Cultural Diplomacy and Conflict Resolution

Introduction

In his poem, The Second Coming (1919), William Butler Yeats captured the moment we are now experiencing:

Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.

As we see the deterioration of the institutions created and fostered after the Second World War to create a climate in which peace and prosperity could flourish in Europe and beyond, it is important to understand the role played by diplomacy in securing the stability and strengthening the shared values of freedom and democracy that have marked this era for the nations of the world. It is most instructive to read the Inaugural Address of President John F. Kennedy, in which he encouraged Americans not only to do good things for their own country, but to do good things in the world. The creation of the Peace Corps is an example of the kind of spirit that put young American volunteers into some of the poorest nations in an effort to improve the standard of living for people around the globe. We knew we were leaders; we knew that we had many political and economic and social advantages. There was an impetus to share this wealth. Generosity, not greed, was the motivation of that generation.

Of course, this did not begin with Kennedy. It was preceded by the Marshall Plan, one of the only times in history that the conqueror decided to rebuild the country of the vanquished foe. Despite the atrocities committed by the Nazi régime, it was understood that the wiser course would be the reconstruction of a defeated Germany with the intention of creating a vibrant democracy. This is indeed one of the greatest success stories of the United States. In strongly supporting the creation of the European Union and participating in the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, the United States has demonstrated its ability to lead both during the Cold War and in the decades to follow. Military might, hard power, was a significant factor, but the soft power of diplomacy was an essential element in spreading a belief in the rule of law as set forth in our Constitution. As a country bound by these laws, we were well positioned to inspire imitation.
American diplomats are tasked with reporting on the political climate and the economic prospects of the countries in which they serve. They do the groundwork for the negotiation of treaties, and prepare the papers on trade that will influence relations with our allies. Much of this is accomplished by highly skilled professionals working with their foreign counterparts behind closed doors. These functions are essentially well understood if not always sufficiently appreciated. The role of public and cultural diplomacy, our outreach to ordinary citizens, as well as influential élites, is less well understood. Public diplomacy includes the work of press officers who communicate current policy to audiences abroad. Good press officers also help to shape policy by providing Washington with insights into the local media culture and information about what issues are at the forefront. The other branch of public diplomacy, cultural diplomacy, is perhaps more amorphous. The cultural officer at an embassy or consulate should be in touch with a wide range of academics, journalists, leaders of non-governmental organizations and artists, as well as his or her counterparts in the ministries. Cultural officers oversee our most important exchange programs such as Fulbright, but they also organize artistic presentations intended to have an impact beyond language. Painting and photography exhibitions, music and dance performances touch hearts as well as minds, often in a way that is subliminal.

In a world in which Yeats wrote that “the center cannot hold” and “the worst/Are full of passionate intensity,” we are witnessing the deterioration of diplomacy. North Korea is demonstrating its nuclear potential; Russia has defied international law in the acquisition of Crimea and its intrusion into Ukraine. The United States is experiencing the erosion of its power in the South China Sea; NATO has been weakened; the European Union is about to lose the U.K. There has been a global increase of populist, nationalist sentiment; the United States has turned inward and forfeited its leadership role. Increasingly, the political debate is not based on conservative vs. socialist values, but on internationalism vs. isolationism. At a time when multi-lateral institutions should be strengthened, they are in danger of collapse. Catalonia wishes to leave Spain; Lombardy and Venice demand greater autonomy in Italy; significant numbers of people in the wealthy blue state of California want to declare independence. Indeed, we are “Turning and turning in the widening gyre,” as things spin out of control. There are powerful forces in favor of anarchy, the destruction of the very fabric of our society.

This fragmentation, if not reversed, is a harbinger of the decline of the West. At the same time, those who witnessed the Chinese Congress saw an ancient civilization rising out of isolation in a display of pomp and circumstance worthy of the British Empire at its peak. It is characterized by unity of purpose, if not intellectual freedom. During the Cold War, we witnessed a world divided between two super powers, reflective of the yin and yang, the negative and positive forces
evident in science and nature. In this age of globalization, it is impossible to so divide the world neatly into spheres of influence. Nostalgia for a mythic past is nothing more than a retreat from the current reality. Countries are no longer homogeneous and self-sufficient. Global integration is essential for the future peace and stability of the world.

When Mustafa Kemal founded modern Turkey, transforming the defeated Ottoman Empire into a modern state, he famously wished for “peace at home, peace abroad.” Cataclysmic events abroad do impact on Europe and North America. Wars, starvation and epidemics sparked by ethnic specificity and scarcity of resources resulting from rapid population growth and climate change, have prompted a dramatic increase in refugees and asylum seekers wishing to escape indescribably dismal conditions. Only investment in these troubled regions, helping these populations to be self-sufficient, will stem the tide and enable these people to make their own societies places in which they wish to remain.

Good diplomats are people who have spent years acquiring the languages and cultural knowledge essential to functioning effectively around the world. Their reporting can provide Washington not only with an accurate picture of conditions on the ground, but also an understanding of the root causes for local conflicts. Public and cultural diplomats are often at the forefront of the effort to communicate with local audiences. Because their mandate is to get messages across, they often have unique understanding of the ways in which such messages will be received. It is they who work most closely with the local academics who instruct future leaders and the journalists who shape opinion. This expertise cannot be acquired overnight, nor can it be replicated by those lacking on the ground experience.

There is a general perception that diplomacy is all “cocktails and laughter.” In the popular imagination, diplomats are drinking champagne at lavish receptions, not riding in jeeps on dirt roads, or living in trailers. While there are elements of the former among those serving in the wealthiest countries, the latter experience, or something akin, is far more common. Aside from networking at receptions, our diplomats working amongst our most powerful allies are holding the transatlantic and transpacific partnerships together by finding points of agreement on global policy and making necessary compromises. Those at the other end of the spectrum, diplomats serving in remote and underdeveloped places, experience considerable hardship in terms of security threats, devastating pollution, and horrific epidemics.

During the Cold War, there was considerable political consensus in the United States on foreign policy issues. The importance of diplomacy, reinforced by a powerful military, was unquestioned. Funding for press, academic and cultural programs was readily endorsed by Congress. There was
a general agreement that the justification given by Senator Fulbright for the exchange program he initiated, the effort to seek “mutual understanding,” was worthy of support. When our scholars and students have the opportunity to live among others in a foreign land, they are unlikely to demonize the foreigner. By the same token, when their counterparts have a chance to spend a year or two in the United States, they are likely to make lasting friendships, establish professional networks, and generally be disinclined to promote anti-American sentiment upon their return to their home countries.

One of the chief goals of all diplomacy is prevention of violent conflict and the promotion of world peace and stability. Foreign service officers working in the political sphere may do so by negotiating treaties that define disputed land or sea boundaries. The ongoing discussions about a final settlement between Israelis and Palestinians, or the disagreements between Greece and Turkey about their respective rights to the Aegean Sea, for example. In the economic sphere, foreign service officers are charged not only with working on mutually beneficial investment and trade agreements, but also coping with global environmental challenges and epidemics. They are dealing mainly with their counterparts in the foreign and economic ministries. Foreign service officers working the field of public diplomacy support these efforts through their direct contact with those who form opinion, as well as the general public. While press officers may be confined to communicating official government policy, they have an extraordinary ability to reach entire populations via television, radio and social media. It is the cultural affairs officers who have the greatest latitude because their messaging is indirect and intended to prompt an emotional, as well as an intellectual response.

Rational approaches and logical arguments are often insufficient to win audiences. Willis Conover’s Voice of America Jazz Hour, entirely free of politics, was wildly popular in the Soviet Union during the Cold War, and even after the collapse of communism. Indeed, an enormous audience comprised of young Russians, attended a concert in his memory in Moscow as late as 2001. The influence of our music continues there to this day. The language of policy messaging, no matter how persuasive, is often treated with skepticism, unlike the language of literature or poetry, to say nothing of music, dance, painting and sculpture which can convey something essential to the human spirit. This discrepancy is even more pronounced in the age of “fake news.” It is the task of cultural diplomacy to promote dialogue on cultural and social issues, as well as political and economic policies. Cultural presentations can stimulate discussion that touches the deepest wells in human experience and finds commonality despite deeply divergent societal structures. It implicitly endorses intellectual freedom and universal human rights by creating a forum in which divergent voices can be heard. It must be remembered that in
traditional societies, or those in which opinion is suppressed, people are accustomed to communicating metaphorically. Artistic expression enables them to do so. Even the very sophisticated audiences in the developed nations will absorb many impressions from a dance or musical performance. German audiences have reacted with extraordinary enthusiasm to a Harry Belafonte concert in Frankfurt, or an Alvin Ailey dance performance in Berlin. Both dealt indirectly with the African-American experience, mingling elements of pain with expressions of hope. Both dealt honestly with the reality of Black suffering and the significance of artistic expression in overcoming it. Both exhibited the enormous contribution to American society made by people of African descent. These performances communicated more than a thousand words, no matter how clearly articulated.

In the period following the collapse of the Soviet Union, so mistakenly identified as “the end of history,” virtually all of the American cultural centers around the world were closed. Aside from housing libraries and the latest research technology of the day, these centers were places where people from many spheres came together for conferences on history or politics, lectures by academic experts on a very broad range of topics, and panel discussions on the most pressing issues of the moment. A loud lament from scholars, students, journalists, government officials and others wishing to engage in dialogue followed the closures, but to no avail. These centers brought together people from across the political and economic spectrum to engage with one another, as well as with the presenters. The inability to comprehend the mutual benefit of this international dialogue was perhaps an early indication of the inward turn our country would take in the following decades. There was a period of hubris at the outset of the new millennium during which we lost the essential ability to listen. There was the widespread belief that we could impose democracy upon other societies rather than fostering its development from within. Like the ideological imposition of utopian concepts in the past, this was doomed to fail, resulting in the loss of vital channels of communication necessary for the prevention of conflict.

Despite the challenges posed by the loss of such valuable connections, it was still possible for public and cultural affairs officers to engage with audiences in an immediate way. These diplomats still had access to discretionary funding and grants to sponsor conferences, panel discussions and cultural presentations. They quickly learned to partner with host organizations, be they government, private sector or non-profit to secure venues where discussion could take place. Freedom Support Act (FSA) funding, in the period following recognition of the Newly Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union, made it possible not only to sponsor the development of small businesses across the formerly communist world, but to create “American
Corners” where research technology could be made available, and in some cases, limited artistic presentations could take place.

The potential of public and cultural diplomacy to foster human rights and conflict resolution is little understood. Both during and after the Cold War, it was possible for diplomats to do so. These efforts however, were often the result of individual initiatives, and not widely practiced. It is my intention to present lessons learned based on my direct experience from which other diplomats and policy makers can extrapolate. Although circumstances have changed rapidly over recent decades, the value of one-on-one contact in the resolution of disputes cannot be exaggerated. It is in the power of public and cultural diplomacy officers to make such encounters possible. In some cases, they support direct dialogue addressing disputed history and current circumstances, in others, negative stereotypes can be challenged by putting people on opposite sides of a conflict into direct contact to promote shared aspirations. In some cases, experienced facilitators conduct the discussions while the diplomats arrange ancillary cultural programs to emphasize commonalities and to create an atmosphere of openness. In other cases, diplomats approve joint projects, oversee implementation and moderate discussion of results. Ultimately, it is my hope to influence our elected officials as well as our career professionals.

Finally, a word about technology. Experts will argue as to whether the greatest break-throughs in terms of living standards and communications came with electricity, radio, television or digitalization. Certainly, the use made for good by President Franklin Roosevelt of the radio for his “fireside chats,” was significant. On the other hand, Adolph Hitler used the radio to perpetrate evil. Technology, like science, is in and of itself neutral. It can be used to inspire good deeds and noble ambitions, or to exacerbate fear and promote hatred. The underlying premise of these accounts is that while technology can be an effective way to communicate with a larger public, nothing replaces direct people-to-people contact in the field of conflict resolution.

Personal Background

Setting the Stage for a Career in Diplomacy

One thing that makes the U.S. diplomatic service unique is that our diplomats come from many different backgrounds. They are not simply the product of one or two schools of diplomacy, but rather a reflection of the broader American society. They enter the service through an examination open to anyone of a certain age. A university degree is not required, although it is extremely rare for someone without such a degree to pass the test. The service “looks like America” and includes people of all races, ethnicities and religions.
My story begins with a ride over the 59th Street Bridge into Manhattan. My father pointed out the United Nations building, a place where people from around the globe were represented in a forum dedicated to world peace. A surgeon who had served with distinction in the Army Medical Corps in North Africa and Italy during WWII, he instilled in us the necessity of preventing another such conflagration in the future. The institutions created by the Breton Woods Conference in 1944 were designed to accomplish just this purpose. The current fragmentation of these institutions poses a dire threat to global peace and stability.

In my childhood, our neighborhood in Queens was full of U.N. diplomats wearing their colorful native costumes. This inspired me to see the world and to strive always for global peace. When I was a senior in college, I read an article in *The New York Times* about how the U.S. foreign service had begun to recruit women, not just as secretaries, but as officers. I quickly discovered however, that women who planned to marry, as I did, were not permitted to join the foreign service. I elected instead to complete a doctoral degree and pursue an academic career. When he returned from the Peace Corps, my husband chose the same academic path as a graduate student of Near Eastern Studies at New York University and later at Princeton.

We found ourselves in Istanbul in 1976, he to research his thesis in the archives and I, a newly minted PhD, with a letter in hand from his professor, Talat Halman, a brilliant scholar of Turkish literature, to the Rector of Bogaziçi University, Professor Aptullah Kuran. After receiving University Senate approval, I embarked on my teaching career in Turkey. Bogaziçi University was undergoing a transition from its former identity as Robert College, a school founded by American missionaries Cyrus Hamlin and Christopher Robert in 1863, to a fully Turkish university. The very impressive faculty included scholars such as İlter Turan who is to this day a leading analyst of political developments in Turkey. My colleagues in the literature department, Sühelya Artemel, Oya Başak, Dilek Doltan and Jale Parla were all married women who had completed their graduate studies abroad. I shared an office overlooking the sweep of the Bosphorus with Shafiga Gözübüyük, a Crimean Tatar who had escaped Russian persecution with her family via Shanghai. As a young American woman, not only was I impressed by the extensive qualifications of my colleagues, I was stunned by the university’s progressive approach to gender and family. At a time when our most distinguished educational institutions had only recently become co-educational, and when there were very few women in senior faculty positions, I noted quickly that the department heads at Bogaziçi, Middle East Technical in Ankara, and other universities were often women. In addition, the Bogaziçi campus had a crèche so that these faculty members could easily manage the demands of family life as well as scholarship. Having grown up in New York at a time when we considered ourselves the most
advanced society on earth, I was pleasantly surprised to see the extent to which women in Turkey were encouraged and enabled to pursue both professional and familial responsibilities.

Turkey was at this time, a country in which the founding father, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, was still universally revered. The reforms he had instituted, transforming the remains of the Ottoman Empire into a modern republic, included not only parity for women, but the introduction of the Roman script, making the languages and knowledge of the West more readily accessible. Turkey strove to be **cagdaş** (modern) and **laik** (secular). With the exception of the small Christian and Jewish minorities, all Turks, if asked, would immediately profess themselves to be Muslim. Educated people tended to make their own personal decisions regarding the degree of observance. In the countryside, the peasantry was devout, but also dedicated to the memory of Atatürk. Turks experienced no inner conflict between their religious and national identities. Religious expression was considered a private matter.

The political tensions in the country were very much a reflection of the global impact of the Cold War. Students across Turkey were divided into factions with pro-communist sentiment on the far left and fascist sentiment on the far right. The students at Bogaziçi ran the gamut from centrist to crypto communist with no visible representation on the right. As a member of the Vietnam generation, I had certainly been exposed to political protest. However, nothing in my past experience prepared me for the degree to which the Turkish students were politicized. Their ideological persuasion formed an essential part of their identity. In class I was challenged to place American and British writers in a political context, or to interpret poetry from a political perspective. I am still haunted by the observation of one of my Marxist students that “the capitalist countries will make war on one another.” My students included the son of Istanbul’s mayor, the daughter of a prominent Turkish ambassador, the son of a Cypriot banker, and a young man who came from a remote mountain village in the northeast near the Russian border where it snowed ten months a year. These students were on the left side of the political spectrum, but also curious about the U.S. Although there was a tiny percentage of people within the larger population who resented the Atatürk reforms, political Islam had not yet emerged as a significant force.

We returned to Istanbul in 1978. Robert had joined the diplomatic service and was posted to the Consulate where his fluency in Turkish was highly valued. My position at the university awaited me. There I found the atmosphere even more highly charged than before. During the 1979- 1980 academic year, universities in Turkey experienced unprecedented turmoil. Conflicts between left and right-wing students often escalated into violence, and many faculty and students were killed and injured in this strife between competing factions. Fortunately, Bogaziçi
University remained calm. Martial Law was in force, so young, illiterate soldiers from the provinces patrolled the campus. Students treated them with the trust and respect Turks accorded the military, often writing letters for them to send home to their villages, or reading letters received. On occasions when the students protested, for example, the prevalent use of English language textbooks, the university administration wisely permitted these protests to take place peacefully. Since few of these texts were available in Turkish, one faculty member did ask the students if they were ready to learn Russian. The language of instruction at Bogaziçi is to this day, English.

Since by then the rule barring married women from the diplomatic service had been lifted, I decided to pursue my original dream. Despite being strongly discouraged by my husband’s boss, the Consul General (“we can’t have mothers and fathers working in the same office”), I wrote the examination in the American Consulate General in Istanbul and passed it. In those days it was given once a year all around the world on the same day. The other person who took the exam with me was Philip Remler who later served with my husband in Baku, and ended his career as Ambassador at the OSCE Mission to Moldova.

By the time I received a telegram under the door of our apartment in Istanbul inviting me to take the oral examination in Washington, I was several months pregnant. I was given the option of taking the test immediately or postponing until the end of the academic year in June. Knowing that I would by that time be nine months pregnant, I chose to fly to Washington right away. The panel I encountered was made up of two men and one woman. The questions were very much centered on Cold War issues: “What will happen if the Italian Parliament becomes communist?” I was asked to explain why as a married woman I wanted to join the diplomatic service. I fielded these easily, but I was stumped by a question on the gold standard to which I replied that I would have to check on that. In those days, one waited outside the room while the panel deliberated. When they called me back in, I was congratulated on passing. When I asked about areas in which I might improve, I was told that I should really do some reading on economics. After that, I was sent to a tiny, overheated room to write an essay on the impact of foreign affairs lobbies in the U.S. Being very familiar with the workings of the powerful Greek lobby, I was able to tackle this handily as well. The secretary who collected this paper noticed with a smile that having taken off my jacket, I was quite evidently pregnant, but I swore her to secrecy. Next, I took the MLAT language aptitude test and got a score of 72 out of 80, high enough to be trained in difficult languages. It was not until I was sent for the medical examination later that afternoon that my pregnancy was discovered. The doctor cheerfully wrote “admission delayed until summer 1980 due to abnormal condition,” on my application.
form. So, I headed back to Istanbul to complete the spring semester. There were terrible shortages of basic supplies in Istanbul that year, so our son was born in New York on June 18th. The Consul General, a father of five, initially refused Robert permission to join me (“Lois had the babies by herself”), but he relented at the last minute. On August 11th, 1980, as the mother of a baby less than two months old, I was sworn into the foreign service.

My childhood in New York, combined with the two years I spent teaching in Turkey formed the basis of my foreign service career. When I took the exam, I had opted for public diplomacy rather than politics in part two. Aside from my great personal interest in press and cultural work, I had to acknowledge that perhaps the Consul General was right on one important point: it would not be a good idea for me to be working in the same office as my husband.

In the first decade of my diplomatic career, I dealt with the conflicts that arose within the Cold War context. The global struggle between the two super powers was reflected in the many fissures within societies around the world. My first posting would take me back to Turkey.
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CULTURAL DIPLOMACY AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

I. Cultural Diplomacy in the Cold War Conflict: Turkey 1981 – 1984

Throughout the Cold War conflict, both the U.S. and the USSR used cultural diplomacy to win support around the world. The State Department sent Martha Graham to Germany and elsewhere to demonstrate the superiority of American classical culture. Victoria Phillips, a member of the history faculty at Columbia University, has documented the extensive thought that went into the selection of our cultural programs. The Bolshoi performed in New York under the auspices of the entrepreneur Sol Hurok. The USSR had Tchaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakoff, but the U.S. had Louis Armstrong, Dizzie Gillespie and Duke Ellington. The whole world was in love with African-American music. If Tolstoy’s Anna Karenina was a Russian tragedy, Fitzgerald’s Great Gatsby captured the ethos of the jazz age with an equally tragic dénouement. Congress willingly supported sending American artists around the globe and stocking American cultural center libraries with literature not because of an aesthetic appreciation, but because we had to demonstrate that we could outdo the Russians.
During this last decade of the Cold War, ethnic and religious conflicts must be seen in the context of the struggle for domination between the United States and the Soviet Union. Turkish society was divided between forces supporting Turkey’s European vocation and those looking with favor upon closer ties with Russia. After a period of extreme unrest verging on civil war, a military coup led by General Kenan Evren took place in Turkey on September 12th, 1980. The country had been torn apart by rival visions for its future. The atmosphere was subdued, if not tranquil. In this my first diplomatic assignment as the Assistant Cultural Affairs Officer, I oversaw the International Visitor exchange program, sat on the committee for the selection of Fulbright scholars, and organized the countrywide tours for visiting American speakers, and performing artists. Funds were available for conferences and other events intended to influence the academic community. I visited universities around the country, delivering lectures in Turkish on American history and literature, donating books to departmental libraries, and showing American films to faculty and student audiences, many of whom had never met an American before. Shortly after my arrival, I was asked to escort a high-level delegation from Ankara to the home of former and future Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit and his wife Rahşan. It was instructive to see that they lived in an ordinary, unpretentious middle class Turkish apartment building and that his wife Rahşan served us all tea herself.

With a combination of public and private support, virtually every major American dance company – Paul Taylor, Pilobolus, Lar Lubovitch, Alvin Ailey and more - participated in the Istanbul Festival and sometimes then toured the country. The Verdehr Trio offered the largest repertoire of contemporary American classical music. Having found a letter from them awaiting me when I arrived in summer 1981, I invited them to perform in Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir the following April. The Ankara program included an Homage to Hayden, three pieces by Max Bruch, a trio by Leslie Bassett, a Saint-Saens Tarantella, and Contrast by Bartok. The audience was completely unfamiliar with modern classical composers, so this combination of the familiar with the less accessible was an excellent approach. My colleagues were skeptical that the Turkish audience would turn up for something so esoteric as music by contemporary classical composers. As it happened, the house was packed with government officials, diplomats, journalists, academics and cultural figures who thoroughly enjoyed the concert following a champagne cocktail reception. It was ever my endeavor to expand horizons regarding perceptions of my country, not only for the Turkish audience, but for the diplomats and guests from other countries as well.

In terms of promoting our historic advances in engineering, in 1983 I was able to organize a celebration of the 100th Anniversary of the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge on May 24th, 1883.
The bridge, conceived by a German immigrant, John Augustus Roebling, was the first steel-wire suspension structure of its kind. This Neo-gothic marvel represented not only an architectural advance, it was aesthetically pleasing as illustrated by the historic and contemporary photos in the exhibition we mounted. This event, like so many others, was also a moment to celebrate the enormous contributions made to our country by immigrants. My paternal grandfather had crossed the bridge from Manhattan to Brooklyn as a young child. How thrilling to bring this bit of American history to Turkey.

Early in my diplomatic career, I received wise counsel from my more seasoned elders. Despite the tensions between NATO allies Turkey and Greece, or perhaps because of them, the most important posting for Greek diplomats, after Washington, was Ankara. I came to know Ambassador George Papoulias and his lovely wife Emily, soon after my arrival. They were extremely skilled, so much so that he was later Greece’s ambassador to Washington and even for a brief time on two occasions, Foreign Minister. He gave me one very simple, but incredibly important piece of advice. I had mentioned to him that my work included recruitment of local journalists for our professional exchange programs. At a time when diplomats considered it wise to avoid dealing with the press, he told me to remember that it is not what you say, so much as to whom you say it. Over the years, I had frank, off-the-record conversations with countless journalists in all the countries in which I worked, and perhaps just good luck, this never back-fired.

Scholars of many disciplines from across the United States spoke to audiences at the cultural centers as well as the universities. Exhibits were shipped to us and mounted by experts from the U.S. In addition, we had a full-time in-house artist who prepared all our posters, invitations, decorations and graphic materials, to say nothing of our own printing press in the basement. Ample representational funds were available for dinners and receptions. Many in the generation of young politicians, scholars, journalists and artists who came to our home would go on to hold major positions in their respective fields in the decades to come. Academics like the security expert Duygu Sezer, the sociologist and journalist Emre Kongar, and the art historian Güngel Renda, were guests at our dinners. The gifted young journalist Sedat Ergin was a participant in our professional exchange program. All rose to prominence and played a major role in the intellectual life of Turkey. All helped me enormously to understand Turkish politics, history and culture. Among our many friends in the cultural sphere were the art collectors Hülya and Yahşi Baraz. Hülya had done her masters degree at Columbia University in Central Asian Studies and had enormous expertise about the antiquities on offer at Istanbul’s Covered Bazaar. Among our friends from other embassies was the Israeli Charge Alon Liel whom I
would meet again many years later when serving at Embassy Tel Aviv. He and his young family joined us and our little son for the Easter egg hunt on the Ambassador’s lawn.

There were practical challenges in those days that actually made the job more fun. Power and water cuts occurred unpredictably. A distinguished professor from Harvard had been sent out from Washington to discuss his research in physics. He came equipped with a collection of slides, the cutting-edge technology of the day, for a presentation at the Middle East Technical University (METU). No sooner had we arrived at the university campus for his program than the electricity was cut. He made a gracious joke out of this and carried on. We first met the Fulbright Scholar Howard Wolf when he telephoned us from the airport to say that no one from the Fulbright office was there to greet him. Mix-ups of this sort happened from time to time in the days before cell phones. We instructed him to take a taxi to our home and we put him up for the weekend. Howard had been initially assigned by Fulbright to go to Israel. At the last moment, this was changed to Turkey. The apartment designated for him was on a very high floor in a new building. He quickly learned to fill the bathtub with water and to be prepared to climb some eighteen flights of stairs during water and power cuts. He did all this with amazing good grace. The enduring friendships he formed with his fellow faculty members at Ankara University somehow made it all worthwhile. On another occasion, the Naval Attaché Bud Hankins and his wife Harriet who had a very large apartment on the top floor of our building offered it to us for a reception while they were on vacation. We invited a large number of guests from all sectors of Ankara society. Early that afternoon, the power was cut. Aside from the fact that the elevator was out of operation, the stoves were electric so no food could be prepared. We rustled up a lot of candles and a lot of wine and whatever nibble food we could find while the dinner was being cooked at the home of my boss, the public affairs officer Marshall Berg, some few miles away. Ambassador Strausz-Hupé, then over eighty, and his wife May Rose had to climb up six stories. Fortunately, the food arrived and we were forgiven. Indeed, undoubtedly due to the wine, everyone remembered this as a particularly good party.

Our cultural office supported the American Studies programs at universities across the country, providing books for their libraries and speakers for their events. When one of our Fulbright Scholars was unable to take up his position, I taught his graduate course on American poetry for Hacettepe University. Flexibility and resourcefulness were ever essential. While the American military presence at Incirlik Air Base in Adana, at the Southeast headquarters of NATO in Izmir, and in Ankara meant that many Turks had contact with American soldiers and their families, throughout the rest of this large country, there were few who had had the opportunity to converse with an American. Television was a new phenomenon, just one channel in black and
white with formulaic news broadcasts. In the larger towns, open air theaters showed films outdoors in the summer months. Exposure to the world beyond Turkey was limited to the élites who could afford to travel and study abroad. Fortunately, the worthiness of our investment in people was unchallenged by Congress.

This period in the early 1980’s might be considered the heyday of cultural diplomacy. The journalists, academics and artists we selected to send to the U.S. through our exchange programs came from across the political spectrum. Indeed, we intentionally sought to invite participants from the far left so that they could have a chance to make their own evaluation of our society. The academic speakers from the U.S. whom we programmed were at times at odds with official government policy, but this was truly an opportunity to contrast our own freedom of thought with the limitations placed on their counterparts in the Soviet Union. Our Viennese-born Ambassador Strausz-Hupé, had been the architect of the Reagan foreign policy. I recall a luncheon hosted by the Rector of Ankara University who bragged to the Ambassador that he had sacked all the leftist members of the faculty. The Ambassador, in a moment I shall never forget, responded that at the University of Pennsylvania, Marxism is taught and no one is sacked. As part of his own conservative credentials, he was a staunch advocate for freedom of speech. When I had to inform him one weekend morning that the leftist Mayor of Istanbul (the father of my former student) had been arrested and jailed, he expressed extreme consternation, again making the point that we do not imprison people for their ideas.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union had powerful intellectual and cultural narratives. The emphasis on the American side was on the ways in which innovation and improvisation, as expressed through our music and dance, were essential elements in the creativity and freedom to experiment that led to our advances in science, medicine and technology. American experts, programmed throughout the country by the cultural office of the Ankara embassy, lectured on the latest developments in these fields, as well foreign and economic policy. The Soviet narrative of course, included the rich cultural traditions for which Russia is well known, as well as projections of scientific proficiency and military power.

Given Turkey’s membership in NATO and its real concern, as a front-line state, about Soviet expansionism, there was a clear preference among the governing élites for a closer association with Europe and the United States. Among students, however, there were many who were captivated by the utopian elements in Marxist ideology. They viewed capitalism as a system based on Darwinian survival of the fittest to the detriment of the weaker elements in the society. They believed ardently that the uneducated masses in rural Turkey could only reach a modicum of prosperity through a system that empowered them.
Since the United States is an open society, our flaws were evident to all. Most notably, students were aware of the history of slavery and the existence of racial discrimination so severe that it had to be countered by a civil rights movement. Far less was known about conditions in the Soviet Union. Under these circumstances, it was necessary to present the achievements of African Americans, and particularly their contribution to literature and the arts. James Baldwin had lived on and off in Turkey throughout the 1960’s. He taught at Boğaziçi University (Bosphorus University) and found solace in a society that accepted him. He, like Louis Armstrong, was highly critical of racism in American, but at the same time, utterly American. Unfortunately, neither was part of the official cultural program in the early days of the Cold War. By the last decade of the Cold War however, efforts were underway to demonstrate that the United States had seriously tackled the problem of racial inequality. The contribution of African Americans was most persuasively presented through literature, music and dance.

An essential element in U.S. public diplomacy outreach were the cultural centers located in Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir. These centers housed libraries and presentation venues. The press office distributed daily summaries to senior government and military officials of articles from the American press, along with editorials dealing with the most urgent concerns of the moment. Our skilled senior research librarians also responded to requests from the highest levels of government and the military for information on a wide range of topics. Journalists, university faculty and students, writers and artists, were frequent visitors to these libraries. Perhaps most importantly, these cultural centers served as venues for programs with American speakers dealing with everything from the evolving situation in Iran to the rise of Japanese industrial technology. These evening lectures were attended by all those from the security, economic, think tank, journalistic and academic communities interested in the American perspective on world affairs, social developments, history and the arts. These programs could not have been successful without the support of our civil service colleagues in Washington. Dr. Judith Siegel (later a Deputy Assistant Secretary) came out to visit Ankara early in my tour to have a better understanding of the situation on the ground. Competent, articulate, highly intelligent and well-informed people like Judy were essential to our overseas effectiveness.

Paul Levine, an expert on Jewish American literature resident in Copenhagen, was one of the speakers whom I invited to visit Turkey from elsewhere in Europe. Although Turkey was among the first majority Muslim countries to recognize Israel, tensions were high at the time of his visit due to the Sabra and Shatila massacre of Palestinians by Phalangists following the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon. Paul suggested that I invite a leading scholar of Post-Modernism, the
Egyptian-American Ihab Hassan at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee to Turkey. Prof. Hassan had never returned from the U.S. to Egypt, but my emissary and former colleague, Prof. Oya Başak, succeeded in persuading him to come to Turkey. This set in motion a series of conferences on Post-Modernism in Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir that formed the basis for an international event a few years later in Pakistan. Turks are much inclined to be aware of the latest trends in the arts. The fact that a brilliant Egyptian-American was a prominent scholar in this cutting-edge field had an enormous impact. Among those who joined the road show were the American poet Michael Lynch, the author and Fulbright scholar Howard Wolf, and the Berkeley trained dance historian Millicent Hodson who had reconstructed Nijinsky’s choreography for Stravinsky’s Rite of Spring. In one glorious episode in this odyssey, Millicent danced for us herself in the ancient Graeco-Roman amphitheater at Ephesus. Faculty and students who participated in this series of conferences across Turkey not only learned a great deal about Post-Modernism in literature, architecture, dance and the visual arts, they also learned that an immigrant from Egypt could become a full professor at an American university and that the American embassy would present an American scholar with expertise on Russian ballet. In very subtle ways, these choices undercut the competition. Arab countries like Egypt were very much in the Soviet sphere. Russian dissidents might be fascinated by American music and dance, but Russian diplomats were not presenting them as part of their cultural diplomacy. More importantly however, these presentations emphasized our shared aspirations and common humanity, creating bridges between those on either side of the Cold War conflict.

