

The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training
Foreign Affairs Oral History Project
Foreign Service Spouse Series

STEPHANIE SMITH KINNEY

Interviewed by: Monique Wong
Initial interview date: November 8, 1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Early FS

Research Paper stating that women FSO's could not be married and remain in FS
Meeting her husband
Decision to join the FS
Husband's A-100 training
Hoping for career with USIA, SSK takes FS exam and becomes second married woman to pass
Accompanies husband to Mexico post while waiting for an appointment

Mexico

Teaching at Colegio Americano
Interaction with foreign nationals
Terrence Leonhardy, Consul General in Guadalajara, kidnapped
Junior FSO John Patterson kidnapped and killed
Mexican hostility toward U.S.
Passing through "dining room" of Mexican guerilla leader Luis Cabanas

Spouse Concerns

Washington, DC (1973)
Pregnant and no job
Spouse classes organized by Dorothy Stansbury
Attended meetings with Research Committee for Spouses
1972 Directive
Work pushing for Spouse concerns
Chairman of working group on modern FS spouse
Forum Report
Retakes FS exam, enters DOS
Fighting for spouse concerns benefiting her health
Assigned to Carol Laise's management reform team
Thursday "Lunch Bunch"
Memo recommending establishment of FLO delivered to Secretary of State Vance
Janet Lloyd chosen as first FLO Director, expansion of FLO

Fights for compensation and annuity for divorced spouses
Institutional approach vs. personal approach
AAFSW's reaction to 1972 Directive
Senior wives' reaction to younger wives' complaints
Convincing Laise

First post: Rome, Italy 1979-1981
Tandem Couples
Lack of Support
Assessment of Skills Bank
Various functions of FLO
Mental Health Program

Further work for and thoughts on the FS
Concerning Evacuations
Laise's career
Foreign Service lifestyle
Primary identity
Compromises so that she and her husband could be together
Odd jobs enhance her promotion rate
Uruguay/Paraguay desk
Work at Oceans, Environment, and Science Bureau
Speculation on Clinton's policy on environmental issues
Husband's view of his career as half of a tandem
Multilateral vs. bilateral diplomacy
Vassar College
Going after her goals
FS suffered from 1972 Directive
Future of FS
What is the image that the U.S. wants to present overseas?
Composition of FS
Need to define the role of the U.S. in the world
Balance

INTERVIEW

Q: This is Monique Wong on November 8, 1992. I'm interviewing Mrs. Stephanie Smith Kinney in Washington, DC.

Mrs. Kinney, I'm very glad to be here. I understand that you came into the Foreign Service with your husband in 1971. Perhaps you can tell me how you two arrived at the decision of coming into the Foreign Service. Any discussions?

KINNEY: Okay. When we were introduced at a cocktail party in Cambridge in the latter part of 1969, I guess, Douglas was introduced to me and made the comment that he was hoping to go into the Foreign Service. And I laughingly said yes, that's what I thought I'd do one day too. He didn't ask me at the time, but as we courted and eventually got married, he took the exam and was offered an appointment to the Foreign Service. We had to face the decision about whether this was what we wanted to do. It was a choice between the Foreign Service, City Bank, or AID. There was some lengthy discussion.

This was in 1970, a little time short of the famous '72 Directive on Spouses. But there had been announcements in the paper in 1971 that there were changes coming in the Foreign Service and after much discussion, we decided that we would do it, my assumption being that, "Well I'll take the Foreign Service exam and come in and be a Foreign Service officer. We'll go around the world being officers together," it never occurring to me that things might not turn out that way. In part because this had been a long-term interest of mine and ended up somewhat as a vindication for my aspirations that had been thwarted as a 16-year old.

My high school in central Florida in the early '60's, 1961 to be exact, taught us to write research papers by giving us a really dumb topic. The topic was "What I Want to Be When I Grow Up." For reasons that I don't remember, it occurred to me to write about being a Foreign Service officer. So I sent off to the Department of State and got all sorts of information and gathered pamphlets and read books and found a person in Winter Haven who was a retired Foreign Service officer and interviewed him. But the fruits of my efforts and my research were discouraging as I recorded in the last paragraph of the research paper which went something along this line. "And so if you're a young girl who hopes to have both a family and a career, it would appear that the Foreign Service is not for you. It appears that the only way for a married woman to make it in the Foreign Service is to marry a successful officer."

Q: And that was in 1961?

KINNEY: That was in 1961. So I didn't think anything of it. I thought, well that's the way the world is, and I put that aside as a possible career possibility and went about my merry way. I went to Vassar College and spent my junior year in Spain where I became quite enamored of things international and knew that I wanted to work in the international area but figured that probably teaching Spanish or history and working as an academic might be the only particular route. I met Douglas some years later.

Q: That's when you were in Harvard?

KINNEY: It was after Harvard. I was teaching at a private school in Boston and he had just come back from the Peace Corps in what was then Upper Volta and had returned to the Kennedy School to get an MPA, Masters of Public Administration. We courted for a very short time, were married, and the next year he finished up school and we had to make career decisions. And I was absolutely elated because word had just come out in the

newspaper that the State Department was changing its directive on married women and married women would indeed be allowed to join the Service. So we came to Washington in I think it was September of '71 and he started his A-100 class and I took the Foreign Service Exam in October, the old exam when it was given on a predictable date. I was elated some month or so later to be told that I had passed. I took the oral exam and was thrilled to death to be told that I was the second married woman who had ever been admitted into the Service at that time. So I was thrilled to death, but I had to wait on the list the same as everybody else, and I had been interested in USIA, being a water lily floating on the sea of culture, essentially I thought that would be the metier for me. But President Nixon at that time, having little faith in the younger generation, put a freeze on hiring for junior officers. This was the period of Vietnam and he figured he didn't need any more rabble-rousers in the government than he already had and was interested only in hiring mid-level, reliable journalist-types that he felt would tell the kind of story he was interested in about the War. So I accompanied Douglas to Mexico, which was his first assignment and kept myself busy down there.

Q: You had already passed the exam.

KINNEY: I had passed the exam when we went to Mexico, yes. And I was waiting essentially to be called, but then this hiring freeze was put on. I didn't know how long that would last, but I figured I would have to find something else to do in Mexico. I set about getting the house set up and after I'd done all that and gotten to know the city and so forth, learned a very important lesson which is a family rule now. When in doubt, go. Because Douglas wanted to drag me to some American Veteran's do one evening, and I wanted to go to that about as much as I wanted a toothache. But he said, "Oh, please, come on. It's very important to them. We have to have some representation from the embassy." He was the ambassador's staff aide by this time, for Bob McBride, who was really one of the wonderful old-style ambassadors. So I reluctantly went. I happened to meet a marvelous woman by the name of Louise Honey at that party who, finding out my background, my interest and desire in working immediately offered me a job as a history teacher at the Colegio Americano. There was just one problem. Diplomatic spouses weren't allowed to work.

Q: Really? In Mexico.

KINNEY: In Mexico. In any place, but particularly in Mexico. They had worked unofficially and under the table from time to time. This was before...

Q: The bilateral agreement and all of that.

KINNEY: Oh, yes, you'll see why the bilateral agreements were so important to me! So therein ensued about six months of intense hustling and maneuvering and manipulating to try to gain official permission to work as a diplomatic spouse. My husband being the ambassador's assistant, there was no choice but for me to be legal. With the help of a really wonderful executive officer, Vic Dikeos, who was a progressive and

forward-looking soul, we started conniving to find a way. As in most cases when people really want something, and in this case Louise Honey really wanted a cracker-jack history teacher and she knew she had found one, she used all of her good offices and means to work the Mexican side of the deal and Vic Dikeos used all of his good offices and means to work the embassy side of the deal and eventually I walked away with the proper and proper consideration (sic).

Q: Wonderful!

KINNEY: It hinged primarily on my leaving the country on my diplomatic passport and coming back on my civilian passport, counting on the fact that Relaciones Exteriores would never check with what Hacienda was doing and vice versa, and they would never know that I was one and the same person. I also had to waive my diplomatic immunity for purposes of transporting myself from and to the school. As long as I was going to work and from work, I could not claim diplomatic immunity. But it was also tacitly agreed with Vic that if anything ever did happen and if anyone ever did ask, I, of course, was coming back from the grocery store.

Q: Right. You would be protected.

KINNEY: (laughs) Right. But the fact of the matter is I finally got the papers just in time to start teaching in September in what was my second year in Mexico. I was only able to teach one year because it was a two-year tour, but I had a wonderful experience. At least I was busy and happy and I had wonderful kids. I started the Model UN program there which I have been tickled to death still exists.

Q: I've heard it exists elsewhere also.

KINNEY: Yes. But it's a big program in the Colegio Americano and the Mexican teacher with whom I worked came to visit me about three months ago and I hadn't seen her in almost twenty years. Again with tales about the program and how it had prospered and what she had done to carry on the work, so that was very satisfying. But having gone through all that rigmarole and all that frustration and, to my mind, foolishness, all of this to earn \$5,000 a year as opposed to the \$13-15,000 that I would have been earning for the equivalent work in the United States. I came back thinking, "This is really crazy. Either he chooses between his career and me or I have to choose between something for me in my life and him or we have to change the Foreign Service." Of the three options, the last one seemed preferable! So I took my frustration and fury at the system and marched myself off to Dorothy Stansbury's what was then called "Seminar for Spouses" or the "Class for Spouses" or something like that. And I figured I'd just go hang out there and see if I could meet people that I thought might be interested in the same thing I was interested in.

Q: And this was in 1970?

KINNEY: This would have been in the summer of 1973.

Q: Was there anything about the Directive that...

KINNEY: Well the Directive had come out in '72. I didn't affect me. That's not true, that's not true at all. The fact that it had come out was what made it possible for Vic Dikeos to support my efforts to work in Mexico. Had that directive not come out, he would not have felt at liberty to support my efforts. And so the '72 Directive was very important for me in an indirect kind of way. But not being a member of the Service, being new to it, so I didn't have any sense of the way things used to be, we were still very much in a traditional regime in Mexico. Senior wives - they weren't dragon ladies. To my mind they were doing what was appropriate and what was proper and what was necessary from the standpoint of providing leadership for the younger generation. I mean to tell you, you learned how to do your calling cards, you were given serious protocol, you were told to show up at parties fifteen to twenty minutes in advance. No, you may not talk to Americans and if they caught you spending too much time or sitting down would come over and nudge you and say, "Circulate, circulate." They were not doing that in a tyrannical or authoritarian way but simply tending to what was at that time understood and properly, and still in my opinion today, is the proper business of good diplomacy, something that I think today we've lost. I don't think we do a very good job. That's another topic. But I was brought up in that context and in that experience in what you could call the last gasp of the old traditional regime. It didn't bother me. People did things properly, they did it well and one took a good deal of pride in it.

Q: Do you think it affected a lot of the ladies then or not? Was it welcome?

KINNEY: That was all anybody knew then. It didn't occur to people to question it particularly. It was good manners. It was good proper behavior as a U.S. representative. It was needed because there was work to be done, there was entertaining to be done. As junior officers we entertained tremendously. We had a large house. I remember one Thanksgiving in particular that I just loved because I had the head of the Communist Student Leadership on my right and I forget who was on my left. But I remember Eduardo particularly, somebody we had met at a cafe and struck up a regular acquaintanceship with and he had become sufficiently impressed with our honesty and our intellectual mettle and we with him that we established an uneasy friendship. We invited him to the house for Thanksgiving and he was absolutely blown away. He had never seen America in that context and in that image and it changed his mind about...

Q: Why did you say "uneasy?"

KINNEY: Well because he was an ideological Marxist and we were representatives of the great Capitalist Satan to the north, you know. (laughs) He was skeptical about us. Security made it clear that we had to be careful about him. There was terrorism in Mexico at the time. Leonhardy was captured, kidnapped. Our consul general in Guadalajara was kidnapped. A young officer, John Paterson, was kidnapped and killed and, in fact, I

substituted for his wife in one of the drops with the FBI and Security boys because Andrea... The kidnapper was running her around from pillar to post saying, "Meet me in X city and have the money and you'll get him back." And then she would go there and they would say within two hours you have to be in another place. Well there was no way for her to make the drop from where she was in Mexico City. She couldn't get back. So I was asked to substitute for her. And I remember I had terrible fever and flu and the Chief of Security called and said, "Would you come down to the embassy urgently?" They called me out of school. No, I was home sick, that's what it was. Had the flu and they were able to get me at home. And he said, "I hate to do this to you, but will you come down to the embassy urgently. We need to talk to you." And so I said, "All right" and went into his office and they closed the doors, put on all sorts of equipment and I thought, "My God, what's going on?" And the first thing they said, "Now you are under no obligation to do this. You may walk out, we don't want to put any pressure on you, but the deal was we need somebody to substitute for Andrea. Would you stake out for her with the FBI waiting for the kidnapper?" So it sounded kind of exciting so I said, "Sure, why not?" I went on out with them and we went to a hotel and I waited there. The head kidnapper never came. It was kind of a let-down at this point. (laughs) It was shortly after that that we found out that John had been killed and that was very sad.

Q: How long was the incident?

KINNEY: It went on for the better part of - gosh I don't remember.

Q: Months, weeks?

