

The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training
Foreign Affairs Oral History Program
American Foreign Service Association Series

BRUCE GREGORY

Interviewed by: Mark Tauber
Initial Interview Date: March 22nd, 2023
Copyright 2024 ADST

INTERVIEW

Q: Today is March 22nd, 2023. This is our interview with Bruce Gregory in celebration of AFSA's 100th anniversary. Bruce, let's just take a moment to go back. Where were you born and raised?

GREGORY: I was born in Providence, Rhode Island, and raised in the nearby town of Barrington. I earned my BA in history at Barrington College, a small liberal arts college in my hometown. In 1963, I moved to Washington to undertake graduate studies at American University's School of International Service.

Q: All right, in any of your prior education or your prior work before coming to Washington, D.C., did you have exposure to labor issues, labor management issues?

GREGORY: No. My involvement with labor management issues began when I became a full time government employee in 1970.

Q: You mentioned that you came to Washington for grad school. What were you thinking about doing with your graduate studies? What was your initial idea?

GREGORY: My plan was to earn a PhD in international relations in preparation for an academic career. I completed my MA and all PhD requirements except the dissertation. Because I needed to support a family, I went to work for the United States Information Agency (USIA) as a part-time research assistant to the Agency's historian in 1967. In 1970, I accepted a full-time career position in the Agency's Civil Service.

Q: When you started full time with USIA, what was your position?

GREGORY: For two years I was an editor in the Agency's overseas book programs office. Beginning in 1972, I worked in a thematic program management office that supported speaker and media activities at USIS (United States Information Service) posts overseas. I remained in this office, first as a project officer and then as office director, until 1978 when I became the Agency's designee in the American Political Science Association's Congressional Fellowship Program.

Q: At that time, USIA was a separate agency from the State Department. And this was also prior to the internet. So, there was a great deal of print information, books, magazines, and so on. Did you focus on any particular area of the world? Were there any specifics in your job?

GREGORY: The program management office had worldwide responsibilities. I was responsible for recruiting and managing the travel of speakers (American academics and foreign affairs experts) on U.S. foreign policy themes. When I became president of the employees' union in USIA, I was released from official duties for some of the time under provisions of the labor-management contract with the Agency.

Q: So shortly after you joined, you become active in the union. What was your motivation at that time, since you had no previous real experience with union labor, politics?

GREGORY: The American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) is a national union affiliated with the AFL-CIO. Its local union, AFGE 1812, was well established in USIA and the Voice of America (VOA). Many colleagues whose judgment I respected were members. Bernie Wiseman was AFGE 1812's founding president. After graduating from Harvard University, he worked as the National War Production Board's chief of labor information and as head of the State Department's international labor relations office. He transferred to USIA in 1953. His official duties included managing overseas programs relating to the U.S. civil rights movement and recruitment of Foreign Service officers with backgrounds in organized labor. They joined the Agency as labor information officers for assignments mainly in Latin America. Bernie had strong personal ties with senior leaders of the AFL-CIO and labor activists in the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. He had earned the respect of union members and USIA's managers for his skills, integrity, and steadfast commitment to employee rights. His experience and national connections were key factors in AFGE's Foreign Service personnel reform activities in the late 1960s and 1970s.

Soon after I joined the union in 1970, Bernie and I had several long conversations about labor management issues in the foreign affairs agencies. He was planning to retire and was looking for someone to succeed him. He also introduced me to two young Foreign

Service officers (FSOs), Gene Preston and Harrison Sherwood. We attended a meeting Bernie had organized with AFGE's national Executive Vice President Clyde Webber to discuss creation of a Foreign Affairs Employees Council and a legal defense fund. Gene and Harrison were part of a small group of Foreign Service activists in AFGE 1534, the local union that represented employees in the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the State Department. They encouraged me to get involved. Civil rights and Vietnam were contested issues in those years. Perhaps in part we were channeling our support for social justice issues in other domains to employee rights issues in the Foreign Affairs agencies.

Q: Sure. Now, when you prepared to take over the leadership, did you run for the office? How was it determined that you became President?

GREGORY: There was an election. I was elected first as AFGE 1812's general vice president in 1971. When Bernie Wiseman retired a year later, I was elected without opposition as AFGE 1812's president. Bernie made his support clear, and the members agreed.

Q: At that time, can you recall roughly how many members AFGE (American Federation of Government Employees) had in the USIA?

GREGORY: I don't recall the membership numbers, but AFGE held exclusive representation rights for all of USIA's approximately 2,000 plus Civil Service employees with the exception of 150 VOA engineers represented by the National Federation of Federal Employees. Not all were AFGE members, but the ratio of members to non-members in USIA was high compared with many government agencies.

Q: And as President, how did you carry out your duties? What was expected of you as you came into the presidency?

GREGORY: I was expected to provide leadership at membership and executive board meetings, negotiate with USIA's management on labor-management issues, and represent AFGE 1812 in meetings with AFGE's national office, Congressional staff, and lawyers handling litigation. AFGE 1812 cared a lot about USIA's budget and professional issues in public diplomacy. This meant we supported the Agency on Capitol Hill and within the Executive Branch on resources and policy issues relating to USIA's independence and organizational integrity in addition to conditions of employment. We also were involved in litigation, begun when Bernie was president, that challenged attempts by State and USIA's management to convert Civil Service employees to the Foreign Service Reserve.

If successful it would have placed them under Foreign Service selection out and mandatory retirement regulations.

Q: Take a moment to explain, as you recall, what the Foreign Service Reserve was.

GREGORY: It was a Foreign Service appointment category authorized by Congress early in World War II and again in the Foreign Service Act of 1946. It enabled the State Department to hire U.S. citizens with economic, technical, and other specialized skills to handle the war effort and post-war reconstruction. Foreign Service Reserve officers were given noncareer limited appointments for overseas service that in some instances could be converted to unlimited reserve appointments.

Q: Was AFGE also concerned with professional issues, training, opportunities to serve in other capacities other than just in the USIA, that sort of thing?

GREGORY: AFGE 1812 certainly was concerned about adequate training and professional education through university year assignments. Other professional issues of concern included USIA's independence from the State Department, enhanced appropriations, legislation to protect journalism standards for U.S. international broadcasters, and equal opportunity for women and minorities. We did not get into foreign policy issues or management decisions relating to how resources were divided between geographic regions, media services, and educational and cultural exchanges. But we devoted considerable energy to supporting USIA's mission at a time when many in State were ambivalent or unconcerned about public diplomacy.

