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

STEPHEN K. KEAT

Interviewed by: Charles Stuart Kennedy
Initial interview date: September 12, 2012

[Note: Mr. Keat is still editing the remainder of his full interview which will be added at a later date.]

Q: Okay, today is the 12th of September 2012. This is an interview with Stephen K. Keat. This is being done on behalf of the Association of Diplomatic Studies and Training and I am Charles Stuart Kennedy. You go by Steve?

KEAT: People always ask me that; you can call me anything you want, but technically Stephen is spelled with a 'ph' can't be shortened to Steve. But people have been calling me Steve since I've been a little boy and that's fine.

Q: Well you can say Steph.

KEAT: That would sound a little bit odd.

Q: Okay, well when and where were you born?

KEAT: I was born in Englewood Hospital, Englewood, New Jersey, March 9th, 1956.

Q: Let's take on your father's side. Where did the Keats come from, what do you know about them?

KEAT: The name was not Keat when he was born. He was Franz Kohn in German and František Kohn in Czech. He was born in what is today the Czech Republic and was at that time Austria-Hungary. His family was Jewish as you can tell from the name Kohn. He was born at the start of World War I. His father, Willibald Kohn, fought for Austria-Hungary and died in that war. The Czech's were not very enthused about the Austria-Hungarian Empire. My grandfather got very sick and the military didn't believe that he was really sick; they thought he was faking it. When he died of the illness they realized that it was true. When my father grew up, it was him, his older brother Paul and their mother Laura. My father's name was Frank Keat, or at that time, Frank Kohn; my uncle was Paul.) My father lived in a fairly prosperous family; they were industrialists, with one-third ownership of a factory that produced uniforms, for example, ones that a nurse would wear. With the death of Willibald Kohn, his Laura Kohn became more active at the factory. When my father and my uncle were getting older, the two of them took increasing roles in the business. I don't know a lot about the partner, but I do know that

he didn't have any children. Apparently he liked my father and was grooming my father to take over. But when the Nazis invaded my family had to flee. My father was Jewish, but he was also active in anti-Nazi movement in his Gymnasium, German for high school.

Q: Was this Sudetenland?

KEAT: This was Sudetenland, yes, a town called Ústí nad Labem. When the Germans invaded Sudetenland they were looking for my father both because of his anti-Nazi activities and because of his Jewish background. But by this time my family had moved to Prague. My uncle was able to get to China. He was one of the Shanghai Jews and he knew for example, W. Michael Blumenthal, Carter's Treasury Secretary..

Q: The Secretary of Defense was…

KEAT: Was there a secretary of defense also? William Cohen?

Q: No, no he was under Clinton. Any way…

KEAT: My father was able to first get to the UK and then get a visa to come to the United States. His mother was not able to get a visa to come to the United States. She could have gone to Shanghai, but they thought that in Shanghai the climate would be unhealthy for her and they figured they would eventually be able to get her into the States. They were wrong and she ended up dying in a concentration camp.

My father settled in New York City like so many immigrants. The first thing he did to survive was to sell postage stamps. My uncle was a stamp collector. When you were leaving Czechoslovakia at that time, you were not allowed to take currency with you. My uncle bought valuable stamps and he gave them to my father. So when my father was in New York, one of the first things he did to survive was to sell those stamps. I'm telling you this was because later in life…

Q: That is very interesting in how one survived.

KEAT: Yes. He got a number of jobs in New York, various manual labor jobs and things of that sort. Then World War II came along. By this time his brother had been able to come to the United States. His brother, my uncle Paul, was sent off to fight in the European Theater. My father was sent off to fight in Asia which he was very upset about. Of course in the military that's the way it is. But he wanted to fight in Europe since that's where he felt he had an axe to grind. I know his experiences in World War II were very difficult ones for him. He spoke about being in Guadalcanal and the Japanese bombing them every night at exactly the same time, at 9:00 p.m. He said that even though that might not have been very good in terms of military effectiveness because you knew that they were coming, it was very effective in psychological terms, undermining the morale of the troops.

Q: The bomber was called bed check Charlie by our troops.

KEAT: You know more than I do.

Q: It was a very difficult time at Guadalcanal and the battles.

KEAT: Yes. My father got shot at, bombed, he himself wasn't injured, but he did catch malaria. Like everyone else in the military, he was going through a hard time. The one thing he did particularly like about the military, when he was first drafted, when he was still in the United States, was that they would get three square meals a day. The soldiers who had grown up in the United States were always complaining about how bad the Army's food was; his attitude was it was food. Having struggled as an immigrant in New York he didn't complain about the SOS (shit on a shingle) and all the other things everyone else thought was terrible.

Toward the end of the War there was a stage when we were still fighting in both theaters but he was sent back to the United States and he volunteered to go to Europe and to fight there.

Q: I assume he spoke languages too.

KEAT: My father spoke English, German, Czech, a smattering of Russian, some Latin, very good Latin. One time we were lost in Italy in 1967. He was trying to get directions. He was speaking to someone and trying everything to communicate. It turned out that person had studied Latin in school just as my father had. So they communicated in Latin. Since I didn't have the foggiest idea what they were talking about, I can't say how good a job they did, but we got where we wanted to go so I guess he did a good enough job. So yes, he spoke a number of languages. My uncle had been involved with intelligence in the European Theater and I think he had been fighting in Italy among other places. My father really wanted to do this too, but I guess it's a classic law of how government works. When he volunteered to do it they said, "No, we think you should stay in the U.S." They did take advantage of his language skills. He was sent to a prisoner of war camp in Upstate New York dealing with German inmates. The military did toward the end of his time in the Army make use of his language skills but they didn't at an earlier stage.

My uncle wanted to have an American name; they ended up with Keat because they had looked in the New York phone directory for names. These two young Czech men didn't really have the foggiest idea of what they were doing and they came up with the name MacGillicuddy. While it is a perfectly fine name and there is nothing wrong with it, but it probably wasn't what they were really trying for. My father must have given my uncle power of attorney. Paul went to change the name. They were both working at the same time at the same factory. My father was talking with one of the co-workers and the co-worker said, "Frank, where is Paul today?" He said, "Oh he's going to change our name, we want a real American name so we will fit in." He said, "What are you changing it to?" He said, "MacGillicuddy." The coworker explained to him that this was probably not

what he was looking for. My father caught a taxi to city hall and apparently literally stopped them at the point where the judge was going to sign the papers to make them MacGillicuddy. They opened the New York phone book and they put their finger down and said, "Keat! How is that?" The judge said, "Yes, that's good." They said, "All right we'll take that one." So that's how we became Keat.

Q: Yeah. So then what did your father do?

KEAT: My father and my uncle both settled back in New York City after World War II. This is why I was talking about the stamps earlier. He and my uncle formed P&F Keat Stamp Wholesale Company; Paul and Frank Keat Stamp Wholesale Company. They were partners and my father did this until he retired. It was a different era than today; I'm sure today if you want Chilean stamps, German stamps, whatever, you'd just go on the internet and you'd have them sent directly to you. But he would order stamps, both new and ones that were 20 years old, 100 years old, etc. from different sources and various parts of the world. He was partnered with my uncle for a number of years. My uncle had a problem with asthma and on the recommendation of his doctor moved to California and became a fairly successful builder. This was the '50s and California was booming. While the company was still called P&F Keat Stamp Wholesale Company, my father was sole owner. From my point of view, he had perhaps the best job of anyone in the world that I have ever met. My father lived in our house, of course, but he worked in our house. He would get up in the morning, go down and my mother would make him breakfast. He would shower and all those things and then go down to the den, ground floor level, and work in his office until lunchtime. He would come up and my mother would make him lunch. He would go back work for a few hours and then come up in the afternoon, maybe read the paper, watch TV a little bit, have a glass of Sherry, take a nap and then go back to work a little bit. When dinner was ready he would come have dinner and if he felt like it he would work after dinner or if not he would just do whatever he felt like doing. He would go into the city and anytime I say the city you can assume I mean New York City. He would go into the city a few times a week and meet clients. There was one for example, Minkus, which had the concession at Gimbels, the large department store. He would call on them and there were a number of other clients. If I remember right, there would be a stamp burse on Tuesday nights at the Hotel Times Square. The stamp burse had dealers sitting at…

Q: That's B-U-R-S-E.

KEAT: Yes.

They would be sitting at aluminum folding tables much like the table we have here although not as fancy. They would lay their stamps out and people would come, talk with each other and bargain. I went a few times with him and it was classic. Dealers would accuse each other of being thieves and crooks; complain at being charged such a high amount.. The dealers were from all over the world, of course, being New York; there were Jews, Arabs…

Q: Were the merchants mainly Jewish or not?

KEAT: A fair number were Jewish but again you had…

Q: This was when Roosevelt was an avid stamp collector and so many others were.

KEAT: There was a fair number of Jewish dealers because they needed a way to survive when they arrive in the United States and this was an option. Again you had immigrants from all over the world in this line of work, so it was interesting. I got involved with the stamp business in a very limited way, first from seeing what my father was doing and sometimes going with him into the city but also going down to the den and looking at him work. He would explain to me the process of valuing the stamp, what he looked for. I also worked a few times at Minkus. I had a summer job there and I worked there once over the Christmas vacation and learned more from that.

Q: For some people stamps represented an opening to the world. I mean whoever heard of Uruguay if you were a school kid or something but if you were a stamp collector you know where it is. How about you did this hit you sort of the geography?

KEAT: It did to a certain extent, but I would view my interest in geography and the greater world in the context of my family background. The vast majority of my family were killed in the Holocaust, both on my father's and my mother's side.. When we would have Thanksgiving dinner, whether the relatives would come to our house or we would go to their house, the adults and the kids would be eleven or twelve people. There wouldn't be that many of us at the table. Except for my uncle's family in California and a few in different parts of the world, that was the entire family. The adults would talk at dinner about Uncle Rudy who lived in Vienna, Uncle so and so doing this and doing that. Most of the relatives were long dead from the Holocaust. The adults would talk about different places mostly in what are today the Czech Republic, Austria, and Hungary. But my father, because again his family had done well financially, he used to take vacations to places like Italy, France, and the Soviet Union. He told me that onetime when he was in Italy he met one of Mussolini's sons and played tennis against him. These dinner table conversations opened my eyes to the world. But yes, because of his business, my father knew every single country in the world. He would tell me all sorts of history about them and that had an impact on me.

I can't say that it was the stamp business in and of itself that got me interested in the Foreign Service, but when I was going to college I was definitely interested in international issues. My father and his personality probably had the most to do with my having eventually joined the Foreign Service. He read a newspaper every day. When it existed, he read the Herald Tribune. When the Herald Tribune went bankrupt he read the New York Times every day. Even when he was getting old and mentally not 100 percent there, he would get the New York Times and read it; how much he understood I don't know but it was a regular habit. We would have conversations, for example about what Mrs. Gandhi was doing in India. He was a very well educated person for somebody who

didn't have a lot of formal education. His formal education stopped with his gymnasium and then he was a refugee.

Q: Well we've talked about your father, what about your mother? What do you know about her background?

KEAT: My mother's family origins are from Alsace Lorraine, so some German, some French. I still have relatives in France. They live in Paris and in Bologna on the outskirts of Paris. I also have other relatives on my mother's side who live in Lyon although I've never met them. My grandfather on my mother's side was Max Kayem. Apparently there are Kayems spread all over the place. I have a relative in Israel, Nurit Hirsch who she goes around tracking down Kayem descendants. From her I found out about a whole range of people that I've never met. My grandfather lived in Germany prior to World War II. He was a Jewish man married to a Christian woman. She was not able to have children and he was not 100 percent faithful. He got a young Jewish woman pregnant. His wife, who clearly must have been a saint, rather than hitting him over the head with a heavy object (but for all I know she did that too) she adopted the child and raised my mother as her daughter. My mother's original name was Irmgard Kayem. It was changed to Irma Kay at Ellis Island. When the Nazi's were coming to power it made my mother's life very, very difficult. My mother was in a school where the teacher would wear a Nazi armband. This was when Jewish children were still allowed in the school. The teacher would and start class with 'Heil Hitler,' giving the Nazi salute and talk about the dirty Jews. Obviously, this which didn't make my mother's life very good or make her feel good. The school officials decided that my mother was mentally defective, to use the terms of the time. While I wasn't there, I think that she was justifiably upset with the situation and suddenly withdrew into herself. At first she was put into a special school for retarded children and then, like other Jewish children, she wasn't allowed to go to any school with "pure" Germans.

My grandfather and my grandmother (or step grandmother, whatever you would want to call her) had to divorce because of the Nuremburg Laws. If they had remained married she would have been killed. My grandfather was a candy maker and he was able to get a visa to come to the United States. They were on one of the last boats out but it was because of the skill that they had that they were able to get out. My grandfather was a difficult person; nobody would say that he had a pleasant personality; I know because I knew him from when I was young. But my mother said with all his faults, she had to give him credit for saving her life at the risk of losing his own. Apparently he had an opportunity to leave earlier but the U.S. Consulate would only give him a visa; they wouldn't give her a visa. He refused to leave without his daughter and eventually he was able to get visas for both of them.

When they came to the United States they came through Ellis Island. I should probably mention that my mother participated in the Spielberg oral history project. They have information on her and I have a copy of a video tape of her interview..

Q: Yeah.

KEAT: My mother got to Ellis Island, but they wouldn't let her disembark, they felt that she had illnesses. I don't know the exact details, but I know that she had to stay there for a certain period of time. My understanding is that someone paid a bribe and she was allowed to leave. My mother and grandfather lived in New York City. She was in the public school system. Nobody was discriminating against her, so she was doing well; at least this is what she told me. But when she was 16 years old, my mother chose to drop out of high school and get a job. She told me that the high school principal tried to convince her not to drop out, telling her she should stay in, that she had a great chance of going to college and making something of herself. She didn't believe him because she just couldn't imagine that a refugee girl like herself would be able to go to college. When I was a teenager she got a high school equivalency diploma, but she never got an education higher than that.

Q: By the time your grandfather and grandmother or your father and mother were they practicing Jews?

KEAT: My parents were cultural Jews; I guess that would be the best way to put it. Back in Europe, my father's family was not a religious family. They did have a feeling of being Jewish but, for example, my father dated a Christian woman whom he was very much in love with. I have at home a picture of her that he kept all these years.. She was a very beautiful, blond-haired woman, very attractive. Apparently his mother was upset about the relationship. She was concerned that my father was going to marry her. Probably he would have if the War hadn't come along. My father never was religious after coming to the United States. We did not keep kosher at home. But he had a very strong feeling of being Jewish after what the Nazi's had done to his family. We belonged to the Synagogue and both my brother and I were bar mitzvahed, but we did not light the candles every Friday night. We did celebrate Hanukah. My parents would go for Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur services when I was young. They would they would go to Synagogue, but no one would say they were super religious.

My grandfather on my mother's side was a very religious man, by the time that I was born; he was Orthodox. He was the only one in my family who was that religious. He would not eat pork and he would go to shul (Yiddish for synagogue) all the time. I remember having conversations in which I asked about this and the answer, not from him, but the answer from my parents was that the closer he got to the point that he was starting to think about the possibility of joining God the more religious he got. He lived to be very old, until his late 90s. When I was a young boy I attended his wedding. He got married for the second time to a very nice Jewish woman who was born in the UK. Her name was Miriam, and she spoke with a beautiful British accent. The two of them, while not fanatics, were definitely Orthodox. They were very religious people. My grandfather continued working for many years as a candy maker in the United States. I remember visiting them in Atlantic City, which is where they were living; this was long before you had gambling there. My brother and I, being typical youngsters, found some of the chocolates he had made. We ate some of them and got some chocolate on the bed sheets.

We tried to clean it up so nobody would know what we had done. I don't know why the Foreign Service took me in given my background of thievery.

My mother, having married my father, she was not religious; but she had a strong concept of being a Jew. When I asked her questions on religion, she said she believed in a God, but we did not observe all the rituals or all the very rigorous things that come along with being an Orthodox Jew.

Q: As a kid where did you grow up?

KEAT: I grew up in New Milford, New Jersey; it's close to New York City. It was the classic post-World War II GI story. After he got out of the Army, my father met my mother in Lake Placid, New York. He got married to her something like three weeks later. When I learned this, I found it very amusing because my mother had always told me don't marry a girl right away, you have to get to know her well.

Q: Oh yeah, in the GI business people have to get back to work.

KEAT: Yeah, he was the stereotype; he married her and then got a GI mortgage to buy a house out in the suburbs and went and got himself two boys and a station wagon, the classic thing.

Q: You do?

KEAT: The town we grew up in, New Milford, was from my point of view a very good place for a child. A lot of people speak negatively about suburbia, but I don't consider suburbia to be bad. Actually, where we lived was very much along the lines of growing up in a place like Queens or a good part of the Bronx. From the front door of the house where we lived--299 McKinley Avenue-- it was all of about a 20 second walk to the corner and a bus into the city in about 25 minutes to a half an hour. So we went into the city all the time to Broadway to…

Q: Can you explain about the city?

KEAT: Huh?

Q: You are talking about New York.

KEAT: Yes, in Manhattan also. Again, anytime I say the city it's a biased point of view. There is one city in the world and that city is only Manhattan, it doesn't include Brooklyn, the Bronx, Queens; that's not fair to those boroughs but it's just the way it is. We were satellites around Manhattan just like Brooklyn and the Bronx were or Brooklyn and the Bronx are.

The town was about one-third Jewish, one-third Catholic and one-third Protestant. Reflecting the time period, almost everyone was Caucasian. There was one girl I

remember from when I was in school. Her name was Karen Segaguchi, a Japanese family, but other than that, everyone was either of Italian background, Irish, English or whatever. I don't remember any Blacks; I don't remember any people from Southeast Asia when I was a young boy. The town didn't have a lot of prejudice against the people living in the town, but what people thought about Blacks and other groups that were not in the town, I don't know. But very rarely did you hear anyone say anything negative about someone. There were maybe two or three times when I was growing up where people made some comments about my being a Kike or something of that sort, but that was so abnormal that I remember that it just happened two or three times. When the Jewish children were having their bar mitzvah or bat mitzvah, their Christian friends came and when our Christian friends were having their christenings and that sort of thing again we would go. The only limited extent to which there was religious competition was childish. At that age I was strongly convinced that Judaism was a better religion because Hanukkah lasted a whole bunch of days and I got a lot of presents as compared with Christmas which was just one day. So clearly Hanukkah was the better religion but that was the only extent to which there was any sort of feeling of religious differentiation; everyone got along.

As the United States evolved, in the Civil Rights era my mother was in her own way active in the Civil rights movement. There were movements to have integration and I remember her signing a petition saying that she would have no objection to Blacks moving into our neighborhood; I guess there must have been some sort of clauses or something that restricted who would be allowed to purchase homes. She signed something saying she had no objection. Because of her experiences she was always a strong believer in Civil Rights. When Martin Luther King was assassinated she took me on a candlelight march to protest. I remember as I was growing up that she had very strong beliefs. She regarded herself, as a she used the phrase from that time period, a 'woman's libber' long before it was a comfortable thing for people to believe, when there were still people who were openly challenging that idea that women and men were equal. She was very emphatic that they are and you should not have discrimination against women. I'd say the only place where there was, at least for a large part of her life, where there was a gap in her tolerance, was toward Germans. When I was a young boy she wanted nothing to do with Germans. In fact, when I wanted to learn German in high school she wouldn't allow me to. I wanted to learn German and then Spanish but she wouldn't allow me to learn Spanish either, but for different reasons; she wanted me to learn French because French was the language of diplomacy. Now this is long before there were any thoughts of me going into the Foreign Service, but it just shows how she viewed the world.

Q: How influential was your mother in your early education?

KEAT: Very. My father was influential in an informal way that he set a certain example and I learned from his example; but was a traditional marriage. My mother would probably have been furious at me for saying this, but for most of their lives my father earned money and my mother took care of the kids and took care of the house. My mother was there everyday when I came home from school. When I was a little boy she

certainly had a big impact on my life in a way that perhaps parents don't have today if their kids are in childcare. The elementary school that I was going to was just one house away from our property, which made it very easy for me to go to school when I was very young. She would walk me there until I got older. So, yes she had a very big impact on my life.

Q: Playing habits, was this still the era where okay kids school is over, elementary school, be back by 6:30 p.m.? In other words were you turned kind of loose?

KEAT: You certainly didn't have the society we have today where kids have to go home and then on a play date and everything is very choreographed. Since I lived close to the school, I often did come home, but then I would immediately go out and play with my friends. I would walk to their homes which were all in the same neighborhood. As I got older, when I was in middle school and high school. I had friends in other parts of the town. I would get on my bike and ride over to wherever my friends lived. In some cases I would ride my bike to neighboring towns. I don't think crime is any worse today but I think today people are very paranoid and children don't have the same freedom that I did when I was growing up.

Q: Yeah, that's true. Was television important to you?

KEAT: Television was important, I had my favorite shows. Then there were also things, for example, when Martin Luther King was assassinated I happened to be watching TV at that time and I called my parents to the TV. When Johnson announced that he wasn't going to run for reelection I happened to be listening to the TV and heard that. So TV played a role, but not in the sense that the Internet does in my kids' lives today. I watched a fair amount of junk TV shows. I also watched a fair amount of shows on PBS (public broadcasting station). At that time William F. Buckley had a regular show, *Firing Line,* on PBS and I used to like watching that show; I found it very interesting.

Q: How did your family get their news? Was it <u>New York Times</u> or TV or what?

KEAT: Both. As I said before, my father would read the <u>New York Times</u> every day. My mother didn't tend to read the newspapers. We would get a local newspaper also, one called the <u>Bergen Record</u> and my mother would look at that more for local things. My father would look at the <u>New York Times</u> and in the evening like everyone else we would watch either Walter Cronkite or one of the other news broadcasts. I don't remember them having a favorite, they might have, but I just don't remember it.

Q: Politically where does your family fall?

KEAT: They would be very much to the left by today's standards; I guess by today's standards they would be Obama Democrats. They were against the war in Viet Nam as far back as I remember. I believe they both always voted for the Democratic candidate for pretty much everything, but definitely for president. My father felt that Roosevelt was a wonderful man and when Roosevelt died he apparently mourned his death. My first

political memory is the time of Nixon vs. Kennedy. My mother and my brother, who is four years older than me, and I were in the car. They were talking about the campaign. My mother was for Kennedy and my brother said he was for Kennedy. Since my brother said he was for Kennedy, I said I was for Nixon. So that was the level of my political discourse at that time. Then when it was Johnson vs. Goldwater I remember my mother being very concerned that Goldwater might win; I don't know why she was so concerned.

Q*: Well Goldwater was portrayed as being a little bit fast and loose with nuclear weapons and all this stuff.*

KEAT: Yes, the famous daisy commercial of the Johnson people did a good hatchet job on Goldwater. It's ironic that later on in my life I came to admire Goldwater, but anyway she was very concerned that he might win. I remember the day after elections that she was so happy to find out that Johnson won. With time, I become fairly conservative; I mentioned I liked William F. Buckley's program. I'd read a number of books by Buckley and Goldwater and I was reading the National Review and I had gone from having worked on Gene McCarthy's campaign just as a volunteer going door to door and handing out…

Q: This was the Democratic candidate of the left.

KEAT: Yes, he was anti-war against Lyndon Johnson in '68. By the time you got to '72 it was now McGovern vs. Nixon. My parents were for McGovern and I was for Nixon. I got my mother very upset because I put a Nixon sign in my window. She wouldn't let me put a sticker on the car and I said, "Well, it's my room and I can put it in the window." She reluctantly agreed to that. Throughout my life my parents were always pretty much to the left as compared to me. I guess in today's terms I am an independent; I've sometimes supported Republicans, sometimes supported Democrats.

Q: In school were you much of a reader?

KEAT: For the first few years of my life, no. When I first started in school I was bored stiff. I didn't really want to be there. I wanted to be outside playing, I didn't like the whole concept of school and I thought most of what they were having us doing was stupid. I was just bored; I would daydream. The teachers in first grade and second grade would yell at me and punish me which made me withdraw even more into myself. My grades were very poor; I think they were C's and D's and things like this. Then when I was in third grade I had a wonderful teacher her name was Mrs. Leibricht. Mrs. Leibricht took me aside; she wasn't yelling at me, she wasn't embarrassing me in front of the other kids and she asked me why I wasn't handing in my assignments, why wasn't I doing the work. I said, "Well…" I gave some sort of meaningless answer. In any case, she said to me, "Look don't worry about when it is due, just do it whenever you feel like it and then just leave it on my desk." Since this was the first time that a teacher hadn't been yelling at me and the first time a teacher actually was sympathetic I went and I did the work and I left it on her desk. You know, she would complement me and bit by bit she got me so that I was paying attention in c lass and doing all my work. Suddenly I was an A student.

From then on and for the rest of my time in school I was always one of the best students in my classes.

Q: Where did reading come in?

KEAT: When I started to read a lot I would read almost everything. I read a lot of science fiction, I read history and as I was growing older I would start to read things that were typical of people my age, like the various books that Barry Goldwater had written, his autobiography and I think there were a few others; William F. Buckley's books and history books. I would usually finish textbooks before the time that we were supposed to get it done and then I would go and read other books. And Lincoln, I loved Lincoln. When I was in first grade I was the tallest boy in my class and so I got to play Lincoln in one of the school plays. My mother had gone to this shop and she had bought me this beard which I had to put on with gum Arabic. After the play was over she had to fight with me because I didn't want to take it off; she had to fight with me because I didn't want to take the beard off. Then in second grade I again got to play Lincoln in a play. So I read books that were really college level books, I was reading these maybe when I was in fifth and sixth grade; biographies of Lincoln. I had a picture of Lincoln on my wall and so he was always someone I admired. I also read a lot of history about the Civil War and could tell you details about the Battle of Gettysburg. There came a certain period of time when I was just a vacuum reading almost everything I could.

Q: Do you recall any series or authors or genre of books that you particularly enjoyed adventure or what have you?

KEAT: Well science fiction, I read a huge amount of science fiction and there were also science fiction magazines.

Q: All those paperbacks. Oh yeah.

KEAT: Yes, so I used to get all those Asimov. I certainly remember when 2001 A Space Odyssey came out, the movie. I happened to be going into the city that day with my father and we were walking by a movie theatre and the movie was just opening in New York; it wasn't yet available in New Jersey. We walked by a theater and I said, "Oh wow, they have 2001 A Space Odyssey." My father, because he was really a wonderful man, went to a pay phone and cancelled his next few appointments. He bought us tickets and we saw 2001 A Space Odyssey. So yeah, I loved science fiction, loved history, was very interested in international relations without necessarily defining it as such.

Q: Was this bringing you into the period of space exploration?

KEAT: Oh yes, in fact when I was in elementary school I wanted to be an astronaut. For the longest period of time I wanted to be an astronaut and then after that I wanted to be president of the United States. I was never modest in my goals until I got a little bit older and perhaps a little bit more realistic about how the world works. But in elementary school I did research, I was very serious about being an astronaut. At that time the best

way to become an astronaut was to be an Air Force pilot so I was checking into going to the Air Force Academy and what their requirements were. I remember being a bit put off because of the heavy emphasis on math. While I wasn't terrible in math, it wasn't one of my favorite subjects. I was far more into the social studies, but in any case the point is I took this very seriously and researched it very carefully.

Q: During the Kennedy election, what you were about seven years old?

KEAT: I was born in 1956 so…

Q: Oh boy…

KEAT: I was four years old.

Q: You wouldn't have been grabbed by that particularly.

KEAT: Only in the sense I told you since my brother was supporting Kennedy I'd supported Nixon. I wouldn't see too much into that in terms of my political development.

Q: As you moved into school what courses really grabbed you and which ones didn't?

KEAT: The courses that grabbed me the most were history and the social sciences; science I also loved. When I got to high school I particularly enjoyed geometry. I liked the geometric proofs; I thought they were very interesting. But the rest of math, it's not that I disliked algebra or calculus, it was just that I didn't find it as fascinating as I did geometry. Our high school had a three-track system, we had general, academic and honors. The guidance counselor I had was a woman who I believe was prejudiced against boys. S she would make it very easy for girls to get into the honors classes but made it very difficult for boys to get into the honors classes. I had wanted to do honors science and honors history and a whole range of honors classes. I had a meeting with my mother and her. She didn't want to let me into honors classes but finally she let me take honors science and an honors history class. I got the highest grade of anyone in the school so after that she couldn't refuse to let me in.

In those days education was very much subject to the whims of the administrators. I remember one of my fellow students, Jonathan Mann, wanted to do Home Economics as opposed to shop. He said, "I'm not planning on ever doing wood working or repairing cars or things like that but when I get older I am going to need to cook for myself and I am going to have to know how to sew." They didn't want to let him do Home Ec because he was a boy. His parents had to raise a real fuss and eventually they let him into Home Ec.

So there were all sorts of problems with the way the school was administered, it was very bureaucratic and inflexible.

Q: What was high school like for you?

KEAT: Well, high school was an opportunity to learn more. By this stage I was past needing somebody to push me to read and to do things; I was studying most things on my own and getting myself into as many honors classes as I could. I was active in conservative issues in the sense that I would debate with fellow students about the elections and what was going on; I was always taking the more conservative view. I was a chess player. At the time of the Fischer-Spassky match I watched the games with a chess board in front of me. I would go through every single move as they were playing. I would listen to people analyzing it and I had all sorts of chess books. I still remember again the example of how the schools were very rigid. I was with a friend of mine, Jim Cash. He and I were both in the library and we were playing chess. The librarian told us that we couldn't play chess in the library; you have to keep in mind chess is not exactly a noisy sport. I don't see how our playing chess in any way disturbed anybody. When we objected, the vice principal threatened to have us expelled from the school for playing chess in the library, something I still consider ridiculous. We stopped playing chess, but I would think the vice principal of any high school around here today would be delighted if the worst problem they were having was kids playing chess in the library.

I played tennis but I was not great at sports, at least not sports like football and track. One year I was the assistant tennis coach to get my letter. That was more to have something to show colleges that I was well rounded; I wasn't a good enough player to be on the tennis team. I was a lifeguard. I had done swimming from when I was a little boy. We had been members of the town swim club and my mother always had me taking swim lessons. She said, "Become a life guard it's a good thing to do…" So I did my junior life saver, my senior life saver and my water safety instructor course. For two summers, the summer when I was 16 and the summer I was 17 I worked as a lifeguard at a pool at an apartment complex in Hackensack, New Jersey. Hackensack was about a 15-20 minute drive from New Milford. I started skiing when I was about four and a half, five years old. My father would take me down the slopes between his legs holding on to me. I skied straight through until I was about 21 or so. I stopped because of the cost of skiing and because of the different countries I lived in; there wasn't a lot of snow skiing in Somalia, for example.

Q: I was thinking about something else. Had foreign affairs crossed your radar much?

KEAT: After high school I went to Franklin Marshall College in Lancaster, Pennsylvania and did a double major in economics and government; government being another word for political science. In the economics there were, of course, the usual intro, macro, micro, etc. I had a wonderful professor, Professor Taylor. He was British, had been an engineer and served in the British Army in World War II. He came to the United States after the War, went to Yale and got his doctorate in economics, and came to Franklin & Marshall to teach. He spoke, well still speaks because he is elderly but he is still alive, speaks a range of languages. He speaks Chinese, Japanese, Korean, English, of course, and I believe French and German. He is the kind of person who makes you feel absolutely inferior; at least makes me feel inferior. One of the courses I took with him was the history of the Chinese economy. When we got our final exam, he handed out the

exam in Chinese. He said, "Well, you all knew this requirement of the course is to know Chinese." You had a number of people having heart attacks; then he handed out the translations. I took three courses with him, all economic history and all on different parts of the world; economic history of developing countries, economic history of China, and the economic history of Japan.

On the government side I had two professors in particular, a Professor Michalak and a Professor Gray, both of whom I am still in contact with. In fact, they are both coming to my house on September 29th when I will be having a retirement party. I had a few courses dealing with international relations under Professor Michalak. I still remember Morgenthau's "Politics Amongst Nations" and The Six Principles of this and the ten principals of that which I have to confess when I joined the Foreign Service not once did one ambassador go and say to me, "But Stephen don't forget Morgenthau's Six Principals." But in any case that was how they taught it and I guess that worked. Taking all those classes certainly helped orient me toward international relations. But I would be lying if I said that I had any clear idea at that stage of what I wanted to do with my life. I don't know that is necessarily a problem because when I did have a clear idea, i.e., astronaut and president, they were extremely unrealistic.

Q: You graduated from high school when?

KEAT: 1974.

Q: By the time you got to Franklin Marshall the '60s had pretty well run through the system.

KEAT: Yes. I only really experienced the '60s in the counter cultural sense through other people. My brother was four years older than me. He was very concerned about going to Viet Nam, and my parents were concerned that he would be sent to Viet Nam. Almost everyone thought that it was a stupid war, at least in the town we were growing up. My brother went to Windham College in Putney, Vermont. Windham College went out of business shortly after the Viet Nam War ended; the only reason Windom College existed was for people to have college deferments. Going with my father to drop my brother off at college or pick him up, I didn't get a feeling that there was a lot of real education going on in Windham College. But, for me, the various demonstrations, the huge concern about the Viet Nam War, a lot of that by-passed me. When I was 18 Nixon was president. While we still had a draft lottery they weren't actually drafting people; they had the lottery in the sense you had a number. I remember my number was 98. Had it been the height of the war I would have been told to go off, but at that stage they didn't require me to.