KINNEY: Weeks. But this was under the administration of Luis Echeverria, a leftist, a very decided anti-American and something of a rabble-rouser. It was also in the early '70's when liberation movements and terrorism and all that sort of thing were quite popular and means of advancement particularly in the Third World among "Revolutionary" groups. So Mexico was just one more place on the map where terrorism was a problem and you had to be careful about it.

Q: Were you ever in danger?

KINNEY: I didn't feel that I was, no. Street crime was probably a greater difficulty, although we did have one very scary moment in the spring of '72 I guess. Some friends of ours invited us to go on the Descent of the Balsas River - the Decenso de Rio Balsas. We didn't know what this was but it sounded kind of interesting and we loved the outback and we loved pre-Colombian archaeology and we were out all the time. We didn't have children. And they said, "Look, it's down in Guerrero. It's kind of rough to get there. It's like a half an hour of not-so-good road and then another half-an-hour of really pretty bad road. We'll meet you at Estopa and we'll go down together " This turned out to be an adventure of larger proportions than we had counted on because first of all, we had a flat tire, so we missed the connection at Estopa. So we knew more or less where we were going so we started out intrepidly in our little Town station wagon which fortunately had

a heavy-handling package on it because it turned out to be three hours of bad road and three hours of no road at all before we met anybody we knew again.

Q: You had a four-wheel...

KINNEY: No we didn't have four-wheel. It was just a heavy-handling package, through corn fields, ruts. The car got stuck three times up to its fenders. About three hours, four hours into this journey, and by this time I was practically in tears because we were too far forward. You know we couldn't go back, but we didn't know where we were going. We didn't know if this would ever end.

About four hours into what turned out to be a six-hour ordeal, we finally stumbled upon a little town out in the middle of nowhere with our diplomatic plates on the car. And I got out and grabbed the first person I could find and I said, "Senor, donde estamos?" Can you tell us where we are? And he looked at me up and down, obviously a gringa. And he looked at the car and he said, "Platas diplomaticas." Diplomatic plates. And I said, "Yes, we're trying to get to the Rio Balsas to see the Decenso de Rio Balsas boat race. Kayaks down the river." And I said, "We don't know where we are. We're lost and we're supposed to meet our friends, but it's been a hellacious day already. Can you tell us where we are and how to get to the Rio? Do you know about this event?" And he sort of laughed and he said, "Bueno, senora, donde esta es en el comodore de Luis Cabanas." Luis Cabanas was the main guerilla leader of southern Mexico at the time and what he told us was, "Well senora, you're in the dining room of Luis Cabanas."

Well I went back to the car and reported this duly to Douglas who freaked out and said, "Oh, my God, let's get out of here," and off we went down the only trail we could find and about two hours later, after almost falling off the side of a mountain because the road was so bad and it was so steep, we finally showed up in our Town Car to huzzahs and shouts of disbelief and congratulations from these other intrepid types, all of whom of course had come with four-wheel drive. And then we proceeded to gleefully try to murder our two friends who had said, "Oh well, it's just a half-an-hour of not so good roads and a half-an-hour of a road that's a little worse." They didn't have the foggiest notion of what they were talking about.

Everyone was very impressed that the gringos had come up. This was a Mexican operation, basically, and they were very impressed that the gringos had found their way out from Mexico City and actually shown up and acquitted themselves very well. That was the only time, though, that I think I ever felt endangered. (laughs)

Q: Yes, I would say. After that long drive and not knowing where you were. And then you came back and you joined the classes with Dorothy Stansbury. Was that sort of the beginning of all these events that lead up to FLO?

KINNEY: Yes. I went to Dorothy and complained bitterly, cried on her shoulder, said how awful I thought this was. And she said, "Well, there's somebody you ought to meet

who might be interested. You might be interested in getting to know her and maybe you all could do something together," and she directed me to Hope Meyers. And Hope and I met. As I recall we had tea at her house on P Street and commiserated. She was, I think, touched by my fervor and energy and the younger generation coming on.

Q: That was in '73?

KINNEY: That was in '73, yes. And I don't remember exactly how the working committee on spouses came about, but at a certain point in time... Oh I do remember. In the meantime, I passed my thirty-first birthday, I discovered I was pregnant, came back to Washington, and had to start all over again. My frustration level was, needless to say, high. And I was going through a major transition in addition to the work issue and all of this other just gave fuel to the fire.

Q: What happened to your exams? The Foreign Service exams that you passed?

KINNEY: Well, yes. Mr. Nixon lifted the freeze two months after my eligibility ran out.

Q: Nice guy, huh?

KINNEY: So that also added to my frustration. Just everything. That year. I just remember that summer was so awful. I just hated everything. I was furious. "Hell hath no fury" and I was really fit to be tied. I thought, "Well, you can go around being angry, but I've always been somebody who was taught that you have to find something to do about your anger, so."

I thought, well, I was pregnant. There was no chance of my getting a job knowing I was going to quit nine months later. I felt obliged to tell them. I remember I interviewed out at Madeira and I blew the interview because I knew I was pregnant at the time and my heart wasn't really in it. So I decided, "Well, I'll do volunteer work." So I got a job as issues analyst at Common Cause on energy issues and went to Dorothy's class and decided, maybe I would meet some people there who would be helpful to me. And I met Hope [Meyers].

And then the next thing I knew we were meeting in what became known as the Working Committee on Spouses. There were six of us as I recall. It was Hope and Anna Ralph, Cynthia Chard, myself, Molly Kux and I can't remember the sixth person. I can see her, but I can't remember her name. (Cecile Ledsky?) We would meet every Tuesday in the Department, initially to complain to each other and talk about all the things that we didn't like, and then to start identifying things that we could do to change things. One of the things that we learned from each other was that the so-called "regulation" that required married women to resign never existed.

Q: It was never on paper.

KINNEY: It never existed. It was just practiced. We got information from the Director General, we talked to people, we learned as much about management as we could. We tried to learn about why people were opposed to these changes involving women that were beginning to take place. We talked about the problems that resulted from taking away the old structure without putting anything in its place.

Our frustration derived largely from the fact that, although we had been declared "private persons" from the '72 Directive, there was nothing private about our lives at all. Our lives were totally circumscribed by our husbands' professions and their vagabond existence, dragging us from pillar to post with no chance of career continuity, pay or anything else. And so out of that frustration came the sense that, all right, there was one thing worse than being an adjunct to your husband. It was being a non-person. That private persons weren't really private persons at all, they were just non-persons because we didn't exist at all. At least before you existed. You were recognized in OERs. There was a certain responsibility owed to you because, although you weren't paid for your work, it was recognized that you did certain things and therefore the Department in general dealt with you. Now nothing.

Q: You were referring to the fact that spouses were evaluated on their husbands' reports?

KINNEY: That's correct. On their husbands' report up until 1972. The Research Committee on Spouses became somewhat loosely allied with the Women's Action Organization. The more we did, the more WAO, the Women's Action Organization identified themselves with us and would point to us and say, "Ah, they're part of our group." I don't ever recall feeling all that close to WAO. Basically my recollection and my feelings at the time were that it was the six of us against the world trying to gather information. It was WAO and our nominal association with WAO that did enable us to get in the building, and that was important, and get the room so we could meet every Tuesday.

Q: Was that a conscious decision that you were meeting regularly and at the State Department?

KINNEY: Yes. I think Hope was the one who arranged the relationship with WAO. I don't remember. I'm sure she must have. But the thing that I remember most about that experience was this growing sense of empowerment by gathering information and being together, sort of solidarity. Getting increasingly fatter as my baby grew in my tummy. The wonderful sort of irony of being an impending mother starting this little nascent revolution with the six of us.

Organizing a study - it wasn't a study, it was really a questionnaire that Cynthia Chard and I did that to my mind was one of the most seminal acts of the Research Committee on Spouses. It was a very unscientific questionnaire. It was designed for the simple-minded to get simple answers and it was about two pages long with considerable space after each question. It was distributed to as many men as we could get our hands on in the

Department who were officers.

The single most important thing we learned from it was that - One, we got a tremendous response back. As I recall, about 33 percent which is very high for any kind of questionnaire like this. Two, 25 percent of the respondents indicated that the working status of their wife would influence their next assignment. And at that point, I said, "Aha, this is our handle. This is not a women's issue. This is not a malcontent's problem. This is a management concern." And from that point on, we started attacking the issue as a management issue.

Q: The fact that it affected the husband.

KINNEY: It affects the Service and so forth. We collated the information, pulled it together, sent it in a small report to Carol Laise who was Director General of the Service at that time. I think we met with her. I don't remember all that clearly.

Q: Hope Meyers indicated that you did.

KINNEY: Yes. I remember being periodically disappointed and indignant because Carol didn't seem to give us the support that we thought we deserved. But basically we kept at it. In that same time frame, Cynthia Chard also did the first effort at putting together a spouse skills talent bank. One of my memories of that is afternoons over at Cynthia's house addressing thousands and thousands of these forms to send out. She financed it with her own money. Maybe we put in some contributions, I don't know, but that was where that started.

We did that work in this format for about a year and then I remember Hope coming into one of the meetings and informing us that new leadership was coming on at AAFSW. She asked me in particular to please come. She was a stalwart member of AAFSW which was the old traditional lady's aid society kind of organization for Foreign Service women, although they would not have appreciated that description. That was the way I looked at them. Hope asked me to come to one of the meetings and to explain my concerns. That this new president was coming in and she thought maybe there was a chance of doing something. And I remember her saying, "Stephanie, you must work. You must give the traditional organs a chance. You can't just dismiss them. You can't act as though they don't matter because they do."

Q: Do you remember who the president was at the time?

KINNEY: I think it was Mary Buell. Lesley Dorman was coming on as the new president, and what I remember about that meeting is that I walked in and it was in a Georgetown home with lovely antique silver. Tea and crumpets crowd to beat the boots. Pearls, real big fat ones all over the place. This was old-style Foreign Service. And what I remember about that meeting is being asked to speak and never in my life having used the conditional, the subjunctive mood as much in my life because I proceeded to suggest to

these dear ladies that while as a young spouse I was concerned about x, y and z because this was how I felt about it and perhaps this might indicate that there could be - notice the use of the subjunctive - difficulties and concerns, particularly among the younger women in the Service that might be of interest to AAFSW such that AAFSW might feel inclined to investigate whether or not there was a possibility that there was something they should be doing.

I am stepping on eggs and being as diplomatic as my poor, bedraggled little mind knows how to do at this point and getting bigger and bigger. So, much to my delight, there was a subsequent lunch, I think at Hope's house, with Lesley Dorman. And Lesley, ever skeptical about young whippersnappers and the obstreperous younger generation was quite tart and quite the disciplinarian to make sure that I understood that I could not just go off popping off and being radical. That I had to give her and everybody else a chance. And that there was a proper way - a "proper" way to do things.

But that was the beginning of, I think, a warm and affectionate, mutually respectful relationship over the coming years that proved to be a very good synergism and very productive one. Lesley was usually holding onto my coattails and trying to keep my feet on the ground when I would go orbiting off into furious space and I would get frustrated from time to time. But basically we provided a happy balance for one another and accomplished some very fine things together.

She was very skeptical in those early days and not at all sold, and it used to amuse me tremendously. Or at least that's my recollection because I know when we would talk about it afterwards, that there was never any question but what she was leading the charge all the way. (laughs) But it was very courageous of her. It was an extraordinary departure for the president of AAFSW to engage in this kind of activity because what I proposed to them and what Lesley accepted was the formation of the AAFSW Forum on the Concerns of Foreign Service Spouses and Families. And that was the beginning of the Forum.

I became the Chairman of the second committee, I think. We were divided up into chapters. What I did essentially was to provide the philosophical and ideological underpinnings for the group and chapter two was The Foreign Service Woman or the New Foreign Service Wife - I don't remember the name of it. But it was the philosophical basis for what we were doing and sort of the concept for the report.

Q: This would have been 1976, wouldn't it?

KINNEY: Well, let me see. The Forum '73. We moved in AAFSW, must have been the end of '74. Mercier was born in July of '75 and I think we were moving into the Forum by then. The Forum was in '74 because it was published in '75 and a year later to the date - you'll have to check the publication date on it. What I remember is that exactly one year after its publication date, the FLO was opened and inaugurated by Secretary Vance. Was FLO in '77?

Q: March, '78.

KINNEY: Okay, well then the report must have been published in '77.

Q: You are referring to the Forum Report?

KINNEY: Yes the Forum Report would have been published then in '77 because one of the really miraculous things was that we moved from the publication of the report to the inauguration of the office in one year. So we must have started The Forum in '76. Mercier was born in '75. Yes, that would be about right.

Q: Could you tell me a little bit more about the Forum Report?

KINNEY: You mean what it consisted of or how we did it? We had meetings at George Mason. I remember the first time we wondered whether anybody was going to show up and we were stunned that there was a roomful of women and they were just all over the place. Vocal and candid. We sent out a very open-ended questionnaire, again Cynthia and I cooked this up, to get the Forum started. The report itself was written in response to letters and phone calls and anecdotal information that we received as a result of another questionnaire. This one was a one-pager and again I remember being over at Cynthia's house until I thought we were going to go crazy. We sent out over a thousand of them overseas this time. The other one had been done in the Department. This was sent exclusively overseas. It was very open-ended. We in essence said, "Tell us what you're worried about. Tell us what's good. Tell us what's bad. Tell us if there are any particular problems that you're facing as a result of being the wife of a Foreign Service officer.

Q: Was this directly addressed to the wife?

