

## **AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE** *(Some aspects of its development)*

*Kh.Olzoy*

In 1981 the US State Department celebrated its 200 years anniversary of the foundation. In 1781 this Foreign Service organization was established. At that time the USA sent its first ambassadors to some countries including France. The first diplomats, consular and trade agents were Mr. Franklin, Mr. Dina and others. In 1789 the US Congress created the position of secretary of state. It was in 1775, when the Committee on Secret Correspondence with the head of V. Franklin was created with the purpose to have correspondence "with our friends in the Great Britain, Ireland and other parts of the world" (V.M. Matveev, *Diplomatic Service of the USA, Moscow, 1987, in Russian*). In December 1776 the Committee sent a special delegation to Paris (The first American diplomatic mission abroad). The delegation was headed by B. Franklin, well-known American diplomat and scientist. As a result of that mission there were signed two documents in February 1778, namely: Franco-American Treaty on Friendship and on Commerce. This fact was important in the sense that France recognized the American colonies and, therefore, international blockade of America was broken. Indeed, the two documents signed were the first achievement of newly established American diplomacy, which strived very hard to achieve international recognition of the USA and the increased isolation of Britain. In November 1782 USA and Great Britain concluded a Preliminary Agreement on Peaceful Regulations. In 1783 the sides signed a Peace Treaty. It was the first step of the American diplomacy.

Today USA has a very comprehensive and multi-sided diplomacy covering the world as a whole. US diplomacy is known, among others, by its broad information and analytical qualities, as well as world-wide influence. Today's US diplomacy has become as part of American dominance in the world and instrument of pursuing US policy everywhere including international organizations. The USA is a leading democracy and a stabilizing factor in the world. Iraq invaded and occupied Kuwait: USA mobilized other countries to free Kuwait. Many countries strive to be democratic and free from Communist ideology: The USA was in the first front to support them. Internationally awakened questions have aroused: international terrorism, narcotic' trafficking, environmental disturbance, etc. The USA and its diplomacy lead the world to fight against them.

Indeed, in response to changing realities President Clinton created the position of undersecretary of state for global affairs. His responsibility includes, inter alia, the protection of global environment, the promotion of democracy and human rights, the management of population and migration issues and law enforcement. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the US Information Agency were integrated into the Department of State. US Agency for International Development has become a part of the Department. These developments in the Foreign Service organization show that US foreign policy is becoming more oriented towards global issues. Globalization has increasingly seen as one of the characteristics of the American Foreign Service.

Looking into the internal “cooking” of American diplomacy we can see some other interesting trends.

First. Some American researchers consider that the Department of state is not only a proud institution, but also an agency slowly losing its influence and becoming dependent on party policy.

Second. Budget of this important Department has a tendency to decrease for many years. It has retarded some actions of the Department. As American scholar Joshua Muravchik writes in the journal *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 1996, p. 10) “Foreign policy spending absorbed about 10 percent of GDP during the Kennedy years, about 7 percent during the Reagan years, and 4.5 percent in 1994. In 1995 it was scheduled to drop to 4.2 percent and in 1996 to 3.8 percent, with further decreases...” Now the US Foreign policy budget constitutes 2.58 bins. USD (about 1 percent of GDP).

Third. Although the Department’s role in American Foreign policy is the most important, the other American government institutions, like Department of Commerce and Trade Representative, Peace Corps, USAID. Agency, etc. have increasingly played a substantial role in the determination of American Foreign policy.

Four. The policy and action of the Department of State may be too much dependent on the political debate in the US Congress and public opinions.

Five. Its policy is very much personalized: For instance, Mr. W.Cristofer, the last but one, Secretary of State, did not have good impression on the policy of engagement, pursued by the Clinton Administration.

Six. Because of the Department’s budget cuttings US foreign diplomatic and Consular missions had to be closed. Only a few embassies and consulates have been newly opened. In the 1980s and 1990s the foreign policy servants have been battling against pruning the operations and costs of the state ma-

chine (see: *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, Vol.8, No.2, July 1997, p.3). The USA closed one embassy and three consulates in 1992, two embassies and 10 consulates in 1993, one embassy and three consulates in 1994. Two embassies and twelve consulates were closed in 1996 alone. In the meantime, the US opened four new embassies in 1991, twelve embassies and two consulates in 1992, one embassy and three consulates in 1994, one embassy in 1995. (*Foreign Policy*, Fall 1997, p.73).