Q: What was the composition of the AFGE union at that time? In other words, you were President, but was there a board, etc.

GREGORY: There was an executive board. It included a general vice president with Agency-wide responsibilities. We had a vice president for VOA, a vice president for print media, and a Foreign Service vice president. A substantial number of USIA's Foreign Service officers were AFGE members. A greater number were members of the American Foreign Service Association (AFSA), but many quietly and openly supported our litigation and legislative activities. We also had union representatives in most Agency offices. After I became president, we hired AFGE 1812's first full-time staff lawyers—initially Mary Jacksteit and then Beth Slavet.

Q: Was it more collegial? How did that work at the time?

GREGORY: Overall it was collegial. It was a time of ferment and innovative thinking in public diplomacy. USIA's professionals engaged in spirited debates on diplomacy's changing tools and methods. Advocates of information programs, international broadcasting, and exchanges were deeply committed and had different priorities. Intense disputes, often in the nature of a family quarrel, were part of USIA's culture, and they shaped the deliberations of a union that focused on both professional and labor-management issues. AFGE 1812's executive board met often, and there were monthly membership meetings. Issues were debated. Major decisions were put to members for a vote. In dealings with USIA's management and personnel policies imposed on the Agency by the State Department, union "solidarity" had meaning.

Bernie Wiseman had negotiated a strong collective bargaining agreement with the Agency. We also had excellent support from the research, legal, and Congressional relations staffs in AFGE's national office in Washington. A lot of our work involved employee grievances. Federal employee unions are not allowed to strike. But they know how to use laws, government regulations, grievance procedures, and collective bargaining to change conditions of employment. Using these tools is not easy, but they can be effective.

Q: Since you mentioned representing officers with grievances, eventually a grievance board would be created in the period of time you were involved with AFGE. What were the kinds of issues that were grieved at the time?

GREGORY: Many grievances related to adverse performance evaluation reports and equal employment opportunity complaints. Grievances in the Voice of America's foreign language services usually involved conditions of employment, but often they also reflected political differences among emigres with strong views on events in their countries of origin. This involved separating issues that were and were not grievable.

Q: As you came into office, what was the most important issue facing you at the beginning of your tenure?

GREGORY: The State Department and USIA's use of the Foreign Service Reserve authority to create a Foreign Affairs Specialist (FAS) Corps was by far the most important issue. In 1966 State sought legislation to authorize use of the Reserve authority for employees in the domestic service. Hearings were held in the House Foreign Affairs Committee by the powerful Democratic Congressman from Ohio Wayne Hays. He supported the Department's efforts in what became known as the "Hays Bill." It passed in the House but not the Senate. Strong opposition from AFGE, the AFL-CIO, and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) blocked the measure.

Q: Why did the Department want to create this opportunity for civil servants to go into the Foreign Service?

GREGORY: State's management officials wanted greater flexibility in hiring and assignments and a mandatory retirement at age 60. The Civil Service had no mandatory retirement age. State especially wanted to use Foreign Service selection out procedures that at the time lacked due process safeguards. Bernie was particularly concerned that selection out would be used "to effect budget cuts." State and USIA emphasized the incentives of Foreign Service retirement benefits and pay levels. They downplayed the early retirement age, selection out, and the absence of Civil Service protections.

In February 1971 State tried again. It established a "Unified Personnel System" known as "The Foreign Affairs Specialist (FAS) Corps" based on proposals generated by task forces appointed by Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management William B. Macomber, Jr. The FAS system essentially imposed the terms of the "Hays Bill" without Congressional authority or pursuant to collective bargaining. At Bernie's request—and with support from Xavier "Mike" Vela, a USAID employee who was president of AFGE 1534—AFGE's General Counsel filed suit in U.S. District Court. In August Judge Howard Corcoran granted a preliminary injunction blocking implementation of the FAS system pending a decision on the merits.

In June 1973 Judge Corcoran ruled that State and USIA had acted contrary to law in attempting by decree to convert Civil Service employees to the FAS Corps. But he also found statutory authorization in a 1960 law for the redesignation of unfilled officer level positions, and he left open the question of whether it was legal to appoint new domestic employees under the Foreign Service Reserve authority.

State and USIA continued to try to persuade Civil Service employees to convert to the FAS Corps. AFGE filed a class action lawsuit seeking a declarative judgment against use of the Reserve authority for domestic positions. The attorney who argued the case was Larry Speizer, head of the ACLU's Washington, DC affiliate. I was a named plaintiff together with several other officers in AFGE 1812 and AFGE 1534. The lawsuit was unsuccessful. A second lawsuit was ruled *res judicata*, meaning the case had been decided and could not be pursued further.

In 1977 new management teams in State and USIA came to terms with the impracticalities of the FAS system and ended the practice of using the Foreign Service Reserve authority for designation of domestic positions. FAS regulations remained in place, however, until enactment of the Foreign Service Act of 1980. A principal objective

of the Act was to restore the obligation of worldwide service for all Foreign Service employees and the use of Civil Service authorities for employees in the United States.

All domestic employees in the Foreign Service Reserve were to be converted to the Civil Service by June 30, 1984. AFGE 1812 negotiated conversion procedures for bargaining unit employees. Under the terms of the Act, no converted employee was to receive a reduction in grade or basic salary. All were permitted to continue in the Foreign Service Health Benefits Plan if they so desired. And all were given 120 days to decide whether to participate in the Foreign Service retirement system or be returned to the Civil Service retirement system. With all legal and legislative processes concluded, I and many other domestic employees in USIA, USAID, and State chose the more advantageous Foreign Service retirement benefits.

After fifteen years of litigation, legislation, and collective bargaining, the efforts of Deputy Under Secretary Macomber and other senior officials to impose Foreign Service conditions of employment on Civil Service employees had failed. Domestic employees retained their Civil Service protections and some gained Foreign Service retirement benefits, which many still receive today.

In addition to the FAS system, there were two other important issues for AFGE. One was State Department FSO Alison Palmer's Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) complaint. The other was lack of due process in the selection out of Foreign Service officers for time in class.

Q: You mentioned that Alison had an EEO complaint, but what was it specifically? What was her specific complaint?