When I went to college there were people talking about the demonstrations that had occurred at the height of the war, but there were no anti-war demonstrations at Franklin & Marshall while I was there.

Q: How did you find the politics at Franklin & Marshall? Was this a conservative college or a liberal college?

KEAT: The town, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, probably voted 80-90 percent Republican on a regular basis; close to what Stalin would get but not quite. The college in contrast was very liberal and I still remember having conflicts with some of my professors. One of my professors was Gordon M. Wickstrom, who I liked a lot, a drama professor. We had a big conflict because he wanted me to write something with a premise about U.S. war crimes in Viet Nam. You had to write it as though that was the actual case, you weren't allowed to go and say "well, some people say this." Students were all assigned someone to be our, I guess, guide. I can't remember what the term was but it was professor who you weren't taking classes with who you could go to for advice; I remember going to speak with that professor about this because I was very upset. I didn't want to be made to write something that I disagreed with so strongly. The easy thing, of course, would to have gone along with it, but he went and spoke with Professor Wickstrom and Professor Wickstrom changed and allowed me to write it in a different way.

I was definitely the odd man out. At that point in time my politics were very conservative and I think the vast majority of the students were very liberal. That never really bothered me; my parents had raised me to stand up for what I believe in.. That's what I did. Professor Michalak introduced me to some students who weren't at the college but who were trying to set up a conservative organization. At first I was talking with them about participating, but then they started talking about doing things that I just considered crazy. They wanted to do was have us pretend to be people in need of welfare and to apply for welfare benefits and then to go and expose this as being something fraudulent. Well that would have, of course, been something illegal. I didn't want to do that and I got out of their group.

A at Franklin & Marshall I was active in a number of plays, never as somebody who was particularly good, but I enjoyed theater. I was in a play in my freshman year called "Utrenja." A Polish composer, Kryzstof Penderecki wrote a piece of music titled "Utrenja" that Professor Wickstrom heard. He directed the play. We performed it at a place called the Other Room, a small theater in a basement.

Q: They call them black boxes, I think.

KEAT: Yes, with pipes going through and so on. You had a central area where we performed and you had about 30-40 people sitting on the floor watching us. Nine people showed up for the audition so we became the cast of nine. The play was based on the story of Jesus, but again in a very experimental way. It was interesting; this was the first time that I read the New Testament. I read the New Testament cover to cover. We all had different roles at different times. There was a handmade wooden cross and whoever had the cross in his hand at any given time, they were Jesus Christ. There was a point in the play when I was Jesus, but I also got to be Judas at the Last Supper which I much preferred; I thought that was a far more interesting role. I got to be one of the gathering swine; it was a very interesting play. I was in "King Lear," but I was just one of the

soldiers, a fairly minor role. I was active in the school newspaper and the school radio. For both of them I did political commentaries and for the newspaper I wrote articles on international relations. I wrote one article, for example, on Israel and the threats that it was facing. The reason I mention that one article is because a number of years ago, maybe about 2005 or so, I went to Franklin & Marshall College; they asked me to speak to the students. Professor Michalak was introducing me to the students and he pulled out this article that I wrote years ago and he quoted something I had written. I was surprised because I had forgotten what I had written back then. To find that he still had the article was quite something. I guess in one way or the other I had some impact in terms of politics.

Q: How stood Franklin & Marshall being in Pennsylvania but race wise because there were various waves of emigration and change? Was Franklin Marshall at all conscious about either civil rights or all that?

KEAT: The town and the college were different on these issues. The town had Blacks and other minorities and I know today, many years later, it's got a large Latino minority. The local people were not necessarily welcoming to Blacks, although when I say that, I'm excluding the Mennonites and the Amish. The Mennonites and the Amish I don't think had that sort of prejudice; I'm not aware of that. The Amish don't trust anybody other than Amish but that's a different issue. They call outsiders the "English.' You could be English whether you were white or Black or whatever, basically it was just another word for somebody who wasn't Amish. Franklin & Marshall College had, of course, Black students and we had a Black student group, The Black Pyramid Honor Society. I didn't have any feeling that there was animosity; I had Black friends. One thing that I admired happened in my senior year. A White Jewish kid, a freshman at that time, who had serious disabilities, wanted to be active with black organizations; I think his name was Howie. In any case, they let him participate; they didn't say no, no you aren't Black. I don't think there was hostility between Blacks and Whites. I remember one very pretty Black girl who had White boyfriends and nobody thought anything about it one way or another. It was the United States and you have prejudice anywhere, but I don't remember prejudice as being a big issue on campus.

Where there was prejudice at Franklin & Marshall was more the total stupidity of students at a certain stage in their lives. When I was a senior there was an Italian kid, his name was Nicolo. Nicolo was a friend of mine. Nicolo's father was American and his mother was Italian. His father was killed in a car accident in Italy when Nicolo was a little boy. His father was from Lancaster County and Nicolo's grandparents were very prosperous. When Nicolo was 18 they paid for him to go to Franklin Marshall College. Nicolo had what I guess could be called a handbag, in any case it is what Italian men use for carrying around their wallet and various things they need. I still remember some of the jocks grabbing hold of Nicolo and telling him, "Oh you are a fag, why do you have that fag bag for?" They shook him up. Nicolo came to me and complained; he couldn't quite figure out these Americans, what's the problem? So we had that sort of prejudice. But I would attribute that against the stupidity of people at a certain stage of their lives.

Most of us were concentrating on our studies. I know I was studying, I was also trying to have fun and I wasn't all that focused on being upset about what other people were doing with their lives. I don't think other people were all that concerned about what I was doing with my life. There were some people who commented about my political views I think; some of them found them a little bit odd. But at Franklin & Marshall--perhaps I was just naïve--I did not get a feeling that there was a lot of discrimination. The Black students did very well academically. One of the Black students from prior to my time became a congressman, Congressman Gray. He came back and spoke at Franklin & Marshall College a number of times; he is no longer in the congress.

Q: Did the Foreign Service ever cross your radar?

KEAT: Well yes but in an accidental way. As I said, at that stage of my life and I wasn't thinking about the future, I was just having fun and studying. I went to the University of Edinburgh for a junior year abroad program and had one of the best years of my life. I was 20 turning 21, had a beautiful Scottish girlfriend, traveled all over Europe, the classes at the University of Edinburgh were fascinating, so everything was fantastic. But then I came back and it was my senior year. "Oh, I'm going to graduate I have to think about what I am going to do with myself after this." So I started trying to figure out what I wanted to do. As it so happened, a guy on the hallway of the dorm where I was living had the Foreign Service exam application form.

I made a photocopy of it. He took the exam and I took the exam. He failed but I passed the written part. It was something I hadn't really given much consideration about but I was sort of like "wow this is great." Then I took the oral exam. The exam was dramatically different than the exam we give today. It was roughly a 70 minute interview with three Foreign Service officers. I think it was meant to be about a 60 minute interview but it went over. I was asked a range of questions on politics, history, etc. There was one question that I was asked, where I was told that I was a junior consular officer in an unnamed country and a father comes to me. His daughter was in jail and he intended to bribe the local officials to get his daughter out. What do I do? I replied that it would depend on the country. If this was a country such as the United Kingdom or France, countries that were allies of ours and which had judicial systems that we could respect, I would advise him that if he would be caught this would be detrimental for his daughter and detrimental to him, that he would go to jail. I would also advise him that this is something that is not in the interest of the United States that we don't want U.S. citizens trying to bribe officials of countries that are allies. If he persisted, I would then go and report him for his intent to do this as a way of maintaining good relations with that country and to stop him from doing something illegal. But, if he indicated he would not do this that would be the end of it. If, however, we were in some country such as Uganda-- and this was the time of Idi Amin--which did not have a system that we could respect and was certainly no ally of the United States, I would warn him of the risks to himself and his daughter if he would be caught, but I would take no action to interfere with his plans.

After they were done with their questions they had me wait in another room. The chairman of the panel came out and told me I hadn't passed the exam. Unlike today he told me why. It was the answer on that one question, which is why I remember that question more so than others. He told me was he liked my answer but one of the members of the panel didn't like it, that he felt that I was cold and heartless towards the father. I don't know what the third person thought and whether it just one person was enough to veto you or whether both of them voted against me and out voted the chair. It didn't occur to me to ask at that time but, in any case, I didn't get in at that point.

This was my senior year and I was trying again to figure out what to do with myself. I looked into the possibility of the Peace Corps and the CIA; I was looking at a range of things, but I also applied to different universities for master's degrees. Jimmy Carter was President and we were in a recession. With only a Bachelor's degree it was hard to get a good job. It seemed like the only type of job I could get was as an insurance salesman, and that didn't really fit in terms of giving me a decent income or my overall interests. Because I had been at the University of Edinburgh, my mind was open to the idea of going to different universities in different parts of the world. I applied to Edinburgh and I also applied to others in the UK; I looked into Australia, New Zealand, India, Canada and a few in the U.S. Professor Michalak had gone to the University of Indiana, Bloomington and he recommended that to me, so I applied there. I was accepted at a number of universities. The University of Indiana was one of them. The University of Toronto was another. I think I got accepted at McGill. I don't remember all of the ones, but I decided Toronto would be where I would go. It was less expensive than going to Bloomington and they had a one year Master's program which made it dramatically less expensive.

I took the Foreign Service exam again a year later. I again passed the written part. When I took the oral, it had changed; it was no longer just an interview. You did have an interview as part of the exam, similar to what we have today. Then you had a play-acting role where you are part of a team and you are looking at dividing up money for aid projects. The projects that you were given were part of the ambassador's special fund. You were told to defend a project that would be roughly in the range of let's say $10-15 thousand. But when you were defending it, you were supposed to present it and not defend it in the sense of falling on a sword over it, just present why it's good and what were its strong and weak points. Then you had to work out something amongst the group as to how things should be divided up. One woman who was defending a project that everybody disliked except for her. Because no one else supported it and she kept insisting on it, time ran out. We never got the memo ready for the ambassador and I think the group as a whole looked bad. Nobody told me why I didn't get into the Foreign Service that time, but it was my assumption that is what had happened.

I finished my masters. My professors at the University of Toronto must have liked my work because they offered me a spot in the Ph.D. program and gave me a teaching assistantship and a scholarship. While I was not wealthy, I had a comfortable life and decided to I stay in the Ph.D. program. When I did my MA, it was in the Department of Political Economy which fit in very well with my background in both economics and government. But now they split into a department of Political Science and one of

Economics. When they made the split they made the decision that I would go into the Department of Political Science since my area of expertise was heavily oriented toward international relations and I was working on a thesis on the AFL-CIO as an actor in international politics. I was looking at the AFL-CIO's support, for example, for Solidarity in Poland, "Solidarność," their support for Black trade unions in South Africa, their support for the trade union movement in Central America, particularly in El Salvador and Nicaragua.

I took the Foreign Service exam for a third time. I took the written exam in Toronto. It was December, if I remember correctly, and I was violently ill. I had some horrible flu or something of that sort. I had a really bad fever and if it wasn't for the fact that the exam was given, at least at that time, just once a year, I wouldn't have taken it. I was surprised that my marks on the written exam were the best of the three times I had taken it. When I took the oral exam, because of my experience the second time, I took charge of the group exercise. I took a piece of paper and said, "Alright, let's do this." I'd ask people "what do you think about your project? What are its strong points, what are its weak points?" When people would go off course, I would say "we have to rush, we have to get this memo ready for the ambassador; we've only got twenty minutes left." We concluded; we got the memo done. I took all the other sections of the exam and must have done well on them because I passed. At that time, unlike today, they didn't tell you immediately whether you had gotten in or not, but I got a letter some time later informing me I had passed the exam. My assumption is my bad experience the second time around and the way that motivated me the third time around made all the difference in the world.

Q: I'm sure it did.

KEAT: Like everyone else I had a medical exam and I had to have a security clearance investigation. I mailed in all the paperwork and went back to working on my Ph.D. program. A year went by…

Q: What was the theme of your dissertation?

KEAT: The AFL-CIO as an actor in international politics.

Q: Was it changing as when you started and when you got toward the end?

KEAT: In what sense?

Q: Well I'm just wondering this is during the period when the unions are getting weaker.

KEAT: Internationally the unions were very active. You have to differentiate between the weakness of the American union movement in the United States and its strength abroad. If you go back, and I can spend a long time talking about this, but if you go back to the time of World War II the U.S. unions played a major role in working with the…

Q: Oh yeah after the Marshall Plan.

KEAT: After the Marshall Plan U.S. unions were involved, for example, in things like making sure that communist unions would allow Marshall Plan aid to get in at the Port of Marseilles. They worked very closely with the CIA--this is public record--they worked very closely with the U.S. government in general in Europe to make sure the communists didn't take over in France and Italy. During the time of Reagan, although he and the AFL-CIO hated each other's guts, they worked closely to help "Solidarność" in Poland and to promote the union movement in El Salvador. The unions were very active internationally despite their declining strength in the United States. I went to Washington, D.C. twice to do research at the AFL-CIO and affiliated organizations. I also spoke with people from individual unions like the United Auto Workers Union, the United Federation of Teachers, and the American Federation of Teachers.

A year went by and I hadn't heard anything back from the Foreign Service, so I wrote a letter to enquire. I had been working on my Ph.D. thesis, doing research, so I wasn't really in a big rush. But I wrote a letter in which I said, "I understand that it takes a long time to process the clearances, but I was just wondering what the status of my application is." About two or three weeks later I got a phone call from the RSO in Montreal. The RSO in Montreal or maybe it was Ottawa; it is so many years ago that I don't remember exactly which, but it doesn't really matter. He wanted to meet me at the consulate in Toronto to do a security clearance interview. We made an appointment. When I got to the consulate on the designated day and time, well when you are being interviewed by basically a cop, usually the person being interviewed is the one who is a little bit nervous and the cop is the one who is very confident and perhaps a little bit aggressive. But it was the exact opposite. When I came into the room, his body language was very nervous and uncomfortable. I sat down and he said to me, "Well Mr. Keat I want to start off on behalf of the Department of State by apologizing to you." I said surprised, "What are you apologizing for?" He said, "Well, when we got your letter we went looking for your file and it seems somebody had misplaced it." I said, "Oh, okay well that explains it." Actually I always figured government was like that, so I wasn't surprised despite having had delusions that the State Department was better at those things than the rest of the government. In any case, we had the interview and the interview went really well. Psychologically I was the one in control. In a very short period of time, something like a month or so, I got a letter offering me a position in a particular class. I was about a year away from completing my thesis. I had done all the research but I had to complete writing it, having only completed two chapters at that time. I had a choice of taking the bird in the hand and being a Foreign Service officer or completing my thesis and maybe getting into the Foreign Service at some point in the future or maybe being a really well educated taxi driver. I chose to accept the position then and to join the Foreign Service; something that I've never regretted.

Q: Well I was just thinking about these lost files, horrible, these…

KEAT: That's government.

Q: Yeah but consider how much time is put in. When the Korean War came along I enlisted, they sent me to Army language school but I applied for a commission. Half way through the Army language school I asked how stands this they had lost your file do you want to start all over again. This meant six months more in the military and I said, "Screw this, no." I'm just glad I did but if they lose your file so much rests on this. When did you come into the Foreign Service?

KEAT: October of 1983.

Q: This is probably a good place to stop.

KEAT: Okay.

Q: And you came into a regular Foreign Service class?

KEAT: That's correct. I came in as an economic cone officer. I served on the board of examiners so I know what the current applicants are like and the current applicants have a really good idea of what the Foreign Service is like. I was clueless.

Q: It's been only recently when it started coming out with all sorts of things. Our organization, ADST, produces a web site where you can real all sorts of things about the Foreign Service and other organizations.

KEAT: I didn't have a clear idea of why I would want or not want to be consular cone, econ cone, pol cone or whatever. I had a feeling that I preferred the political cone and after that the econ cone and my grades on the written exam were higher for the political segments than they were for the econ. Both of those were much higher than managerial and consular, but all of them were passing. In those days to be considered at all you had to have at least a passing grade on English language, on the verbal section, and then for each cone you had to have a passing grade to be considered for that one. I had passing grades on everything. I can't remember exactly what my grades were, but I think it was a scale of zero to one hundred and I think my ones on the political were something like a 95-96 and econ it seemed like a 92 but again that's stretching my memory to swear to that. I can say for sure that my consular and admin, while they were passing, they were lower than that, maybe in the 80s. But again, I wouldn't know for sure what they were. So somebody called me up because my name had come up to the top of the list and at that point of time they had a job opening as an econ cone officer. This was just at the time when we were going to be moving from the old pension system to the new pension system. I wanted to be under the old pension system, so I figured I would just go and take the econ one and I won't wait around and see if a political cone comes open. It's ironic because then later I shifted to the new pension system. My reason for doing it was basically irrelevant. But also it is ironic because even though I think career prospects are better for political cone officers, I really liked the work of an econ cone officer. I think I was happier doing econ cone work than I would have been doing political cone work, but that is not because I was brilliant and I had figured this out.

Q: Well I think most of us…I fell into the counselor thing and everybody is trying to get out of that but I loved the work so much I'd stayed in and did well in that. Okay, well I will put here in the end we will pick this up in 199…

KEAT: 1983.

Q: 1983 and we will pick it up then.

Q: Okay, today is the 26th of September 2012 with Stephen Keat isn't it?

KEAT: That's right K-E-A-T.

Q: K-E-A-T and I am Charles Stuart Kennedy. This is our second interview and we're a little hazy about where we left off but let's start when you came into the Foreign Service. When did you take your exam?

KEAT: Well I can't tell you off the top of my head what day I took the exam but I came in October of 1983 and I...

Q:

KEAT: …would have taken the exam about one to one and a half years before.

Q: Okay.

KEAT: In the last interview I think I was explaining that I had done the exam, had passed and sent in everything and then they lost my file for a security clearance. They eventually found them. I can't remember exactly how long it was that it took.

Q: Okay, let's pick it up when you went into a basic officer's course of A-100.

KEAT: It was the 18th A-100 class. For that time I gather we were quite a mixture of women and minorities in addition to what I guess was then considered the classic white male Caucasian. I thought that that was normal. I found out later that our class was not normal but we had a fair selection of women, minorities, a lot of very smart people, a lot of people who had done extremely well, a few people who have become ambassadors and DCMs, things of that sort.

Q: Alright, what was your impression of the group? Did you fit in, were you an outsider?

KEAT: I think I fit in well, I liked them and they seemed to like me although, of course, you probably want to ask them privately.

Q: Sometimes a person comes into a different group and feels not necessarily…they are just different.

KEAT: I liked them; they were fascinating people to talk to. There was a guy for example, Jon P. Dorschner, who was married to a woman from the subcontinent. He earned a PhD. in South Asian studies from the University of Arizona. Jon had spent a lot of time traveling around the subcontinent. It was very interesting to talk to John and his wife. My class had a range of people with different backgrounds. One guy who went off with me on my first posting to the Dominican Republic, his name is Eric Botts. He was a Black man married to a white woman, came from Texas, so I had interesting conversations with him about politics of race and a whole range of stuff. I fit in well and I liked them and I think they liked me.

Q: How did you find the courses there?

KEAT: They varied dramatically; some of them were really boring and draggy. Your classic bureaucrat would come in and talk to us about the rules and regulations in a monotone voice and people would want to fall asleep. But some of the other speakers were excellent. We had one of the Iran hostages, L. Bruce Laingen, who had been the chargé d'affaires in Tehran, come to talk to us. He said that it's not all cocktail parties; you have to keep in mind the possibility of some unpleasant things happening. That was quite a good session from my perspective. We had one speaker who explained the practicalities of life in the Foreign Service, things like explaining how you deal with having servants. Of course I'd never had servants as a typical middle-class kid growing up in New Jersey. One of the things he said which I thought was very good was if you are in a country that has different minority groups or different ethnic groups that don't like each other and you have multiple servants, the best thing is to get a few servants of each group. The reason is that if one of them is stealing from you, the others will tell you because they don't like each other; things like that which never would have occurred to me. Another thing he said is whatever your religious beliefs, whether you are religious or not, whether you believe in Christianity, Judaism, Islam or whatever, make sure that the people you hire country are religious because they are less likely to steal from you. I thought he gave us practical and sensible advice. It was a consensus of my class that the A-100 went on too long, but when we raised that, we were told that they needed to keep us in the class for that amount of time to figure out what they were going to do with us; until we got our your onward assignment.

Q: Did you have any particular desire, preference at all as to both place and type of work?

KEAT: I was an econ cone officer, so I wanted to do econ work to help me get tenure. We were given a list. There were about 35 of us. In any case, we had a list of openings that were exactly the same as the number of people. Some of the postings were ones, for example Hungary, which I thought would be fascinating. I spoke with my CDO (career development officer)…

Q: Career management.

KEAT: Career development officer.

Q: Oh yes.

KEAT: She was someone who most of the people in my class who had her as a career development officer didn't like. She was very abrasive and to the point, and didn't stand for a lot of BS. But I found her helpful because when I went to see her I didn't have a clear idea of what I wanted. She quickly said that going to Hungary, and one similar place with a language only used in that part of the world, would be a real mistake. If you go to a place like that and you don't get off language probation on your first tour you are not going to get off language probation. She broke me out of this bubble of not really understanding how the Foreign Service worked. Looking again at the list, I determined that the best place for me to go would be the Dominican Republic. There was a rotational position. I would serve one year in consular, one year economic. I would have an opportunity to learn Spanish and then to either get off language probation or if I wasn't off of language probation there were plenty of other Spanish speaking countries in the world to serve in. I put that as number one on my bid list, I don't remember what I put as number two, but it may have been Bamako, Mali, I seem to remember having put that high on the list because it had a foreign language, French, that you could use in more than one part of the world. I got the Dominican Republic. I got the rotational slot for my assignment and it worked out well.

Q: You were in the Dominican Republic from when to when?

KEAT: It would have been June of 1984. After I joined and after I was in A-100 I had language training, the consular course known as ConGen, and other things of that sort. It was June of 1984 until June of 1986 – it was a two-year posting.

Q: What was the situation in '84 more or less in the Dominican Republic?

KEAT: Although I probably didn't realize at that time, it was a pretty good place to live. The president was Jorge Blanco. Joaquín Balaguer led the opposition. Balaguer was more conservative, but conservative is a relative concept in a place like the DR. Blanco was from the leftist party. I used to joke with my friends that the difference between the leftist and the rightist politicians was which pocket they would put the bribes into. I don't think ideology made a huge difference. The country, of course, had massive poverty. Electricity was an unknown thing in many parts of the country and even if it was known, it would be irregular, you couldn't rely on it. At the beginning of my tour the electricity in Santo Domingo was fairly good, but toward the time that I was leaving we were having frequent apagones, the Spanish word for outages. Sometimes apagones would just last an hour or two. At the very worst I remember it lasting for eight hours or so. Because it hadn't been a problem when I arrived, many places didn't have generators. My building didn't have a backup generator. I would wait in the dark for the power to come back on, which was inconvenient but not nearly as bad as when I was served in Somalia. I had a penthouse apartment, so if you opened the windows the breeze would come through, although it might be 90 or 95 degrees and very humid. You would have a breeze; you could deal with it.

Americans were very popular; I never had a huge feeling of anti-Americanism. They spoke of gringos but they didn't speak of it in a huge insulting way. Under Johnson we had invaded and so you could have said there was reason for hostility, but I didn't find problems of hostility in my two years there. The extreme left, to whatever extent it existed, was really a very, very minor force; I never encountered anyone who was super antagonistic towards me because of my nationality.

Q: Who was the ambassador?

KEAT: That was Ambassador John Anderson.

Q: Anderson, John Anderson.

KEAT: He had been at one point the Spokesperson at the department. If you walk in the department, on the wall where the Spokesperson's office, there in an old photo of him. He was a crusty old guy, a cold warrior. As a very junior officer, I didn't have a huge amount to do with him, but he would have regular meetings with the junior officers. I remember him talking about the strategic position of the Dominican Republic and how important it was for us to control this because of the sea lanes and where Cuba was. That's why I made the comment about the crusty old cold warrior. I remember thinking, although I kept my thoughts to myself, that this was an absurd argument to make. It might have been appropriate for World War II and the immediate years after World War II, but that in today's world or the world of the mid-'80s, had Cuba or anyone else tried to interfere with the passage of U.S. ships it would have been a suicidal thing to do. So I couldn't take that very seriously.

But he also gave us some very practical advice. He spoke about annual leave, saying that if you have use or lose leave, make sure you take it. He said there were times when he had lost leave and he had never gotten any particular credit for it. He didn't recommend to us to give up our leave on the thought that this was in some way help us get ahead. The DCM was Joe McLaughlin; Joe's wife, Anita, is working here at FSI in the registrar's office. I had more to do with Joe than I did with the ambassador, which makes sense; it's the DCM's role to manage the post. Joe was a really nice guy, very outgoing, friendly and gregarious. He was from a different era in terms of attitudes on tobacco. He was a chain smoker of cigars. When you went into his office there was a special fan that had been set up to push the air out; it was stuck in a window so it would keep the place quasi reasonable for everybody else. At that time, again being a different era, I didn't think too much about it. Subsequently, Joe died very young of lung cancer as he was such a cigar addict; he would always be smoking. He was very outgoing, all the junior officers, to the best of my knowledge, liked him a lot. When I was looking toward my next assignment he gave me very good advice in terms of how to get it. Sadly enough he liked me, and I say sadly enough because his previous posting had been to Somalia where he was the DCM. He gave me a very good recommendation for my second assignment to Somalia in a stretch position that I might not have gotten without his introduction. So, again I say sadly enough he liked me.

I was working the first year in the consular section; Dudley Sipprelle was the consul general. Dudley was a competent manager in the sense that he moved the bodies along and got the visas processed. I know the junior officers didn't like him, he was not a warm and fuzzy guy; his way of talking was very sarcastic, acerbic. He set rules and was inflexible about the rules. A junior officer, Bob Blau had a pregnant wife. Her first child had been born by caesarian section so they knew the second child would also be born by caesarian section. She had gone back to the States for the birth. Bob was applying for leave to be there for the birth of his child. Dudley turned him down because this was in the summer rush season and there was a rule in the consulate that you weren't allowed to take annual leave in the summer. I thought that this was really inflexible. It would be one thing to go to the other junior officers and say that you have to work extra because your co-worker wants to go on vacation to Florida, but if your co-worker wants to go for his child's birth, I think everybody would have been willing to agree to this. Bob appealed to the DCM, Joe McLaughlin, and Joe McLaughlin told Dudley you have to let him go on leave. He did, but he did it very begrudgingly. He found out what date the caesarian was going to be on. I think it was going to be on a Friday, so he let Bob fly out on the Thursday, have the Friday off as well as Saturday and Sunday but he had to be back on Monday to process visas. This gives you an idea of the kind of pressure was on the junior officers at that time and why most people, myself included, didn't enjoy consular work.

Q: Okay, let's talk about it. In the first place what were your clientele and how did you react to them and all?

KEAT: My first six months I was in the immigrant visa (IV) section; my second six I was in the non-immigrant visa section. When I started in the IV section my Spanish wasn't as good as it should have been. This is something that I would be critical of the Foreign Service for. At that time, and perhaps to some extent today, there was a tendency to push people through language training to get them out to post; The Service wanted the body at post more than it wanted the trained body at post. I was only given 20 weeks of Spanish, the standard at that time for junior officers. I went from having no Spanish to having a 2-2 in Spanish, which is what they considered the minimum for the job. But when I got there, particularly because the Spanish the people of the Dominican Republic speak is by no means the clearest in the world, I found I was struggling to understand what people were saying and struggling to move bodies along. I was struggling to have the clients come through my office as quickly the Consul General, Dudley Sipprelle, wanted us to. I suspect there were times when I was unjust to people because I might not have fully understood what they were saying; that's not really a good situation, but you weren't really allowed to take the time to ask them again and again until you full understood.

There was a huge amount of visa fraud in both the immigrant and non-immigrant visa sections. For the immigrant visas the classic case would be somebody who had gone to the United States with a non-immigrant visa, had adjusted status and was now petitioning for their families to come stay with them. There were many fraudulent marriages. A person might be paid to marry Maria and let her go to the States. When I would ask them questions, there would be no sign that they actually had been married. They might have

known each other for a week or two; They didn't have any children together, etc. There were cases where you had someone have his "mujer," his wife or his woman as they called her, and he had known her for years and years and they had plenty of children. That was a good case, but then there was the question of income. Under immigration law you can't issue a visa to somebody who is likely to be a public charge. So somebody was earning let's say six thousand dollars a year working in a sweatshop in New York. He wanted to bring in his wife and their six kids. You had a sheet of paper with guidelines and you would look at it. For one person to bring in somebody this is what the income would have to be, for two people, for three, and so on. So often you were either just denying them outright or you were splitting up families; you let in one but not the other. That, of course, is an awkward thing. I had to say to a mother who was petitioning her son and her daughter, "I'm sorry they both can't come." I had to give her a Sophie's choice of which one did she want to leave behind, which one did she want to take? Obviously it's not as bad as Sophie's Choice because the child left behind will be staying with the grand parents or some other members of the extended families.

Q: Let me just stop here and say Sophie's Choice is a book and later a movie about a Jewish woman who was taken to a concentration camp and the Nazi officer said which one lives and which one dies.

KEAT: Yes.

Q: This is in reference to it.

KEAT: Yes and if she hadn't made that choice, they would have killed both of them; so she had a choice as to which one she was going to save. I was using it as a metaphor; it was Sophie's Choice, which of your children will come with you to the States. The people were by and large lower income, extremely poor, didn't speak good Spanish, and were not well educated. We would see their medical histories and they often had a whole range of diseases which in some cases made them ineligible. They would have to be treated for these diseases before they would be allowed to immigrate to the United States. Their documents on what jobs they allegedly had were often fraudulent. I had lived in New Jersey, in the suburbs of New York City, so I knew the streets and the neighborhoods of New York City, not as well as a resident but I had a pretty good idea of some of them. I would have people coming through with letters proving employment from addresses that didn't exist or with phone numbers that no longer existed. Prior to having area codes, we had letters as a way of code. Applicants would have a letterhead that instead of having the area code for New York or Manhattan, the phone numbers would have these letters; so I knew this was not current. Applicants both in that section and then when I was in the immigrant visa section would sometime try and bribe us, which was something that bothered me quite a bit; I didn't like it at all.

There is one pathetic story that illustrates the situation. One petitioner was showing me evidence of his job. He was working at a plant that made pens, not Bic pens but something similar, very cheap plastic pens that you could probably get for about 19 or 20 cents. In any case, I was convinced that he actually did have this job, but, the income was

not enough to bring in his kids. He was showing me the paperwork for himself and his wife. His wife's paperwork which was clearly fraudulent. I said to him, "I'm sorry sir, but there is not enough income for both of your kids to come to the United States." He said to me, "Wait, I have this very good job, I make these pens" and he brought some of the pens to show me. I said to him, "Yes, sir, I believe you have this job making these pens but I'm sorry that the documents about your wife's work, I'm not convinced of that." He said to me, "Please, please, issue my kids. If you do it, here is a pen, I give you this pen." I knew I was being offered a bribe, but also a little bit insulted; he thought that he could get me to break the law for a 20-cent pen. I guess I was less upset about that than sometimes when people go and literally push hundred-dollar bills at me.

So you had a mixed situation. There were relatively few times, and I can remember most of them, when I had immigrant visa applicants where everything was straight forward and where it was a pleasure to issue them. There was one case, a guy had a Ph.D. I think it was in biology or something like that; he was a very well educated scientist. He had been working in the States and he had previously studied in the States. He was being petitioned by his university to come there. He had a charming, well-educated wife with two charming kids and all of the paperwork was in order. Everything was honest. H he actually had a job and they actually were his kids. I remember what a pleasure it was to go through that, a straight forward conversation with them without trying to probe whether he was lying to me about this or lying about that.

Then there were also the cases of the Marine guards who very often had Dominican girlfriends. They were forbidden from getting married while they were in the guard program. But at the end of their tour they would often marry their girlfriends. So when the girlfriend would be coming in to get her visa to go to the United States it was fairly straight forward. I had gone to the Marine House and drunk beer with them and chatted with them. So I knew that she had actually gone out with this guy for the last year and they actually had a legitimate relationship. But again, that was the exception rather than the rule.

Q: Were there visa fixers around sort of a person came in and they paid somebody to fix everything up not that they necessarily would?

KEAT: Yes, that was more of a problem with the non-immigrant visas than the immigrant visas or perhaps I should say I was more aware of that problem with the non-immigrant visas than with the immigrant visas. With the non-immigrant visas I remember one case. There was a Foreign Service National, a woman who was very friendly to all the junior officers. She used to invite us to her house to parties and introduce us to people. We didn't think anything of it one way or another until one day when she didn't show up for work. It turned out she had been arrested. What had happened was that when she was introducing us to people, she was basically saying see I'm friendly with the vice consuls. She would tell them to give her money and she would see that the vice consul issued the visa. Of course, the vice consul knew nothing about this. There was one case where somebody came in and was applying for the visa and was told sorry you are not eligible. He got very angry. He said, "But I paid five thousand dollars, give me my visa."

The fraud unit went and interviewed him, determined what she had been doing, and arranged to have police arrest her. We all had a meeting with Consul General and he told us we had to stay away from her and be very careful. It was one of the things that I didn't like about visa work. I couldn't let my guard down; I couldn't be friendly with my co-workers. Foreign Service Nationals, while they are not a Foreign Service officer and they are not a U.S. citizen, they are your co-worker. It's nice to be friendly with your co-workers, but I had to be suspicious of everybody.