KINNEY: It was directly addressed to the wives. You know, Mrs. Harry Barnes, Jr. We had the Stud Book and we had an assignment print-out that we could filch from someplace. And a lot of people had changed, you know. But again, we got a phenomenal response back to these one-page, open-ended questionnaires. People would write seven and eight-page letters.

There was nothing scientific about it. It could only be described in scientific terms as anecdotal information. But there was a distinct pattern, and as we would read through these things, we would begin. One, we saw and heard echoes of our own experiences and anxieties and anguish and frustration and so forth. We were gratified that there was a lot that was positive in it and we wanted to make sure to emphasize that portion of it. But there were a lot of problems and they began to fall into a pattern.

And so as we began to read these responses, that's how we formed the basis for the organization of the report based on what we got back. We met with women in Washington. We had these meetings at the George Mason Center and took notes and listened and so forth. We consulted the wives' senior generation. I remember Betty

Atherton and Jean Newsom. The really splendid senior wives at the time who had lived the traditional lives of Foreign Service wives, but wanted something better, something different for the younger generation and were very supportive. Many of them had worked in their own way, had been career people, had to give up careers, one thing or another.

And then I remember writing sessions. We would write at home and we would bring our drafts to Jean Vance's house. I remember one session there. And I remember being devastated because Janet Kennedy absolutely tore up my first draft. She just marked it up one side and down the other. She's a very good editor. And it came out a better product as a result.

Q: To whom was this report submitted?

KINNEY: The report was submitted to the Secretary of State. It was also submitted to the Director General. The ironic and curious thing where I was concerned was that in 1976, in the midst of all of this, I had taken the exam again in 1975, passed, took the orals, passed, and came in on my own in September of '76. The first year I was in the Service, I still spent more time promoting and helping direct the revolution than I did working as a Foreign Service officer because by this time I was in full swing with Hope and Lesley and a couple of other people, moving this thing along.

And by this time it really had assumed quasi-revolutionary proportions. We were a force to be dealt with. Everybody knew it. You came anywhere within 50 yards of me, at least, and you were very likely to get the latest report from the front. (laughs) I was expending a tremendous amount of energy on it. This was something I felt very, very deeply about and with a certitude that I look back, and I remember after the FLO was up and everything, looking back on it and thinking, "My God, how did I have the audacity to assert with such certainty these things, because what if it hadn't been that way? What if I hadn't been right?" (laughs) But fortunately, I never questioned it. But the first six months or so in the Foreign Service, I was very involved and I started working it from the inside because now I was inside the Service and I was able to provide the link between the outsiders and the insiders.

Q: I don't suppose it was planned, was it?

KINNEY: Well no it wasn't. I had followed the entry into the Foreign Service on a separate track. They offered me the position in September and I figured I'd better take it now or never. I really didn't want to go back to work. Mercier was about 15 months old at the time.

I came in September of 1976 and I remember I got to know Steve Pzierchinik, a rather well-known psychiatrist. He was Larry Eagleburger's shrink and was working in the Department. He's come in and out since then. He does a lot of terrorism stuff. He's also the author of spy novels and is still in and out of the Department in shadowy ways, but I remember Steve encouraging me to stick to my guns. He, as a psychiatrist had very

definite opinions about the affect of all of this on women and spouses.

In my A-100 class, the representative for the Director General was somebody by the name of Bill Bacchus and he came over and talked to us. And I remember going up to Bill afterward and saying, "You work for the Director General. I have something that I'm very concerned about and if she ever decides to do anything about it, would you please remember me. I would be interested in working on it." The issue was spouses. That must have been around October or November of '76.

The great again curiosity is that I was assigned to work in Cultural Affairs for West Africa when CU was still in the Department and that was a wonderful job because it was a nothingburger job and I was able to devote my time to what I considered to be my serious work which was moving the revolution forward. (laughs)

But at a certain day, I remember Margaret Sullivan and I were called by Shaw Smith and asked to have lunch over at the Foreign Service Club. And I called Margaret and Margaret called me and we conversed on this and I said, "Margaret, something's off. I don't know quite what it is, but I think this is an important lunch." We were introduced to Charles Hill, Charlie Hill, who later became the Executive Secretary for the Department with George Shultz. But Charlie was working in Carol's office at the time, the Director General's office at the time, and the two of them sat on this side and Margaret and I sat on this side, and we talked about many things, and at the end of the lunch, I remember Margaret and I walking back to the Department and my saying to her, "I don't know which one, but one of us has just been interviewed for a job." We were both very excited. It was just splendid. Because we had heard that something was afoot, that we had made enough trouble and caused enough uproar in the Department that now it was going to have to deal with the problem.

It turned out that I was the one who had been interviewed. Shaw came to me a few days later and indicated that the Director General wanted me to come up and "solve the spouse problem" on which I was known to have just a few opinions.

Q: And this was working with Carol Laise?

KINNEY: This was working with Carol Laise.

Q: I remember you saying earlier that she was not all that excited about the original contacts with the spouse groups.

KINNEY: Yes.

Q: Did that change, and what was your relationship like with her?

KINNEY: My relationship with her was very good, very respectful, very appreciative that One, she was dealing with the issue, and Two, she had given me an opportunity to help

address it. Politics mattered and politics had made addressing the issue unavoidable. It was also the right timing, because what Carol really wanted to do was some very serious managerial and organizational reform within the Department of State. And at a certain point in time, she couldn't do that, but what she could do was address the spouse problem, and that's what she did. It was something.

But there were problems because the position I was supposed to take over belonged to Terry Heale who was an FSO-2 and I was an FSO-7 and the system didn't think that this was appropriate. I learned many things in this job, among them how everything is fungible in the Foreign Service personnel system and probably should be if you really want to get the job done. Shaw left Carol's office before I arrived, and Charlie Hill was my boss, the head of a small unit called Policy Coordination. And enter again Bill Bacchus. Because it was Charlie Hill, Bill Bacchus, Torry Whitman, and Stephanie Kinney. The four of us were Carol's policy people and operatives and formulators for the management reforms that she was trying to undertake.

For a variety of reasons, we were able to make the most progress in the spouse area. There was the class action suit of women which Torry dealt with. There was reform or changes and modifications of the evaluation system of the Cone System. There were many, many things going on. But my particular brief was spouses and in that connection, I had a unique opportunity because on a certain day, word came down and I was asked to write the Secretary's response to the Forum Report in which, needless to say, I had had a very large hand in formulating and developing the recommendations. So there was no question as to what the Secretary's response was going to be! The question then became, "Well how are we going to get it to the Secretary?" And therein lies another interesting story.

Q: You're referring to Secretary of State Vance?

KINNEY: Vance. Secretary of State Vance. Therein lies another interesting story about the importance of networking and the power of women. Once I went up to the Director General's office, the spouses then had a fox in the chicken house. And I spent most of my time acting as liaison between the external spouse organizations and militants and internal management, translating for one and another, trying to keep confrontation at a minimum, unhappiness at a minimum, and incremental progress forward maximized. Meeting, networking, conversations, cocktails parties, talking to the right person, planting the idea, seeing it come back to you.

The same thing among the spouses. I would very often see something we were going to need two or three weeks hence and have a conversation with the right spouse leader so that they would come up with the idea about the time we needed it, or they would come forward with whatever action it was. But spending a lot of time suggesting or planting ideas in people's heads as to what we needed to do next, what had to happen next. And part of this was facilitated through something known as the "Lunch Bunch." When Carter was elected, Jean Newsom, whose husband David was a very old friend of my

father-in-law, both of whom...

Q: Jean Newsom?

KINNEY: She was the wife of the former Under Secretary for Political Affairs, David Newsom. David and my father-in-law, Sheldon Kinney had gone to the War College together and had been in London together in the '50's. When Douglas came into the Foreign Service... Well, David had provided Douglas with information when Doug was a teenager about the Foreign Service and when Doug actually came into the Foreign Service on his own, they were both very thrilled and sort of looked after us as young chicks that they would nurture and take care of.

When Carter was elected, Jean called me. She had been interested in what I was doing and she had been supportive of the spouse movement. And she said, "Stephanie, I was wondering if you could come and have lunch with me and some friends" on a certain day. And she had gathered together the senior spouses: Gay Vance and Nan Read, Betty Atherton, Jean - who else was in that group - Barbara Hoganson from the Overseas Briefing Center from the spouse course, Joan Wilson from FSI. Who else was in that group? Those were the people that I remember most, who stand out most to me. I think Hope might have been there, but I'm not sure. I don't remember.

The basic idea was that the senior wives of the Department, the wives of senior officials, needed a good project and this was going to be it. And so we would meet every Thursday in the Secretary's conference room upstairs and we would bring a bag lunch and we would invite speakers in to learn from the speakers. We would invite people from management in the building in to educate them. Also very decorous, also very purposeful, and always full of good fellowship and friendship among us. I was the youngest one in the group and the only one who was an official of the Department, but again it was serving as this link between the official and the unofficial.

Q: It was perfect, I'm sure.

KINNEY: It was wonderful. The best thing, in addition to being able to write the Secretary's response to our recommendations, the other good part of that story was that when the memo was ready, which, of course, recommended the establishment of the FLO and a number of other things, I announced with great glee at the Lunch Bunch the first Thursday after the memo was finished. I guess I'd finished it on a Wednesday, as I recall, and I announced to the Lunch Bunch that the memo was ready and it was ready to go upstairs, but we were expecting problems because it was well-known that the administrative officers, the executive officers both in the Department and at the Cone loathed this idea. They had opposed us all the way. They had no use for spouses, they had no use for families, they thought that this was evil, pernicious stuff. There were one or two enlightened ones, but as a group, the administrative officers of the Foreign Service were not enthusiastic about what we were doing, much less about what we were proposing. A new office that we would control, would have a direct link with

management and they would have no say in, but it would make for all sorts of things overseas.

I was worried about the memo getting through SS because I knew it had to have all sorts of clearances. I had to have the clearances from all of the executive directors. And I expected them to hold it up. Which in effect, began to happen. And they said, "When is Cy going to get it?" Cy Vance, the Secretary. And I said, "Well, Gay, I don't know. We're having some trouble with clearances from the executive directors, but it'll get there eventually." And she said, "Stephanie, you do have an extra copy of it, don't you?" (laughter) And I said, "Well, I suppose that could be arranged." And she said, "Well, you know, I think Cy would be very interested in reading this tonight." So I got her an extra copy of it and she took it home and tucked it under his pillow. And within 24 hours, we had the Secretary's blessing.

Q: Wonderful. This is the blessing for?

KINNEY: For FLO. So therein ensued about a year's worth of work of how you actually implement what we had proposed, and I was intimately involved in that. We had a very open and highly publicized talent search for the first coordinator. Janet Lloyd was chosen. And then once Janet was chosen, I sort of took her under my wings and started introducing her and tutoring her in the wiles and ways of the Department. And we would have wonderful times roaming the building and plotting and conniving to get what we needed for this, that or the other. She was more than a quick study and an apt student. She was very talented in her own right and as soon as she got her feet on the ground and got sort of oriented to things, she took off on her own.

Q: What was her background?

KINNEY: She was a counselor in high school counseling. She was a Foreign Service wife of years and years. She had worked on school boards. She was a very traditional wife. She had four children. She and Wingate left the Service some years ago now, but Wingate was still in the Service when she became the first head of FLO. And she was wonderful. We couldn't have had a better person. I just remember such marvelous, giggly, fun times with her, sort of introducing her to how to get things done.

Q: So she hadn't been that involved prior to that?

KINNEY: She hadn't been that involved prior to that. She had little if any knowledge of the Department as a bureaucracy. This was really the shift, and with some difficult moments because it was hard for the spouses to turn it over to the Department from the unofficial to the official, just as it was very hard for me a year or so later to let go of it and go on my way in my own career in other areas of the Department and other worries and concerns.

Because projects like this are really like having babies. There's a gestation period, there's

intense labor, pain, anxiety and effort to produce it. Then there's nurturing it to get it off the ground and actually make it happen. Then, like children, you have to let go and it either succeeds or fails on its merits. Either you were right and you've designed it well and you've prepared it well and laid a good foundation and it thrives, or you didn't and it won't survive. So one of my great satisfactions has been the fact that I was very involved in it from the concept to the implementation.

Q: That ought to give you some great satisfaction then.

KINNEY: And that it survived on its own merits. We were right. It was needed, there was a role for it, it was well-designed to help people help themselves, not do it for them, but to help them help themselves on one hand, and to be a management tool and research and mechanism on the other. To have direct links to management, to get families recognized as significant elements of this business. To exact and exhibit a certain social responsibility to those people whose lives are circumscribed and affected by this business. And in turn, to reap the benefit of the freeing of their talents and the enrichment that that ultimately puts back into the system if you nurture it and encourage it to grow, as opposed to ignoring it and watching it wither.

I remember (laughs) swearing to the Secretary on a stack of Bibles that if he would just let me have that little space right down there as you come in. It was a cloak room. It had a window that lifted up like this. It was a coat check place. I remember promising them, "We just need three officers and just that tiny little space. You just turn that coat check place into an office and that's all we'll need and we promise we won't ask for anything more."

Q: And they gave it to you?

KINNEY: They gave it to us. And within seven months, I think we had requests for new people. You know, the empire was expanding. I don't know how many people are hired down there today.

Q: I was going to ask you how many people were hired initially with Janet.