Seven. US assistance to other countries has concentrated only on few "friends" and has a tendency to decrease. Although the US position is to support in all ways the so-called "transitional" democratic countries, its assistance can not be understood to be sufficiently adequate to their needs. By saying this, I did not intend neither to belittle the strategic importance of the political support and assistance having been given by the USA to these countries, including Mongolia during the period since 1989-1990, nor to express a complaint to the USA and other countries, as well as to international organizations rendering assistance to new democracies in their efforts to firmly embark on the path of democracy and a free market economy.

Eight. The State Department seems to be much slow in determining US foreign policy in comparison with other agencies, like the US Council of National Security. Although a Strategic Management Initiative was adopted in 1995 the Department is still considered to be too bureaucratic in its structure and actual policy-making. In this connection it is worthwhile to note that at present the US Department of State has 19 assistant secretaries, 5 undersecretaries in addition to the secretary and deputy secretary. In the Department 13,000 people work and the US abroad missions have a total number of 249. As state! Above, in 1984 foreign affairs spending amounted 2.5 percent of the federal budget, but today it constitutes only one percent. As a result, the USA closed 32 embassies and consulates around the world during last few years as well as had to diminish its foreign assistance. The USA is the most debited country to the UN. We should also note that through the efforts of the present secretary of State, Albright, the budget of the US State of Department was increased by 5 percent in 1997 for the first time in the past few years. Now the total amount of US Department of State's budget constitutes 2.58 bins USD. The Department's budget includes developmental/financial assistance to foreign countries, humanitarian assistance, security assistance, so-called diplomatic operations (to modernize overseas facilities and meet the growing demand for US passport and visa services), building democracies all over the world, US assessments to inter-

national organizations, support of public diplomacy. The present tendency is that the share of security assistance is visibly going down and assistance to “building democracies” has the noticeable tendency to increase. /A detailed information and figures can be founded in Foreign Policy magazine, fall 1997, p.76/.

Nine. Political, economic and public diplomacy of the USA has very close and constructive relations. Indeed, throughout most of American history, commercial interests have played a central role in foreign policy, and vice versa, as Jeffrey E. Garten stressed in his article “Business and Foreign Policy”. (Foreign Affairs, May/June 1997, p. 67). As Prof. Douglas Brinkley, Director of the Eisenhower Center, pointed out rightly, President Clinton considered three foreign policy priorities to be essential in his doctrine “Democratic Enlargement”: updating restructuring American military and security capacities, elevating the role of economics in international affairs, and promoting democracy abroad while stressing that free trade is the core of his Administration’s foreign policy. (Foreign Policy, spring 1997, p.112). Undersecretary of commerce for international trade Stuart Eizenstat was quoted by Prof. Brinkley as having said “Tony’s /Mr. Anthony Lake, former National Security Adviser/ enlargement strategy makes perfect sense. In the Cold War the concept was containment; now it’s to enlarge the scope of democracy. It’s all about widening market access”. We should remember that American foreign policy has been rooted in idealpolitik as well as realpolitik. However, we may say that concept of Democratic Enlargement was greatly drawn from geo-economics. Public and personal diplomacy have optioned a greater role in the American foreign policy activities. Today it also is a widely shared opinion that the success of America’s foreign policy and economy depends on a close cooperation between business community and the State Department. These are some basic characteristics of the US State Department and its activities.

Below we try to review further the present state and perspectives of US Department of State. There are many very attractive and to-be-learning lessons in the practical work of the US State Department:

-Increasingly widening economic diplomacy to promote US trade interest all over the world and refine the US companies’ negotiating strategies. That means US diplomats greatly help their businessmen abroad with a view to increase the volume of US export as well as create more job places in the USA. The American Government sees trade and investment have become more important to US economy. It is the reason for the Department of State to expand and

deepen its coordinated work with economic and trade, agencies.