What also was very difficult was that we couldn't go anywhere and just relax and live a normal life. There were always people approaching us for help in getting them a visa. The vice consuls were some of the most famous people in country. There were skits on TV shows, I guess their equivalent of Saturday Night Live. They would have people going up to the visa window. For example there was one Black guy I particularly remember who was a very strict person in terms of not issuing a lot of visas. So they had a Black actor who was just really difficult and saying things and everyone was laughing and so on, so people knew try to avoid that vice consul. So we were all famous in one way or another. But also people asked you what do you do and I did not want to lie so you I would say I worked at the U.S. Embassy. "Oh, what do you do at the U.S. embassy?" "I'm a vice consul." So they say, "Oh, can you help me? My daughter went to the consulate a month ago and she was turned down." You are trying to have your dinner or beer or whatever and you are trying to listen to this person and be polite.

Q: Were you married at the time?

KEAT: I wasn't married; I got married in my last few months there. After I had been there for maybe four months or so I met an American woman who was studying medicine in the Dominican Republic; I met her at the Marine House. Her name was Antoinette Renee Madden. We dated and ended up living together; she moved into my apartment. Then like so many other people, because of how Foreign Service works, my tour was coming up and so I had a choice of either breaking up with her or getting married. I made what in retrospect I can see was a mistake of marrying her and we went off to Somalia, my second posting. While we were in Somalia the marriage fell apart; it probably would have fallen apart anyway but Somalia…

Q: Somalia is a little bit of a test.

KEAT: Somalia just accelerated things, but in any case toward the end I was married and I would say about half way through I had a steady girlfriend so I might as well of been married in the sense that I wasn't dating Dominican women at that point.

Q: I was going to say that single officers, men and women, have a real problem in a situation like that because obviously there are attractive people out there and they would be perfectly legitimate dates anywhere but then you hold the power of a future life in these guys or girls hands and that sort of screws things up as far as the relationship.

KEAT: I dated a lot less than I would have been capable of and then I think one of the reasons I ended up dating Renee and developing such a close relationship with her was that it was a safe thing. She was a U.S. citizen, she wasn't going to look to me to help her get a visa for a friend and if she was marrying me she wasn't marrying me for that passport. So that certainly was a big factor. Before that I was always very cautious. I know the results of one case where there were some junior officers -- I think this happened before I arrived but not that long before. There was a house of prostitution that some of them were going to and they were getting the services free. Then it turned out there was an expectation of something in return. That was not helpful to their careers and it was explained in no uncertain terms: a) don't go to the house of prostitution, and; b) if you ignore A, you better make sure you pay for what you do.

Q: How about protection and welfare problems? Did you get involved in any of those?

KEAT: I did, I sort of forced my way into that. If you were in a rotational position like mine, you were supposed to just do six months immigrant and six months non-immigrant visa work. The people who were doing a purely consular tour, they would also work in Citizen Services. They would also get, if they wanted it, what was called a mini-consular district. They would be responsible for another part of the country and travel there. I requested a mini-consular district. Dudley Sipprelle wasn't super happy about that because I was not going to be his officer for a whole tour; I was only going to be his officer for a year. But I was able to convince him and he assigned me one. When I went out to the mini-consular district I would do things like meet with the local governor, local mayor and other officials. I did a little bit of political and economic reporting, but I would also go to the jails and visit with Americans. These jails were pretty pathetic, but the Americans weren't being maltreated, no more maltreated than a Dominican in jail. In most cases they were in there because of drug use. They had arrived at the airport with a few joints in their pocket or something of that sort and say, "Oh, it's not legal? Why is that an issue?" When I would visit I would have to explain this is Dominican law. Are you being mistreated? If they weren't being mistreated there wasn't much we could do about it. We could assist them to have a lawyer, we could put them in contact with their family, and we would collect things like for example old magazines that somebody in the Embassy or a Consul was done with, and we would bring those out as well as toothbrushes and things that people would contribute. But other than looking at them and making sure they were okay, there wasn't a lot we could do. It was probably helpful to them. In fact I'm sure it was helpful to them that we would be speaking with the people in the prison and they knew that the Consulate was paying attention and that we would be coming out again in the future.

Q: I would think that given the comparative large number of Dominicans and Americans or who lived in America that they had a lot of relatives and the Embassy would be asked to look after and find out what is going on for the family or something like that.

KEAT: I didn't work in the American citizen's services section so I can't really comment on what they were doing. I'm sure that they had some of that, but I can say that when I went to visit people who were in jail, none of them were Dominicans who had become

Americans; these were Americans who wanted to go to Cub Med or someplace and were just stupid and not respecting the laws of the country they were visiting. If you are smoking a joint on the street in New York City, you can get arrested. If you are in the Dominican Republic and you are smoking a joint in the street, you can get arrested and there is not much that the American Consul can do other than visit you and make sure you are not being maltreated. Those were the kind of people I visited. I think Dominicans who had become American citizens would have been too smart to get arrested for that sort of stuff; they would realize that there would be a problem.

Q: All right so you moved to the economics side.

KEAT: Yes.

Q: What was the economy of the Dominican Republic?

KEAT: The economy was sugar and tourism. First a personal thing: moving over to the Economic Section was a blessing. I was so much happier so much more relaxed. For example, I became very friendly with a Foreign Service National, Francisco Campisano. I could be friendly with him without worrying about it. What's he going to do, tell people I can introduce you to somebody who can do Economic reports; he would not get money for that. When I was in the Consular Section I was drinking a huge amount of coffee, particularly when I was working on the non-immigrant visa line. I would have as much as six cups of coffee just to keep myself going. Then I moved into the Econ Section and I cut back to one or two cups of coffee a day; I would have cafe con leche (coffee with milk) instead of just pure black coffee, because I wasn't trying for that caffeine effect. So in terms of me, it made it much more pleasant.

But in terms of the economy, the U.S. had and still has a sugar quota policy. The sugar quota policy makes no economic sense. It both benefits and penalizes places like the Dominican Republic which are natural sugar producers. The policy was set up mostly for the benefit of a few small, well I shouldn't say small, a few businessmen with sugar production mostly based in Florida and Louisiana. The Fanjul brothers, Cuban-Americans, were the ones who controlled most of it at that time; I don't know if they are still involved with sugar today. Countries get a quota. You can bring in so much sugar in this quota and the sugar that you bring in is at the American price. Because it is a closed market, this is a much higher price than the world price for sugar. Then the rest of your production can't be sold to the U.S. You sell in your own country and you sell globally. It benefits you in the sense that what you are allowed to sell in the U.S. you can sell at a very high price, but it penalizes you in that you can't just go and sell everything at the largest, closest big market, the U.S. A free-market economist would say you should be shutting down production in Florida and Louisiana if they can't compete with places like the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Nicaragua, and you should bring in as much sugar as you can.

Then the other big thing was tourism. The DR had resorts all over the country, a growing industry which continues to grow today. It's very successful; the beaches were beautiful.

At the time I was there some parts of the country were still relatively inaccessible. I had a Jeep CJ7, so I used to go exploring. There was one beach I remember called Playa Grande, the big beach. A at that time there were no hotels on Playa Grande; now I understand there are. When you got to Playa Grande the width of the beach was maybe about 400 yards and the length was something on the line of three or four miles. Other than seeing maybe a campesino with his donkey, you could just wander around with nobody else. Then there were places where the resorts had been established, Samaná, Sosúa. Throughout the country you had resorts, the next biggest industry after sugar. Then you had some textiles, you had the Zona Franca, Duty Free zones, where you had some production.

But the economy, other than sugar and tourism, wasn't really a flourishing economy. There was high unemployment, a lot of poverty, a lot of subsistence farming. When I first arrived it was summer and I wasn't allowed to take any leave, but then when we got to the Labor Day weekend I took the four days after Labor Day. That gave me a weekend, all of the week and then another weekend. I used that to go from Santo Domingo driving on the southern coast to the Haitian border, then along the border with Haiti up to the north, and then along the northern part of the Dominican Republic before coming back down to Santo Domingo at the end. So I had a chance to travel around and see a lot of the country. Most of the people outside Santo Domingo were living in small little villages in basic shacks. They would be farming cassava and have some chickens and pigs. They led a very simple and poor life.

Q: Were there any after affects you noticed of the Trujillo regime?

KEAT: Well there was a range of after effects. First, Balaguer, the so-called conservative, he had been working under Trujillo. The conservatives were all descendants of Trujillo and the party that he had established, you know a fig leaf. You had some oddities. The town of Sosúa, this is in the northern part of the country; this was a Jewish town. Trujillo had slaughtered a large number of Haitian Blacks just prior to World War II. He had killed, I'm not sure what the exact number is, and I suspect nobody would have good figures, but I think it was supposed to be around 20 thousand Haitian laborers. The Haitians would come and work on the sugar farms. The work was so bad and so difficult that Dominicans, in general, didn't want to do it. He went, and under his rule, again roughly 20 thousand people were slaughtered. This was publicized in Europe and the United States. To counter the negative publicity, the criticism of him, and because of the situation of Jews in Europe, he agreed to allow German Jews to come and settle in Sosúa. He obviously had a serious problem with Blacks, but he didn't mind Jews. He liked the fact that they were white, so he allowed either 300 or 400 Jewish families to come and settle in Sosúa. It was an oddity. When I went to Sosúa, aside from the beautiful beaches, you also could buy European sausages, European cheeses and things of that sort. So you had that left over from Trujillo's time.

In terms of day-to-day life, it was just your typical third-world country. There was a lot of poverty, a lot of corrupt government. They had elections and the elections I think were quasi-honest. There was no election at the time that I was there, they were leading up to

an election when I was leaving the country, so I didn't experience an election and I can't say to what extent there was actual fraud in the electoral process. I know that the electoral process affected the country in ways that are far greater than here. There was no such thing as a career civil service; every single employee from the janitor on up was working for the ruling party. So you knew that if the President lost, you were out of a job. People really cared about the election and what was going to be happening. When an election was coming up, people were very nervous about spending money and that had an impact on the economy. Because I was leaving about six months before the next election, for example, it was difficult for me to sell my Jeep. Normally selling something like a Jeep would be very easy to do because it is a very practical car for a place like the Dominican Republic. I remember having great problems in selling it and finally I did end up selling it to some Europeans who were coming to the country to set up a resort. I had been surprised because people before me with cars like that had sold them instantly with no problems at all.

Q: How about Haiti? I've been told by people who served there that there was a real line meaning that there really just wasn't much to do with Haiti.

KEAT: There wasn't much to do with Haiti. The employees on the sugar cane fields were almost all Blacks and either were people who had come from Haiti just for the harvest or people who had come from Haiti and had settled in the Dominican Republic and were allowed to work in this role. This was very much quasi-slavery, it was very disturbing. I would want to emphasize that Dominicans were extremely prejudiced against Blacks and extremely prejudiced against Haitians which, of course is ironic. Most Dominicans were mulatto so they were a mixture of a Black and white but depending on how white your skin was that would increase your status in society. One of the candidates for President, José Francisco Peña Gómez, was a very, very Black man. Some members of the military had often indicated that they would not allow him to become President because he was Black.

But going back to your question with the Haitians, when I drove along the border it was very clear. When I got high up on the Dominican side in some of the mountains I could look over to the Haitian side. It was all deforested, unlike the Dominican side where there were trees all over the place. This was the time of Baby Doc Duvalier, and this was the time that Baby Doc was in the process of being overthrown, so it was very difficult. I had wanted to visit Haiti and had tried numerous times and was not able to do so.

I eventually went to Haiti for the Memorial Day weekend just before I was leaving the Dominican Republic, just before my tour was coming to an end. My visit was very disturbing, and made me appreciate the Dominican Republic; I hadn't realized how good I had it serving in the Dominican Republic. I arrived and I was traveling with another guy from the Consulate. There were some people from the Consulate there who he knew from his A-100 class who were traveling, so they had agreed that we could stay in their house. We were met at the airport by yet another guy from his A-100 class, who brought us to the house. When we were driving, most of the streets were very narrow, winding; Port-au-Prince is very hilly. You would see great poverty from the vehicle, much more

poverty than you would see in the Dominican Republic. It again opened my eyes as to actually how well off the Dominican Republic was compared with Haiti; things like seeing a young boy, probably six or seven year's old and naked, washing himself in the street, which I don't remember seeing in the Dominican Republic. Then when we got to the compound where they were living, it was this classic walled compound with guards to let you in. On one side great poverty and then you come in and you have these amazing homes, very luxurious, very nice. But about a week before we came an AID contractor in one of the compounds, not the one we were staying but in a similar one, had been killed. Some of his local employees had been stealing and he fired them. People broke into the compound at night, cut the wires for the phone and for the electricity, came in and executed him and his wife in bed. We were told about this incident, and then the couple who had shown us to the house we were staying in invited us to come over and have something to eat and drink. We were in their place and the power failed. Now in the Dominican Republic the power failed all the time, but when the power failed this guy's wife went into hysterics. She was afraid that maybe the lines had been cut and somebody was going to be attacking them for one reason or another. That made me again appreciate the Dominican Republic. If it happened in the Dominican Republic I would have cursed at another power failure, but I wouldn't have worried that someone was coming to kill me.

One day I went outside the walls to walk around. I was curious to see what it was like. Unlike the Dominican Republic, where I never felt uncomfortable walking around, not only was there great poverty, but immediately I was surrounded by a group of people. They started yelling things. They were speaking, of course, Creole. I spoke very bad French, but very bad French in Creole were two different things, so I couldn't really understand what they were saying. But I could tell that it was hostile. I bee lined back to the safety of the walls. I wouldn't have liked serving in a country where I had to be continually nervous going about.

We did travel around the country a little bit. There is a place Pétion-Ville, up in the hills where the well-off live. I went to a monastery where they ran a school and sold handicrafts. I bought a beautiful trunk and some other things. The handicrafts were nice, but there was constant poverty everywhere you went. Then I went scuba diving. I had learned to scuba dive in the Dominican Republic. We drove along the coast and when you are going along the coast every once in a while you would see a tree but almost everywhere you went all the trees had been cut down.

Q: Were they cut down for …

KEAT: Firewood.

Q: Firewood.

KEAT: Yes. It was very rare that you would see a tree and there was great poverty. In a place that you would see a tree it would usually be, for example, a Club Med; they had palm trees that they were protecting. When we went diving, the whole place had been

fished out, so you hardly saw any fish until you went very deep. When I went deep, I saw interesting coral formations and this huge sponge, a sponge that was bigger than I am, and things of that sort. The lack of fish was a big contrast to the Dominican Republic.

When I got back to Santo Domingo I wasn't quite doing the Pope and getting down kissing the soil, but I certainly had a new found appreciation of how lucky I was I had gone there for my first two years not to Haiti.

Q: While you were in the Consular Section did you find, I assume, a good number of junior officers there?

KEAT: Yes.

Q: Was there a good bonding?

KEAT: Excellent, yes we were all friendly with one another. There were constant parties. Let me give you one example of a great party. Two male junior officers had put their housing allowance together so that they could get an even nicer place. They had this really nice, large, penthouse apartment with a huge balcony area. They had a party with a group Cuatro Cuarenta, 4.40. At their party they probably had about 150 people there and Cuatro Cuarenta. The guy who was lead singer was Juan Luis Guerra and I was talking with him. He and one other member of the group had studied at Berklee in Massachusetts. They were inspired by the Manhattan Transfer. They played merengue but a softer merengue, more vocal. I liked them a lot; everyone liked them and they played a long set. The next time I encountered the Cuatro Cuarenta was when I was serving in Madrid in the early '90s. They were playing a soccer stadium with 80,000 people; they had become fairly popular. So it shows in terms of the experiences you have as a junior officer; things were very close, we were all friends with one another.

I had mentioned before Eric Botts, he and I had different lifestyles. He by that time had a little boy, a little Eric, Jr. I was the single guy going out and he was with a wife and kid, but we still hung out, and we are still friends till this day. I'm having my retirement party this coming Sunday. He's now living in Texas and he can't come to the party but he called me about two weeks ago and we spoke about what is going on in our lives and things of this sort. Tom Navratil is still in the service but he's getting close to the point where he will be retiring. In my last assignment working in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, I would run into Tom at various meetings and we would talk about our kids, etc. One junior officer who was one or two classes ahead of mine, Dan Russell, is now a DAS (deputy assistant secretary of State) in the European bureau. I stayed in contact with these people and we had very close relationships.

Q: Well then you were sold on Somalia?

KEAT: Excuse me, I was...

Q: You were sold on Somalia?

KEAT: Well what had happened was the good advice given to me by my CDO (career development officer) was not so good when it came time to look for my next assignment; I was off of language probation. When I was in the Dominican Republic I was determined that I was going to learn Spanish, so, for example, I refused to speak English with the Foreign Service Nationals. I would only speak to my Dominican friends in Spanish. The Consulate discouraged you from going to Spanish class--you could get Spanish during working hours--but they couldn't forbid you from doing it. I would go to my Spanish class religiously. I got off of language probation after about a year, and it was time to bid. I wanted to do an Econ job but I had already done a job in economics. I had satisfied all tenure requirements. I had done some in-cone work, I was off of language probation, and I had satisfied Consular work. I was finding it very difficult to get an overseas assignment as an Econ cone officer because they wanted to give those to the Econ cone officers who hadn't done Econ work yet, who had done a pure Consular tour the first time around. I didn't want to go back to the United States; I really wanted to stay overseas.

Looking at the jobs that were available, there was a job in Liberia which I bid number one. I had a conversation with Dudley Sipprelle at a party in which he asked me what I was bidding on. When I told him I had bid Liberia number one he looked at me like I was completely crazy. But it was an Econ job and this was at a time when Liberia was still a functioning country. You had a large Voice of America presence there, a large U.S. presence. While it would be a difficult place to serve, I figured that it wouldn't be bad, and again, I would be doing Economic work. I was unlucky and I didn't get it, sort of classic how you actually want to go there so the system won't let you. It ended up going to a tandem couple, one of whom was Economic cone. I forget what other things I was looking at but there was an opening in Mogadishu. It was a stretch position. I was an O-4 and the job was an O-3, a member of the country team, and in charge of all the Economic and Commercial work. Joe McLaughlin, the Deputy Chief of Mission, was encouraging me to apply for it; so I did. Now this is a sign not only that Joe liked me and thought that I was a good officer, but was a sign of my naiveté; I really didn't understand how things worked. If I did, I would have realized that if you are going to be a member of the country team in charge of all the econ/commercial work and you are only a second tour junior officer, it can't be all that important. Because of Joe's intervention I got the posting and got sent there. But first I came back to the United States and did my home leave and then after that…

Q: Did you find on your home leave people didn't ask you much about what you were doing or not?

KEAT: The opposite. I would say they asked me a lot but also they made completely inaccurate assumptions. For example, my then wife was a Black American and she was from Chattanooga, Tennessee. I was visiting Chattanooga and we went to the church that her family went to. It was your classic Black Baptist Church with singing and energy. I was the only white in the church, which was fine, but then the minister in his sermon spoke about how honored they were to have an Ambassador visiting them. Of course, I

was as far away from an Ambassador as you could get, I wasn't even second tour yet since I hadn't even gotten out to Mogadishu. I was a junior officer and he just announced to everyone how honored they are to have the Ambassador there; I said thank you but not really. People made all sorts of assumptions about me and what I was doing. Somalia had its problems but people would say things like "Oh aren't you worried about going there, Libya with all of its problems and aren't you are so close to that." Of course Libya and Somalia are very far apart.

Q: People would call up when I was in Yugoslavia there was an earthquake down in Macedonia and people would call and say "My daughter's up in Norway and I was wondering it looks like it is very close. How are things up there?"

KEAT: Probably okay.

Q: Probably okay.

KEAT: When I was on home leave…well first visiting my wife's family they had no comprehension of what I was doing. When we would speak about it they didn't really understand it, it was a problem dealing with her family.

Q: Was a Black/white issue a problem?

KEAT: Yes, I had been very naïve. I obviously didn't have a problem about her being Black, otherwise I wouldn't have married her. But a lot of them had big problems with my being white and a lot of them also had problems with my not being Christian, my Jewish background. This bothered me quite a bit and that was probably the first little chink of problems in our relationship. She had a grandmother who she loved a lot and her grandmother really disliked me, I was just the great Satan in every way you could imagine. It's not fun spending time with a person who makes it very clear that you are evil and there is nothing that can be done about that.

Q: I was wondering when you look at it some of the Christian churches sort of the right-wing Christian churches look upon the Jews as being the chosen people and Israel as being a cause to which they subscribe in a way.

KEAT: Not to say that everyone believed this because not everyone wore their prejudice on their sleeve in the way that her grandmother did. But I think it is more a question of total lack of comprehension. They first didn't have a lot to do with whites and the whites they did have to deal with were probably very abusive towards them; the white cop, the white this and things like that, some authority figure going in and oppressing them in one way or the other, or the white person they would be working for would call them a Nigger, or some other phrase of a similar sort. They didn't have a positive attitude toward whites for good reasons, but they didn't need to carry that over to me.

In terms of Jews I don't think they had any concept of a Jew. They still believed the stuff as Jews being the Christ killer. All the people they knew, whether they were white or Black, were Christians so when it came down to Jews it was huge ignorance.

Q: When you left the Dominican Republic did you see any future there? How did you see things?

KEAT: I didn't see that the country had a great future. Most of them were doing their best to get out of the country and go live in the United States. You have a small group that in the economic oligarchy was doing well. The politicians in both main parties were corrupt and when they were in power, their goal was to rip off the country as much as they could; I didn't see it as having a great future, I didn't have the experience that I have now to realize that it was actually a lot better off than a huge number of other places in the world. I was able to tell that it was a lot better off than Haiti having visited Haiti, but I hadn't yet been to Africa so I didn't see that the Dominican Republic was actually much better off than most places in Africa.

Q: Was there any residue from the events that had happened not too long before you got there in Grenada?

KEAT: Not really, I don't remember people really talking about that, no I don't remember there being any…

Q: It just wasn't a…

KEAT: It wasn't a factor. As I said earlier I didn't have a strong feeling that there was anti-gringo prejudice. When people would say gringo it was on the line of saying somebody who comes from the United States.

Q: Yeah.

KEAT: It wasn't meant as an insult. It wasn't the sort of thing…I remember when I was in graduate school, a Filipina whom I met when I was in Toronto, as soon as she found out that I was a U.S. citizen and not a Canadian citizen changed from being friendly to being very antagonistic because of what she viewed as U.S. support for the Marcos regime. There was nothing similar to that when I was in the Dominican Republic. Many, many people had relatives in the United States. Their dream was to go live in the United States.

Q: The Catholic Church was it important?

KEAT: In the sense that almost everyone was Catholic, but they were Catholic and they didn't go to Church a lot. They would be baptized in the Catholic Church and they would be buried by the Catholic Church, but when they were living their day-to-day lives the men and women would have multiple affairs and have multiple children by whomever. When I was working in the Immigrant Visa Section you would see women coming in

with birth certificates of her kids and they would either show that the father was unknown because she was sleeping with so many different men at that time or they would show one kid with one father and another with another and another with another, etc.; to whatever extent they were Catholic they certainly were not practicing what the Catholic Church was preaching. At this time, the Unification Church, the Moonies, were becoming relatively strong in the Dominican Republic. There was one Dominican woman whom I was dating for a while whose father had become estranged from her family because he was not only part of the Unification Church but he had become one of their highest level official in the Dominican Republic. Her mother was a Catholic. She wouldn't divorce her husband because she didn't believe in that as a Catholic. She more or less kicked him out of the house and had nothing to do with him because of his role in the Unification Church. In the time I was there and after she and I had broken up, he was assassinated because of his role in the Church.

Q: You mentioned this Jewish community. Did they welcome you with open arms or did you identify yourself as Jewish or anything of that nature?

KEAT: I identified myself, they had a Synagogue and I was curious to go and see their Synagogue. There was this older man who had come over; he married a Dominican woman and he had children. His children had since gone to live in the United States; I believe in New York City. They had some cottages. I stayed in his cottages the first time I was there and then every other time I went I stayed in those cottages because they were very nice. I would speak with them and speak with his wife. It wasn't a religious thing. We weren't going and praying together or anything of that sort, but it was interesting talking with him about what his experiences had been.

Q: Well I guess this is probably a good place to stop and we will pick this up when you are off to Somalia.

KEAT: Okay.

Q: Today is the 2nd of October 2012 with Stephen Keat and we are going to Somalia. How did the Somali assignment happen?

KEAT: Sadly enough, I did perhaps too good a job in the Dominican Republic. The Deputy Chief of Mission there, Joe McLaughlin, who had been the deputy chief of mission in Mogadishu before he came to Santo Domingo, liked me and thought I was doing a good job. He recommended me for the position in Somalia. I was a junior officer, an untenured O-4, at that time, and the job in Somalia was a stretch position; it was an O-3. It was a position which had been vacant for a long period of time; as I found out later, my predecessor had had a nervous breakdown because of the stresses in dealing with Somalia. While you heard different stories, one of the stories I was told is that the Marines came to get her out of her apartment and that she was literally throwing knives and other things at them because she had taken it so badly. I didn't witness any of this, but given how difficult Somalia was, I find that highly credible.

Q: In the first place you were in Somalia from when to when?

KEAT: That would have been 1986 to 1988.

Q: Were you married at the time?

KEAT: Yes, I was. I had married in the Dominican Republic before I left. The marriage started unraveling almost immediately and certainly being in Somalia did not assist.

Q: I don't want to get into persona details but the Foreign Service, was it a factor in unraveling a marriage?

KEAT: Well yes, because it was also a factor in our getting married. We had met when I was in the Dominican Republic; she was an American medical student studying there. We had a relationship for somewhere between a year and a year and a half. Like many people, my tour was coming to an end and I had a choice at that point in time; I could either marry her and she could come with me to my next assignment or we could break-up. If I hadn't been in the Foreign Service, we probably would have dated for a longer period of time and perhaps not have gotten married. So the Foreign Service contributed to our getting married and then going to Somalia. I don't blame the Foreign Service; it was my own choice to go there; I applied to the position, but certainly that is not a good way starting out a marriage.

Q: Actually, Somalia you know if I was to think about it would be fairly quiet down on my honeymoon preferred list.

KEAT: It was the second stupidest thing I had ever done in my life; the stupidest being getting married to the woman I was married to at that time. They were both big mistakes on my part.

Q: So you were in Somalia and when did you get there?

KEAT: I would have gotten there in August/September of 1986.

Q: What was the situation there at the time?

KEAT: Mohamed Siad Barre was the dictator; he was our dictator, a Marxist-Leninist thug who had turned to the United States for support when Ethiopia had its communist revolution and when the then Soviet Union and the Cubans fought with Ethiopia against the Somalis. He then turned to us. We did not have a formal military relationship but we did have a military relationship. For example, we didn't have bases in Somalia; we had staging areas where we would put field hospitals in case of U.S. involvement in a war in Afghanistan or Iran. We had runways that had been built by the Soviet Union, particularly in the north at Berbera, and in the south at Kismayo. We had inherited the entire infrastructure that they had built in the north, Berbera and Hargeisa; Kismayo is a port to the south. So we inherited all their infrastructure and we had people working up

there. They were contractors, not official U.S. Government employees. But if you are getting a salary from the U.S. government, you certainly have something to do with us. When I went up on business trips to the region, the contractors met me, and arranged for me to go to my meetings and do the other work I needed to do. They fulfilled the roles of U.S. Government employees whether or not they were direct hire personnel.

In Mogadishu itself, at the point of time that I arrived, Siad Barre was still very much in control; he was in control of the whole country with a very ruthless, efficient dictatorship. The secret police had been trained by the KGB, by the Stasi, and by the West Germans. The West Germans were grateful because of a hijacking of a Lufthansa plane which landed in Mogadishu; the Somalis cooperated 100 percent with the West Germans. The West Germans provided assistance as did the United States; our intelligence agencies and other parts of our government, all fully cooperated with them. With all this training, the Somali secret police was very ruthless and efficient. I was constantly followed around, of course, as was everyone else from the embassy, which had both its good and its bad sides. The bad side was, of course, was that we were followed around; the good side is that it did provide you with a certain amount of projection. If somebody would start to do something untoward to you, it wouldn't have been healthy for them.

Q: As we've learned to our sorrow the Somalis are very much a tribal society, tribes are important. Were we having problems with local warlords or that sort of thing?

KEAT: Okay, well first I would phrase it differently than you did. In a superficial way you could say it's a tribal society, it's a clan society because that's how they organize themselves and that is something that I wouldn't expect that people who haven't either lived in Somalia or studied it to necessarily understand. But the whole Somali framework is one that makes it extremely difficult for a Westerner to function there. You have circles of relationships in Somalia. It comes from being a nomadic society. Relationships are based on murder; this may sound strange but it's the way it is. The reason it is based on murder is, for example, if you are my second cousin and my third cousin goes and kills you, I am required to go with the relatives of my second cousin after the third cousin and the relatives of the third cousin in a revenge attack; sort of Hatfield and McCoy but carried to a new level.

In Somali society you have a nuclear family, although they don't think of it as a nuclear family. You have the man, since it is an Islamic society, up to four wives, you have the various children that the man has had with these wives and you have his most valuable possession, which is his livestock. His livestock is worth more than his wives are; it's not necessarily worth more than his sons, but would be worth more than his daughters. Then you will have his brothers and the other relatives. As you keep moving out, you get further away in the relationship and then you have the sub-clan. Each sub-clan has a distinctive name. Within the sub-clans there will be very intricate relationships that only the Somalis will understand. There is no way that someone like myself, if I were to be in Somalia, even if I would be fluent in Somali, studied Somali to a great extent, there would be no way I would fully understand it; the Somalis would never accept me. You could never really be a full friend of a Somali in the same sense that I had full friends in

other countries. Some of them were friendly with me, but there was always a barrier that I had never encountered in other countries.

As you keep moving out, you get bigger and bigger circles. You get the clan, then you get the Somali people which would be defined basically as people who speak the Somali language. After that you would have Muslims and then after that, the rest of the world. In terms of relationships with people, the closer in you get the more constrained you are, the more respect you have to show to people, the more when they come to your house you want to greet them very well, etc. But the further out you get, if you are getting past Muslims, if you are getting to the infidels, you don't owe these people anything. When an infidel comes to your house, you may show courtesy, ask them to sit down, give them some tea and things of that sort, and obviously if it is useful to you to show friendship to them you will. But there is no particular moral problem about killing somebody who is an infidel. The society is extremely violent because of the harshness of the nomadic life.

When you are a nomad and you are in one area, and keep in mind you don't have ties to that area per se, because remember you are a nomad and move from one place to another. You are in this area and the rains have failed. You go and look for a place that there have been rains and where the pasture is still healthy. But, as the population expanded over the years, you have more people and when you are going into that area there are already people and livestock there. How do they respond to you coming and how do you respond to their being there? You kill each other and whoever is the strongest wins. So the strongest men will go and take the women and they now become their wives. They will go and take the children and the children, depending on their ages and their utility, they will either be killed or they will become somebody working for them. Depending on a whole range of things, they become sort of adopted children or they become *de facto* slaves.

Southern Somalia at this time had Black slavery. It wasn't official, but it did exist. I don't know whether it exists today any more. You had a very harsh and difficult society. Having lived there for almost two years and having worked with Somalis, I had a very good understanding for a Westerner of their society. But I would also argue that I am totally ignorant about that society. It is not my fault. It is just a very impenetrable society.

Q: Let's talk about first sort of the American presence there. Who was the Ambassador and DCM, what were you doing and then we will talk about what America was doing in the area.

KEAT: Sure. When I arrived we didn't have an ambassador, we had a Chargé, later the DCM, David Rawson, who became ambassador to Rwanda.

David and his wife were both very decent people and we were blessed to have them. Actually, even though I didn't intentionally use the word blessed in this way, it makes sense because they were both very religious Christians. We were blessed to have them; they managed to get along with everybody. He always had a smile and he always was laughing. While he was an important officer, he wasn't protocol conscious. For example,

I invited him and Sandy, his wife, to come to my apartment for dinner. I was a second tour junior officer who had been at post for something like a month and a half. They came and we had a very pleasant diner, enjoyable conversation and so on. So again, he wasn't super protocol conscious. He was Chargé for about my first eight months there. I was in charge of the Economic/Commercial section and I was a member of the country team. It was very difficult work because of the country, but in another sense writing economic reports was easy because there wasn't very much of an economy to report on.

Q: Bananas was it?

KEAT: Bananas, livestock on the hoof, frankincense and myrrh. This is the land of Punt. If you remember the story of baby Jesus, this is the land of frankincense and myrrh. I still have some dried out frankincense and myrrh.

Q: Oh now you say frankincense and myrrh which is which and what?

KEAT: Well they are both gums from trees, bushes that grow in Somalia, obviously from different trees and bushes; I'm not an expert on this.

Q: Okay so…

KEAT: They are incense. I have a meerschaum incense burner; Somalia has huge reserves of meerschaum for whatever that's worth. I don't think anyone is going to go to war for it, but they are easy to get at, they are close to the surface. The Somalis would carve incense burners from the meerschaum, put the frankincense and myrrh in burners and put a hot coal from the fireplace. They didn't have a lot of water and the people didn't bathe a lot, so they would go and pass the incense burner underneath their robes, particularly the women. This would be their equivalent of perfume. Economic reporting was a challenge; I had to be creative because there were no good statistics. The statistics that they had were out of date on even basic things such as the population of the country. There were estimates of the population that were as low as two million people and as high as ten million people. This was a very important political issue to the Somali government as they would get a lot of aid, particularly aid for refugees, based on the number of people; it was always claiming that it had more people than it probably did.