During this first tour in Turkey, the divide in the society was ideological. Although I knew Turkish citizens of Greek, Armenian and Kurdish extraction, to say nothing of Alevis (adherents to a syncretic Islamic tradition), minority issues were not at the fore. Indeed, when I asked friends on the METU faculty, they told me that with some rare exceptions, they were unable to distinguish which students were ethnic Turks and which were Kurds. The Sephardic Jewish community had been in Istanbul and Izmir since they had been welcomed into the Ottoman Empire by the Sultan following their expulsion from Spain by Ferdinand and Isabella. It would be during my second tour some thirteen years later that I had the opportunity to work on these minority issues.

Lessons Learned: Turkey 1981-1984

One of the great assets I had in this first posting was my fluency in Turkish. I had taught myself while lecturing at Boğaziçi University, and had had further lessons in Washington to smooth my grammar. I was able to communicate with people around the country. Language skills are essential to effectiveness. Another lesson learned was that we must never betray our own
values. Supporting freedom of thought and freedom of speech is a must. Most importantly for cultural diplomacy, I learned that subliminal messaging is a very powerful method of communication. People understand who we are through our visual and performing arts. I would not have used the term back then, but this was soft power at its best. Finally, it is very important to adapt rapidly to unexpected circumstances and to improvise solutions.

II. Conflict Resolution in the Cold War: India – Pakistan 1984 – 1989

During the Cold War, Pakistan, like Turkey, was a strategic U.S. ally. Despite repeated U.S. efforts, India remained very much in the Soviet sphere. Pakistan was established however, not as a secular republic emerging from the ashes of a defeated empire, but rather as a state rising from colonial rule and dedicated to providing a homeland for the Muslim minority of the Indian Subcontinent. Although initially secular, it evolved into an Islamic state. On the Pakistan Airlines flight from Karachi to Lahore, we were served tea with milk, just one of the many reminders of the British imperial past. The educated classes spoke English as a mother tongue with a pleasing musical inflection. The civil service introduced by the British was still intact. A small number of highly inter-related, landed families held sway in a feudal society governed by the military dictator General Zia-ul-Haq whose cooperation in Afghanistan in a bid to oust the Russians was considered essential by Washington. Women had not been given equal rights, as in Turkey, but many of the most influential women, including the future Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, and the world famous human rights activist Asma Jahangir, had attended the Roman Catholic Convent of Jesus and Mary in Karachi, or other similar institutions where they had been imbued with universal values.

Early in his political career, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the founding Father of Pakistan, had advocated for secular Hindu-Muslim unity, a necessity in the struggle for Home Rule. By 1946, he had agreed to the Cabinet Mission Plan that proposed a confederation of three states: the areas that constitute Pakistan, Bengal and central India. In such a configuration, Gandhi nominated Jinnah as the first PM. This would not have been a powerful position as most subjects would have fallen into the purview of the confederating units. However, Nehru and the Congress leadership were against Jinnah becoming PM, so this proposal fell apart. By the time Lord Mountbatten oversaw the transition to Indian independence, Jinnah had forsaken his earlier position to advocate for the creation of Pakistan as a separate state. It was Jinnah’s intention to make Pakistan a pro-Western bastion against the Communist threat. The inability to reach a compromise led to the very bloody Partition of the Indian Subcontinent. This tragedy
of the last century is graphically documented in the 2017 historical drama *The Viceroy’s House* which makes extensive use of original film footage.

Estimates vary, but it is generally believed that the partition of India, ending the British Raj, resulted in the deaths of over one million people in communal violence as Muslims sought to make their way across the Radcliffe Line to the new state of Pakistan and Hindus left Pakistan for India. Lahore and New Delhi became cities in which people lived in what had been “other people’s houses.” The founding father of Pakistan, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, held, like Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi, a law degree from the Inns of Court, having received his higher education in Britain. Jinnah, revered by the people of Pakistan as Quaid-i-Azam, or the Great Leader, was personally secular, as documented by the historian Stanley Wolpert in his excellent biography. He intended that all citizens of this new country be treated as equals, regardless of faith or ethnicity. In his Presidential Address to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan on August 11, 1947, he spoke of his vision for a new beginning:

> If you change your past and work together in a spirit that every one of you, no matter to what community he belongs, no matter what relations he had with you in the past, no matter what is his colour, caste or creed, is first, second and last a citizen of this State with equal rights, privileges, and obligations, there will be no end to the progress you will make.

Unfortunately, Jinnah died on September 11, 1948, not long after Pakistan was founded. The primary unifying identity of Pakistan would become religious nationalism.

There were many other differences between Turkey and Pakistan. Atatürk had made the Turkish of Anatolia, adapted to the Roman script, the official language to reinforce his country’s secular identity and Western orientation; in Jinnah’s Pakistan, the decision was taken to make Urdu, the language of North India, written in the Arabic script official, emphasizing the Subcontinental and Muslim identity of the new land. In the former case, those fluent in the ornate and aristocratic Ottoman language of imperial Turkey had to learn a new alphabet and the Turkish of the heartland; in the latter case, the peoples of what became Pakistan had to learn an elegant language imported from North India, now another country. The argument has been made that given the four regions – Punjab, Sindh, Baluchistan and the North-West Frontier Province (NWFP) – it was best not to show a preference for any one of the major languages native to Pakistan. In fact, the people of Lahore on the Pakistan side of the border, and the people of Amritsar and New Delhi on the Indian side, spoke a mutually intelligible Punjabi, although one was written in the Arabic script and the other in Sanskrit. Decisions such as these, made internal coherence difficult, so much so, that only two decades after its creation, Tariq Ali was to write a book entitled *Can Pakistan Survive?*
The question of Kashmir, a north Indian province with a Muslim majority population ruled by a Hindu prince, had not been resolved. East Pakistan (Bangladesh since independence from Pakistan in 1971), was geographically divided from West Pakistan by nearly 2000 km of Indian territory. So bitter was the rivalry between India and Pakistan that two Indo-Pakistan wars were fought over Kashmir and Jammu in 1947-48 and 1965, and over East Pakistan in 1971, resulting in the creation of Bangladesh as a separate country. In the early days of Pakistan, military leaders were sometimes engaged in fierce battle with their former classmates from the élite Doon School in India. At the same time, centuries of co-habitation had led to the merging of many customs. Both Hindu and Muslim brides wear red and the wedding guests have their hands painted with henna. Sitar music and the films of the Indian Bollywood, and now the Pakistani Lollywood, are avidly appreciated on both sides of the border.

A typical member of the Pakistani landed gentry might well have a grandparent or two from Bengal or Uttar Pradesh (UP), as well as the Punjab or the NWFP. In the nineteen eighties, English speakers constituted about 1% of the population and Urdu speakers about 6%. The remaining Pakistanis spoke their regional language or a local dialect. Overall literacy in any language was abysmally low, particularly among women, and sinking fast due to the failure of the educational system to keep up with the extraordinarily rapid population growth. Obsessed with the belief that India intended to defeat Pakistan, precious resources were invested in military might rather than the betterment of the people. In terms of social behavior, events such as large wedding receptions were nearly always gender segregated, although this was not the case for the private parties of the élite.

Lahore (1984-1986)

Lahore in 1984 was city of 3.5 million people, many of whom commuted by bicycle. The leisured class resided in vast extended family compounds with multiple entrances for different branches of the family and enormous numbers of servants. They entertained themselves with horseback riding and polo matches. Lahore was the country’s cultural center, a place where the arts were esteemed. The muhajirs, or ethnic Urdu speakers who had crossed over from India, had carried with them remnants of the high Mughal civilization of Lucknow. Together with the local Punjabis, they attended literary evenings and sitar concerts in private homes, as well as the many art exhibitions presented by local galleries. Ijaz ul Hassan, a postmodernist painter of extraordinary talent, and his wonderful wife the portraitist Musarrat Hasan, were among the most influential artists. The beautiful landscapes of Shahid Jalal and other painters were much in demand. Anna Molka Ahmed, a British woman of Russian Jewish ancestry trained at St. Martin’s School of Arts in London, had married a fellow student, Sheikh Ahmed, converted to
Islam, and settled with him in India. At the time of Partition, they left for Lahore where she founded the Department of Fine Arts at Punjab University. The renowned poet Faiz Ahmed Faiz read his work to audiences of musicians, artists and architects. His daughter Salima Hashmi was a painter teaching at the National College of Arts founded by Rudyard Kipling’s father. Her sister Mooneea was a television actor and producer. Pakistan’s leading journalist, the internationally recognized author, Ahmed Rashid and his wife Angie were part of the vibrant intellectual and aesthetic life of Lahore, as were the poet Kaleem Omar, the architect, Kamil Khan Mumtaz, and the journalist Najam Sethi and his wife Jugnu. Babsi Sidwa, a noted novelist, represented the Parsi community, followers of the Persian prophet Zoroaster. We got to know the entire Alam family – their son Shaban with whom we had crossed paths at Princeton, their daughter the ceramic artist Sheherezade, and her husband the painter Zahoor ul Akhlaq – some of the most admired artists in the country. Among my closest friends in Lahore was Zarene Shafi who founded a private school offering progressive education. She went on to study at Harvard and later became director of the Pakistan Fulbright program. In Karachi, I came to know Dr. Akhtar Husain Raipuri, his wife Hamida, and their extraordinary family – writers, artist and architects who represented the best of the intellectual life of the country.

My office in the American Cultural Center was located on the site of a building that had been burned down by an angry mob a few years before. The staff was understandably traumatized. The Center included an auditorium, conference rooms and a very well-stocked library. Before my arrival, I had dispatched the American poet Michael Lynch, resident in Paris, to tour Pakistan. On my very first day at the office, I found him, a former participant in the Turkey Postmodernism conference, reading his poem about Istanbul to a group of Pakistani authors who wept at the beauty of his work.

Although the security situation in Pakistan was never good, in those days it did not prevent me from experiencing the expansive hospitality of the Pakistanis and entertaining the most prominent artists and writers in my own home. We also had extensive contact with academics, but particularly with those at Kinnaird College. Many of the best and brightest young men of Lahore were sent abroad for university education in England or the United States. The young women attended Kinnaird College, a renowned institution that produced leaders in many fields. The Principal of Kinnaird, Dr. Mira Phailbus, a Christian, later served as Minister of Education and Minority Affairs in the Punjab government. My colleague Saeeda Ajmeri was instrumental in introducing me to many of the most distinguished writers, artists and intellectuals. It is essential to understand the importance of the local staff in effective public diplomacy. It would have taken me many months to meet the most influential writers and artists. Saeeda had
introduced them to me within the first few weeks. Although I wore business clothes to the office, I took to wearing salwar chemise or saris in the evenings.

When people visited my office, I often asked them whether they viewed Pakistan as culturally part of the greater Middle East or the Subcontinent. People in the artistic sphere invariably chose the latter, an indication of the strong cultural ties between India and Pakistan. Those of a more conservative and religious bent, chose the former. Crossing the border was fraught with complications, if not impossible. I had already experienced the long check point delays when travelling overland from Turkey to Greece. There were flights between Lahore and New Delhi for the benefit of those families separated since Partition. It was clear that aside from the enormous rift between Pakistan and India, there were also many tensions within the society between progressive and obscurantist forces.

Since the building had been attacked, we had security measures in place at the Cultural Center. The plan was that should we have to evacuate the building, we would depart from a rear window and descend the fire escape to an ally. Fortunately, this was not necessary during my years in Lahore, but I kept a burka in my desk just in case I had to depart precipitously and meld into the crowd. Since I was the responsible person, the police would call my office to alert us of an impending demonstration. We usually had about ten minutes warning because the demonstrators arrived via motorcycle. On one occasion when they had gathered outside the gates, I recognized that the leader was one Chaudry Aitzaz Ahsan, a young Cambridge-educated politician who would later enter Parliament and become the Minister for Law and Justice in the government of Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto. I went outside and walked up to the gate to greet him. My very presence calmed things down a bit. This was an instance in which it was important to listen. He asked that I receive a letter. I immediately said that I would. Of course, as a still relatively young foreign service officer, I had no idea whether this was the correct thing to do or not. I just followed my instincts. Once I had taken the letter, we chatted for a few moments before he suggested that I jump the gate and join the demo. That elicited some laughter and completely diffused a situation that might well have gone in another direction. Anti-American sentiment was strong, but this episode illustrates the extent to which it was possible to engage in dialogue despite the objections the demonstrators had to official U.S. policy.

Not long after my arrival, the Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, was assassinated by her own Sikh bodyguards in October 1984 following the destruction of the Golden Temple in Amritsar the previous June. The daughter of Jawaharlal Nehru, she was the first, and to date, the only, woman to serve as head of government in India. Pakistan’s Prime Minister Zulfiqar
Ali Bhutto had been deposed and subsequently executed by General Zia ul Haq in 1979. It was clear that political leadership in this part of the world was a life-threatening pursuit.

Despite the tumultuous environment I encountered in Lahore, fomented to some degree by the leftist Viewpoint Magazine and the Iranian-backed newspaper The Muslim, edited by the impressive young journalist Maleeha Lodhi who would later serve her country with distinction as Pakistan’s Ambassador to Washington (twice), High Commissioner in London and Ambassador to the U.N., it occurred to me that it might be possible to use my cultural diplomacy resources to bring Indians and Pakistanis together. I proposed to Washington an expanded version of the conference on Postmodernism that had worked so well in Turkey. It was my intention to invite Indians to come to Lahore, a very challenging ambition at that time. I flew to New Delhi to meet with Prof. A. N. Kaul, a distinguished scholar of American Literature at Delhi University who had studied at Yale. I invited the Indian Jewish poet Nissim Ezekiel from Bombay, and a host of other Indian artists and scholars to participate in the conference. Once they had agreed to attend, I had to negotiate with the local authorities on both sides of the border to get them across. It was a bit of a cliff hanger until the very last moment, but they all arrived safely just in time. I had Ihab Hassan come from the U.S., Millicent Hodson from London, along with the Brooklyn-born architect Nathan Silver and Helen McNeil, also born in Brooklyn, a literary scholar teaching at the University of East Anglia who had done her graduate work at Yale. Prof. Oya Başak and Prof. Gönül Ucele joined us from Turkey. Oya and Gönül, unaware that alcohol was banned in Pakistan, had arrived with bottles of vodka in their suitcases. Fortunately, I did not have to call the Turkish Embassy to retrieve them from jail because the customs inspector, unfamiliar with the Roman script, had assumed that these two lovely ladies must be carrying rubbing oil for a feverish infant and let them through.

The international composition of the participants deflected any concerns about potential Indian/Pakistani disputes. We were there to discuss Postmodernism, not the Kashmir issue. The writers, artists, and architects of Lahore welcomed these visitors graciously. The conference was an extremely elevated discussion of the Postmodern movement and its impact on the arts. Modernism is the architectural concept that gave us buildings around the world shorn of locally distinctive characteristics, making the important, if utopian point, that we are all part of a universal humanity. The magnificent Hilton Hotel in Istanbul, overlooking the Bosphorus, is an early example. Postmodernism restored local ornamentation in recognition of the human need to express identity. Indians and Pakistanis, Turks and Americans were able to celebrate at once their vast and coherent cultural frame of reference while at the same time highlighting local distinctions defining their respective origins. On a more personal level, the
older Indian conference participants who had been born in Lahore were reunited with their classmates from Forman Christian College and other institutions whom they had not seen since Partition. This was an extraordinarily emotional experience which served to diminish political antagonisms. This taught me the importance of creating neutral territory for people from different sides of a conflict. Finding common ground while respecting differences, is a means to finding common humanity.

Of course, it was my responsibility to win the hearts and minds of Pakistanis, many of whom, educated in the West, objected to our support for the military leadership of their country. The large number of art galleries in Lahore, the existence of art education at two leading institutions – the National College of the Arts and Punjab University - were indications to me that the visual arts could be a powerful way to communicate a vision of my own country that went beyond military hardware. Mounting an exhibition of original art works was out of the question due to security concerns, the lack of climate control, and most importantly insurance costs. I discovered that our office in the Philippines had produced a “paper show” of works by American Impressionists. These were large poster prints of major works of art that could be easily shipped and framed upon arrival. When this exhibition opened at the Cultural Center in Lahore, I was astonished to see that people lined up in a long queue around the block in the blazing heat to see replicas of paintings by Mary Cassatt, Childe Hassam and William Merritt Chase.

Music and dance posed more difficult challenges. Sitar concerts and Kathak dance performances in private homes were quite common, but the regressive version of Islam imposed by the Zia regime made public events more complicated. Considering the exquisite miniature paintings of Lahore and North India depicting dance, to say nothing of the tradition of poetic verse rendered into song, it was most unfortunate that these high art forms were restricted to the private sphere. The local love of culture was obvious from the fact that the people of Lahore were riveted to their televisions watching Indian films broadcast from Amritsar, just across the border. When I discovered that a group of six singers from the Metropolitan Opera in New York had been invited to Japan, and would stop in India on their way home, I contacted them and asked them to perform in our Cultural Center in Lahore. The auditorium was packed with music lovers who were for the most part entirely unfamiliar with the operatic tradition. When those powerful voices filled the room, the audience trembled as if struck by an earthquake. They heard selections from Carmen, and other popular operas, and even some more familiar Broadway show tunes. They applauded wildly and demanded an
encore. The request came forward for *La Donna e Mobile*, and the singers readily complied. This was a side of America our Pakistani guests had never imagined.

The Library at our Cultural Center was always crowded with students in those days before computers. Pakistanis were avid readers of American Literature and complained bitterly if we did not stock the most important recent American publications. I was invited to lecture at the **Quaid-e-Azam Library** housed in the building that was once the **Lahore Gymkhana**, a former British colonial club that had moved further up the Mall. The Library was run by a retired Air Commodore, a devout Muslim. He was sufficiently open minded to permit me to deliver lectures on **Lillian Hellman** and other such subversive authors, while at the same time very personally pious. I knew that as a devout Muslim, he would not want to shake hands with a woman (a European custom in any event), and I did not mind. I was very touched that he actually bandaged his fingers and made a long and complicated excuse about an injury by way of apology. He was exceedingly polite. Such events brought together progressive and conservative Pakistanis motivated by curiosity about our literature, and in some cases, outright admiration.

**Islamabad (1986 – 1989)**

The Minister for Public Affairs at our Embassy in Islamabad was **Marilyn Johnson**, a Radcliffe graduate from Boston who had been our Ambassador to Togo. She encouraged me to apply for the Cultural Attaché position in Islamabad and recommended me to her successor. It was most unusual to be transferred from one post to another in the same country, but I was delighted to stay in Pakistan. Having responsibility for the cultural programs across all of Pakistan with its Consulates in Lahore, Karachi and Peshawar, as well as the reading room in Hyderabad, Sindh, was quite a promotion. For reasons of Cold War politics, our exchange programs in Pakistan 1986 – 1989 were the largest in the world as many in Washington believed that support for the Afghans would ultimately topple the mighty Soviet Union. Our Fulbright and International Visitor exchanges were enormous. One of the challenges in the Fulbright program was to identify candidates who would return to Pakistan to build the academic communities in their homeland, rather than remaining in the United States. Another was to make sure that we sent scholars in the social sciences and the liberal arts as well as future engineers and doctors to study in America. While the latter were desperately needed, so were the former if Pakistan was to pursue modernization. There was a massive **USAID** effort as well, led by the very competent **Jon Gant** with whom I often consulted. While we at the Embassy supported exchanges amongst policy makers, government officials, academics and journalists, USAID provided training at the technical level in much needed areas such as agriculture, energy
transmission and water management. “Load shedding,” as electrical power cuts were known, was quite common. However, much is to be said for the orderly way in which in those days it was conducted. We knew in advance when we would be without electricity and for how long.

In Lahore, I counted among my friends two very dedicated human rights activists, the lawyers Asma Jahangir and her sister Hina Jilani. Having pulled together a major international conference on Postmodernism in Lahore, I thought it was time to tackle the topic of human rights. The conference on Rule of Law in Karachi included experts from India and Turkey, as well as Pakistan and the U.S. Among them Prof. Ergun Özbudun, a leading scholar of Constitutional Law from Ankara University spoke about political participation in his country. Asma Jahangir courageously advocated for a more secular approach to dealing with the rights of women. This international event emphasized the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, formulated in Paris in 1948 by representatives from around the world. It provided moral support for those fighting for the rights of women and minorities, as well as the larger struggle for free speech. It empowered human rights activists.

Women certainly needed defending. Among the punishments meted out to women who had deviated, or were deemed to have deviated, from the most retrogressive norms, were the acid attacks. These took place even among the well-educated students at Karachi University. In this context, I was invited by the Literature Department to deliver a lecture on Nathanial Hawthorne’s Scarlet Letter. The punishment visited upon Hester Prynne by her neighbors in a Puritan village in this iconic American novel seemed quite moderate in comparison with the violence of an acid attack. What stunned me however, was the extent to which the students were able to relate to a novel written in 1850 about the New England of the 1740’s. I realized that young people in Pakistan were living in many different time zones. While well aware of popular culture in Europe and North America, their lives were circumscribed by mores from a much earlier era. Young women who transgressed these narrow boundaries risked far more than social ostracism.

As part of my job in both Turkey and Pakistan, I was responsible for negotiating permissions for American archaeologists and their multi-national teams to explore the vast treasures of antiquity within their borders. Procedures in Turkey had been extraordinarily, but understandably, complicated due to the extensive plundering of precious artifacts over the previous century. In Pakistan, I worked closely with the Smithsonian Institution, and its very capable Director of International Affairs Francine Berkowitz, who travelled often to both India and Pakistan to oversee these efforts. The distinguished Berkeley archaeologist George Dales, an expert on Indus Valley civilization, who had founded the Harappa Archaeological Project,
was a frequent visitor. **Mohenjo-daro** in Sindh, one of the world’s earliest cities and a **UNESCO World Heritage Site**, also drew his considerable attention. *Excavations at Mohenjo-Daro, Pakistan: The Pottery* (1986), co-authored with his student, **Jonathan Mark Kenoyer**, was a significant contribution to Indus Valley scholarship. Whenever possible, I joined the Smithsonian teams for excursions to **Taxila**, the ancient city located at the junction of the Indian and Central Asian trade routes, a UNESCO World Heritage Site as well. Another prominent guest from the **Smithsonian Institution** was **Milo Beach**, the Director of the Arthur M. Sackler Gallery and the Freer Gallery of Art. An expert on the Mughal Empire, his visits to Lahore and Islamabad deepened my appreciation of the exquisite miniature paintings produced during that period. The role of the Smithsonian in cultural diplomacy can not be overstated. At a time when the impetus behind our cultural outreach was to exhibit our own achievements in contrast to those of the Russians, the curators, art historians and archaeologists from the Smithsonian were demonstrating our respect for the art forms of other civilizations. Years later, I would have the opportunity to expand on this when I oversaw the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs at the State Department.

Another of my frequent guests in Islamabad was the brilliant Brooklyn born scholar **Nikki Keddie** whose enormous range of expertise included Iran, Islam and women of the Muslim world. A graduate of Harvard, Stanford and Berkeley, she was a faculty member at UCLA. Her book *Roots of Revolution: An Interpretive History of Modern Iran* (1981) remains one of the most important studies of the sources of the cataclysmic events of 1979. She lectured to audiences at our Centers in Lahore and Islamabad, often demonstrating a deeper knowledge of Islam than her interlocutors. When I met her, she had embarked on a major study of women in majority Muslim countries around the world. Having visited virtually all of them in the course of her research, she told me that the women of Pakistan were the most impressive. Having lived five years in Turkey where women had had a high level of independence conferred upon them by a visionary leader, I was surprised by this. In fact, however, perhaps because their opportunities were limited, the women of Pakistan were indeed very impressive. Despite quota restrictions designed to discourage women, for example, they succeeded in achieving higher marks in the entrance examinations for medical school than their male counterparts. Many Pakistani women have gone on to hold senior positions in international organizations. **Dr. Nafis Sadik**, for example, headed the U.N. Population Fund from 1987-2000, dealing with one of the most crucial issues facing our planet.

Despite the challenges, I was able to continue to present musical programs in Islamabad. While in Lahore, I had arranged for the **Verdehr Trio** to play in Karachi, Islamabad and Lahore in 1986.
This tour had been so successful that I invited them back in 1988 to perform at the Ambassador’s residence in Islamabad, as well as Rawalpindi. On this occasion they presented the World Premiere of Lake Samish, Op. 415, an evocative piece by the American composer of Armenian descent Alan Hovhaness which the Trio had commissioned. Once again, my Embassy colleagues had been skeptical, but the concert, followed by a reception in the garden of the Residence, drew a large and appreciative audience. Benazir’s husband, Asif Zardari, was among the guests.

In addition to the musicians I recruited myself, I snapped up an offer from Washington for the talented young African-American jazz musician Kevin Eubanks who with his band performed for us in Islamabad. He later went on to be the leader of The Tonight Show Band for some fifteen years. Charlie Byrd, the jazz guitarist whose ensemble performed a mix of jazz and blues also was sent to us for a concert in Islamabad. These programs were an important way to present a more nuanced version of American society and culture to the many Pakistanis in the intelligentsia who were critical of our foreign policy. Nothing has won more friends for our country around the world than our music, especially our jazz and blues.

Ambassador Arnold Raphael had arrived in January 1987 to take over the Mission. A gifted career diplomat who had served an earlier tour in Pakistan, he and his wife, Nancy Ely-Raphael, also a foreign service officer, had an immediate positive impact. He accepted my invitation to address our audience at the Islamabad Cultural Center, a magnificent edifice facing the Margalla Hills. He told the audience that although the United States and Pakistan voted differently on many U.N. resolutions, we could still be good friends. Because Arnie and Nancy were very well-connected in Pakistan society, he was an effective leader at a difficult time. He had known Zia since his earlier tour in Pakistan and established a close relationship with him.

On April 10th, 1988, I was in my office in the Cultural Center when a terrible rumble commenced to rock the building. Having lived in Turkey and Greece, I assumed it was an earthquake. We quickly realized that it was something else when shells began to rain across the sky. We ascended to the roof for a better view. An explosion at the army ammunition depot between Islamabad and Rawalpindi sent rockets and mortar shells randomly, terrifying the residents of both cities. I requested leave to retrieve our son from the Beaconhouse School. The children at the American School spent the day in the auditorium protected by a wall that fortunately was not hit, although they were much closer to the explosion. For weeks afterwards, all the children were drawing pictures of shells and rockets. The English language Muslim put the toll at one hundred dead, mostly in Rawalpindi.
On August 17th, 1988, I was hosting a Cultural Center performance by a Pakistani-American musician who used South Asian motifs along with elements of American jazz and blues in his compositions. As I was introducing the musician from the stage, I suddenly noticed one of my colleagues waving to me frantically from the back of the hall. Seeing that the matter was urgent, I made apologies to the audience and walked back to find out what had happened. My ashen faced colleague, in tears, informed me that there had been a plane crash, and that Ambassador Raphael and General Zia were dead, along with our Chief Military Attaché Brigadier General Herbert M. Wassom, and ten senior Pakistan army officers. The plane had exploded in mid-air shortly after take-off. Despite their personal shock and grief, Nancy Eli-Raphael and Judy Wassom behaved with extraordinary dignity in the face of this tragedy, calling on Mrs. Zia the following day to offer condolences. Just before all this happened, I had written a note to Ambassador Raphael seeking permission to send the activist Hina Jilani on an exchange program to Columbia University. His hand-written approval reached my desk just a few days after his death. This was truly a poignant moment.

General Mirza Aslam Beg, the most senior military official not on the plane, was appointed chief of the army staff, replacing Zia. Defying expectations, he allowed the return of Benazir Bhutto to Pakistan, the restoration of democracy and civilian control. Vast numbers of people greeted her entourage in both Karachi and Lahore. The Harvard and Oxford educated Bhutto won the election and took over as Prime Minister in December 1988. She was the first woman to be elected head of government in a majority Muslim country. I invited several friends to watch the inaugural ceremony on television in my home. One British-educated guest raised his glass to “God, Queen and Country,” an indication of the reverence in which she was held by her supporters.

Ambassador Robert Oakley replaced Arnie Raphael. He and his wife Phyllis were both seasoned diplomats who went to work putting things right immediately. For the Pakistanis, it was time of heady elation. Many of my friends from Lahore were now in government, including Aitzaz Ahsan, the former protester. Aspiring politicians like Shahnaz Wazir Ali, later a member of the Pakistan Parliament, and the journalist Kamran Shafi, later the Press Minister at Pakistan’s High Commission in London and the Pakistan ambassador to Cuba, were guests, along with Bob and Phyllis Oakley at my dinner parties. Indeed, the Ambassador and his wife were able to meet with many future leaders in these informal social circumstances.

On February 13th, 1989 I found myself in Lahore with our young son to take part in the lovely kite flying festival known as Basant, to welcome the spring. The women wore yellow saris and people of all ages mounted the buildings to fly kites from the roof tops. When we arrived back
in Islamabad, I realized immediately from the expression on the face of our driver Selim that something terrible had happened. The American Cultural Center had been attacked by an angry mob furious over the publication in the United States of *Salman Rushdie’s* book *Satanic Verses*. The windows in my office had been broken by rocks and the staff had had to flee to the roof. The protesters were surely people who had been incited to violence. It is almost certain that none of them had read the book. I had obtained a surreptitious copy purchased abroad. As a student of literature, I realized that this was magical realism including dream sequences, not meant to be read literally. However, the Muslims around the world angered by this publication were not about to make that distinction. In the course of quelling the demonstration, five protesters were killed and many more injured.

Despite these difficult moments, I found my tours in Lahore and Islamabad to be extraordinarily rewarding. The conferences, the exchange programs, the performances, the exhibitions, had made a difference in people’s lives. I was very pleased with my ongoing assignment as the Greece, Turkey Cyprus desk officer, but at the same time, it was with great sadness that I left this multi-colored world to return to Washington.

*Lessons Learned: Pakistan 1984-1989*

Despite the extraordinary turbulence in Pakistan, it was still possible to conduct successful programs. In terms of conflict resolution, the *Postmodernism* conference in Lahore brought together Indians and Pakistanis in the very safe space of shared aesthetics. The inclusion of Turks, Europeans and an Egyptian-American provided an even larger context in which their commonalities would take precedence over their differences. Cultural diplomacy is traditionally the effort made by a given country to promote its values through exchange programs and the arts. It is the quintessential soft power so thoughtfully elucidated by Joseph Nye. What I learned in Pakistan however, was that one of the most effective ways to win the affections of people imbued with the values of a different culture, is to demonstrate respect for their art forms. It was important that I presented the Impressionism exhibition and had singers from the Metropolitan Opera perform in Lahore. It was also very important that I attended countless music and dance performances in the homes of my Pakistani friends and was a frequent visitor at their art exhibitions. It was important that I visited their archaeological sites and supported the Smithsonian projects. This was a lesson I was able to put to good use many years later when I served as the Acting Assistant Secretary in the State Department’s Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.
In summer 1989, I arrived in Washington to take up my position as the desk officer for Greece, Turkey and Cyprus, a return to European Affairs. The Fall of the Berlin Wall on November 9th, 1989 marked the beginning of a period of extraordinary optimism. At the same time, with Turkey on my watch, the onset of the Gulf War in August 1990 drew me into close cooperation with my colleagues in Near Eastern Affairs (NEA). These meetings were led by Ambassador William Rugh, a highly respected expert on the Arab world with extensive experience in public diplomacy. Although Turkey, a NATO ally, a member of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), was considered by the State Department to be part of Europe rather than the Near East, it played an important role in the Gulf War. It was my contribution at these meetings to report on developments and reactions in Turkey, often very different from perceptions in the Arab world. Like Istanbul itself, I served as a bridge between Europe and the East.

President George H.W. Bush had cultivated a close friendship with the Turkish President Turgut Özal. The relationship was based on deep mutual respect reinforced by frequent, almost daily telephone calls leading up to the War. When the President asked for Turkey’s support, the immediate response was affirmative. I had been skeptical that President Bush would be able to win the support of the Arab nations for an intervention in an Arab country. The Ottomans had certainly never succeeded in such an endeavor. To my amazement, he put together a coalition of Arab states, and obtained support from Europe including Turkey and Japan as well. The rationale for the War, based on Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait, was the breach in the international order. Public support was to a great extent based on horror about the human rights abominations inflicted on the Kurds, as well as concerns about energy. The War was mercifully swiftly executed, ending in February 1991. The Bush Administration stopped short of deposing Saddam based on the realpolitik recognition of the importance of maintaining a regional balance between the arch rivals Iraq and Iran.

As desk officer, I was responsible for coordination with our embassies in Athens, Ankara and Nicosia. It was essential to keep Ambassador Morton Abramowitz in Ankara informed immediately of the American press coverage and editorials regarding Turkish support for the war. In those days before widespread reliance on the internet, that meant getting in very early to scan the press so that my assistant could fax him the most crucial items. Official
communications were still largely conducted via cable or telephone. It was also my duty to write memoranda and briefing papers on the war for my seniors in preparation for their dealings with the Turkish, Greek and Cypriot embassies.

In early 1991, my husband Robert joined the Gulf War Task Force at State. Ambassador Abramowitz requested that he go to Turkey and establish an embassy office in Diyarbakir to coordinate international assistance with NGO’s, the UN, the Government of Turkey and the U.S. military’s Operation Provide Comfort. In June he was transferred to Ankara to be the embassy point of contact for the Bush Presidential visit. When President Bush visited President Özal in Turkey in July 1991, I was also sent out from the desk to support the trip. This included presidential stops in both Ankara and Istanbul intended to show our gratitude to Turkey for its cooperation in the Gulf War. The conclusion of the visit was an unforgettable dinner hosted by President Özal in historic Dolmabaçe Palace on the Bosphorus. The first Turkish president from the heartland, Özal represented the more devout segments of the population. At the same time, his wife Semra was quite outspoken and openly fond of cocktails, creating a counterpoint for urban women worried about any erosion of Turkey’s secular identity. She presided over the Turkish Women’s Empowerment and Promotion Foundation and was active in Motherland Party (ANAP) politics. Although a growing rift between the secular élites and the people of the countryside was apparent, Turgut and Semra Özal were able to keep the country unified. The Turkish military, as ever, was strongly supportive of Turkey’s secular identity, including the rights of women. In February of the following year, Robert would be asked to open the first American Embassy in Baku, Azerbaijan on March 17th, 1992, after the fall of the Soviet Union.