KINNEY: Initially? Janet, a secretary, a deputy. Three people. When we were doing the design, one of the fun things was that I had a network of folk overseas. Marilyn Holmes was very important, Molly Whitehouse was very important. People who were overseas who were watching this with great interest. Again, senior wives who were sympathetic who were just waiting for the FLO to be established so that they could come in and request overseas branches. And Marilyn and Molly were two of the first people. I remember Molly was in Bangkok and Marilyn was in Portugal, I think.

As soon as the FLO was up and running and had been inaugurated by the Secretary, about three months later, we started getting these requests from overseas to establish overseas branches and that was the beginning of the CLO program. And with much discussion

over whether you kept the name FLO or CLO. It was felt that overseas, it needed to be "community." But one of the political factors on which the establishment had turned... I must say that when Carter was elected in '76, from that time on I never doubted that there was going to be this office, because my political sense...

One of the reasons that I was so intense about it was that Carter had a big family theme and I just knew it was the right issue, the right time, and we were going to do it the right way. It was a win/win situation. It was a way of their implementing their agenda and their plan. It just never crossed my mind from that point on that this wasn't going to happen. But having put all that emphasis on family...

I remember Janet Eagen was the person who thought up the name. We were over at Jean Vance's house one afternoon and were playing around with acronyms and titles and everything. And Eagen was the one who came up with "FLO" and she said, "Family Liaison Office, FLO. Like it makes things flow and it's like Flo, my old friend that I can tell anything to. My buddy, the person whose shoulder I can I always cry on. Good old Flo will always take care of me. You know, Flo the beautician, Flo my friend, Flo the secretary or whatever." And we all said, "Absolutely right. That's it." And so it never changed from that afternoon. But the concept of family, the word "family" was crucial to the political selling of it, because it was a political idea as well as a necessity and a management resource. And we had sold it as "family" up on the Hill as well.

Q: I was going to ask you about that. Tell me a little bit about that. Marching up to the Hill.

KINNEY: Well, gosh, I don't really remember. I remember I testified. I had never testified in front of Congress before. I just remember being awed. I'd done a lot of public speaking. It doesn't bother me. I love getting up and moving people. But I remember walking into that hearing room and looking up and there's something about those Senators behind that hard-wood dais sitting up there peering down at you with their little plaques in front of them and you're at the table. And you're sworn to "tell the truth, the whole truth." And all of the sudden my knees felt like they were going to give out from under me. And I got cotton mouth and my stomach started churning. The worst stage of stage fright. I don't normally have nerves like that.

But I just suddenly realized I had been in the Service probably less than a year and this was pretty heady stuff. I mean you don't normally testify before Congress unless you're at least a Deputy Assistant Secretary. (laughs) I had written my testimony and I remember thinking, "Oh my God, thank heavens I've written it because I just couldn't bear to do this extemporaneously." I normally speak extemporaneously. I don't usually talk from notes. I can't remember whether I read it or not. I think I probably didn't because you usually have to give this sort of precis. And then they asked me some questions.

And I remember there was one question that kind of threw me because I thought it was kind of antagonistic and it was supposed to be all friendly. I had to respond back. I don't

remember what the question was, I just remember thinking, "Ooooh, I hope I don't say the wrong thing!" I was trying to be so diplomatic and so cool. But the hearing went well. It was basically a softball because as most good hearings go, this was...

Q: Pro forma?

KINNEY: Well, not pro forma, but you should know in advance what the outcome is going to be. And in this case, the hearing was arranged so that we would be on the record, so that there would be a legislative and statutory basis for the office so that nobody else... Because our main concern still were the administrative officers in the Service. The Secretary had mandated this thing from the top down. This was regarded as an outrageous coup on the part of the spouses. And there were many people who were very irritated and resentful of it. And the concern was that as soon as Secretary Vance goes, that somebody might do it in.

And there was also the issue that was beginning to brew and that we were beginning to work on of compensation for Foreign Service spouses through the annuities. Spouses who were divorced lost any entitlement to the annuity and that was really unfair because here they had served all this time overseas, and these men would run off with these young chickies at a certain age, and the Foreign Service wife, who had served all the years overseas, wouldn't get a penny of the annuity and the young chickie would get the whole thing even if she'd never turned her hand or done the first thing or suffered the first sacrifice. So people were pretty steamed about that.

We worked with Pat Schroeder and a number of people on the Hill. Ginny, what was Ginny's name? She was Fossil's staffer. But that started a period of very intense and effective lobbying at the staff level particularly and it became very regular for five or six years after that.

Q: Who else went with you?

KINNEY: I don't remember. I really don't. I think I went as the spokesperson from the DG's office. But I really don't remember. I remember the emotions attached to it and I remember being very glad that it was over. Because I was surprised. I didn't expect to be affected like that. That has always stayed with me. How the power, how the weight, the seriousness of institution, of the Constitution bears down on you when you are called to testify before Congress. It's a very interesting dynamic.

Many people testified after that. The spouses became very, very effective in organizing their Congressional networking and they were successful in getting language and in getting laws changed. The annuity problem was finally addressed, to my mind, equitably. I think in large part because of this tremendously empowering experience that coming together, organizing, documenting the problem, pursuing the political and the social goals in a responsible way, and then implementing the commitments demonstrated that spouses could exert some control over their destiny. The Department was capable of change,

institutions matter, and we had taken an institutional, not a personal approach to it and made a difference.

Q: I want to go back to a couple of points. One was AAFSW's stance on the spouse issues at the beginning. Why was there so much resistance from them?

KINNEY: Resistance? In general terms, it was a generational thing. Women who had dedicated their entire life to being Mrs. Foreign Service officer, whose identity was founded on being Mrs. Foreign Service officer, were very hurt and outraged that, in essence, what they were being told was, "You were wrong. You were stupid. You're a damn fool."

Q: Being told by young wives.

KINNEY: No, no, they weren't being told by young wives. Implicitly what the 1972 Directive did to the older women was say, "You were wrong. You were foolish. You don't matter. Your contribution doesn't matter." So it was a double-edged sword. And it's not fair to draw this strictly along generational lines because there were older generational women who, as I mentioned - Jean Newsom and Betty Atherton and Marilyn Holmes and I could list them forever - were very supportive, were very forward-looking, were very encouraging to the younger generation.

But on the whole, it was the younger generation wives who were bitching, moaning, complaining, criticizing, taking them to court, etc., saying, "This is not right." And in general it was the older wives who had lived their lives in the traditional fashion, who had done everything they were supposed to.

Take for example the wife who had spent fifteen or sixteen years in the Service working her way up and was about to be Mrs. Queen Bee, Mrs. DCM or Mrs. Ambassador, and suddenly was told she had no place anymore. She had no authority, she had no respect, she had no status, and mostly she had no help to get the work done so she ended up doing it all herself.

Q: Which is something that she had been doing for years for other people.

KINNEY: Exactly. So I never faulted, and I don't think anyone should ever fault, those who resisted, those who felt uncomfortable, those who were skeptical. The psychological dimensions of this problem deserve consideration and generosity and we tried, or at least I certainly tried to be very conscious of that and sensitive to it. But the mere fact that you were asking for something else, the mere fact that you were asserting the proposition that something else had to be done was an implicit criticism of the way many other people had dedicated their lives. That's very hard. Change is not easy.

Q: No. This was also a time when more and more younger wives had careers.

KINNEY: Well one of the things that we pointed out in the report... A lot of this had been couched in terms of women's lib or the Feminist Movement. The association with WAO certainly gave it that cast and it was one of the reasons I, at least, wanted to move it to AAFSW and I was very glad for the opportunity to do that because feminism in the Department of State had a bad name. It was associated with Alison Palmer and Class Action Suits and general cantankerous rabble-rousing. That made it harder to get things done because that particular style evoked opposition in what was a very male-dominated, basically macho institution.

So what we did was play the old sweet Southern thing. I mean, I'm a fifth-generation Floridian, bred and born and when I came into the Foreign Service, in my autobiography I had to say why I was qualified to be a diplomat. I said that I had been born and raised a Southern woman and I knew there was more than one way to skin a cat. (laughter) Well what we did was use female networking - shamelessly played on our male counterparts to mentor and ram through for the better good of womankind, dramatic institutional change.

Q: I'm glad you did that.

KINNEY: And there were those who, for feminist purity and ideological reasons, might have found all of that reprehensible, but frankly I was more interested in getting something accomplished, not the ideology.

Q: Interesting. The other point I was thinking was why was there resistance in the Director General's office when they first brought the reports of meetings to Carol Laise?

KINNEY: You mean from the Research Committee on Spouses?

Q: Yes.

KINNEY: I'm not sure that we appreciated adequately the imperatives of bureaucratic process.

Q: This is why I asked you because you've been on the other side.

KINNEY: Yes. And I'm not sure that Carol initially appreciated how real the problem was and how determined we were. What was being proposed was pretty radical and she had already made one very radical move, the '72 Directive, implementing it. I don't think she actually did. I think the DG before her was the one who did that.

Q: Yes, I have the name.

KINNEY: But she was charged with implementing it. And you'll recall the '70's were a very socially turbulent time. You had all of the angst and dissent and division over Vietnam. You had feminism on the rise, a very vocal and strident variety. You had concerns with Civil Rights and the rights of minorities.

And Carol, in a very traditional... I mean, the Foreign Service diplomacy, they say, is the world's second oldest profession, you know. She was responsible for managing a venerable institution which was in some ways not adequately prepared and suited to social revolution and the changes that were happening in American society. Institutions change slowly. If the change is sound, a certain deliberate speed is necessary. I mean a certain slowness, a certain considered speed is necessary, because if it's too much and too fast, it's not going to produce a good result. So I think, looking back on it, Carol probably had to be convinced that One, we knew what we wanted.

I mean in the Research Committee on Spouses, we had a general complaint but we didn't have a proposal for a concrete action and a plan. It was sort of "Do something!" And a policy-maker can't deal with that. A policy-maker can deal with concrete recommendations A, B, C, and D. That you take a decision on. "Do something, I'm unhappy" isn't something that you can really deal with. So it was extremely important. I think we sensed intuitively the importance of evidence, the importance of documenting the problem first and that was how we started out. And that's what the research committee basically did. We sought to document the problem and then we documented it further with the Forum Report.

But having documented the problem, documenting helped lead us to how you solve it. What the recommendations are. And then when you have concrete recommendations, that's something that a policy-maker can deal with because you can look at it in terms of what the impact is going to be on the institution, what the legal ramifications are, what the political ramifications are. Part of the problem is, "What happens if I don't respond?" It's as big a problem as, "What happens if I do respond?" So I would say that in fairness to Carol, her position evolved and she took action commensurate with the state of the debate. When it was inchoate, poorly defined and devoid of specific proposals, she rightfully...

Q: Rejected it.

KINNEY: Not that she rejected it, but she simply was not enthusiastic. I mean she never told us, "You're wrong." But we just wanted her to say, "You're right and I'll solve the problem for you tomorrow." Well that's not the way it works.

Q: So there was some question about how the report conformed to the State Department format perhaps?

KINNEY: No I don't think that was the specific issue. I would say that initially, our perception, and I suppose if we had the good fortune to talk to Carol, God rest her soul, today, her memories of us might be very different. She might have looked at us as disorganized, not knowing what we wanted, whiners. I mean one doesn't know. But the issue was young. The issue was still insufficiently formed. The changes between 1974 and 1977 were dramatic in terms of the number of women involved, the degree of

organization of those women, the definition of the problem, the supporting evidence, and concrete recommendations. We had all that together. We were a force to be dealt with. The timing was right. And Carol hired me and said, "Solve it."

Q: With the group of four at the DG's office, were you the only spouse or former spouse? There were four of you at the policy coordination.

KINNEY: Yes.

Q: So you must have made a tremendous difference there.

KINNEY: Well, I thought I did. There were very few women. I remember while I was up there, I got commissioned the first study of tandems. My recollection is probably a little imprecise, but I think I recall that when the first count was done, there were thirty-four tandem officer couples, and most of those were couples in which the wife had left the Service and had come back recently. Because when they promulgated the '72 declaration and rescinded the non-existent rule on married women, a good number of women came back into the Service. They had been being Foreign Service wives in the intervening years, accompanying their husbands overseas, etc., etc. And they were able to come back and work and be their own officer, they took the opportunity. There were relatively few of us, in fact there was practically nobody I felt I could turn to who was my age, my stage in life, you know, young, small child, and married, and also an officer.

I remember when we went to Rome looking around, it was a huge embassy. It was about 600 people. The country team was about 35 people and I remember being as lonely as I had ever been in my life because I left the DG's office and went to Rome, and when I left the DG's office, when I left Washington, I left all of my women friends, all of my women support group. And I was utterly alone and there was no one like me. I know how a minority feels when he or she goes into a room and doesn't see him or herself in the group because I went into Rome and I was a freak. There were women who had small children, but they weren't officers. There were officers who were women, but they weren't married or they didn't have children. There was no one that I could look at and see myself in.

Q: That was the first time you went overseas as a tandem?

KINNEY: Yes. And candidly and openly share souls, experience, and exchange notes on how you survive. So I basically had to figure it out on my own and it was hard. It was very, very lonely, very, very conflicted because it's bad enough to have the childcare situation such as it is in Washington, but then to take your sweet little rosebud at age 3 ½ or 4 and transport her overseas and fall into the hands of foreigners and long bus rides to the school and the chaotic city that Rome was and everything. There were many wonderful moments and we all had ultimately pretty happy memories of that time, but the conflict and the loneliness of that first year, added to the fact that we didn't have a house to live in, was as miserable as I ever remember being in the Service.