At that time we had to write something called an Economic Trends Report; I think they've been eliminated, but in any case in it I had to put in figures for population, GDP, GDP per capita, GDP growth, population growth and so on. I was under pressure to get this done because one hadn't been done for two or three years. I decided that I believed the population was somewhere in the range of six million people. If you had wanted me to defend that, there was no way of defending it; my response to you would have been "please tell me what you want it to be." I found an old World Bank or IMF document in which it provided a figure for total GDP. Then I found a document from the other institution which provided a yearly growth figure for the economy. So using these figures, making educated guesses, and doing some math, I came up with statistics for the population, the per capita GDP, the growth of the GDP, etc... We had to provide figures

for the previous year, the current year and a projection for the next year. All of this, again from my point of view, was somewhat dubious, but I was fully transparent with my bosses as to what I was doing. If they had wanted me to do it in a different way, I would have. Experiences like that one make me skeptical about the economic reports and the other reports that have come out of a lot of places in the world and then are relied upon by others.

The most important part of my work was renegotiating Somalia's debt with the United States. This is an example of how we tie ourselves in knots; cause ourselves problems that we don't really need to. We had, and maybe still have, something called the Brooke Amendment. It was named for then Senator Edward Brooke from Massachusetts, a Republican Senator. The Brooke Amendment said that if a country falls behind in its debt payments to the United States, they will not receive any foreign assistance. That sounds like a reasonable thing except for the fact that we were providing assistance to the Somali government as a *de facto* payment for the military access rights that we got; again we didn't call them bases, they were military access rights. Siad Barre didn't have us stay because he loved us. Siad Barre had us there because of the money they were getting. To be more accurate I'd say there were three things that he cared about. One was the "non-lethal" military assistance we were providing. I will leave it up to you to decide what is lethal and what is not lethal but that was what he definitely appreciated. I don't think he cared about the humanitarian aid in a major sense. When AID projects were built, after they were completed, they usually fell into disuse. But in the process of building an AID project, there were all sorts of opportunities for graft. The projects imported Land Rovers. The workers would have TV sets and the whole infrastructure that Americans bring with them when they go to these difficult places. So when the AID project would end, these things would go to the government; it was a spoil that could be divided up amongst his supporters, people who came from his clan or clans that were aligned with his clan. So in that sense it was a very useful thing.

Looking at assistance, if we were to stop our assistance payments we would lose our military access rights and we would be out of there. We cared about military access rights because of the Soviet Union and the situation in Afghanistan, and then also because of the problems in Iran; there were all sorts of possibilities that there might be U.S. involvement in that area and that we might need staging areas, we might need field hospitals for the wounded, a whole range of things.

I had to go and first figure out what the Somali debt was, second renegotiate it with the Somalis, get it signed, and then get it all back to Washington. Now those things sound easier than they were. We would get cables warning us about the upcoming Brooke deadlines, but I couldn't find anywhere anything that would show what the loans were, what it was that Somalia owed us. You would think it would be nice if it would be similar to a mortgage from my local bank. You would hope that if I went into them and said, "Well how much did you loan me and how much do I still owe you," that they would be able to say well you have been making payments every month and you owe us $365 per month and you have 20 payments left. Well there was no easily available information on the loans. I sent something like ten or fifteen cables back to the Pentagon asking for

information about what the Somali debt was. These were just falling into a black hole. I would send the cables and would never get a response. I would speak with David Rawson about the problem. This was a time when if you wanted to make a phone call it would cost you something like $70 or $80 a minute and it had to be arranged ahead of time because it was going through the Somali system. You couldn't just pick up a phone and call people and say, hey what's going on here. It is not like today. Of course, there was no such thing like the Internet at that time. I was working in a "backward third world country" and I had a contact in the central bank. I was speaking with him about the problems. He said, "Oh, I can help you. Come to my office tomorrow." So I went to his office and he pulled out this folder and there he had very clear records of all the loans that had come from the U.S. and of all the previous renegotiations and what the next amount was that was coming due and so on. So the information that I couldn't get from the Pentagon I got from this third-world bureaucrat which says something about first-world bureaucrats and that we shouldn't be so conceited.

Now that I had figures I could work from, I drew something up. The negotiation process was very simple because this was a farce. The Somalis had absolutely no intention of ever paying us back any of the money, so whatever I proposed they would agree to. I just drafted something. It rolled the payments that were due into the principal and moved everything forward. The first payment was going to be due a year from then, two years from then, whatever the exact date was. The Somalis were delighted to sign and we sent it back to Washington. I think it was either David Rawson, or the Ambassador who might have arrived by that point in time, I don't remember, but one or the other of them signed on behalf of the United States government. We sent it to Washington and everyone was happy. But again, it shows the challenges of working in a place like that and of dealing with the U.S. bureaucracy.

Q: I know at one time back at the end of the '50s I was in INR and I had the Horn of Africa and I very quickly realized that in Ethiopia and Somalia if you had either of those basically Somalia was up for grabs. If you had good relations with Ethiopia and needed it as we did with Kagnew Station then Somalia sort of fell on the outskirts. You couldn't get too close. But later when Mengistu took over Ethiopia, Somalia was out there and Somalia was ready to be taken. You were there during the time of that. How stood things in that situation?

KEAT: Somalia didn't have a choice in one sense. The Soviet Union and the Cubans had fought against them and now were allied with Somalia's arch enemy, Ethiopia. The only choice they would have would be to totally stand alone or to ally themselves with the U.S. While we were annoying to them about human rights, in the real world they ignored that and we didn't push that hard on it. In fact, when Ambassador Crigler came in, he very much did not push on human rights issues. So human rights really weren't a huge problem and they appreciated the "non-lethal assistance". They also probably assumed that the military access rights--bases by any other name, or skeleton bases-- gave them a certain amount of protection. They probably realized that the Soviet Union would restrain Ethiopia if Ethiopia was thinking about attacking and possibly killing U.S. citizens. The

chances of Ethiopia attacking them at that point was probably fairly low; they had gone to war over the Ogaden area of Ethiopia which is an ethnic-Somali area.

Now in terms of the U.S. relationship with them when…well some of this I am now going to speculate on. I say speculate because it wasn't possible for me to exchange emails, pick up the phone and talk with people in Washington in that era. But I think we were so obsessed or so concerned--concerned is probably a better word--about the situation in Iran and the situation in Afghanistan, that we were willing to overlook the flaws of Said Barre's regime. Ambassador Crigler had a difficult personality and he didn't get along with the Somalis, although he did try and do so. He didn't get along with his fellow Americans. In contrast to David Rawson he was a very prickly person, very convinced of his own importance and oblivious to cultural things you would expect an ambassador would be aware of. When he arrived at post, various Somali ministers and members of the country team were waiting to meet him at the airport.
The Ambassador got off the plane. Rather than greet the ministers, the first thing he did was go where baggage was being unloaded from the plane. The Ambassador had a large dog. He got his dog out of the cage, made sure the dog was okay, was petting him, and the dog was jumping all over him. To Muslims, a dog is right up there with a pig in terms of being unclean. After he had the dog licking him, the Somali ministers wouldn't shake his hand. They were also insulted that he had gone to see the dog before he went to see them. That got his time in the country off to a bad start. .
Ambassador Crigler was imperious and quite frankly there wasn't one head of agency that I was aware of whom liked him and who welcomed him coming there. They all would make a point of trying to work through David Rawson rather than through the ambassador.

Shortly after he arrived I was no longer on the country team, but not due to anything I had done. Ann Inspector General's mission prior to my arrival had recommended merging the Econ and the Political sections; this was something that I was upset about until I met Ambassador Crigler. Part of my going to Mogadishu was I my desire to be head of my own section and to be on the country team. But when I met Ambassador Crigler and quickly found out how difficult he was, I welcomed the fact that there was now a new layer of bureaucracy in-between him and myself. I, for whatever it is worth, I think having combined political and economics sections around the world is one of the major mistakes that the Foreign Service made in my time. What this, in effect did, in most cases was to guarantee that political officers would be in charge of combined pol/econ sections and that political reporting would get emphasis over economic reporting. Each has their role and I don't think it makes sense to mix the two of them, but that is just an aside. The ambassador really wanted to be liked by the Somalis, he wanted to be popular with the Somali government but all the reports that I would get back from my Somali contacts and from other people is that the Somalis really didn't like him because of his personality. He would invite them over to his residence. He was a former music major and he had a grand piano which he had arranged to be brought to Mogadishu at great expense to the U.S. government. He would invite the Somalis and let them sit there and listen while he was playing piano. This didn't go over well with the Somalis; he

would keep trying, but he had this tin ear in terms of his relationship with them and his understanding of their culture.

Q: How about Mrs. Crigler?

KEAT: I don't remember anything about her one way or the other, either positive or negative. I don't have strong memories of her, contrasted to Sandy Rawson whom I remember as being a warm, open, loving person. I guess this is probably a mean thing to say, but she must have been a good person to deal with her husband.

Q: Yeah. What about relations within the embassy and the Americans before and after, how did this happen?

KEAT: I had a very naïve attitude when I was going to Somalia. I thought it was going to be a hardship post, but because of the hardships we would all pull together and work cooperatively. But it was the opposite and it only got worse after Ambassador Crigler got there. The hardship of living in the place made people constantly tense, in a bad mood, and they tended to fight interagency to an extent that I'd never seen in other posts; it's not to say that you don't have interagency battles in other posts. But the AID mission was them against the world; other agencies again didn't have a good relationship with the ambassador. On the AID mission, just to give you an example we had at first a male AID director, I'm trying to remember his name but can't remember it right now. He was replaced by a woman, Lois Richards, a very abrasive person. She used to curse in a very vulgar and loud way. I know this upset a lot of her staff; some of my friends at AID would complain about her all the time.

Coordination meetings on economic assistance were held once a month under UN development program auspices at their office. Representatives of non-governmental organizations, different embassies and international programs would participate. The whole purpose was to talk about what we were doing in Somalia. Lois Richards would participate. I had been asked to go to the meetings by the Ambassador so we would also have an idea of what was going on. She came up to me at one of these meetings and said, "What are you doing here? I represent the United States government." I remember being quite taken aback about this because other people could hear what she was saying and I thought it was most inappropriate. I didn't answer her; I simply reported it back to the DCM and the Ambassador. It was just another example of how the interagency process wasn't working well; but it sticks in my mind as a vivid example.

We had a large military presence in the Embassy, military attachés; we had a military assistance program which was run by Colonel Albert V. Short, a very nice guy. I liked him a lot. He was married. I think this was his second marriage, but whether it was his second or first, the woman he was married to, this was her second marriage. She had a little boy who was maybe about ten or eleven years old. At that time we had elementary school up through early middle; we didn't have any high school instruction in country. Colonel Short was the head of the Cub Scouts or Boy Scouts; I guess it would have been Boy Scouts. I volunteered to go with him to help out. I'm not particularly skilled at that

sort of thing and I said to him, "If you want an adult along and if you want to tell me what to do I will do my best." When we were camping, and we were camping in the middle of Somali desert, it was true camping. The military assistance mission was one of the two branches of the U.S. government the Somalis were most enthusiastic about. Their work went relatively well and they had good access.

Military attachés had some prestige because they were military and Somalia was a military dictatorship, but they were more limited in terms of their access. We would get better information out of the members of the military assistance missions than we would from the ones who were officially there to gather information. The Ambassador blocked attaché reporting in the second half of my time there, when the civil war in the north was raging. Government forces bombed Hargeisa and something in the range of 200-300 thousand people fled Hargeisa.

Q: The old name is called British Somalia.

KEAT: Yes, but they fled from there to Ethiopia. If you were fleeing from anywhere in the world to Ethiopia at that point of time, you were not an economic tourist. You were someone who had very legitimate concerns for your life and for the lives of your family. I remember we were getting reports from the military attachés and from other parts of the Embassy about various atrocities being committed by government forces. The Ambassador was blocking the reporting of this to Washington; I think he was blocking because he didn't want to complicate his relationship with the Somali government by allowing the information to get to Washington. When the military attaché would say we had reports that in the following town this is what happened; these people were killed, these women were raped, etc., etc. The Ambassador would say, "Well, how did you hear about this?" "Well I was told this by a source." "Do you have corroborating evidence?" So unless they would have had a second source that had seen the exact same thing, he wouldn't allow it to be reported. Even if you had different sources reporting very similar things around the whole area, he did his best to block that reporting. I don't know to what extent reporting was getting back through other channels. I'm sure there would have been some.

Q: I'm sure when you try to stop that it stops the official communications. People write letters, they get that.

KEAT: Yes, I understand, but he was definitely doing his best to put a spin on the relationship.

Q: When you are in a particular small place like that it can't have helped relations with those of you who are reporting and trying to do your job.

KEAT: As I said before, one of the two stupidest things I'd done in my life was going to Somalia. It was extremely uncomfortable, extremely dangerous and the work was very frustrating. I could see the country starting to fall apart around me, and I could see that our policies were not effective in a humanitarian way. Our AID programs were not doing

anything to help the Somali people; that perhaps is an exaggeration, there might have been something where in one individual's life, let's say a clinic was built, or whatever, and there might be people who were helped in the short term. But, in terms of reforming the economy, in terms of giving them infrastructure that they could use, we did not help them. We would build irrigation systems that relied on pumps. These pumps relied, of course, on fuel, and once we pulled out, the Somali government didn't have the money for the fuel. Even if it had some aid funds for the fuel, you have to maintain these pumps, so you need trained engineers and mechanics. Looking at our AID program, it was ineffectual at best. In terms of our relationship with the government, it was a very difficult relationship and it was purely based on their desire for military assistance and their desire for whatever they could steal from AID programs. I often said, and I realize this would go nowhere with Congress, but I often said that what we really should have looked at our total assistance in Somalia and gone to Siad Barre and said, "We are canceling our assistance package but we are going to give you 20 percent of it directly deposited into your Swiss bank account and in return for that you give us military access rights." That would have been better for all sides, but it would be very hard to sell with Congress and probably a lot of people would have ethical qualms about it.

Q: Did you feel at the time that Siad Barre's hold on the situation was being weakened or not?

KEAT: Yes, by the time I was leaving he was referred to as the mayor of Mogadishu. The central government when I arrived in one sense had strong control of the country. Strong control is a relative concept you are talking about a nomadic society. Nomads wandered from one place to another, hence the census was very difficult, they are armed and they are violent and they are used to people trying to kill them, steal their wives, steal their kids, etc. So their immediate reaction when they see somebody is that they are going to fight. Then you had the Ogaden War. The Ogaden War left battlefields littered with dead bodies and weapons. The nomads went to the battlefields and liberated the bodies of AK-47s, of hand grenades and other weapons. So when you were going through the desert and you ran into a nomad, not only was this person who was used to violence, but this was an extremely well-armed person used to violence. While in theory the government was in charge when you were going through Mohamed's territory, Mohamed was in charge and you were very polite to Mohamed if you knew what was good for you. Then the regime started to break down. Hargeisa revolted and violence was spreading. General Morgan was the son-in-law of Siad Barre. He was in charge of the military district where Hargeisa was and he committed horrible atrocities. I went up there one time with the visiting desk officer and we met General Morgan. We had to be very careful about how we spoke with him as we were very aware both that he was a powerful and important man but also a man with hands dripping with blood. He was almost like a mini-Saddam Hussein. He invited us for dinner, and you couldn't turn down General Morgan for dinner. I remember him taking us to the back part of his house and he had a private zoo there. He had all these different animals including some leopards in cages. Later on, reports about Saddam Hussein reminded me of that. Haile Selassie supposedly had lions.

Q: I've heard stories about people hearing them roaring at night which could be discomforting if you didn't know where. What about this northern revolt? How did it come about and how did it play out during your time?

KEAT: Well you mentioned British Somalia. To a certain extent you have the north vs. south division, but that's a western way of viewing it. The southern area was Italian controlled and the northern area was British controlled so you did have people in the south speaking Italian and people in the north speaking very good English. But you have to look at clan divisions. The clans in the north were different from the President clans and the clans allied with him. They wanted power and given how the society was structured, if you lose power it's not like when Bush beat Gore. Al Gore was no longer Vice President, didn't become President but won a Nobel Prize and has lived very well since then. In Somalia, if you are out of power, you are killed and all your wives are raped or murdered, all your kids are murdered or enslaved, so there are definitely downsides to losing power. When conflict breaks out, they are ruthless. If you go past my time, you have northern Somaliland that is a *de facto* independent country and you also have Puntland that is right up there in the north, so if you think about it even being British then the two should be together but they are not together because there are different clans involved.

Q: The Danakil is something similar, the tribes were trying to spill over into Djibouti I thought?

KEAT: The people in Djibouti are ethnic Somali. When you say "spill over," that's a very good way of putting it because all these borders are artificial western creations. That's why you had the Ogaden War. The nomads going back and forth they don't know that there is a line in the desert here; this is just pasture, pasture is over here and that is where I am going. All of these national boundaries were totally artificial creations. If you go down to Kenya, the northern part of Kenya along the Somali border has a heavy Somali population.

Q: Were there any real developments in north-south or this civil war?

KEAT: Well the biggest development was the number of people fleeing to Ethiopia; it was just a sign of the violence as it was intensifying. Within Mogadishu it was becoming more dangerous, including for a Westerner. There were cases of people being attacked. A Western woman was on the beach and some people cut her throat. It was going from a situation where the secret police had very firm control to where the violence was beyond what they could deal with. I remember one time when I was in the market. In countries like Somalia you bargain with people, that's the system. I was bargaining with somebody about something and the guy got angry with me. I guess he didn't like the way I was bargaining. He started to talk about "you foreigners who come here" and he made vague threats. Then a guy came out of the crowd and spoke with him, this was one of my secret police watchers. The merchant calmed down a little bit but had this angry look. The policeman turned to me and said in English, "I recommend that you leave now." You could see deterioration also in terms of the government's behavior. It is hard to say

whether this is a reflection of deterioration or a reflection also of the uneasy relationship that they had with the infidels that were crawling all over Mogadishu.

There was one case of an employee for USAID who was having a party. He had a maid was working for him. One thing to keep in mind, in Somalia, unlike other countries, it was very rare for a servant being male or female to actually live in the residence of the people they work for. They would usually go home to their own family at night as compared with Kenya where at my home there was a little house out back where the gardener had a room and where the housekeeper had a room; you had nothing of that sort in Somalia. In any case, he was having a party and his maid was working late that night. He offered to drive her home. That was a big mistake. They were stopped by the secret police. The secret police saw this Westerner driving a Somali woman and started questioning her. They pulled her out of the vehicle and beat her to a bloody pulp with him watching. Then they turned to him and they said, "We don't want to ever see you driving a Somali woman around again." He was "doing a favor for her" but it was a big mistake. Was this related to the deterioration in relationships or deterioration in control of the central government or was this just something that would have just happened two years before, it's hard to say.

Q: Obviously you were in a very difficult situation. What about social life there?

KEAT: Social life was strained and limited. We had a compound where they would show movies a few times a week. There was a movie projector and you'd sit outside. You would bring along your folding chair and bring a six-pack of beer or whatever you were drinking. You'd sit outside and they would have old American films, usually have a double feature. My house was near this compound: it was only about a five minute walk. I acquired a pet cat by virtue of being there. I was there for a film. When the film ended, I was walking away and this woman said to me, "There is this little kitten that keeps crawling under my car and I don't want to accidentally crush it. Can you please hold it while I leave?" I grabbed the cat and held it while she drove off. I put it back down on the ground and I started walking off. The cat followed me, and it followed me all the way to my place. So then I had this cat for about 16-17 years afterwards. That was the type of social life that you would have. You would also go to people's homes for dinner and conversation. I had good friend, a German aid worker; he was sort of an angel of death for birds. There were small black birds in the southern part of Somalia where there was cultivation because of the two rivers that went through southern Somalia. Even though most of the people are nomads, you also had people who were settled and had farms. These birds would descend on the fields and strip them clean. It must have been strange being a German doing this, but they would go and gas the fields and in that way kill off these birds. Whatever Rachel Carson would have thought about that, whatever the analogies to World War II, I used to go over to his place and we'd have German wurst and German beer and that was one of the highlights of my time. The French embassy on Bastille Day, that was by far the best day of the year in terms of food because they would fly in French champagne and they would bring in French cheese, and *foie gras*; it was wonderful to have that kind of event after being in Somalia.

I didn't have relationships with Somalis in more than a very limited way. I took some Somalis for lunch and had business contacts; I'm sure they had to get approval of that ahead of time. I'm sure we were being watched the whole time and the conversation was being listened to. If Somalis had come to my house for dinner or something of that sort, the repercussions for them would have been too much. I'm sure they wouldn't have accepted, but if they did it would have been a major mistake; so social life was limited. Towards the end of my tour, social life became even more limited. The main power plant blew up about half the way through my time there; after I'd been there a year or so. This was an example again of Somalia's infrastructure problems. When you are in other countries of the world you often think of power outages like I mentioned in the Dominican Republic. Outages for maybe two or at most eight hours. When the main power plant blew up we had hardly any power for about six months. People who were working for the State Department, we had small generators that we were told we could only run safely for four hours at a time. If you ran it for more than four hours it might overheat and if it burned up you would be out of luck with no power. People who worked for USAID and for some other agencies had generators that they could run all night. If you would think in terms of a security threat, the guys with the generators were either USAID or some other agency, so you could decide who you wanted to go after based on their generator usage. That wasn't a very smart thing to do.

Not having power cut back on what you could do in terms of having people over. With power for four hours at a time it was impossible to have a long dinner party. In terms of stress, I know I certainly was not in a good mood a lot of the time. At night time I would turn on the generator four hours before I wanted to go to sleep and have the air con as cold as possible in my bedroom. When I wanted to go to sleep, I'd go turn off the generator, go into the bedroom and sleep. I would usually be able to sleep for about two hours and then wake up drenched in sweat. I lie in my sweat for the next two hours and then I'd go and turn the generator on and get four hours a sleep until dawn. Then I would shower and go to the office. I was going to the office day after day with six hours or less of sleep. It didn't put me in a good mood and a lot of other people dealing with similar things were also starting off their day in that mood.

Q: Did the fact that you were Jewish have any affect there or was this kept sort of…?

KEAT: I don't remember it being an issue in a direct way, although I can tell you something interesting about their attitudes on Judaism. At first I didn't say anything one way or the other on religion. For Somalis, since I was an infidel, I don't think it mattered. They would be equally disdainful of me if they thought I was Christian and if they thought I was Jewish. Maybe there would be a slight difference, but I am not sure if it would be important. In Somalia at that time there were Christian groups, helping people with food and things of that sort, but it was forbidden for them to try to apostatize. If a Somali was converted to Christianity they would have been killed; this was a very effective way of cutting back on conversions. I was taking Somali language lessons; it was an example of how the economy was less than effective as the teacher was a veterinarian. He could make more money teaching Somali part time than he could practicing his profession even though this was a society where they depended on

livestock. I had gone to see a play at the national theater the night before. The play was in Somali and I was describing the play to my teacher. He said about the actor, "Yeah, he's a very good actor, people like him a lot. They like him even though he is a Jew." I looked at him and reacted with surprise. I said, "A Jew?" because Somalia was 99.9 percent Muslim. He said to me, "Well, no of course he is not Jewish, but about five hundred years ago his family was Jewish and they converted and people remember…" so in that sense, yes they were aware of the issue of Judaism. I think had it been a different actor it might have been, "Oh yes, but he's Catholic" and you know 500 years ago his family converted or else they would have been killed.

Q: Well you left there in '80…

KEAT: I left there in '88; it was an early direct transfer to Kenya. I had gotten assigned to Nairobi where I was going to be the econ officer, one of the econ officers; it was a two-person econ section. There were staffing gaps so I was able to get a direct transfer and when I first arrived in Nairobi I was econ officer, acting econ counselor, acting agriculture counselor and acting commercial counselor. I was there for three or four months doing all those roles before I went on a late home leave to the United States.

Q: Did you instigate this transfer?

KEAT: When I found out there was an option I did everything possible to make it happen. I almost over played my hand; David Rawson said that after a while he was getting pissed off with me. First I had lobbied hard to get the Nairobi assignment. With the Africa bureau, having done Somalia, I had a few chips to call in, so I was able to get that assignment. Then they were asking would I be willing to do an early direct transfer. I was, "please don't throw me in the briar patch." But they had to get approval from David Rawson and he did grant approval in the end.

Q: One thing before we leave. What about the role of bananas? At one point the Italians…this is where the Italians got their bananas. How stood things when; you were there?

KEAT: The banana plantations in the south were all owned by the mafia. There was a company called Somali Fruit which more or less had been given a government monopoly on the export of bananas. The major market was Italy. I don't know if Italy got bananas from anywhere else in the world because I wasn't posted there, but I know my understanding was the mafia had made sure that Somali bananas would be allowed to be sold in Italy and that they controlled production of the bananas. When I'm saying production I'm talking about the big plantations because, of course, there were many small farmers growing bananas. One of the common things we would do would be to go to a bush restaurant. You would be sitting outside with these thorny bushes around you and eat roast baby goat with rice and banana. That would be a typical meal, actually a very tasty meal; that wasn't under control of the mafia. But, yes, one of the major exports of Somalia was bananas.

Q: Did you feel any pressure at all from the banana lobby in the States? Maybe it was the United Fruit but we have a big banana export, was that at all…?

KEAT: No, in my time in Somalia as compared to other countries I've been in, economic interests in the United States were largely oblivious to my existence. One time a guy from Chevron came through because they were looking at possibly doing some exploration in southern Somalia; the oil companies go to the worst places in the world. This guy was based in Nairobi and I particularly remember him because it turned out he had studied at Franklin and Marshall College, where I had done my bachelor's degree. He was a geologist. Franklin and Marshall College had a very good geology department; he had studied there a number of years before me, let's say ten years before I had. So I remember him coming through. It was not a good place for doing business unless you were the mafia. People who came to Somalia to invest would usually lose their money. One example-- not an American businessman--was somebody who had wanted to build a small airport in the southern part of the country. He had paid a bribe to a minister of roughly $100 thousand. After paying the bribe, the minister said, "I want more, I want $200 thousand." So he was then in a position where he could either throw good money after bad or walk away from a loss. So compared to some countries in the third world and even the first world, people pay a bribe but then after they get to do what they wanted to do at first. In Somalia you paid your bribe and then you wouldn't necessarily get anything for it. It was a very difficult place for people to do business.

Somali exports of bananas would have been minor. I remember right, I think total Somali exports were about $7 million in my last year there and total imports were about $90 million, most of which was funded by assistance programs. This was not a vibrant economy; the vast majority of the economy was nomadic, living without currency in the sense that we know currency. To whatever sense they used currency it was the Somali shilling which was pretty much worthless. It had a value, but the government set an artificial value and the black market value was much lower. In the market, people had huge wads of bills. There would be times when there would be shortages of bills; there just weren't enough bills because they didn't have large enough denominations.

I remember a Nairobi based reporter from the Financial Times. He would come to Mogadishu every once in a while. He would take me for lunch and ask me questions about the economy. I was just talking in passing about the shortage of currency when he stopped me and wanted me to go into more detail about this because I just took it for granted. He being an outsider, found this very interesting.

One thing I should probably talk about since one of your earlier questions was about the security situation. I should mention one incident when I was going to the northern part of the country and going to Hargeisa. I went to some refugee camps near the Ethiopian border. The driver took a short cut and, of course it, was unbeknownst to me; I didn't know he was taking a short cut. The area he took us through was an area that we shouldn't have been driving. We came under fire. The fact that I'm here talking with you today indicates that I didn't get killed. But that showed that the government's control of

the north and the government's control of the country as a whole was slipping dramatically in the time that I was there.

Also in terms of your questions about the government's control it's harder in many ways to answer because of the amorphous nature of Somalia and Somali society at that time. It's such a huge country. If you put it over the map of the United States, it would take up pretty much the entire east coast from Maine down to Florida. It's got such low population and communication was so bad at that time -- I assume it is still very bad today -- that things could be happening in the country and you wouldn't necessarily be fully aware of it.

Q: Was there any effort or how set things with Eritrea? Eritrea wasn't a county; it was part of Ethiopia but was it…

KEAT: The Somalis had relations with the Eritrean rebels; they recognized them. We, as the U.S. government, were not involved with the Eritrean rebels or at least, I should say, I was not involved with them. If there were people involved with that I wasn't aware of it.

Q: You left Somalia did Jim Bishop go there at that time or he came later?

KEAT: He would be later.

Q: He had the distinction of having been withdrawn from Liberia and Somalia under fire, people coming over the walls.

KEAT: Well, I can tell you that when I was leaving Somalia it was very clear to me that it was only a question of time. As I mentioned, I went from Somalia to Kenya, we are getting ahead of ourselves but this brings us back to Somalia. After Kenya I went to the Bureau of Intelligence and Research where I was associate editor for Secretary Baker's morning intelligence summary. While I was there, there was a FSO who came to talk to me about Somalia. He was working in INR. He was part of a tandem couple and his wife, I think his wife was USIS, United States Information Service; it doesn't really matter for our purposes. He was going to get a job in the embassy and she was going to be there doing something else. My response to him was do not do it, I said, "This will be a very big mistake if you go. It is only a question of time until the place falls." He said, "Yeah, but I want us to be together." I said, "You are better off each of you going somewhere else than you going together to Somalia." He said, "No, no, no." Then I said to him, "Well look, if you do go, at the very least don't take anything else with you other than your clothing. Everything else can stay in storage because I guarantee you during your time there you are going to be evacuated." I was pretty strong in my opinions about what I thought was going to happen. He ignored me; he went to Somalia, and he apparently took all his worldly possessions with him. Sadly enough, I was right and he and his wife were evacuated. Thankfully they were evacuated with their lives. But they lost everything in the evacuation. I don't think I was particularly insightful when I was making these predictions. It's amazing to me that we didn't have a better idea about how badly things

were falling apart and I guess it is a sign of bureaucratic inertia that we weren't doing something at an earlier stage to get people out.

Q: Well then okay so you ended up in Kenya.

KEAT: Yes.

Q: And you were in Kenya from when to when?

KEAT: I was in Kenya from 1988 through 1989. It was an early direct transfer and as I said, at first I was first working in the economic section as both the economic officer--the job I was assigned to—and as acting econ counselor, acting commercial counselor and acting agricultural counselor. At that time I was still married but my wife had left Mogadishu before I did and had gone back to the United States. She had left for two things. First she had gotten pregnant and second she wanted to study for the exam you take to be a doctor…

Q: OAS the medical.

KEAT: …the medical board, whatever it is. She wanted to take some, Stanley Kaplan courses. I hadn't been happy about her leaving and that didn't fit in well with the deterioration of our marriage while in Somalia. While she was back in the United States she also lost the child. I went back for the funeral, then back to Somalia, and then to Kenya. I was in Kenya on my own at first. I was working very hard because I was covering so many positions, but was really enjoying the work. The first thing is that I loved Kenya. To me it would be hard not to love Kenya, but I think if you are coming out of Mogadishu it certainly gives a wonderful tint to everything. My house, which was called a cottage, was British style; it was a colonial era building. It was on probably an acre or so of land, and you could barely see the front gate from the house itself. It had huge palm trees and roses and all sorts of flowering plants all over the place, a smaller backyard but still fairly good size. By American standards it was a gigantic one. Servants' quarters were in the back and I had a full time gardener and a housekeeper. At the front gate you had a security service, guards. The guards would rotate every 12 hours. The house was beautiful; it had four bedrooms, one of which I used as a study, one was the master bedroom, and the other ones I didn't know what I did with them because I didn't have any kids. But that was in the safe haven area because crime was so bad in Kenya.

Q: You might explain what a safe haven is.

KEAT: A safe haven is a fortified area. Depending on the country you are in, you have different kinds of fortification, but there is a door that you lock at night that separates that part of the house from the rest of the house. If people are breaking in, that door is reinforced and will hopefully stop them from getting to you. The windows have bars and again hopefully will stop them. You have a radio in the safe haven which you would use

for contacting Post One where you would have the Marine guards in the embassy. You also could go and call for reinforcements from the guard force. The guard force was pretty useless as were the guards at the front gate. The guards at the front gate would often be sleeping, often be drunk. They had their jobs due to tribal loyalties. In Kenya you can talk about tribes; you don't talk about clans anymore. So if you complained about your guard…there was one time when I was coming home and I was honking and the guard didn't come to open the gate. I got the gate open on my own and I found him sleeping. He was so drunk that he didn't hear me. I tried to shake him awake, but he was barely moving and barely with it. I complained and he was taken away; he didn't work for me anymore, but probably he just got assigned to somebody else's house, so that didn't really resolve the problem. I got two dogs for security; a Rhodesian Ridgeback, which is the best dog in the world for security and a Labrador Retriever that came as part of the bargain with the Ridgeback. The Lab was a wonderful dog, but useless in terms of security.

Q: He would probably lick an intruder to death.