In the early 1970s, Alison and a small, courageous group of State Department FSOs were active members of AFGE 1534. They sought to gain exclusive recognition and collective bargaining rights for Foreign Service employees under Executive Order (E.O.) 11491, "Labor Management Relations in the Federal Service." AFSA had value as a professional association, but they believed AFGE was better suited to achieve the Foreign Service personnel reforms they were seeking. Other FSOs included John Vincent (AFGE 1534's Foreign Service vice president), Harrison Sherwood (AFGE 1534's chief steward), and Gene Preston (an ordained minister who had been active in the U.S. civil rights movement before joining the Foreign Service.) Alison and John were assigned to the Africa office in State's Bureau of Intelligence and Research. Their supervisor was FSO Bill Harrop, a strong AFSA supporter. State opposed their efforts and took steps to exclude the Foreign Service from the E.O. 11491. (["Department Seeks FS Exemption from Executive Order,"](#) Department of State Newsletter, November 1970, p. 10.)

In her indispensable book *Diplomat and Priest: One Woman's Challenge to State and Church* (2015), Alison writes:

“I was very active in AFGE. I took a union shop-steward training course at the HQ of the AFL-CIO at night, and found that the same problems that existed at State also happened to truck drivers, retail store clerks, etc. I proudly posted my shop-steward certificate in my office, possibly the first (and last?) time this has been done by an FSO. And many FSOs who were AFGE members, including me, began an active campaign, handing out leaflets at State's entrances, putting them on desks all around the building, and even going to the underground parking lot and sticking them on windshields” [pp. 135-136].

Earlier this year, I wrote to Alison to tell her about this interview. She recalled in her reply that she had filed an unfair labor practice against Harrop, because he had ordered her to take down an AFGE poster after he had hung an AFSA poster. “We won,” she wrote, “he was enraged.”

Alison had filed a sex discrimination complaint in 1968 while serving in Vietnam. It was the first EEO complaint filed by a Foreign Service Officer. She alleged three ambassadors had rejected assignments to their embassies in Africa for which she was qualified. A State Department investigation found evidence of discrimination, but the relevant documentation was not placed in her file. In 1971 she appealed her case to the Equal Opportunity Commission. She was represented by Judith Hirst, an experienced AFGE national office hearing representative, and Harrison Sherwood, her AFGE 1534 representative.

In her book, Alison was generous in her praise.

“Judith Hirst . . . was a huge factor in the victory because she knew how to present evidence, ask questions, etc. I was also very ably represented by an FSO, Harrison Sherwood, who devoted hundreds of hours to working on the case, preparing questions, collecting data, and providing encouragement to me whenever I got ‘down.’ In speaking for me he may have risked damaging his own career because it is generally believed that ‘corridor reputation’ definitely affects assignments and promotions, and certainly being a fighter on behalf of women FSOs would be at least considered ‘odd’” [p. 130].

After a number of weeks Alison received a favorable decision from an EEO examiner assigned by the Department of Labor. State at the time had no qualified hearing examiners. Her book describes what happened next.

“[W]e were told to report to Macomber’s office. I had the common good sense to realize Macomber would try to make this a great public relations coup by having people there to see him provide ‘justice’ to me, and I definitely was not going to become part of his ploy, so I told Harrison to go on my behalf. He did, and came back later saying Macomber was visibly angry that I was not present. Harrison added that I definitely would need to appeal the decision, so that led to my first lawsuit in which I asked that my promotion to O-3 be made retroactive with back pay, something State had apparently never considered” [p. 133].

Alison won her suit for retroactive promotion. In 1976, convinced that separate complaints by individuals could not achieve real change, she filed a class-action lawsuit on behalf of all women in the Foreign Service. Certification of the class, delays in State’s production of data, and appeals took years. Although she was represented by public interest lawyer Bruce Terris and associates in his firm, costs were high. The case was finally settled thirty-four years later in 2010. She was pleased it had achieved significant reforms and that she was awarded legal fees. But she also stated it would take decades more to achieve the equal treatment of women required by law.

Looking back on her earlier EEO complaint in 1971, Alison made the following observation about the contrasting roles of AFGE and AFSA in her book.

“My advice to any individual FSO who is being treated unjustly is to become a member of the American Federation of Government Employees, by joining the chapter which is active at the State Department . . . AFSA on the other hand, avoided providing any help or support in my fight until the decades-old class-action lawsuit finally ended in 2010 after which an AFSA officer contacted me to offer an award for my ‘contributions to the Foreign Service Corps.’ I would call that an overabundance of caution (39 years!) in avoiding controversy. I rejected the award” [pp. 333-334].

Alison also played a key role in creating AFGE’s Foreign Affairs Employees Council and legal defense fund. In March 1971 officers of AFGE 1812 and AFGE 1534 met in Alison’s apartment. They unanimously agreed, on a motion by Harrison Sherwood, to form the Council and the fund. Bernie later recalled that Alison made the first financial contribution. The Fund was named after Charles Thomas, a Foreign Service officer who had been selected out and who tragically committed suicide in April, a month after the fund was created. His widow Cynthia Thomas welcomed the initiative and became a strong supporter of the Fund and efforts to achieve due process in Foreign Service selection out procedures.

Q: As I understand it, Thomas was selected out in 1969, after 18 years of service, and they refused him a pension. And he had trouble finding another job. And his suicide occurred in 1971.

GREGORY: A number factors contributed to his suicide. He had not been promoted from Class 4 to Class 3 within the required eight years. Accordingly, he was selected out of the Foreign Service for too much “time in class” with one year’s salary and the money he had put into the retirement fund. A laudatory report by a Foreign Service Inspector was mistakenly placed in the file of another Charles Thomas and was not considered by his promotion panel. There were no grievance procedures to contest the panel’s decision. Unable to find work, he took his own life. This provided death benefits for his wife and two daughters. His death led to national media coverage, increased commitment by friends and colleagues to achieve reforms in State’s personnel system, and alarm on the part of Macomber and State’s director of Foreign Service personnel Howard Mace.

State took a few remedial steps. Macomber offered Cynthia Thomas employment in the Department. Selection out rules for “time in class” were changed to assure that officers who reached Class 5 could serve until age fifty or twenty years of service. This would assure they received retirement pay. An Interim Grievance Procedure was created until permanent procedures could be established under a Foreign Service employee-management relations system contemplated by the Nixon administration.

