cones, but encounter obstacles—not the least of which are diminished promotion prospects—when they seek out-of-cone assignments to broaden themselves for eventual management responsibilities. To overcome these rigidities, Bremer proposes reducing the four cones to two more general "disciplines" (Policy Development and Operations/Resource Management) with an undefined number of "sub-specializations" in each, while Thomas would instead increase the number of areas of specialization by the establishing of "functional categories" of which he gives an illustrative list of 14 for the State Department. Both proposals would have officers move around between the disciplines or among the functional categories, and would require a variety of experience for promotion.

It appears from the remarks of Under Secretary Selin last week that he and the director general are moving towards a third option: the creation of a fifth, or "interfunctional" cone for officers who seek to move more freely among the Foreign Service disciplines, leaving intact the four existing cones for others who prefer (or are counselled toward) developing deeper expertise in one area. We think this is an enlightened interim course; in fact, it recognizes a recent trend, which features selection for promotion of a fixed percentage of middle-grade officers each year on an "interfunctional" basis. The process needs to be regularized and spelled out more clearly, so that officers can make informed decisions about which track they prefer, but AFSA believes that most affected Foreign Service officers would support the idea of a separate multifunctional cone as an interim solution, and possibly a lasting one . . .

Career Pattern: The Thomas model would establish substantially slower promotions and longer careers, with promotions strictly limited to vacancies at higher levels. Bremer also proposes to abolish the senior window (which he thinks the secretary of state could bring about without legislation), and suggests various time in class limits which his analysis indicated would slow down promotions slightly but would assure a 25-year career for tenured officers.

AFSA would not oppose in principle the idea of slightly reduced promotion rates, but the financial impact on already strained family resources must be considered. What is more urgent is the restoration of pay parity between government professionals and private sector. Moreover, reduced promotion rates should not be implemented unless and until it can be demonstrated clearly and objectively that such a step is necessary to establish a more stable career pattern and reduce the present loss of experienced and still relatively young officers who fail to pass the senior threshold. The Foreign Service is not the NFL, and an officer is not necessarily less useful at age 50 than when he was younger. We need seasoned diplomats with languages and experience who are capable of handling many situations more effectively than younger, less-experienced officers. Overall, to keep in the older officers who are still effective while giving younger officers a chance, we prefer the Bremer recommendations on time in class requirements.

Legislative Action: The two reports differ sharply on the need for legislation. The Bremer study concludes that necessary reforms can be made within the framework of the 1980 Foreign Service Act. We agree with this conclusion. The Thomas Commission, on the other hand, proposed a series of amendments to the Act. AFSA opposes many of these amendments, which are only distantly related or even contrary to the Commission's mandate to develop a system that provides career stability.