While on the desk, my visits to our embassies in Athens, Ankara and Nicosia enabled me to have a better understanding of the differing perceptions of the Cyprus dispute. Cyprus had been annexed by Britain in 1914 after three hundred years of Ottoman rule, becoming a British colony in 1925. Thirty years later, Greek Cypriots waged a guerilla war against the British in pursuit of enosis, or unification with Greece led by the fiery Archbishop Makarios whom the British briefly deported. He returned in 1959 and was elected president. Cyprus became independent in 1969 after the Greek and Turkish communities agreed upon a constitution. When President Makarios attempted to tamper with the power-sharing arrangement, communal violence erupted and U.N. peacekeeping forces arrived on the island. On April 21, 1967, a group of right-wing army officers led by Brigadier General Stylianos Pattakos and Colonel George Papadopoulos seized power in Greece. On July 15, 1974, the Greek military dictatorship deposed Cypriot president Archbishop Makarios and installed the pro-enosis Nikos
Sampson in an attempt to annex the island. In response, on July 20, 1974, Turkish forces invaded and occupied the northern part of the island. In a situation reminiscent on a much smaller scale of the Partition of the Indian Subcontinent, Greeks fled from the North and Turks fled from the South. The UNSC demanded that Turkish forces withdraw, but they refused to do so. In 1983, Turkish Cypriot President Rauf Denktaş declared the independence of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, recognized only by Turkey.

This was an instance in which memory played an enormous role on both sides of the conflict. For the Greeks, Cyprus was a Greek island with a Turkish minority deserving of unification with Greece on the basis of shared language, religion and culture. For the Turks, the centuries of Ottoman rule meant that the island should be a confederation with a shared constitution along the lines of the agreement in 1969. Although separated in terms of religion, in fact Turkish and Greek Cypriots shared a knowledge of English due to British rule, as well as many common cultural values in terms of dance, music and cuisine. When I visited the island, I discovered considerably greater prosperity on the Greek side. One of my former students at Boğaziçi University had returned to the island and followed his father into banking. While his family was comfortably situated on the Turkish side, and very open to making compromises with the Greeks, the situation had been complicated by the plantation of less educated central Anatolian Turkish settlers unfamiliar with the English language and unable to communicate with Greeks even should the occasion arise. As was the case in India and Pakistan, people were “living in other people’s houses,” a phenomenon to be associated with British partitions. The Greek Cypriots had the support of the Europeans who essentially saw Cyprus as a Greek island. Under these circumstances, the only solution would be a dialogue between those willing on both sides to engage on the basis of so much shared heritage rather than the divisions created to a great extent by religious differences. At this point however, my time as a desk officer was over as I had been assigned to our Consulate in Frankfurt and was to spend the next few months in German language training. Not until my subsequent tour in Turkey (1997-2000) was I to return to the Cyprus question.

Lessons Learned: Greece, Turkey, Cyprus Desk

This experience was invaluable in terms of understanding how diplomacy works in Washington. I relied on many resources, including research done by, and books borrowed from the Library of Congress, to deal with the many memos I wrote in preparation for the visits of dignitaries from Greece, Turkey and Cyprus. I also prepared briefing papers for calls made by representatives of the diplomatic services and lobbyists from those three countries. It was clear that the role of these Eastern Mediterranean nations was significant in terms of our strategy in Southern
Europe and the Middle East. Perhaps most importantly, I came to understand the enormous importance of NATO in providing transatlantic security. It was during this period that I transitioned from a specific focus on cultural diplomacy to a larger focus on public diplomacy, of which both press and culture are important components.


The Fall of the Berlin Wall on November 9th, 1989, was perhaps the single most significant event in the collapse of the Soviet Union. Although scholars may dispute the details as to how this came about, it is generally recognized that the restraint demonstrated by Mikhail Gorbachev, the last leader of the USSR, was essential in preventing a bloodbath when East Germans made their way to the West. The German euphoria was projected by the media around the world. It was clear that there could be no turning back. Although Germans faced many major decisions, such as moving the capital from Bonn to Berlin, there was an overall feeling of optimism. It was elsewhere in Europe that the negative fall-out would most severely be felt. The greatest turbulence was centered on the disintegration of Yugoslavia.

While in German language class in 1992, I followed closely the disastrous developments in Yugoslavia knowing that the impact on Germany and the rest of Europe would be enormous. The German press reports were full of dire news about the emerging conflict. The collapse of the Soviet Union was like the separation of tectonic plates, prompting unanticipated consequences including the rise of ethnic nationalism in its former realms. Set up after World War II as a Federation of six republics, Yugoslavia included Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovenia, as well as the autonomous provinces of Vojvodina and Kosovo within Serbia. One of the most beautiful parts of the communist world, its people had often been permitted to travel abroad because there was little concern that they would not return. In 1984, Sarajevo hosted the Winter Olympics. Yugoslavia, with its mixed economy, had achieved a relative degree of prosperity under the rule of Josef Tito who died in 1980. Tito had instituted a policy of even-handed treatment of the various ethnic groups insuring that in each town a triumvirate represented the three major denominations – Roman Catholic, Serbian Orthodox and Muslim. However, in the decade following his death, things had begun to unravel.

On June 28, 1989, the ferociously nationalist Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic had delivered the Gazimestan speech marking the 600th Anniversary of the 1389 Battle of Kosovo which the Serbs had lost to the Ottoman Empire. Ambassador Warren Zimmermann, our last envoy to
Yugoslavia before its disintegration, told the story of how the European diplomats called one another, uncertain as to whether or not they should attend this provocative nationalist event intended to incite aspirations for “Greater Serbia.” After all, this is what had sparked World War I. Finally, someone called the Turkish Ambassador who immediately responded that he planned to go, pointing out that the Ottomans had won the battle.

Throughout Yugoslavia, those identifying as Yugoslavs were losing out to the forces of ethnic exclusivity and intolerance. Zimmerman had tried to focus the attention of Washington, but the impact of the Soviet collapse and the clamor from newly independent Poland and Hungary, to say nothing of East Germany, and the countries of the Caucasus and Central Asia, created a great distraction. No one in Washington was used to worrying about Yugoslavia. In Germany, Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher had persuaded Chancellor Helmut Kohl to recognize Croatia in 1991, taking Washington by surprise. When the war broke out in 1992, Zimmermann argued strenuously for military intervention, but that was not to come until after much devastation had ensued. With great reluctance, the Bosnians declared independence as well, not wanting to be divided up between Serbia and Croatia and fully anticipating a bloodbath, knowing there could be no alternative.

As the Norwegian anthropologist Tone Bringa documented after spending six years living in a mixed Croatian/Bosnian town north of Sarajevo, there had been no hostility between the Roman Catholic Croats and the Bosnian Muslims. Indeed, they participated in one another’s festivals and at times intermarried, in which cases the girl would sometimes take the religion of the boy. In Sarajevo, and to some extent elsewhere in urban Bosnia, secular intermarriage was quite common and constituted a significant percentage of all marriages. When the war came, families were torn apart. During the Siege of Sarajevo, Serb residents of urban apartment buildings left their homes and went to hills to work as snipers shooting at their own former neighbors.

It was into this European turmoil that I was to step in summer 1992. In the diplomatic service, a posting to Germany was considered to be a reward. Although Germans were worried about the costs of bringing the East up to the standards of the West, there was a general sense that this could be done. Despite being a Consulate rather than an Embassy, Frankfurt was our seventh largest Mission in the world. Although the Cold War had ended, there was still a huge American presence, including the Army’s Fifth Corps. Our young son, spotting a Black jogger in the Grüneburg Park, said, “Look, Mom, there’s an American.” As the Public Affairs Officer at our Consulate, I was at the same time, the Director of the Frankfurt Amerika Haus (America House), a position that required all my public and cultural diplomacy skills.
After the Second World War, the United States had established reading rooms across West Germany that became known as the Amerika Häuser. These were centers where Germans could hear American experts speak on foreign and economic policy issues, participate in conferences and engage in discussions about transatlantic relations. They could also attend concerts, and exhibitions of American painting or photography, and do research or borrow books from the well-stocked libraries. A typical Amerika Haus included an auditorium, a library, classrooms for English instruction, offices for advice about exchange programs and college applications, and an exhibition space.

The Frankfurt cultural center had a storied history. It had emerged from a small library containing books donated by departing troops in 1945. It was so popular with the Germans that by March 1946 it had been named the Amerika Haus. As part of the “Marshall Plan of Ideas,” it prefigured the whole concept of soft power cultural diplomacy, something the US was to emulate eventually around the globe throughout the Cold War. One of its most distinguished early directors, Hans N. Tuch (1949-1955), has described the thousands of films, large staff of librarians and multiple children’s programs. The impact of children’s literature on the young people of Germany was an astute investment and made many of these young readers life-long friends of our country. Tuch recalled also the parade of famous Americans - composer Paul Hindemith, actor Gary Cooper, writer Thornton Wilder and the Juilliard String Quartet. This outreach had been part of our concerted effort to bring Germany swiftly back into the family of nations.

My own office overlooked a lovely garden with ancient trees. It had a large conference table suitable not only for meetings, but for entertaining the German bankers who generously supported our cultural presentations over brunch. In those idyllic days, I often rode my bicycle to work through the Grüneburg Park, a lovely green space created by the Rothschild family. Our events were attended by many prominent Frankfurt residents, such as Joschka Fischer who later became Foreign Minister, and Mayor Andreas von Schöller. Frankfurt had long history of publishing. This enabled me to continue in the path of engaging German audiences through our literature that had been marked out by early directors such as Hans Tuch. I had already seen firsthand in Turkey and Pakistan how effective this could be. Over the centuries, many in the book trade had moved to Frankfurt from Torino in Northern Italy, another great historic publishing center, giving the city a bit of an Italian undertone. The Frankfurt Book Fair began in 1454, soon after Johannes Gutenberg had developed his printing press in nearby Mainz. Interrupted by World War II, the book fair had been resumed in 1949 and expanded to become the largest in the world. While in Frankfurt, my colleague Dr. Gerhard Wiesinger and I worked
closely with the German publishers to present their translations of the most important American works of fiction. Germany has not only a high readership, but a very high percentage of people who purchase books. What better way to promote a deeper understanding of American history, culture and society than through our literature.

We hosted book readings to packed audiences at the Amerika Haus throughout the book fair, including such distinguished world-famous writers as Gore Vidal, Susan Sontag, Richard Ford, Chaim Potok, Paul Kennedy, Thomas Crichton and the playwright A.R. Gurney, a personal friend of Ambassador Holbrooke’s. I often hosted a buffet dinner afterwards in my home for some twenty or thirty people anxious to spend more time with the author. Gore Vidal entertained my guests with a series of charming first-hand stories about the Kennedy family. Although it was Thomas Crichton whose Rising Sun dealt with the emergence of Japan, it was Gore Vidal who predicted that in the long run, the true rising star would be China. Ignatz Bubis, leader of the Frankfurt Jewish community, joined us for lunch with Chaim Potok. Although the Orthodox Jewish community in New York was Potok’s subject, he told me that he had received letters from around the world. His books had a universal appeal to those struggling to reconcile their immediate identity with the larger realities of their societies. I gave a lunch in my home for the New York novelist Louis Begley, but I was unable to host him at the Amerika Haus because the crowd who wanted to hear a reading from his Wartime Lies was too large. This dramatic account of the escape from the Nazi’s of a young German-speaking Pole with his Tanta, was so big an event that it was convened at the Judische Gemeinde. This was my first visceral lesson in the extent to which Germans had learned to deal with their past. When an actor read a passage from the German translation in which a Nazi soldier kills an infant, there was palpable anguish in the audience. Louis subsequently spoke for me in Vienna and later in Berlin. He and his wife, the writer and scholar Anka Muhlstein, became great family friends when I returned to New York.

While on holiday at our summer home in Bodrum in July 1993, I had read in the Turkish press about Susan Sontag’s efforts on behalf of the Bosnians. She had staged Waiting for Godot in Sarajevo, a particularly apt choice of play for people desperately in need of assistance that had not arrived. She had become a great heroine in Turkey for drawing attention to the suffering caused by the war. I had very much admired her writing as a student, so it was doubly thrilling to meet her when she came to Frankfurt. She invited me to visit her in New York where I also met her son the journalist David Rieff. Susan described to me the conditions in Sarajevo. The actors were so hungry that they were in danger of fainting on the stage. People were not able to bathe, or to heat their homes. They were sniped at on their way to the theater. Despite all
this, she had carried on, sharing these miserable conditions with them. She asked me to help her to bring a Bosnian family to New York. She called Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan who intervened. David came out to Frankfurt and with the help of our Consular officials, this was managed.

At the Frankfurt Amerika Haus, we were able to sustain a superb musical program thanks to generous contributions from the German banks which were permitted a discrete word of thanks on the back of our monthly brochures. My colleague Thomas Schaller, a music aficionado, recruited groups playing everything from contemporary classical to big band, to blue grass, to ragtime, to zydeco – all of which dazzled our audiences. Our brilliant and cultivated Consul General Pierre Shostal was a music lover who regularly attended and actively supported these efforts. He also nominated the promising politician Petra Roth for an International Visitor grant. We sent her off to the U.S. unaware that she would before too long be elected the Mayor of Frankfurt. The American composer Philip Glass gave permission for an American soprano, Frances Lytton Fenton, from the Frankfurt Opera to sing his music for a well-attended charity event at the Amerika Haus. Dr. Wiesinger and I orchestrated conferences on the enormous influence of American jazz and blues on German dissidents in the years leading up to World War II. With the support of the banks, I was also able to mount works by American painters in our generous exhibition space. One particularly moving exhibition of photographs by Edward Serotta documented the tragic exodus of Jewish refugees from their homes in Bosnia. The Amerika Haus brochure was full every month with offerings of lectures, performances, films, conferences and art exhibits. Although our basic expenses were covered by Washington, this extensive cultural program would not have been possible without the generosity of private sector German banks and companies dedicated to promoting good U.S. – German relations.

The far right played a very minimal role in German politics as this time, however, it is important to mention that in May 1993, one of the most horrific xenophobic attacks was perpetrated by Neo-Nazi skinheads in the town of Solingen in North-Rhine Westphalia. Four young German men set fire to the home of a large Turkish family, killing two women and three girls, and injuring fourteen other family members, prompting both German and Turkish protests in support of the victims. Although this incident occurred in the West, most anti-immigrant sentiment was concentrated in the East where the population had little experience of foreigners. To his credit, Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel, the leader of the FDP (Free Democratic Party), attended the funerals in a demonstration of support for the bereaved. During a visit to Frankfurt, Turkish President Turgut Özal had spoken of the Turkish contribution to the
Wirtschaftswunder, reminding his audience that Turks were good workers who contributed to the social welfare of the country by paying taxes. He refrained from provocative remarks and sought to be reassuring to Germans concerned about this ethnic minority.

In fall 1993, Richard C. Holbrooke arrived to take over as our Ambassador. He was a larger than life figure, a commanding presence with a giant intellect, a nimble sense of humor and a large heart, but at the same time, someone who would not suffer fools. His mother’s family had fled Hamburg in 1933 for Buenos Aires and later New York. Although both his parents were Jewish, he had not been brought up to be observant. An Asia expert, he had expected to go to Japan, but the Clinton Administration decided at the last minute to send him to Germany. Even before presenting his credentials, he arrived in Frankfurt to address a meeting of American publishers at the Book Fair at which he touted the importance of Turkey as a US ally at a time when Turkish immigrants in Germany felt themselves less than fully accepted. One evening, not long after his arrival, I was hosting a book event at the Amerika Haus when a call from him came through. He wanted me to go immediately to a Bertelsmann reception to escort his mother who had just arrived in Germany for the first time since she had fled with her family in 1933. Hastily turning over to my deputy, I made my way there. A great advocate of culture, on another occasion, he assigned me to attend the Harry Belafonte concert in an enormous Frankfurt auditorium and to give his greetings to Belafonte after the show. It was an exhilarating experience to sing Hava Nagila, as well as The Banana Boat Song (Day-0), with an audience of over a thousand Germans. Harry Belafonte was gracious and a real trouper who soon headed off from the post-concert reception to get on a bus bound for the next gig. When I wrote my report to Ambassador Holbrooke about this event, I mentioned that my parents had seen the very young Belafonte perform at the Waldorf in 1956 on their tenth wedding anniversary. He responded that I was “the real thing.”

Soon, however, I was writing messages to Ambassador Holbrooke in Bonn about a much more serious topic. I had read an article in The New York Review of Books about how our satellite imagery had captured truck-loads of Bosnian men being driven out of the northern town of Brcko, the trucks only to return empty. This prefigured the large-scale genocide to follow a few years later in Srebrenica. Despite his many obligations in dealing with German-American relations, he brought the full weight of his enormous personality to bear on the Bosnian tragedy. The Nazis had perpetrated the extermination of a non-Christian minority in Europe half a century before. It was essential to make sure that our audience understood the true dimensions of the ethnic cleansing that was taking place in the former Yugoslavia. An eloquent and scholarly Bosnian Muslim from Brcko was to tell me years later that he had attended school
there with Serbian and Croatian children, and that they had all been friends. How dreadful to see that amity destroyed by communal violence.

It was the American journalist Roy Gutman and his heroic German cameraman who brought the Serb-run concentration camps filled with starving Bosnian men to the attention of the world. When the photographs of these wretched and emaciated Muslim prisoners behind barbed wire appeared in the international media, viewers were forced to confront the fact that there were once again concentration camps in Europe. After World War II, everyone had agreed “never again,” but this was again, and again in Europe. In 1993, when Roy won the Pulitzer Prize for his book, A Witness to Genocide, I invited him to read at the Amerika Haus. Michel Friedman, a prominent member of the Frankfurt Jewish community whose parents and grandmother had been saved by Oskar Schindler, spoke eloquently and movingly at this event on behalf of the Jewish community about the genocide being perpetrated against the Bosnians. I also invited Daniel Cohn-Bendit, known as Danny the Red from his days in Paris 1968, to appear. He was at that time the head of the Office of Multi-Cultural Affairs in Frankfurt and a member of the German Greens. Before launching into an impassioned plea for action in Bosnia, he told the audience that he had not been to the Amerika Haus since he had been chased over the roof by the police during an anti-Vietnam War demonstration many years before. Cohn-Bendit had been opposed to U.S. policy on Vietnam, but he was very much in line with our eventual policy on Bosnia which did ultimately lead to military intervention.

Schindler’s List opened in Frankfurt on March 1, 1994 under the Schirmherrschaft (patronage) of German President Richard von Weizsacker who told Steven Spielberg that the film should have been made by a German and much sooner. Ambassador Holbrooke hosted a reception before the screening attended by Stephen Spielberg, Liam Neeson and other members of the cast, along with Michel Friedman and his mother, and other survivors who had been saved by Schindler. Although Schindler died in obscurity, he was honored several times in Israel by those he saved. He is buried in the Roman Catholic cemetery in Jerusalem. Spielberg told The New York Times journalist Craig Whitney that the war in Bosnia was one of the reasons he made the film. A powerful and deeply moving story of the efforts of Oskar Schindler to rescue Jews from the Holocaust, Schindler’s List was widely shown all over Germany. Teachers were provided with guide books for discussion to increase the impact of the film. Although there is no question that West Germans were actively engaged in Vergangenheitsbewältigung, or dealing with their past, this experience enhanced their efforts. It did not translate however into unequivocal support for military intervention to stop the Bosnian conflict. The experiences of the past had rendered almost all Germans pacifists.
Ambassador Holbrooke had invited President and Mrs. Clinton to visit Germany to support NATO, and particularly the effort to end the conflict in the Balkans. My job was to prepare for the visit of the Clinton’s to our enormous military base at Ramstein outside Kaiserslautern located in our Frankfurt Consular District. This involved multiple coordination meetings with our military colleagues on the base. It was always a pleasure to work with the American military. They are competent, enthusiastic and willing to do the job right. When President Clinton addressed the enormous crowd of servicemen and women and their families, he drifted into a strong Southern accent and shortly had the audience enthralled. I had been assigned to escort the German Minister Rudolph Scharping, and I did so, but I could not help but notice that Hillary Clinton was extremely shy and reserved, in stark contrast to her husband who was kissing babies and hugging members of the crowd who flocked about him after the speech. I had the good fortune to meet her again in Vienna and Ankara and Berlin.

Ambassador Holbrooke and his fiancée, the journalist Kati Marton, were enormously well-liked in Germany. In the foyer of his Residence in Bonn, he had the medals won in World War I by his German-Jewish grandfather. He would show them to his guests remarking, “if you had played your cards right, I could be the German ambassador to Washington, instead of the American ambassador to Germany.” Unfortunately, we did not have Holbrooke as long as we would have liked. He was called back to Washington after a year to become the Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs. Having earlier been the Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, he was the only person to have served in this capacity twice. Before he left however, he envisioned one of the most important and enduring landmarks for cultural diplomacy in Germany.

With the endorsement of former German President Richard von Weizsacker, and the co-chairmanship of former Secretary of State Dr. Henry Kissinger, the intention to create a cultural exchange between Germany and the US was announced on September 9, 1994. The fulfillment of this commitment, the American Academy in Berlin, opened three years later in the former home of the German-Jewish banker Hans Arnhold on the Wannsee. Since then, the Academy has hosted a distinguished list of American writers, scholars, and policy experts and presented an extraordinary array of American talent. Among the Fellows and Distinguished Visitors were Attorney General Eric Holder, the playwright Arthur Miller, the novelists Jonathan Letham, Gary Shteyngart, and Jonathan Safran Foer; the journalists Roger Cohen, Anne Applebaum, and George Packer; the international relations expert Parag Khanna, and the historians Hope Harrison and Angela Stent. The Annual Henry A. Kissinger Prize has been awarded to President George H.W. Bush, former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, former Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and
New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg. In the years since its inception, the Academy has become the most vital intellectual and cultural link between Germany and the US.

Throughout my years in Frankfurt, I made many dear friends – the President of the Princeton Alumni Association David Fisher; the leading expert on transatlantic affairs at the Frankfurter Algemeine Zeitung (FAZ) Klaus-Dieter Frankenberger; the Deputy Editor of the Frankfurter Rundschau Jochen Siemens; Prof. Otto Kempen, an expert on labor law at Frankfurt’s Goethe University; Dorothee Peiper-Riegraff who had amassed the largest single collection of Native American art and invited me to speak at exhibition openings in her gallery; Diedre Berger of National Public Radio (NPR) who would later take over leadership of the American Jewish Committee’s Berlin office. They and many others were frequent guests at my dinners. Robert had gone out as Chargé to open our Mission in Azerbaijan, but he would fly in unexpectedly whenever he could, laden with mounds of caviar from Baku to be instantly devoured by my guests. My neighbors were extremely hospitable. The family Haas and the family Schultz invited me often to dinners that invariably began with a glass of sekt. Herr Haas showed me a large volume containing the family history over many generations, including Italian ancestors who had migrated north from Torino for the book trade. Herr Schultz took time away from a visit to Boston to drive all the way up to Groton School to deliver a packet of German cookies to our son. These Frankfurt friends taught me a great deal about Germany. Many stayed in touch and provided me with further education when I was posted to Berlin years later.

After a splendid farewell party hosted by the new Consul General Janet Andres, at which, as a carefully rehearsed surprise, my friend Frances Fenton from the Frankfurt Opera sang the Shaker Hymn Simple Gifts, accompanied by my young son Edward on the trumpet, I set off for my next posting in Vienna.

Lessons Learned: Germany 1992-1995

The lessons I learned from my posting to Frankfurt are perhaps almost too many to recount. Most importantly, I learned the effectiveness of our efforts to rebuild a war-ravaged country following its defeat, rather than seeking punitive measures as had happened with the Versailles Treaty after WWI. Germany was our ally, not our foe. The impact of the Marshall Plan was still evident on a daily basis. Whenever a flood or fire occurred in the United States, older Germans would call me at the Amerika Haus to ask how to help. The enormous influence wrought through the existence of the network of cultural centers known as the Amerika Häuser was a clear illustration of the value of people-to-people exchange at cost far less than military firepower or potential future wars. I learned too that Germans were to be respected for
dealing with their own past, in particular the **Holocaust**, but also the crimes of the **Stasi**, the repressive East German security apparatus of the communist era. The German press was characterized by an openness and fair-minded independence. The importance of intellectual conferences, literary readings and cultural programs was reinforced in my mind. I also saw firsthand the extent to which individuals could change the course of history. Roy Gutman brought the suffering in Bosnia to the attention of the world, as did Susan Sontag. Richard Holbrooke perhaps foresaw the American retreat that precipitated the closure of our cultural centers. He had the imagination, the vision and the force of personality to create an **American Academy** in Berlin that could keep the transatlantic dialogue alive. In terms of conflict resolution, my work on Yugoslavia had just begun. Our Embassy in Vienna had been designated a platform for our Embassy in Sarajevo.

**V. Post-Cold War Conflict Resolution: Austria 1995 – 1997**

Austria is a small, wealthy, exquisitely beautiful country with a brilliant imperial past. On the one hand, it took a very enlightened view of the Bosnian conflict, attempting to deal fairly with all factions. The Austro-Hungarian Empire had governed the region, taking over from the Ottomans in 1878. The Ottoman Empire had annexed Bosnia in the 14th Century, even before the conquest of Istanbul. The Slavic landed gentry had been given tax benefits in exchange for conversion to Islam, resulting in a contemporary Bosnian society in which the educated upper crust adhered to a very gentle and tolerant form of that religion. Beyond refraining from pork, there was little to distinguish them from the larger European society. Peasants working the land had clung to their Christian convictions, but relations amongst the three main confessions in Bosnia - Muslim, Roman Catholic and Orthodox, - were relatively amicable. Until the Second World War, Sarajevo had also been home to a large Sephardic Jewish population as well. In the face of the Bosnian conflict, the Austrians were extremely generous taking in refugees, making no distinctions amongst the religious/ethnic groups. Bosniaks were treated as kindly as Croats and Serbs. On the other hand, Austrians, unlike the Germans, had never really acknowledged their support for Hitler, many claiming, despite film footage and much other evidence to the contrary, that they had been victims of Nazi aggression. A third factor that made Austria unique was that it had managed, unlike Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, to escape the Iron Curtain. It was known for its neutrality, making it an ideal place during the Cold War for the various parties in a dispute to meet.
Vienna was a cosmopolitan city. Despite its international banking sector, when I visited friends in an apartment block in Frankfurt, all the names on the door in those days would almost certainly be German. In Vienna, one encountered a great variety of names from Eastern Europe, the Balkans, and far beyond. The German spoken in Frankfurt was very close to what I had learned in my language classes. The German in Austria was distinguished by a musical character. The intellectual prose in the newspapers was easier for me to decipher as it included a much higher percentage of abstract words with Latin roots. In Frankfurt, my official meetings were conducted in German and my invitation cards were printed in German. In Vienna, meetings were often conducted in English and invitation cards were printed in English. The Viennese were in conversation with the world due to the number of international organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) seeking to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy, or the Vienna Office of the United Nations, or the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban-Treaty Organization (CTBTO) located in their city.

Assistant Secretary Holbrooke had recommended that Ambassador Swanee Hunt, a political appointee close to President and Mrs. Clinton, recruit me to be her Public Affairs Counselor, a position for which I had already applied. When I was on Home Leave in Boston, a location chosen because our son was a student at Groton, Swanee contacted me and invited me to attend a talk she was giving at Harvard’s Kennedy School. It was immediately evident that she, like Richard Holbrooke, was a larger than life character with an enormous impetus to do good in the world. As the youngest daughter of the oil tycoon H.L. Hunt, Swanee had a huge fortune. She had dedicated her life to philanthropic endeavors even before her arrival in Vienna. Her first priority was always to help women. Over the years, through her many projects, she inspired thousands of women around the world to excel professionally, particularly in the most difficult circumstances.

Working with her, I came to appreciate why a small, relatively problem-free country like Austria would want a political appointee as ambassador. For one thing, Swanee was able to entertain lavishly, hosting several large dinners a week, often in promotion of worthy causes. She invited Placido Domingo and Thomas Hampson to sing in her home and accompanied them herself on the piano. Dave Brubeck celebrated his 75th birthday at a post-concert dinner she hosted in his honor. The other reason Austrians were thrilled to have her was that she could pick up the phone, should the circumstances warrant it, and call the President or Mrs. Clinton, something no career diplomat could ever do. Swanee’s husband, Dr. Charles Ansbacher, was a gifted conductor and a man of great intelligence and sensitivity. A former Fulbright scholar, he had a great appreciation for the mutual benefits of our exchange programs. During Swanee’s tenure
in Vienna, Charles performed not only in Austria, but in Sarajevo as well. Later, he and Swanee would travel at their own expense to many of the NIS countries in the Caucasus and Central Asia to conduct orchestras there and to inspire languishing music communities with hope for the future. For her part, Swanee gave the women in these emerging countries reason to hope for a better future by involving them in her many projects designed to promote women’s professional and financial independence.

One Thanksgiving, Swanee asked me to represent her at a dinner in the magnificent National Library in honor of the New York filmmaker Martin Scorsese so that she could spend the holiday with her family. My husband was on duty at our Embassy in Zagreb and our son was away at school, so being a Scorsese fan, I was delighted to take the seat next to him and have the opportunity to discuss his films over the course of a splendid Austrian repast. He told me that he was interested in making a movie in Turkey, but unfortunately, that never transpired.

On another Thanksgiving, we hosted Defense Secretary William Perry and his delegation during their visit to the troops in the Balkans. Yet another distinguished visitor was Austrian-American Rabbi Arthur Schneier from Park East Synagogue in New York. A human rights activist, he maintained close ties with leaders from all the religious communities in Vienna. Swanee gave a luncheon in his honor with Vienna Archbishop Christoph Schönborn, another advocate for good inter-faith relations, particularly for partnership between Jews and Christians, and dialogue of both with Muslims.

Perhaps the most controversial visitor was Samuel Huntington whose Clash of Civilizations had caused quite a stir. The Handelskammer (Chamber of Commerce) had organized an event so well-attended that video monitors had to be set up in adjacent rooms. Since Huntington was an American author, Ambassador Hunt had been invited to sit on the panel along with a conservative Austrian politician whose view of the Huntington book was positive, and a young, strikingly handsome Roman Catholic priest. I had provided Swanee with a summary of the book in advance. In the course of the rather anti-immigrant panel discussion, she described her work with young people of immigrant background in Denver, differing starkly with the Huntington perspective. It was the priest however, who carried the day. He recounted his work with the youth of the Vienna immigrant community, largely from Muslim countries. Looking the audience square in the eye, and picking up on a point made by the conservative politician, he said he agreed that these young people were very different from their Austrian neighbors. To an astonished audience, “they believe in God,” he said.

My office was located in a building quite close to the Vienna Amerika Haus, but I soon found myself ensconced part of every day in an office near that of Ambassador Hunt in the Embassy.
Fortunately, the two senior public diplomacy staff members, Dr. Karin Czerny, responsible for press, and Dr. Roswitha Haller, Director of the Amerika Haus, were eminently experienced and qualified. Dr. Czerny maintained close ties with the most influential Austrian journalists such as Der Standard’s Eric Frey, all of whom held her in high regard. Eric was married to Katinka Nowotny, the daughter of Dr. Eva Nowotny who served as the Austrian Ambassador to France, Great Britain and the U.S. Dr. Haller, a devoted reader of The New York Review of Books, succeeded in bringing many of our most prominent authors to Vienna not only in conjunction with the Frankfurt Book Fair, but throughout the year. I had the opportunity to host a dinner for Donna Leon, the mystery writer from New Jersey resident in Venice whose novels feature the endearing Commissario Guido Brunetti. The renowned scholar of Ottoman history, Bernard Lewis addressed our audience in the Amerika Haus about his latest work on the role of Muslims over the centuries in Europe. The New York author Cathleen Schine read to us from her novel Love Letters. We presented readings by Russell Banks, David Guterson and many other well-known American authors, including Frank McCourt, Irish-born author of Angela’s Ashes.

I was once again, most fortunate in having a talented and highly educated senior foreign service national staff at my side. Either Karin or Roswitha would have made superb diplomats. Through their good offices, I was immediately in touch with the most influential people in the Austrian society. We held lectures, book readings and conferences in the splendid, wood paneled Amerika Haus Library located on the ground floor of the elegant Rathaus Apartment building. I hosted musical evenings with accomplished American pianists performing works by Gershwin and Copeland on the beautiful Bösendorfer grand piano in my salon. The literati and artists of Vienna along with such distinguished internationally acclaimed journalists as Alison Smale attended my receptions, including the very active circle of Princeton alumni.