AFGE, the Fund, and many FSOs were unimpressed. Under the Interim Grievance Procedure FSOs were required to take up their complaints with their superiors, often the source of the grievance. Appeals could be made only to an in-house board hand-picked by State. There was no possibility for judicial or other third-party review.

The Council and the Charles William Thomas Legal Defense Fund had the same executive board with equal participation from AFGE 1812 and AFGE 1534. State FSO Gene Preston was president; USIA’s Bernie Wiseman was vice president. State FSO Harrison Sherwood was secretary. I was the treasurer. Later I served as a Fund trustee and as the Fund’s president when Gene was assigned overseas.

Gene’s deep commitment and his rhetorical, organizational, and leadership skills were a primary reason the Fund quickly began to gather resources and address Foreign Service personnel issues. But there were many other reasons. The strong support of union activists in State and USIA. The willingness of nationally-known leaders to join the Fund’s Advisory Committee in the weeks after Thomas’s death. Cynthia’s intense interest in supporting the Fund and pursuing retroactive justice in her husband’s case. AFGE’s success in soliciting solidarity contributions from a number of AFL-CIO unions

(teachers, auto workers, craft unions, steel workers, communication workers). And the strategic thinking of Stephen Koczak, a brilliant retired FSO now head of research at AFGE's national office.

Ambassador Fulton Freeman, Thomas's chief of mission in Mexico City, agreed to form the Advisory Committee. Leo R. Werts, a former associate director of the U.S. Department of Labor, agreed to serve as chair. Other distinguished members were E. Clinton Bamberger, dean of the Catholic University Law School; U.S. Senator Birch Bayh, a Democrat from Indiana and Charles Thomas's home state senator; retired Supreme Court Associate Justice Tom Clark; Walter Fauntroy, Washington D.C.'s Delegate to Congress; Monsignor George G. Higgins of the U.S. Catholic Conference; Brother Cornelius Justin, a professor of labor relations at Manhattan College; Clyde Weber, who by then had become AFGE's national president, and Cynthia Thomas. Subsequently, other members included former assistant postmaster general Richard Murphy, former International Association of Machinists president Albert Hayes, and Wesley Theological Seminary professor Philip Wogaman.

Within a few months, AFGE and the Fund retained a prominent Washington law firm, Hogan and Hartson, to challenge selection out practices in the foreign affairs agencies. Attorneys William O. Bittman and George Miller agreed to take the case. Bittman, a trial lawyer in Attorney General Robert Kennedy's Justice Department, famously had prosecuted Teamsters President Jimmy Hoffa and Lyndon Johnson's Senate aide, Bobby Baker. Miller was an accomplished legal research and trial attorney. They were an excellent team, and they got State's attention.

In November 1971 Bittman, Miller, and AFGE representatives met at the Department with Macomber, Mace, and State's lawyers. I attended the meeting. I can recall few details, but I do remember it was a serious and intense conversation. Bittman said we would withhold filing a lawsuit if State agreed to negotiate fair, impartial, and enforceable third-party due process procedures. State refused to negotiate. But it did place a moratorium on selection out, which meant we couldn't file suit.

The moratorium held for nearly two years. During that time, the Thomas Legal Defense Fund succeeded in getting approval for full tax exemption as a "charitable institution" from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Charitable functions within the IRS definition included "defense of human and civil rights secured by law" and "elimination of prejudice and discrimination." The decision received helpful media coverage in *The New York Times* ("[State Department Staff Unit Gets I.R.S. Exemption.](#)" November 5, 1972) and the Washington, D.C. *Sunday Star* (Philip Shandler, "Legal Fund Exemption Gets Unions' Attention," November 19, 1972). The unsigned piece in the *Times* was written by

its State Department beat reporter Benjamin Welles, son of former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles. Shandler reported that this first tax exemption for a union-sponsored legal defense fund caught the attention of the AFL-CIO and officials at the United Farm Workers and the American Federation of Teachers.

State resumed selection out in 1973. Hogan and Hartson quickly filed suit on behalf of ten selected out FSOs. Philip Lindsay was the named plaintiff. The case was heard by Judge Gerhard Gesell in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. AFSA filed a supportive amicus brief in August 1973 following consultations with George Miller paid for by the Thomas Fund.

Q: This case, was it intended to establish a grievance board?

GREGORY: The case was filed to obtain a judicial ruling on the inadequacy of the Department's Foreign Service personnel procedures and on what constituted a fair hearing and other due process criteria. How a ruling would be implemented was to be determined after the case was decided. Judge Gesell issued his landmark decision that State's regulations were constitutionally defective on December 13, 1973. Selection out is "no light matter," he ruled in [Lindsay v. Kissinger](#). "It threatens an involuntary separation. It carries a stigma and, to use the words of Justice Frankfurter, causes a 'grievous loss' to the officer's professional standing." Gesell did not provide detailed procedures. But he found that State had "offered no adequate justification for denying" procedural safeguards." He identified criteria that would constitute fairness, and he ordered new hearings for the plaintiffs.

"It is clear that an officer is entitled to more than a general conclusory form of notice. He must, in addition, be advised of the facts on which the Selection Board's notice is based and he must, before the hearing, have full access to all materials concerning him that were considered by that Board. While no subpoena power is available, he should be given an opportunity to present favorable witnesses willing to appear in person or by affidavit. He must be allowed to interrogate adverse witnesses in person or by written interrogatories approved by the Selection Board. If he can retain counsel at his own expense, such counsel must be permitted to represent him at the review hearing."

As George Miller later summarized for AFGE 1812's newsletter, *News and Views* (April 1974), "Judge Gesell's decision which resulted from a class action suit, financed entirely by the Thomas Legal Defense Fund is of fundamental importance to the constitutional rights of all foreign service personnel."

This was good news. But State refused to comply with the decision.

In October 1974, nearly a year later, Miller went back to Judge Gesell to argue that State was not compliant. Although many selected out FSOs were still on the payroll, they were "dangling in the wind." They were denied hearings before a special review panel, and they were not being considered by selection boards for promotion. An alarmed State Department hastily revised its guidelines. AFSA signed off on them on October 29th. The following day Gesell was blunt: "These last-minute papers do not impress me. I note the date and realize they were born out of this lawsuit and are not a serious effort." He asked who was responsible for the guidelines. The Justice Department lawyer representing State did not know. Gesell gave State thirty days to come up with adequate guidelines. Eventually Congress authorized a Foreign Service Grievance Board with the safeguards he had ordered.