Q: How does that compare to your first tour as a spouse in Mexico?

KINNEY: 75 thousand million times harder.

Q: Harder as an officer of a tandem couple.

KINNEY: Oh, yes, because I didn't have a wife. I very badly needed a wife to run the house, take care of the child, worry about the schooling, and make life easy for me. And the fact that we worked with a rather demanding officer.

Q: What was your job in Italy?

KINNEY: I worked the first year as an assistant science attaché and the second year I did six months on the visa line and six months as an information officer in USIA.

Q: And your husband?

KINNEY: He was the ambassador's executive assistant. He had been brought to Rome to "stop the firings." It was a challenging assignment.

Q: How many tours had he done before that?

KINNEY: Mexico, EUR RPM.

Q: That was during the time you were speaking?

KINNEY: Yes. And Open Forum. Did he do one year of UNP? I think he might have done one year of UNP in order to get things in sync. God, my memory is failing me these days. This is awful.

Q: Were you pretty happy to at least get that assignment together?

KINNEY: Oh, no, it was an incredible, I mean... We were minding our own business. We didn't ask for the assignment. It came to us. Richard Gardner was the ambassador in Rome and the embassy was not a happy place. People kept getting fired. And once again, he needed an executive assistant and so he asked three people whom he should seek for the job. They happened to be David Newsom, Alan Holmes, I forget who the third one was, and they all said, "Doug Kinney." And so we got a telephone call saying, "How would you like to go to Rome?" And we said, "My God, are you kidding? Fantastic." We were thrilled at the assignment.

Little did we appreciate or understand at the time how challenging it would be. A very demanding and challenging ambassador to work for. A city which is one of my favorite places on earth, but the only Middle Eastern city without a European quarter. Rome has its own very special- (end of tape)

Q: Mrs. Kinney, we were talking earlier on about the skills bank that I think was Cynthia Chard's idea. That certainly was sort of the beginning of FLO and I would like you to tell me a little bit more about that. How that worked. Was Cynthia ever compensated?

KINNEY: Cynthia was compensated. As I recall, we paid her \$4,000 finally after much agony. But the project at that point in time was a good example of the conflict that an officer can face vis-a-vis making responsible decisions that involve friends. One might look perhaps a bit more sympathetically on Carol Laise as a trailblazer, as a woman, perhaps she was sympathetic to what the women were saying - I don't know - early on. But I suspect as an official, as a bureaucratic decision-maker and policy-maker, she had to draw certain rather hard decisions and assessments about how far advanced, how well-developed the debate was at a given point.

I think the skills bank presented me with a similar problem. I don't really remember the origins of that. I know that Cynthia and I both came together on the Research Committee on Spouses very early. I know that both of us were very enthusiastic about the concept of the skills bank. I do know that Cynthia could claim motherhood to it in that she was the one who actually did the work. She was not working at the time and she had the time to develop forms and write letters and that was a connection with WAO. She is the WAO connection for this project.

It presented me with difficulties after I went up into the DG's office, because on one hand here was a woman with whom I had been good friends, with whom I had worked closely, but in whom I frankly and honestly did not have a great deal of confidence at the time that she would be able to do everything she claimed. Not because she was mis-representing or not because she wasn't capable, but because it was my honest, personal assessment, which I did not share with anybody, and I kept very quiet about, that the concept, the product wasn't ready for prime time. The timing wasn't right. Notwithstanding all of the angst, notwithstanding all of the demand and the whining and crying that was out there, it was very clear to me that we did not have a critical mass yet to actually make the skills bank work. You could put a tremendous amount of money into fixing up a very expensive computerized data bank and you wouldn't have anything in it. Because most of the women were still not in the working mode in 1976.

Q: So you would have liked to see perhaps the office of FLO get started first and implement these things?

KINNEY: Absolutely. And Cynthia created the skills bank and pushed the skills bank. It was her thing and she was very single-minded about it. There was no question in my mind that if I had to choose between the two, the skills bank was not viable in 1976. It didn't really become viable for another ten years. I don't know how well it's working today. My sense is that it has a reasonable product today, but my assessment in 1976 is that for all the idealism, for all the energy that I had put in to help, that the idea made sense to me as something that one wanted to work for, that the timing was not yet right.

If you paid ten, fifteen, twenty thousand dollars, whatever it was Cynthia was asking for it, or was proposing be spent, we were going to have a project that would not have a successful outcome. Above all, success, I believe, was an essential ingredient of future success. In other words, if we demonstrated that we made bad decisions or we had poor judgement with regard to product and timing, then we would never be trusted again. I remember agonizing over this, feeling terribly uncomfortable, avoiding her phone calls. Never coming out. I never wanted to hurt her feelings, I never wanted to say anything against her; I felt like a traitor.

The fact of the matter was I could not recommend to anyone in good conscious and good faith in the DG's office that we should spend \$20,000 on this at that point in time. And as I recall, when push came to shove, mostly to get rid of her because it went nowhere, but for her past time, I did manage to get \$4,000 for her. I felt like that was fair. It wasn't what Cynthia expected. It wasn't how she valued it. But I felt that at least I had gotten her some recognition. We had paid her something for her efforts. And it really fell to Susan McClintock a couple of years later to start putting the thing together in a way that could be integrated with the systems and the process in the Department itself.

Q: Were your feelings shared by other people or were there other people who supported Cynthia's idea more and tried to push that forward?

KINNEY: Speaking from the official side of the ledger, from the bureaucratic side of the ledger, this was not a project that inspired confidence in anybody, so I was the only person who was even charitable. And I did feel obliged to ensure that she got some recompense for her efforts to be kind. There was no tolerance for it within the bureaucracy at all. That changed in coming years as it grew out of the FLO and it became more integral to what was going on.

I don't recall among the spouses themselves - I know Lesley was always very kind and very supportive of it, but the grandiose images of it were never matched by reality and by actuality, and I think most people felt a little uneasy.

Q: Could you describe a little bit of your understanding of what Cynthia Chard was thinking? What that skills bank would be?

KINNEY: Well the idea was very simple and all you have to do... I don't know whether any of the original forms still exist or not. It was one page and we did it up over at her house and she got them printed.

Q: It's still one page!

KINNEY: It's still one page. Basically the assumption was that there were lots of women who were highly skilled and that those skills, if made known to business, would be a resource for business to draw on, whether that business was government business in an

embassy, in a consulate, in the Department itself, or whether that was private business. And so all you had to do, she said simply and naively, was record who the women were and what they could do and make it available to anybody who might hire someone and the two would come together. Easier said than done.

Q: Sure.

KINNEY: Advertising or getting people who needed to hire - how shall I say this? The fundamental issue was one of market development. You had to provide a service of reliable, accurate, centralized consistent information to over time build a market of employers who would come to this source of information to seek employees. That's a big proposition when you're talking world-wide. Because what it amounts to is one job here, two jobs there, three jobs over there all the way around the world. Maybe a half a dozen or so in the Department. And how much does it cost?

Q: To put all that information on the computer.

KINNEY: To build that system and so forth and so on. How many jobs are you actually going to get out of it? In 1976, my feeling was in my honest heart of hearts that the cost-benefit wasn't there, as much as I wanted to support it, as much as I liked the idea, as much as I had been a party to saying, "Hey, this is what we need to do." Thinking of my own future, basically, at that point. I wanted to make getting a job easier for me and the skills bank seemed a logical way to do it. But when you looked at the costs involved and the small benefits initially, because of the timing - you know everything is in the timing - in 1976, I couldn't personally in my heart of hearts justify it. I think it's more justifiable today.

Q: So there was the issue that there wasn't a place to house the skills bank?

KINNEY: Well no, once we had FLO, there was no problem.

Q: But prior to that, that was an issue?

KINNEY: There was something of a contest. As I said I put all of my money on FLO and there was never a question in my mind as to what the priority was and how you had to start. You had to have a significant bureaucratic entity integrated into the personnel management of the Department of State.

Q: Which FLO is.

KINNEY: Which FLO is, to deal with these issues. Once you had that, then it could grow in any number of ways and you have educational counseling, you have self-help information, you had evacuation specialists, you have work and skills bank functions, a variety of things that are needed by families. Aged parents, counseling and advice on how you deal with that problem now is something that is coming on that was not a major issue

before. Single-parent households.

The Foreign Service had an abnormal number of divorces, not of bad marriages, but an abnormal number of divorces relative to the American population in the early '70's. We've now caught up and probably surpassed the national norm, but in those days, while divorce was becoming more common and more acceptable in the society at large, within the Foreign Service it was still something of a taboo. It demonstrated you couldn't manage your affairs, and if you couldn't manage your affairs, how could you be a good officer? If you're not a good officer, you won't get promoted, and if you don't get promoted, end of career.

So there was a lot of unhappiness, there were a lot of bad marriages, there were a lot of women in what I consider to be deplorable and unbearable circumstances. But they were tough. They were disciplined. They didn't question. If they questioned, they kept it to themselves. You know, stiff upper lip and all that. Sometimes they drank themselves under the table, but you know that happens today, too. It's no big deal. We're just a little bit more open about it and we have programs.

One of the things that came out of that period of time when I was in the DG's office that Betty Atherton was very involved in and I enjoyed working with her - magnificent woman - was the mental health programs. And, again, those programs and those support systems got a tremendous boost from that particular time and I used every bit of influence that I could to push that from a management standpoint.

Q: I didn't realize that the Director General's office had such influence on that program.

KINNEY: The Office of Medical Services is under Management. It's not under Personnel except Personnel hires the shrinks who are the regional psychiatrists, etc. It's all part of a piece and we certainly used DGP in those days to push that. In fact it's really funny that you should mention it because I was for some reason looking at my old efficiency reports from those days and was reminded of that, the work that we had done, very prominently highlighted the last year I was there. Some workshops and seminars and working with Pat Hayes and others to try to start getting profiles on Foreign Service officers and families. And trying to ascertain whether this population, one, had a particular and special psychological profile like the air traffic controllers do, for example.

Two, to try to identify particularly outstanding psychological characteristics and stresses and strains of the business so that you could help people manage it, deal with it, know about it up front, confront it, engage in a more constructive way.

The spate of evacuations that occurred in '79, for example. We had recommended - I think it was the eighth recommendation - maybe eighth or tenth, I don't remember. One of the last recommendations of the ten that was on the Forum Report had to do with evacuations and specialists and so forth. Here again, my role, I'd ignored it completely. I never mentioned a word about it. Nothing was done in '76. When I did the memo to the

Secretary, I said, "Forget about it. You don't have to do that. Just do this." Because I knew I couldn't get all ten. So you have to make some decisions. What do you start with? Well you start with the office because again, in 1976, there was no apparent need. I mean there were general complaints and so forth, but there wasn't a crisis.

By '79, you had an evacuation crisis because you had Pakistan, you had Iran. I forget how many others. There were four or five all at one time. Sudan, maybe? I don't remember where they were. It was a clutch of evacuations that just produced paralysis and chaos because they had so many people coming back from overseas. Pets, dogs, children, everybody disoriented, no services and all the rest. And suddenly everything that we had recommended in '76 was seen to be true in spades. And so then those recommendations were acted on.

Q: If I may, I'd like to go back to Carol Laise one more time because she had an interesting background, and perhaps having worked with her, you can comment on that.

KINNEY: The significant thing about Carol was that she was a self-made woman. She started out as a secretary and she made it to ambassador in the Foreign Service, one of the few women ambassadors at that time. She ultimately ended up marrying Ellsworth Bunker, one the great statesmen of this country. They had a commuting marriage. She was in Nepal and was he in India - I don't remember exactly. India or China, I can't remember exactly.

Q: She had been in India in the beginning of the '60's, the late '60's, but I don't know where.

KINNEY: But she was ambassador to Nepal as I recall. And Bunker was ambassador either to China - oh, he was ambassador to Vietnam! So they were really a startling couple at that particular period in history. She married very late. She never had children. I always felt very sympathetic to her because, as disappointed as we were at her lack of enthusiasm and apparent empathy for our problems, she was one of the women who had had to give up everything in order to have a Foreign Service career.

Back to my introduction to the Foreign Service as a 16-year old. You could not have both. You had to choose. And she chose the career. It was a difficult career for a woman. There was no social underpinning and sympathy for it. She could not get married in the terms of her time and did not and was solely and exclusively dedicated to the Foreign Service.

One of the things that I remember most about Carol and that has stayed with me most, and I find myself interestingly enough in the last year or so repeating to younger officers who I think need reminding of this. It was Carol who said to me when I was furious one day and ranting and raving about all the things I thought the Service should do for me who said, "But Stephanie, the Service is not here to serve you. The point of this career is service to the U.S. Government and its citizens. Your concerns are secondary and will always and should always be thus."

Q: Wow.

KINNEY: So she had as strong a service ethos, something that I think has been significantly and unfortunately diluted, damaged, diminished today. But she felt that dedication, she believed that the first obligation was to serve, and anything personal came second.

Q: And how did she make the transition from Foreign Service secretary into the Foreign Service officer? They were separate, weren't they?