Among the impressive residents of Vienna whom I met at one of Swanee’s dinners was Dr. Bruce Leimsidor, Director of HIAS, the Jewish organization dedicated to the rescue of refugees. Founded in 1881 to assist Jews fleeing pogroms in Russia and Eastern Europe, the HIAS Vienna office was occupied at that time largely with refugees from Iran, not all even Jewish. Dr. Leimsidor is today a widely respected expert on all aspects of the European refugee crisis who is quoted often in The New York Times. Another was Simon Wiesenthal, the famed Nazi hunter whose office I visited several times at Swanee’s behest. He maintained a close friendship with the official Bosnian diplomatic representative in Vienna, a man his own age, the scion of the union between a Polish aristocrat and a dashing Turkish officer. These two elderly men, one Jewish, one Muslim, both Viennese, often enjoyed a morning coffee together.
Not long after my arrival in Vienna, the *Dayton Accords*, the framework for peace in Bosnia-Herzegovina, had been signed in Paris on December 14, 1995, putting an end to the three and a half-year Bosnian War. French President *Jacques Chirac*, U.S. President *Bill Clinton*, UK Prime Minister *John Major*, German Chancellor *Helmut Kohl* and Russian Prime Minister *Viktor Chernomyrdin* witnessed the signatures of the President of the Republic of Serbia, *Slobodan Milosevic*, the President of Croatia, *Franjo Tudjman*, and the President of Bosnia and Herzegovina, *Alija Izetbegovic*. The peace conference had been led by U.S. Secretary of State *Warren Christopher*. *Ambassador Richard Holbrooke* was the chief negotiator who brokered the final agreement involving compromises on all sides that made it possible to stop the bloodshed. It was widely believed that he was the only person who could have accomplished this feat.

Vienna had been designated a platform embassy for our mission in Sarajevo. Ambassador Swanee Hunt took this responsibility seriously, determined to do all she could for the suffering inhabitants of that city. Once Dayton had been signed, it was possible, although very difficult, for me to visit Sarajevo. We held regular meetings in Vienna to discuss our strategy. We sought a project that would attract the attention of donors to the plight of the Bosnians. Among those who participated in these meetings was *Dr. Fahrija Ganic*, a dermatologist, and the wife of *Dr. Ejup Ganic*, the Vice-President (and later twice president) of the *Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Fahrija was in Vienna with their children *Emina* and *Emir* while Ejup recovered from a near fatal road accident that was probably caused by sabotage. A graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Ejup Ganic would work closely with us on reconciliation projects once he had recovered. He had spent a year living in the basement of the Sarajevo Presidency while it was being shelled by Serbs, surviving on one loaf of bread a day, sleeping in his wife’s fur coat to stay warm, and remaining in touch with the outside world via satellite telephone.

Once the *Dayton Accords* had been signed, it was possible to travel to Sarajevo, although this was always rather happenstance as there were no commercial flights. In the course of my two years in Vienna, I made some eleven trips there, along with one to Tuzla. Conditions directly after the war were extremely difficult. I stayed at the Hotel Bosna when possible, communicating with the staff in French, German or Turkish. In one of the rooms I was assigned, there was a damaged television set in front of a large hole in the wall where it might have once been plugged in. Otherwise, I stayed at a pension whose large, uncurtained windows faced an apartment complex, making it imperative to dress and undress under the covers. One bathroom was shared by everyone and a line formed early in the morning for cold showers.
during the hour or so that water was available. This pension featured a restaurant with two menus, one labeled “Food” and the other labeled “Big Food.” When I inquired, I discovered that this latter menu was for those who included pork in their diet, a “b” having taken the place of a “p.”

The National and University Library of Sarajevo, a magnificent building in the Spanish Moorish style, had held some 1.5 million volumes and over 155,000 rare books and manuscripts representing the cultural and intellectual history of all the confessions of Bosnia. Courageous library staff, at least one of whom died, had been able to secure some of its most precious possessions, including many of the illuminated manuscripts, before Serbian shelling caused the complete destruction of the remaining library collection on August 25, 1992, perhaps the largest single book-burning in history since the destruction by fire of the ancient library of Alexandria.

Since the world had witnessed the brutal shelling of the Sarajevo Library on television, we decided that this would be a significant, neutral symbolic project inclusive of all ethnic communities. I had seen an article in The New York Times describing the efforts of the library director to rescue precious illuminated manuscripts, historic books and documents during the siege of the city. With great difficulty, I was able to reach Dr. Enes Kujundzic on the telephone. We invited him to Vienna to meet with Ambassador Hunt and others interested in developing a project to draw the attention of the world to the loss of irreplaceable intellectual property in the course of the Siege. Over the following year and a half, under the sponsorship of Ambassador Hunt, the Books for Sarajevo project resulted not only in the collection of book donations for the library, but also in European Union sponsorship of the preservation of the outer structure and eventual restoration of the building. It had become apparent that what was left of this stunning edifice would soon collapse if not properly bolstered by girders. The functioning Library was moved to the former Tito Barracks, prompting a number of my Bosnian friends to comment that they missed the days when Tito ruled and the country had not yet succumbed to ethnic madness.

When Ferdinand and Isabella’s Alhambra Decree expelled the Jews of Spain in 1492, they were welcomed by the Sultan into the Ottoman Empire. Istanbul, Thessaloniki and Sarajevo soon had the three largest Sephardic populations under Turkish rule. During World War II, at risk to his own life, the Muslim Museum Director, Derviş Korkut, smuggled the Sarajevo Haggadah out of the city and gave it to a Muslim cleric in Zenica where it was hidden under the floorboards of a mosque. During the Siege of Sarajevo, it was again concealed, this time from Serb forces in an underground vault. Geraldine Brooks has written a novel recounting the fictionalized history of
the Haggadah. In the *New Yorker*, she recounts the true story of Derviş Korkut who had also hidden a Jewish girl from the Nazi’s. As an elderly woman, this same girl, now living in Israel, secured the safety of Korkut’s daughter during the Bosnian war. More recently, Sarajevo’s **Grand Mufti, Mustafa Ceric**, presented a replica of the Haggadah to a representative of the Chief Rabbinate of Israel. The good Muslim-Jewish relations in Sarajevo were not unique to Bosnia, but the result of the Ottoman *millet* system which permitted each religious community to be governed in personal matters by its own religious law.

Among my good friends in Vienna was the Israeli diplomat **Doron Grossman** (later Israel’s Ambassador to Senegal). He too participated in events hosted by Ambassador Hunt in her reconciliation efforts. He and his partner, a lovely former dancer from Switzerland, invited me to their Sukkot celebration, the Feast of the Tabernacles. Knowing my interest in the Sarajevo Haggadah, he kindly alerted me to the existence of a rare copy he had discovered in a Viennese bookstore.

Sarajevo’s Old Synagogue dates to the 16th century. In 1932, it had been splendidly refurbished in the Moorish style making it the most beautiful synagogue in the Balkans. When the Nazi’s occupied the city during World War II, it was looted and ultimately demolished. They had used it as a detention center for Jews bound for deportation. In the period during and directly after the Bosnian war, Jewish life in Sarajevo centered around the new Ashkenazi Synagogue which served as a safe haven in the war-torn city, providing sustenance for all in need regardless of ethnicity. The leader of Sarajevo’s Jewish community was the Sephardic **Jakob Finci**, born in Rab concentration camp in 1943. Throughout the Bosnian war, he dedicated himself to humanitarian outreach. In 1995, he was elected President of the Jewish Community of Sarajevo. He is a founding member of the Inter-Religious Council of Bosnia and Herzegovina established in 1997 in which the Muslim, Christian and Jewish communities are represented.

On my visits to Bosnia, I met with the leaders of the religious communities in preparation for an inter-faith conference Ambassador Hunt hoped to sponsor in Vienna. I came to know Jakob Finci well, indeed he said that since Finn and Finci were almost the same name, we must be cousins. The conference was eventually convened in Vienna. Jakob Finci served in the role of honest broker. The Muslims were represented by the Grand Mufti Mustafa Ceric, the Roman Catholics by their Bishop, and the Serbs by a humble Orthodox parish priest courageous enough to join us. Ceric had earned a doctoral degree at the University of Chicago. He was an extremely enlightened and well-educated man. Finci held a law degree and was also well-educated. The Catholic Bishop was committed to reconciliation, as was the Serbian priest, although the latter was hampered by lack of support from the Serbian community. In order to keep the
proceedings private, Swanee provided lodging in her guest house adjacent to the beautiful Schönbrunner Schloss Park so that the participants would be able to engage in dialogue during peaceful strolls. With Jakob Finci as facilitator, these representatives of the Muslim, Roman Catholic and Serbian Orthodox religious communities hammered out a set of principles advocating peace and tolerance to be taken back to their respective communities. This was the beginning of a long process of reconciliation in which Jakob Finci and Mustafa Ceric are still prominently involved.

In July 1995, the Bosnian Serb Army of Republika Srpska, under the command of Ratko Mladic, perpetrated the massacre of 8,000 Bosnian Muslim men and boys in and around the town of Srebrenica, despite the fact that it had been declared a safe area under UN protection. One year later, Ambassador Hunt decided to hold a memorial in nearby Tuzla in commemoration of the victims. Austrian Airlines provided a plane to transport us there. We were joined by the American born Queen Noor Al-Hussein of Jordan (the former Lisa Halaby), a graduate of Princeton’s first co-ed class in 1973, as well as Bosnia-Herzegovina’s Vice President Ejup Ganic, Dr. Fahrifa Ganic and diplomats from the Bosnian Mission in Vienna. The event took place on a very hot day in a large, unventilated gymnasium filled to capacity with the wives, mothers, sisters and daughters of the victims. Shortly after the beginning of the documentary film about the genocide, women in the rafters began to cry out. Many fainted. Sensing that the situation should be calmed, I consulted with the Bosnian diplomat seated with me. He recommended that I send a note to Queen Noor requesting that she take the stage and recite the Bismillah, the opening phrase of the Koran. The previous speaker had addressed the audience in English, a language few could understand. Queen Noor said a few words of Arabic and led them in prayer, after which a peaceful atmosphere permeated this large audience of indescribably bereaved women. The raw pain of these women was unimaginable. Eventually, forensic experts would retrieve the remains from multiple mass graves and enable many of the families to properly bury their loved ones.

At the invitation of Ambassador Hunt, First Lady Hillary Clinton visited Austria for five days during which she made a special effort to focus attention on the situation in Bosnia. We decided to organize a major event in Vienna’s National Library for Bosnian refugees and the leaders of the Austrian and international aid organizations dedicated to assisting them. As a student, Hillary Clinton had worked in the civil rights movement in the American South, so it was no surprise that she wanted to do something to alleviate the suffering of those who had fled war-torn Bosnia. I prepared extensive notes on her interlocutors with background and talking points on the larger refugee issues. She came to the event fully prepared. I was
immensely impressed by her professionalism. Not only did she provide reassuring messages to the audience, she listened attentively to the stories they had to tell her and took extensive notes. Imagine the feelings of a Bosnian refugee who finds the First Lady of the United States full of earnest compassion for his or her plight. Imagine the hope inspired in the director of an aid organization when the First Lady records the requested requirements. Although the Clintons had been initially slow to react to the unfolding tragedy in Bosnia, they made amends once they realized the dimensions and implications of the war.

In Pakistan, I had organized international conferences that included participants from India, as well as other countries. However, these conferences dealt with topics like Postmodernism, or Rule of Law, or the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, subjects other than the ethnic and religious divide between India and Pakistan. Now I was to embark on a project that would deal directly with a major European conflict, only shortly after the Dayton Peace Accord had been signed.

The Vice President of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ejup Ganic, was born near Novi Pazar in the Sanjak region of Serbia. The holder of a doctoral degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), he was highly educated and fluent in English, as was his wife Dr. Fahrija Ganic. Fahrija had been the only Muslim woman in her class at the Medical School in Belgrade where she witnessed the development of the racist, Nazi-inspired ideology of faculty member Dr. Radowan Karadzic who was, in many ways, the architect of the Serbian justification for the war. Eventually, like Ratko Mladic, and Milosevic himself, Karadzic was brought before the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia in The Hague. Mladic and Karadzic were convicted many years later of war crimes. Milosevic died in custody before his trial had been completed.

The human tragedy prompted by this ultra-nationalism included the destruction of much historic memory. While in Austria, I came to know the Hungarian-born scholar Andras Riedlmayer, a Princeton educated expert on Islamic art and architecture at Harvard University who had particular expertise on the cultural heritage of Bosnia. A large number of village mosques were obliterated by Serb forces during the war. However, some of the most appalling desecration in Sarajevo involved the defacement of the magnificent 16th century Ottoman Gazi-Husev-bey Mosque, perpetrated by the Saudis who objected to its decorative elements. They even defaced the exquisite calligraphy on Ottoman tombstones. Dr. Riedlmayer’s knowledge of Islamic art extended far beyond the Balkans. It was Andras who would place an urgent call to me years later to warn of the Taliban intention to blow up the twin Buddhas in Bamiyan, Afghanistan.
Once the war had come to an end, Vice President Ejup Ganic approached us at the Embassy hoping to find a road to reconciliation amongst the warring Bosnian ethnic factions. Ambassador Hunt who never made ethnic distinctions of any kind amongst the Bosnians, enthusiastically endorsed this project. I spent the following months working out a Tripartite Agreement to create a Center for Democracy in Vienna to be sponsored by Austria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and the United States. Although the war was over, it was still difficult for those former enemies to meet in Bosnia. It was the Vice President’s idea that this could best happen in historically neutral Vienna. Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs could come together to engage in peaceful dialogue without the repercussions that would occur should they meet publicly in Sarajevo so soon after this bitter conflict.

Acting on behalf of Ambassador Hunt, I approached the Austrian Foreign Ministry. Ambassador Franz Cede, the Director of the International Law Office and his colleague Ferdinand Trauttmanndorff (later Ambassador Trauttmanndorf), another legal expert, were extremely forthcoming in their response. In both Austria and Germany, virtually all the diplomats with whom I dealt had law degrees. Austria had a long history with Bosnia. Although still technically part of the Ottoman Empire, after the Treaty of Berlin was enacted in 1878, Bosnia and Herzegovina had de facto fallen under Austro-Hungarian rule. The Austrians had governed Bosnia wisely, treating each of the three religious confessions equally in emulation of the Turkish millet system. There were however, undercurrents of Serbian nationalism. The assassination of the heir presumptive to the Austro-Hungarian throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand, by the Serbian extremist Gavrilo Princip in Sarajevo on June 28th, 1914, triggered World War I. More recently, throughout the Bosnian War, the Austrians had generously received refugees fleeing the carnage.

The negotiations for the creation of the Center for Democracy went quite smoothly since all parties were favorably disposed. The United States contributed the Amerika Haus with its magnificent, wood-panelled library, conference rooms and exhibition space centrally located near the Vienna Rathaus (town hall). It was essential to have this conspicuous and well-known venue to demonstrate to the world that the meetings that would take place in Vienna would do so under American auspices. The Austrians, with their inevitable unsurpassed generosity, contributed the travel/hotel funds to enable the participants to come up to Vienna from Sarajevo. The Bosnians were responsible for identifying and inviting those who were to take part in the dialogue, scrupulously including all three ethnic persuasions. Once we had reached agreement on our respective responsibilities, I drew up the formal document for approval by our partners. Ambassador Hunt signed it, along with the representatives of Austria and Bosnia.
The Amerika Haus was the ideal venue for this endeavor. Created in the spirit of the Marshall Plan, it continued to be dedicated to the U.S. – Austrian relationship. How appropriate to take advantage of the excellent partnership between our two countries to work together to promote peace in war torn Bosnia. The opening conference enabled Bosnian Serbs, Croats and Muslims to come together for the first time since the war to discuss their plans for a better future. I invited Richard Goldstone, the South African judge who had issued key rulings undermining apartheid, to deliver the keynote address. Due to his work in South Africa, he would be nominated to serve as the chief prosecutor of the United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, eventually prosecuting the cases of Karadzic and Mladic. Also present was Simon Wiesenthal. I had invited him to speak, but he had declined, lending the gravitas of his presence as an endorsement. When I asked him about speaking, he replied “die stille Hilfe ist die beste Hilfe,” (the quiet help is the best). It was terribly important to the Bosnians that these two Jewish opponents of racial bigotry had come to the Center for Democracy in support of human rights. Although Goldstone was not religious, he has written that his Jewish heritage played a part in the fight against Apartheid in South Africa. Jakob Finci and the Jewish community of Sarajevo had served as honest brokers throughout the conflict. Susan Sontag had told me during the war, that when she looked around the table at a conference of people who had stepped in early to help to end the conflict that everyone was Jewish.

Although my posting to Vienna was supposed to be four years, I was told in the summer of 1997, after only two years, that I was needed in Ankara. I did have an opportunity to work with Ambassador Hunt on one more major project before I left however. She had come up with the idea that we should provide musical instruments to the children of Bosnia. It can be debated whether the Vienna or the Berlin Philharmonic is better – both are superb. Austria is an intensely musical country, meaning that in most homes there would probably be an old violin or clarinet or stored in the closet. We put out a call for donations and the response was just as overwhelming as it had been for the books we had donated to the Sarajevo Library. The Austrian government undertook the transportation of the instruments to Bosnia by rail. It was lovely to leave this beautiful country on a musical note.

Lessons Learned: Austria 1995-1997

It was clear to me that the collapse of communism, while freeing a vast number of people in the former Soviet domain from a repressive state, had opened Pandora’s box regarding ethnic nationalism. People who had once thought of themselves as “Yugoslavs,” now had a new self-definition as Croat, Serb or Bosniak. The Serbo-Croatian language was now categorized as
Croatian, or Serbian or Bosniak, despite its mutual intelligibility. The Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian Empires had dealt relatively well with the multi-ethnicity of their subjects in the Balkans by finding ways in which to cultivate allegiance to the rulers without complete loss of local identity. I observed also that those who had suffered under communist rule were now drawn to strongmen like Milosevic and Tudjman as leaders. It was evident that democracy does not take root overnight. It was also apparent that given the willingness of the religious leadership, common ground could be sought for an endorsement of fundamental human rights and civil liberties. The impact of Ambassador Hunt’s inter-faith conference in Vienna was long-lasting. As for the Center for Democracy, as Robert Frost wrote, “nothing gold can stay.” It served an important purpose in the period immediately after the Bosnian War. Representatives of the various factions were indeed able to meet to discuss their differences, and in some cases, to renew their friendships despite the bitter legacy of the war. Ambassador Hunt left Vienna not long after I did to go to the Kennedy School at Harvard. Once we were both gone, the Amerika Haus was taken over by the Consular Office and put to an entirely different purpose. This was the end, not only of our reconciliation efforts, it was the end of a stellar landmark in the Austrian-American relationship going back to the days of the Marshall Plan.

As the Public Affairs Officer in Vienna, I was charged with writing a trimestral letter to Washington providing an analysis of the political and economic conditions, the major issues and challenges. Although my letters contained many upbeat observations about our peace efforts and the enormous degree of Austrian cooperation, I did repeatedly warn of the emergence of nationalism in Austria, in particular with reference to Joerg Haider and his far-right Freedom Party. I worried that resentments smoldering under the surface might be let loose in the future.

VI. Post-Cold War Conflict Resolution: Turkey 1997 – 2000

I had left my earlier posting to our Embassy in Ankara in 1984 in the last decade of the Cold War. The Turkey to which I returned thirteen years later in 1997 following the collapse of the Soviet Union was enormously changed. Of course, some familiar figures were still in place. Süleyman Demirel was now President, having served as Prime Minister seven times over a period of nearly thirty years. As leader of the Justice Party (AP) and later the True Path party (DYP), he represented moderate urban voters as well as those in the conservative heartland and managed to be a unifying force for the country. It might be said that he was the last major political figure to hold the disparate elements in Turkish society together. Necmettin Erbakan, the founder of a series of Islamist political parties, had been forced by the military to step down
As Prime Minister in June 1997 after serving only one year. **Mesut Yılmaz**, leader of the Motherland Party (ANAP) founded by **Turgut Özal**, had replaced Erbakan as Prime Minister, representing a moderately conservative constituency. The extraordinary difference was that Erbakan’s supporters, just a tiny fraction of the population in the early 1980’s, were now sufficiently influential for him to have been elected Prime Minister at all. Turkey had always been nationalist, but this was the emergence of an Islamist nationalism harkening back to an earlier era. When the secular Republic was created out of the ashes of the Ottoman Empire, an entirely new ideology had taken hold. Turkey would not look to its imperial past, but to its future as a modern society.

As part of this modernization, the language employed by academic élites in the early 1980’s was yeni Türkçe (“new Turkish”), based on öz Türkçe (“authentic Turkic” roots). Efforts to eliminate Persian and Arabic words and create "pure" Turkish over the previous decades had resulted in a new Turkish vocabulary exemplified in the prose of Cumhuriyet, the leading secular newspaper. With the rise of Islamic nationalism, changes in politics led to the renewal of the old Arabic and Persian vocabulary of Ottoman Turkish. There was an ideological component to the words that were used in everyday speech, such as the choice of okul from a Turkish root, as opposed to the word mektep from Arabic as the word for "school." The old Arabic and Persian words of Osmanlıcî were being revived, and along with that, a nostalgia for a glorious past, one in which Turkey had ruled a vast empire and been home for four hundred years to the Caliphate. Turkey had been the de facto leader of the Muslim world. It was Atatürk who had abolished this institution, at a time when the implications of its disappearance were barely understood beyond educated Islamic circles in the Indian Subcontinent whose weak objections were soundly ignored. There was a sense that perhaps Turkey’s secularism, modeled on that of France, had gone too far in suppressing religious identity.

My return was nostalgic in a different and more personal way. Ankara had been my first diplomatic posting. Memories of walks with our little son in the Swan Park and weekend visits with him to the Zoo made Ankara seem very familiar despite the changes. One of the wonderful things about returning to a prior posting in the diplomatic service is that one immediately reconnects with a network of friends from an earlier time. Whether in Istanbul or Ankara, **Yavuz and Günsel Renda, Emre and Bilgi Kongar, Duygu Sezer, Sedat and Canan Ergin, Ibrahim and Füsun Kavarakoğlu, Oya Başak, Gönül Uçele** and many others were still there, except now they held far more elevated and influential positions. **Dr. Toni Cross**, an American archaeologist resident in Turkey, was still producing the Ankara Scene at the Embassy, a wonderful monthly guide to the infinite possibilities for archaeological exploration Turkey had
to offer. She and her husband, Ihsan Çetin, a professor of economics, were full of insights into the changes that had taken place in my absence. There were new friends as well such as Mehmet Ali Bayar, a gifted young diplomat in the office of President Demirel who had earlier worked closely with my husband in Baku when they were assigned to our respective embassies there. He was clearly one of Turkey’s rising stars. The journalist Zeynep Alemdar Tinaz, and the academics Feride Acar, Ayşe Ayata and I met frequently for intense discussions of the latest political developments.

As Counselor for Public Affairs at the Embassy, I was responsible for public and cultural diplomacy outreach throughout the country. Our cultural centers had been closed, a fact bitterly lamented by many of the academics and journalists with whom we worked, but it was still possible to organize conferences and seminars at the universities and other venues. I travelled often to Istanbul, as well as to Izmir, Adana and elsewhere to oversee our programs. Our press officer, Ian Kelly (later Ambassador Kelly) had developed a network of readers for our policy briefs and other materials across the country in an early and effective use of the internet. The Istanbul public affairs officer, Mary Ann Witten, introduced me to many of the leading cultural and academic figures with whom she was working. Among those I met was Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu, later Secretary General of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), a Turkish diplomat dedicated to the restoration of historic cultural sites. He was overseeing research that would prove useful for the international organizations planning to rebuild the beautiful 16th Century Ottoman bridge in Mostar, Stari Most, that had been destroyed in the Bosnian War.

We had a constant stream of visitors at the Embassy. One of our top priorities was the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline. We organized many press conferences and interviews for Ambassador John Wolf, special advisor on the Caspian at which he would dispel skepticism about the project. Defense Secretary William Cohen visited Ankara to reinforce our strong military ties with Turkey. With the second largest standing army in NATO after our own, Turkey was an invaluable ally. We had visits from David Harris and the American Jewish Committee, immensely pleased by the positive turn in Turkish-Israeli relations. Ambassador Richard Holbrooke came to consult with the Turks on a solution to the Cyprus dilemma. As Special Envoy to Cyprus and the Balkans, he had brokered the deal making Turkey part of the Customs Union of the EU, an important step towards EU membership at a time when this seemed an eventual possibility. In addition to these and many other important visitors, we had countless Congressional Delegations.

Ambassador Mark Parris was a skilled diplomat who got off to an excellent start by speaking to the journalists who greeted him at the airport upon arrival in Turkish. Having served in senior
positions in both Moscow and Tel Aviv, he was exactly the right person at the right time. I have always believed that the most effective way to influence public opinion was by working with respected and informed local voices. Turkish journalists of high integrity always gave us a hearing, even if they were not in agreement. We could be sure that in conveying their understanding of U.S. policy positions, they would do so accurately. They were able to reach a large public that trusted and respected their views. During the three years that I worked with Ambassador Parris, I arranged and attended many “off the record” lunches and other meetings with the most influential print and television journalists of the day such as Cengiz Çandar, Nuri Çolakoğlu, Hasan Cemal, Mehmet Ali Birand, and Amberin Zaman. I was in regular touch by telephone with Sami Kohen in Istanbul who had been covering foreign policy for the daily paper Milliyet since 1954. Sami came from one of Istanbul’s Sephardic families and could speak Ladino, the language of the Jews of Spain who had made their way into the Ottoman Empire centuries before. He told me that when he travelled in parts of South America where an older version of Spanish was spoken that he had no trouble in communicating. The leading newspapers remained the same – the leftist and staunchly secular Cumhuriyet, and the centrist Hurriyet and Milliyet had retained their profiles. New on the scene was Zaman, a daily appealing to an emerging Islamist readership. There was a proliferation of new television and radio stations, many of them private and local. In terms of recognizing Turkey’s cultural leaders, I was able to arrange for Ambassador Parris to host a dinner in Istanbul in honor of the Turkish novelist Orhan Pamuk (later a Nobel Laureate) with other distinguished Turkish artists and literary figures.

On the academic side, in the spirit of Turkey’s Gilded Age, the most powerful families had now founded private universities. Ihsan Dogramaci, born into an Iraqi Turkmen family in the Ottoman Empire, had founded Bilkent University (1984), a private institution fostering preparation of students for a future in a globalizing world. His son, Ali Dogramaci served as Rector of Bilkent. This university introduced a superb arts program, sponsoring musical training and concerts, as well as pursuing a broad range of other academic endeavors. Ihsan Dogramaci was later a co-founder of the Assembly of the Parliament of Cultures with Prince Hassan of Jordan, dedicated to promoting intercultural understanding (2004). Koç University (1993) in Istanbul, founded by the family of that same name, was a non-profit institution catering to the graduates of élite secondary schools like Robert College and also sponsoring a competitive international perspective. The ground-breaking for a third private institution, Sabanci University, took place in 1997 under the auspices of the Sabanci family foundation. Our friend of many years, Ahmet Evin, a foreign policy expert and his wife Zehra Sayers, a bio-physicist, were among the founders of Sabanci. Ahmet invited me to participate in discussions about the
curriculum of this new university. At the same time, Turkey’s two leading public institutions, Boğaziçi University in Istanbul (where I had earlier been a member of the faculty), and the Middle East Technical University (METU) in Ankara, both American-founded and English-speaking, continued to be cutting edge and highly competitive. Indeed, a mathematician friend of mine on the Harvard faculty who had been teaching one semester a year at METU told me that her METU math students were very bit as good as those she taught at Harvard.

The German Embassy in Ankara is located next to our own on Atatürk Boulevard. It was a great pleasure to interact with the highly professional German press and cultural affairs officers whose work was most impressive. Germany had extensive educational programs in Turkey at that time. The close German-Turkish relationship is historic, going back to the first Ottoman siege of Vienna in the 16th century, after which captured Turks were settled in southern Germany. In the 1960’s as Germany was undergoing its Wirtschaftswunder, the economic miracle which sped prosperity in West Germany, Turkish workers were invited to help with the rebuilding of the country. These workers made a significant contribution, and eventually brought their families to join them. What most Germans did not see however, was the great impact this had particularly in the less-developed regions of Turkey. Turkish workers invested in their villages, prompting the introduction of electricity and improved water systems in remote parts of the country. In my early travels in Turkey, it was easy to see which villages had sent their workers to Germany, and which had not. On the whole, this was an arrangement that benefitted both sides.

The time when Mark Parris was our Ambassador to Turkey and Jim Jeffrey (later Ambassador Jeffrey) was the Deputy Chief of Mission were the golden years of the U.S. – Turkish relationship. Turks were immensely relieved by the collapse of the Soviet Union. There were extensive professional, academic and military exchanges between our countries. The media, if not always in agreement, was receptive to the accurate conveyance of our policy positions. The Turkish military was engaged in exercises with the Israelis, putting our two most reliable allies in the Eastern Mediterranean on the same page. Overflights out of Incirlik Airbase were protecting the Kurdish region of Northern Iraq on Turkey’s border. The number of universities and access to higher education was increasing. Across the country, the standard of living was improving. Work on the infrastructure was making the horrific bus and car accidents of the past more infrequent. Health standards were improving. A spirit of enterprise had permeated the business world. Overall, despite the many challenges they faced, the Turkish people were experiencing a period of expansion and optimism. We planned extensive tours of the country for Ambassador Parris and his wife Joan. I joined them on several of these, visiting provincial
capitals such as Mugla, Gaziantep, Isparta and Diyarbakir. We were greeted by the governors, mayors and local populations with tremendous warmth and hospitality. In light of subsequent developments, it is now difficult to imagine the boundless extent of the good feeling at that time.

Progressive public and private institutions were encouraging the technological and economic development of Turkey. The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) actively supported research in an effort to promote a culture of science and technology in the country. Founded as an independent, non-political public institution, it was governed by the Science Board. TÜBİTAK was led by Prof. Dinçer Ülkü, a highly respected physicist who had trained in the U.S. Dinçer and his American wife Patty had many friends among the American community. The Turkish Industry and Business Association (TÜSİAD), a non-governmental organization dedicated to the development of private enterprise, supported democracy, free market economy, environmental responsibility and human rights. TÜSİAD was headed by the Robert College and Stanford University trained Industrial Engineer, Dr. Erkut Yucaoğlu, whose wife Nilgün was the daughter of one of Turkey’s most distinguished former foreign ministers, Ambassador Vahit Halefoğlu. Erkut’s extensive experience and informed approach to the corporate world did much to advance Turkey’s interests. Robert and I had come to know Erkut and Nilgün while Robert was at the Consulate and I was teaching at Bogaziçi in the late 1970’s. These two major institutions, TÜBİTAK and TÜSİAD, under such intelligent and competent leadership represented an advanced and enlightened commitment to Turkey’s development and were responsible to a great extent for the leaps and bounds Turkey was to make in the following decades.

There was one very dark element to this otherwise rosy picture however. During my first tour in Turkey, I had not dealt with the Kurdish issue. Although Abdullah Ocalan had founded the PKK in 1978, the insurgency did not begin until after I had departed Turkey in 1984. In the context of the Cold War and beyond, the PKK was seen to be an organization supported by the Soviets. However, since the beginning of the 1984 uprising some 40,000 people, largely Kurdish civilians, but also Kurdish fighters and many Turkish soldiers as well, had died in the conflict. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, there was new attention on our part to this tragic situation. While most Turkish Kurds were demanding only linguistic and cultural rights, others were committed to a struggle to create a Kurdish state to include Turkish territory. The Turkish political leadership had not really attempted to deal with the problem through dialogue and negotiation. Nor had it made a serious effort to increase material prosperity in the Southeastern Kurdish region of the country. Instead, the military was given a free hand to use
excessively repressive measures. As a result of the conflict, an enormous number of Kurdish villagers had fled to Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir where they would soon constitute significant minorities.

The Kurds are the largest ethnic group in the world without their own nation state. Since there are large numbers of Kurds in Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Syria, as well as smaller numbers scattered about in the former Soviet Union, such a state would have to be carved out of existing countries, violating the principle of territorial integrity. Perhaps the most ironic element of this is that the Kurds were seeking a homeland based on ethnic identity at a time of globalization when the concept of an ethnic nation state was seriously challenged as a way forward. In more recent years, there has been the emergence of ethnic nationalism and nativism as a reaction to globalization, but at the time, the benefits of global economy transcended other considerations. The Kurdish language is unrelated to Turkish and can be best described as West Persian. The Kurds essentially belong to the Iranian family of peoples. The European Union was engaged with the Kurdish population of Turkey in an effort to foster incremental steps towards civil rights. Gradually, Turkey was permitting the use of the Kurdish language in certain circumstances, as well as broadcasts of Kurdish music. It is important to understand that in the great urban areas, Turkish-Kurdish intermarriage is not uncommon. In reality, it is Sunni and Shiite who rarely intermarry. Kurds in the big cities of Turkey were increasingly part of the normal social fabric.

Abdullah Ocalan, also known as Apo, founder of the PKK, was arrested in Nairobi under Greek diplomatic auspices in 1999 and taken to Turkey where he was sentenced to death. However, this sentence was commuted to life imprisonment when Turkey abolished the death penalty. The fact that the Greek government had harbored Ocalan set off a real firestorm in Greek-Turkish relations. These two NATO allies had come close to war on a number of occasions over air and water rights in the Aegean, but this capture reverberated throughout the society in a far more pervasive way, striking Turkey’s most sensitive nerve. At the end of World War I, the Treaty of Sèvres was intended to partition the Ottoman Empire, ceding its lands to the European powers. It was never ratified. Instead, it sparked the Turkish War of Independence. Led by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the Ottoman forces defeated the combined armies of the signatories. The Treaty of Lausanne, signed in 1923, preserved Turkish sovereignty through the establishment of the Republic of Turkey. One of the most profound positions of Turkish foreign policy ever since has been the defense of its territorial integrity. Atatürk vowed that Turkey would neither expand nor contract and that has been the case now for nearly a century. Nevertheless, Turks always suspected that the Greeks sought to undermine their territorial
integrity, particularly by supporting the Kurdish insurrection. This recent event with Ocalan convinced them that their suspicions were correct. This phenomenon became known as the *Sèvres Syndrome*, the belief that outside powers wished to dismantle the Turkish Republic.