-There are very close relationship between the State of Department and Defense Department. Peacekeeping operations and new security arrangements like the Partnership for Peace, have been worked out together by the two departments. CIA has a close relationship with the State Department too.

-The US Department of State collaborates closely with US law enforcement bodies. It is a timely arrangement, because international organized crime, narcotic trafficking, unlawful migration, hijacking of liners, etc. have become open and often-made phenomena of the international life.

-It is notable that public diplomacy has played increasingly growing role in promoting US interest abroad. Multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations (NGO) help vigorously in promoting the US interest and expanding US global influence. One can notice that personal diplomacy has gained its place in carrying out foreign policy objectives /Visits made to foreign countries by former President J. Carter in his personal capacity and a greater involvement of first lady Hillary in foreign policy activities can be mentioned as an example/.

-The USA has often used the work and assistance of international financial, trade and economic organizations for its national interests. It is widely publicized fact. The USA has a view that they are a leverage to assist democracies all over the world and improve US ability to address transitional threats.

-Some American politicians consider that the word "foreign" has become obsolete in over-all policy because international problems touch upon the very national interest of every country and relevant to their people. That means, as they think, foreign policy has become less foreign and more national. Therefore, the Department of State officials including the secretary hold many meetings with ordinary people and listens to their opinion and views of international questions and problems.

-As writes the Deputy Secretary of State, Mr. Strobe Talbot in the Journal "Foreign Policy", people is still living in bipolar world without an iron curtain existed during the Cold War period, but "between the forces of stability and instability, integration and disintegration, prosperity and poverty" (Foreign Policy, fall 1997, p.83). Therefore, the Department of State believes that in that "bipolarity" the US should play a central role and US diplomats must be used in order to achieve success in this struggle.

-The summit diplomacy has recently become one of the parts of the American diplomacy. Indeed, other countries' diplomacy has the same tendency. It is

a well-known fact that President J. Bush surpassed the enthusiasm of all his predecessors for summit diplomacy having 135 meetings with the leaders of other countries during his first year in office alone.

-Telephones added a novelty to diplomacy of presidents. Prof. Bourke writes in his book "International Politics on the World Stage" (5th edition, 1995) that during just one year Mr. Bush spoke on the telephone with other leaders about 190 times. There should be also mentioned about the "telecommunication and information revolution" in the diplomacy.

-In American diplomacy and Foreign Service one can notice its close relations with the public and every practical step is prepared with the consideration of domestic public opinion. Scientific and research institutions have been also playing an influential role in the determination of American foreign policy directions.

-The US Foreign Service Act of 1980 allowed for the continuation of political appointees, yet has required for the first time that chiefs of mission: "(1) should possess clearly demonstrated competence to perform their duties..., (2) that positions as chief of mission should normally be accorded to career members of the Service... and (3) that "political campaigns should not be a factor in appointment" It means that professionalism or qualifications must be the first requirements in the appointment of those who represent a country abroad. It is a good lesson for us too. As calculated by James S. Pacy and Daniel B. Henderson (Journal: *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, Vol.3, No.3(1992), p.385), while many appointments of the chiefs the US Foreign Missions have been made as political rewards, 61.9 percent of all appointments have been made to career Foreign Service officers. Since the designation or career/non-career status began in 1915, presidents have appointed 2,294 personal representatives to foreign countries. Of these, 1,419 have gone to men and women of the career foreign service, while 875 (38.1 percent) have gone to political appointees, his response to a question about the value of non-career political appointees, President J. Bush stated in 1988 that "We try to hire the best America has to offer the fill these positions. They are chosen for their intellect, their enthusiasm, and their ability to represent this country on foreign soil. The professional Foreign Service officer is trained in diplomacy and the various needs of American citizens abroad. I feel political 'appointees can serve with honor and distinction and do have a place in representing the United States.'" It demonstrated that he followed the tradition of appointing both career and; non-career ambassadors, while praising the career officer. During his first 33 months in office, Mr. Bush made appoint-

ments at a rate of 63.9 percent career and 36.1 percent political.