KINNEY: Damned hard work. Talent and perseverance. At a certain point in time in her career, there was an opportunity to shift systems and she simply lifted the opportunity. Things had opened up enough that she could work as a mid-level officer and she was talented, she worked hard. In her later years, she benefited from the feminist movement because when they were looking around for token women - there weren't very many - Carol was there and she exploited every opportunity as the political overlords exploited her.

I don't want to ascribe anything negative to either side. It was simply the right time in history. She had the skills, she had the background, she had the ability and she was a woman when they needed women.

Q: How many of those women were there, do you think?

KINNEY: Very few. I mean we still don't have more than 1 or 2 percent in the senior ranks of the Foreign Service. And I don't believe that's because the Foreign Service is inherently evil, sexist, and discriminatory, I think it's because most women are not willing to make the sacrifice that Carol made. Most women are not prepared to be single-minded about it. Now that's not to say that you have to be single-minded today. There are women at the top, ambassadors who are mothers, wives, etc. But the career is a very hard one. It is hard enough to be a working mother in Washington, DC. It is four times as hard when you transport it overseas, have to move in and deal with a foreign culture and your children the same.

There are more models now certainly, and I think that makes it easier. The younger generation I think, I hope is a little less conflicted than my generation was, too. Such anguish, such pain, such "Oh my God, what am I doing? Am I doing the right thing? Am I doing the wrong thing?" Just some days having to close your eyes and say, "I have faith. This will all work out. I am not damaging either my family, my daughter or myself. We are just very challenged." And hope and pray that something terrible doesn't happen as a result of the decisions you've made.

But having no support anywhere you turned to say, "You're doing okay. Don't worry, it's all right." At least today, a lot of the young mothers may still have a very tough time.

They may still feel very conflicted, but there are sources of affirmation, there are sources that confirm them, all around them. Whether it's the media or the television or other officers in the embassy or just American society. But it's still tough because learning foreign languages, learning foreign ways.

I think the hardest thing for me about the Foreign Service is what I call, "Going back to kindergarten." That every three years, just as you achieve a certain level of competency and accomplishment and recognition for that, you are stripped of it and you have to start back at square one, proving to everybody that you're worth it. And this doesn't change. It's the part that I just hate.

There are two parts I hate that are psychologically wrenching. One is that and the other is having to leave good friends, relationships that you have worked very hard developing and opening up, and then from day to night, that's the end of them. Some people are better at writing letters. I don't seem to be very good at carrying on long-distance relationships and so I've developed a certain hardness about learning to be open and to love, if you will, to give, to share while it's there, but moving on when it's over, because I just can't deal with the... If I thought about it, I'd sit down and cry.

And then coming back to Washington, you know you're not coming home. This place is just as strange as going to East Wa-Wa when you come back because the friendships, the networks, the support systems and so forth, don't necessarily stay the same. When I left in '79, I left with a very heavy heart. Rome was tremendously difficult. We did end up loving it, which was important and good. Then we were sent to New York, very unexpectedly, to the UN Doug was Jeane Kirkpatrick's Latin American specialist. I was given a nothing job that they hadn't been able to fill for nine months because nobody could afford to do it. And here again, one reason we had that tandem assignment was because I was convenient for them. They could slam dunk me into it because we would have two salaries and therefore they could get the job filled.

New York turned out to be great. We had a good time. Mercier loved it. It was a satisfying assignment in the final analysis. One makes do and creates things and I ended up having a good time. But then we came back to Washington and it was like starting all over again because I couldn't really go back to my old spouse network because that wasn't my primary identity, that wasn't my primary modus anymore. I was an officer now.

Q: How did they see you? The people who were still there.

KINNEY: They didn't think of me all that much. Lesley and I occasionally have lunch and bump into each other. We're very tied by the nostalgia and the experience that we shared at a certain time in history.

Q: Do they sort of joke that, "Well, you're an officer now, you're not really the same," or anything like that?

KINNEY: I think they sense that I care, I hope they sense that I care, that I remain interested.

Q: I think they do.

KINNEY: But that I simply don't have time anymore to devote myself to these issues. And these issues don't need me anymore. There was a time when they did. They have served several generations of women now as vehicles for their own empowerment, their own advancement. These women have contributed to the issue in their own way and when their contribution is finished, you're at a new stage and another woman will come forward to add her contribution.

There was the generation of women who did all of the work on the Hill on the annuities. There was the generation of women who did the second Forum. There was the generation of women who did the foreign spouse issue. There was the generation of women who did the evacuation issue, so I remain interested and caring because One, it's a period of my life that was wonderful and satisfying and full of accomplishment and good friends. Because I am still a spouse, because I care about women and women's issues.

But beyond a certain point it's artificial for me because that's not my world. It is a major part of the world for women who are involved in those issues now and I look at it in retrospect as - certainly it was a form of self-help for myself. It was a political conviction. After a certain point, a certain amount of ambition. I have a lot of political instincts and leadership instincts and it was certainly a vent for that element of my being and creativity and so forth. It was fun. It was exciting. It was uplifting. But I go into the FLO office today and I'm just another person. Some of the people remember me. I used to be introduced as a founding mother and I always loved that and that was maybe five, six generations into FLO. Now it's so far removed, the people who are there...

Q: May not recognize you.

KINNEY: Probably don't even recognize my name; so time marches on.

Q: We talked about some of the difficulties as part of a tandem couple. It appears that you might not have gotten as good assignments sometimes?

KINNEY: You can't have it all. You can have it all - how do I say this? I believe that it is extremely difficult to have it all and make it big. Occasionally an extraordinary person does it. Donna Rhinak, for example, married late in life to a wealthy jeweler who was able to support her. She had a child and she's extremely talented and Louis takes care of her and makes life work for her and makes it bearable. She's fantastic. A very bright woman, and she's a deputy assistant secretary. I would say Donna has had it all and made it big.

In general, however, I think you can have it all and make it small. That's how I would

characterize myself. Or you can have it big but not have it all. And you have to choose. One of the reasons Donna has made it big and has it all is because she's not married to a Foreign Service officer. She's married to a gentleman whom she met in Mexico who is a businessman. He's a good deal older than she is and he's at a certain stage in life, secure, able to go around with her.

I think it is virtually impossible for two Foreign Service officers to both make it big, have it all - by that I mean marriage, family, children, and good work all at the same time, and make it to the top. Carol and Ellsworth Bunker did it, but it was a marriage late in life. She never had children. It would be interesting to go through and see who the tandem ambassadors or tandem DCMs are. I think they're probably very, very few.

Q: But this is something that you and your husband are conscious of so that you decide together what assignments you should make and who should take what, that sort of thing, in order to work this out.

KINNEY: One, we spend a lot of time in Washington which I love because it's where policy is made and I think the policy is really where it's at. Two, we have been flexible. We have settled for jobs that are less sexy, will get us less recognition, from which we are less likely to be promoted. But we have stayed together. I mean that for us is... Now, maybe there are some tandem ambassadors and DCMs out there, but were they able to stay together? I believe that in the final analysis, you're probably not going to be able to have everything and it's just a question of what you're willing to sacrifice or what decisions are going to be right for you at a given time, and it's going to be different for different people.

I think that Doug's career has suffered more than mine because his expectations were greater. He came in assuming, desiring to be an ambassador. I don't think that will happen. That hurts me. I think he thinks it won't happen now. He's an office director in IO. You know maybe fate will strike again like that call out of the blue, "Do you want to go to Rome?" Weird things like that happen in the Foreign Service. You sort of have to keep the faith, and we don't know what's going to happen. But I think his perception right now is he's not even sure he'll be selected into the Senior Service, much less DCM or ambassador in anyplace meaningful.

Q: But you never know.

KINNEY: You never know, but he has definitely accepted jobs that were less career-enhancing for him in order for us to be together and in order for me to have a job. And in most of my cases, my jobs are not things that mainline Foreign Service officers would ever want to do, but they have been extremely career-enhancing for me. I've had a faster promotion rate than Doug has. I don't fit in anybody's scheme of things. I've never done what I was supposed to. I've only done what I wanted to which was a little off-beat and weird, but I've been terribly satisfied and pleased while I was doing it.

Q: You have accomplished a lot. It seems like everywhere you went, you were awarded everything. Would you care to comment on that? I mean that's really remarkable, looking at your list.

KINNEY: Well I don't know. Maybe I was just lucky and had bosses who were nice people. I don't know. It's what I call "making it small." Big fat important people would sneer at being the Uruguay/Paraguay Desk officer. I thought it wonderful because I like being in charge of things. I like doing everything. I like being able to do it myself, not having a bunch of people around telling me what to do. So I would much rather be the doyenne, the empress, the queen bee of a small little ignored part of the world than officer number five on the UK Desk. Forget it.

So when I came into the Uruguay/Paraguay Desk I had a marvelous time because I got to manage the U.S. relationship and role with Uruguay during its transition back to democracy. During the hunt for Mengele, a major period of transition with Stroessner, human rights issues in Paraguay, and not a leaf dropped in this town that involved those two countries that people didn't check with me first, including the ambassadors.

And then I ended up running the state visit for President Sanguinetti of Uruguay. First of all I got the visit on the docket, I got 30 million dollars that nobody upstairs wanted to give to Uruguay through some machinations with the Congress which, if anybody had known at the time, I'd have been kicked out for probably. (laughs) I got 30 million dollars in ESL. Really exercised control and a major role and influence on the planning and the development and the carrying off of the visit itself, and got some nice kudos from Protocol in that regard. Everything from testing the dinner menus to working up the visits for Mrs. Sanguinetti, etc. And I had a perfectly marvelous time. At the end I didn't have to share it with anybody. It was all mine. And people were impressed.

Q: Well obviously you had the good sense of what needed to be done.

KINNEY: Yes. If I'd been on the UK desk, it would have been undistinguished.

Q: You would have been one of many.

KINNEY: One of many. The award in Venezuela was because I managed to hold the embassy together, do some very good things for the embassy in the face of a boss who was very problematic and very difficult. Everyone thought that coming down... They knew me and they knew him and they just said, "This is going to be a disaster. She won't put up with him for five minutes." And instead I worked around him, I worked with him, I made lots of good things happen. The counselor, who was most grateful because this one in the middle was really something to be dealt with...

Q: Who was your counselor?

KINNEY: I don't want to name any names, but he's no longer in the Service. He was the

Admin Counselor at the time. But he was very impressed and very grateful for what I did, and so that was where that award came from. I've gotten a lot of awards in OES which is sort of embarrassing. I sort of think, "Oh, no, I've gotten another one. It's going to devalue the currency." But I have been involved in some rather dramatic events. Each one has been more dramatic than the last one, and so since they gave me an award for the first one, they said, "My God, this is even bigger and better. We've got to give her an award for this one. And then the next one is even bigger and better."

I have been involved for the last three years up until last June in the negotiation of the framework Convention on Climate Change which is probably one of the largest negotiations to ever take place. And the extraordinary thing is that the only other negotiation similar to it was the Law of the Sea. That went on for ten years and we didn't sign it in the end. This was done in eighteen months and we signed it.

Now I can't claim credit for that. It belongs mostly to the chief negotiator, Bob Reinstein, but Bob and my immediate boss, Dan Reifsnayden and myself were responsible for managing the policy, the inter-agency process, the negotiations, the substantive side of the house. And in addition to that I essentially coordinated and put on two major international negotiations from an operational standpoint.

There are three awards. The first one was for the working group, the RSWG, the Response Strategies Working Group of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC. And I came into the office in July of '89 and it was a disaster. No one knew what the name of the office was, they didn't know what an embassy was, they were all civil servants. There was no Foreign Service in it. They didn't know what a cable was, they didn't know how to do a cable. I was low man on the totem pole and the United States was responsible for putting on a major workshop in Geneva in October. The first of September, no work had been done. No invitations had gone out, nothing. And so I came in and just did my Foreign Service thing.

Q: That was '89?

KINNEY: That was '89. And it was a wild success. Everything went perfectly, it went well. It was well organized. The Assistant Secretary was just grateful beyond belief and impressed out of his mind. And I wasn't doing anything special, I was just being a Foreign Service officer because that's what Foreign Service officers do and they know how to do these things. And so I was very surprised when I got the award. I had no idea anything exceptional had been done, but they were so grateful, so that was that award.

And then the following January, in '91 I guess it was, the United States was the host to the Third Plenary of the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change which was a major international event involving over 75 national delegations, countries. Within the UN context, it was a major negotiation over a report. The President came, gave a speech. It was held at the Levi Center at Georgetown University. I coordinated all of the operations, I made all that happen. And so they gave me another award.

And then the reward for doing well was more work of course. No, that was in '90. Then in February of '91, it fell to the United States to host the first negotiating session on a framework Convention on Climate Change which we hosted at Chantilly, Virginia at Westfields International Conference Center. That was a mega-UN production of about 140 countries and translators, procedure, the whole bit. And I didn't do that one single-handedly, but I was right at the heart of it. Stan and I insisted on that being a group award. I guess we'd gotten another award for the IPCC and we'd gotten the award for Chantilly because it was bigger and better and more impressive. That was a Superior Honor Group Award. And I understand I'm about to be given another Superior for the work we did on negotiating the convention itself.

All I can say about OES is that they are very appreciative of hard and good work and they do seek to recognize it. And on the other hand, I have been in a situation where I have really gotten to participate in some unusual little pieces of history involving the negotiation of one of the major treaties of this decade. I was there, so I guess I was just very lucky or... (laughs)

Q: Well, you did good work I'm sure. It sounds like you...