KEAT: I hoped that if the Ridgeback, a female and very protective, if she had attacked somebody, then maybe the Lab, who was a male and an idiot, hopefully he would have followed her lead. I can't say for sure. In any case, when I got into the house I was so happy to be out of Mogadishu and to be in this place. There were all sorts of basic things that I should have been reporting to GSO, the General Services Office, to have fixed. There were things like lamps where the electrical cord didn't have a plug. I waited about two weeks before I put in any work orders because I was so delighted to be in Nairobi. Everything had a halo. There wasn't anything at all that I really needed to have changed.

Q: Who was the ambassador?

KEAT: Ambassador Elinor Constable, she was career Foreign Service, as in my previous posting. T. Frank Crigler had also been career Foreign Service. I guess I was just unlucky that my second and third postings were where I had the worst ambassadors that I worked for. She was a very difficult person, didn't get along with people, played favorites, things of that sort. Embassy morale was very low as compared to other embassies that I went to afterwards where it was very high. But in terms of my attitude, being in Kenya, when I got there at first I was in love with the place. Just to show how people are funny, the Embassy did not have a commissary and people were complaining. They wanted to buy Hellmann's mayonnaise and Charmin toilet paper and other American products. I thought that you can go to the store and buy mayonnaise and you can go to the store and buy toilet paper, they actually sell it here. I was just so happy to be in a country where I could buy these things at the local stores and they were so concerned about the fact that they couldn't get the American brands that they were used to. It was quite an experience.

Q: What was the situation in Kenya at the time?

KEAT: At that time Daniel arap Moi was President of the country. He was by no means democratic in his outlook. The largest ethnic group in the country, the Kikuyu, was

repressed by his government. Their property was being taken away, and Kikuyus would have trouble getting ahead in business. The Kikuyus were very strong in business but their businesses were discriminated against by the government. When new opportunities opened up, they would go to other tribes, tribes that were aligned with Moi. Crime was a problem, far more of a problem than it had been in Somalia. When I first got to Somalia, crime was not a problem, but when I was leaving it wasn't so much crime as it was just general civil unrest; not to say that wasn't a bad thing to deal with, but it wasn't that they were trying to get your TV, as they were trying to kill you. That may be a fine distinction but it shows the difference in the societies.

Kenyan people had nothing against me as an American, or if they did it wasn't obvious to me. However, they definitely envied the wealth that came with the Western style of life and I had to be very careful. I could walk in the area around the Embassy during the day. There was a Hilton Hotel very close to the Embassy, but at night you couldn't walk from the Hilton to the Embassy, which would be about a five-to-ten minute walk; you couldn't have safely walked that at night.

You had to be careful driving at night. When you were driving at night, you didn't want to stop; you wanted to go from one safe place to another safe place. You could go from your house to a restaurant and park in an area where armed guards were watching over your car. If you were driving and you got stopped at a red light, and somebody hijacked your car, there are a number of things that might happen. I know a case of a woman where they stole her car; they made her strip, and they weren't making her strip to rape her, although she is lucky that didn't happen because that was a frequent problem. They made her strip because they were stealing all her clothing. They are doing this for two reasons. First, your clothing has a value, but second if you are naked and you don't have any shoes, it's harder for you to go after them when they are fleeing. It's harder for you to get help. That is the sort of thing you had to be careful of. When you were in your house, if the gangs would come, they would come with machetes and you would have a gang with say 14-15 guys coming in. They were probably drunk and maybe had taken various drugs. If they got in, they would probably kill everybody and/or rape them.

This is an example of how something that sounded like a good idea was a bad idea. The penal code had the death penalty for murder. But the code also had the death penalty for rape, for aggravated assault, and for robbery. Once I had broken into your house to rob you, if you are there, I might as well murder you. Because if I leave you alive and you testify against me, which obviously you can't do if you are dead, I am going to be just as killed for having robbed you as for having murdered you. If you are a woman I might as well rape you too. When they wrote the penal code, they thought they were fighting crime by making it harsh, but they actually provided perverse incentives for some really, really bad crimes.

It was a beautiful country in terms of the physical infrastructure, in terms of all the wild life, the mountains and the sea coast, but it was a dangerous place in a different way than Somalia was dangerous. People had to be very security conscious. I know I was.

Q: Alright, let's talk about the job. What was happening there and how were you reporting it?

KEAT: When I first got there, of course, everything economic was mine. I would run from one meeting to another. We had a new secretary; we didn't yet use the term office management specialist. We had a new secretary who had been working in Mattel prior to this. She and I were the only Americans in these three sections; everyone else was Foreign Service Nationals, Kenyans. I would run from one meeting to another. There would be some commercial issue and I would ask her to write a letter. I would just tell her to do this and do that, please do this a whole array of different things. The division of labor was a very efficient one, as she managed everything and I was off going and running around doing things. If I had a meeting with somebody, I would dictate a very brief cable to her to send back to Washington with the results of the meeting. Once the Economic, Commercial, and Agricultural section heads got to post, I went to the United States on home leave. When I returned to country, I was in charge of reporting on various economic sectors, including coffee, which was big in Kenya, tea which again was a very big reporting sector, and tourism. I'm trying to remember what other sectors I covered, but those were the most important ones. It was a lot of fun to report on both coffee and tea. I would gather statistics, but there would also be the process of going and talking to people in the business and finding out how things were doing. This was a time, unlike today, where I drank drink coffee and tea. Kenyan coffee in particular is some of the best in the world. Many traders, had their offices near the Embassy. Often when I walked near the Embassy I would enjoy the smell of the roasting coffee in the air; it was just fantastic.

I would visit a trader, let's say at one o'clock in the afternoon. We would sit and talk about the coffee business. Of course, he would offer me a cup of coffee. Since he was a coffee trader, this was going to be the best cup of coffee that he could provide. That is a very civilized way working. After I would get done talking with them, and you have to keep in mind they are doing something that is a favor to me -- I had nothing to offer them. They would say, "Oh, can I give you a kilo of coffee to take with you?" There was no ethics rule against this; I made a point of checking. There was no ethics rule against this, because it was not like I was the GSO and I was going to contract out with them. So, not only would I gather information for my job, but I would get a kilo of really good coffee to have at home. A similar thing would happen during my work on the tea sector.

I had various contacts in the Kenyan business community and the U.S. business community. I was dealing with the oil sector. The head of ESSO Kenya was ethnic British. Because it was in Kenya it had the name ESSO despite the breakup of Standard Oil. But it was part of what today we call EXXON. I remember one time talking to him when he was having a problem with the Kenyan government. He wanted the embassy to help him with it. I said to him, "I would be more than happy to see what we can do to help you but I think if I were the Kenyan government I'd be more concerned about having EXXON upset with me, more than having the U.S. government upset with me." He laughed, but it was a true observation in terms of the power they had in the country.

Unlike Somalia, Kenya had a real economy with regional ports. Mombasa, in particular, was one of the most important ports in that part of the world. But Kenya, both in terms of its political system and its economic system, only looked good in comparison with its neighbors. Somalia was to the north; Uganda to the west, which depending on the point in history you are looking at, had people like Idi Amin and Milton Obote in charge. Then you had Tanzania to the south, which while more or less democratic, was a Socialist basket case. The Kenyan economy only looked good in comparison with them. There was a refinery in Mombasa. Different companies sold gas, ESSO being one of them, but the gas they were selling all came from the same refinery and was all selling at the same price since the government set the price it could be sold at. They would get a certain profit but it was not an entrepreneurial environment. There was a trading class, largely ethnic Indians living in Kenya. In Uganda the ethnic Indians had been kicked out under Idi Amin. The Kenyans didn't do the same, but the Kenyans had much the same prejudice towards the ethnic Indians so they had a difficult life.

Tourism was the major source of foreign exchange. The Embassy produced more economic reporting than when I was in Somalia because there were things to report on. When I think back on the different countries I've been in, while it was fun to report on coffee and tea and certainly more important than reporting on camel exports from when I was in Somalia, these were not important reports. Stephen Keats' report on Kenyan coffee exports would not be shown to the Secretary of State.

Q: You said that Elinor Constable, your Ambassador, was not your favorite Ambassador. How did this intrude on your work?

KEAT: Well in a range of ways. If you look at my face you will see that I have a beard and I had a beard at that time too. The DCM called me into his office when the Ambassador was on vacation and I had just arrived at post; this was something like at the end of my first month there. He had this very serious look on his face.

Q: Who was the DCM?

KEAT: George G. B. Griffin. He had this very serious look on his face. I was thinking, I'm barely at post what have I done that's wrong now? Then he said to me, "I've been speaking to the Ambassador about you." So I'm thinking, oh my God, the Ambassador is not even here and already there is a problem. He said to me "the Ambassador's heard that you have a beard." I said "Yes." Griffin told me that she doesn't like men to have beards. I still remember being totally baffled. It was not that I inadvertently insulted the Foreign Minister or did something of that sort. It was that I had a beard. We concluded the conversation with him suggesting strongly that I shave my beard, which as it so happens, I never did. Not just to stand up to her, but also because I have a face where it gets easily irritated if I shave. Before I ever met her there was already a problem with her about something that quite frankly was completely idiotic.

The Ambassador had problems with a range of people. She did not like the Econ Counselor who was there before I arrived and she gave him a very bad efficiency report.

He had to leave the service; his time in service was coming up and the report prevented him from getting promoted. He went back to Washington a year early for his final year in the service; she arranged for that. There was a woman who was assigned by the Foreign Commercial Service to be the Commercial Officer. Keep in mind this was a female Ambassador. There was also going to be a woman as the Political Counselor and the Ambassador said she didn't want to have too many women on the country team, that it wouldn't be good with the Kenyans if there were too many women. She was able to block the assignment of the female Commercial Officer. This totally blew my mind, to use a '60s phrase, that a) she could get away with this, and b) a woman discriminating against another woman on the grounds that she is a woman.

The Embassy had a two person political section; the Political Counselor was a woman, and a junior person who was male. Washington was going to replace the junior person with a woman. The Ambassador tried to block that woman's assignment but that woman had been studying Kiswahili, studying Swahili, at the Foreign Service Institute and Washington told the Ambassador, "No, we are not going to block her assignment." The Ambassador was able to arrange to have a new position created. She had the male junior officer stay go into that position. He was more or less doing the same work he had been doing before. When the female junior officer came to post she hardly had any work and was bored stiff. You had a situation at post where relationships were very difficult; it was a very arbitrary situation.

In terms of my own life, I had gone back to the United States and I had made the mistake of returning with my wife. My mother later asked me "why did you ever bring her back with you, you should have just gotten divorced at that time," but I was still trying to make the marriage work. So she came to post. She was working as a volunteer in Kenyan hospitals. Our relationship was deteriorating; again it was stupid for me to have brought her to post. After I had been there for about a year, and when I say a year it was about a year after I went on my home leave; I was probably at post for somewhere in the range of fourteen or fifteen months. I ended up leaving and going back to the United States where my wife and I got divorced and where I ended up working in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research.

While I was in Kenya there were fascinating things that I saw and did aside from the fun things you did just as a tourist going to the game parks. I went to the Lake Turkana area, which is where the Leakey's found artifacts that go back to the earliest humans. It's like Somalia in the sense that it is totally different from anything you can imagine, but it's a totally different culture than the one in Somalia. There was a period of time when I was Acting Principal Officer in Mombasa. We had a consulate there at that time, and the Principal Officer was going on home leave. I was there for about three weeks; that was the only period in my career where I was sending out cables and at the bottom of it said KEAT, which was sort of a neat thing. I was doing reporting on the port and its importance to the economy and interviewing local business leaders. Mombasa is, of course, largely a Muslim area so its economy is very different and the whole structure is very different from what you have in the rest of Kenya, or I should say in the non-coastal parts of Kenya.

In that part of Africa you have what you can call the Swahili culture. The Swahili culture to a certain extent starts in the Saudi Arabian Peninsula and goes along the coast. From Yemen it goes along the coast of the Red Sea up to the Sinai Peninsula and then coming down Sudan, what is today Eritrea, Somalia and then down along the African coast Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, and South Africa. This is the culture that comes from the dhow trade. The dhows would go back and forth…

Q: The dhow being a sailing ship.

KEAT: Yes, a traditional sailing ship you would see in Mombasa. It was fascinating how that whole culture worked. The primary religion was Islam, the primary language, at least the language of trade, was Kiswahili. Ki from Swahili actually means the language of, so it is the language of the Swahilis. The Foreign Service Institute (FSI) teaches Swahili, but unless what I was told is totally wrong, that is like saying you teach a people. You don't teach a people; you teach the language, you teach Kiswahili. You have the Luo tribe, for example. Somebody who was a Kiswahili speaker would have said that they are learning Kiluo.

Q: While you were in Mombasa you were there a very short time but was there any concern about fundamental Islam?

KEAT: No, that was a different era. Islam was a phenomenon to be looked at, but no, we were not concerned about fundamental Islam. When I was in Somalia it wasn't a big concern. People had their beliefs. Some people drank alcohol and ate pork without anyone doing anything to them. You didn't people calling on others to burn the churches, Muslims against Christians or anything of that sort. So no, that wasn't a big issue. I would say the major issue that we were concerned about in Mombasa and for the country as a whole was AIDS. This was one of the issues I was assigned to cover. It is a sign of a different time that it was highly classified that I was reporting on AIDS. I had access to World Health Organization reports that showed that 98 percent of prostitutes in Nairobi were HIV positive. In Mombasa, 99 percent were HIV positive. There was a place I liked going to in Mombasa's port to get chicken tikka. Chicken tikka is spicy, similar to tandoori chicken and excellent. Mombasa is a Muslim city, but it was wonderful to wash down the chicken tikka with ice cold beer. I had a favorite restaurant that had the best chicken tikka. It was also a place where the prostitutes would hang out. Drunken sailors came in with two or three prostitutes on each side. I was interested in my chicken tikka, but that is not what they were interested in. I couldn't say anything to them, but I remember thinking, "my God do you realize what you are getting yourself into?" I would say that was one of our biggest concerns as an Embassy because the U.S. was using Mombasa as a port of call; Kenya was an ally. When you asked about the Muslim Christian issue, the Kenyan government did regard itself as a Christian government. They were happy to have Americans there to assist them with dealing with Somalia and the other non-Christians in the area. But there was a great concern about AIDS spreading to sailors and what we could do about that.

Q: I assume the sailors were all warned about it.

KEAT: Yes, but you have to keep in mind that these were 18, 19, 20 year olds. I think I was more with it at that age than they were, but let's be real. People at that age are not necessarily known for their good judgment. If they had been, I wouldn't have been seeing them in the place when I was enjoying my chicken tikka, or they would have been sitting down with me having chicken tikka and some ice cold Tusker, which is the local beer.

Q: Well then you left relatively early didn't you?

KEAT: Yes. That was because of my marital problems.

Q: Would you say the service was, in this case, accommodating then or was it your beard?

KEAT: No, the service wasn't accommodating. I made a big mistake in who I married and I made another mistake in bringing her back with me to Nairobi. She was becoming disruptive and our marital problems were becoming disruptive. So, I was told in no uncertain terms that they wanted me to leave. The fact that I had a beard and the Ambassador was already prejudiced against me didn't help. If I didn't have a beard would that have made a difference? I doubt it, but who knows? In any case, the time came and I had to leave. I came back to Washington and found myself a job in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, INR. I got the job because a friend of mine from my first post, the Dominican Republic, was working on the staff of the Secretary's Morning Intelligence Summary. He was talking about his job and I said "that sounds interesting." He said, "Well we have an opening," and I ended up getting it.

Q: I think this is probably a good place to stop and we will pick this up you are doing INR from when to when?

KEAT: This would be in 1989 to 1990.

Q: Okay.

Q: Today is October 11, 2012 with Stephen Keat and we are going to pick this up while you were still in Kenya. You were in Kenya when to when?

KEAT: Kenya we pretty much covered the last time. I was in Kenya from 1988-1989.

You had asked me a question about Somalia, the influence of Islam and whether at that time we were noticing precursors of the current situation with the al-Shabaab movement. I said no, but I've been thinking more about it and I want elaborate. Not only no, but the opposite. Either we were naïve and didn't realize what was going on, or the country was different from how we perceive it today. Somalia was viewed as having a very moderate form of Islam; women did not wear the chador and women and men would mix freely in the markets. In terms of the culture, the women suffered from infibulation, which is

genital mutilation. Some cultures have a paranoid attitude about women's sexuality. The Somalis dealt with women's sexual desires by destroying them. That may, at least in part, explain the easy mixing of sexes. But, in any case, when I was in Somalia we did not have a feeling of a place that was religiously fanatic. We definitely had a feeling of a place that was very, very Muslim, and as I mentioned the last time, had somebody converted from Islam to Christianity the solution would have been to kill them. Going forward to today's situation with al-Shabaab, I'm not involved with Somali politics anymore, but my assumption is that if you would dig deep, you would find clan roots behind al-Shabaab. I suspect that it doesn't have that much to do with Islam, that the people who believe in al-Shabaab or are members of al-Shabaab believe in Islam no more or less than any other Somali.

Q: Maybe it's their clan; you mentioned it's the clan that unites people.

KEAT: Yes. So in any case, that's just tying up a few loose ends from our previous session. When we left off we were about to start talking about my joining INR. I was in INR from 1989-1990. I was associate editor of *Secretary Baker's Morning Intelligence Summary*. *The Morning Intelligence Summary* is a publication that no longer exists. The closest equivalent to it would be the *President's Daily Brief*, put on by CIA analysts for the President. It is a document he sees every day. I think there is actually one day of the week, probably Sunday, that he doesn't get it. *The Summary* was a 7-day a week publication. We added items to the front of the book and the back of the book. The front of the book had short pieces, roughly a sentence or two followed by another sentence or two explaining why you should care about it. To give you a fictional example, we might have included something along the line of "An armored brigade crossed from the Soviet Union into Northern China today." Then you would have a sentence or two explaining why the United States should care about this. The idea of the front of the book was that these were the things the Secretary of State needed to see immediately; there were 10 to 15 items with a maximum of 15 items in the front of the book.

Then we had what were called BOBs, back of the book items. The BOBs were one page. I forget what the exact word limitation was on them, and maybe they could have gone to a page-and-a-half, but I seem to remember that they were limited to one page. These would be longer items, but as you can tell, still not very long. They would be something along the item of "Chancellor Kohl of Germany is visiting today. These are the issues we expect he is going to bring up with you." Now, of course, the Secretary would be given briefings by the European bureau and other bureaus, but this would be looking, of course, at intelligence sources that only INR had access to. It also had the advantage of the INR analysts and their perspective. The people covering Germany for INR were only thinking about Germany and doing nothing else. There were three back of the book items, so the total length of the Morning Summary was very short. In terms of intelligence publications, it had what I consider a well-deserved reputation for being the best one at that time.

Q: I've heard that again and again and again.

KEAT: At that time I used to read the President's Daily Brief in addition to a number of other items. The clearances that I had were of the highest level, to the best of my knowledge, the highest level you could get, because I had to, of course, be able to review everything before it would be going to the Secretary of State. There were things that were so sensitive that they would totally bypass the Morning Summary process. I might not have seen them, but in terms of things that I did see, I saw a range of extremely sensitive items. The readership was wide and important. The document was seen by the Secretary of State, but all the high-level officials in State, the Deputy Secretary, the various assistant secretaries, would be briefed using the Morning Summary. The Joint Chiefs of Staff would see it; the President would see it, as would the Vice President and a range of cabinet officers. Of course the National Security Advisor would see it. So this was a truly influential document. Since that time it has been discontinued; it was discontinued in the time of Colin Powell. I've heard different stories as to why it was discontinued. Some people claim that Colin Powell didn't read it and felt he didn't need it. Other people felt that Tom Finger, the head of INR at the time, made the decision to eliminate it. I think it was a major mistake to eliminate this publication, and I know there are a range of people who still work in INR who also think that it was a mistake.

One aspect of INR that continues through today, is that it is the branch of the intelligence community that is most likely to question accepted wisdom. There is the famous footnote from the Iraq War where INR did not fully go along with the intelligence community's assessment on Saddam Hussein's possession of weapons of mass destruction. I can't go into details because a lot of this material, whether it should be or should not be, it's still classified. I can say that the CIA would be far more cautious than INR in taking risks. This was the case when the Berlin Wall fell, at the time of the first Gulf War and so on. INR was more likely to be the one to predict the next leader is going to fall in the near future, while the CIA would be talking about demonstrations in the streets and how this was a risk to the leadership but not predicting that the leadership was going to be overthrown. One of the things I was encouraged to do in my job as Associate Editor was to encourage the analysts to be aggressive and take risks. That meant sometimes you were wrong, but it was a feeling that we were not serving the Secretary well if we didn't go and say this is what we think is going to happen. Again, I can't go into what was in CIA documents, but a lot of them were so hedged, full of so many, "well if this happens" or "if that happens." At the end of it you are going to be like Harry Truman and wish for the one-handed economist who will just tell you one thing rather than saying on one hand and then on the other hand.

Q: One of the things that strikes me is it's almost a bureaucratic problem in that the CIA is layered.

KEAT: Yes.

Q: It is heavily layered and the more layers you put on somebody down at the bottom who is close to facts, comes up with ideas, somebody who is maybe less knowledgeable will say well why don't we just qualify this a bit and then they start qualifying; layers qualify…

KEAT: Yes.

Q: …in bureaucracy.

KEAT: Yeah, …

Q: INR is a fairly small home unit and which you kind of let the analysts have quite a bit more freedom.

KEAT: INR has approximately 200 employees. I don't know how many are analysts; let's just say for the moment 125, I don't know if that is an accurate figure. In those days an analyst, let's just say the German analyst thought something was going to happen. They wrote a front of the book or back of the book item. Who will they need to clear off on this? Assuming their boss is around, they would show it to one or two people in their office and those people would make some quick changes. You have to keep in mind that there was a culture of getting things out quickly. The front of the book was like a newspaper, it was time sensitive. They would show it to their boss. If their boss was okay with it, then it came to me. I would look at it and look for stylistic issues and why it was important. This was one of the fun things about the job. We would have about fifteen items in front of the book, but I would be reading between 30 and 50. I would read all the things that didn't get in. Part of my job was to determine which items were important enough to get in. I would read and ask the analyst why it's important, perhaps discussing with him or her changes that we might make to clarify things. Then it would go to Harlan Robinson, the Editor. Harlan would do further cutting, improve the style and language further, and either agree or disagree with my suggestion as to the order and which ones would get in or not. If he needed to speak with the analyst, he might call the analyst at home. We worked shifts, so the vast bulk of my work was from 4:00 in the afternoon until midnight, which was the shift that did most of the editing. He might have to call the analyst at home. Depending on how sensitive the item was, the analyst might have to come back and discuss it further. But sometimes it was unclassified or you could talk around the issue. Then it would go to Henry Meyer, the head of the publications division in INR. Henry used to work for the analytical side of the CIA. After that it would be published.

If you look at the timeframe for getting an item in the Morning Summary, if the analyst had written something in the morning, it could take half a day. But that's just because this was an analyst who is doing things further in advance than most. But in all probability, from the time that they wrote it until the time it would be approved for publication, you'd be talking somewhere between one-and-a-half to four hours.

Q: Let's say your armored brigade is moving, if it looks like it is kind of hot, do people come back and rally around? Would you have a gathering of people staying late?

KEAT: In terms of the role of the Summary, issues like armored brigades were more likely being handled by other people. The Pentagon, for example.

Q: Well let's say there are significant demonstrations at State, its fast breaking.

KEAT: You might call people back on that, yes. Like anything else it also depends on the analysts and how dedicated they are. Some analysts are very dedicated and would come back and work until all hours of the night. Others were, "well I'm at home why are you bothering me." While there was an attempt to be timely, it wasn't really for breaking news. If the embassy has been stormed or something of that sort, the Secretary has already been informed. It's not brought up through the *Morning Summary*. Or if somebody had gotten an intelligence report ahead of time that there is a threat to storm the embassy, people wouldn't be waiting for it to appear in the *Summary*; that would be handled through other channels. You had people staying late, but the *Summary* was quick and thoughtful. It did the sort of analysis that the CIA still does still today, but did it in a much less bureaucratic way. Later on in our interview, I'll speak about my final assignment in the Foreign Service. I was doing analytical work on the Caucuses. I can say that even though INR had become more bureaucratic than when I was Associate Editor of the *Summary*, it was still dramatically less bureaucratic than the CIA and other intelligence agencies.

Q: Why do you think you were put into a pretty critical job? Because the flow of information up is the business we are in, in a way.

KEAT: Yes.

Q: And I mean you are one of the people doing it. I mean was this just a routine assignment or did somebody pick you out and say, "Hey, you're my man."

KEAT: This was more luck than anything else. I would say that the vast majority of my assignments were luck, although there have been times when people have given me good recommendations. But for the vast majority of assignments, things just happened. I had come back from Nairobi because my marriage was breaking up. I was looking for an assignment. A friend of mine had served in the Dominican Republic with me. He and I were getting together and talking. I was talking with him about finding an assignment and then he was telling me about the job he was doing. He was an Associate Editor of the *Morning Summary*. I said to him, "Wow that sounds like a really interesting job." He said, "Well, they have a vacancy, would you like to apply?" He introduced me to Harlan Robinson, the Editor, who interviewed me. I was a fairly junior person at that time. I gave him the information he wanted. They decided they wanted me, and I was paneled into the position.

I have a funny story to show how the bureaucracy does not function. When I came into the Foreign Service, I was given a full top secret clearance. Diplomatic Security (DS) was supposed to be doing the updates on clearances every five years or so. I came in the service in 1983 and this was now 1989. My clearance should have had an update and it hadn't. DS needed to give me a temporary clearance to work in INR while they did a full update. The clearance involved a diplomatic security agent, who would be sitting at his or

her desk, getting up from the desk, going to some file cabinets, because this was when people still used file cabinets for personnel files, looking up Keat. Keat, "ah here is Keat," looking through the folder and seeing if there was anything in the folder that jumped out that would be of concern. If there was nothing of concern, they should give me a temporary waiver so I could work. From when I was assigned until I actually got that temporary waiver was four or five weeks. Every morning I would get up and I would call INR, call Steve Halter. Steve is still in INR, but now as a contractor. Steve Halter was the head of personnel. I would ask, "Steve has the waiver come through?" And he would say, "No." Because he would say no, I couldn't go and work in INR. I was being paid and I would go to a museum or I would go to a movie or something else. I spent roughly a month really getting to know Washington, D.C. really well, far better than all the tourists. In one sense you could say "well this is great," but if you are being paid for doing nothing it gets a little bit boring. Finally, after a month or so, that bureaucrat got up from his or her desk and checked the file. In a logical world somebody would have poked that bureaucrat and say go do this. But the world of bureaucracy is not a logical world.

Q: I'm wondering these updates I would think would be quite important because okay you are coming out of college maybe or other employment or something and you are pretty clean but maybe as you get a little more mature you also maybe develop a liking for horse racing or for poker or for foreign girls or something like that all of which brings smells. How do they pick up this sort of thing?

KEAT: During the process of conducting a security clearance and security clearance updates, if people are in an obvious way doing things, and if the institution is functional -- and that last one is a big if -- they should catch it. If a junior officer suddenly is driving a Ferrari, somebody might want to ask well how did you pay for this Ferrari. If it turns out that his father is a millionaire, then fine; there are no concerns. In terms of my life, in my various assignments I had worked in the embassy context with people from a whole range of different agencies, so they knew me pretty well. I really don't know to what extent they did or did not just get on the phone and say, "Hey is there something about this guy we should know about?" Even when you are not working in INR, if you are a Foreign Service officer you can have access to a whole range of sensitive things that if you wanted to go chat with the ***New York Times*** or if you wanted to chat with your local KGB operative, it would be very harmful. I think the security clearance process is flawed. I know that when I was interviewed for my security clearance, the people who did it were usually contractors, perhaps retired FBI agents or retired whatever. They did not necessarily understand how the Foreign Service works.

During my most recent security clearance update, the interviewer was particularly concerned about all the foreign people I was associated with. I explained, "Well this is what diplomats are paid to do." My current wife was born in the Philippines. She is ethnic Chinese and the vast majority of her family lives in the Philippines, but she also has some great aunts and other distant relations who live in China. The interviewer was very concerned about these people, both the ones in the Philippines and the ones in China. The ones in China, I haven't the foggiest idea of who they are, never seen them, never spoken with them; it is something like a 90-year-old woman living in some village

somewhere. The ones in the Philippines I've also not had a lot to do with. I had to get my wife to find out their addresses and a whole range of things which I didn't have the foggiest idea of. Where they were working, for example. The security clearance process often focuses on things that are largely irrelevant. If somebody is a traitor, they are presumably sophisticated enough to cover up the obvious things. You want to look for things in their lifestyle where they are showing unexpected large amounts of wealth or they are traveling to places that seem odd for them to be traveling to. In my security clearances, and I've had, of course, a number of them in my career, they never did that. They either focused on things that were irrelevant, like the addresses of my in-laws, or the clearances went relatively smoothly without people asking particularly in-depth questions.

Now, when I'm saying smoothly, without people asking in-depth questions, which may also be because quite frankly I've had a fairly boring life. I mean that as a compliment to myself. I'm not going to wild parties; unless you define a wild party as being with a bunch of Embassy employees at the Marine house drinking beer on a Friday after work. There is an interesting article in the paper, about Dominique Strauss-Kahn, the disgraced former head of the IMF. He was talking about how he would go to all these parties in Paris, these really wild parties, and he said, "You would be amazed at the people you would see at these parties." He spoke about how he was surprised and there was a problem when these behaviors continued while he was head of the IMF; I wouldn't have gone to those parties and I don't think I would have gone to them even if I was in a higher position. The security clearance process wasn't a big issue for me other than being something of an annoyance, getting in the way of doing my job.

Q: Tell me, how did you find INR? Was it a collegial bit or were there a bunch of people sitting hunched over their desks completely immerged in their subjects? What kind of person was there?

KEAT: Well a bit of both. It is collegial. People are friendly. They tend to like each other. It's a small organization. I'm not sure what the percentages are, and I think they change from year to year, but right now I think you have more Civil Service employees. I'm talking about the analysts. The analysts today are maybe 60 percent Civil Service, 40 percent Foreign Service; when I was there working on the *Morning Summary*, I think it was more like 50/50. The people who make it work, the administrative staff, were mostly Civil Service. Because INR is small, people know each other. From the Assistant Secretary down to the lowest people, everybody is going to deal with each other. That makes for a friendly atmosphere. You have an analyst who is the expert on X or Y country. In my last job in INR I was a Caucus analyst. I worked closely with Toby Davis. I first met Toby when I was on the staff of the Secretary's Morning Intelligence Summary. At that time she was a junior employee. Now she is a fairly senior analyst; she has been covering Georgia for 20 plus years. Toby knows almost everything about Georgia and she is super enthused about everything about Georgia. If you want to know what the Minister of Defense said on this or that in 1995 or perhaps even just knowing who the Minister of Defense was in 1995, Toby will know these things. INR has people like her who are great experts on their part of the world.

You have, for example, employees like Bob Otto, from my last office. Bob gets up early in the morning because he does Russian internal politics. He gets up about 2 a.m. to read the Russian papers on line, listen to Russian news, and all that. He gets into the office at some God-awful hour, something like four or five in the morning, and he works there until about 2:00 in the afternoon. He leaves for the day as all the Russians are going to sleep. That's the life he leads. He is this monk, off doing his own thing, but he is also associating with all of us as a perfectly friendly guy. There is a high number of PhDs in INR.

I think one of the critical things that make INR different from the analytical side of the CIA and from the people who work at DIA and NSA is having the Foreign Service element. INR has Foreign Service officers who come in for a short assignment, usually a two-year tour. They don't have the in-depth knowledge that the people who have been doing this stuff for 20-30 years do, but they can bring a different perspective. They might actually know the Defense Minister of Georgia and they would say, "Well, you know the Minister told me…" I remember having conversations with Toby and other people in my office. I would be talking about Armenia and Azerbaijan and I would see parallels to places like Somalia and Kenya. One of things people often raise about the former Soviet Union is the high level of corruption. I told them that from my point of view it wasn't all that corrupt; even though it is very corrupt. Somalia would be worse as would be the Philippines. I think having a mixture of Foreign Service officers with Civil Service makes INR unique.

The fact that INR is in the same building as policymakers and that it is focused on servicing the needs of the Secretary makes a dramatic difference. The CIA is out in Langley talking with each other and, of course, you have a small group that's with the *PDB, the President's Daily Brief*, they go to the White House six days a week or wherever the President may be and brief the President. But the vast majority of them are just talking with each other. Every once in a while they would come to State. I often organized meetings of the intelligence community with the people who I would be working with at State, the Ambassadors, and the DASes. But it is not the same as working at State where somebody would say, the Secretary said this at the morning staff. You had a far greater input.

In my last assignment, one of the people who I was briefing on a regular basis was Ambassador Bradtke. He was the U.S. ambassador to the OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe) group responsible for trying to work out a peace agreement with Armenia and Azerbaijan. I didn't have to speculate about what was going on in the OSCE group because Bradtke would be sitting in my office, talking with me about the last negotiation session. Whether you are talking about my most recent INR assignment or my first one, the people in INR have a much better idea of what is going on in the policy community than others in the intelligence community do.

Q: Was there a feeling, particular in the job like yours, of competition between the CIA in other words the difference between maybe the Herald Tribune when it existed and the New York Times or something of that nature?

KEAT: Yes, there was very much a feeling that INR wanted to do a better job than the CIA. There was also a lot of pride in the belief that INR was doing a better job than the CIA.