As pointed out in the journal "Diplomacy and Statecraft", Vol.3, No.3, 1992, the first woman appointee to the chief of American Mission was Ruth Bryan Owen, daughter of William Jennings Bryan. She served in Denmark beginning in 1933. Since then women have received appointments to 84 positions, only 3.6 percent of the total. Of these 40 appointments have gone to female Foss (47.6 percent) and 44 (52.4 percent) have been political. Mr. Carter and Mr. Bush had the highest percentage of women appointed as chiefs of missions. Madam M. Albright is the first female secretary of State in American history.

There are many criticisms in press and public opinion on the political appointees. For instance, as underlined in Time magazine (30 March 1981, p.24), one of the earliest foreign appointees of the Reagan Administration, Mr. John Gavin, a noted personality of American stage and screen, is a person, who "speaks Spanish, rides horses and has had leading roles in such films as Psycho, Spartacus and Romanoff and Juliet. He is also an acquaintance of Ronald Reagan's. It is not difficult to guess which of those qualities makes him the Reagan Administration's most probable choice as the new Ambassador to Mexico." The Bush Administration was criticized in a similar manner: Joseph Zappala, Bush's man for Spain, knew no Spanish, but was able to speak and understand some Italian. Peter Secchia, named Ambassador to Italy, was criticized in the Italian press as reconfirming the "suspicion about the lightness with which the superpower takes its relations with the small power, Italy" (The New York Times, 9 July 1989). All this gives an impression that US presidents and their parties use diplomatic postings as presents for friends or rewards to major contributors to their election campaigns. Our Parliamentary elections have given the same "right" to parties won. It is really a bad habit to appoint as well as to dismiss and to replace ambassadors and other important senior officials. It is well known and widely accepted that any appointment requires professionalism, knowledge and experience. For instance, while every US president does engage in the practice of appointing political friends and supporters to diplomatic positions, career Foreign Service officers make up a majority of appointments to most important places and countries, including areas of conflict, tension and turmoil; As above-mentioned James S. Pacy stressed, where American policy must be fine-tuned or improvised, the task is most frequently performed, by the broad-shouldered professional diplomats of the US Foreign Service. In my opinion, the percentage difference of American Ambassadors to foreign countries has clearly demonstrated it.

-As was written in the Life magazine (editorial, 1945) "...Foreign Service Officers are the eyes, ears, fingers and tongues of the US government abroad". It is, maybe, the guiding principle on which the the State of Department works. With this in mind it may be appropriate to note that the diplomat's work is not easy one. It requires to show a broad knowledge, experience, negotiating art and tactics, as well as an excellent command of foreign languages, especially that of English. It happens that diplomats face sometimes an unusual situation. The below-mentioned few facts can demonstrate the unique feature of diplomat's work. As unveiled by the American researcher John T.Rourke in his book "International Politics on the World Stage" 5th edition, 1995, p.317, J.Baker, the former Secretary of State, had marathon meetings, including one that lasted for nine and half hours with only one break to go to the bathroom. Mr. Baker labeled the painful memory as "Bladder diplomacy". Meeting with King Fad of Saudi Arabia had also required stamina from. Mr.J.Baker, because the King liked to hold meetings in the middle of the night. Another fact which cannot be avoided to be mentioned is that American diplomats abroad are increasingly targeted to be victims of terrorism. As stressed in American press, it was late 1979, when American Foreign Service men and women had become hostages in the Iranian capital, Tehran. It suddenly, made American people aware of the Foreign Service as they never had been before. Really, the 444 days captivity showed the dangers and hardships faced by members of the Foreign Service. Before that event the Foreign Service and its activities "neither understood nor appreciated" by the American people, although statesmen, academicians and diplomats has repeatedly expressed the view over centuries that the diplomatic establishment, not the military establishment is the first line of defense. (Andrew L.Steigman, foreword by Carol C.Laise, *The Foreign Service of the United States. First line of Defense*, West view Press, Inc., 1985, and pal)

Finally, it should be emphasized that the post Cold War Foreign Service and diplomacy of the USA have been changing and obtaining new directions. It constitutes a lesson for other countries' Foreign Service, including that of Mongolia.