KINNEY: Another funny thing about the way life turns out. When I came into the Service, you had to write an autobiography. I still have a copy of it someplace. Towards the end, one of the paragraphs noted that I wanted to [work] in the soft underbelly of the Department. By that I meant in global issues such as environment, science and technology. That was back in '76. It wasn't a very respectable ambition or goal then. I'm not sure that it is now. It's still not very well integrated into the Department.

Q: It is encouraged, however, I think, as part of a multi-functional cone, possibly.

KINNEY: No, it's a sub-cone now and it's growing. But the interesting thing to me is that we have not had leadership in OES that has built institutionally and that integrated it very well with the Department because of the problems with environmental policy and climate change in particular. Secretary Baker was [lukewarm] on the issue and so we were out there really. We worked directly with the White House ultimately because the Department was disconnected.

But what is fascinating to me now of course is that with the advent of the election of Clinton and Gore, a senator whom I got to know rather well during the course of the climate negotiations because he was vigorously opposed to the administration position and accompanied us on many of our negotiation sessions and I was usually the control officer for him. His daughter is also one of the best friends of my daughter. I'm going to be in OES at a very interesting time I think. I'll be curious to see what the new administration does and how these issues come of age.

There's a major management study being done, which in fairness has been done at the

request of former Secretary Baker, called State 2000, and it is focused primarily on how the Department of State needs to reorganize or modify itself in order to do a better job with multilateral diplomacy, global issues, such as environment, and economics. All three areas in which I have been intimately involved in the last three years and in which I have developed a number of obstreperous opinions. (laughs)

Q: I'm sure they're useful.

KINNEY: Right now, in fact, those kinds of institutional questions and debates are of very great interest to me. I think that's one of the next areas in which institutional work is needed.

Q: I'd like to ask you a slightly different question. You said that you felt your husband's career probably suffered more because you are a tandem couple. Does he feel the same?

KINNEY: I think if he were honest he would, yes. He simply did not choose, in order to accommodate certain family values and/or his wife, to do certain kinds of jobs at certain points of his career that are important. And also he has moved into the multilateral area. We're both in multi-lateral diplomacy now. It's a lot harder, a lot more complex than the bilateral, but it's not rewarded in the Department.

Q: Really? Why is that?

KINNEY: Because the Department is very slow to change and because the metier of the Foreign Service is bilateral relations. Most of the multilateral diplomacy is not done by the Foreign Service which is something that appalls, shocks and scandalizes me, and I hope it will bother other people as they become more aware of it. It's done by the Civil Service. For example, I was the only Foreign Service officer in the Climate Negotiating Team and we had a team of about 20 people.

So the Foreign Service is irrelevant to an awful lot of multilateral diplomacy and yet multilateral diplomacy is becoming increasingly the negotiating mode for many of the key issues. Anything that goes through the United Nations is multilateral so from the Persian Gulf War to international environmental policy to human rights to population, sustainable development, all of these issues are multi-lateral, and the Foreign Service is relatively little involved.

Q: This is very interesting for me because I was recently involved with two workshops at FSI. One was the negotiation arts and skills and the other one was multilateral diplomacy. I was doing observation as a linguist, too, how language was used and communication in negotiation and different settings of negotiation. The sense I got was that everybody was ready and would be willing to move into more multilateral diplomacy and what I found was that, in general, they felt very little training and emphasis was given...

KINNEY: Oh, I was appalled. The fact that I was involved in negotiating and managing the policy formulation process which involved formulating the policy, and then negotiating legally binding obligations for this country. And I didn't have the foggiest notion what I was doing. Now the chief negotiator did, bless his heart and thank God I was able to work with a master. And most of the Foreign Service work is learned by doing and apprenticeship.

But before Reinstein came on board, Dan Reifsnyder and I would sit down in these interminable skull sessions late in the evening to talk about what had transpired that day and what we thought the U.S. would have to do next week. The blind leading the blind. We were guided by good sense, we were guided by what we understood the White House wanted, we were guided by what was going to bite us in the ankle next that we would have to contend with. We made it up as we went along. There were no books, there were no guidelines, there were no how-tos for doing this. I have a much better appreciation of the process now.

I was dropped into Montreal Protocol in July and all I could think of... I left Climate, went on vacation, spent two days in Washington, got my briefing books, climbed on the plane and went to Geneva for a two-week negotiating session there. All I could think of was "Thank God, thank God, I've been through Climate. Otherwise I would be scared witless." Montreal Protocol is a lot more technical than Climate. I'm not a technical person, I don't have a scientific technical background, don't really need it. The issue is politics. But had I been dropped into it not having the Climate experience...

What I learned from Climate is that process is the product and I learned a lot of the lingo, a lot of the code words, a lot of the policy issues are the same, the big issues are the same. The tensions and dynamics and things to watch out for. Now I know and can apply them to any environmental negotiation that I run into. To a certain degree, there's a continuity and a similarity there. You just have to learn the details that are different. But if I hadn't had the Climate experience, I would have been absolutely lost. So one learns by doing.

But it is strange to me that the Foreign Service, one, doesn't recognize multilateral diplomacy as an issue of greater value than it does. That recognizes it as at least as important as bilateral. When you come into the Service, what you're basically taught is bilateral and maybe by circumstance for a series of unpredictable reasons, but it's not given to you as a major theme.

UN conference diplomacy is a world unto itself. It's a vocabulary and a language unto itself. It's a sub-culture. It's a mind-set, for Christ's sake. It's a mode that is totally unique and I, at least, had never exposure one to it prior to being dropped down in OES in the fall of 1989. I might add this was not a job again that I sought. I actually sought and was assigned to the job that I have now. But in the summer of 1989 when I got to the Department I was unceremoniously told that the position had been moved and I was in this new office.

Q: You're referring to the position of the Deputy Director?

KINNEY: Well I didn't start out as a deputy. I started out as number three in the office. This did not make me happy either, but the Deputy Director had small children, was not up to the job and fortunately left. I was very glad that I'd bided my time and kept a happy demeanor and emphasized the positive because she eventually went and I was moved up to the position halfway through.

Q: There was something else I was going to ask you now - it kind of slipped my mind - relating to that. Oh, yes. I was thinking of the diplomats in other countries since you mentioned that the U.S. does not emphasize multilateral diplomacy. Is that your observation of diplomats of other countries?

KINNEY: No, I think other countries by and large do it much better, do it much more seriously than we do. Take a country like Brazil, for example. A small country, small developing country. Bilaterally, what difference do they make? They don't. They're too small. They're too inconsequential. It's not true for Brazil, but smaller countries. But when they grouped together as the 77 at the UN and they send people who are really, really good and they leave them there for eight, ten years at a time, they master the mechanisms. We send amateurs, leave them there for two years, three years at the most, and then yank them out and send in another amateur.

Q: Very interesting. That was exactly what I heard from the multilateral diplomacy workshop that I was involved with.

KINNEY: No, it's absolutely absurd. And the reason the UN got in the mess that it got into - and it drives me nuts, but it's the best we've got - is that the U.S. didn't take it seriously after a certain point. And so it stopped acting seriously. We're taking it more seriously now. It was very interesting to be in New York with Jeane Kirkpatrick because Moynihan started it, but Jeane really was the one who came in and said, "By God, we're going to play in this game. You're going to be accountable." And we started taking names and kicking butts and that was just fine. And there's a lot more that needs to be done.

Certainly the fall of the Soviet Empire has put a whole new spin on things. All of these environmental policy issues do some very interesting things. Climate was fascinating. It fractured the 77. It is not a monolithic group, in part because we're fifteen years further down the path of history, and different countries are evolving at different rates and different speeds under different conditions. What became clear in Climate, which was easier to paper over and cover up when you had the east/west divide, was that these people don't have a whole lot in common.

And in Climate, we saw the creation of AOSOS, the Alliance of Small Ocean States. The oil producing countries worked as a block, the poorest of the poor Africans, the next, the newly industrializings, the Brazils, Indias and Chinas and Mexicos of the world, the tigers. It's much easier to negotiate when you get the real issues and interests out on the

table.

What's devilishly hard to accomplish anything is when you've papered it over with a lot of fluff, lowest common denominator, that doesn't address anything in reality, and that's what an awful lot of the rhetoric and mode of the 77 has been for a long time. There's tremendous strain being put on that right now, and I think one of the healthiest things that could happen is to see that group busted up, for their own good, because development is possible, we need to identify the winners, put them forward as models, demonstrate that it can be done, identify what it is that holds the other ones back - faulty thinking, poor policy, ideological dunderheadedness - and really hold people accountable. Developing countries don't want to be treated like children. They don't want to be disrespected. There's nothing in the world that people hate more than not being taken seriously, and we have not taken them seriously.

Q: Just like the spouse issues!

KINNEY: Exactly. So nothing really changes, you just move on and run into the same dynamics someplace else.

Q: It's just different issues, but the same process. I can't help but notice that there was a Vassar contingent. There were a number of you who had been graduates of Vassar. I was hoping you would talk about that.

KINNEY: A felicitous coincidence. One day we were - well it was in the Lunch Bunch, actually. We all had our rings on. We didn't realize we were all three from Vassar and it sort of came out one day. Joan Wilson, Janet Lloyd and myself. We were all graduates of Vassar when it was a woman's college, we were all daughters of a very strong women's tradition that, as one of my classmates said to Newsweek magazine when we were interviewed in 1966 when we were graduating - we were there, class of The Group. The Group was published the year we came in as freshman, so everybody was very interested in us when we left, mostly from the sex angle. (laughter) But one of my friends I thought described it best. She said, "It's like they stamp it on your forehead when you come in. 'Go out and do something significant.'"

Q: That's a nice quote.

KINNEY: That doesn't necessarily mean significant in terms of fame or world changing, but I think meaningful is probably a better word. We were certainly raised in a tradition with a very, very high expectation that women are capable, women should go out and do, and they should make a difference where they can. What we were imbued with most of all, I guess, blessedly, was confidence and nurturing. We came from a tradition that told us at every corner we were wonderful, that we could do anything we wanted to, and you just had to go out and solve whatever the problem was at the moment. And I think that's probably one of the most important qualities that any human being can experience growing up.

Q: So that came from family?

KINNEY: Well, certainly it came from family. My mother is a pianist and a very creative and innovative person who's been zooming around causing trouble and doing things ever since I can remember, so it never occurred to me not to work. I just assumed that that's what you do. I was surprised to find out that there was an issue about women working because I thought that, "Of course you work." I got my first job when I was thirteen. I wanted money to get those furry angora sweaters in pastel colors with matched boxed pleated skirts that they were selling down at Belks and the only way I was going to do it was to earn the money, so I got a job so I could have my own clothes money. I'm horrified that my daughter at age seventeen still has never had a job. She doesn't seem to show any great inclination to go out and do it. On the other hand, this is Washington and I grew up in a small town in Central Florida where everybody knew me.

Q: And also she's been moved around.

KINNEY: Yes, she's been moved around and it's very different getting a job in an anonymous overpowering city than it is... I mean we just called up the manager of the local department store. You know my daddy owned a store and that daddy talked to another daddy, and Stephanie had a job. Next summer, I wanted to work at the bank. We called the president of the bank and here I had another job. So I have to be careful not to be too critical of her. It was very easy, much easier for me.

I think childhood for many people in my generation was much easier than it is for children today. The questions that they have to make decisions about by the age of fourteen or fifteen, sex, drugs, just never entered my world.

Q: Was that a coincidence, also, that you were all holding important positions? You know, Janet Lloyd was the first FLO Director and Joan Wilson was very - was she the Director of OBC?

KINNEY: Well she originally worked, I think, with Dorothy Stansbury on the old seminar for spouses and then she was very instrumental in the creation of the OBC because she moved from the creation of the spouse course to... She identified the need for information about posts and things, and she really forged the creation of that. Barbara Hoganson was her deputy, as I recall. I think it just comes from being who we were. We were women who were fortunate to be well-educated, to have been brought forth in circumstances that One, encouraged us to do things and Two, permitted us to do things.

And we were problem-solvers. We were all very committed to the proposition that women did have a rough row to hoe in the Foreign Service, particularly spouses, since spouses were overwhelmingly female in those days, and that as women, we should do something about our situation. That was silly to let that go on. If you were going to complain about it, you should go do something about it. So we did.

Q: Great. Well I'm sure that we all benefited from all of you who did all this work, really.

KINNEY: But I don't know. My life is full, as you can see, of these little things that at one period of time connect with another of time. Vassar and Vassar, Foreign Service, Foreign Service, global issues, global issues.

Q: But you knew what you wanted. I think that was a significant part of it.

KINNEY: I have always known what I wanted. I don't know where I get that from or why I have the temerity, but I guess I was never discouraged from wanting. I was never told that it was bad or that I didn't have the right to want. And so One, I have wanted, but I have also assumed that it was up to me to go out and get it. That's part of the fun. You certainly can't expect for it to be given to you on a silver platter. But the more you do and the more you get, the better positioned you are to have additional opportunities present themselves.

Q: And control over what you wanted to happen as well, I'm sure.

KINNEY: But if I haven't always known what I've wanted, I guess I've always known what I didn't want. FLO really started out with knowing that I didn't want my husband to have to choose between his career and me. And I didn't want to have to choose between having a career and him. So the only alternative was to change the Foreign Service.

Q: To change it. Perfect!