To fully understand the complexities of Greek – Turkish relations, it is important to be aware of the impact of the exchange of populations. *The Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations*, signed by the Greek and Turkish governments in Lausanne in 1923 forcibly transferred over one million ethnic Greeks from Eastern Thrace, Anatolia and the Caucasus to Greece, and over 300,000 ethnic Turks from Greece to Turkey. Despite Atatürk’s secular wish that the exchange be done on the basis of language, ultimately, it was implemented on the basis of religious identity. Turkish-speaking Christians went to Greece and Greek-speaking Muslims went to Turkey. Among my friends in Ankara were a family from Ioannina on the Greek-Albanian border whose ancestors had written both Greek and Turkish in the Greek script. As a result of this transfer, some 40% of the Greek population was estimated to have Anatolian roots.

In the midst of this crisis, a highly experienced Track II facilitator, David Phillips, arrived at our Embassy in 1998, offering to help establish a Greek-Turkish dialogue. Over the following year, I worked with David to organize a series of meetings between Greeks and Turks in an atmosphere so highly charged that these had to be held surreptitiously under the auspices of neutral diplomatic representations in Istanbul and Athens. The Swedes offered their beautiful Consulate in Istanbul for the first round of talks. We decided to invite media owners and journalists to engage, believing that they would be in the best position to influence public opinion on both sides. Embassy Athens was much smaller than Embassy Ankara and had fewer resources, so I offered to cover the travel/hotel expense for the Greek participants who came to Istanbul. Although the conversations were initially chilly, Greeks and Turks do have a great deal in common, so a skilled mediator like David was able break the ice. I also organized ancillary dinners and other social occasions so that our Greek guests could meet with Turkish journalistic counterparts in informal settings. In those days, we still had the Consular yacht, the *Hiawatha*, so I was able arrange for a beautiful evening on the Bosphorus. These meetings were followed by one in which the Turks travelled to Athens, by which time the dialogue had achieved a degree of harmony. The Track II discussions ended with a splendid starlit evening in a taverna near the magnificently illuminated Acropolis enabling the Greeks to display their classical heritage in all its glory. The familiar food and music constituted an important cultural bond.
All along the Aegean seaboard, Turks listen to Greek music on their radios. Their ancestors lived together for centuries in Aegean towns and villages. Indeed, the Turkish coast is one great Graeco-Roman archaeological site. Track II diplomacy can make use of the deep emotional undercurrents that bind people on both sides of a conflict. And after all, most conflicts occur between neighbors. The great Greek singer **Theodorakis** performed with Turkish artists, always drawing enormous crowds at his open-air concerts in Turkey. Perhaps the most important element in conflict resolution is the utilization of these subliminal elements that enable the antagonists to see the humanity of their opposite numbers.

Perhaps those who best understood the profound emotional ties between the two countries were the Greek Foreign Minister **George Papandreou** and his Turkish counterpart Foreign Minister **Ismail Cem**. In 2001, on the Greek island of Samos, these two men planted an olive tree to symbolize their commitment to peace. This opened a new era of relations between Greece and Turkey. To this day, there is a peace award dedicated to these two men for their work to create the unthinkable between Turkey and Greece. Turkish Prime Minister **Bülent Ecevit** clearly supported this effort to enhance dialogue. It began with Papandreou’s visit to Ankara in January 2000, the first such trip by a Greek Foreign Minister in 38 years, marking the beginning of the rapprochement between the two countries in a spectacular fashion. **Bülent Ecevit** had famously written a poem about Greek–Turkish friendship years before while living in London:

**TURKISH-GREEK POEM**

*You become aware when you feel homesick<br>That you are brothers with the Greek;<br>Just look at a child of Istanbul<br>Listening to a Greek epic.*

*We’ve sworn at each other<br>In the free manner of our language.<br>We’ve drawn knife on blood<br>Yet a love lies hidden in us<br>For days of peace like these.*

*What if in our veins<br>It were the same blood that flows?<br>From the same air in our hearts<br>A crazy wind blows.*

*So generous like this rain<br>And warm like the sun.<br>The armfuls of goodness of spring<br>That surge from within.*
Our hostility is like a drink  
Distilled from the fruit of the climate  
As harmful and as tasteful as any drink.  
From this water from this taste have we sinned.

A blue magic between us  
And this warm sea  
And two peoples on its shores  
Equals in beauty.

The golden age of the Aegean  
Will revive through us  
As with the fire of the future  
The hearth of the past comes alive.

First a merry laughter comes to your ear  
Then some Turkish with a Greek accent.  
Nostalgic about the Bosporus  
And you remember the Raki.

It is when you are homesick  
That you recall you are brothers with the Greek.  
Bülent Ecevit  London 1947

One snowy night that January, the auditorium at the Middle East Technical University (METU) was packed with students, faculty, diplomats and government officials at an event moderated by the renowned television journalist Mehmet Ali Birand in honor of George Papandreou. Despite the inclement weather, no one wanted to miss this historic occasion. When Foreign Minister Papandreou took the stage, there was a breathless aura of expectation. He quietly opened his notes and read a moving speech about Greek-Turkish friendship, concluding with the following statement:

This rapprochement, which shows that even peoples divided by the most serious differences can come closer to each other when they become filled with the sincere desire for peace, was beneficial both for the two countries involved and for keeping peace in the Near East.

He then looked up at the audience and said, “these are not my words.” There was a stunned silence in the room. He paused a moment before explaining that these words were written by Greek Prime Minister Eleftherios Venizelos in his nomination of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk for the Nobel Peace Prize on January 12th, 1934. Like Atatürk, Venizelos was a charismatic leader who recognized that Atatürk’s decision to found a secular republic in place of the Ottoman Empire would introduce peace, stability and modernity to the region. Venizelos marveled at the rapidity with which this had been accomplished:
In the life of a nation it is very seldom that changes to such a radical degree were carried out in such a short period of time... Without a doubt, those who have done these extraordinary activities have earned the attributes of a great man in the complete sense of the word. And because of this, Turkey can be proud of itself. (October 31, 1933)

Some years later, I met Papandreou at a small reception in Washington and told him that I had been present that evening at METU. He said that this was one of his finest memories.

Turkish – Kurdish relations were more complicated. We had been supportive of the efforts of Prof. Dogu Ergil from Ankara University to foster Turkish-Kurdish dialogue. His attempts to promote a greater tolerance for the use of the Kurdish language were sponsored by the European Union as part of its plan to move Turkey’s EU bid forward, but these efforts had met with strong official resistance. One afternoon as I was at my desk in our public affairs office, my cell phone rang. The caller was my friend the journalist Amberin Zaman, who told me very hastily that she had been arrested and was in jail in the Southeast where she had been reporting on the Kurdish issue. I had time only to ask her where she was before her phone was snatched away. Amberin, born in New York, was the daughter of a Turkish mother and Pakistani diplomat father who had served at the U.N. Because of his diplomatic status, she was not a U.S. citizen despite having been born in the U.S. Nevertheless, I felt it our duty to get her out of jail. I informed the ambassador and called our extremely competent Consul in Adana, Stuart Jones (later Ambassador Jones) who had excellent contacts with the police throughout the Southeast. Fortunately, I was having lunch that day with President Demirel’s Press Secretary, Aydin Sezgin (later Ambassador Sezgin), so I was able to bring this immediately to the attention of the highest levels of the Turkish government as well. She was soon released. Had Amberin not been able to hold onto her phone, it is unclear how this would have unfolded.

Natural disasters also took their toll. On August 17th, 1999, the horrific Izmit earthquake (magnitude 7.6) struck northwestern Turkey, not far from Istanbul. Estimates vary between the official Turkish government death count (17,127) and more than double that number according to other sources. Over 120,000 homes collapsed leaving some 300,000 homeless. The earthquake affected the Turkish naval headquarters at Gölcük, and many factories in the area. An oil refinery went on fire and a tsunami killed another 150 people. In the chaos that followed, people rushed from all over Turkey to help dig out survivors. The failure of the authorities to enforce building codes and the use of cheap, sandy cement by corrupt construction companies was blamed for the huge number of casualties.

I was in Washington on a promotion panel when the earthquake struck, but I hastened back to Ankara. When I arrived, I was stunned to see the outpouring of sympathy and support from the
people of Greece. The extensive Greek news coverage of the disaster had sparked an immediate response. Greece too is earthquake prone, and the Greek people in this instance were able to look at their Turkish neighbors in friendship rather than enmity. Our Greek Track II media friends had made sure that the earthquake was thoroughly and sympathetically covered. The positive Greek response was reported widely in Turkey. In this tragic situation, it seemed that the work David Phillips and I had done with the Greek and Turkish media owners and journalists had been an excellent investment in conflict resolution. Turkish television was carrying the Greek coverage in Greek, something unthinkable only a short time before. The quarrel over Ocalan was forgotten and a new era in Greek-Turkish relations begun. There was a massive international response as well, including from the Fairfax, Virginia Search and Rescue team who saved four people and assisted a Swiss team in saving another.

Less than one month later, on September 7th, Athens was struck by its worst earthquake in over two decades. There was again an international response, but the Turkish assistance was the first to arrive only 13 hours after the quake. Phone lines of the Greek Embassy in Ankara and the Greek Consulates were immediately jammed with Turkish citizens offering blood donations. Fortunately, the death toll on the Greek side was under 200. The impact of this reconciliation was enormous. It came to be known as “Greek-Turkish earthquake diplomacy.” No better argument for Track II could be possible.

In the months following the earthquake, Ambassador Mark Parris and his wife Joan and I visited towns and villages along the Aegean coast where we met with older Turks whose parents had been part of the population exchange with Greece and who still spoke some Greek. In several towns, they had taken the initiative to invite the descendants of their counterparts, Turkish speaking Christians, who had been settled in the nearby Greek islands to come back. The village of Gölköy on the Bodrum peninsula even held a Greek festival with Greek flags flying to welcome their visitors.

Of course, with nearly half a million displaced by the earthquake, there had to be a great humanitarian follow-up. The Israelis, in cooperation with the American Jewish Committee, constructed a village for the survivors of the earthquake in a special demonstration of the increasingly close ties between the two countries at that time.

President and Mrs. Clinton announced a visit to Turkey in November 1999. The intention was to demonstrate sympathy for the survivors of the earthquake, but also to bolster Turkey’s tourism industry following this disaster. Two impressive senior Clinton staffers, Phil Gordon (later Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs) and Tony Blinken (later
Deputy Secretary of State) came out in advance to work out details of the visit. Their depth of knowledge and professionalism gave me great confidence that this would be a success. Anne Edwards, responsible for press aspects of the visit, contacted me with a request for a list of ten books about Turkey that the President should read in preparation. It was clear that President Clinton was in very good hands.

It was agreed with the Turkish government that President Clinton would address the Parliament. We at the Embassy worked with Clinton’s speech writer Ted Widmer on this address. When I met Ted, I was delighted to learn that he was a direct descendant of Cyrus Hamlin, the co-founder of Robert College. Presidential visits in modern times are often a matter of a few hours duration due to the press of business in Washington and the fact that we are now living in a world of fast-forward and sound bites. The Clinton visit was five days, the longest to any country during his eight years in office except China. The delegations included not just Bill, Hillary and Chelsea Clinton, but Madeleine Albright, Bill Richardson and many staffers. It was understood that the Clintons wanted to visit, not only Ankara and Istanbul, but Izmir and Antalya as well. I was responsible, working with Anne Edwards, for all public affairs aspects of the visit. Since it was necessary to cover not only these four cities, but multiple sites within each, I had to bring in foreign service officers as reinforcements from nearby countries so that there could be an onsite person responsible for each location. A retired senior press officer, Don Cofman, resident in Ankara, also volunteered to help with the planning.

The highlight of the trip was President Clinton’s tour of the tent city outside Izmit where he shared tea with the earthquake survivors and offered further assistance. The press coverage up until this point had been wonderful, but then it went through the roof. The following day, there were front page photos in all the major papers of a baby pulling on Clinton’s nose. Turks are crazy about children so the entire country fell in love with Clinton. Indeed, the Turkish press continued to follow the life of that child as he grew up, so enthralled were they with this great moment of Turkish-American friendship.

In terms of tourism promotion, aside from the visit to Istanbul, Hillary spoke at one of the archeological sites outside Antalya and the family toured the most important site at Ephesus with its classical and Biblical history. On the final evening, President Demirel hosted a marvelous dinner for the Clintons with live music. President Clinton joined the band, playing saxophone to wild applause. During this unimaginably glorious time, our approval ratings were around 85%, but they shot up to 97% after the Clinton visit. It was evident to me that President Clinton had actually read the books I had recommended. I could tell from the detailed and historically correct way in which he responded to questions in the many meetings he held in the
course of this visit. It would be fair to say that both Clintons were people who assiduously did their homework. There was some backlash against the Turkish political leadership as the public took note of the fact that neither Prime Minister Ecevit nor other senior officials had visited the earthquake zone.

Throughout my early years in Turkey, there had been no evident conflict between the secular and the religious. Many villagers were devoted to Atatürk and devout at the same time. While the reforms he instituted had an impact on urban life, they were not so deeply felt in the countryside. Educated women in cities and towns across the country were relieved to be freed from the veil. Village women continued to wear their traditional headscarves, not dissimilar to those worn by women in the Russian countryside or southern Europe. Since many Turkish women worked in the fields, it was indeed a sensible attire. Gradually, this issue of head covering had been politicized. As Turkey rapidly urbanized, young women from rural areas, now living in the cities, wished to attend university where the head scarf was banned. At the same time, forces from elsewhere in the Muslim world were influencing Turkish society so that some more politicized young women adopted costumes reminiscent of those worn in neighboring countries. My academic friends at Middle East Technical and other universities in Ankara and Istanbul, took the tack of reasoning with the students on an individual basis. In some cases, they found that this was the choice of the young woman herself. In others, it was imposed by male members of her family. For young women living in the shanty towns known as gecekondu (built by night) surrounding the big cities, it was sometimes a practical step to avoid harassment as they travelled alone back and forth to class.

My earlier experience lecturing in a Turkish university at a time when the country was torn between left and right-wing factions had taught me that in Turkey, conflicts of this sort are often a zero-sum game. One side wins and the other loses, with no middle ground or compromise possible. A Turkish professor who had been educated in the United States told me the following story. When a young woman appeared in his class wearing a headscarf, he explained to the students that in America it was customary to be tolerant of individual choice. He turned to the student and said that he would be happy to permit her to wear her headscarf in his class. He assumed that she would tolerate his consumption of a glass of raki with his evening meal. Instead of thanking him, or even agreeing to what he proposed, she replied, “You will change.” This story says it all. She did not simply wish to express her own religiosity unhindered; she wanted to impose it on others.

Towards the end of my tour in Ankara, I was asked to apply the conflict resolution techniques developed by David Phillips to the increasingly pressing demands from the Armenian-American
community for dialogue. David, now an Advisor to the Department of State, had been tasked with moving forward on this project. The Turkish-Armenian conflict is infinitely more complex than the situation involving Greeks and Turks, or even Kurds and Turks. Turkey is a large, majority Muslim country and a member of NATO. Armenia is a tiny, land-locked, predominantly Christian country of the Caucasus that had been under communist rule and was now a Newly Independent State (NIS). On the other hand, there was an extremely well-educated and articulate Armenian-American diaspora, particularly in California. Fewer Turks had emigrated to the United States. Many of them were well-educated secular professionals – doctors, architects, bankers – who wanted no part of ethnic politics. Indeed, they had been so absorbed into our upper-middle class suburbs that some wondered how to explain their Muslim heritage to their children. They did not identify with the immigrants from other majority Muslim countries, but they felt themselves very much at home amidst their non-Muslim neighbors.

The issues were multi-dimensional. Historic records show that large numbers of Armenians were massacred in southeastern Turkey in 1915. Others were driven into exile, leaving their homes and successful businesses behind. For Armenians, and many supporting their cause around the world, this was a genocide, although the term did not exist in 1915. For many Turks, Armenians were traitors who had acted against Turkey on behalf of Russia. Armenians sought recognition of the events of 1915. Turks claimed that the last actions taken as the Ottoman Empire collapsed had nothing to do with the Turkish Republic created in 1923. The challenge was to create a Track II dialogue that we hoped would lead to some agreed version of what had happened in the past. David was able to identify the Armenian participants for these meetings. It was left to me to identify the Turks. Ultimately, I was able to engage a former foreign minister, a former university president, and leading academics and journalists on the Turkish side in the series of Track II sessions we organized in Turkey and the U.S. Although it had been suggested that I might also work with Armenians in Yerevan, it was decided at the Embassy that this would be too complicated to be undertaken by someone posted as a diplomat to Ankara. The sensitivities on all sides were too acute. Although this work was begun while I was still in Turkey, I carried on with it once I returned to Washington for my second home posting.

Having spent quite a bit of time during my first tour in Ankara obtaining permission for American archaeologists and their international teams to work on digs in Turkey, to say nothing of the many trips I had made to Ephesus, Pergamon and other sites with visiting family and friends, I had retained my interest in Turkey’s classical heritage. Toni Cross had sometimes arranged for experts to provide guided tours of these sites. She herself had taken us to see the complex arrangements for bathing and the sophisticated water systems in ruins near Antalya.
One of Turkey’s best authorities on its ancient history was Özgen Acar, a columnist for Cumhuriyet and an ardent defender of these treasures. I was very touched when he invited Ambassador Mark Parris, his wife Joan and me for a spectacular fish dinner at his favorite restaurant on my last evening in Turkey.

Lessons Learned: Turkey 1997-2000

Although I had worked in the field of conflict resolution in India-Pakistan and former Yugoslavia, I had not consciously employed Track II dialogue until my second tour in Turkey. The enormous benefit of putting people from both sides of a conflict together in private settings brought home to me once again the effectiveness of person-to-person dialogue. During my tours in Pakistan, I had brought together writers, poets, playwrights, visual and performing artists, architects and others to discuss a contemporary aesthetic movement known as Postmodernism. I had also brought together legal experts, historians, civil rights activists from a range of countries to discuss constitutional protections of human rights and freedom of speech. While in Austria, I had fostered the creation of the Center for Democracy to provide a venue where representatives of the various Bosnian factions could meet under American auspices in neutral Vienna. In both Pakistan and Austria, these meetings were held in the public domain, the participants were known, and at times, there was press coverage. For example, aside from conferences and panel discussions, we mounted an exhibition of paintings by Bosnian artists of all persuasions at the Center for Democracy in the Vienna Amerika Haus.

What was different about Track II was that the identity of the participants was protected to permit them to engage in direct discussion, not about such abstract subjects as civil rights or current cultural phenomena, topics about which they could find common ground, but to speak directly about their disparate views on the issues that divided them. Aside from the meetings between influential media figures from Greece and Turkey to reduce the tensions resulting from the capture of PKK leader Ocalan, we also organized meetings between historians of Greece and historians of Turkey in an attempt to reconcile their differing interpretations of documented events in the past. We brought together retired military officers to discuss their vastly different memories of the many conflicts between these two NATO Allies. We brought together educators to try to reach agreement on historic events for the purpose of producing textbooks free of negative stereotyping. Of course, the inter-religious dialogue sponsored by Ambassador Hunt in her home in Vienna did prefigure Track II, essentially because these conversations involved a mediator, a role played by Jakob Finci. However, the results were made public by the participant religious leaders who returned to their respective congregations.
to promote the principles of peace, harmony and tolerance that they had agreed upon, making these results a matter of public record.

Considering that my field was public diplomacy, including both press and cultural outreach, it would be legitimate to wonder how Track II fell into my bailiwick. After all, public diplomacy officers are tasked with producing materials and organizing events for public consumption. They work in the realm of press releases and exchange programs and conferences, not private meetings. The reason Track II worked so well with public diplomacy, despite the requirement to protect the identity of the participants, is that public diplomacy officers had the broad range of contacts in academic, think tank and journalistic circles from which to recruit non-government participants. In addition, public diplomacy officers had the access to venues and the experience organizing events that are not part of the reporting profile of other diplomats whose work is largely confined to their contacts with government officials in the host country. I could work with my public diplomacy colleague at Embassy Athens to arrange for the Greek journalist and media figures to travel to Istanbul, just as I had done when I invited speakers from India and Turkey to take part in conferences in Pakistan, or speakers from Sarajevo to take part in meetings in Vienna. Finally, it must be said, that this was also due to my own abiding interest in the resolution of conflict. Ambassador Raphael’s widow, Nancy Eli Raphael, became at a later date our Ambassador to Slovenia. I recall talking with her about the situation in the Balkans and explaining that I came from a family of doctors, people dedicated to healing. This was perhaps my own way of fulfilling that need to mend the torn fabrics of this world, a form of Tikkun.


The State Department had called me back to Washington to serve as the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. The Assistant Secretary, Dr. William Bader, was a Clinton appointee who was extremely well-connected in Washington. Bill Bader was an appropriate choice, having been a Fellow in the first Fulbright group to go to Germany after WWII. He had subsequently become a member of Senator Fulbright’s staff. I had first met Bill when he made a whirlwind visit to Turkey during my recent tour there. Not only had I organized meetings for him with academics, journalists and cultural leaders in Ankara, I also took him to call on the faculty at Boğaziçi University in Istanbul. At a dinner on the Bosphorus at which our Turkish hosts quizzed the waiter extensively about the preparation of the fish, Bill remarked that the Turks were as discriminating about their cuisine as the French.
The Clinton Administration, realizing that perhaps the closure of our cultural centers around the world had been a step too far, called a White House Conference on Culture and Diplomacy scheduled for November 28th, 2000. When this was planned, there was a presumption that Al Gore would win the election and to some extent our cultural exchange programs would be restored. Writers, artists, musicians and poets were invited from around the world to discuss the influence of culture in their respective countries. President Clinton, Hillary Clinton and Madeleine Albright were present for these discussions. Ambassador Swanee Hunt and her husband, Dr. Charles Ansbacher, the conductor, were among those who participated. As it happened, despite winning the popular vote, Al Gore did not win the electoral college, so there was no follow-up to this important event. However, the discussion about the importance of art and culture in a global context, as well as its potential impact in developing countries, inspired those of us in the career diplomatic service despite the challenges.

When George W. Bush was elected to the White House, Clinton appointees throughout the government were ordered to step down. We had hoped that Dr. Bader would be permitted to stay, but unfortunately, that was not the case. I was then asked to take over as the Acting Assistant Secretary until the new Administration filled the position with a political appointee. I was now responsible for the U.S. government’s global academic, professional and youth exchange programs, including Fulbright, and the Office of Cultural Preservation. Since the U.S. does not have the equivalent of a Ministry of Culture, when Culture Ministers came to Washington, it was I who received them. I also had the privilege of sitting on the Board of the National Gallery, a responsibility delegated to me by Secretary of State Colin Powell, giving me the opportunity to approve acquisitions.

Among my friends at the Smithsonian Institution was the Director of International Relations, Francine Berkowitz who had travelled often to both Pakistan and India to oversee Smithsonian archaeological and other projects. Francine asked me to meet Jonathan Hollander, the President and Artistic Director of Battery Dance in lower Manhattan. I found the work of this dance company in the field of conflict resolution to be emblematic of what cultural diplomacy could accomplish when rightly employed.

Secretary Powell, held meetings every morning at eight sharp which I attended, along with the other bureau chiefs. He was a masterful leader, beloved of the foreign and civil service staff of the State Department. He arrived each morning fully informed of the latest events around the globe and he was quick to question those responsible for each region about these developments. As a subscriber to The New York Times, I grew to very much appreciate the accuracy and timeliness of its foreign affairs reporting, often producing detailed stories even
before we had the cable reports from the embassies. Secretary Powell was extremely supportive of the Fulbright and other exchange programs. He willingly addressed exchange program participants from around the world when they visited the Department. When he was unable to attend functions in my domain, I was asked to step in as speaker. On his behalf, I delivered his speech at the annual dinner held at the State Department for American University and College Presidents. This constituency provided strong support for Fulbright, the Department’s flagship educational program. I was also invited to speak at the U.N. and elsewhere on educational and cultural topics representing the Department.

Perhaps my single most significant responsibility was oversight of the Freedom Support Act (FSA) funds dedicated to the development of democracy and free markets in the former Soviet sphere after the collapse of communism. The FSA provided for the creation of business centers in the Newly Independent States (NIS) dedicated to the creation of a free market economy. The Future Leaders Exchange (FLEX), funded by the FSA, provided for high school students from the former Soviet Union to spend a year in the U.S with a host family and to attend an American high school. Having witnessed during my tour in Frankfurt the life-long impact of high school exchange amongst older Germans who had spent a year in the U.S. via the American Field Service (AFS), I was absolutely convinced of the effectiveness of this program. Not only would the participants become fluent in English, they would have lasting ties with their “American family.” In addition, we had other exchange programs with young people from across the communist world. I often met with these groups to talk about democracy and diplomacy. On one occasion, after I had established that foreign service officers were charged with promoting U.S. policy as determined by our elected leaders, a student actually asked me if we were permitted our own ideas if they were at variance with official policy. This extraordinary question struck me as an example of the perfidious nature of communist era thought control.

It was my responsibility, as Acting Assistant Secretary, to make policy decisions regarding the allocation of funds and to resolve funding disputes between competing divisions within ECA. The overall budget at that time was in the vicinity of three quarters of a billion dollars. It was also my responsibility to defend the budget to the Deputy Secretary of State, Richard Armitage. Although he disputed my insistence that the countries of Central Asia be considered of strategic importance to us, he was overall positive and prompt in giving his approval. The old internationalist wing of the Republican Party had always supported our investment in foreign exchange programs, and this certainly continued under Secretary Powell.
During this time, I was approached by Anthony Richter of the Soros Foundation to discuss the possibility of cultural exchange with Iran. Several of the leading oil companies had recently sponsored an exhibition of Iranian artists in Washington. There was a sense that we could empower progressives in Iran through cultural exchange. I attended the opening of the exhibition and noted that the works on display were somehow caught in a time-warp. These clearly talented artists had been suffocated by an oppressive and obscurantist regime. It was evident that they had been cut off for over two decades from the kind of global exposure that feeds the creative spirit. Eyebrows were raised at the morning meeting with Secretary Powell when I reported attending the exhibit. There was a collective sigh of relief however, as I rattled off the names of the sponsors. It was in this atmosphere that Anthony Richter and I discussed the possibility of cultural exchange. We were both very aware of the risks. Iranian participants in such a program might face severe penalties. The Smithsonian Institution has an extraordinary collection of Islamic calligraphy. We decided to begin with an exchange of curators in this field and I actually met with the potential candidates at the Smithsonian. Unfortunately, a tragic event of momentous proportions having nothing to do with Iran would soon force us to put this project indefinitely on the back burner.

My job also included foreign travel. In the summer of 2001, I was invited to Russia to speak at the opening of a jazz concert in commemoration of Willis Conover who had broadcast American jazz and blues into the Soviet Union via the Voice of America (VOA). Conover had wisely never spoken about politics. He had had an enormous following throughout the communist world. My colleague, the Senior Cultural Affairs Officer at our Embassy in Moscow, the quintessential diplomat John Brown, had advised me to expect a crowd of about 1000 in a large auditorium. I anticipated having an audience of elderly people from the height of the big band era in attendance. Imagine my surprise when I discovered a room filled with young Russian jazz aficionados. Later that same summer, I travelled to Japan where I met the Minister of Education in Tokyo, a very impressive lady who had previously been Japan’s ambassador in Ankara. Our Embassy arranged flawlessly for a series of substantive meetings with Japanese officials in Kyoto and Osaka, as well as Tokyo. The Japanese were especially desirous of expanding all exchange programs, but they were particularly interested in high school exchange.

The former Israeli Ambassador to Ankara, Uri-Bar Ner, contacted me in Washington regarding an exchange program he had created to permit African Americans and other minorities to visit Israel. The America-Israel Friendship League was unique among U.S. – Israeli exchange programs in its focus on young people from under-privileged, inner-city backgrounds. As former
Israeli Consul General in Chicago, and Deputy Consul General in New York, he recognized the importance of engaging this segment of the American population.

Ever since my return to Washington, I had been working with David Phillips on a continued series of Turkish-Armenian meetings. Noting that we had no prominent Turkish-Americans involved in these discussions, I suggested to David that he invite Ahmet Ertegün, the Turkish entrepreneur who had founded Atlantic Records, to join us. Robert and I had known Ahmet for years because he and his lovely wife Mica had a summer home in Bodrum, Turkey not far from ours. Aside from his importance in the music world, I thought Ahmet would be a good choice because he came from a diplomatic family. His father, Munir Ertegün, had been the Turkish ambassador in Washington. While growing up there, Ahmet had fallen in love with American music, Duke Ellington in particular. As a young man, he was particularly enthralled by African American jazz and often attended concerts at the Jewish Community Center, the only place in Washington in those days that allowed racially mixed audiences and bands. When it came to my request regarding the Turkish-Armenian dialogue, Ahmet was more than willing to engage with the Armenians. On the Armenian-American side, Van Krikorian, a prominent New Yorker from the banking and business sector, led the discussions with quiet determination and persistence. My coordinator at the National Security Council was Dr. Hope Harrison, a scholar of German and Russian history who had been assigned this portfolio.

The Office of Cultural Preservation also fell into my bailiwick. It was the responsibility of this division of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) to support the protection and preservation of ancient and historic sites and artifacts. Coordinating closely with customs officials, the staff were engaged in the return of stolen cultural treasures to the countries of origin. Under the inspired leadership of Maria Kouroupas, the Cultural Antiquities Task Force was actively tracking and reporting the theft of cultural patrimony.

When I learned in 2001 of the existence of a fund elsewhere in the Department dedicated to cultural preservation, I worked with the extraordinarily competent Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, Ambassador Patrick Kennedy, to have the funds transferred to us in ECA. Maria Kouroupas and I developed the Ambassador’s Fund for Cultural Preservation, enabling the ambassadors in the world’s one third poorest nations to apply for grants to support preservation projects including sites, rare manuscripts, artifacts and traditional arts and crafts. This was an important new horizon for the world of cultural diplomacy. Up until this point, our efforts abroad had been dedicated to promoting American culture. This program permitted our ambassadors to demonstrate respect for other cultures. We had a very strong response to our initial cable informing those embassies of this opportunity. Our ambassadors were able to
show the value we placed on precious ancient manuscripts, traditional dance forms, and endangered works of art. Although the initial grants were relatively small, they created a big splash in societies unused to recognition from the United States.

In March 2001, I received an urgent call from my friend András Riedlmayer, a preservation expert at Harvard University who informed me that within days the Taliban were planning to destroy the giant statues of the Buddha carved between the 3rd and 6th centuries into the side of a limestone cliff in Bamiyan, Afghanistan. These twin statues were superb representations of Gandharan art. The local Muslim population had lived in peace with them for centuries. It took the Saudi inspired Taliban to determine that they were idolatrous. Maria Kouroupas and I stayed late in the office that Friday night drafting a memo to the State Department Front Office recommending that we intervene with the Saudis, Saudi Arabia being the only country we thought capable of preventing this. Unfortunately, this intervention did not take place. Other priorities took precedence. Although the Japanese, the Swiss, the Italians and others attempted to intervene, the statues were dynamited the following week, probably with the assistance of outside Saudi engineers, since such a feat would most likely have been beyond the capacity of the Afghan Taliban. They were destroyed on orders from Taliban leader Mullah Mohammed Omar.

The destruction of the twin Buddhas prefigured a far more devastating event to take place in our own country only six months later. On the morning of September 11th, I was in my office at the State Department when I received a call from David Phillips in New York who told me to turn on my television. Since I had no tv, I hurried upstairs to the office of the Under Secretary for Public Affairs to discover my colleagues viewing in stunned silence the first of the two attacks on the Twin Towers. The initial shock was profound and compounded by the additional shock of the second attack soon to follow. Shortly after that, were told to evacuate the building. This took place in a calm and orderly fashion with ready assistance for the disabled. Although I had an office in the State Department building, my staff of some three hundred were housed in a building in Southwest Washington. It was now my challenge to get there, a distance of about three miles. It was a beautiful sunny day, reminiscent of the day on which Pearl Harbor was bombed. As I tried to flag down any driver to give me a lift in the right direction, I saw the smoke billowing up from the Pentagon. Finally, a woman in complete denial picked me up. I begged her to turn on news, but she kept her radio dial fixed to a music station. When I reached ECA, our senior Administrative Officer, the incredibly competent and sensible David Whitten, had already evacuated the staff. There were a few stragglers however, people unable to deal with the shock, who remained glued to their computers and had to be cajoled into
leaving the building. Everyone was told to go home on this gloriously beautiful day. Wearing high heels, I walked as far as upper Georgetown and finally, when only a few blocks from my home, was able to hail a cab. Miraculously, my home phone worked so I was able to call my family to let them know that I was alright. My husband Robert and our son were both at Princeton University that day – the former as a faculty member and the latter as an undergraduate student. Robert and I come from large New York families. When we tallied up, we realized that we had twelve close relatives – nieces, nephews, cousins, a brother-in-law – in the Twin Towers that day. Fortunately, in our case, everyone escaped safely. It was not until late that night that everyone was accounted for. However, in towns like Ridgewood, New Jersey, or Garden City, Long Island, there were many parents who did not return home. The New York City Fire Fighters were heroic in their efforts and many of them died when the buildings collapsed. Mayor Rudolph Giuliani said all the right things in the immediate aftermath. Most importantly, he told New Yorkers that this action had been taken by people from the outside, not by their fellow New Yorkers.