Hogan and Hartson covered a significant share of the costs pro bono. But the lawsuit had cost the Thomas Fund almost \$70,000 in 1974 dollars. Adjusted for inflation in 2023, this would be \$478,000. This was a sizable amount for a legal defense fund that depended on volunteer contributions.

AFSA was quick to take credit for Gesell's decision, "Judge Gesell's decision accords in every important respect with the brief filed by AFSA in this case on August 31, 1973," wrote Rick Williamson. (["This Month in Washington,"](#) *The Foreign Service Journal*, February 1974, p. 39.) Williamson and the *Journal* were silent on the roles played by AFGE, Hogan and Hartson, and the Thomas Fund.

AFGE welcomed AFSA's amicus brief, but when the Thomas Fund requested help with the costs and to pay full advertising rates for an appeal for contributions in the *Journal*, AFSA was reluctant. In April 1974 AFGE 1812's *News & Views* reported that the Fund had requested publication of its appeal for contributions in February. Tom Boyatt, had replied that a decision would be made by AFSA's board, and he could not "offer much hope" that the board would agree. *The Journal* had turned down the Fund's earlier requests to pay for advertisements, and it had not printed its letters to the editor. It did not run the Thomas Fund's appeal in its March 1974 issue.

Q: Do you know anything more about what was behind that decision? That seems rather vague.

GREGORY: I don't know with certainty what AFSA's thinking was at the time. It likely was in part because AFSA had concerns about other Thomas Fund cases. *News & Views* also quoted Boyatt as saying AFSA's board continues "to doubt that the actions of the

Thomas Fund are in all cases in the best interest of the Service.” At the time, the Fund was providing partial support for litigation involving Foreign Service time in class regulations, restoration of Alison Palmer’s backpay, mandatory Foreign Service retirement at age sixty, resignations required by marriage to an alien spouse, duty officer overtime, retirement credits for employees designated as binational cultural center “grantees,” and other issues.

AFSA’s views also likely stemmed from AFGE 1812’s continuing efforts to represent Foreign Service employees in USIA. In 1972 AFSA had won representation elections in all foreign affairs agencies. In 1974 AFGE 1812 was collecting signatures for a showing of interest leading to another election. In a *Washington Star-News* article at the time, Boyatt described AFGE as “the enemy,” and added, “I’m willing to use every legal tactic to make life tough for them.”

When the April edition of AFGE 1812’s *News & Views* reached employees in Washington and US missions overseas, however, AFSA reversed course. The *Journal* printed the Thomas Fund’s appeal in May. ([*Foreign Service Journal*](#), May 1974, p. 7.)

Q: This contest to determine which group would represent employees goes all the way back to the 70s. What caused the competition?

GREGORY: Good question. There are a number of reasons. There were significant differences on issues. Basically, however, I think it was because AFGE was an AFL-CIO union that represented Civil Service employees, and AFSA was a professional association that self-identified as the only legitimate voice of an elite community of Foreign Service officers, staff, and retirees. Its leaders were convinced AFSA, not an AFL-CIO union, could best represent the Foreign Service in employee-management relations.

It was a clash of cultures. In Harrison Sherwood’s colorful recollection, “When I described my union activities to my AFSA colleagues, I found them incredulous that a fellow white, male, upper-middle-class FSO would be involved in the tawdry business of grievances brought by what might be termed malcontents or losers. Truth be told, I never realistically expected AFGE to represent the Foreign Service in labor/management affairs. Most FSO’s mothers had been frightened silly by John L. Lewis, Walter Reuther, and others in the American Labor movement” (Harrison Sherwood, [Letter to the Editor](#), *The Foreign Service Journal*, January-February, 2016, p. 13).

Over time, AFSA became more comfortable with its role as a union. This was due in considerable measure to the leadership of Tom Boyatt and F. Allen “Tex” Harris, supported and pressured by other reform-minded activists in the late 1960s and 1970s.

Tom and Tex were formidable opponents and our differences were never personal. AFGE believed it had more experience and was better equipped to achieve results in the courts and the federal labor-management system. We viewed AFSA as a “company union.” If Foreign Service employees voted for AFGE, we argued, they could still belong to AFSA and have the benefits of a professional association.

Q: I think we're a little ahead of ourselves. So, it's 1974 and the Grievance Board gets created. How does AFGE then continue? In terms of its representation attempts to represent the whole of the Foreign Service community?

GREGORY: AFGE did not think it could represent the whole Foreign Service community. The odds clearly favored AFSA in State and to a lesser extent in USAID. But USIA was a different matter. Before discussing the reasons, there is more to be said about the Foreign Service Grievance Board. Its origins are central to the representation issue.

On June 8, 1971, Senator Birch Bayh (D-IN) introduced S. 2023, a bill to create a statutory grievance board for the Foreign Service. This was two months after the death of Charles Thomas and two years before the Gesell decision. Senators John Sherman Cooper (R-KY), Hubert Humphrey (D-MN), and Hugh Scott (R-PA) co-sponsored what became known as the “Bayh bill.” In August State implemented interim grievance regulations in an attempt to head off the legislation. The Department expected a permanent grievance board eventually would be negotiated with an elected exclusive representative of the Foreign Service, which it assumed would be AFSA. The negotiations would take place pursuant to an employee-management system to be created for the Foreign Service.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee held lengthy hearings in October. Senators Bayh and Humphrey questioned “serious injustices” in State's personnel procedures and were critical of its “grossly inadequate” interim grievance procedures. National press coverage of the Thomas tragedy continued. (“The State Department: Undiplomatic Reforms,” TIME, November 15, 1971, p. 20; Myra McPherson, “‘Selected Out,’ The Legacy of a Discarded Man,” *The Washington Post*, December, 19, 1971.)

The Committee heard extensive testimony (342 pages) from AFGE’s national office, representatives of AFGE 1812 and 1534, AFSA, the ACLU, Cynthia Thomas, and individual Foreign Service officers. All supported the legislation. Cogent arguments in AFGE’s statements were developed by its national research director Stephen Koczak, a former FSO who knew the issues and State’s personnel system well. AFGE’s and AFSA’s positions on the bill were similar with one exception. AFGE wanted a provision for

recovery of legal fees by successful grievants and unsuccessful grievants whose cases presented important issues.