If there is any need for legislation, it would be to implement a package of complimentary measures worked out by the Department of State and other Foreign Service agencies in consultation with AFSA and other interested organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AID: Back to the Drafting Table, by Richard E. Bissell</td>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AID: Development Specialists, Managers and Diplomats, by William Haven North</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AID: Population Funding Controversy, by N. Piet-Pelon</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AID: Task Force Assesses AID Trends, by Lee Hamilton</td>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AID: Trade Can Be Aid, by Karl Hofmann</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AID: The U.S. and the Majority of the World, by R. J. Berg February</td>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Jim, The President's Man in the State Dept</td>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Jim, The Secretary Speaks, Interview</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICA: Delivering Grain to Angola, by R. Gordon</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are Diplomats Patriotic?, by David D. Newsom</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMS CONTROL: New Initiatives in Force Reduction, by C.G. Stefan</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back in the USSR, by Alan and Nicole Logan</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back to the Drafting Table, by Richard E. Bissell</td>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, George, Clienti in Economic Reporting</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Katharine G., Moving in Step</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER: The President's Man, by Jim Anderson</td>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER: The Secretary Speaks, Interview, by Jim Anderson</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bank Robber, by Franklin E. Stevens</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry, Robert L., Virginia James Byerly</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton, N.F., State's Press Briefing</td>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg, Robert J., The U.S. and the Majority of the World</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisell, Richard E., Back to the Drafting Table</td>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloch, Felix S., The European Community</td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushnell, Prudence, Leadership at State</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL AMERICA: Response to Frank McNeil, by Elliott</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL AMERICA: Short-order Intelligence, by Frank McNeil</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL AMERICA: 1,000 Points of Light in Central America, by Daniel J. Seyler</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA: The Last Americans in Hankow, 1949, by Rolf J. Huso</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA: Handling the China Evacuation, by Patty J. Meier</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill, Malcolm, Up or Out</td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clienti in Economic Reporting, by George Baker</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coming Together in Crisis, by Marthin Precht</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connors, Stephen Edward, Jefferson in Paris, 1789</td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts in History, by Stephen N. Sestanovich</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convinstional Wisdom, by John E. Lange</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation with George P. Shultz, Interview</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Orders End to Sex Discrimination, by E. Lee Fitzgerald</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a Life Service, by Rhoda E.A. Hacker</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt, Bette J., The Winner is...</td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dankert, Roger, Foreign Service Crystal Ball</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear Mr.Secretary</td>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering Grain to Angola, by Robert Gordon</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Both Experts and Generalists, by Lannon Walker</td>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIPLOMACY: Jefferson in Paris, 1789, by Stephen E. Connors</td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIPLOMACY: Uncharted Waters, by L.S. Eagleburger</td>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIPLOMACY: Negotiations in Concert, by Roger Fisher</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIPLOMACY: Working with Dulles, by Marshall Green</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INDEX 1989**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL: Last Americans in Hankow, by R.J. Huso</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL: Memorial Day in Kabul, by Mary Thomas Sargent</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL: Metropolis, by Edward C. Ingraham</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL: The Microdot, by Curtis F. Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL: Niger Storm, by Alice Slattery</td>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL: Rough Road to Moscow, by T.F. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL: The Toughest Consul, by Fred Godsey</td>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL: Virginia James Byerly, by Robert L. Barry</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL: The President Comes Calling, by M. Kraus</td>
<td></td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL: The Winner is..., by Bette J. Ceuit</td>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadershirt at State, by Prudence Bushnell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Elizabeth, Intercultural Marriages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lessons of Islamabad, by James Thurber, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life after Retirement, by Elizabeth Lee Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan, Alan and Nicole, Back in the USSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost in Creation, by Nancy Bernkopf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luppi, Ann, Thomas v. Bremer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matlock, Rebecca B., Spaso House: Backdrop to History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulk, R.W. &amp; S.M., Adverse Environments and Foreign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNel, Frank, Short-order Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meier, Patty J., The China Evacuation</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meier, Patty J., Single Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day in Kabul, by Mary Thomas Sargent</td>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis, An American Disease, by E.C. Ingraham</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Microdot, by Curtis F. Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, George C., World Affairs Councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving in Step, by Katharine G. Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, C.W., 1992 and European Political Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naas, Charles and Proct, Henry, Historical Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations in Concert, by Roger Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Initiatives in Force Reduction, by Charles G. Stefan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsom, David D., Are Diplomats Patriotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger Storm, by Alice Slattery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 and European Political Cooperation, by C. Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North, William H., AID: Development Specialists, Managers, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Points of Light in Central America, by D.J. Seyler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odor, Sandra and John Koenig, Time on the Watch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAKISTAN: The Lessons of Islamabad, by James Thurber, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE: Fast Times at Hindi High, by Kitty Thuermer</td>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE: Handicapped Children, by E. Lee Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE: Intercultural Marriages, by Elizabeth Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE: Life After Retirement, by E. Lee Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE: Moving in Step, by Katharine G. Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE: Single Parents, by Patty J. Meier</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE: Time on the Watch, by S. Odor and J. Koenig</td>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE: The Unmarried Dilemma, by E. Lee Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL: Up or Out, by Malcolm Churchill</td>
<td></td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL: Thomas v. Bremer, by Ann Luppi</td>
<td></td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL: Rejuvenate with Expertise, by Leo Reddy</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL: The Prune Book, by John H. Trattner</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL: Develop Both Experts and Generalists, by Lannon Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piet-Pelon, Nancy, The Population Funding Controversy, by Nancy Piet-Pelon</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precht, Marian, Coming Together in Crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The President's Man, by Jim Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Prune Book, by John H. Trattner</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readdy, Leo, Rejuvenate with Expertise, by Leo Reddy</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Frank McNeil, by Elliott Abrams</td>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough Road to Moscow, by Thomas F. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIPS: AFSA Merit Scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Secretary Speaks, Interview, by Jim Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyler, D.J., 1,000 Points of Light in Central America</td>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman, Thomas A., The Unaccepted Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shellenberger, Jack H., John Bingham... Who?</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-order Intelligence, by Frank McNeil</td>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurtz, Mary Thomas, Memorial Day in Kabul</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space House: Backdrop to History, by Rebecca B. Matlock</td>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State's Image: Legacy of 200 Years, by Barry Rubin</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State's Image on the Hill, by Vicki Huddleston</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE: Leadership at State, by Prudence Bushnell</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE: State's Image: Legacy of 200 Years, by B. Rubin</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE: State's Image on the Hill, by Vicki Huddleston</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE: State's Press Briefing, by N.F. Benton</td>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Franklin E., The Bank Robber</td>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Assesses AID Trends, by Lee Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Years Later, by Bruce Laingen</td>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas vs. Bremer, by Ann Luppi</td>
<td></td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuermer, Kitty, Fast Times at Hindi High</td>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurber, James Jr., The Lessons of Islamabad</td>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on the Watch, John Koenig and Sandra Oder</td>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Toughest Consul, by Fred Godsey</td>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Can Be Aid, by Karl Hofmann</td>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING: Econ Trainings, by Teresa and David Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING: Hi-Tech Diplomacy, by Teresa Chin Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING: Human Rights: The Unaccepted Challenge, by T.A. Shannon</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING: Language Training, by R.A.C. Goodison</td>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker, John H., The Prune Book</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncharted Waters, by Lawrence S. Eagleburger</td>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Unmarried Dilemma, by Elizabeth Lee Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up or Out, by Malcolm Churchill</td>
<td></td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The U.S. and the Majority of the World, by Robert J. Berg</td>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USRR: Rough Road to Moscow, by Thomas F. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USRR: Back in the USSR, by Nicole and Alan Logan</td>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USRR: Spaso House: Backdrop to History, by R.B. Matlock</td>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia James Byerly, by Robert L. Barry</td>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Lannon, Develop Both Experts and Generalists</td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the President Comes Calling, by Max Kraus</td>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Winner is... , by Bette J. Cruit</td>
<td></td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Dulles, by Marshall Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD Affairs Councils, by George C. Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td>July/Aug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mona Lisa would be Safe and Secure here—So will Your Valuables!