Not long after 9/11, Columbia University’s School of Journalism hosted a conference on Cultural Diplomacy. There was a growing awareness in the wake of this horrendous terrorist attack that the State Department should amplify its outreach around the world in an effort to prevent radicalization. I delivered the keynote address in which I advocated for a much stronger commitment on the part of our government to cultural exchange of all kinds. Interestingly, in the course of the panel discussion that followed, it was the politically conservative panelists who advocated for this kind of investment abroad. The audience included many prominent cultural figures such as Richard Ford, the distinguished American writer who had visited both Frankfurt and Vienna while I was serving in those cities. The Cultural Preservation committee decided to award one of its grants to the U.S. Embassy in Dushanbe for the preservation of a giant Buddha located there. This was an example of using cultural diplomacy to reinforce not only our respect for other religions, but the value we place on tolerance.

Lessons Learned: Department of State 2000-2001

My service in Washington taught me a great deal about the effective use of resources. Freedom Support Act (FSA) funds were put to very good use developing market economies in countries where entrepreneurial spirit had been long suppressed. These funds were also important in promoting reconciliation between Armenia and Azerbaijan despite their very conflicted historic memories. Secretary Powell was an inspiring leader who instilled in all of us a desire to excel and to adhere to the values upon which our country is based. This tour provided me with the opportunity to visit regions of the world in which I had not served – the
former Soviet Union and Japan. I certainly reconfirmed my conviction that the people-to-people
dialogue enabled by our academic and professional and youth exchange programs was
indispensable for promoting world peace and stability.

VIII. Sabbatical Years: The Washington Institute and the Council on Foreign
Relations 2001 – 2003


After 9/11, the White House moved quickly to install political appointees, so it was time for me
to think about what to do next. I decided that I wanted a sabbatical. With a recommendation
from the great Ottoman historian at Princeton, Prof. Bernard Lewis, and the approval of the
Under Secretary for Political Affairs, Ambassador Marc Grossman, I took over as the Director
of the Turkey Program at The Washington Institute for Near East Policy (TWI). Our friend Alan
Makovsky had been doing this job for several years, but he had accepted a position as senior
staffer in the office of Congressman Tom Lantos of California. His replacement, Soner
Cağaptay, was completing his doctoral studies at Yale, leaving ten-month gap which I was able
to fill. Working for TWI Counselor Ambassador Dennis Ross and the Executive Director Robert
Satloff gave me an opportunity to promote good Turkish – Israeli relations at a time when it
was both possible and crucially important. Aside from publishing analytical pieces for the TWI
website, I organized meetings with distinguished visitors from Turkey for the TWI audience. I
also spent considerable time on the telephone talking with journalists who could not
understand Turkish reservations about the 2003 Iraq War. In the wake of 9/11, Secretary
Powell had asked Robert to go out to Afghanistan on short notice as our ambassador. On
March 17th, 2002, I was giving a TWI dinner for a delegation of Turks including Mehmet Ali
Birand, Erkut Yucaoglu, Attila Asker and his wife my friend Elsie Vance at our home on
Cleveland Avenue, a dinner Robert had planned to attend. Instead, he had been sent out two
days before and spoke with our guests via satellite telephone having just been sworn in by a
colleague in Kabul. In terms of the Middle East peace process, I learned a great deal from both
Dennis Ross and Rob Satloff. TWI organized many presentations dedicated to enhancing
understanding of the politics of the Middle East. The staff included experts not only on Israel,
but Iran and the Arab world, as well as Turkey. Among these were David Makovsky who wrote
remarkably prescient pieces analyzing Israeli-Palestinian relations, and Matthew Levitt, a
terrorism expert. It was at a TWI event that I met the Palestinian scholar and peace activist Sari
Nusseibeh and his son Jamal, a law student at Columbia University. I would pursue this
friendship with the Nusseibeh family when I was later posted to Embassy Tel Aviv.
In fall 2002, I took up my State Department assignment as the **Cyrus Vance Fellow** at the **Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)** in New York. Under the guidance of my mentor, **Ambassador Frank Wisner**, I produced a series of articles on U.S. – Turkish relations for the Council’s website. I also wrote about public and cultural diplomacy. On occasion, I was asked to appear on television to explain some of the complications in the U.S. – Turkish relationship in the context of the lead-up to the Gulf War. The Turkish Parliament had voted on March 1st against allowing some 60,000 U.S. troops to operate out of the **Incirlik Airbase** in southern Turkey. The vote was very close, an indication as to how deeply divided Turks were on this question. This was the first time Turkey had stepped away from close alignment with our defense policy. While at CFR, I also organized programs dealing with the very contentious **Cyprus** issue and in particular, U.N. **Secretary General Kofi Annan’s** Peace Plan which proposed to create a United Republic of Cyprus as a federation of two states. When this came finally to a referendum in 2004, Turkish Cypriots supported it by 65%, but Greek Cypriots were only 24% positive. Acting as a mentor myself, I had encouraged my assistant, **Inge Hunter**, to prepare a paper on the plan. She had accurately predicted the regrettable result that would come to pass.

While at CFR in New York, I continued to work with **David Phillips** on Turkish-Armenian conflict resolution efforts. **Ahmet Ertegün** was so kind as to attend the Turkey programs I organized at CFR. Even more important, he and Mica opened their magnificent East Side townhouse to the representatives from both sides in the **Armenian-Turkish dialogue**. We were able to bring together in his home government officials from Armenia with the Turkish participants. It became increasingly apparent to me that while a sophisticated expediter like David Phillips could bring the parties together for meaningful dialogue, that ultimately, this issue would only be resolved by the will of the people of Turkey. In the years to follow, conferences were held at **Boğaziçi University** and elsewhere in Turkey to examine this complicated history. However, participants in these events did so at great personal risk from nationalist extremists.

The **Cyrus Vance** room at CFR was the scene of the smaller meetings and discussion groups that I organized. It was pure coincidence that **Cyrus Vance’s daughter Elsie** and I had met and become friends in Istanbul. Elsie’s husband, **Prof. Attila Askar**, was the Princeton-educated President of the new, private **Koç University** in Istanbul. While in New York, I had the opportunity to meet Elsie’s family and to attend the wonderful Vance Christmas Party in their
Fifth Avenue apartment. Guests included such influential figures as the Indian-born journalist and author Farid Zakaria and U.N Ambassador John Negroponte.

As the Cyrus Vance Fellow at CFR, I had an opportunity to attend events at which foreign policy issues around the world were analyzed. I also had occasion to discuss these developments with some extraordinary colleagues: Princeton graduate Isobel Coleman (later Ambassador Coleman) was an expert on economic opportunities for women in the developing world; Rajan Menon was a scholar of Russia, Central Asia and Ukraine; Elizabeth Economy was writing about Chinese domestic and foreign policy, including the environmental impact of China’s rapid economic growth. These conversations enhanced my understanding of global issues and provided me with context for future diplomatic assignments. During this sabbatical, aside from publishing regularly on the CFR website, at the recommendation of Deputy Editor Gideon Rose, I wrote an article entitled The Case for Cultural Diplomacy: Engaging Foreign Audiences which appeared in the November/December 2003 issue of the CFR journal Foreign Affairs. In the following years, academics and students from around the world sought me out to discuss this defense of cultural diplomacy.

Lessons Learned: Sabbatical Years 2001-2003

Perhaps the most important thing I learned from these two sabbatical years was the importance of having time to reflect. At both The Washington Institute and the Council on Foreign Relations, I was able to broaden my horizons and expand my networks. TWI was an excellent preparation for my subsequent tour in Israel. CFR provided me with an invaluable circle of friends in New York. In both cases, I had the opportunity to read and write about public and cultural diplomacy, as well as U.S. – Israeli and U.S. – Turkish relations. Having had in even my most junior diplomatic positions a sophisticated staff, I had learned to navigate with one or two interns, mostly because these interns were so amazingly competent. While at TWI, I saw the impact that a policy organization can have on government when it is producing a regular stream of articles about the most crucial developments in the Middle East. At CFR, I had the opportunity to view from the inside the workings of an extremely prestigious non-profit. These small organizations have an impact that far outweighs their modest staff levels. Soon I would be off to Tel Aviv to work on one of the most complex and intractable conflicts in the world.
IX. Public and Cultural Diplomacy in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Tel Aviv and Jerusalem 2003 – 2007

My grandfather was a surgeon and his very close friends and doctor colleagues Abe Braunstein, Eddie Steiner, Teddy Fuchs and others would shower us with Israeli oranges at Christmas. In my childhood, Israel had for me the sweet scent of citrus. When he died, trees were planted there in his name. In the diplomatic service, one waits for the right job to open in the right country at the right time. So, it was kismet that I was assigned as Counselor for Public Affairs to Embassy Tel Aviv in 2003. When I met beforehand with Ambassador Daniel Kurtzer in Washington, he asked me about my aspirations. I quoted a Turkish proverb, “damliya, damilya, göl olur,” (drop by drop the lake is formed), meaning that I hoped that my work in Israel would be part of the much larger effort by people of good will to find a path to peace.

Although I was not involved in working on the Middle East Process (MEPP) in any direct way at Embassy Ankara or The Washington Institute, I was firmly convinced that good Turkish-Israeli relations, and the good relations of both those countries with the United States, would be an important element in any peace settlement. The Ottomans had ruled Palestine for four centuries prior to the British. Perhaps the most significant legacy they left behind was the millet system in accordance with which each religious community was governed by its own laws in personal and family matters under an overarching civil authority governing the public sphere. The British had employed a similar system successfully in India, so it remained intact in Palestine under British rule. All citizens of Israel had recourse to civil authorities, but for the most part, Muslim and Christian citizens in the Arab minority were subject to their own religious authorities regarding personal matters such as marriage and divorce.

The MEPP was an attempt to reach an agreement upon which a final settlement could be based. This involved not only the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but also Israel’s relations with the larger Arab world. By the time I arrived in Israel, peace treaties were in place with both Egypt (1979) and Jordan (1994). The Madrid Peace Conference hosted by Spain in 1991 was co-sponsored by the United States and the Soviet Union. This was an international effort to revive the peace process. The Oslo Accords, agreements between Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) were begun in secret under Norwegian auspices. The PLO recognized the State of Israel; Israel recognized the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people. The Accords were signed in the presence of President Bill Clinton on September 13th, 1993 at a ceremony in which Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin shook hands with PLO leader Yasser Arafat. Although the Camp David Summit in July 2000, ended without an agreement,
President Clinton had come tantalizingly close to reaching one with Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat.

The Geneva Initiative, sometimes called the Geneva Accord, a draft Permanent Status Agreement, was completed in October 2003 and launched in Geneva that December. Among those involved in two years of secret negotiations were former Israeli minister Yossi Beilin and former Palestinian Authority minister Yasser Abed Rabbo. While the Geneva Initiative was greeted with great international acclaim, it was not formalized by the government on either side. All these negotiations had been conducted with a view to achieving a two-state peace agreement. Within the Israeli context, there was strong support for these efforts in the peace camp, but not across the board.

Ami Ayalon, a former head of Shin Bet, the Israeli secret service, had been a recipient of Israel’s highest decoration, the Medal of Valor. In June 2003, together with the very distinguished Palestinian Professor Sari Nusseibeh, he launched a peace initiative called The People’s Voice, advocating a two-state solution without the right of return for Palestinian refugees. He was joined by other former senior Israeli security and intelligence officials who were convinced of the necessity of reaching an agreement with the Palestinians.

At this time, the demographic issue became a topic of debate. Sergio della Pergola was an Italian-born demographer who had emigrated to Israel and completed his doctoral studies at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Arnon Soffer, one of the founders of Haifa University, was an Israeli geographer specializing in demographics. By 2003, these two scholars had begun to make the point that according to their calculations, the Jewish population of Israel would not continue indefinitely to constitute a majority. This raised the probability that Jewish Israelis might have to make a stark choice between retaining the Jewish character of the country, or retaining its democracy. It became more urgent in the eyes of those in agreement with their projections to find a two-state solution.

In 2003, there was still an atmosphere of hope among many with whom I worked about the possibility of achieving a lasting peace. In terms of my own efforts, the most important supporting document was the Wye River Memorandum, signed in the White House by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat in 1998. Along with many other stipulations in this Memorandum, it had designated $10 million for cooperative Israeli – Palestinian efforts in fields such as emergency medicine, water management, education, civil society, dialogue, shared history and archaeology. Oversight of these joint projects fell to my office. The concept behind this was that direct engagement between the two
peoples was essential to creating the atmosphere for peace. The Wye River grants were not used to bring people together to discuss the conflict. They were used to bring people together to solve problems, share professional interests, understand other perspectives, and to pursue joint projects in the expectation that these two ethnicities would be living side by side in peace in the future. They were a means of building trust. Even in some of the worst moments, after one of the many incidents of bloodshed, participants in the Wye River projects were known to be in touch with one another. This kind of people-to-people effort enabled the participants to demonstrate generosity of spirit towards one another, to experience one another’s travails, to erase negative stereotypes, and to recognize their shared humanity.

Dr. Mark Alan Davis, a physician affiliated with Brigham and Women’s Hospital in Boston, oversaw Harvard University’s effort to promote conflict resolution through emergency medicine. His project created a connection between Hadassah Hospital in West Jerusalem and Augusta Victoria Hospital in East Jerusalem with a particular emphasis on women’s health. The American-born Yossi Alpher, a former senior official in the Mossad, had also been Director of the American Jewish Committee’s Jerusalem office. Together with his co-editor Ghassan Khatib, a Palestinian politician born in the West Bank, he produced Bitterlemons, an internet publication creating a space for civilized dialogue on Middle East issues amongst participants with a wide range of views. These discussions were conducted in English, making them accessible to an international readership. Dan Bar-on and Sami Adwan created an Arab-Israeli reader entitled Side by Side: Parallel Histories of Israel-Palestine intended for use with students to enable them to understand both narratives. It was based on the assumption that resolution of the conflict would require, at the very least, a recognition on both sides that another point of view existed, and to come to understand that perspective. Prof. Mina Evron worked with Israeli and Arab archaeologists on the restoration of historic Graeco-Roman and Ottoman sites in Akko and elsewhere in recognition of the complex history of the region. Gershon Baskin, a self-described “left-wing Zionist” born in New York, had founded the Israel/Palestine Center for Research and Information (IPCRI) in 1988. Dedicated to the two-state solution as its premise, IPCRI worked to build partnerships between Israelis and Palestinians to promote economic development and environmental cooperation. These and other Wye-funded projects such as water conservation and the removal of negative stereotypes in school texts, were all intended to lay the groundwork for a future peace settlement. I called regular meetings of the participants in neutral sites in Jerusalem such as the IPCRI office or the Jerusalem International YMCA. I felt it was important that they report their efforts at these conferences so that all involved would become aware of the other projects underway. It was a way to expand the dialogue. The Israeli participants were extremely enthusiastic and wanted
to publicize the results, but we could not do so without endangering the Palestinian participants. At worst, Israelis and their children, or Jewish students who engaged in educational programs with Palestinians, might be subject to ostracism; the Palestinians were taking far greater risks from within their own community.

In addition to the Wye River projects, there were other efforts to encourage better relations between the two peoples. The Seeds of Peace Jerusalem office was engaged in promoting dialogue. It brought young people from conflict zones together at its camp in Maine so that they could meet in a safe environment without risk. Germany was thought to be the closest friend of Israel in Europe. The German Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) in Jerusalem was actively engaged in peace efforts of many kinds. The KAS organized discussions with Dr. Khalil Shikaki, a Palestinian pollster who had studied at Columbia University and been a visiting fellow at Brookings. The B.Z. Goldberg documentary Promises (2001) perhaps more than any other film of its kind, took a look at children of the conflict in Israeli West Jerusalem and Palestinian communities on the West Bank. These children, seven on each side, developed friendships by playing together and coming to appreciate one another’s humanity. These efforts reflected an optimism about the possibility of achieving a lasting peace.

Perhaps the most deeply moving experiences I had were my encounters with the Bereaved Families Supporting Peace, Reconciliation and Tolerance, also known as the Parents Circle – Families Forum (PCFF). My colleague Jacob Schwartz recommended that I meet with Yitzhak Frankenthal, an Israeli who had lost his beloved son Arik in the conflict. He founded this organization in 1995 along with other bereaved Israeli families who decided to advocate for reconciliation rather than revenge. By the time I arrived in Israel, this had become a joint Palestinian-Israeli organization of people who had lost a family member in the conflict. Those who joined had a shared conviction that reconciliation between the two peoples was necessary for peace. They spread their ideas through public events and the media. Their goal was to prevent further bereavement through dialogue and tolerance. Although they did not get directly involved in politics, they certainly advocated for basic human rights. Meeting these people made me consider how differently individuals react to the most painful of all human experiences, the loss of a child. I was filled with admiration for these parents who were able to reach across the great divide to console and be consoled by their opposite numbers.

One of my responsibilities was oversight of the office responsible for public diplomacy contacts with Gaza. As I proceeded with my official calls on organizations in my domain, a trip to Gaza to meet with the university rectors to discuss the Fulbright program had been arranged. Due to a calendar error, I was double-booked on October 15th. Since our convoy made the trip to Gaza
on a regular basis, I kept the appointment in Nazareth and postponed the Gaza excursion. In
the midst of a meeting in Nazareth, I got an urgent call from my public diplomacy colleague
who had joined the convoy. His voice was shaking. One of the cars in the convoy had been
bombed in a terrorist attack. Three of our security colleagues were killed that day. They had
reordered the cars as security people often did. Had they not done so, the car with the
diplomats would have been the one struck. A powerful remote-controlled bomb had been
used. This was presumably intended as punishment for promoting Fulbright scholarships for
students in Gaza. The Embassy community was quite shaken by this event. A plaque was
placed on the entrance wall in commemoration of John Branchizio, Mark Parson and John
Linde, Jr. who died in the attack. While the Israelis and Palestinians with whom I was working
wanted peace, this episode brought home to me in a very immediate way the extent to which
the extremists abhorred reconciliation. It came back to me many times that the greatest
peace-makers, Anwar Sadat and Yitzhak Rabin, had each been killed by radical members of his
own respective community. Due to the serious security concerns raised by this tragic event, all
further travel to Gaza was banned.

In order to have a better understanding of the history of the conflict, I had asked the great
Ottoman historian, Prof. Bernard Lewis, a scholar whom we had known at Princeton, to
recommend a mentor. At his suggestion, I called on Prof. Asher Susser at Tel Aviv University
who provided me with fascinating and detailed accounts of the history of the conflict and
possible solutions. He had been involved in the research necessary to develop a grammar for
modern Hebrew and many other endeavors essential to the creation of a viable state. He
proved an excellent guide to understanding Israel’s complex history, as well as its relations with
its Arab neighbors.

It was my privilege to meet a number of Israel’s greatest writers. A friend arranged for me to
have a conversation over coffee with David Grossman, whose nonfiction books such as The
Yellow Wind, and Death as a Way of Life had helped me to understand the psychological
damage done to people on both sides of the conflict. We had a long and intense discussion
leaving me with an overwhelming sense not only of his great intellect, but also of his genuine
goodness of heart. Ambassador Kurtzer was kind enough to invite me to join a small group at
his residence in a discussion with Amos Oz whose autobiographical novel, A Tale of Love and
Darkness, vividly conveyed the texture of daily life in the early days of the State of Israel. His
understanding of the conflict in all its human dimensions was profound. On another occasion, I
met A.B. Yehoshua. Unlike David Grossman and Amos Oz whose families had emigrated from
Eastern Europe, Yehoshua was a fifth generation Sephardic Jew. His novel, The Liberated Bride,
deals with the extent to which the lives of Jews and Arabs are interwoven. All three of these writers were utterly dedicated to the State of Israel, and at the same time advocates for peace and reconciliation with the Palestinians. All three brought the weight and dignity of their creative reputations to bear in the search for deeper mutual understanding. Of course, at that time, there was still reason for optimism. In 2006, after initially supporting Israel in the Lebanon War, all three authors controversially raised their voices in support of a ceasefire. Two days later, David’s son Uri was killed by an anti-tank missile. Despite this terrible personal tragedy, he continued to advocate for peace. His powerful novel, published after I had left the country, To the End of the Land, recounted the agony of those parents who send their children into conflict.

Among those who gave me tremendous insight into the history of the conflict, perhaps the most remarkable was Tom Segev whose One Palestine Complete: Jews and Arabs Under the British Mandate, had been designated the best book of 2000 by the editors of The New York Times. Segev’s parents had emigrated from Germany in 1933 and at one point, he had worked as a journalist in Bonn. Segev holds a doctoral degree from Boston University. His riveting account of the British Mandate (1917-1948) gives a clear and detailed picture of the events leading to the creation of the State of Israel. When it came to understanding the complexities of the U.S. – Israeli relationship, I found Michael Oren, then a fellow at the Shalem Center in Jerusalem, an excellent guide. A graduate of Columbia College with a doctoral degree from Princeton, Oren had grown up in New Jersey. When I met him, he was working on Power, Faith and Fantasy; The United States in the Middle East, 1776 to 2006, a topic which had fascinated me since the days when I had been a faculty member at the American-founded Bogazici University in Istanbul. More than any other book I have read, this exploration of American identity going back to the time of our founding fathers, explained the steadfast support Americans give to Israel. Very favorably reviewed, it became a best-seller. Michael Oren later served as Israel’s ambassador to the United States (2009 – 2013). One of the very impressive younger voices was that of Bret Stephens, editor of The Jerusalem Post, a thoughtful and articulate conservative. A graduate of the University of Chicago, he was a staunch advocate for the Iraq War who at that time also supported military intervention in Iran. He later went to The Wall Street Journal and is now a columnist for The New York Times. His recent book, America in Retreat: The New Isolationism and the Coming Global Disorder (2014), is concerned with the security threat posed by our withdrawal from our international responsibilities. Brenda Shaffer, an Israeli-American professor at Haifa University, was an expert on energy issues who understood the strategic importance of cultivating relations between Israel and Azerbaijan. As the research director of the Caspian Studies Program at the Harvard Kennedy School, she
played an important role in linking Israeli foreign and economic policy decisions. Sari Nusseibeh, the President of Al-Quds University in Jerusalem, hailed from a distinguished Palestinian family proud of its thirteen-hundred-year history in Jerusalem. While a philosophy student at Christ Church, Oxford University, he studied with the British philosopher, J.S. Austin whose daughter Lucy he married in a ceremony in Jerusalem. He spent a year at the Warburg Institute in London and then earned his doctoral degree in Islamic Philosophy at Harvard. I had initially met Sari at The Washington Institute, and came to know the family well during my four years in Israel. Always a moderate voice within the Palestinian community, he shared with Ami Ayalon the conviction that the two-state solution was essential for the creation of a lasting peace between the two peoples. He received considerable international recognition. Earlier on when he had been placed under administrative detention for protesting the killing of civilians in wartime, Isaiah Berlin and other prominent Oxford scholars spoke out in his defense. His book, Once Upon a Country: A Palestinian Life, has been widely praised. It is often seen as a counterpoint to the writings of Amos Oz who grew up very nearby on the other side of the no man’s land that divided Jerusalem. These two advocates for peace became friends. Sari’s wife Lucy Nusseibeh, the founder of Middle East Nonviolence and Democracy (MEND), has also been a senior research fellow at Harvard’s Kennedy School in the Women and Public Policy Program. Lucy is a tireless proponent of education as a means to spread non-violent advocacy for democracy and human rights. My friendship with Sari and Lucy inspired in me the conviction that reconciliation was possible. I have very wonderful memories of our meetings in the lovely inner courtyard of the American Colony Hotel, as well as a family dinner in her home.

Among the Israeli Arabs whom I came to know was Judge Tawfiq Kteily who presided over the Supreme Court in Nazareth, a city home to both Christian and Muslim Arabs as well as Jews. A man of moderate views, Judge Kteily oversaw judges who were Muslim, Jewish and Christian, emphasizing the pursuit of justice in his relations with all three communities. On one occasion when both he and Sari Nusseibeh were guests at one of my buffet dinners, he requested that I introduce him. It came as a surprise to me that they had not met. In my dealings with Arab Christians, I came to understand that they had a double identity problem. As Arabs, they were a minority in Israel, and as Christians, they were a minority within the Arab community. On my visits to Akko, for example, older Arab Christians would often lament the fact that their children were leaving for Europe and the United States. Another impressive member of that community was Michael Karayanni who held degrees from the Bar-Ilan and the Hebrew universities in Israel, as well as the University of Pennsylvania and George Washington University. He was an expert on multiculturalism, minority religions in Israel, Israeli jurisdiction over the Palestinian territories. A member of the faculty at Hebrew University, he lived in Neve Shalom.
Wahat al-Salem – Neve Shalom was a utopian community established by Jewish and Arab citizens of Israel located midway between Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. The Arabic world salam and the Hebrew word shalom are cognates meaning peace in these two related Semitic languages. This Oasis of Peace was a remarkable attempt by people of good will on both sides to demonstrate that Jews and Arbs can live together and even join forces in promoting peaceful coexistence through education.

My Embassy responsibilities as Counselor included oversight of both the press and cultural affairs offices. As in Ankara where I had maintained close ties with leading journalists such as Sami Kohen, in Israel, perhaps the journalist with whom I met most often and from whom I learned most was Ze’ev Schiff. A military and security correspondent for the Israeli daily Ha’aretz, he had broad ranging expertise, particularly concerning Iran. His assessment of the situation was that a military strike would not be feasible because he believed that the facilities dedicated to developing nuclear capacity were dispersed throughout the country and in many cases hidden. At the time, this view was shared by others in the military and intelligence establishment. Another Iran expert whom I cam to know was Bernard Lewis’s friend Uri Lubrani who had served as the head of Israeli diplomatic mission in Iran with the rank of ambassador. Although Turkey is often mentioned as one of the first majority Muslim countries to recognize Israel, it is now forgotten that Iran also conferred early recognition. In the course of his long and storied career, Uri had studied at London University and served as an advisor on Arab Affairs to Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion. He was one of the few Israelis who had a first-hand knowledge of Iranian history and civilization as well as its security profile. His advice was often sought by those who had not had the opportunity to visit or work in that country. The editor of Ha’aretz was the extraordinary David Landau, a British-Israeli who had founded the paper’s English edition, making it accessible to readers around the world. He was Orthodox, but at the same time, very much in favor of a reconciliation through a peace agreement. An exceptionally articulate man, he was able to have empathy with Palestinians, as well as Israelis. Another journalist friend was Helen Schary Motro, a New York lawyer who had become a writer. Her book Maneuvering between the Headlines: An American Lives through the Intifada, conveyed graphically the complexities of the conflict. I later learned that she was a family friend of those other New York writers, Louis and Anka Begley.

On the cultural and academic side, I maintained good relations with the major universities, particularly Tel Aviv University and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Prof. Itamar Rabinovich, the President of Tel Aviv University (TAU), had been Israel’s Ambassador to the United States. He had also served as Ettinger Professor of Contemporary History of the Middle
East and Chair of the Department of Middle Eastern Studies. He completed his undergraduate studies at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, his M.A. at Tel Aviv University and received his doctoral degree from the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). When I met with him, he asked me to do everything possible to strengthen the American Studies Department at TAU. I was able to do so through our Fulbright program, and by making grants for lectures and conferences from my discretionary funds. Among our friends on the faculty were Prof. Amy Singer, an expert on Ottoman philanthropy who had done her graduate work at Princeton, and her husband, Prof. David Katz, a professor of early modern European history who completed his doctoral studies at Oxford University. Many of these impressive people attended the dinners for twelve I hosted once every two or three weeks. The conversations around my table were invariably stimulating as I mixed politicians, journalists, academics and artists, often from diverse sections of the political spectrum.

While in Tel Aviv, I had the opportunity to come to know Turkish Ambassador Feridun Sinirlioglu and his wife Ayşe Sinirlioglu, the Deputy Chief of Mission at the Turkish Embassy in Amman. He served later as Foreign Minister and Turkish Ambassador to the UN. She subsequently served as Ambassador of Turkey to Bucharest and Madrid. The Sinirlioglu residence was around the corner from my own in Kfar Shmaryahu. Since Ayşe traveled by car to Israel on the weekends, we were able to become good friends. Although Turkish-Israeli relations were more complicated than they had been while I was at the U.S. Embassy in Ankara, they were in good hands with these skilled diplomats. Over a thousand Israelis attended the Turkish National Day including such luminaries as Shimon Peres.

It was inevitable that after two tours in Turkey I would meet Barry Rubin, editor of the journal Turkish Studies. Rubin had immense expertise on the Middle East and we spoke often. He was the Director of the Global Research in International Affairs Center (GLORIA), and editor of the Middle East Review of International Affairs (MERIA). An advocate for Arab, as well as Jewish democracy, he had no illusions about the complexity of the problems throughout the region.

When I reflect on memorable events, perhaps the most outstanding was the celebration of the 80th birthday of Shimon Peres at the Mann Auditorium in Tel Aviv in September 2003. Seated with Ariel Sharon, he received accolades from a host of world leaders, including former U.S. President Bill Clinton. When Clinton took the stage, there was a standing ovation of many minutes duration. Clinton joined a group of Jewish and Arab children singing the John Lennon song Imagine. Although the hawk Sharon and the dove Peres had had bitter disagreements, this was a moment in which they celebrated their shared goals and overriding friendship. Shimon Peres had been a hawk himself in his early years, responsible for Israel’s nuclear project.
Despite this, he was never so popular within Israel as he was internationally. Recipient of the Nobel Peace prize in 1994 for his contribution to the first Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement, he was regarded by some Israelis as too dovish. On several occasions, I had an opportunity to hear him speak. He was one of the most eloquent statesmen I have ever heard anywhere.

Although the cultural centers had been closed around the world, fortunately, the American Cultural Center in West Jerusalem had remained open. It was headed by a brilliant young political officer, Cherrie Daniels, who had worked for my husband at Embassy Zagreb. A few years before, Cherrie had consulted with me about doing this public diplomacy tour in Israel while I was at the State Department. I had strongly endorsed the idea, little knowing that I would later be assigned there myself. Cherrie and her excellent staff made the most of the venue at their command. This center became a good place for Jewish and Arab Israelis to meet one another and engage in dialogue. On my many visits to Jerusalem, through Cherrie, I was able to extend my already extensive contacts to include leading government and political figures. Perhaps the most noteworthy of these was the President of the Supreme Court of Israel Justice Aharon Barak, a most impressive man, who spent an hour giving me an assessment of Israeli law that filled me with respect for this functioning democracy. There were many happy occasions at the Jerusalem Center, one of which was the celebration of the Institute of International Education's (IIE) Victor J. Goldberg Peace Prize for peace in the Middle East awarded to Dan Bar-on and Sami Adwan for their Wye River-sponsored primer on the history of the conflict from two perspectives. Cherrie was a creative and indefatigable worker who brought the cultural center fully to life as a venue for lectures, conferences and meetings, as well as a top-notch library.

Believing in the importance of cultural centers, particularly in areas of the country with mixed populations, I sought support from the State Department for American Corners. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the belated realization that closure of the cultural centers nearly everywhere around the globe had been a mistake, the State Department had created a new concept, the American Corner. The idea was that we diplomats would seek the collaboration of local government officials to donate a space in a public facility such as a library. The State Department would provide the funding for books, reference materials, computer equipment and in some cases, furniture. The activities in these Corners would be overseen by the public or cultural affairs officers at the embassy. They would be staffed by those already working at the facility on a part-time basis. It was possible in this way to program speakers, organize seminars, present book events and poetry readings, and in some cases, even cultural performances or small, locally generated exhibits. The concept was flawed in the sense that the
staff on the ground answered to local authorities, not to the embassy. However, this something was significantly better than nothing. I decided to seek American Corners for Israel, Initially, I was rebuffed because not only was Israel not part of the former communist world, it was a developed country. However, I persisted, and eventually, I was able to open four corners in Akko, Jaffa, Beersheva and Karmiel all areas with mixed Jewish and Arab populations.

It was my belief that we should also use our exchange programs to promote better understanding between Israeli Jews and Arabs, as well as providing them with an opportunity to travel to the United States. Through the International Visitor program, we regularly sent small groups of professionals in a variety of fields to meet their professional counterparts across the United States in the course of a three or four-week tour. Many of the participants in these tours told me that they had never before met someone from the other community. In nearly all cases, the result was positive, and in some, lasting friendships were formed. The Fulbright program was a bit more problematic. The Israeli Fulbright fellowships and scholarships were highly competitive and candidates had to be fluent in English. For Hebrew speaking Israelis, English was a second language, or in some cases, even a first, if the parents had emigrated from an English-speaking country. For the Arabs, Hebrew was the second language, and English the third, thus handicapping them. Nevertheless, some did qualify. We also were able to create some modified programs to enable more Israeli Arabs to participate.

My commitment to cultural programs has never wavered. It was a great pleasure to invite Jonathan Hollander and the Battery Dance company to perform in Jaffa where they managed to work with young Jewish and Arab dancers who would never have come together under other circumstances. The Battery Dance performances were attended by people from both communities.