State strongly opposed the legislation. Macomber compared the Foreign Service to the U.S. military. Like the armed services, the Foreign Service required its own unique personnel procedures. Macomber also argued the Foreign Service required personnel regulations and an employee-management system different from Civil Service regulations and the federal government's labor-management system. Bayh agreed with the military analogy, but he used it to hold the Foreign Service to the high standards of military justice and due process.

The Bayh bill passed unanimously in the Senate in 1972. At State's urging, Representative Wayne Hays blocked it in the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The Senate passed the bill again in 1973 and again in 1974. Each time, at State's behest, it was blocked by Hays. The Bayh bill was finally enacted the following year, and President Gerald Ford signed the legislation on November 29, 1975. The law provided that Foreign Service employees had a right to hearings in cases involving disciplinary action or separation, access to relevant records, a right to legal counsel, and a right to judicial review.

Q: And in the background of all this, the competition between AFGE and AFSA over exclusive representation rights continues.

GREGORY: Correct.

Q: What do you recall about that era of competition?

GREGORY: We lost the first election in 1972, but AFGE had made a good showing in USIA. We thought it was worth another try after the mandatory two years had elapsed before another election could be held. One important reason was the activism of USIA's labor information officers. During President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress, the Agency had recruited qualified AFL-CIO members to join the Foreign Service for assignments primarily in Latin America. They included Joe Glazer, a guitarist and folk singer known internationally as "Labor's Troubadour." USIA sent Joe to perform for labor audiences around the world. He was a staunch AFGE 1812 member and a hit at office parties in Washington. Others included Frank Chiancone, Tom Martin, and Mel Blum. These officers had experience with representation elections and excellent organizing skills.

I was AFGE 1812's president at the time. Frank had returned to Washington from an overseas assignment in the summer of 1973. We had never met, but he called me the

week after he returned. I went to his house the following Saturday morning, and we had a long conversation about challenging AFSA again. Frank was a superb organizer, and he sprang into action. We started publishing a monthly newsletter, *News & Views*, which we circulated in Washington and at USIS (U.S. Information Service) posts abroad. AFGE 1812 had rights under its Civil Service labor-management contract to use the diplomatic pouch and the Agency's printing facilities. Most of the print shop employees were AFGE members. (AFSA later challenged this arrangement unsuccessfully.) We began making the argument for another election. AFGE 1812's Foreign Service vice president Bob Coonrod, a skilled and highly regarded field officer, and other FSO members with credibility campaigned effectively. The election primarily was about issues, but the organizing skills of USIA's labor information officers was a major contributing factor in the successful outcome.

Q: Let me interject here with a bit of historical context. At this moment in the 1970s we were still deep in the Cold War. One of the reasons USIA brought these labor union organizers in is because many of the overseas labor unions had connections to communists. The U.S. was concerned that their power in the societies in Latin America and other places would be such that they might be able to foment unrest or even force a change of regime. In response, we began to send out our democratic labor union representatives to help those labor unions develop more along the lines of democratic unions

GREGORY: You're absolutely right. This had a long history. It goes back to the First World War and the overseas operations of the Committee on Public Information led by George Creel. It sent Samuel Gompers, the founder of the American Federation of Labor, to meet with union leaders in Europe. In the early Cold War, the AFL-CIO's international activities were funded in part by the Congress for Cultural Freedom, which was a front group created and funded by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). When the CIA's funding was revealed in 1967, union leaders denied it at first but soon took pride in the relationship. In the early 1980s, Congress created the National Endowment for Democracy, an openly-funded nonprofit organization that still gives grants to support the overseas democratization activities of the AFL-CIO, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Democratic and Republican international party institutes.

It was in the context of this history that the AFL-CIO maintained a strong interest in keeping labor information officers in USIA. The AFL-CIO also maintained connections with FSOs in State who served as labor attachés in countries with powerful labor movements such as the United Kingdom and South Africa. One labor attaché who served in South Africa and who supported AFGE's activities, was Ed McHale, father of Judith

McHale, who served as State's Undersecretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs in the Obama administration.

Q: And that specialty, labor union or labor politics, remained a specialty in the State Department. But as the American labor union movement diminished over time, similarly, the labor specialty in the State Department went away.

GREGORY: I don't recall when, but USIA eventually stopped recruiting labor specialists. However, State still has an Office of International Labor Affairs in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

Q: So that's the macro look at the labor specialty. But we're still in the period of competition between AFGE and AFSA for exclusive representation. Let's return to that.

GREGORY: Federal employees gained the right to collective bargaining through unions of their choosing when President Kennedy issued E.O. 10988 in 1962. President Nixon's E.O. 11491 in October 1969 created a government labor-management relations system with specified unfair labor practices and binding arbitration. AFGE 1534 immediately began organizing Foreign Service employees in the State Department.

On October 14, 1970, Macomber appealed to the U.S. Labor Department for a Foreign Service exemption to the federal system. He cited the exceptional nature of the Foreign Service, which is "entrusted with the execution of United States foreign policy," and the "intimate relationship" between the President and the Secretary of State. In a follow-up memorandum on November 9, State argued the "inappropriateness of negotiated agreements" between the Foreign Service and the Secretary and that a formal adversary relationship "could be detrimental to our national security."

On November 16, 1970, AFGE's national president John Griner submitted a lengthy statement to the Federal Labor Relations Council objecting to Macomber's appeals as an attempt to evade "enforceable accountability." Despite lip service to employee participation in the formulation of personnel policies, Griner argued, State's personnel system was "inequitable," "paternalistic," and discriminatory "in the equal enjoyment of due process." AFGE also maintained that AFSA was not a union within the meaning of E.O. Order 11491. AFGE lost. But Macomber did not achieve the degree of managerial autonomy he was seeking either.

In March 1971 President Nixon issued a memorandum stating that a Foreign Service "employee-management" system would be established with the approval of the Federal Labor Relations Council. On December 17, 1971, he issued E.O. 11636, "Employee

Management Relations in the Foreign Service of the United States.” It differed substantially from the federal labor-management system. It did not use the words “labor,” “union,” “collective bargaining,” and “negotiated agreement.” Instead of negotiations, it authorized “consultations.” From time to time the results of consultations could be reduced to writing—a concept of “rolling negotiations” rather than negotiated fixed-term contracts. Bargaining units were defined by government agency (State, USIA, and USAID). The Board of the Foreign Service, chaired by the Deputy Secretary of State, was authorized to administer E.O. 11636 through an Employee-Management Relations Commission acting “as a Committee of the Board.”