Q: At least from news accounts and all, the State Department stands to be much more agile and coming up with better predictions.

KEAT: I can't give specifics. I assume some of this is declassified, but I don't want to risk anything. I can say that when countries in Eastern Europe, former Soviet Bloc countries, when these countries were falling, INR was out front predicting what was going to happen before the CIA was; that I can say without saying X or Y country. I can think of a particular case where I was talking with an analyst of a country and the analyst was being too cautious about what was going to happen. I said something to the general effect, "Let's not do this like the CIA, tell me what do you think," encouraging him to talk. He said, "I think that this person is probably going to fall really soon." I said, "Then I want to see that in this piece of paper." He changed what he was writing and that went to the Secretary. The next day that particular leader did fall. This was the process of INR and yes, there was a feeling of competition with the CIA. I think the decision to get rid of the *Morning Summary* and also the post 9/11 reforms, have harmed INR's role in the intelligence community. As part of these reforms, the intelligence community is supposed to be working together more. INR is supposed to be participating to a greater extent in things like the *President's Daily Brief* and other intelligence products; but you have little INR compared with the CIA monolith and its absurd.

Q: I know I interviewed Phyllis Oakley and she talks about when Madeleine Albright was Secretary of State. She used to brief, as had been the practice, every morning the Secretary of State. Phyllis was told at one point it was no longer necessary, we were now told by the Secretary by one of her staff, one of Albright's staff that she was getting a briefing by the CIA and it wasn't necessary for her own intelligence operation to brief her. You never know what was going on; it could have been personalities or it could have been bureaucratic infighting or maybe an irrational decision but it struck me as being particularly the reputation of the two organizations as Secretary of State would be depriving him or herself of a major asset.

KEAT: I would agree 100 percent with what you just said. I have never been privy to private conversations with the Secretary about why the *Summary* was eliminated. I also did not speak to Assistant Secretary Finger about what was his rationale.

Q: Do you know if Mr. Finger is still there?

KEAT: No, he is no longer at the State Department, he is retired. You could Google him to try and find out where he is and what he is doing. He was Assistant Secretary at the

time of Colin Powell. It would be interesting to talk to him and get his perspective. There were those who said that Colin Powell was not interested in reading the Summary anymore and there were other people who said that Tom Finger had suggested to him that he didn't need it. Which is actually the case I don't know, I wasn't involved. There are some people like me who were strongly enthusiastic about the *Summary*. but I can think of a person in INR who informed me the *Summary* was no longer published. I said that's a shame and that person responded, "No that's great that it's gone, we don't have that end of the day pressure to produce." There may have been some people who preferred getting rid of it, but these days I think INR has less influence than it did in the past.

Q: I realize that the work was tremendously episodic but can you think of any sort of instances that stick in your mind that you can talk about during this period?

KEAT: Actually, I can think of a million interesting things to tell you, but they would all be extremely classified.

Q: Anyway, later on as you think this over if anything pops up that illustrates something that you can talk about…

KEAT: I had mentioned we had shift work. My job had two shifts and the *Summary* had three shifts. The first shift would be 8:00 in the morning until 4:00 p.m. That shift was largely routine, making things move along, gathering up the materials that were left over from the *Summary* that had just been published, attending the morning staff meeting, seeing what needed to be done for that day, making preliminary contacts with offices, perhaps encouraging them, "Chancellor Kohl is coming can you come up with something for us, either a FOB or a BOB, things of that sort. Offices would contact us and let us know that an item is probably going to come today or tomorrow. That would be the shift that would work from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. I should also say that we worked ten days a week in a row and then we had four days off. I would have two days on the 8:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. shift.

Then I would go on the 4:00 p.m. to midnight shift. I would do that for six days in a row. On that shift I would come in a few minutes before 4:00 p.m., usually about 3:45 p.m., and have a handover from the daytime staff. They would let me know what was happening; this is what we were expecting, etc. Then I would be dealing with the analysts coming bringing me their pieces, the process I've already described for talking with them about it, selecting which one would be in, and making editorial changes. This would be seen by Harlan Robinson and Henry Meyer and by about 8:39 p.m. they would usually be gone. There would just be the Associated Editor and other people working in the publication staff. We would finalize the *Summary*. The night shift, which I wasn't part of, would work until from midnight until 8:00 a.m. in the morning to make sure that all the details of publication were in order.

When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, that extended hours considerably. In my case, while I would still come in at 3:45 p.m. instead of leaving at midnight, I often would be working until 3:00 or 4:00 in the morning. While it was tiring, I didn't mind it. If you

remember, one of the things the United States did fairly quickly was we sent maybe 2,000 or so soldiers to…

Q: The First Airborne.

KEAT: …to Northern Saudi Arabia. Their basic role was a tripwire, sort of saying to Saddam Hussein "you invade Saudi Arabia, you are going to kill American soldiers and you are going to instantly have a war with the United States; don't invade Saudi Arabia." If he had invaded they would have been dead meat, simple as that. When I was looking at what they were doing and I was looking at the inconvenience of having to work until 3:00 or 4:00 in the morning, it was pretty clear to me that my inconvenience was very low. In fact, one of my criteria's in my career when I was looking at whether you should work later or not, is did human lives depend on it; in that case they did. So immediately it was very easy to figure out.

There were things I would see at that time, again I can't go into too much detail, but there were some things for example that AWACS would bring in. I would see some very interesting things. Some of it really was above my level of ability to understand; you really had to be somebody at DIA, Defense Intelligence Agency, who would understand what these things meant. But I would get people to explain to me what things meant.. That was one of the great things about the job. I mentioned that I would see all the items that didn't make it in the book. There was this continual working process and learning process about the whole world; that was great. At the time of the Gulf War we were working very, very long hours and you often had analysts who did work late at night.

Q: At the time of the Gulf War, the forces that went into Kuwait, were we looking at that possibility?

KEAT: I guess I can speak in negatives without touching on classified things and I guess I can say I'm not aware that we were expecting him to invade.

Q: I've interviewed I want to say Robin something or somebody who was an analyst for Iraq and she was talking about he felt that the go-ahead could have been just plain impulsive…

KEAT: On Saddam's part.

Q: …On Saddam's part.

KEAT: It may very well have been; people criticized Ambassador April Glaspie for not having done more to dissuade him. I wasn't there; I don't know to what extent that criticism is valid, to what extent she was just a scapegoat for administration failures. As a Foreign Service officer, I tend to think the latter rather than the former.

Q: I do too.

KEAT: What I do know is that Saddam was extremely erratic. He did really stupid things in his career; he was a thug and an erratic thug. As long as he was pushing around his own people, as long as he was pushing around people in the local area, he could get away with it. But when he started to push around the United States, that was a big mistake. In an ideal world, we would have given him a clear signal that invading Kuwait would be completely unacceptable to us. We didn't, that we can say.

Q: The problem was too the Arabs, Egypt and particularly Kuwaiti's didn't want any assurances as they thought they had it well in hand.

KEAT: That could be. I can say that to the best of my knowledge we were not expecting this.

Q: I was just trying to think we have talked about the operations at State, is there anything else we can talk about on this job or should we move on?

KEAT: Well, I guess the final thing I will say is that having worked in INR at the time of the first Gulf War and having worked in INR later, I tend to agree with former Senator Moynihan's critique of the CIA. He felt that the analytical side of the CIA should be abolished; that's probably going a little too far, but I think it could certainly be cut back dramatically to bring it more to the INR model. Senator Moynihan pointed out that the CIA did not predict the fall of the Berlin Wall, did not predict that the Soviet Union and all those communist countries were going to collapse. We can go later and we can see the Arab Spring. They weren't predicting that either. You could be unfair and expect people to predict everything. But we are spending all this money on the intelligence community; we spend a fortune on our intelligence community, way way too much. When you are spending all this money on the intelligence community, it's fair to ask what you are getting back for it. INR with its 200 or so people is providing bang for the buck. I would argue that other intelligence agencies are bloated and are not really giving us the quality we should expect.

Q: I realize it is outside of your realm of expertise but did you get an overall feeling about the military intelligence field?

KEAT: Yes, both from working in INR and from serving overseas. We had defense attachés in the different countries where I worked. They are more or less declared spies; declared spies dealing with intelligence issues. The defense attachés range from one in Somalia, probably the least impressive of all the ones I've ever dealt with. His major concern was making sure that his boots were shiny. Of course, in Somalia with all the dust it was hard to keep shiny boots, but that was the big thing he cared about. The quality of his reporting, was on the level with what you would expect of somebody who's biggest concern was having polished boots. (This did not necessarily carry over to the people who worked with him,) But there were other people who had good contacts with the local military, good contacts with other parts of the government and would provide excellent reporting. I'd mentioned before that in Somalia you had cases of atrocities the military guys would be reporting on. They would hear that an entire town had been

eliminated by government troops, that all the women had been raped and taken off as well as the kids taken off either to be killed or enslaved, that the males were all killed, etc. Those that survived fled to Ethiopia. Ambassador Crigler did not allow those reports to go forward. There were people who were out there gathering on the ground information; they were doing some very good work. We had people like that in every embassy I've been at, and some of them really earned their salaries. Others just went to representational events with other military attachés, drinking and chatting. Then you have people who are doing analytical work, the NSA which is part of the military. You have people who are experts on different languages and they are listening to things and going in and translating. Analysts who would warn us that something was coming up and we needed to pay attention to it. They performed a very useful and important role.

Then you have the National Geospatial Agency, the people involved with the satellites. You have the satellites themselves. The technicians are involved with that. Then you have people who analyze the photos. A famous example would be the photos taken from planes during the Cuban missile crisis. The experts were saying these were missiles. You had to look close to figure out, or guess they were missiles; some of the people I've worked with can say not only that this is a tank, but this is this kind of tank or that kind of tank. I can't go into too much detail about some of this because it is classified as to how much resolution we have in the photographs. But, however much we do or don't have, the expertise of these people is clear. They can look at these photos and figure things out; they also know the different things about this particular tank and why is it significant. Unless you are a military analyst, you wouldn't realize that. I would say for the defense attachés, it would be a good thing if we had higher standards. When I say higher standards, I mean ones that would be used for evaluating them.

I've been told that attachés are evaluated on the number of reports they do. Of course, if you are evaluated on the number of reports that you are going to do, you are going to churn out as many as you can. I can say that there would be reports where X defense attaché reported something that he or she had heard on the radio and it's classified. I'm sorry, if it is important maybe you want to report it in a cable to get it to people quickly, make sure they are reading it, but it shouldn't be classified; they did a lot of things of that sort. Or again, people getting together with other defense attachés at a defense attaché lunch. You would get to hear what the other defense attachés think about what is going on in country X or country Y. It's not really giving you any great insight into what is going on in those countries. So I think it would be helpful to hold their reporting to a higher standard. There would be some reporting from defense attachés I would read which was excellent and really gave me good insights, but I think that was a reflection on those individual attachés not necessarily of the analytical standards of the program as a whole.

In terms of the amount that we spend on satellites, the amount that we spend on the National Security Agency, the CIA is not the worst, but I think we could dramatically cut it back. I've spoken with other people in the Intelligence Community and they agreed with me that we could easily cut back the analytical side of the CIA by about 80 percent and it wouldn't harm output. It would probably improve output, because there would be

less layers of bureaucracy. I would assume we would probably cut back on NSA and the amount we are spending on the satellites and so on; exactly how much I can't say. If I would start talking about specifics, I would probably be stepping into classified areas. I think to whatever extent we are doing collection on terrorism and things of that sort, that is a good thing. But to whatever extent where we are collecting on internal political situations in countries where there is not a great risk of a war, where there is no great risk of terrorism that is going to affect the United States, I don't think that's necessary. Economic issues are things where you don't need the intelligence community. Those issues are open. I would say that is a waste of money and could be eliminated.

Q: You left INR when?

KEAT: I left INR in 1990 to go to Spain. That is an example of how the assignment process is dysfunctional. When I was in INR I was in what is called the off cycle; you have the summer cycle and the off cycle. The summer cycle is geared to most people, particularly because so many people have families, children…

Q: Children in school.

KEAT: Yes. They will be leaving during the time of school vacations. I was on the off cycle, which is for people whose assignments are coming open at different times for one reason or another. Because there are fewer candidates in the off cycle, sometimes you can get a really interesting assignment that you wouldn't normally get. It has the disadvantage that there are many fewer slots. There was an opening in Panama; we had recently invaded Panama and overthrown Noriega. State was reestablishing an embassy in Panama. The economic section had a job that required Spanish. I was an economic cone officer. At this time I was a tenured O-4 which for assignment purposes is the equivalent of being an O-3. This was an O-3 job. This seemed like a fascinating job, so I went to the desk and provided them with information about my previous assignments and gave them references. The desk loved me. I thought that's great and I thought I would bid on it. Then the desk said, "Well, don't. " I was like, "Well why not?" Our ambassador at that time, Deane R. Hinton, was a career ambassador and a very crusty old guy. A junior officer had bid to go there, and also had bid to go to Spain. Personnel had decided that she should go to Spain; she wasn't experienced enough to go to Panama. The ambassador was very upset about this so he appealed to the DG (director general) to have her assignment to Spain broken and have her sent to Panama. The desk told me that if I bid on the position and Ambassador Hinton became aware of it, there would be no way he would allow me to come to post, not even if the DG ruled against him. They would keep me in mind and if the DG ruled against the ambassador, once the ambassador had cooled off, they would put my name forward. I thought, okay if this is what I have to do this is what I have to do. But the DG went along with what the ambassador wanted, broke this woman's assignment to Spain and sent her to Panama.

At that point in time I didn't have the foggiest idea of what I was going to do; there wasn't anything else out there that interested me. I went to a friend's wedding in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, and also took some time to see my parents in Westchester

County. I came back after about a week. While I was away, I was still thinking about the situation and I figured I would extend in my job in INR to get on to the regular summer cycle; I liked INR, so I might as well extend and then see if I would have better chances. I came back and called my CDO to discuss this with him. The first thing he said to me was "Congratulations." I said, "Congratulations for what?" He said to me, "Well you were just paneled to go to Madrid, Spain." "But I never bid on Madrid, Spain." He said to me, "Yeah, the job was open and we figured you would love it." Under all the personnel rules, this is not supposed to happen. First, Madrid is a place people are killing to get. Second, you are not supposed to be assigned to anywhere unless you bid on it. It is one thing if you are forced into an assignment, but that is a very specific sort of thing, and usually you image that for people that are going to Iraq, not going to Western European capitals where they drink a lot of red wine.

I wasn't that crazy about the job in Spain but I felt I had no choice. If I had said I won't go, they would have had to break the assignment because they'd broken all the rules. But then it would have been, "Oh, you don't want to go to Spain, have we got a posting for you."

Q: Yeah, in Africa.

KEAT: Or wherever. It would be the absolute worst thing possible. So I went on a two-year posting to Spain.

Q: This is from when to when?

KEAT: This was from 1990-1992. I was the junior-most person in the Economic Section. I did not want to go there because it was not challenging enough. Ambassador Joseph Zappala was a political appointee; he had given a lot of money, I think it was $300,000, to the campaign of the first President Bush. He was from Florida. He was a developer and involved in Greyhound racing tracks. People in the embassy said, and this is the sort of thing that is either slanderous or perhaps a reflection of the truth, I really don't know. But people in the embassy said, "Greyhound tracks were used by the Mafia for laundering money, and that this was one of the sources of his wealth." I don't know how true any of that is, I can say that he was an easy person to dislike. He was superficial. He didn't like going to Spain, but for different reasons than mine. He had wanted to be assigned to Italy. Another donor got Italy, and he resented that. Most people if they were given the chance to be ambassador to Spain would be fairly happy with it. He was not. I know that the people who worked with him, his staff assistant and the other people in his office, didn't like him at all. Because I had such a fairly junior position, he didn't affect my life in a direct way. My immediate supervisor was the deputy in the econ section, Chris Lynch. Chris is one of the best bosses I ever had in the Service. He was an Irish-Catholic guy, married to a Jewish woman. Both had great senses of humor. They had two nice, and at that time little, girls. He had worked in a range of places in Latin America including Chile; I think Chile was his assignment before Spain; Chris was a smart guy, hardworking and a very, very good person to have as a boss. The first econ counselor I was working with was Pierce Bullen. Pierce was very senior in the service, a pleasant

person, but extremely disorganized and not a good manager. Since it was a big section and because we had some very interesting personalities in the section, it was a place that really would have required a good manager. The second econ counselor was Emile Castro. Emile had a very difficult personality. He was fighting all the time with everyone in the section and with everyone in the embassy. He had problems with people in other sections of the embassy, and that of course, affected the econ section.

Q: Who was he fighting over these, what caused these fights?

KEAT: He had a very acerbic personality. Also, his wife he was trying to get a job in one other section of the embassy and they apparently weren't interested in hiring her. He was pushing very hard on this issue. That didn't go over well and it negatively affected our relationship with that section. Emile was continually sarcastic and continually abrasive, so people in the section didn't like him and people in the embassy as a whole didn't like him.

I was responsible for working with the Spaniards on assistance to Latin America, learning what they were doing, what they were planning on doing, and reporting back to Washington. Hopefully, this would assist in our not duplicating things that they were doing and perhaps cooperating with them. In terms of the war with Iraq you had, of course, the Kurdish crisis. Many Kurds fled to Turkey. The United States was airlifting assistance, some we were dropping in from planes by parachutes. I was coordinating with the Spanish government on this; some of our flights were landing in Spain and some of them were overflying Spain. I was the point person on that.

Economic issues and macro-economic reporting were my areas of responsibility. I wrote a lengthy report on environmental issues. I was assigned to work with the science counselor, a really nice guy. The report was almost a master's thesis because Emile wanted me to do it that way. I wrote a lengthy cable. It must have been about 80 pages long. I did this because my boss told me to. I covered every single aspect of what the Spaniards were and were not doing on environmental issues. There may have been one person in the EPA who actually read the full cable; I am dubious, but there may have been. I'm not sure how vital it was and how useful an expenditure of my time this was, but again, my boss wanted me to do it.

Q: Again, you have something like that and okay you are reporting on using the wind power or something like that then the wind power person would pick up on that; in other words bits and pieces.

KEAT: At that time, mostly it was reporting on their failure to do things. In the early '90s, Spain was not doing much to protect their environment. In fact, Europe wasn't doing very much in general in terms of protecting its environment. There is this image of the Europeans as being so green compared to the United States. That image is totally false; the United States through today has much better environmental policies than Europe. The EPA was founded by President Nixon, a Republican. The EPA was the first agency of its sort. It was quite a while before the Europeans established ministries to deal

with environmental issues. Spain had various laws related to protection of the environment and public health, but these laws were largely ignored. One example would be hormones. In the United States we use hormones to raise various animals and the Europeans are very critical of us for this.

Q: Franken food.

KEAT: Yes.

In Spain it was illegal to use hormones. But farmers would still use hormones. They wouldn't declare it, so you'd have situations where young kids, sometimes five-or six-year-old girls, would develop breasts. Animals would be given huge doses of hormones and they would continue until the time of slaughter, unlike in the U.S. where hormones were tapered off before slaughter. Spain had rules and regulations, but they weren't properly enforced.

It was frustrating working in Spain. Spain, and therefore the other countries in the European Union were becoming less and less relevant in terms of economic and other policies. These issues were decided in Brussels. This is not to say the Spaniards didn't have a role in decisions being discussed in Brussels. I would present a demarche requesting support on issues. Instead of an answer that Spain thinks this or Spain thinks that and yes, we are happy to work with you on this or no, I'm sorry we can't work with you on this, the response almost universally would be "well there is going to be a meeting in Brussels next week in which we are going to be discussing this. After that meeting we will get back to you and let you know what we've all decided." A fair amount of the reporting and the demarching that I was doing reflected a Europe of 20 years earlier. It was an example of how the institution, meaning the State Department, hadn't yet adopted itself to the changes in Europe. So a fair amount of what we were doing at the embassy was irrelevant.

One of the things that showed how dramatically irrelevant the Embassy was would be the Madrid Peace Conference. Ambassador Zappala got the job because of his contributions to the campaign of then President Bush. But he was not respected by the White House and was not respected by the State Department. Normally if you have a major conference, you have months of work to prepare for it. We had ten days of preparation. We found out that the conference was going to take place the same way the Spaniards and everybody else did. A news conference was held in the Moncloa. The Moncloa was the palace of the prime minister, their closest thing to the White House. White House staffers had flown in. They announced to the world that in ten days there was going to be a peace conference in Spain with participants from the Middle East. This was something that Ambassador Zappala was ignorant of and everybody in the embassy was ignorant of. This made my life prior to this conference much easier, because I didn't go to meetings where people were talking about what we need to do. We had the White House team parachuting in, and parachuting in a metaphorical sense, a State Department team; all these high level people suddenly showing up. We rented space in all the major hotels. I was largely a gopher. We had ambassadors from many countries participating. Ambassador Strauss,

our ambassador to Russia, came. I remember meeting him; he was well along in his years at that point of time. We had U.S. ambassadors from the Middle East. One example, Ambassador Crocker, was a young impressive guy; now he is still an impressive guy, but not quite so young. I remember meeting him and his wife. We had the Secretary of State and all these other high level people. It was a very interesting conference and this was something special to participate in, it but the embassy was largely irrelevant to the whole process. On a range of foreign policy issues, if the Secretary of State wanted something from Spain, the Secretary of State, at this time Jim Baker; picked up the phone and called them. If the U.S. wanted something, the White House called the prime minister. It was as simple as that. The embassy was irrelevant and again Ambassador Zappala did not help with this.

Q: Did you ever run across him or I mean did you manage to stay out of this?

KEAT: I ran across him in ways were not good. They didn't affect my life but were not good. In Spain, if you are single, as I was, you would stay out to all hours. If I would be leaving work at six pm, sometimes of course I'd have to leave much later, but if I'd be leaving at six, I'd go back to my apartment, about a twenty minute walk from the embassy. Let's assume this is a Friday night. I would go to my apartment, take a siesta because I learned from the Spaniards, and then meet my friends about nine o'clock in a bar and have a drink. Then we would go somewhere around ten o'clock and have dinner. After dinner, around eleven thirty-midnight, we would start going to bars, discos, whatever. You would always have one drink wherever you were and then go somewhere else. Sometimes, around four o'clock in the morning, I would be at a disco and see Ambassador Zappala. This was, of course, not a good thing, at least not in my view. I don't think it is a good thing for the Ambassador of the United States to be at a disco at four o'clock in the morning. He would be there with attractive young women, maybe giving him foreign policy advice, but his wife would not be there. I was told that towards the end of his time in Madrid, the Ambassador was driving on the Paseo de la Castellana, the main street in Madrid. He was driving the official vehicle, which, of course, ambassadors don't usually do; they usually have a chauffeur. But he was driving the official vehicle and again I wasn't there so I don't know for sure, but I was told he was very drunk and that he had a very attractive lady sitting in the front seat next to him. In any case, he allegedly got into a traffic accident. His wife left the country and went back to the United States and filed for divorce. In that sense I ran into him, but in terms of my daily work life, no.

It was a big embassy and unlike some ambassadors, he never came to the econ section. I assume he never went to other offices. He would have country team meetings but it was very much an imperial ambassadorship. I don't think he had much to do with the daily running of the embassy or policy issues; for example, at the econ section staff meetings, I never heard either of the econ counselors I worked with say the ambassador cares about this issue so we have to make sure we do some reporting on it. I didn't hear that even once. It was as though we were our own little duchy in the embassy going off on our own way.

I know his staff assistant disliked him immensely. He was a chain smoker. He would smoke, throw the classified cables in the trash and then empty his ash in the trash. At the end of the day she would have to go through the trash to remove the classified cables and secure them; she hated him. She did her best to get out of his office. She curtailed to get away from working with him. She was originally assigned to work in the econ section for a two year tour, but then the previous staff assistant left; I'm not sure of the details but probably they were also not happy about working for the ambassador. He was not an effective ambassador; he was an example of a political appointee in the worst sense. I've worked for good political appointees, but he was somebody who was not qualified for this job, who was not serving the United States well.

Q: What was your impression of the Spanish bureaucracy, the Spanish officials you were dealing with?

KEAT: Excellent, some of the most qualified people that I've dealt with anywhere in the world; very smart, very knowledgeable, hardworking but hardworking in a sensible way. You have to keep in mind the culture. At that time the official embassy hours were 9-6:00. This made no sense at all if you were in the econ or political section. You had to get in at 9 o'clock and read the morning cable traffic. Then you were supposed to see Jose in the foreign ministry and talk about something. Jose did not get in at that time; the earliest he would get in would be 10:30 or maybe 11:00. You would get Jose on the phone and he would be delighted to talk with you. He would say, "Why don't you come by about 6:00 today." 6:00 in the afternoon was, of course, the time that the embassy closed. Washington wanted you to do the demarche, so that is when you had to go. The Spaniards would be working from about 10:30 or 11:00 until about 1:00-2:00, somewhere in that timeframe; then they would take a long lunch, about three hours. The conservative guy would go home and have lunch with his wife and kids, take a nap and go back to work. Others would get together with male friends, have a long lunch with wine, good food, smoke cigars and have cognac at the end of it. Then you would have a guy with a small apartment who would meet with his mistress at lunchtime.

I would meet with my counterparts in the afternoon, when they were back in their offices. The people I was dealing with always knew their issues very well. Sometimes the decision was going to be made in Brussels, but other times, when the issue would be purely related to Spain or something the White House cared about, they could give me an immediate response. Given the idiocy of the hours that we kept, I would have to go back to the office and write a cable. I wrote the cable, maybe at 7:30-8:00 at night and, of course, we would have to have a communicator to send the cable out, because these were the pre-PC days. The cable would finally go out, maybe about 9:30-10:00 at night. So the hours didn't make a lot of sense. But Spanish government officials were very impressive. The prime minister was Felipe Gonzalez. He was a Socialist, but a Socialist in the sense that that was the name of the party. They had less of a budget deficit than the United States did and I think they may have even had a surplus at that time. They had very sound economic policies, the country was booming, it was very well run. This was the time of the Sevilla World Fair and of the Barcelona Olympics. Now, of course, there may have been a hangover from these things after I left. I don't know what the impact was of the

long term financing. Sevilla is where the prime minister was from, so they built a high-speed train to go from Madrid down to Sevilla. I went on those trains and it was wonderful, but did it make economic sense? They built a whole range of bridges and other infrastructure in Sevilla, and also in Barcelona for the Olympics. Spain was a country on the move. Again there may have been a financial hangover, but there was a dramatic change from Franco Spain to the time of Felipe Gonzalez. Spain was a country where you had a feeling of opportunity, a country waking up after so many years of an oppressive regime.

Q: Was there any desirable impact on migration from Africa into Spain when you were there?

KEAT: Some but not nearly as much as today. I visited Spain about a year ago. The Deputy Chief of Mission, Luis Moreno, who is from my Foreign Service A-100 class, is a good friend of mine. Also I saw Angel Navarette, an engineer, a Spaniard who I knew from when I was serving there. He was one of these people who I would be out with until 4:00 in the morning. Now there are a huge number of people from Morocco and other places in Northern Africa. Back in the early 1990s there were some, but not that many, no. Spain still had a fairly high unemployment rate and the salaries of Spaniards were still fairly low. I think it would have been far more interesting for somebody from Morocco to have gone and worked in France than to work in Spain. The biggest source of non-Spaniards who were working there were people from Latin America. There were a lot of Dominicans and others who would come and could blend in fairly easily because of the language.

Spain, like many countries, was a very prejudiced place. It was particularly prejudiced against Blacks and gypsies. Gypsies they would call gitanos. I was listening to the radio one morning, listening in Spanish because I am fluent in Spanish. A woman had gone into a small store, equivalent to a 7-Eleven although not part of a chain. She wanted to buy some milk and the store's owner, calling her a gitana, had refused to sell her milk and told her to get out. As it turned out, the woman was Dominican. She brought a case against him, a complaint, or denuncia, against him before a tribunal that dealt with discrimination. He was apparently very apologetic, responding, "I thought she was a gypsy, that's why I refused to give her milk, if I had known she was a Dominican, of course, I would have sold her the milk." So you see how ingrained discrimination was.

I remember another conversation that I had with one of the Foreign Service nationals. It was at lunchtime and I was sitting in the cafeteria.

Q: This is someone who was working for our embassy?

KEAT: Yes. We were having lunch in the embassy cafeteria. He and a few others were talking about some of the small towns and the culture there. The issue of abortion came up. He said, "In Spain, we don't need to have abortion. If a girl in one of these towns gets pregnant, the fathers get together and the boy has to marry her." So I said to him, "well, what happens if the boy who got her pregnant is a gypsy, a Moroccan or a Jew?" He

responded, "Of course, she gets an abortion." That was the response, so you can see they had very strong prejudices that I assume today are still part of the culture. Countries don't move away from things like that that quickly.

Q: How did you feel that Spain was integrating into the European Union?

KEAT: Very well, they were super enthusiastic about it. They loved Europe as this was their path away from the Franco era. They were extremely enthusiastic about adopting European rules and regulations, about amending their laws, and they were also getting a significant amount of assistance from the European Union at that time.

Q: Now if the question today arises, in the economic section were you raising flags about Spain was taking or experiencing I don't know what you call it a bubble or what would you have it I mean…? Today its expenses are exceeding its income.

KEAT: Today yes, but at that time no. The government had very sensible economic policies. I remember a conversation with Chris Lynch because I was doing macroeconomic reporting and Chris, as my supervisor, would see the things that I had written. We were talking about the economic policies of the Spaniards. This was a time when the United States had a Republican administration, but we were running pretty big deficits. Chris, by the way, was a Republican. We were talking about how the Socialist government of Spain had sounder economic policies than the United States. Later on their policies changed, but in all fairness to them, when we talk about the bubble, many of the present problems in Spain are because the government has assumed the debt of the banks. You could make a good argument that the previous government should have done a better job of regulating the *cajas*, their name for savings banks, and the other banks of the country. But in terms of the size of the deficit that the government ran, I believe actually it was a fairly conservative one that was well within the three percent guidelines of the European Union. If you go back to the time I was there, there weren't really a lot of red flags. As I said, there might have been a hangover from the expenditures for the World's Fair in Sevilla and the Barcelona Olympics, but in general they were coming from a situation where little or nothing had been done in terms of infrastructure during the Franco era. When Spain started to develop its infrastructure, people were investing in Spain in a major way. The money that was coming in from the European Community, this was money that was far more than the money that was flowing out from Spain towards the European community. Their economy was doing very well at that time.

Q: What about Spain, was it playing much of a role in Latin America?

KEAT: Well yes, and one of the things I was doing was dealing with the Foreign Ministry's aid program for Latin America. They were playing a role in Latin America, a cultural one and an economic one. The United States didn't always like what they were doing. For example, Cuba where they were more than happy to deal with Castro, particularly again under a Socialist prime minister. They traded with Cuba; they had large investments there and many Spanish hotel chains set up in Cuba. So yes, they had a big role. They invested in Argentina and a range of countries. Recently, some of that has

come back to bite them. The Argentine government has nationalized some of their investments in the oil sector. They were heavily involved in Latin America. It's a natural market for them.

Q: I suppose so you wouldn't have been hit with it but Spain must have been overflowing with students from other countries including the United States would you?

KEAT: Yes. To a certain extent I was hit by it because I was single at this time and relatively young; I was in my early 30s. I would go to parties. I would meet students. One girl who I dated for a while was an American studying Spanish. She was an older student, in her 30s, but I did meet students. Spain would be one of the best places in the world to go as a student. It's a very hospitable place and there is no real anti-Americanism. There was an insular attitude of some Spaniards. They would talk about the guiris; guiri is a derogative word for foreigners. But they were welcoming to Americans and they were welcoming to students from other parts of the world.

Q: Did you get a chance to sample or look at how much influence the Jewish culture had on Spain back before Fernando and Isabella did their number on the Jews?

KEAT: Toledo has a few Jewish synagogues that I visited. It's not only the Jewish culture. Spain has elements of the Moorish culture. The Synagogues in Toledo have elements of a Mosque, or at least what I associate with a Mosque because of the time when they were built. There was some Jewish influence but not that much. Madrid was a Catholic city. I assume there is a Synagogue somewhere in Madrid, but it wasn't super obvious. I don't remember seeing one.

Q: Madrid's a fairly new city anyway isn't it?

KEAT: It's a fairly new city.

Q: In Spain wise.

KEAT: Yes, Spain wise, it is pretty new. At the time of Ferdinand and Isabella, Jews either were expelled, converted or killed. There are places like Toledo where you can see traces of Jewish civilization, but there wouldn't be a huge amount that you would see in Spain. I think they are embracing these things more today as a way of getting the tourist dollar.

Q: Well then, do you have anything else of significant developments while you were in Spain?

KEAT: No, I think we've pretty much exhausted Spain. After I left Spain I went back to Washington and was working in the economic bureau. That might be a place to start the next time we are talking.

Q: So we will pick this up when?

KEAT: That would be 1992-1994 when I was back at State in the economic bureau in the office in intellectual property rights and competition policy.

Q: Okay, today is the 27th of November 2012 with Stephen Keat. You'd left Spain and you went to the State Department. What job did you have and from when to when?

KEAT: It was from 1992 to 1994. I was in the economic bureau as it was then called, and I was in the office of intellectual property rights and competition policy. I was given responsibility for competition policy for the world and for intellectual property rights for the Middle East and Africa.