It was a great privilege to serve under Ambassador Daniel Kurtzer. He was a scholar of Middle East politics and history, as well as U.S. – Israeli relations. He had served as our Ambassador in Egypt and was familiar with the Arab world. He spoke Hebrew fluently. He always asked the most penetrating questions at our daily morning press briefings. Daniel and Sheila Kurtzer were gracious hosts who seemed to know everyone in the country. Sheila had made the official residence both elegant and welcoming. She had also put in a desert garden filled with plants suited to this tropical climate, rather than retaining the water-consuming lawn. When we received instructions from Washington to hold an iftar dinner during the Muslim month of Ramadan, we agreed to make this an inter-faith celebration, creating an opportunity for Jewish rabbis, Arab imams and Christian priests to engage in dialogue. For some, a coming together of this sort was a first. When I accompanied Ambassador Kurtzer to the Israeli think-tanks, I had a
chance to learn from a master diplomat whose intellectual depth and extensive knowledge provided me with an education about the Middle East. It was also a pleasure to sit in on his discussions with Steve Erlanger, then The New York Times bureau chief in Jerusalem, a gifted and sensitive observer and just about the finest journalist I encountered in my three decades in public diplomacy. He had the ability to make the lives of Israel’s people, as well as those in the West Bank and Gaza, come alive for an international readership.

On several occasions when the Deputy Chief of Mission was away, I sat in his chair. It was during these times that I came to know Chris Stevens, then a political officer at the Consulate in Jerusalem, responsible for the Palestinians. It was always good to work with Chris – he was very intelligent, fair-minded and competent. He spoke Arabic fluently and had his finger on the pulse of the Arab community. It was heartbreaking that he was later killed while serving as our Ambassador to Libya.

Ambassador Kurtzer’s Distinguished American Speaker Program was a lecture series held at his residence at which we presented academics, policy experts, journalists, authors, artists and others to an invited audience. Graham Allison, a scholar at Harvard’s Kennedy School, and a former Assistant Secretary of Defense, spoke about prevention of nuclear conflict. Henri Barkey and his wife, Ellen Laipson, affiliated with Washington think tanks, addressed Turkish-Israeli relations and the role of Turkey in the Middle East. Robert Putnam, from the Harvard faculty, discussed his prescient book Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital, a study of the decrease in civic engagement in American society. My colleague from the Council on Foreign Relations, Walter Russell Mead, presented his book Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World. These and many others held lively discussions with our invited Israeli audiences. We had many high-level visitors, most notably Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia who set forth his espousal of originalism in constitutional interpretation, and Leon Botstein, at the other end of the political spectrum, President of Bard College and conductor laureate of the Jerusalem Symphony Orchestra. Fortunately, I had DVC technology in my home, enabling me to host foreign policy discussions between Israeli experts and their counterparts in Washington for an invited audience.

Ambassador Kurtzer left Embassy Tel Aviv to join the faculty at Princeton University in summer 2006. He was replaced by Ambassador Richard Jones. I remained in Tel Aviv for one more year until 2007 and had the pleasure of working with someone whom we knew from Central Asia. Dick Jones had been Ambassador to Alma Ata when Robert was Ambassador to Dushanbe. Due to the dire security situation Tajikistan, Robert had an office and residence in Alma Ata as well as Dushanbe thanks to Ambassador Jones so that he could meet with important Tajik
representatives without danger. Embassy Tel Aviv was my longest tour, amounting to four years. Before I left, Ambassador Jones hosted a large farewell party for me. Bernard Lewis was unable to attend, but my colleagues Ephriam Cohen, Anne Walter and Matty Stern had filmed a message from him which was shown on a floor to ceiling screen at the residence. Given Bernard’s popularity in Israel, this was quite a send-off.

Lessons Learned: Israel 2003-2007

It would not have been possible to accomplish so much without the support of a dedicated staff. Press Officer Paul Patin was competent and experienced. Ruth Anne Stevens was full of excellent ideas. As always, my locally employed staff opened many doors for me. Anne Walter put me in touch with leading academics. Ya’el Feldboy briefed us each morning on the Hebrew language press; Jacob Schwartz did such a good job managing the accounting for the Wye River grants that he was invited to Washington to teach recently hired local staff from the Newly Independent States (NIS). My secretary, Ruth Melamed was truly a treasure. Born in Bulgaria, she had grown up in Teheran where her family had business interests. She was fluent in English, French, Persian, Hebrew and Ladino, the language of the Sephardic Jews.

Given my interest in conflict resolution, I found it enormously rewarding to work in Israel at a time when there was genuine hope for the “two state solution,” our official policy. Israel was distinguished by a truly free press. Ha’aretz was a world class newspaper read and respected around the globe. In my meetings with the editors, they explained their dilemma. Reporting on Israel’s failings could potentially provide damaging information for the country’s enemies. Nevertheless, they were dedicated to the truth without equivocation. My admiration for these journalists was enormous.

Oversight of the Wye River grants was an education in itself about the challenges inherent in creating opportunities for dialogue between two peoples with completely different interpretations of historic events. The great lesson of Wye however, is that when people of differing perspectives are brought together to work on something of mutual interest such as emergency medical care, bonds of mutual respect, and even friendship, can be formed. I saw that there were people on both sides who could listen with the goal of deepening their understanding and empathy without sacrificing their own values. On the other hand, I also saw how debilitating such a conflict can be for both parties. Failure to reach resolution has the very negative effect of brutalizing both societies. The Israeli military and intelligence services also earned my great respect for their appreciation of the necessity to resolve the conflict. As always in these situations, there is a fine line to be walked between providing security and
keeping the door open for negotiation. Once again, my conviction that nothing can replace people-to-people dialogue was confirmed.

Perhaps the most important lesson learned was the important role played by our American Cultural Center in Jerusalem, one of the last of its kind around the world. **Director Cherrie Daniels** made this into a vibrant venue for dialogue, as well as a research library. Cherrie, supported by her dedicated staff, led by the eminently competent **Linda Slutsky**, took full advantage of having this well-known venue in West Jerusalem. Among other things, she introduced students from the Jerusalem Music and Dance Academy to the relationship between American jazz and Afro-American Literature as part of Black History month celebrations. She also invited Jewish and Arab teens from five schools to the American Center for a festival of Black poetry and music. For International Women’s Day, she hosted an inter-faith event that included women from Jewish, Druze, Muslim and various Christian sects in a program designed to promote dialogue. When **Ambassador Swanee Hunt** came to Jerusalem, Cherrie created an event for women involved in peace activities, some of whom Swanee later invited to Washington to meet with Members of Congress and other policy makers. **Charles Ansbacher**, Swanee’s husband, conducted *Shared Hopes: A Special Concert in the Name of Peace* with invitations in both Hebrew and Arabic. The existence of this Center and the role it played in the cultural life of Jerusalem were crucial to our efforts in support of conflict resolution.

X. **Public and Cultural Diplomacy: Germany 2007-2010**

When it came time for what I knew would be my last tour, there were many tempting prospects. Embassy New Delhi for example, was an enormous job and I was familiar with the Indian Subcontinent from my tours in Pakistan. However, I have always considered the transatlantic relationship to be crucial to global political and economic security, and Germany was the powerhouse of Europe. In addition, although he had learned many other languages both simultaneously and subsequently, Robert had studied German in high school and college. Our son Edward had been with me in Frankfurt and had very fond memories of our years there. So, for both professional and personal reasons, my top choice was Berlin.

Shortly before my departure for Berlin, our old friend **Avrom Udovitch**, and his wife **Lucette Valensi**, both scholars of the Near East, invited me for dinner in their New York apartment on
the West Side. Avrom had chaired the Near Eastern Studies Department at Princeton when Robert was a graduate student. During the dinner, a surprise guest appeared. **Guido Goldman** had been many years on the Harvard faculty. Aside from founding the **German Marshall Fund** in Washington, he had been instrumental in the creation of the **Minda de Gunzberg Center for European Studies** at Harvard. Guido was also a collector of Central Asian ikats and a board member of the **Alvin Ailey American Dance Theater**. In short, thanks to Avrom, I had a chance to encounter this truly **Renaissance Man** who could lucidly analyze the political situation in Germany or speak eloquently about dance. He told me that his interest in dance, and the Ailey Company in particular, had grown out of his commitment to civil rights. Guido was to become one of the most important mentors of my life. On this occasion, he spoke to me about the possibility of an Alvin Ailey company tour to Germany and Switzerland. Nothing could have pleased me more. The Ailey dance company is a major showcase for African American talent.

When I arrived in late summer 2007 to take up my position as Minister-Counselor for Public Affairs at our Embassy, I found a Germany much changed from the country I had left twelve years before. As a stipulation of the Unification Treaty, Berlin had become the capital of the Federal Republic. This had been confirmed by a vote in the German Bundestag on June 20th, 1990. When I left Frankfurt in 1995, our Embassy was still located in Bonn. By the time I returned, it was in Berlin, as were nearly all the German ministries with which we would work. In the European Union, Berlin was second only to London in terms of population. After serving in Ankara, Lahore, Islamabad and Tel Aviv however, for me, its broad avenues and tree lined streets revealed a comparatively low population density beyond the center of the city. Nevertheless, Berlin was a truly international city with residents from around the world, numerous think tanks, and a thriving arts community. It was ethnically diverse, with the largest minority comprised of the descendants of the Turkish workers brought to Germany in the 1960’s to enable the **Wirtschaftswunder**.

**Chancellor Angela Merkel** had been elected in 2005 and was viewed by many as the most powerful politician in Europe. The daughter of a Lutheran minister who had grown up in the East, she was a phenomenon in many respects. A chemist and research scholar by training, she applied her scientific expertise to decision making, dealing with complex problems through rationality and logic. As the leader of the **Christian Democratic Union (CDU)**, her politics were centrist and reassuring to the vast majority of Germans. Indeed, she managed to steal the playbook from the Social Democrats and the Greens by advocating for educational and social welfare programs, and ultimately deciding to abandon nuclear energy in favor of environmentally friendly clean wind and solar power. Her popularity was such that Germans
called her Muti, or Mom. She managed to create a comforting atmosphere of stability in the midst of the economic prosperity fueled by Germany’s success as an exporter of brand name cars and high-tech machinery. As a child of the East, she was fluent in Russian, enabling her to converse with President Vladimir Putin of Russia. Since he had headed the KGB in Dresden, he was fluent in German, providing them with two linguistic options for dialogue, and perhaps even more importantly, a good understanding of each other’s political motives and values.

Our mission in Germany was exceeded in size only by that of Embassy Cairo with its large development assistance programs. Aside from the Embassy in Berlin, we had Consulates in Dusseldorf, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Munich, and a new one in Leipzig serving the former East. As Public Affairs Minister at the Embassy, I oversaw not only my own staff in the press and cultural sections, but also the press and cultural staff at the Consulates. In all, I supervised some seventy American officers and German nationals conducting intensive public diplomacy programs throughout this large and important country. Unfortunately, the cultural centers had been closed, creating a serious problem in terms of venue. I was quickly drawn into the discussion about the new embassy building due to open the following year. When I was shown the plan, I immediately noted that there was no public access space allocated to public diplomacy. I made the case to Ambassador Timken, a Bush administration political appointee, that it was essential to have a location for lectures, conferences, book readings, seminars, student events and small receptions within the Embassy. He concurred and the plans were redrawn to include such an area accessible through a rear lobby graced by a magnificent Sol LeWitt wall painting. It was in this very room that we invited students to watch the live broadcast of President Obama’s speech at Cairo University in Egypt on June 4th, 2009, in which he pledged a “new beginning” to our fraught relations with the Muslim world resulting from the Iraq War. The audience included German students, faculty, journalists and think-tank researchers, as well as a delegation of students from Kentucky who were visiting Berlin. It was marvelous to be able to prompt this kind of dialogue between Germans and Americans about ways in which Europe and the United States could cooperate in the Middle East.

The old Embassy was located just off the famed Unter den Linden behind the Einstein Café in the building that had once been our Embassy to East Germany. For my first year in Berlin, my office was on the ground floor. It was a spacious room, but there were exposed pipes on the walls and a mysterious hole where once a fan had lodged. Since we planned to move to the new Embassy in 2008, it had remained largely unrenovated. Both to spare my visitors the security measures, and to provide them with excellent coffee, I held many meetings that year at the Einstein Café, overseen by the charming Herr Wollstein who managed to know
everyone’s name and to make his patrons feel in true Viennese fashion that he was welcoming them to his own living room.

Berlin in 2007 was absolutely overcome with Obama mania. In every café and pub, the television was tuned to the American election campaign. So great was the Obama fervor that one had the impression that Germans could vote in our election. Of course, their interest made great sense. Germany, like the rest of the world, looked to America for moral leadership, as well as political and economic security. Most Germans counted on the United States to be the guarantor of the freedom and democracy they had experienced since the end of WWII.

Obama’s Democratic Party in the U.S. was very much in line with centrist elements in the CDU and the SPD, even perhaps a bit more conservative. When candidate Obama spoke in Berlin in 2008, he drew an enormous crowd of well-wishers supportive of his opposition to nuclear proliferation, his advocacy for measures to fight climate change and his support for global human rights. As diplomats, we had to remain neutral, so we were not permitted to attend the speech. We viewed it live on television instead. I had checked with a public diplomacy colleague in South America who confirmed that our diplomats posted there had not been permitted to attend the speech given by Obama’s rival John McCain. This rule was implemented even-handedly.

We spent a good bit of time 2007 – 2008 making preparations for the move to the magnificent new Embassy on Pariser Platz very close to the Brandenburg Gate. We formed a committee including colleagues in the German foreign ministry and the local government to make sure that we had checked all the boxes, and to coordinate on the official program. Christoph Eichhorn (later Ambassador Eichhorn), an extremely talented German diplomat who had served in the U.S., played an important bridging role in these meetings with his understanding of American cultural values and German requirements. We had secured the agreement of the city of Berlin to hold the festivities outdoors in Pariser Platz since the Embassy itself could not possibly accommodate the over one thousand guests we had invited to attend. President George H.W. Bush was a great hero with the German public because he had supported Chancellor Kohl’s reunification. We were thrilled when he accepted our invitation to take part in the opening ceremony along with Chancellor Merkel. Former President Bush and the Chancellor would be seated on the stage under a canopy that also protected the orchestra. It was agreed by our committee that we would invite the Alvin Ailey II dancers to perform at the opening. When I informed Ambassador Timken of this decision however, he nixed it, preferring to have a German Elvis Presley impersonator for the entertainment. As things worked out, it poured rain on the day of the opening, July 4th, 2008, but stalwarts in the crowd stayed on to
hear some of the more famous Presley songs. The following day, the festivities continued with a Volksfest in Pariser Platz open to the general public. It was a spectacularly sunny day and the Ailey dancers performed beautifully. Since it would have been impossible for them to have danced on the rain drenched stage the evening before, I had to conclude that this was a case of “all’s well that ends well.” My good friend Beate Maeder-Metcalf (later Ambassador Maeder-Metcalf) from the German foreign ministry tactfully said, “Regen ist Segen.” Rain is a blessing.

The location of the new Embassy was significant. In 1797, John Quincy Adams had been appointed head of our Legation in Berlin, then Prussia. The legation became an embassy in the late 19th century with the unification of the German empire. There were interruptions due to WWI and WWII, but it was quite symbolic that the U.S. should choose to locate its new Embassy to a united Germany on Pariser Platz in Berlin in 2008. Although there had been great pressure to identify a remote location due to the heightened security concerns following 9/11, former Ambassador John Kornblum had been adamant about Pariser Platz and fortunately, he won the day. The embassies of the Allied victors in WWII - the British, the French and the Russians are located in close proximity in the vicinity of the Brandenburg Gate.

We moved into the new Embassy shortly before its official opening. I remember actually carrying my plants down Unter den Linden to house them in my new office with its view of Pariser Platz. On the topmost floor, near the Ambassador’s office, there was the spectacular Quadriga Room overlooking the Brandenburg Gate. Outside was a terrace which provided our visitors with a magnificent view of Berlin. Among the many well-known figures we invited to dine with us in the Quadriga Room were leading media stars Tom Buhrow, the ARD anchorman, and Georg Mascolo, editor of Der Spiegel. During the Berlinale Film Festival, we hosted such famous German directors as Wim Wenders and Volker Schlöndorff.

The new Embassy was very beautiful architecturally. It was also a museum due to the generous donations made by the Foundation for Art and Preservation in Embassies (FAPE). The Board Chair, Jo Carole Lauder, had been tireless in securing paintings by leading American artists to line the walls. Ellsworth Kelly’s forty-foot Totem graced the interior Embassy garden. One of my German colleagues told me that she pinched herself every morning to make sure that we were all really working in such a splendid environment. Of course, we took great pleasure in touring the many visiting delegations. It was profoundly pleasing to be able to show the world this side of America. Aside from the Ellsworth Kelly and the Sol LeWitt wall painting, the FAPE Embassy Berlin collection also includes a print by Ellsworth Kelly in the Ernst Cramer Room, an Andy Warhol triptych depicting Joseph Beuys, prints by Robert Rauschenberg, Jasper Johns and Roy Lichtenstein, two photos by Inge Morath (one of Arthur Miller), and a series of Gee’s
Bend Patchwork Quilt prints made by African American women in a remote community in Alabama.

Germans celebrate the American elections as if they were their own. In each of the major cities where our Consulates were located, parties took place on the evening of the election and well into the morning as the results were tallied. The only exception was Frankfurt, the staid banking city in which we had held a breakfast celebration at the Amerika Haus the following morning when Bill Clinton was elected in 1992. There was tremendous fervor in Berlin surrounding the 2006 election. Both Telekom and Bertelsmann hosted elaborate all night parties including live election coverage, lectures, panel discussions, music and lots of excellent food and drink for the large crowds of people invited to attend the festivities. It was a particular pleasure working with R. Michael Ropers, the Public Relations czar at Telekom. We were quite overwhelmed with gratitude towards both organizations for their enthusiasm and their spectacular generosity. Now that our cultural centers were closed, we had no large venue in Berlin. Embassy fire regulations limited the number of guests for our receptions to just over one hundred. Telekom and Bertelsmann were able to accommodate many hundreds. Indeed, the total tally must have been over one thousand.

Before departing for Berlin, I had called on Ambassador Holbrooke at his office in New York. He had given me wise advice for each of my tours ever since I had worked for him in Frankfurt and indirectly in Vienna. He asked me to do everything I could for the fledgling American Academy in Berlin. He made a special plea that I work closely with Academy’s Director, Gary Smith. Throughout my tour at Embassy Berlin, I found as many ways as I could to support the Academy. When Attorney General Eric Holder or former Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott came to Berlin, I arranged for them to speak at the Academy. I invited the State Department’s Director of Policy Planning, Anne Marie Slaughter, whom we knew from the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton to lecture. When my friend Mica Ertegun asked me to look after the film star Frank Langella during his visit to Berlin, not only did I host a reception in his honor at my home, I made sure that he gave a dinner talk at the American Academy. When we got word that Ambassador Holbrooke, now Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, would do a press conference in Berlin on his way back from a trip to the region, I made sure that we co-sponsored this with the American Academy. With the closure of the cultural centers, I felt that the Academy was the single most important public diplomacy instrument in Germany. It had been Richard Holbrooke’s brainchild with strong support from Henry Kissinger, making it importantly bi-partisan. Events at the Academy included such
prominent Germans as former Chancellors Helmut Kohl and Helmut Schmidt, former President Richard von Weizaecker, and a host of others.

The Munich Security Conference organized by Ambassador Wolfgang Ischinger, draws political leaders and military experts from around the world. It is a testament to Germany’s centrality in relation to global peace and security, as well as economic prosperity. Some of the country’s most influential academics, writers and think tank experts like Prof. Karl Kaiser, Dr. Constanze Stelzenmüller and Dr. Karen Donfried (now the President of the German Marshall Fund) are in attendance at this annual event, finding ways to strengthen the transatlantic partnership.

Among my many responsibilities in Berlin was chairmanship of the German-American Fulbright Commission Board. I had been involved with Fulbright at all my postings, but there was nothing quite like the German program. It truly fulfilled Senator William J. Fulbright’s initial concept – the promotion of mutual understanding through academic and cultural exchange - with an enormous array of options for both American and German participants. The German-American Fulbright Commission was the largest in the world, generously supported by the German government, as well as our own. It was run by the eminently capable Dr. Rolf Hoffmann whose visionary guidance had led to the creation of multiple programs designed to accommodate a wide range of scholars and students with varied academic interests. He was imaginative and highly innovative without sacrificing the highest standards. Of course, the world was changing rapidly. During the Cold War, virtually all German academics and students wanted to go to the U.S. By the time I arrived in Berlin, potential Fulbright candidates were looking far afield to China, the Arab countries and elsewhere around the world. We still had a superb slate of candidates, but we wondered about the long-term impact of globalization on the German program. The other issue was one I had dealt with years before in Frankfurt. Far more Germans wanted to go to the U.S. than vice versa. One reason for the reluctance of American undergraduates to pursue German exchange programs was that parents paying the enormous tuition fees charged by our universities were not enthusiastic about having their son or daughter trade places with a German student for whom the state took care of these expenses. The other issue was that while many German students were fluent in English, few Americans were fluent in German. On the other hand, the American fascination with Germany was increasing as its reputation for being a progressive country was becoming more widespread, making it an increasingly attractive choice. So, on balance, we were able to have the most vibrant and successful Fulbright program imaginable.

Chairmanship of the RIAS Berlin Commission was my other board responsibility at Embassy Berlin. RIAS had been Radio in the American Sector during the Cold War. When the Berlin Wall
came down, it was apparent that such a service would no longer be needed. The RIAS Berlin Commission came into existence on May 19th, 1992 when Ambassador Robert Kimmitt and German Interior Minister Rudolf Seiters signed an agreement for the promotion of German-American understanding through exchanges of German and American television and radio journalists. It is very much to the credit of Ambassador Kimmitt and Minister Seiters that they had the imagination to transform this now obsolete radio station into a vehicle for bi-national exchange modeled on Fulbright. Dr. Hidlegard Boucsein, Permanent Undersecretary for Federal and European Affairs in the Berlin Senate, and the journalist Elizabeth Pond were among those who attended the first meeting in the historic City Hall of Schöneberg on December 7th, 1992. It was in this City Hall that President John Fitzgerald Kennedy had delivered his famous “ich bin ein Berliner” speech in 1963.

In 2007, RIAS was in the hands of an extremely competent Executive Director, the distinguished former radio journalist, Rainer Hasters. Shortly after my arrival, board member Jürgen Graf, the legendary figure who had been the Chief Executive News Editor at the RIAS Station during the Cold War, died. His stature in German society had protected RIAS from incursions. There were seats on the board for both Deutsche Welle (DW) and the Voice of America (VOA), our respective international broadcasters. However, RIAS had been created as bi-national exchange, not an international one. I was confronted with a long report from the German equivalent of the Office of Management and Budget, making serious criticisms of RIAS. In this report, it was treated not as a bi-national exchange program, but as a part of the German bureaucracy. One criticism was that the salary of the Executive Director was too high because it exceeded that of a German civil servant with the same title. It had been the intention of the founders to use this program to strengthen German-American ties. An extremely experienced and competent Executive Director had been identified. Rainer Hasters was worth his weight in gold. Not only could he organize superb programs for the journalists, he also kept meticulous records and prepared detailed and accurate budget reports and proposals. Unfortunately, we had to adjust his salary. Another complaint had to do with the office car. RIAS had an office car which was used for the transportation of television journalists with cumbersome equipment. Since German bureaucrats were not permitted official cars, this necessary item had to be sold. I advised Rainer to do so promptly rather than to quarrel. One recommendation did make sense. RIAS had taken on the obligation to cover the medical expenses of the Executive Director. While these were surely a fraction of what such costs would be in the U.S., it made eminent sense to take out a health insurance policy instead. We did so. The final complaint was the one with which we could not concur. It was proposed that our RIAS bi-national program be absorbed into Deutsche Welle. This was out of question as our by-laws, like those of Fulbright,
indicated that this was to be a bi-lateral, not an international exchange program. On this most important point, we won the day. Finally, the German members of the board had not been appointed as required by the by-laws. When I explained the situation to Ambassador Timken, he expressed willingness to present the case to the German authorities in the office of the Culture Secretary. I prepared his talking points and he used them to great effect. After he presented our case, the German members were appointed in short order and RIAS was up and running once again.

As Minister-Counselor for Public Diplomacy at the Embassy, I was responsible for country-wide press and cultural affairs. When Claus Kleber, the leading anchor on ZDF, contacted me regarding a documentary he was preparing on nuclear non-proliferation, I was glad to assist. His work in this field, and also on climate change would have an enormous impact even beyond the German-speaking world. Furthermore, what he wanted to accomplish was very much in line with Obama Administration priorities. Kleber had worked for years in Washington and was an expert on transatlantic German-American relations. He had also served as the Chief Editor of RIAS, then Berlin’s most influential radio station, at the time of the Fall of the Wall. When he wanted to visit U.S. military facilities while making his documentary about nuclear proliferation, I was glad to vouch for this top-notch journalist with the Pentagon. The three-part series entitled *The Bomb* (2009) brought home to proliferation skeptics the threat of nuclear weapons. He followed this with a two-part documentary on climate change, *Machfaktor Erde*, released in 2011 shortly after I had left Berlin.

Having served in Turkey, it was only natural that I would connect with the Turkish-German community. The Turkish Ambassador invited me to embassy receptions and other events where I was able to meet some of the leaders. I was also routinely invited to Turkish cultural events in Berlin. Perhaps the best-known German of Turkish background is Cem Özdemir whose Circassian parents had emigrated from Tokat in Central Anatolia to Germany in 1983 and subsequently acquired German citizenship. I had actually first met him at a conference in Washington many years before my assignment to Berlin and found him at that time to be extraordinarily impressive. He had explained to the audience at a DC think-tank that Germans of Turkish background were drawn to the left politically despite their very conservative social values because of its tolerant policy toward immigrants. A Member of the European Parliament, he also served as co-chair of the Green Party. On many occasions, I heard him address conferences in Berlin, invariably advocating for the progressive Green agenda. Despite being a German politician, he was often asked to criticize or defend Turkish government policies. He invariably responded diplomatically, reminding his interlocutors that...
he was a German, critical of some Turkish official positions, without evidencing any embarrassment about his background. Another Green politician of Turkish background was Özcan Mutlu, a member of the regional Berlin Parliament representing Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg. An electrical engineer by training, he had entered politics due to his interest in education and integration policies. Campaigning in a mixed district including Germans of immigrant background, he appealed to wary German constituents by announcing that his name Mutlu, is the Turkish word for happy. He told me that he had taught himself English by watching television while on an exchange program in Omaha. Mutlu was later elected to the Bundestag.

As Germany came to grips with its multi-ethnic reality, other figures emerged as well. The Vietnam-born Philipp Rösler, Leader of the Free Democratic Party became Federal Minister of Health in Angela Merkel’s second cabinet. He would later take a principled stand regarding German export of a lethal drug used in the U.S. to execute prisoners on death-row. Another impressive politician of immigrant background was Omid Nouripour, born in Teheran. He had been elected to the Bundestag in 2006, taking the seat vacated by former Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer. A long-serving member of the Defense Committee, Nouripour’s chief focus was on security. As only the second member of the German Parliament of Iranian descent, he was often asked to interpret developments in that country. He was a tireless advocate for migrants and refugees who told me that the immigrants from Iran often had the advantage of well-educated parents, giving them a bit of a head start in Germany.

Having served in Pakistan, I was also invited by my friend Sarmad Hussain, a German of Pakistani background, to political discussions about German-Pakistani relations. Sarmad had a wide circle of devoted German friends of Turkish, Persian and Pakistani background. When distinguished visitors from Pakistan came to Berlin, he would invite me to meet them, enabling me to renew friendships from an earlier time. By chance, I met the Pakistani Ambassador Shahid Kamal, one day at the Einstein Café. When he learned of my postings in Lahore and Islamabad, he and his lovely wife Sameena, began inviting me to their dinner parties where I was able to meet some prominent members of the German cultural community, including distinguished gallerists and art collectors.

The work of our Embassy with Germans of immigrant background was made much easier because of the extremely sensible policies put in place by then German Interior Minister Wolfgang Schäuble, one of Germany’s most distinguished and long-serving politicians. He understood the importance of integration in the struggle to combat radicalization. The conferences and exchange programs we organized at our Embassy for these vulnerable young people always received the support of his ministry. Among those working with him was Ali
Aslan, the son of educated Turkish immigrant parents, who had studied at Georgetown and Columbia universities in the U.S. A television journalist, he brought not only his sardonic wit, but his understanding of transatlantic German-Turkish relations to his political and social analysis. A veteran of CNN and ABC in the U.S., his Quadriga program on DW was very well received. Recognizing that many of the immigrants to Germany were coming from majority Muslim countries, the Ministry of the Interior had had the prescience to create the Islam Conference in 2006 in an attempt to make a space for dialogue between government authorities and the Muslim minority population. One of its most important initiatives was to recognize the contributions made by Muslim immigrants to German society, providing young Muslims with a sense of pride and self-respect.

One of my most wonderful partners in the effort to combat radicalization was my old friend from Frankfurt, Deidre Berger. I had known her there as a journalist with NPR, but since 2000, she had been the Director of the American Jewish Committee (AJC) in Berlin. Recognizing the need to work with the Muslim immigrant community, she had organized Jewish-Muslim dialogue efforts aimed at enlightening both sides about the other despite the tensions between them. A smart and perceptive leader, Deidre understood that rising anti-Semitism in Europe was coming not only from the far right, but more directly from recent arrivals from majority Muslim countries. This was challenging work, but she tackled it with imagination. Politicians such as Cem Özdemir and Özcan Mutlu were supportive of these AJC efforts, participating in the discussions, a part undertaken by Ali Aslan as well. These secular Muslim leaders provided excellent role models for disoriented Muslim youth.

Aside from my many new German friends, such as Bundestag Member Hans-Ulrich Klose, my old friends from Frankfurt – David and Etel Fisher, and Claus-Dieter Frankenberger let me know when they came to Berlin. I had first met Dorothee Pieper-Riegaff, owner of the most extensive collection of Native American paintings in Germany, when she had invited me to open an exhibition in Frankfurt years before. She and her husband had caught up with me in New York while I was at the Council on Foreign Relations, and we were able to see one another again in Berlin. These and so many others remain friends to this day.

It was my great good fortune to serve in Berlin under Ambassador Philip Murphy (now Governor of New Jersey), the Obama Administration appointee who succeeded Ambassador Timken. A natural diplomat, a gifted public speaker, visionary leader, he and his wife Tammy had an enormous impact on the country, winning friends among all segments of society from policy wonks to soccer fans. They managed to entertain not only visiting luminaries from the U.S., but German leaders in virtually every field of endeavor. The Murphy family, with its four
beautiful children, provided a model of all that is best in American society. He led our Mission in Germany with immense talent and imagination. When I recently joined a group of German journalists who called on him in Trenton, one of them remarked after the meeting that his faith in America had been restored. The Deputy Chief of Mission, Greg Delawie, was one of the finest career diplomats with whom I ever worked.

As always in my diplomatic postings, it was the local staff, particularly Anne Menden-Deuer and Angela Engmann who kept the Front Office of Public Diplomacy humming along with brilliant efficiency. Their advice on matters great and small was always right on the mark. Nancy Rajczak had been on my staff in Frankfurt and outdid herself in Berlin providing a depth of expertise on all things German, despite her birth in Canada.

It was with considerable sadness that I left Berlin in summer 2010, but my tour had come to an end. I had been offered a position in the U.N. office at the State Department, as well as one at the U.N. Mission in New York. However, my friend Marie Warburg had mentioned that I might want to join the American Council on Germany upon my return. When ACG President Bill Drozdiak offered me the position, I was most pleased to accept. My family had been clamoring for my return.

Lessons Learned: Germany 2007 - 2010

The investment made by the United States in Germany after WWII is something about which we can be very proud. A generation of Germans born after the War have looked to us with respect and admiration for our Constitution, our system of checks and balances, and our way of life. It is this generation that is now deeply worried about what the future may hold in a world in which transatlantic relations are being challenged for the first time in over seventy years. Germany is indeed the powerhouse of Europe, but it is also a country that has dealt with its past in a most extraordinary way. In this respect, it is a model for the world. It has provided intellectual freedom for its people as well as a high degree of prosperity. When I left Germany in 2010, I could not have foreseen that Chancellor Merkel would remain in power until the present day, and that in 2015, she would welcome one million refugees and asylum seekers into the country, despite the political risks. I believe that this daughter of a Lutheran pastor saw this as a moral imperative and an opportunity to put her country on the right side of history.

Germany now gives hope to Europe, along with France. It is Germany that is dedicated to the preservation of the institutions created after WWII and to the continued unification of Europe within the European Union. The rise of right wing populism threatens this agenda, but it can
only be hoped that wise leadership will overcome nativist instincts, particularly in the eastern part of the country that did not experience the decades of democracy that benefited the west.


My seven wonderful years at the American Council on Germany (ACG) flew by quickly. Having overseen a bureau of three hundred staffers in Washington, and as many as seventy-five overseas, joining a tiny non-profit in 2010 was initially something of a challenge. My motivation was my steadfast commitment to transatlantic relations. The American Council on Germany is a very distinguished transatlantic organization with a fascinating history. My dear friends Guido Goldman, Marie Warburg and Karl Kaiser, the Germany experts on the board, were instrumental in steering the organization. Their guidance and encouragement were truly inspiring. The board chair, Garrick Utley, was a wise and highly sophisticated television journalist who had an excellent relationship with the president Bill Drozdiak. Under Garrick’s leadership, I could see that the ACG would accomplish its mission in a most effective and harmonious fashion. I was immensely proud to have been asked to join its staff as vice-president.

Founded by such luminaries as John McCloy and Eric Warburg in 1952, the mission of the American Council on Germany had always been the promotion of a deeper mutual understanding between the German and American peoples. In the wake of World War II, this had been a challenging goal. The ACG was the first organization to invite Chancellor Adenauer to speak in New York. In the spirit of the Marshall Plan, its purpose was to encourage the development of democratic values in Germany at a time when NATO was a fledgling organization. The onset of the Cold War had made it apparent that West Germany would be a front-line state in the face of Soviet expansion. There were profound security implications to the German-American relationship.