AFSA also wanted a separate system. Threatened “by the current drive of an AFL-CIO affiliate to obtain exclusive recognition for Foreign Service personnel,” and after a “thorough study” of E.O. 11491, its board had decided in 1970 that “AFSA must itself seek exclusive recognition as a ‘labor organization’ for *all* Foreign Service personnel.” At the same time, it would “jealously” protect “AFSA’s professional character and goals.” ([Editorial](#), *The Foreign Service Journal*, November 1970, p. 4.) This was a pivotal moment. I give Tom Boyatt, Tex Harris, and Bill Harrop a lot of credit for steering AFSA in this direction. The term union was difficult for many FSOs at first, but today ASFA proudly wears the union label.

Q: Were these three among the early group of activist AFSA organizers known as the “Young Turks.”

GREGORY: They represented AFSA’s unionizing phase. As I understand it, the term “Young Turks” was first used to describe a group of changed-oriented FSOs who several years earlier had challenged Foreign Service leadership by a “hidebound old guard.” They focused on policy reforms and campaigned successfully to take over AFSA’s board. They included State’s Charlie Bray, Lannon Walker, author of the reform manifesto, *Toward a Modern Foreign Service* (1968), Barbara Good, and Princeton Lyman—and USIA’s Alan Carter, John Reinhardt, and Rob Nevitt. Harry Kopp discusses their activities in his excellent book, *The Voice of the Foreign Service: A History of the American Foreign Service Association* (2015). Reinhardt and Bray later become USIA’s director and deputy director in the Carter administration.

With many more signatures than needed, AFGE 1812 petitioned for an election in 1975. The Employee Management Relations Commission ordered a secret mail ballot election beginning no later than January 21, 1976. AFSA raised a number of procedural challenges. Its major argument was that USIA’s management was colluding with and providing improper assistance to AFGE by allowing it to use the Agency’s printing facilities. We had a contractual right to these facilities, and we used them to great effect.

Administrative law judge William Naimark ruled the charges had no merit. In part it was because USIA had granted similar printing privileges to AFSA.

AFSA also challenged the eligibility of Foreign Affairs Specialist employees to vote. Because they were not likely to serve overseas, which was true, they should not vote or be in the unit represented by AFSA. This was despite AFSA's practice of recruiting FAS members, benefiting from payroll deduction of their dues, and representing them for more than two years. This too, was tossed out by Naimark. They were eligible to vote.

The third major issue was that AFSA wanted to give USIA's geographical area directors, media directors, PAOs (Public Information Officers) at U.S. missions, and other officials the right to vote. AFGE argued they were management officials. They had not voted in the previous election, and they should not do so again. AFSA lost this challenge as well. At the end of the day, Naimark ruled that no unfair labor practices had been committed by AFGE 1812. We did lose on one issue. We argued PAOs in one-person posts should be able to vote because they did not manage American employees. Nevertheless, they were PAOs and they were not permitted to vote.

Q: Interesting. Okay.

GREGORY: These were procedural issues. AFGE 1812 and AFSA had lawyers who represented their interests in third party proceedings. Tom Boyatt has written recently that AFGE "had millions of dollars to spend on campaigning; it could field scores of lawyers; and it was an affiliate of the all-powerful AFL-CIO" (Thomas Boyatt, ["When Lightning Strikes Twice: How AFSA's 'Young Turks' Launched the Union."](#) *The Foreign Service Journal*, January-February 2023, p. 24). We hardly had "millions of dollars." We had two very good lawyers, AFGE's national office attorney Jim Rosa and AFGE 1812's staff lawyer Beth Slavet, who helped us beat AFSA on the procedural issues. We indeed were an AFL-CIO affiliate, but we were an autonomous local union in a small foreign affairs agency. It was AFGE 1812, not the AFL-CIO, that campaigned for Foreign Service votes in USIA.

Substantive issues had much more to do with AFSA's defeat. One involved USIA's independence. During the 1970s, several advisory panel reports, including notably the so-called "Stanton Panel" led by former CBS President Frank Stanton, proposed dividing USIA into three components: an independent Voice of America, a separate endowment for exchanges and cultural diplomacy, and an office for information activities in the State Department. Lawmakers, senior government officials, think tanks, opinion writers, Foreign Service employees, AFGE, and AFSA were players in this drama. State had long been ambivalent about public diplomacy, and it supported the Stanton Panel's

recommendations. State had no desire to take on additional management responsibilities, but it was interested in access to USIA's budget and greater control of some of its activities. USIA's directors and most of its employees were deeply committed to the Agency's mission and opposed to losing organizational independence.

In the 1970s most of USIA's employees, Foreign Service and Civil Service, favored a degree of distance from State. They valued the flexibility of a smaller agency, and they disliked State's bureaucracy and cumbersome clearance procedures. Public diplomacy required specialized training and skill sets that State didn't have. The opposition of USIA's directors made it easier for hundreds of the Agency's professionals to voice their opposition in Congressional hearings and other forums, both individually and in ad hoc groups.

AFGE 1812 was committed to USIA's independence. I presented the union's views opposing the Stanton Panel's recommendations in a meeting with the panel and later testified in hearings held by House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Dante Fascell (D-FL). *News & Views* framed USIA's mission and organizational integrity as a central issue in AFGE's campaign to represent USIA's Foreign Service employees. On this we were quietly supported by many of the Agency's FSOs who were not AFGE members. FSOs in State, however, to the extent they took an interest, generally supported the Department's views. AFSA's President Patricia Woodring testified in Fascell's hearings that AFSA supported "full integration of the function of public diplomacy" into the Department. AFSA's representatives in USIA were conflicted. Fundamentally, this was an issue of critical importance for USIA and AFGE; it was only of marginal interest for State and AFSA. I believe this was a key reason we won the election.

There were other substantive issues. AFSA argued Foreign Service employees would be lost in a national union as large as AFGE. We responded that AFGE locals are autonomous. We pointed out that AFGE's national office provided expertise, legal assistance and a strong voice in Congress. We argued AFGE's Thomas Legal Defense Fund had long represented Foreign Service interests in the courts. We emphasized Judge Gesell's decision on constitutional due process rights and the Fund's "bread and butter" cases: tax deductibility for home leave expenses, overtime pay for duty officers, retirement credits for binational center directors, and recovery of legal fees. FSOs had divided views on the Fund's challenge to mandatory Foreign Service retirement at age 60, but many were impressed that the Fund had persevered until the case was lost in a ruling by the Supreme Court following oral argument by Thomas Fund attorney Zona Hostetler.