Q: It's really to stop people from copying their damn stuff and not paying for it isn't it?

KEAT: That's one aspect.

Q: Do you want to talk about what the problem was and how you dealt with it from your particular vantage point?

KEAT: Again, my portfolio had two separate parts, intellectual property rights and competition policy. I was the only one in the office dealing with competition policy, other than my bosses who dealt with it in the sense that they supervised me. I was given the least important intellectual property rights portfolio because I had competition policy for the whole world.

Q: Let's talk about competition policy.

KEAT: Oh, you want to do competition policy first? Fine. Competition policy is what Americans call antitrust. We've got two main bodies responsible for it, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission. The Department of State doesn't have an obvious role in competition policy. It does, however, when it becomes international. Competition policy is an issue at the OECD, Organization for Economic Cooperation for Development. The OECD has a committee on competition policy. U.S. delegations were led by the assistant attorney general for antitrust. This was a time of transition; we were moving from a Republican administration into the early years of the Clinton administration. We had a Republican Assistant Attorney General who I was told didn't do much on antitrust. This is just hearsay because I didn't actually work with him, I just saw him as he was leaving, but it was not the policy of either the Reagan or the Bush administrations to come down heavily in favor of antitrust policies. The Clinton administration was very vigorous, or comparatively vigorous, on its antitrust policies.

The new Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust at DOJ was Anne Bingaman. Her husband was a senator from New Mexico. At that time he was a two-term Democrat senator; I believe he is up to five terms now, and I think he is retiring. She was quite a lively person, good sense of humor, very loud, but not in a negative sense. She was the kind of person you would like to have at a party, the kind of person you would enjoy

having as a neighbor, somebody who is fun to talk with. She would do relatively outrageous things, but when I say outrageous again I mean this in a positive sense. For example, this is one of the times when we were having budget cuts and everybody was required to fly in coach, including somebody of her rank. She would take some sleeping pills, go to the back of coach, and find a bunch of seats in the center that were not occupied. Instead of just sleeping on the seats, the conventional thing, she would lay on the floor and go to sleep. It worked, but was different than what most people would do.

The delegation included Chuck Stark, a civil servant and the expert giving Bingaman advice on what to do. I learned a lot from him. The delegation also included various people from the Federal Trade Commission; they were all smart people. You had the usual interagency rivalry with people from FTC (Federal Trade Commission) grumbling about Justice and Justice complaining about FTC. That didn't seem to be a problem at the political level.

Q: I know what antitrust is but how did this manifest itself? What were typical cases?

KEAT: Well, you have a range of typical cases. We covered this issue when it would be something going on outside of the boundaries of the United States. For example, the Microsoft case. Both the FTC and the Department of Justice were investigating Microsoft. Later the European Commission investigated Microsoft. The different sides coordinated. They exchanged information and the exchanges of information were, of course, governed by a range of legal procedures as to what they could and could not exchange; but they were all trying to figure out what the other entity was doing. They all had abstract concepts that favored avoiding a dominant position by one firm, avoiding an abuse of a dominate market position. Each used various economic theories to help define whether an economic position was dominant or abusive.

I attended bilateral and multilateral antitrust meetings. I went to meetings in Paris led by the Department of Justice. We would usually meet with the European Union; I think at that time it was still called the European Community, and have discussions on what they were doing and what the U.S. was doing on antitrust. Since we were in France, we would also have meetings with the French government. I developed a good friendship with François Souty. He is still in the French government, a civil servant. At that time François was their leading antitrust expert. He would represent France at OECD meetings. I would go out with him and the French and U.S. delegation for dinner. In later years when I was in Paris for other OECD meetings having nothing to do with antitrust, I would continue to meet François for dinner. Just recently, a huge storm tore through New Jersey and New York…

Q: Hurricane Sandy.

KEAT: Yes. Everyone was concerned that Sandy was going to hit the Virginia area. François sent me emails asking if I was okay and if my family was okay. We've stayed in contact over the years. But back then the two sides held bilateral discussions and we were aiming at a bilateral agreement between France and the United States. I was not involved

with the fine aspects of antitrust law. It was the responsibility of the DOJ and the FTC to make sure that anything they agreed to was in conformity with U.S. domestic laws. I was trying to make sure this was in conformity with our having a good relationship with these entities, i.e., the European Commission and the French government. We also held negotiations with the Germans and other countries. Many of those meetings would be held in national capitals. Usually I didn't go to them, but sometimes we would have meetings on the margins of OECD meetings.

The work of the OECD committee on competition policy was academic in nature. I think this is typical of a lot of the committees, especially ones where 99 percent or more of the people on it are going to be lawyers. They were always analyzing definitions of various concepts and how this would fit into antitrust. They would have endless discussions about this wording and that wording, and a study had been done by some professors. The committee would contract out typically to professors let's say professors from Cambridge University or from Harvard and have them write a paper. The committee would have long discussions about the language and there would be preliminary drafts which were OECD confidential. This didn't mean confidential in the sense that the U.S. government regarded it, but meant that OECD members were not supposed to be giving this out to the Herald Tribune or the New York Times. After some years, the document would be fully declassified and would be issued as an OECD document. This would represent the consensus amongst the OECD members on competition policy and on what laws should be based on.

Q: I would think that we would be caught in almost a dilemma of something like Microsoft who had an extremely successful computer organization. An American organization, what the hell…I mean wipe the plates clean of all these other competitors. Yet at the same time makes the Europeans particularly mad that their people's operating system isn't used at all. Did we find ourselves sort of conflicted between trying to promote American dominance and trying to see that the law was maintained?

KEAT: Yes and no. Yes would be that I still remember one conversation with one mid-level guy from the FTC who was saying how stupid it was that we had been going against Microsoft, similar to what you are saying. Then as now, the Europeans were using antitrust law as a way of hobbling an American firm and as a way of competing more effectively against an American firm when the problem was that their companies were just not producing good software. So certainly that was his analysis. The argument that people from DOJ would have made--of course, I am speaking for them and they are not here to object--but the argument they would have made is that it was in the U.S. interest to make sure that there are competitive markets globally, not just to allow a firm to go and to do whatever it feels like. We were trying to make sure that we had similar global standards. In addition to my work at the OECD there was also work at UNCTAD, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. The person below Chuck Stark at DOJ, I can't remember his name right now, used to go every year to a meeting that the UNCTAD would have on competition policy. I also went to UNCTAD meetings, the UNCTAD Ad Hoc Working Group on the Interrelationship between Investment and Technology Transfer.

Q: Oh that sounds like fun.

KEAT: I have to thank Google for helping me find that name and remember it after all this time. I went and Googled 1989-1990 UNCTAD working groups, and it came up with this one amongst others. This was an example of how I achieved something fairly significant, but in a negative way. UNCTAD was left over from the '60s. It is still around, but at that time was viewed by USTR (United States Trade Representative Office), the Department of Commerce, and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (part of the Department of Commerce) as being a left-wing radical organization opposed to U.S. interests. I don't know how we view UNCTAD today, but at that time it favored redistribution of global income and restrictions on international firms. My instructions were to make sure they did no harm. I didn't have a positive agenda. We did not try to work with other delegations to try and get an agreement; we had to make sure that UNCTAD did no harm to competition policy or intellectual property rights. I went to about five or six different meetings over two years. You have to keep in mind the title: it was an ad hoc working group, not a working group that had an indefinite time; it was limited to two years. The goal was to make sure that they did not extend past the two years and that they didn't propose things such as requiring firms to provide technology transfer on either free or concessional rates to companies in the Third World, that it didn't agree to any language attacking intellectual property rights.

Despite the negative aspect of what I was doing, the UNCTAD meetings were very interesting. Other than at the OECD, this was the first time I had been working in a multilateral forum. Until that time, I had mostly worked on bilateral issues in embassies. The delegation consisted of two people. Gil Donohue was the head of the delegation. Gil was older with a stock of white hair, very distinguished looking, very conservative in the way he spoke and did everything; so a good person to head a delegation. We split up the work. Of course, since he was the head, he told me what he wanted me to do and I did it. My approach was to develop personal contacts with the different delegations. Delegations were composed of people who came to the meetings, who were traveling there especially for meetings such as Gil and myself. Other delegates would be the ambassador or the economic minister counselor serving in Geneva. They would come to the meeting, but would have a broad range of responsibilities. This would be just one thing amongst many. They tended to come toward the later part of the meetings, while the delegates who came from out of town would be there at the beginning and be there for all the meetings.

I had to read through these God-awful long papers with proposals written by bureaucrats. I realize that I was a bureaucrat for 29 years, but there is nothing worse than an international organization bureaucrat. They have to please everybody, so the language is anything but precise. I would read through these documents looking for language that we weren't happy with and then bargain with different delegates on what we wanted. My Spanish was pretty good, so I particularly specialized in becoming friendly with delegates from Latin America. I became very friendly, for example, with the Chilean ambassador. Gil and I were invited to a working dinner that he hosted to discuss the language in the documents. I made a point of speaking from the floor in Spanish. I don't know if this

violated some sort of protocol, but if so nobody from the State Department ever slapped me on the wrist about it. Sometimes I would speak in English and sometimes I would speak in Spanish, which got big kudos with the Latinos. I think it really pissed off the interpreters. You could hear I would start speaking and they would be all ready to translate English into other languages and suddenly they were scrambling to translate Spanish into the language.

Q: I would think that particularly in medicines or something like that that you would have somebody from one of the main American medical companies sitting at your shoulder saying you can't let them get away with that, they are trying to steal our formula or something.

KEAT: Well not so much like sitting at my shoulder, but you did have representatives of firms not just American, but international firms, who would go to UNCTAD meetings. In Washington we would meet with people from industry all the time and we knew what it was that they wanted. There wasn't really any difference of opinion. I'm not aware of anyone important in the U.S. government who was arguing that we should just give our technology away to the Third World. The delegates who were going to UNCTAD meetings from Third World countries may have had an ideological motivation, but they were also just delighted to come to Geneva. If you are from Tanzania or Zambia, for example, and you get a chance to go to an UNCTAD meeting, it is special. You may be their representative in Geneva and have a house provided for you by the Tanzanian or Zambian government, a certain allowance, and servants or you are traveling there with *per diem* and all the benefits. Their biggest concern was keeping UNCTAD moving and keeping their participation in the process going. They had an ideological agenda, but there was more of a bureaucratic agenda of maintaining their benefits. In an abstract world, this was not a good thing, but in the real world it was just the way it was and probably is today.

Q: Yeah.

KEAT: During negotiations, which spanned several meetings, we moved the documents forward and in the final negotiating session I was able to get most of what the United States wanted. I did this particularly working with diplomats from Latin America and Tanzania. At that time you had stereotypes in the Third World of the imperialist U.S., but my best relationships were with the Tanzanians and Latin Americans, Third World countries. We had come up with acceptable language that they would agree to and the U.S. would agree to. On the last day a French delegate who was representing their mission showed up. He had never been to any of the meetings beforehand. He started objecting to the language and proposing changes. I wasn't about to renegotiate what I had already spent two years and umpteen meetings and phone calls and etc., working on. I protested from the floor and pointed out that he was coming in after there had been a compromise carefully worked out and that if he was going to be proposing changes to this language which was acceptable to the U.S., that the U.S. would no longer be willing to accept the compromises it had agreed to. I said if he insists on this then I propose the following and came up with particularly obnoxious language that I knew would outrage

people. We had a very interesting situation where France, nominally a U.S. ally, was opposing the U.S. Suddenly you had Tanzania, Chile and other Third World countries piling on the French official and telling him basically to shut up and go away.

Q: Why was the guy taking a stand?

KEAT: I don't have the foggiest idea because I had no relationship with him. This was the first time I ever saw him. Was this just himself doing something because he believed in it? Was it instructions from Paris? Was it whim? I really don't know, but I don't think it was based on instructions from Paris because he did back down. We got language we were happy with. If he had been acting under instructions from Paris, he probably would have had to go back to them to get clearance. Why he did this, I don't know. But the interesting point this illustrates is that diplomacy is not just the official stances of governments; it is the human relationships that diplomats develop with one another which go beyond stereotypes. Tanzania, a "left-wing socialist" country, was working very closely with the "evil capitalist" United States to come up with something that we were both happy with.

Q: What were these negotiations essentially doing in the world?

KEAT: I'm not sure what you mean.

Q: Well in other words was this in the terms of American football terms leveling the field or was this distributing good things so everybody had a chance to better their people like medicines?

KEAT: I guess there would be three ways of looking at what this *ad hoc* working group was doing. The official one would be that it was studying in an impartial way issues related to technology transfer and investment to make suggestions to governments and to the international community as to the best policies. That was the official way of viewing it. The second view would be the left wing, which had a Raul Prebisch view of the world - - are you familiar with Raul Prebisch?

Q: No.

KEAT: Raul Prebisch was the first Secretary General of UNCTAD. He was a left wing, Latin American economist responsible for what I think and many people think, were some of the worst economic policies in the Third World. One example would be import substitution, where countries would set up high tariff walls to protect inefficient domestic industries. In theory this was a way of making themselves wealthier, the opposite of what it did in fact. It just produced over-priced goods of poor quality: bad cars, bad computers, etc.. It was the exact opposite of what today we would regard as being good economic policy. The Raul Prebisch people within UNCTAD were supporting transfers of technology from wealthy countries to poor ones. They supported requiring firms to provide either concessional or free technology transfer. They wanted to undermine intellectual property rights by proposing that poor countries wouldn't have to worry about

copyright, they could just go and copy whatever they wanted without paying anything to anybody. They wouldn't have to worry about patents. If they wanted medicines they would produce the medicines with no restrictions.

The third view was held by the United States government, which was also held by Switzerland and Germany, was that technology transfer should be as a result of a contract between two or more parties that are freely agreeing to it. AU.S. firm going to, for example, India would only transfer technology to Indian partners as part of a contract where it is getting paid a certain amount of money for the technology that it is transferring or getting some other benefit. Agreements would be on a voluntary basis. Obviously, if a U.S. firm felt like giving away technology, that would be its own business, but it wouldn't be something that would be obligated to do. In terms of patents, copyrights, trademarks, and trade secrets, it was the U.S. point of view that these were important, that these facilitate technology transfer, that these facilitate investment. Taking them by government fiat is actually detrimental to the development of a country and is detrimental on a global scale.

The U.S. perspective was that there was no need for the UNCTAD group, but we couldn't say so; we could think it. We were benefiting from the international status quo which was a capitalist status quo. To whatever extent there would be proposals made by the group they would either be in conformity with that status quo, what we wanted, or ones that would harm U.S. firms and from our point of view also harm the Third World countries.

Q: So basically you were defending the status quo.

KEAT: Yes. The United States was then and still is today largely a status quo power. So yes we are defending the capitalist economic status quo.

Q: Did you feel that I mean in a way that you are dealing with what reflects more the world today than the old world when using things of steel and iron structures and all now more in the intellectual field or at least formulae or processes rather than steal things.

KEAT: Well certainly if you're talking about something solid, yes. But technology transfer might have been the technology for making engines. So it did involve manufacturing processes. I see what you are trying to get at but I wouldn't necessarily put it in today's context. While technology in one sense is technology, it wasn't quite like that; there was no Google at that time. When you are thinking of technology this was the technology for setting up a pharmaceutical plant or the technology for building generators, it wasn't an algorithm for getting answers to peoples' questions.

Q: Well you mentioned Google and for the non-initiated God knows what it will be but it's a pre-eminent search engine today, finding out whatever you want on the thing. The fact it was in American hands must have driven some of the countries nuts, didn't it?

KEAT: Well again, Google was not an issue in those days.

Q: It wasn't an issue?

KEAT: Google was founded in 1997.

Q: _____

KEAT: A at this time Microsoft was still a fairly new company, having been founded in 1975. IBM was the major U.S. technology firm. I still remember, I'm jumping ahead of myself chronologically, but, it wasn't until my next tour in the Philippines when I started sometimes doing cables on computers--on the old Wang's--instead of writing them on a typewriter. We still had secretaries who would type final drafts into cables. So technology hadn't moved to anything close to what it is today.

My anti-trust portfolio was important, but more defused in many ways than the intellectual property rights aspect. While we did touch on intellectual property rights at OECD and UNCTAD meetings, but the vast majority of my IPR work was bilateral. We were trying to work with individual countries to improve the level of protection they provided to intellectual property rights. The office was divided up geographically. As I'd mentioned before, I was given responsibility for the Middle East and for Africa. In those days these were the least important parts of the world in terms of intellectual property rights. Again, because I had competition policy for the whole world my bosses thought it was appropriate to give me a less important IPR portfolio. Delegations would come to the United States. We would discuss their IPR laws and the United States would make suggestions on modifying the laws.

There was and is an international IPR organization, The World Intellectual Property Rights Organization. Howard Lang, the office director, used to go to WIPO meetings. WIPO had standards for what a copyright law should be, what a patent law should be. There are various international agreements, the Bern Convention, the Paris Convention and so on. We don't need to go on into what these are, but the basic point is these are standards that were agreed to which were be updated over the years. When the United States signed and ratified one of these agreements and let's just say for the moment that France and Germany have also done so, that means the U.S. has to provide to a French and German firm the same protection that it would provide to a U.S. firm; that is the whole idea behind these agreements. Later, with the founding of the World Trade Organization, there was an agreement on intellectual property rights which was based on and incorporates these earlier agreement in addition newer protections.. But the principals are the same, the concept of national treatment, that you treat an Italian firm the same as you treat a U.S. firm, that you treat an Israeli firm the same as an Egyptian firm and so on. If countries sign these conventions, in theory all firms and individuals should have similar rights.

Of course, not every country has signed all these conventions. In fact, the U.S. at different times has chosen not to sign on to some of them for one reason or another. Also, these are legal areas so you get into questions as to what national laws actually do. But

the critical point is to try and make sure that firms are protected and are protected in a consistent way. So, if you are talking about copyrights, you want to make sure that Steven Spielberg comes up with a new film and that when he comes up with this new film, if this film is being shown in China, India, Egypt, wherever, that he is actually getting paid for it. Often bootlegged copies are made and shown openly; now today's world is somewhat different. We now have DVDs and Blu-rays. Back then people would go into movie theatres with VCRs or Betamax.

Q: Back to the '70s.

KEAT: The '70s and '80s. People would go to a movie theater and film it with their Betamax recorder. Then they would show it to people somewhere else. Let's just say to see the legitimate one you paid the equivalent of $5 and they would show a copy for let's say fifty cents. While it would be a terrible copy, fifty cents is a lot cheaper so people would go to see it. The U.S. tried to encourage governments to A) have laws saying that's illegal and B) and this is the harder part, to actually enforce those laws. Often countries would pass all sorts of beautiful laws to placate us but do nothing on enforcement.

Patents is probably the single most controversial area. Most countries accepted the idea of a patent for something like a new engine. They would come up with some new gismo to make an engine work more efficiently; there are all sorts of regulations relating to patents, there is the whole question of first to file vs. first to invent. In general, the European and the global standard had been first to file as that's the easier one; the U.S. had been first to invent. We've now moved to first to file, at least I believe we have. So that's a significant concession on our part. But when you are talking about a new motor or other new invention, the general idea is once you have a patent you now have the exclusive rights to that for the number of years provided in your patent law. Seventeen years for example. At the end of seventeen years anyone else can go and make a similar device. But medicines are more controversial. India and Israel are perhaps the two most important countries which didn't agree to the international standards on patents related to drugs. India and Israel developed huge generic industries and the U.S. wasn't particularly happy about this.

Trademarks you have similar sorts of problems. The most important aspect of trademarks is their role in protecting the reputation of the firm. If somebody thinks they are drinking Coca Cola, it is important to the company that they are actually drinking Coca Cola and not something that has been made from sweetened waters contaminated with sewage. Thus trademarks protect the consumer in addition to the firm. When you are drinking Coca Cola, the company is standing behind it.

Discussions with the African and Middle Eastern delegations varied dramatically. I went on a very long trip, about three weeks. I went to Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and United Arab Emirates; in the United Arab Emirates I went to Dubai and to Abu Dhabi. The trip had two parts to it, the bilateral meetings in all of these countries led by USTR, United States Trade Representative. The delegation included experts like Keith Kupferschmid from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Organization and ones from the Copyright Office.

We also attended meetings in Saudi Arabia with the Gulf Cooperation Council. These were big meetings with a broader agenda than intellectual property rights issues. Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown was leading the U.S. delegation with different working groups underneath that. The very first meeting was a formal meeting led by a Saudi prince on one side and Brown on the other. I can't remember which prince it was. After the ceremonial opening, we had various meetings at a lower level. Unlike the bilateral meetings, instead of U.S. talking with the Saudi Arabians, the U.S. was talking with all the members of the Gulf Cooperation Council about appropriate standards. At that time, most of these countries were not members of WIPO nor the World Trade Organization. We discussed what would be required for them to accede to these organizations.

Big issues were the different levels of expertise and in the case of some countries, blatant hypocrisy. Different levels of expertise were very clear during our bilateral meetings with the Kuwaitis. In one sense they were the easiest meetings in the world. This was after the United States had liberated Kuwait from Saddam Hussein. I remember when we landed in Kuwait there was graffiti praising the United States; probably the only time in my life where I had seen graffiti on walls talking about how wonderful the United States was; I still have photos somewhere that I took of the graffiti. During meetings with the Kuwaitis they were falling all over themselves to show us hospitality and be nice to us because we had saved them and their country. But the problem was that they had literally no concept of intellectual property rights. They were happy to do whatever we said, but they did not have the foggiest idea of what we were talking about. We would try to explain copyright to them; we might as well have been talking about some obscure aspect of quantum physics.

Q: The Kuwaiti's are extremely sophisticated sitting in London for generations.

KEAT: Well first of all when you say they are extremely sophisticated there may be some Kuwaiti's who are extremely sophisticated and maybe in some ways but in terms of intellectual property right law, no. At least not the people I spoke with. I'm not sure what the population of the country was at the time; I think it was about a million people, something of that sort. Maybe they had two or three copyright lawyers who actually understood the concepts. They came from a nomadic tradition. It was a coincidence of geology that they were sitting on top of a lot of oil which made them wealthy in a fairly short period of time. They had no tradition of international property rights. They didn't produce much of anything that required international property rights. What did they have? The traditional economy was one of nomads and the new economy was one of oil. Maybe there are a great works of Kuwaiti literature, but they are certainly not internationally famous. If there were pharmaceutical plants in Kuwait, they were certainly not well known outside of Kuwait. I think that when I was talking with them that this was genuine ignorance. They really were willing to do pretty much anything we suggested, but the problem was understanding what we were talking about. Our discussions were very basic; they were pleasant in the sense that there were no disputes. They would agree to look into the issues, but it was definitely a learning curve for them.

The hypocrisy came with the Saudi's. Saudi Arabia a wealthy country, with a very efficient, and I don't mean this as a compliment, a very efficient police state. They were very good at keeping control of what they regarded as pornography, and for them pornography was something that would show a woman's leg. In the bazaar and on the streets all the Saudi women are fully covered and any American women would also be fully covered. If Time magazine had a picture of a woman that showed her leg or a little bit of cleavage, that would be censored. They had very strict controls on which movies could and could not be brought into the country. The movies that they allowed into the country were heavily pirated. When it was convenient for them they would stop something from coming in because they claimed it was immoral. A Steven Spielberg film about Schindler can't be allowed because that has Jews in it and because it also has some scenes of naked people. But if you have a Walt Disney film that is acceptable to them, it was sold in pirated copies all over the Kingdom. The conversations we would have with the Saudis were very difficult. They would agree to study issues, but it wasn't with the friendliness and willingness of the Kuwaitis; it was sort of shut up and leave us alone, that sort of thing, yes, we will study this.

Discussions with the Egyptians were more positive than the ones with the Saudi's. They had and still have today a great cultural tradition. Egyptian works are pirated across the Middle East, so they shared a certain interest with us. If you are talking about literature, if you are talking about music, talking about movies, Egypt is a leader in the Middle East. Of course, there is a big problem within Egypt of U.S. films and literature being pirated, but the Egyptians were very conscious that they were losing a lot of money. In Cairo we had meetings with Egyptian authors and at the Egyptian ministry of culture. They were very sympathetic to what we were trying to do. At that time Egypt had far more of a manufacturing base than did Saudi Arabia including foreign firms that were producing pharmaceuticals in Egypt, foreign firms with representative offices or some other presence. Their local representatives were pressuring the Egyptian government for protection. Nobody would have argued that the Egyptian government was a democracy, but that didn't mean that it was immune to pressure. It wasn't a hard line dictatorship on this sort of issue; it might have been if you had been out there from the Muslim Brotherhood trying to oppose the regime, but it was OK for someone from the business community to pushing on something. I remember meeting with a businesswoman who was representing some U.S. organization; I'm can't remember if it was copyright related or patent related. She was the daughter of a minister. For all the wrong reasons she had a lot of influence. We had far more successful negotiations with the Egyptians than we did with the Saudi's.

Discussions went well with Dubai and the UAE.. Dubai was at that time just sort of starting to set itself up as a duty free zone and trying to get people to invest from all over the world. They didn't have a lot of oil. They were very interested in IPR because they thought it would be a way of attracting investment. Our discussions with them were fairly positive.

It would be hard to go and say we made dramatic progress in my two years in dealing with the intellectual property rights issues in these countries. We moved things forward.

Later in my career I was, again, working on intellectual property rights issues. While some of the same issues were still around, by that later time the Saudi's had more industry and were members of the World Trade Organization. W laid the groundwork for changes these countries were eventually willing to adopt 10-20 years into the future.

Q: All right well this was in a way one of our fundamentals of economic concerns.

KEAT: Yes.

Q: This is not a sort of minor little thing. This is something that is sort of like fighting forest fires that keep cropping up all over the world, aren't they?

KEAT: The U.S. loses billions of dollars of exports of intellectual property every year to piracy, so yes this is particularly critical. One thing that I should have mentioned is the Special 301 process. Section 301 of the trade act is the basis for USTR issuing a list every year about countries and their performance on intellectual property rights issues. The process has evolved over the years. Countries are judged and placed higher or lower on the list. It never fully made sense to me the way countries reacted to this because it's just words. There is the possibility of bringing sanctions under Special 301 but in most cases countries are on the watch list, the priority watch list and some are designated you priority foreign countries, the ones we have the biggest problems with. One year they created a new category, special mention, which was for countries that weren't on the watch list but where they wanted raise one particular area or another that was a concern; industry was pushing for them to be on the watch list and for political reasons they weren't put there. So USTR came up with special mention to placate industry. But all these categories do no real harm. If I put you on the watch list it is bad boy, but if I put you on the priority list watch list it is also bad boy. Even priority foreign countries, while we hold heightened negotiations, nothing happens in the real world. China and India which been designated priority foreign countries at different times with no real harm to them. It's impractical to sanction China. Officials from USTR would probably be furious about my saying this, but that's the real world. We would harm ourselves more than the Chinese if we were to impose major sanctions. It's similar to the Chinese owning so many T bills. Some people say the U.S. is heavily indebted to China that it puts us at their mercy. Actually it puts China at our mercy because they own so much of our debt that they are truly dependent on the U.S. economy doing well. If they were to suddenly decide to sell all their T bills it would harm the U.S., but it would mean that they would suddenly be owning a lot of worthless debt.

Q: Yeah.

KEAT: In a similar way, if we brought major sanctions against China because of their theft of intellectual property, the Chinese wouldn't just sit there, they would retaliate. We would be harming the U.S., it would make no sense. But every year there is a build up to Special 301. The industry associations, the copyright associations, patent associations, trademark associations are very successful lobbies. One of the most famous is the Motion Picture Administration of America which is e very effective at lobbying. I was invited to

receptions at their headquarters in the days when things like this were permitted. They would give us drinks and *hors d'oeuvres* followed by a first-run film in their very nice movie theater with the best sound and overstuffed seats. MPA would, of course, host senators, and members of the house, and persons far more important than I was from the executive branch.

I industry would prepare submissions prior to deadlines, which would then be published in the federal register. They would be calling for Egypt to be on the priority watch list, Saudi Arabia on the watch list or whatever they'd be calling for. This is followed by discussions between industry and the State Department, the Department of Commerce, USTR, etc., all the different agencies that were involved with this. We had numerous inter-agency meetings that would go on and on. We'd be arguing where Egypt should be put, where should France be put, etc. This was a lot of spinning wheels and it still exists today, a lot of spinning wheels about nothing, but it keeps the lobbyists employed and it keeps government bureaucrats employed. Now, of course, government bureaucrats could be employed and doing more useful things. Despite everything negative I'm saying about 301, it does have an impact on countries' policies. It is a very slow and it's hard to say because you can't have two worlds, one where the Special 301 process exists and another where it doesn't exist. It is hard to say what it would be like if it didn't exist, but countries do seem to get upset when they're raised to a certain level or when they are expecting that they are going to be lowered and it doesn't happen. U.S. embassies are always prepared, cables are sent out preparing them for the Special 301 announcement, giving them language for use in *demarches*. The countries would be very upset when they were raised to a worse status. There was a process, and I worked on this in the Philippines and other countries where I served, a process where countries would slowly change their laws and slowly change their enforcement of those laws to provide greater IPR protection.

Would this have happened without Special 301? If we had a similar effort with foreign countries I don't think we needed that we did not need Special 301. By the way, I keep talking about Special 301, but there are different clauses in the law and it has been amended at different times. I am speaking in an imprecise way, but for our purposes that's fine. If you have a student of intellectual property rights enforcement they can go and they can check on the exact dates and aspects of the law.. But, for the kind of discussion we are having now it's enough just to be aware that the U.S. government had this process and that it provided full employment for lobbyists in one sense and full employment for government bureaucrats in another sense, but also some pressure on countries around the world to meet what we considered to be acceptable standards for IPR laws and enforcement of IPR laws.

Q: Well you know what you are saying and correct me if I am wrong but the United States plays a really major role in setting up legal framework around the world in many things. I mean intellectual property and all.

KEAT: Yes.

Q: And one thinks too of anti-bribery laws?

KEAT: Yes.

Q: There are other ones that are sort of obscure that none of us think about but we do think about trying to create a world structure and you have people like yourself running around enforcing this.

KEAT: That is correct. On anti-bribery, for example, there is an OECD Convention which the U.S. was the major force in pushing for. Prior to that convention, in France and in Germany you could deduct the bribes that you paid in foreign countries from your taxes.

Q: And people laughed at us but at the same time like Pall Mall has smoking regulations. I think we were probably the first major country to say you know smoking really does do awful things to you and you shouldn't smoke. Putting up prohibition as to where you can smoke and all, even Ireland no longer allows smoking, which I find incredible.

KEAT: I agree with you that we were the first, but I also wonder to what extent that was a natural progression as countries became more developed and also as people become more educated on the harm from smoking.

Q: But Russia and China had a terrible problem.

KEAT: They are still culturally fairly backward countries; they have a lot of development to do. In the case of China, I know until recently the government had a large economic interest in the tobacco industry. I don't know if it is still the case.

Q: I've read quite recently where the same answer doled out according to your rank and society.

KEAT: Yes.

Q: But anyway the United States I suppose part of the thing I'm saying is it comes across and I shudder at it that God knows we aren't that big a country but there is some talk about being the indispensable country. I have to subscribe to this and in many things that the United States acts as a world leader in things and it's not driven by a sense of moral superiority but out of a sense of self interest.

KEAT: I agree with you that there is a strong dose of self-interest, but I also think there is a feeling of moral superiority on the parts of many Americans. If you look at the recent presidential campaign, Mitt Romney made a point of talking about America's special role in the world. Ronald Reagan spoke of that shining village on the hill, isn't that the phrase he used? And Woodrow Wilson, it's both parties not just one.

Q: The thing is that as Foreign Service people we shudder and don't like these belligerent statements but there is something there. The United States often meddles and sometimes the meddling doesn't help and in fact sometimes it is almost destructive. But in sort of the world community I'm dubious that you would have the world community we have today if it weren't for the United States.

KEAT: I agree. You say you're dubious; I would be stronger and say we wouldn't have the world community today if it wasn't for the United States. I'm a child of refugees; my parents came to the United States to escape persecution in Europe. I'm very aware of the important role that the U.S. has played; imperfect, but that's because humans are imperfect. But at the same time we do have self-interest. Let's go back, for example, to George Bush, the most recent George Bush. He pushed through an expanded program to fight AIDS. That was done for humanitarian reasons. You can take almost anything you want to and find a selfish reason if you analyze it hard enough. But to me that was clearly just something done…

Q: That was driven by Africa.

KEAT: Yes and a feeling that we had a moral obligation to help these people. Something different was the first Gulf War that his father conducted. If Kuwait had not been sitting on top of a lot of oil, it would have been some country in the middle of nowhere sitting on the top of nothing and we wouldn't have gone to war, it's as simple as that.

Q: Okay then after two years what did you do?

KEAT: Well after that I did a two-year tour which ended up being a three year tour in the Philippines; I was there from 1994-1997. I was assigned there for two years and I extended and made it for three.

Q: What was your job in the Philippines?

KEAT: I was working in the economic section. My primary responsibilities were civil aviation, intellectual property rights, telecommunications and energy. Because of cutbacks I ended up taking two positions and making them into one. It was quite frankly too much. It wasn't too much in the sense that I did not cover them. Did I do a good job in covering them? Hopefully, but obviously I couldn't have covered them as in depth as if I'd only been covering one person's portfolio instead of two.

Q: In the first place how would you put the state of our …you were there from when to when?