"During our two-year stay in Indonesia, Interstate took excellent care of our prized belongings. Their storage facilities are wonderful and they were responsive to our every need."

Dorothea Judy, Fredericksburg, Virginia

"We had a large number of priceless and irreplaceable antiques. Interstate was meticulous in attention to every detail in terms of wrapping and padding the furniture and in packing and unloading each item."

Henry L. Taylor, Seymour, Illinois

"... this was not only the longest move we have made, it was the best! Absolutely nothing was broken."

Catherine Beale, Germany

"It was a great comfort to see the way you handled my possessions, from a pair of boots to my dishes and glassware to my very precious bric-a-brac. Imagine my relief and delight when I found that not one piece of furniture had been scratched nor one precious item damaged in any way."

Connie Smith, Helena, Montana

"When it's time to entrust your valuable belongings for moving or storage, you can select Interstate Van Lines with confidence. Since 1943 Interstate has represented a tradition of excellence and quality for all of your moving needs. A contractor for the Department of State, Interstate offers you trained professionals, custom-tailored and safe climate-controlled storage, personal consultation throughout your move, a world-wide network, and an enduring commitment to provide you the finest in service."

A personal message from Arthur E. Morrissette, founder and president.

INTERSTATE Van Lines Inc.

In VA 703-569-2121, Ext. 233 • 800-336-4533 • In MD 301-773-3555
5801 Rolling Road, Springfield, VA 22152

MC1745
As a member of the Diplomatic Corps, you are entitled to special privileges through Chrysler's Diplomatic Purchase Program. In addition to professional service, you'll receive preferred savings on a full line of 1990 Chrysler Motors products. Choose from Chrysler, Plymouth, Dodge and Eagle cars, or Jeep and Dodge Truck vehicles. Delivery can be arranged for the United States or most overseas locations.

It's easy to take advantage of these special privileges. Just mail in the convenient response card on page 7 and we'll send you a catalog plus complete information on the Diplomatic Purchase Program. Or call (313) 978-6526 or telex 0235264 CHRYEXIMDET.