AFGE 1812, AFGE's national office, and the AFL-CIO also had a long history of supporting USIA's budget requests. We argued the AFL-CIO was a more powerful voice

in Congress than AFSA. We compared AFGE's many years of representing employees with AFSA's lack of experience in collective bargaining and third-party procedures. We made it clear that AFSA's role as a professional association, the Foreign Service club, *The Foreign Service Journal*, and the scholarship fund would in no way be undermined. A vote for AFGE would give Foreign Service employees the best of both worlds—a professional association and an experienced union.

In June 1976 AFGE 1812 won by a substantial eight to five margin. AFGE represented USIA's Foreign Service employees for seventeen years. In 1992 another election was held and AFSA again became the exclusive representative.

Q: Interesting that AFGE could hold on to USIA that long. What do you ascribe that to?

GREGORY: When I became a Congressional Fellow in 1978, my active involvement with AFGE ended. From 1980-1997, I served as deputy and then executive director of the bipartisan, presidentially-appointed U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy. I then was assigned for three years as USIA's faculty representative at the National War College. Following my retirement from State in 2001, I turned to research, writing, and adjunct teaching at George Washington University and Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service.

For these reasons I have no detailed knowledge of AFGE 1812's activities in subsequent years. Before I left, we were negotiating with USIA on promotion panel precepts and other issues that served the interests of Foreign Service employees. We continued to have effective staff attorneys. And my successors were competent union leaders.

The Foreign Service and foreign affairs agencies faced unusual labor-management issues in the 1970s. New institutions were being created. Transformational and durable reforms were achieved. AFGE was better equipped than AFSA to deal with the employee rights, due process, and equal employment issues of the day. In the years since, AFSA has become a much more effective union. AFGE's primary focus, nationally and locally, is on representation of Civil Service employees. It was not destined to represent Foreign Service employees in the long run. It's a bit surprising that it took seventeen years, but it's not surprising that AFSA regained representation rights.

Q: For the Foreign Service officers, but not the civil servants?

GREGORY: Yes. AFGE still represents Civil Service employees in State, USAID, and the US Agency for International Broadcasting. USIA ceased to exist in 1999 when its activities, other than international broadcasting, were merged into State.

Q: As you look back on that time, what do you think prompted AFSA to move beyond its work as a professional organization and take on a labor advocacy role?

GREGORY: I think it has a lot to do with leadership and inequities that simply could no longer be ignored. As I said, I think Tom Boyatt's and Tex Harris's leadership was pivotal. It also has to do with the activities of change agents who played critical roles individually and in other organizations. Stephanie Kinney was a leader in achieving State's 1972 "Declaration on Spouses." It helped to end the exploitation of Foreign Service spouses as free labor and their inclusion in officer evaluation reports. Mary Olmstead, Barbara Good, Marguerite Cooper, Bernice Baer, and others who formed the Women's Action Organization (WAO) in 1970 had a significant influence on the treatment of women in the foreign affairs agencies in addition to Alison Palmer. The Thursday Luncheon Group was founded in 1973 to address inequities in the inclusion of African Americans in U.S. diplomacy. Pressures on AFSA to take on a labor advocacy role came from inside and outside the association.

There also were FSOs who simply took it for granted that representing employees and achieving fairness in personnel procedures were normal activities for Foreign Service professionals. Barry Fulton, Stan Zuckerman, and Juliet Antunes, good friends and former colleagues, were outstanding career officers and AFSA's representatives in USIA during the 1970s. They were skilled competitors who gracefully accepted the outcome when AFGE won the election. Years later during the Clinton-Gore administration in the early 1990s, USIA "reinvented" its Information Bureau. Barry was the Agency's associate director responsible for the process. He ensured that representatives of both AFGE and AFSA were full participants on the reinvention teams.

Issues too were powerful motivating forces. Lack of due process. Discrimination against women and minorities. The need for a dissent channel on policy issues that provided access to senior officials and protected employees from retribution. America's reprehensible habit of sending unqualified political appointees to serve as chiefs of mission.

Q: There is one other individual from AFSA's early days as a labor advocacy organization, that is Hank Cohen. He had some previous experience with labor reporting before becoming involved with AFSA. Did you have an association with him back in the day?

GREGORY: I don't know Hank Cohen personally, and I had no association with him in the 1970s. But I know he was a leader for AFSA on grievance issues, that he chaired

AFSA's Members' Interests Committee, and that he played a key role in AFSA's decision to become a union. Credit for the transformational reforms in the 1970s is due to many courageous and far-sighted individuals.

Q: It's a fascinating period of ferment, as you know, when both AFGE and AFSA try to become the exclusive representatives for the foreign affairs agencies. In a way, it comes to a head with the Foreign Service Act of 1980, in which so many of the issues regarding governance of the Foreign Service and management-labor relations get codified.

GREGORY: Which raises a question. The 1980 Act was achieved through the efforts of many FSOs and others interested in Foreign Service reform. Today is also a period of ferment, and many current and former FSOs are calling for major reforms. Some are recommending a new Foreign Service act. Consider the article by William Burns and Linda Thomas-Greenfield ([“The Transformation of Diplomacy: How to Save the State Department,”](#) *Foreign Affairs*, November/December 2020, pp. 100-112). There is also the Harvard Kennedy School report by Nicholas Burns, Marc Grossman, and Marcie Ries ([American Diplomacy Project: A U.S. Diplomatic Service for the 21st Century](#), 2021). A follow-up report by Grossman and Ries operationalizes its recommendations ([Blueprints for a More Modern U.S. Diplomacy](#), 2022). Consider also Anne-Marie Slaughter's call for a global diplomatic service with very different rules ([Reinventing the State Department](#), 2020).

These reports seek transformational change, but the consensus seems to be that a new Foreign Service Act is unlikely for political gridlock and other reasons. So why new Foreign Service legislation could be achieved in 1980 and 1946, and not now, is an interesting question.

Q: Yes, and that is the subject of another discussion. Before we conclude, are there any issues I have missed?

GREGORY: No, I think this pretty well covers it.

Q: Then I want to thank you for this excellent recollection of the early years of AFSA as we approach its 100th Anniversary.

End of interview