It was also the goal of the ACG to make Germany known across the United States. In 1992, the Eric M. Warburg Chapters were created to further foster transatlantic ties. One of my chief responsibilities at the ACG was oversight of the Chapters. When I arrived, there were seventeen. When I departed seven years later, I had expanded the Chapters to twenty-one. By that time, the Chapters were holding close to one hundred fifty events per year. Aside from supporting local programs generated by our dedicated Chapter Directors, I also recruited speakers from Germany to do Chapter tours. Since our resources were limited, I relied on my German and American Embassy and Consulate networks to let me know when Germans of
interest would be visiting our country so that I could invite them to spend a few days on tour. I also maintained close ties with the German diplomats at the Consulate in New York and the Embassy in Washington so that they would advise me of high-level government visitors. The German political foundations, Konrad Adenauer (CDU), Friedrich Ebert (SPD), and Heinrich Böll (Greens) were also very helpful about informing me of upcoming visits from Members of the Bundestag affiliated with their respective parties.

I was proud to be part of the ACG and very much enjoyed working with its President Bill Drozdiak, a top notch former journalist who had been foreign editor of The Washington Post and who had a broad network of influential contacts across Europe. While there, I organized study tours to Berlin for American experts on climate/energy and immigration from across the U.S. These journalists, academics, business leaders, researchers and local officials were amazed to learn of the advances Germany was making in clean energy technology. For a country that experiences rain almost all the time, Germany’s solar production was most amazing. The judges, lawyers, university professors, media figures and non-governmental organization representatives who came on the immigration tours were very impressed with overall German policy, but particularly with the sophisticated approach to police work. They were stunned by the extent to which the Berlin police were in close contact with the immigrant communities in their midst.

Having just returned from three years at Embassy Berlin, it was a simple matter to contact friends in the foreign, economic and interior ministries to get meetings for our delegations with high-level officials and superb German briefers. Among the dinner speakers were such world-renowned figures as former foreign minister Joschka Fisher whom I had first met years before when I ran the Amerika Haus in Frankfurt. More recently, he had spent a year at Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School in an office near Robert’s. He had even paid us a Christmas visit for tea and stollen at our home in Berlin one snowy afternoon while I was still at the Embassy. Hans-Ulrich Klose, Omid Nouripour, Ali Aslan and many others were kind enough to address our delegations. Aside from visiting government offices, we also received briefings at the German Marshall Fund, the American Jewish Committee, Humboldt University, the Konrad Adenauer and Heinrich Böll foundations and many other significant organizations. These study tours were made possible by a generous grant from the German Ministry of Economic Affairs and Energy. I discovered to my delight that my good friend from Berlin, Sarmad Hussain, had been an ACG Young Leader. He contacted me shortly after I arrived in New York and offered to help. He made an invaluable contribution to the study tours by recommending
dinner speakers, briefings and even excellent restaurants. His deep commitment to the transatlantic partnership was very touching.

Starting with my arrival in 2010, I revived our cooperation with our sister organization, the Atlantik-Brücke (AB). It was a great pleasure working with the Executive Director Eveline Metzen whom I had known years before when she was the German Director of the Amerika Haus in Cologne. Together we organized a series of conferences, including one dealing with the Arab Spring that took place in Istanbul at a time when the participants from North Africa were filled with hope for a better future. In this case, the ACG and the AB coordinated with the Council for the United States and Italy, headed by Bill’s friend the American journalist Dennis Redmont, who happened to be the long-time partner of my very dear Turkish friend Zeynep Alamdar. Zeynep had been the AP rep in Ankara while I was at the Embassy there. She would later assume a much larger AP managerial role covering a host of countries in Europe and beyond. We three organizations united to sponsor participants from the Arab countries of North Africa. My Turkish and American friends at the private universities in Istanbul provided spectacular venues for the events associated with the conference which was also attended by a large number of Turkish academics and journalists. The opening dinner took place in the beautifully restored Pera Palas Hotel, an historic building with rooms named for such famous guests as Agatha Christie, author of Murder on the Orient Express. The Sabanci University downtown Istanbul building in Karaköy, the historic Minerva Palas, with its exquisite marble interiors had once been a German bank during the Ottoman period. The Koç University venue on İstiklal Caddesi included not only spectacular reception and dining areas, but a terrace with a magnificent sweeping view of the Bosphorus. I am very grateful to Prof. Ahmet Evin for the arrangements at Sabanci, and to Elsie Vance and her husband, Prof. Attila Aşkar, for the dinner hosted by the President of Koç University, Prof. Umran Inan. Aside from engaging in intensive discussions about the future of the Arab Spring and its potential impact on Europe and North America, the German, Italian, Arab and American participants in the conference saw a different side of life in Istanbul from what they had imagined. Turks are known for their generous hospitality. In this case, they pulled out all the stops.

For three years, I coordinated with the Dräger Foundation in Hamburg and the Center for International Relations in Warsaw on a series of Tripartite Young Leader conferences held successively in Warsaw, Brussels and Washington under the sponsorship of our three organizations. We were able to line-up high-level speakers in each location. It was always a pleasure working with Dräger’s skilled and highly organized Petra Pissulla, to say nothing of our Polish counterparts, led by Ambassador Janusz Reiter. On Bill Drozdiak’s recommendation, we
invited a number of highly influential American speakers with a deep knowledge of Poland’s history to join us in Warsaw such as the journalist and author Andrew Nagorski. My old friend from my days at Embassy Tel Aviv, Steve Erlanger of The New York Times, now Bureau Chief in Paris, joined us in Brussels. Mathew Kaminski of The Wall Street Journal attended our meeting in Washington. After three years together, the Multi-Lateral Young Leaders had become true experts on the Euro crisis, one of the most challenging issues confronting Germany and the rest of Europe at that time. The German-Polish-American network established by this series of meetings is still active.

With the untimely death in 2010 of my diplomatic mentor, Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, shortly after I joined the ACG, the board had suffered a terrible loss. Fortunately, former Secretary of State Dr. Henry Kissinger frequently took part in our programs. With Bill Drozdiak’s support, I was able to obtain a generous grant from the Bosch Foundation to celebrate Dr. Kissinger’s 90th birthday with the Dr. Henry A. Kissinger Distinguished Speaker Program. The parliamentarians Ruprecht Polenz (CDU) and Hans-Ulrich Klose (SPD), the journalists Klaus-Dieter Frankenburger (FAZ) and Stefan Kornelius (SDZ), the political analyst and transatlantic expert Constanze Stelzenmüller and other leading German thinkers and writers toured the U.S. as part of this effort.

As the Minister-Counselor for Public Affairs in Berlin, as well as in my earlier postings to U.S. missions with multiple Consular locations, I had always called the public diplomacy staff together at least once a year for strategic discussions about current policies and programs and to chart the way forward. I was very surprised that the ACG had not done so with the Warburg Chapter Directors. Indeed, many had not met one another, although they shared the same mission and often had to coordinate on scheduling. With the support of board members Guido Goldman, Marie Warburg and Karl Kaiser, and the approval of Bill Drozdiak, I organized a conference for the Warburg Chapter Directors in San Diego in 2012 to celebrate the 60th Anniversary of the ACG and the 20th Anniversary of the Chapters. The Warburg Chapters had been named for Erik M. Warburg, Marie’s father, who was instrumental in the creation of the American Council on Germany, and in promoting German-American transatlantic relations during the crucial period following the Second World War. A highlight of the conference was the keynote address delivered by Dr. Marie Warburg about her father. Her account of his dedication provided great inspiration to our Chapter Directors. Each of them delivered a report and in many cases, they learned from one another. It was also an opportunity for us in the New York headquarters to hear their views and better understand their aspirations.
Karl Kaiser, emeritus professor of German Studies at Harvard University, another one of my most important mentors, encouraged me in 2014 to apply for yet another grant from the German Ministry of Economic Affairs and Energy. This time, the purpose of the grant was to enable us to invite future German leaders to tour the Warburg Chapters across the United States. I learned early in 2015 that my application had been approved. This project enabled me to invite the best and brightest young journalists, academics, researchers and other experts on German foreign and economic policy to tour the U.S. Initially, our Chapter Directors were hesitant. The Bosch grant had enabled me to invite very distinguished senior German parliamentarians and leading journalists and to provide them with business class airfare. The grant for the young professional speaker program was intended to recruit rising stars on a more modest budget. It had the dual purpose of cultivating younger audiences at the Chapters, and of giving these impressive young Germans an opportunity to get to know the U.S. beyond the East Coast. We did not have Chapters in New York or Washington. It was the intention of this program to reach out to such places as Seattle and Charlotte and Minneapolis and San Diego - indeed to all of the twenty-one Chapters located across the country. This program was extremely complex as we sometimes had three or four speakers moving about the country simultaneously. Within a very short time, the Chapter Directors became extremely enthusiastic about this project. The speakers had the extraordinary experience of meeting Americans from our smaller cities, and even in some cases, our rural areas.

My responsibilities at the ACG did not involve just covering the Warburg Chapters, organizing transatlantic conferences and Multi-Lateral Young Leader meetings. I also often identified speakers for our New York programs. Shortly after my arrival in New York in 2010, Dr. Nina Smidt, the President of the American Friends of Bucerius, called on us to propose the Transatlantic Global Agenda lecture series. Working closely with Nina and her deputy Melis Tusiray, we organized a series of some eight to ten luncheon programs per year with both German and American experts on such global issues as the rise of China, unrest in the Arab world, Turkish relations with Europe, economic policies in Latin America, the Iran nuclear deal, the financial implications of the Japan tsunami, and much more. In every case, the impact of these developments on the German-American partnership was explored. These luncheon lectures were so well attended that we often had an extensive wait-list. This series was made possible by the law firm Alston & Bird. During the early years of the project, we also published an annual brochure recounting the events. This was an effective way to extend awareness of the contribution of the ACG and the AFB to the transatlantic partnership.
A New York project with a lasting legacy was the Transatlantic Entrepreneur Conference (TEP). I organized the first meeting in 2011 at the Columbia University School of Journalism with a focus on media entrepreneurs. Our partners at the university were extremely cooperative. Garrick Utley offered the opening remarks and the keynote address was delivered by the Journalism School’s Nicholas Lemann, a long-time staff writer for The New Yorker. In 2012, we had planned to hold the conference at SUNY, but due to Hurricane Sandy, the university facilities were closed. Fortunately, the German participants had arrived before the storm. Thanks to Bill Drozdiak, we were able to relocate to the University Club. Garrick hosted the event which included presentations by such distinguished German intellectuals as former German Culture Secretary Michael Naumann. The TEP grew each year as both German and American entrepreneurs understood its significance. Our ACG member Marc Lemcke, was the driving force behind what has become a major international event. His vision and imagination were instrumental in its conception and ongoing success.

None of this would have been possible without the support of my dedicated young assistants. After a successful stint in the private sector, Johanna Gregory is in Berlin as a recipient of the prestigious German Chancellor Fellowship funded by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation to work on right wing extremism under the sponsorship of the American Jewish Committee in Berlin. Cathy Hatten, is on her way to a great legal career once she completes her law studies back home in Ohio. Bright, talented and great fun to work with, they managed to juggle many balls at once without dropping a one. We also had a series of wonderful interns recommended to us by Maryalice Mazzara, the Director of the Jewish Foundation for Education of Women (JFEW) at the State University of New York.

I shall always be very proud of my affiliation with this extraordinary non-governmental organization dedicated to the transatlantic partnership. Just as I had chosen Berlin for my final diplomatic tour, I had chosen to join the ACG to promote close ties between Germany and the United States, something in the best interest not only of our two countries, but of global peace and security as well. It was a fitting coda to my diplomatic career.

XII. Looking Forward: 2019 and Beyond - Policy Recommendations

As I write this final chapter, I am struck by the number of former members of our military who have sought elected office across the United States. It occurs to me that this desire to serve our country, to promote the greater good, is an echo of the same impetus that led many idealistic young people of my generation to join the Peace Corps or the Foreign Service. The difference is
that in the days of John F. Kennedy, we thought about healing the world. Now it seems, these candidates are hoping to heal the divisions at home. It is to be expected that they will place the values that have made this country worth fighting for above partisan politics. In many cases, they will have had the experience of living in war torn and impoverished countries. They will surely have learned the benefits of cooperation with our most trusted allies. It is always true that people of good intentions can differ widely on the means to achieve a similar goal. This is something I certainly learned from my years working in conflict resolution. Our military veterans know the horrors of war and many in their highest ranks have recognized the significance of diplomacy in preventing war. Some of the strongest advocates for the State Department have been our military commanders. If the ultimate goal is world peace, perhaps our next generation of politicians will make good decisions not only domestically, but on issues that affect the rest of the world. At the core of this memoir is the assumption that all people of good will do share this goal. For this reason, conflict prevention and resolution must be at the heart of all our efforts. Throughout three decades of working in the field of public and cultural diplomacy, I saw firsthand how effective these efforts could be.

It seems to me that public and cultural diplomacy approaches to conflict resolution can be broken down into four categories. The first is exemplified by the *Postmodernism* conference. I was prompted in my first diplomatic tour in Ankara to choose *Postmodernism* as a theme because of its contemporary universality. Although the concept for this conference involved literature, music, the visual arts, and dance, at its core was architecture, one of the most important art forms of the Islamic world. The Middle East Technical University and the Istanbul Technical University produce many superb Turkish architects. I understood instinctively, even this early in my career, that the conference should not just be a case of exhibiting American expertise, it should allow residents of the host country to participate on an even footing. It was an exercise in soft power going in both directions. In terms of subliminal messaging, the fact that the leading expert was the Egyptian born American scholar Ihab Hassan, made it evident that ours was a society that respected diversity, and one in which an immigrant from North Africa could become an influential member of the academic community. Underlying all this were the tensions that had arisen in Turkey regarding its historically good relationship with Israel following the widespread television coverage of the Sabra and Shatila massacre of Palestinians by Christian Lebanese Phalangists closely allied with the Israeli Defense Forces in 1982. One of the most potent underlying messages of the conference had to do with our respect for people of all the major faiths. Although the topic had little overtly to do with religion or ethnicity, participants included experts from all three Abrahamic confessions invited to share their contributions to the endeavor known as *Postmodernism*. A reaction to
Modernism, Postmodernism was an attempt to reconcile local cultural values with internationalism by the addition of specific cultural detail to futuristic artistic manifestations be they literary, architectural or in the visual or performing arts. Lasting scholarly and academic ties were established as a result. When I recreated the Postmodernism conference in Pakistan as an international event involving Indians, Pakistanis, Turks and other Europeans as well as Americans, it was done in the context of the conflict between India and Pakistan. In this case, participants long separated by the Partition were reunited and enabled an opportunity to find commonality in their shared love of literature, architecture, dance and fine arts.

The second category of endeavor is best represented by the Wye River grants which I oversaw in Israel. Intended to promote Jewish – Arab cooperation in such crucial areas as emergency medicine, education, civil society, water management and archaeology, this wise endeavor was based on the understanding that people-to-people dialogue is the very essence of conflict resolution. When individuals enthusiastic about saving lives, restoration of cultural heritage or the preservation of precious resources come together, they relate to one another on multiple levels. Demonization of the “other” is diminished. The Norwegians understood this when they called the meetings that led to the Oslo Accords. Although there were moments when tempers flared, they were very rare. Each group was headed by one Israeli and one Palestinian partner. In every case, they worked together amicably, instinctively sensing the mutual benefit of such cooperation. These people were committed to a peaceful resolution of the conflict. They understood that painful compromises would be necessary on both sides. They also understood that they were profoundly grounded in the very earth of this region and that their experiences were interwoven in countless ways. This was a step beyond the Postmodernism conference in the sense that it not only involved direct confrontation between those on either side of the conflict, it required them to work together on specific projects with set goals. Nevertheless, the focus of their activities was never discussion of the conflict itself. It is extremely regrettable that when the Wye River grants came to an end, they were not reinstated. This was an important effort to break down barriers, rather than to erect them. It was a truly visionary attempt on the part of the Clinton Administration to work towards a lasting peace in the Middle East.

The third category is exemplified by the creation of the Center for Democracy in Vienna following the signing of the Dayton Accords that ended the Balkan War in 1995. This was exceptional in many ways, not least of which was the tripartite agreement between the governments of Austria, Bosnia-Herzegovina and the United States. It was an effort to seize the opportunity presented by the peace accord to bring together willing representatives of the warring parties in a neutral setting under the auspices of the Austrian and American
governments. The conferences, meetings, exhibitions and cultural events held at the Center for Democracy were done very much in the public eye. The American role in bringing this terrible conflict to an end was much appreciated by the Austrians, hence their willingness to provide the necessary support to enable the Bosnian participants to travel to Vienna where they could meet their counterparts in a neutral location. The memory of the conflict was still far too raw for them to do so in Sarajevo. This is one of the contributions I was able to make in the field of public and cultural diplomacy of which I am most proud. This was possible, of course, because we had a cultural center in Vienna, an Amerika Haus, that could be dedicated to this purpose.

The fourth category in which public and cultural diplomacy can play a role in conflict resolution is exemplified by Track II diplomacy. It was during my second tour in Turkey that I had the opportunity explore the enormous possibilities inherent in this approach. Track II was a step beyond both the Postmodernism conference and the Wye River grants insofar as it involved creating the opportunity for dialogue between the opposing parties dealing directly with the conflict and exploring their respective grievances. The Postmodernism conference in both Turkey and Pakistan was held very much in the public eye. While it was necessary to impose some restrictions on press coverage for the projects supported by the Wye River grant, they did not take place behind a veil of secrecy. They involved representatives of various organizations on both side of the conflict whose activities were well known and understood. Because Track II is so very sensitive, it was necessary to protect the Greek and Turkish participants from scrutiny. Track II requires the intervention of a skilled facilitator, accompanied by ancillary social events that permit conversations beyond the conflict intended to humanize the participants. Meetings had to be held under the auspices of neutral diplomatic representations. In an effort to overcome the enmity created by the extensive news coverage of the capture of Abdullah Öcalan under Greek auspices, it was determined to focus on both journalists and media owners. This series of encounters led to an enhanced level of understanding. Greeks and Turks, when they find themselves together, can hardly deny their shared cultural dimension. These two peoples lived together for centuries in the Aegean region and have a common heritage. The results of this endeavor were very positive as exemplified by the “earthquake diplomacy” that followed sympathetic media coverage in both countries of the terrible earthquakes of summer 1999. This effort was so successful that it was applied to the much more difficult challenges posed by the conflicting narratives that dominate the discussion between Turks and Armenians. Although these conversations prompted a series of events in the Turkish academic community intended to closely explore the historical dimensions of the conflict, it must be said that this is an ongoing challenge.
As I reflect on my three decades representing our country to audiences abroad, it strikes me that one of the most important ways in which we have cemented our international relations has been through our exchange programs. Whether academic, professional or youth exchange, all promote a much deeper mutual understanding. Exchange programs have always been a two-way street, even long before we understood the two-way possibilities of soft power. This investment in people is our blue-chip stock. Our diplomats come from many disciplines – international relations, area studies, law, history, literature, science and the arts. This mixture of backgrounds at an Embassy gives our outreach a depth and complexity unique to the United States. In addition, our diplomats come from across this wonderful country – from small towns to big cities providing an embassy with a rich tapestry of experience. They are able to connect with a broad range of people in the host country, not just with the élites. Unlike diplomats from other countries who function in their native tongue, English and perhaps one or two other world languages, the State Department’s Foreign Service Institute trains career professionals in virtually every language of the world. I have been asked whether this is efficient. My response is that it is indeed highly effective, but also very efficient. Since languages are inter-related, the person trained for example in Turkish, will quickly learn the Turkic languages of Central Asia. Someone fluent in Italian can easily learn the other Romance languages. German opens the door to the Scandinavian tongues. Kurdish, Urdu and many other tongues are related to Persian. Of course, good diplomats do their homework. Not only do they master the language of the country to which they have been assigned, they take Area Studies courses to understand the region in which they will be immersed. Most importantly, they are encouraged to read widely about each of the countries in which they work.

Perhaps the most important lesson learned in the diplomatic service is that we must absolutely remain true to our values. Intellectual freedom, press freedom, freedom of speech are all enshrined in our Constitution. Truth is of the utmost importance in building trust. We earned the respect of our audiences when we permitted free debate, even on controversial issues. It is a demonstration of our strength as a nation that we can present speakers who criticize our policies, as well as those who support them. This search for truth has been the impetus behind Germany’s recognition of the events of the darkest days in its history. This search for truth led the editors of Ha’aretz to publish information about events in the West Bank, despite their certain understanding that their enemies might use this information in a damaging way. Bringing both sides of an issue to light is not the same as moral equivalency. Only by examining opposing views can we begin to consider ways in which we can build bridges and heal wounds.
In terms of the way forward, I would ask that the next generation of diplomats extrapolate from my experience and adapt my techniques to the challenges of the future.

It is difficult to make policy recommendations in a world so radically changed from the one I experienced during my three decades in the diplomatic service. During the Cold War and beyond, there was a general consensus on foreign policy. There was an undisputed acceptance of the necessity of promoting our interests abroad through the Foreign Service. There was unequivocal support for the European Union, NATO, open markets and free trade. There was a belief that support of our treaty commitments was a matter of integrity. We sought to inspire trust. There was also a recognition of our flaws as a society and an attempt to rectify them. The Foreign Service was selective, but not confined to any one economic class or geographical background. Of course, when I entered the diplomatic service in the last decade of the Cold War, we were still in many countries, “the only game in town,” or one of two games, the other being the Soviet Union. There was an effort, particularly in terms of the Middle East conflict, to play the role of “honest broker.” Among my public diplomacy colleagues there was also the belief that it was in our interest to open up repressive societies and to foster the efforts of those within seeking to achieve change. Our withdrawal from the world goes back to the period following the collapse of communism, but it was magnified during the “sole superpower” phase. This led to the unfortunate idea that we could impose democracy rather than cultivate it. This sort of Utopianism was reminiscent of communism itself. The disappearance of the Soviet Union led to great confusion within the countries in its sphere. Communism had repressed religious expression, but the new order encouraged forms of religious expression that oppressed minorities and non-believers.

In terms of public and cultural diplomacy, there was an unspoken agreement that hitting our audiences over the head with a policy hammer could be counter-productive. The kinds of conferences I proposed, the exchange candidates from across the political spectrum whom I endorsed, the reconciliation efforts in which I engaged – were supported by Washington.

Throughout this document, I have not mentioned the United State Information Agency (USIA), a sister organization of the State Department that was specifically devoted to public and cultural diplomacy. I joined USIA in 1980 when I entered the diplomatic service. In both my tour in Austria and during my second tour in Turkey, I was responsible for all activities of this separate Agency in each of these countries, including our own separate communications. My cables were signed “Finn.” USIA was absorbed into the Department of State in 1999 at which point I
became the Counselor for Public Affairs at Embassy Ankara. The transition at that embassy was exceedingly smooth due to the wisdom of Ambassador Mark Parris and the Deputy Chief of Mission Jim Jeffrey. I have not referred to USIA throughout this document because many others have written perceptively about it, and because it no longer exists. By the time I reached Embassy Tel Aviv, the transition had been completed. The Mission remained the same and in Israel, we even still had our cultural center in West Jerusalem.

When I look to the future, I do not recommend the recreation of USIA. I do recommend that we recruit talented young people to the Department of State who are willing to become fluent in the languages of the world and who have the personal skills, as well as the intellectual capacity, to interact successfully with people from cultures very different from our own. The new technologies are an enormous asset, but as I have noted elsewhere, they are neutral. These new recruits must learn to use them to the best advantage in communicating with our interlocutors. My generation of Foreign Service officers learned on the job. Now that the senior career diplomatic corps has been so severely decimated, one can’t help wondering who will train them. This must fall to the Foreign Service Institute, and it must go beyond language training, important as that may be. Our diplomats must be trained to read the minds and hearts of those with whom they are interacting. They should employ the kinds of conflict resolution techniques I have outlined, but I also recommend that they improvise to reach their counterparts effectively. It might be said that I “made it up as I went along,” and that is what I would hope they will do as well. While it is important that they be grounded in the language, history and culture of the country to which they are assigned, it is also important that they be given the breathing space to innovate and adapt.

One of the most distressing developments is that our diplomats are now often attempting to function from embassies and consulates in remote locations deemed safe for security reasons. At one point when I lived in Turkey, it was very dangerous for Americans. Pakistan was always very dangerous. In spite of that, we lived in housing “off campus” and interacted with the society at many levels. Of course, we must be cautious about security, but we should also learn to make good judgments about what is possible. There are still places in this world where a first encounter with an American can have a positive impact. In Turkey and Israel and Pakistan, I traveled far and wide to lecture at universities and attend conferences. It is difficult to demonize someone once you have met.

One of the very negative results of the closure of the cultural centers was the loss of venues for people-to-people programs and encounters. From Germany to Turkey to India and around the world, this is to be lamented. One solution is to insist on a dedicated space within our
embassies and consulates for public and cultural diplomacy programs. In these venues, not only do the audiences interact with American experts, they also interact with others within their own society whom they may not know, but who have a shared interest in achieving a better understanding of the United States and its policies. Of course, our embassies and consulates should actively support the creation of new institutions such as the American Academy in Berlin. Richard Holbrooke was one of the most brilliant people with whom I worked over the years. He was the engine behind the creation of the American Academy, and this vision of his should be emulated elsewhere.

There are those who believe that diplomacy does not have a future, but all the background work done with North Korea in the past is a perfect example of the way in which skilled diplomats can set the stage for serious negotiations later. When it comes to the real work of public and cultural diplomacy, winning hearts and minds, the circumstances may change, but the goal remains the same. The connections established by diplomats in this field are part of an enormous global network of people favorably disposed to the United States. This network is invaluable when it comes to getting good things done.
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Many believe the societal and political challenges of today can be addressed by leaders with a global background and the managerial integrity to bring all voices to the table. Sustainable dialogue will be achieved only when cohesive teams whose leaders possess the intellectual curiosity to redefine status quo are brought together in respectful conversation to identify innovative opportunities. These teams will have the ability to transform organizations in the complex global marketplace in which society now must operate. Helena Kane Finn has documented success as just such a leader.

• **Global background**

Helena Kane Finn has created and ultimately managed strategic, operational and cultural change at a national and international level. Most recently as vice president/director of programs at the American Council on Germany and, prior to that, as a U.S career diplomat, representing the U.S. in progressively responsible positions including minister-counselor for public affairs at the U.S. Embassy in Berlin, counselor for public affairs at the U.S. Embassy in Tel Aviv and director of the Turkish Studies Program at The Washington Institute. Throughout her diplomatic career, her distinguishing hallmark has been her ability to create the opportunity for dialogue between disparate cultures including Indians/Pakistanis; Israelis/Palestinians; Greeks/Turks. As a diplomat, Finn was responsible for the State Department’s global academic, professional and youth exchanges, including Fulbright and the International Visitor program. She also oversaw the Office of Cultural Heritage and Preservation. She has been recognized many times for her contributions, receiving multiple outstanding performance-honor awards, including the Presidential Meritorious Service award. She is proficient in German, Turkish, and French.

• **Transformational management**

A believer in team-based results, Finn works with multiple cultures and generations within organizations to maximize potential—of the organization and the individuals who take organizations forward. She has the managerial confidence to identify, select, invest in, and empower individuals to lead ongoing strategic change. She has led the policy decisions in multiple high-profile, highly contentious areas. Within those areas, she has reshaped public attitudes by working with media and targeted spheres of influence to help alter public perspective—resulting in meaningful dialogue between opponents. Most recently (November 2017), she was invited to be a visiting scholar at the Institute for the Study of Human Rights, Columbia University. She knows how to articulate sustainable, strategic progress and how to fund ongoing strategic growth through successful, grantsmanship.

• **Diplomatic success—navigating through complex structures**

Effective diplomacy requires respectful, innovative, effective and positive communications between groups—communications specifically tailored to address not only the challenges of today but the anticipated challenges of tomorrow. To thoughtfully represent the U.S. through the Department of State, Finn was an innovative force in embracing the cultures, history and the people in the countries of assignment. From managing a presidential humanitarian visit (President Clinton to earthquake-damaged Turkey) to creating student-dialogue safe place (Israeli-Palestinian), Finn has initiated sustainable, positive interactions between the U.S. and multiple nations. She has the creative vision and determined persistency to steer complex organizations toward a successful future.

• **Sought-after lecturer**

Change can be unsettling, but when completely articulated and confidently managed, positive change becomes a reality. Whether as a career diplomat with international media or as a chairman of a not-for-profit board, Finn’s ability to deliver insightful lectures to audiences has been recognized throughout her career. Although asked to serve on conference panels and provide multiple lectures each year, Finn limits her availability to a select few—to ensure each lecture has the insights, intellectual inquiry and strong delivery that have become her hallmark.

• **Creating networks built on trust**

People are the definitive resource. Understanding cultures and organizations ultimately requires the ability to positively interact with all levels, all cultures and all generations—within the U.S. and around the globe. Finn’s tradition of working closely with all levels, from field personnel to ambassadors or board members, has enabled her to be known as an individual who creates an environment of respectful forward development.

Any network starts with a single conversation. Let’s begin the next conversation: Contact Helena Kane Finn via email at helenafinn3@gmail.com.
Career summary
Career diplomat and non-profit executive with extensive, multi-national management experience and strong communication abilities—interpersonal, written and platform. Demonstrated success in conflict resolution, brokering dialogue between disparate cultures including Indians/Pakistanis; Israelis/Palestinians; Greeks/Turks. As both an executive and a diplomat, known for establishing future-state vision delivered with strong analysis and structured solutions to transform initiatives into accomplishments. International reputation for developing productive and fair organizational cultures. Recognized with numerous foreign-service honor awards, including the Presidential Meritorious Service award.

Career highlights

Vice President and Director of Programs 2010–2017
American Council on Germany, New York City

Manage all aspects of national network for this international organization focused on enhancing U.S.-German foreign and economic policies. Key responsibilities and results include:

- Develop and deliver national programming (350 percent increase in programs delivered)
- Created outreach to recruit additional (younger) audiences and leaders to participate
- Managed global speaker program (NYC) with presentations on transatlantic relations with China, Russia, the Middle East, Latin American, the Far East and Africa
- Recruited participants and conducted cultural relations tours for American professionals to Germany to focus on immigration and climate/energy issues
- Secured almost 90 percent of multi-year grant funding
- Prioritized, established and maintained strong embassy, consular and transatlantic non-profit organizational relationships

U.S. Department of State 1997-2010
Progressively responsible career-diplomat positions representing the U.S. throughout the world:


- Managed all aspects of public diplomacy outreach across Germany including consulates in Dusseldorf, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Leipzig and Munich
- Managed embassy press and cultural sections
- Apprised and advised ambassador and deputy chief on all public diplomacy issues
- Represented embassy in media and at speaking engagements
- Chair, board of trustees of the German Fulbright Commission
- Chair, board of trustees, RIAS German-American Journalism Exchange

Counselor for Public Affairs, U.S. Embassy in Tel Aviv (2003-2007)

- Oversaw public diplomacy outreach throughout Israel
- Managed $10 million grant designed to promote Israeli-Palestinian partnerships in education, emergency medicine, water management, archeology and civil society
- Provided management oversight for the Jerusalem American Cultural Center (location for Israeli and Palestinian students to meet for intellectual exchanges)
- Served as chargé and acting deputy chief of mission
Helen Kane Finn

- Responsible for analysis of foreign policy and domestic politics with Turkey and orchestrated occasions for high-level discussion and dissemination of information
- Published extensively on U.S.—Turkey relations and public diplomacy

- Spearheaded programs on Turkey, delivering multiple analytical pieces on Turkish politics, economics and culture

- Managed global U.S. educational exchange and cultural programs, including but not limited to Fulbright and Freedom Support Act funding
- Managed Office of Cultural Preservation, dedicated to protection of international cultural artifacts and supporting U.S. embassies

- Managed nationwide public diplomacy outreach (press and cultural offices)
- Established and maintained media and educational outreach venues via conferences and lectures
- Flawlessly coordinated and executed U.S. presidential humanitarian visit

**Education**
- Post-doctoral study, Comparative Literature, Princeton University
- Ph.D., British and American Literature, St. John's University
- Bachelor of Arts, British and American Literature, St. John's University

**Affiliations and Community involvement**
- Visiting Scholar, Institute for the Study of Human Rights, Columbia University (2017–present)
- NYU Chapter European Horizons Advisory Board (2017–present)
- National Committee on American Foreign Policy (2014–present)
- Battery Dance Company, board chair (2012–present, member 2010-present)
- Network 20/20 Committee of Twenty (2011–present)
- Fulbright Commission Berlin, (Chair 2007–2010)
- Metropolitan Opera Guild, member
- Princeton Club of New York, member

**Presentations, publications and lectures 2014-2017 (Complete list available upon request)**
- Fostering Connections through Cultural Diplomacy, panel member, Brooklyn Academy of Music/New York University (2017)
- Pax Americana, lecture, New York University (2017)
- America and the 2016 Election: US Foreign Policy and Global Opinion, lecture, New York University (2016)
- Women in the Corporate World: Impact and Influence, panel presentation, United Nations (2016)
- Public Diplomacy and Techniques in Foreign Policy Advocacy, lecture, New York University (2015)
- The Language of Diplomacy, lecture, New York University (2014)
- The Cold War and the Power of Cultural Diplomacy, lecture, New York University (2014)