KINNEY: So that's what I set out to do.

Q: Do you have any final comments on the... It's been twenty years since the 1972 Directive and many things have happened and you have accomplished a lot. FLO is certainly working very well.

KINNEY: I think American diplomacy has suffered. I think that American families, American spouses, contributed a unique and valuable dimension to our representation of who we are, what our interests are and what we're about to people overseas. I think the loss of that contribution has been to our detriment. There are now posts overseas where there are no families.

Q: Like when they're not allowed to?

KINNEY: No, they're just single people, divorced people, gay people. But the American family is not vital and present. Most of the rest of the world values tradition and families as a priority.

Q: This is very interesting. I have to interrupt because when I was at Jewell Fenzi's

yesterday, she received a letter from an ambassador - I forgot his name. She's been corresponding with him. He made a comment in his letter that the Foreign Service can work without families. Officers without families.

KINNEY: Oh, no problem, no problem. It depends on what you want to represent.

Q: Exactly.

KINNEY: It depends on how you want to be understood and viewed. We can have a Foreign Service of dwarfs. Is that what you want to be represented overseas? In the final analysis it requires discrimination, that is to say discriminating, choosing between one option or another option. And we are a fragmented and chaotic society in transition coming from something and going toward we're not quite sure what. We're not going to get there for another decade or so and the country, two decades from now, is going to look very different. It's going to think very differently than the one that I grew up in.

But those values which attract - democracy, respect for the individual, honor, fair play - a word which can't be translated in many languages - honesty, rational problem-solving pragmatic process, enduring values, some dimension of spirituality, and in that I include some respect and recognition of family because that's continuity, are the things that draw other countries to us. Not because we're the United States or because we have the biggest army or because we have the wealthiest economy. In the final analysis - those things certainly don't hurt. Brute power is very useful. But in the final analysis, the reason we are still here and the Soviet Union is not is because of the values. Is because of what we stood on and stood for. And if we don't manifest that, if that is not what people know when they know us, why should they want to be associated with us?

Q: And without a family you can't really...

KINNEY: And I think myself that the family, the contribution of entertaining in the home, of vital, alive, active women who are linking with the wives of the other important people in the country, is an essential element of good diplomacy. I think they should be paid for it.

Q: Bravo!

KINNEY: I think they should be required to do it as a condition of employment. If that's not the way you want to spend your life as a couple, you shouldn't come in the Foreign Service. But if you come in the Foreign Service, state clearly what the condition of employment is, why we're doing it, what the value added is, and then pay for it. And then and only then will we have what I would consider to be serious diplomacy again. I think we had it once. I think we don't.

I think we have serious policy debate. I think we have serious contest of policy, but I don't think that's the sum total of diplomacy. I think diplomacy is in a certain dimension a

question of art. It's a question of feel. It's a question of tone, it's a question of posture. It's a question of drawing people in. And as I said, I don't think brute force is something on which we should rely exclusively.

Q: This sounds like a perfect note to end this interview, but I do want to ask then how does the tandem couple fit into this picture when both officers are working?

KINNEY: With difficulty, with difficulty. One way to have family is to move toward a more conscious policy of tandem employees. It will be a bitch to administer, and we will have to go back to the way the personnel system used to work, which frankly I think was pretty good. That is, the races to the fastest. Inside jobs, who you know, corridor reps, I mean forget equality. But I've always maintained that if you're not smart enough to figure out how to make your way in the informal system in the diplomatic corps, what in the world is to make us think that you've got any chance at all or that we should have any confidence in you at all in negotiating with the Chinese!

Q: Exactly. I think you have a very good point there.

KINNEY: I don't have a problem with - how shall I say - unbureaucratic systems. They tend to work out pretty well. They're not always equitable. Out groups have a hard time getting in. But maybe in another five or six years, the out groups in the Foreign Service will have developed enough confidence, enough know-how, enough force that they can start acting on their own rather than as groups. And it'll just be individuals again. And the races to the swiftest. You'll have to work it out, because there's no way that it can be absolutely equitable. It's a big problem. For all these things, it probably won't happen. I think ideally you probably don't manage... There's another element here and that is, to what degree are we manifesting ourselves as culturally American overseas?

Q: As opposed to?

KINNEY: As opposed to... A large number of spouses - I'm going to get in trouble on this one - as opposed to a large number of spouses who are foreign born and have not necessarily culturally assimilated. And I'm drawing some distinctions here and making some value judgements that would get me in deep hot water with all the political correctness around, but if you don't speak English well, if you haven't incorporated a certain fundamental understanding of this country, its history, its culture, its impulses, and you are not perceived by others as American, and I think that's the distinguishing characteristic. A few people that's fine. It shows that we're open, we love immigrants, and we don't discriminate and all that. But when you get up to fifty percent of the embassy population being perceived as not American, then maybe you ought to think about that a little bit.

Q: Very interesting.

KINNEY: It's a very delicate subject. I wouldn't touch this one publicly with a ten-foot

pole, but here again I'm looking at it from an institutional, from a professional point of view, and this is without malice or recrimination for any individual, any group. You know, immigrants versus residents versus native-born or what have you. It comes down to, "What is the purpose of our job?"

Q: After all, you are representing the United States.

KINNEY: What is it that you want to be projecting? I think you ought to have that better defined and more consciously decided and projected and disciplined than we currently feel comfortable with doing, because what it means ultimately is implying, and explicitly so in some cases, this is preferable to that. And we are scared to death of that because of the legal system, because of the politics, because of the political correctness, because of all the rest. So it's not an idea whose time has come.

But I would predict, as we have to deal with competition for the first time in our lives... The United States has been fat and sassy ever since World War II. It's not had any significant competition. We're entering in an era where we are going to have to fight and scabble for our place in the world, to hold onto our authority and our power, and we are going to be much more conscious, much more political, much more strategic and tactical about the way we deploy our resources, including our diplomats. And the style and the messages that we send and all the rest. We can't afford to not care, to be nonchalant, to be super Mr. Joe Kool, laid-back, it don't matter none, we can do anything we jolly well want because, well we're who we are and the individual above all.

Q: There's more than that.

KINNEY: But that one's going to be a while coming yet because we're going to have, I think, have a greater appreciation of our need to compete with Japan and our need to compete with the E.C. We're going to have to get a little more serious about it. I still think we have probably one of the finest corps in the world, but as a disciplined corps, I think there's some questions today.

Q: Do you have any more comments on this - well it's a little harder for you now, I guess, since you're really an officer - but comments on the spouses of today?

KINNEY: I am tremendously impressed by the competency and the skill and the education of the younger generation. I think it's sad that they do not have masters and mentors, role models that they can really sort of go "Oooh!" Professional role models. The Department is very, very much more politicized than when I came in. When I came in, the assistant secretaries were all Foreign Service officers. When I came in the DAS's were all Foreign Service officers by and large. When I came in, the older generation prided itself on who their prodigies were. It was not by accident that my husband was plucked up for Rome. They looked for good people, they nurtured them, they cultivated them.

Now a certain amount of that still goes on. But it is much more difficult because we are so much more diverse, because Foreign Service officers do not control the assistant secretaryships and the deputy assistant secretaryships anymore. We don't have the grand names. I remember the Ellsworth Bunkers and the David Bruces and Roy Atherton, Bob McBride. And there was a generation before that where the names were even more illustrious. They were not people with whom I was associated with. I mentioned Ellsworth Bunker and David Bruce, neither of whom were Foreign Service officers per se, but tremendously accomplished individuals. Max Campbellton, maybe today a lot of people remember.

But within the Foreign Service itself, we don't seem to be generating the inspiring and inspired leadership among senior officers that we once had. Thomas Pickering does a fantastic job, but what happens to him? He does too well and he gets kicked out of USUN and gets sent to India. That's wonderful for India that Tom is there! But he has to fight for his own political survival. He doesn't really have time to come back and nurture and play grandfather to the Foreign Service, nor do many of the other senior officers. Because everybody is under the gun, because you're going to be gone if you don't move on. So that quality of life... It's very difficult.

There are some women, and I certainly try to do it with young women who come along, you know women looking after women, Blacks looking after Blacks, Chinese looking after Chinese, and white males looking after white males and if they try to look after women, well they have to be very careful because, my gosh, you know, maybe chemistry breaks out and that's always dangerous. It's a very, very much more difficult situation. On the other hand I know a couple of male officers who regularly cultivate - they are known. "Link up with him because he likes women, he promotes them actively."

So the opportunities, the experiences are still there, but I don't have the sense that the younger officers are necessarily getting - and I may be totally wrong on this - are necessarily getting the kind of mentoring and nurturing that they once did. It would be interesting to ask them. Maybe they feel very differently. I do know that an awful lot more people are coming in and leaving than used to be the case. I mean, by and large Foreign Service officers tend to stay, but my sense is... I'm very distressed by a statistic from two years ago. The question is, who are we getting? Two years ago, no one from the Georgetown School of Foreign Service applied to the Foreign Service. It used to be our major feeder school.

Q: Why is that?

KINNEY: Well, the Foreign Service has made it very clear that kind of specialized expertise in policy training is not necessarily what it cares about anymore. Other factors are more important than merit. The pay is not as good. A lot of them went to Wall Street. There are other opportunities out there. The fact remains there is still only one place that you can do U.S. foreign policy, and that's in the Department of State. And that's what hooks most people.

Q: And they are going to change the name of the Foreign Service Institute to reflect that.

KINNEY: What are they going to say?

Q: I'm trying to think. It's like the "School for Diplomacy."

KINNEY: Diplomacy or something? I think that's wonderful because I think that we need to bring diplomacy back into the Foreign Service. I think we have been so mechanized, so trivialized, infantilized, bureaucratized, mericratized to death that we've lost sight of the art.

Q: Certainly none of the Thomas Jefferson State.

KINNEY: Yes, and we need to look back and seek inspiration and seek a mission again. It's the right time in history. The Cold War has been put aside. We're going to see a proliferation of conflict and fragmentation and brush wars the likes of which we didn't think were possible four or five years ago. The nice thing about the Soviet Union was that it provided a certain amount of stability. There was tension, there was threat, but at least, better the devil you know than the devil you don't. Now we're going to see every Tom, Dick and Harry seeking his ambition and raising hell all over the place and it's going to be a real problem.

And we're going to have to compete. So it's a very exciting time, I think, and I'll be curious to see what comes, what the new balance is. I would hope that there is a better balance between bilateral and multilateral in the way we train people, the way we prepare them, the way we urge them to think about it, the way we value the work they do. I would hope that there is a better balance among groups and interests in the Foreign Service.

I would hope that there is, frankly, more discrimination and greater courage to say some things are more important than others. And sorry if that gores your ox, but that's just the way it is. The most important thing is not being a good hotelier for CODELS. The most important thing is developing an elite, in the best sense of the word, meaning most accomplished, most experienced, most skilled. Not snobby, not classist, not racist, but the true meaning of the word. A sophisticated cadre of men and women who can navigate the rather choppy waters into which we're about to head. And in the final analysis, who are prepared to serve, I guess. I come back to Carol Laise.

Q: Yes, I can't imagine that. This has been such a great experience for me, really, to talk to you about all these things. It's really very [insightful].

KINNEY: Well thank you. But you have given me a great opportunity. I have never talked about them like this before. So you've forced me to think about some things and articulate some things. I find myself articulating some feelings that I haven't really shared or thought about for a while, and that's very nice. Thank you.

Q: Well, I'm the one who has to thank you on behalf of the Foreign Service Spouse Oral History and myself, really. This has just been so enlightening. Also encouraging in a way, I think, to know that you can be yourself, know what you want.

KINNEY: It's a little more complicated in the Foreign Service.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA:

Spouse: Douglas S. Kinney

Spouse's position: FSO-Political, Office Director in IO

Spouse entered Service: September 1971

You entered Service: by marriage September 1971; by exam, FSO status September 1976

Posts:

1989-present Washington, DC (OES/ENV, OES/EGC Deputy Director)

1986-1989 Caracas, Venezuela (Assistant GSO, Assistant Cultural Affairs Officer)

1983-1986 Washington, DC (Paraguay/Uruguay Desk Officer)

1981-1983 New York, NY (USIA program officer)

1979-1981 Rome, Italy (Assistant SCICOUNS, Assistant Information Officer)

1976-1979 Washington, DC (Cultural Officer for West Africa, DG/PCC, Policy Coordinator: responsible for establishing FLO)

Date of birth: June 24, 1944

Maiden Name: Carole Stephanie Smith

Parents:

Billye Mullins Smith, pianist

Charles Carroll Smith, Jr., businessman

Schools:

Vassar, BA 1966

Harvard Graduate School of Education, MAT 1967

University of Madrid, Hispanic Studies 1964-1965

Profession: Teacher 1968-1974; FSO 1976-present

Date/place of marriage: June 27, 1970 - Winter Haven, FL

Children: Mercier Caroll Kinney - July 4, 1975

Volunteer and paid positions held:

At post: Mexico, teacher of history at Colegio Americano

In Washington, DC: AAFSW Forum Committee, 1976-1977

Honors:

Vassar, cum laude

Harvard Phi Lambda Theta

FSO: Averell Harriman Award for FLO, 1978

Meritorious Honor, 1986

Meritorious Honor, Caracas, 1988

Meritorious Honor, 1989

Superior Group, 1990

Superior Honor 1991

Meritorious Honor, OES/EGC, 1992

End of interview