KEAT: I was there from 1994-1997, the time of President Ramos. When Marcos was overthrown Corey Aquino, the wife of the slain opposition leader, became president.

Q: _____

KEAT: No disrespect to housewives, but her only experience had been as a housewife. Her husband had been the ambitious politician; she had been doing whatever she did supporting him when they were in exile in the United States., If I remember right he was at Harvard.

Q: He was at Harvard.

KEAT: He was the activist, not her. They returned to the Philippines and was gunned down when he got off the plane. This horrified the Filipino people; the Philippines was used to corruption, they were used to bad government; there is a word in Filipino called hiya. There is not a direct translation into English, the closest one would be shame but it has a stronger connotation. Someone who has no hiya is beneath contempt. Do you remember Chuck Colson from Watergate? Chuck Colson said that he would walk over his grandmother's face if that would help Richard Nixon get reelected. Chuck Coulson had no hiya. When Aquino was gunned down, it wasn't that he was taken off the plane and taken to jail, the Filipinos would have accepted that.

Q: He was gunned down…

KEAT: Right on the tarmac.

Q: …right on the tarmac.

KEAT: When that happened, from the point of view of the Filipinos, the Marcoses had no hiya and it was time for them to go. It didn't happen overnight but it started a process. The church turned against them, the people on the street turned against them, the military turned against them. Ramos was one of the people who turned against the Marcoses. He was a key leader of rebellious members of the military who were supported during the famous EDSA revolt, a march where people came out to support the rebels. Corey Aquino took control, but when I say took control, that's probably not good phraseology, she became president. Corey Aquino was, from how everyone described her, a very sweet and decent person with absolutely no concept of governance. She came from a very wealthy and powerful family, as did her husband; she came into office and was largely a figurehead. Around her were powerful and extremely corrupt officials continuing the Marcos tradition of robbing the country blind, except with a veneer of respect for human rights. The country had a relatively free press, which could criticize the government, but terrible corruption and disorder, a lack of control. Groups in the military were constantly rebelling, trying to overthrow Aquino. I still saw bullet holes in buildings when I arrived in Manila. Hotels and malls always had armed guards out front. But Ramos supported her and basically kept her in power. As a reward, he became the next president. He did so by way of an election but still it was a reward for keeping her in power.

Within a few days of arriving I was going to a reception at the ambassador's residence. I was being taken to the reception by the deputy in the economic section. He picked me up from my apartment and this just gives you how as an example of how things are different in the Philippines because of traffic; traffic is one of the main issues Manila. People get

used to the road being gridlocked and totally unpredictable. As I'm sure you know, the normal protocol is for the staff to arrive at a reception at the ambassador's residence fifteen to thirty minutes early. We were not there to enjoy ourselves, but to work, to greet people, take them around, introduce them to the ambassador, etc. The deputy picked me up fifteen minutes before the start of the reception. I was concerned that this was a problem that we should have been at the residence already. I had been ready for 45 minutes to an hour waiting for him. He said, "No, no, no, don't worry about it." The traffic was terrible; we ended up showing up at the reception thirty minutes late. Normally this would be a terrible thing but Ambassador Negroponte didn't say anything negative to us, no one commented. Because of the traffic in Manila people always accepted the idea that you came when you came. If you had a meeting with a minister at two o'clock in the afternoon your meeting might start at two if by sheer chance you actually got there at two but it might not be there until 3:30 p.m. because either you or the minister might be late. People always accepted traffic as an excuse and, of course, that made things worse because if people were busy with something else they would just come late and say it was the traffic even if it wasn't.
Q: What piece of the action did you have?

KEAT: Civil aviation, intellectual property rights, telecommunications and energy.

Q: Okay do you want to pick those up?

KEAT: Why don't we talk about telecommunications and energy and then the next time we meet we can go and talk about the others.

Q: Yes, I imagine it's quite a bit.

KEAT: Yes, and when we get to civil aviation there is a whole issue of terrorism which will take some time. The country was developing and opening itself up and keeping itself closed, a contradiction, which is normal. Energy is the sector where it was opening the most. There were serious blackouts under Aquino. This was probably from decades of underinvestment in the energy sector. Under both Marcos and Aquino money was being stolen that should have been going into infrastructure. The problem was reaching a height under Aquino with blackouts for extended periods of time. The wealthy bought individual generators but the middle classes and the poor had to suffer extended periods with no electricity. Ramos brought a military approach; he had gone to West Point and was not necessarily a democrat in the sense that we like to think of democrats but a leader who knew how to make the trains run on time as Mussolini would have put it. They brought in power barges-- American companies would provide a barge there that would generate electricity. They started letting U.S. and other foreign companies build generation plants. A "small" U.S. firm, Enron, was very active in the Philippines. A lot of the work that Ambassador Negroponte, I and others did in the energy sector was on behalf of firms like Enron. To the best of my knowledge the people who were doing the energy stuff for Enron in the Philippines were legitimate. These were actual projects…

Q: We are talking now about Enron a decade later or so is a bad name because of…

KEAT: It went bankrupt.

Q: …it went bankrupt and great fraud.

KEAT: And great fraud.

Q: It was very destructive, going bankrupt and the administration of the place was not very savory.

KEAT: That's one way of putting it. They were corrupt and people went to jail.

Q: As we've seen today…

KEAT: Yes.

Q: …it's a very bad name but at the time it was considered one of the….

KEAT: One of the leading U.S. firms.

Q: It was filling a major niche in energy.

KEAT: Yes. In general the Filipino's had their arms open wide; they were delighted to have anyone who produced energy come in. Many non-U.S. companies were paying bribes; The Philippines was very corrupt. U.S. firms to the best of my knowledge were not paying bribes; for one thing, we had the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act.

Also, in the energy sector I don't think they needed to pay bribes. A corrupt official would be delighted to get a bribe from a Japanese, French, or German firm, for example. But Ramos wanted to ramp up energy production. I think if you had been holding up an American plant and the U.S embassy had come and complained to the secretary of energy, it would have been very bad for your career. It was fine to be corrupt but don't stand in the way of producing electricity. Massive plants were being built all over the country. There also were geothermal plants. The Philippines is a volcanic country. Chevron had a fairly substantial geothermal plant.

Q: Is that an effective form of tapping energy?

KEAT: They made money from it, so I guess the answer is yes. I'm not an engineer but, it is fairly simple. I think you inject water, which becomes steam and turns turbines to produce electricity.
Q: As long as all of a sudden molten lava doesn't come up.

KEAT: Yes. Butut in any case, my point was to show there was a lot of activity in the energy sector. It was very welcoming to U.S. firms.

Q: Nuclear?

KEAT: No. This was an area of dispute between the Philippines and the U.S. A nuclear plant was being constructed under Marcos by Westinghouse with financing from U.S. EXIM Bank Aquino decided they weren't going to pursue the plant, that it wasn't safe. From the point of view of the U.S. engineers, it was perfectly safe, but from the point of view of Aquino, it wasn't going to happen. EXIM and Westinghouse felt that if the Philippines did not want to finish the plant, that was its decision, but they wanted to be paid.. Nationalists jumped on the issue and it was not helpful to our bilateral relationship. While the issue was subject to continuing discussion, there wasn't a lot of progress.

Dam construction was also a significant part of the Philippines energy strategy. One interesting story may or may not be true, but even if it's not true is still illustrative. Mountain Province is in the North. , Banaue, in Mountain Province, is famous for its rice terraces. The inhabitants of Mountain Province allegedly practiced cannibalism and headhunting until fairly recently. When the Spaniards took over the Philippines they never successfully subjugated the Mountain Province. The U.S. did successfully take over Mountain Province, but probably with less control than perhaps in other areas of the Philippines. Under Marcos allegedly the government was going to build a dam up in Mountain Province. Again, I don't know if this story is 100 percent true, but even if it's not, it shows the character of the local people. The local people lived in a particular area for hundreds, perhaps thousands of years. But they did not have formal deeds. People lived in their village which was where their ancestors lived. The government said, "We are building a dam here, you all have to move." They said, "No, this is where we live, we are not moving." The government said, "Show us the deed." Of course, this was under Marcos and the government had no respect for human rights. An engineering camp was built to prepare studies for the dam. Supposedly two engineers disappeared one day and their heads were found on poles. For some reason nobody else was willing to work on the dam project after that.

Again I don't know if that is true but it has the ring of truth.

Q: But they didn't send you up to convince the natives?

KEAT: No, by the time I was there it was post Aquino and there were no plans for dams in that area. The government actually had a fair amount of respect for the rights of the people of Mountain Province. One of my best contacts, an undersecretary in the department of energy, was from Mountain Province. (Because of the U.S. influence, the Philippines has departments, not ministries,) Rufino Bomasang, he used to go by Boomy, was the highest ranking person from Mountain Province in the government; he was a very hardworking, smart guy. One time I went up to Mountain Province with him. We went to the school where he had been educated which had been built by Protestant Missionaries after the U.S. invasion We went to his father's house, a hut in the middle of

the fields. I suspect that Boomy was one of the few honest Filipino officials I dealt with. The tradition in the Philippine government was to steal for your family as well as for yourself. While his father's hut was not horrible, it was a hut. They served us local dishes, killing a small pig in our honor. But to get away from Mountain Province and return to the energy sector, it was fairly open with great opportunities for U.S. firms.

Telecommunications was more complex. There was a great boom in telecommunications due to some deregulation of the sector. The Filipino equivalent of AT&T was PLDT, the Philippine Long Distance Telephone Company. PLDT was listed on the New York Stock Exchange with ADRs, American Depository Receipts. I think it was the largest company on the Philippine Stock Exchange at that time. PLDT was reluctantly moving away from its monopoly position. There were other local telecom providers, particularly for cell phones, but the rules and regulations definitely still benefited PLDT. U.S. firms sold technology to local telecoms companies. U.S. EXIM Bank was heavily involved in financing telecom deals as had been the case with the energy sector; many Enron deals had EXIM Bank financing.

So one of the big things we were doing with varying degrees of success was trying to further the liberalization of telecoms to allow more entry of U.S. firms. We also dealt with issues of the charges that were imposed when you complete a call. If I make a call from the U.S. to Manila using AT&T, they have a charge for using their wires. The second it gets to PLDT's wires, PLDT would charge a connection fee a certain amount for going over their wires. These charges are largely artificial. It doesn't make a big difference whether you are making a call from New York to Ohio or from New York to Manila given that electricity moves at the speed of light. American firms wanted PLDT to lower charges so they could compete more effectively in the Philippine market place, have lower prices and make more money. That was one of the issues that we were raising with the Filipinos with varying degrees of success. Unlike the energy sector, American firms could not play on a fairly level playing field and bribes were a big issue. It was not just a question of a French firm paying bribes to win sales; Filipino firms were bribing Filipino government officials to get regulations they liked. I raise issues with my contacts and I would write talking points for Ambassador Negroponte to use with the minister, but we had far less influence and far less success in helping American firms than we did in the energy sector because the minister was the one who was pocketing the money.

Q: Okay, well this is probably a good place to stop.

KEAT: Okay.

Q: We will pick this up the next time covering…

KEAT: We will look at intellectual property rights and civil aviation.

Q: Good and then I would like to talk about life in the Philippines...

KEAT: Okay.

Q: …because the social life can get pretty hectic there and has become a problem for the Foreign Service. I speak as a counselor officer.

KEAT: Well I got married in the Philippines so that's probably a good subject, life in the Philippines.

Q: Okay, and also your impression of Ambassador Negroponte and all.

KEAT: He is the finest ambassador that I ever worked under and I will go into greater length.

Q: Okay, great.

Q: Today is the 11th of December 2012 with Stephen Keat and where are we?

KEAT: The last we were talking about my tour in Manila which was from 1994-1997. I had primary responsibilities for civil aviation, intellectual property rights, telecommunications and energy. We went over telecommunications and energy and left it that we were going to talk about civil aviation and intellectual property rights. You also wanted me to talk about Ambassador Negroponte and life in the Philippines. I probably should also talk about Ambassador Hubbard who came after Ambassador Negroponte. He wasn't as famous, very few ambassadors would be as famous as Ambassador Negroponte but he was a skilled ambassador who I worked under.

Perhaps starting with life in the Philippines maybe we should have done that before. Philippine society is very stratified; I'd be tempted to use the word segregated. There is nothing official about it, but it is certainly socially segregated. You have three classes. First is what I will call the Filipino Filipinos, people who were ethnic to the area, people who are similar to Malays, Indonesians, Thais and so on. The people in that part of the world were seafarers, sailing back and forth and intermarrying, having children with each other. So there is not a huge difference in the way people looked. Tagalog is the main Filipino language, but there are a range of dialects throughout the country. The languages spoken in the Southern Philippines are very similar to the languages of northern Indonesia. The distances between those islands is not that great. While it's not the same as with Africa, it is the same in the sense that the colonial powers came and drew lines which didn't necessarily have that much to do with reality; so in any case you have the Filipino Filipinos.

When I was there, the vast majority of these people were extremely poor, oppressed socially, oppressed by their government. Their government was theoretically democratic, but it was corrupt and had been corrupt for many years. Under Marcos it wasn't even theoretically democratic. Under Marcos it was a dictatorship and a kleptocracy robbing the country blind. The governments which came afterwards while better than Marcos--that is damning with faint praise—suffered from endemic corruption. Somebody growing up in a poor area of the Philippines could not expect to get a decent education; they

would have free education but couldn't expect it to be particularly good. The teachers weren't well paid, they weren't well educated. The poor could not expect to get good medical care at the public hospitals. So you had the trappings of democracy and you had the trappings of a social welfare net, but it didn't really do much to help them. A huge number of Filipinos have gone overseas and have gotten jobs to escape the grinding poverty of their homeland. People went to work as nurses, maids, construction workers, etc. Filipinos would come to a place like the U.S., Canada, or Europe and they become very successful because they no longer had to operate in this corrupt system that oppressed them. In the United States you have lots of very successful lawyers, doctors, and others who came from the Philippines and have done very well for themselves.

An elite group of Filipinos is the political class. They are robbing the country blind. If you become a senator, if you become a member of the house or better yet a minister or secretary--they don't use the word minister, they have a secretary. So if you are the secretary of energy, that's a license to steal. While some people in the bureaucracy are honest, they're definitely rare. Once I had dinner with an undersecretary dealing with transportation issues. At this time President Ramos was officially earning $5,000 a year, so this undersecretary was officially earning about $1,000 a year. He had a gold and diamond encrusted ring and a similar watch. If he had gotten them on his salary, he was really, really frugal and really good at investing. That sums up one strata of Philippine society which happened to be the strata that was, of course, the vast majority of the county. While there were exceptions, in most cases people were poor and oppressed or corrupt and rich.

The second group was and still is the ethnic Chinese. The ethnic Chinese in the Philippines and throughout Southeast Asia are often referred to as the Jews of Asia. Even though China is a huge country, the ethnic Chinese in Southeast Asia are minorities. Their culture places a high emphasis on education; they work extremely hard and they're good at dealing with the system even though the system doesn't accept them. They don't really care who the president is, they don't care who the different politicians are, and they give money to all the candidates as a cost of doing business. Whether you are making political contribution or a bribe is a fine distinction, so they do both. The system is such that people can collect what economists call a very high "rent." That doesn't mean renting out a building, it is an excess of money of the restrictions on free enterprise. They are given privileges be it in telecommunications, energy, tobacco, civil aviation, or some other areas. They are able to make much more money than you would in a full free market. Of course this is very common around the world. In Mexico, for example, Carlos Slim has a dominant role in telecommunications and has done very well because of limited competition. It's not an oddity but it is one aspect of the Philippines.

The Chinese were then and still are greatly discriminated against. Discrimination was probably worse when I lived in the Philippines. Based on conversations I've had with people, I get a feeling that the Chinese are more comfortable with their position in society than in the past. One of the biggest problems when I was there was kidnapping and the ethnic Chinese were the main target. They were targeted for a number of reasons. First, they tended to have money. Second because of discrimination, they felt that they didn't

have recourse to the legal system. If Uncle Joe was kidnapped they paid the bribe to get Uncle Joe out and didn't waste time going to the police. They especially didn't waste time going to the police because the police may very well have been the ones kidnapping him. The police in the Philippines at the time I was there were incredibly corrupt. Members of the police and the military were behind many bank robberies and kidnappings. There was a bank robbery near where I lived were the robbers were using portable missiles…

Q: RPGs.

KEAT: RPGs, yes. A RPG slammed into an office building next to the apartment building where I was living. We have bank robberies here in Virginia, but I've yet to hear of anyone using an RPG; it's usually a gun or something of that sort. The Chinese were a basic source of income for the police and the military, and the criminal class; I wouldn't necessarily differentiate between the criminal class and the police and the military. I heard rumors that President Ramos was using kidnapping as a campaign finance tool, that when it was time for the elections that he would raise money through increased kidnappings. There were various allegations that he was behind kidnappings not just related to elections, but that in general that he allowed them to go forward and that he got a certain percentage. I have no particular evidence, but I can tell you that people believed this. The fact that they believed this and the fact that kidnapping was so widespread was not a healthy thing for the society.

Q: No.

KEAT: The third group is the descendants of the Spaniards, in many cases, extremely wealthy people such as the Ayala family which owns an area called Makati. Owning Makati is the equivalent of having one U.S. family owning Wall Street and all of Lower Manhattan. Makati is the business district, it is the area when I was there where all the well-off people would live, you had all the fanciest apartment buildings, all the big office buildings, the stock exchange, etc. Many other Spanish families were similarly well-off. They were an incredibly small percentage of the population; perhaps one half of one percent. I met the Ayalas because they were involved with a cell phone firm. I took a U.S. Export-Import Bank delegation meet them about guaranteeing some loans. The members of the Ayala family all spoke Spanish; they also spoke English and Tagalog. Spanish is not a particularly useful language in the middle of Asia, but that was the language that the parents spoke with their kids. The kids in many cases were sent to Spain for education, but that was changing while I was there; I don't know how it would have worked for lower levels of education, but they would be more likely to send their kids to Harvard for their MBA than to Madrid. But certainly in the past the tradition had been to send their kids to Spain. Another example of discrimination within Philippine society: the Ayalas and other Spanish families did not marry Filipinos. The boys were all married to women from Spain, it had to be a white, Spanish woman; it would be okay if it was a white, Spanish woman from the Philippines. But they would often be married off to imported brides from Spain. It was okay to have sex with Filipina women and it was okay to have children, but those wouldn't be your legitimate children, they wouldn't inherit

anything; they would be taken care of but they were definitely second class within the family.

A fourth group was not at all Filipino--people like myself; The expats, diplomats, and foreign business people were all in a very good position; people within Filipino society were friendly towards us and we were viewed neutrally in terms of their societal divisions. I would be talking with one group, maybe with the Filipinos, and they would be talking about how the Chinese are rich businessmen ripping off the country. The Chinese would talk about the corrupt Filipino elite and the lazy Filipino. The Spaniards would say similar things about the Chinese and the Filipinos. It gave me a unique insight into the society. I never felt any hostility; it's a nice country for Americans to live in, Filipinos have, in general, a good opinion of the United States. Under Spain that small elite group of Spaniards ran the country and everyone else was kept down. There was no education of Filipinos under the Spaniards. Education was restricted, but they did educate their illegitimate children; that led to the rise of what was called the *Ilustrados*, which were the mixed breed Filipinos/Spaniards who led the revolution against the Spaniards and who then were very upset when the U.S. took over after the Spanish-American War. They were delighted when we were supporting them. But then we decided to take over. As President McKinley put it, "To help our little brown brothers." At that point the *Ilustrados* shifted from fighting on our side against the Spaniards to unsuccessfully fighting against us.

In comparison with the Spaniards, the U.**S**. had a fairly benign colonial rule. We provided education throughout the country, we provided excellent infrastructure; at that time there was safe public drinking water in the cities, something which is not the case today, and there was good electricity throughout the cities, something again, which was not the case when I was there. The Filipinos recognized this. Prior to World War II, the U.S. was preparing the Philippines for initially a sort of quasi-independence and then presumably independence. But the Japanese invaded. The Japanese were not only far worse than the U.S. but far worse than the Spaniards. With all the atrocities that they had to put up with under the Japanese and after fighting on the side of the Americans against the Japanese, their attitude toward the United States was very positive. At the end of World War II they were given their full independence, although they regard their r independence as having started in 1898. In any case, their attitude toward the United States and toward expats was good; it's a very hospitable environment.

Ambassador Negroponte was the finest ambassador whom I directly worked with. He was an extremely smart, calculating guy and I mean calculating as a compliment. He analyzed Philippine society extremely well. He understood the buttons to push when we needed to get things done. He also was extremely well wired into the U.S. political system, particularly with the Republican Party, but also with the Democrats. He served in the Philippines under President Clinton, who came for the APEC summits and who Ambassador Negroponte greeted at the airport. But Negroponte had gotten his start working under Kissinger and had Nixon-era ties. One time I was invited to the ambassador's residence for lunch to speak with a group of visiting businessmen who wanted to talk about opportunities in the Philippines; if I remember right it was in the

energy sector. One of the businessmen was Cap Weinberger. Weinberger had been pardoned for his role in Iran Contra by the first President Bush and Negroponte was serving under Clinton, but he still had good ties with the ambassador. Negroponte knew who to call in Washington, who to speak with to get things done and the Filipinos recognized his influence.

I worked very closely with him on civil aviation issues in particular and perhaps the best thing would be if I talk about civil aviation and IPR and talk about Ambassador Negroponte's role in these areas. You can ask me more questions if you want.

We had a multifaceted relationship with the Filipinos on civil aviation. First, we had a bilateral civil aviation agreement which we were renegotiating. We wanted to get permission for more U.S. carriers to fly to the Philippines; we also wanted to get legal status for FedEx's operations. Subic Bay, which had been a U.S. Naval Base in the northern part of the Philippines, was becoming a hub for FedEx. This was clearly in the interest of the Philippines, but an example of how it can be a mistake to get presidents and other high-level people involved in issues that can be resolved at a lower level. Fred Smith, the founder and CEO of FedEx, had apparently gotten hold of Bill Clinton and told Clinton that he wanted him to speak with Philippine President Ramos about Subic Bay and let him know how important it was that they do everything they could to let FedEx operate there; Clinton did that. The problem was that Ramos, a smart guy, thought, "Oh, this is something the American's want," so it shifted from being something that was good for the Philippines to being something that was good for the U.S. It became a bargaining chip in the civil aviation negotiations with the U.S. Again, you want to be careful if you can do things at a lower level, if you can do something at the level of a bureaucrat like Stephen Keat, do it at his level don't raise it unnecessarily to the level of the ambassador and God forbid don't raise it to the level of the president unless you've carefully thought over what you are doing.

American Airlines, United, Delta and Continental Micronesia were also involved in the negotiations. Continental Micronesia, Delta and United already had flights to the Philippines; American wanted to have flights and Philippine Airways wanted to restrict the entry of the American carriers. Lucio Tan was doing his best to keep things under control. American carriers were interested in getting rights to fly to Cebu, another major city in the Philippines. It was a very complicated set of negotiations. I was the only American in the official negotiations, the only American from the embassy I should say; I misspoke. I wasn't the only American. Delegations came from the United States, including at one point Tom Martin, head of the office of civil aviation affairs in the economic bureau.

The negotiations were fought out in the press; the Philippines had a free-wielding press that didn't bother with the truth. I remember one day reading about how a knowledgeable member of the U.S. delegation told this reporter X, Y, and Z. I was the only member of the U.S. delegation in the Philippines at that point and I hadn't spoken to that reporter but I was very interested to read what I had supposedly told that reporter. The secretary of Transportation, Telecommunications and Communications, Secretary Garcia had this

huge department that he was responsible for and hence a lot of possibilities for bribes. He was heavily involved in the talks and it's safe to assume that all the people who were involved in the negotiations were either directly benefitting from large sums of money being paid as bribes or at least eligible to do so. I don't want to bring in U.S. legal standards to this, I have no proof of money changing hands, but you could see at times that the Philippine delegation would be agreeing to something and then Lucio Tan would fly in …one time for example he flew to Cebu and then the Philippine delegation immediately changed its position. This could have been just pressure from Lucio; it could have been from sums of money exchanging hands. I had no proof but it was certainly the belief of people in the embassy that sums of money were changing hands.

In the end, the U.S. and the Philippines did come up with a new agreement, one that took many sessions to conclude. But coming to that agreement was complicated by the more important part, at least from my perspective, of the civil aviation relationship: the issues of safety and security. It's important to differentiate between safety and security. Security refers to the measures taken to avoid having terrorists or nut cases hijacking planes, blowing them up and so on. Safety is making sure that the plane is safe, that it had proper inspections, that the pilot knows how to fly the plane properly, etc. The Philippines was a real problem child in all cases. For safety, the FAA has a program where they check on how their equivalents are performing their regulatory functions. In one sense this is an extraterritorial assertion of FAA authority, but in another sense it is something that the Congress mandated that they do to protect American citizens.

Q: Yeah.

KEAT: The FAA placed aviation authorities in category one, two and three. If you are a category one, everything is fine; if you are a category two there are restrictions on flights by carriers based in your country; category three imposes an absolute ban on your carriers. Countries in category three could not fly planes that are supervised by the national authority to the United States. I believe at that time Nigeria fell into this category. The Philippines when I arrived in country was still category one. I don't know if the category one was just inertia or if it was actually based on inspections, but the FAA came, inspected and decided to change the Philippines to category two. When they changed the Philippines to category two this meant that Philippine Airlines was able to continue flying its existing flights to the United States but was not allowed to expand capacity. The Philippines in retaliation put restrictions on American flights to the Philippines. This also complicated our negotiations for the civil aviation bilateral accord because the Filipinos didn't see any particular reason why they should agree to things that would theoretically give them more frequencies to the U.S. if the FAA wouldn't be allowing them to exercise these increased frequencies. Again, we had a long process of working with the Filipinos on this issue, Secretary Garcia and other Filipinos would often accuse us of using this as a lever in the negotiations for the bilateral, that we were coming up with safety issues that were not based on fact for negotiating leverage. The people whom I spoke with in the FAA all denied this, and I have no reason to disbelieve their denials. But in the Philippines, where officials would abuse such a power if they had it, that denial had no credibility. The technical officials from the FAA, were different than

the officials involved with negotiations and, in fact, the FAA was not involved in the negotiations. The negotiations were led by the Department of State with the participation of the Department of Transportation. The FAA comes under the Department of Transportation, but it functioned as though it were a separate entity for safety issues.

Security was the single most important issue I worked on in my time in the Philippines.

Q: That's an active area.

KEAT: Well when I got there we didn't realize it was an active area. However, our "friend" Ramzi Yousef and al-Qaeda woke us up to the fact that it was an active area. When I got to Manila and started working on civil aviation, the embassy had no huge concern about security. When I said there was no huge concern there is always the possibility that other parts of the embassy were aware of things that I wasn't and that they weren't sharing those things with me. If so, they were incredibly negligent in their jobs. I don't want to dismiss that possibility because after 9/11 one of the big things that came out was that FBI and CIA weren't talking to each other and did not share critical information with the State Department; so there is a possibility that people weren't fully informing me of things. The FAA opened an embassy office in my last year in Manila. Prior to that, I was in effect the FAA, I was the person responsible for all issues on safety and security. If the ambassador, if the DCM, if other agencies were aware of a terrorist threat and didn't let me know, I would say that would have been gross negligence. I tend to think that they just didn't know. Particularly Ambassador Negroponte--I would be the last person in the world to accuse him of gross negligence. There were many things that we spoke about; he would sit down with me in the cafeteria for lunch and would discuss with me the state of the civil aviation negotiations. On a regular basis he would have me come to talk with him about other issues; he wasn't particularly protocol conscious, unlike some ambassadors who would only meet with the head of section. I think this probably comes from his time as an aide to Kissinger where he was a fairly junior guy working with one of the most important people in the U.S. government. From his point of view it wasn't your rank that mattered, it was what you were doing and your ability to get things done.

We had a situation where a Philippine Airlines plane was flying over the Pacific and a bomb had been planted in the plane.

Q: Really, flying from the Philippines?

KEAT: Flying from the Philippines and the bomb went off. That pilot is the guy I want to be piloting any plane I'm in if anything happens because he landed the plane successfully despite a bomb going off. It was a small bomb and it was a test, as we found out later. Al Qaida had a plot to blow up eleven U.S. aircraft simultaneously over the Pacific. They were going to plant these bombs with timers set to go off at the same time. This was pre 9/11, but they had these ideas back then. The bomb went off, the pilot landed the plane despite the explosion and suddenly we had FAA safety people crawling all over the place. We also had intense interest from a range of different agencies. I was involved in

discussions and saw information that I can't really divulge now, but which again makes me think that prior to that, when I wasn't seeing things, I wasn't seeing things because people weren't paying attention.

Malate is an area of Metro Manila which is not too far from the embassy; it's sort of a red light district. It's got a mixture of poor people, prostitutes, and some interesting bars. Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, Ramzi Yousef, and Abdul Hakim Murad were operating out of an apartment in Malate where they were planning various terrorist attacks. There was a plot to assassinate the Pope who was going to be coming to visit the Philippines, the plan to blow up U.S. aircraft, and a plot to assassinate President Clinton during a future visit to Manila.

The Filipino's deserve the credit for uncovering these plots, not the United States. The U.S. is often very contemptuous of other countries. We have an attitude that the United States is a First World super power and these Third World countries should follow our lead. To the best of my knowledge, the U.S. was oblivious to the threat and it was Filipinos who uncovered these plots. A small fire in the apartment raised concerns and a local police woman, Aida D. Fariscal, persisted with an investigation that disclosed what was going on. The whole profile of this issue escalated, Cathal L. Flynn, a former admiral who was head of the FAA, came to visit the Philippines and I was his control officer. I was sitting with him and Ambassador Negroponte discussing the issues. Flynn was literally considering the possibility of going and just shutting down all flights from the Philippines to the United States over security issues. He did not do so but that was something that he had in mind. When I was describing to him what the security concerns were and the problem with bribery and so on he, from my perspective, overreacted perhaps because of his military background, His immediate reaction was we'll just shut everything down.

Q: That's the military.

KEAT: Yes, but this would not have been an effective way of dealing with the situation. So we started an intensive program, the FAA, other agencies working with the Filipinos, to beef up security. It was a very intense time. Again, I can't go into everything for reasons of security classifications. But I can say that in terms of things that I have done in my career, this is the one case where I can say that I had an impact on saving human lives.

Q: Were these terrorists with al Qaida tied to the Moro insurrection?

KEAT: Not really, depending on what you mean by tied. There may have been some links and al Qaida was certainly interested in supporting that insurrection. After 9/11 the Bush administration provided assistance to the Philippines to deal with the insurrection. In the time that I was there I don't remember seeing anything really indicating a strong lasting tie. The insurrection in the south was largely a result of repression of the Muslims by their fellow Filipinos. When I gave an explanation of the Philippines earlier, I should have also talked about the Muslims. The Muslims live largely in the south representing

about five percent of the country. The rest of the Philippines acted largely as if they didn't exist; the country is Catholic and I want to say Catholic with a big C. Christmas time starts even earlier than in the United States and all over the country they have big celebrations of Jesus with a general assumption that people should be Catholic. I never would hear anything about any of the Muslim holidays; they just didn't exist from an official point of view. The people in the south were poor and in one sense that is not unusual in the Philippines, but they felt oppressed as Muslims. It is hard to say when insurgencies started. The Moros resisted the Spanish, the Americans, the Japanese and this continued when the Philippines became independent after World War II. But Marcos made things worse. There were people fighting against Marcos. Some people fighting against Marcos were communists, some people were Muslims, some people were representatives of different indigenous groups, but all were they fighting against Marcos because he was oppressing them in an even worse way than he was oppressing the rest of the country. The Moros felt oppressed and they were aware of their Muslim identity.

Catholic Filipinos, again 95 percent of the ethnic Filipinos, does not understand Muslims and probably really doesn't understand how they were being insensitive towards them and complicating the situation. The south had some parallels to Northern Ireland. When insurgencies go on for a long time, the difference between them and organized crime can perhaps diminish. They were very much into kidnapping people, kidnapping tourists in particular. Scuba diving groups would get kidnapped on these little islands and they were held for money. When the Morrow Liberation Front is holding you for money, is this because they are liberating people or because they want to get some money? How different is this from what the Mafia is doing? I will leave it up to others to draw that fine line. When you've been kidnapped all you know is you are kidnapped or when your relatives have been kidnapped or your son or daughter is being held in a jungle somewhere, you don't really care whether it is a Mafia type thing or if it's related to oppressed people. Despite press reports and Bush administration policies, I wasn't aware of a big tie; Al Qaida trying to exploit Moro grievances is not the same as blaming the problems in the south on al Qaida. Quite frankly I don't think we had a lot of information coming out of the south. After 9/11 resources were found for measures in the south, but not while I was serving in the Philippines.

Q: Yeah.

KEAT: We would have had people with USAID down in the south. I'm not sure we had the Peace Corps down there. We did have the Peace Corps in the Philippines, whether it was safe to have them down in the south or not I don't know, but we would have AID projects. We would have had some information coming out, but it's not the same as having other agencies being involved and to have perhaps the political people in the embassy going down there on a regular basis. I hope I'm answering your question.

Q: Yeah, it gives us a feel for this. So what happened?

KEAT: Well, what happened was we had a dramatically escalated presence. Secretary Pena, the U.S. Secretary of Transportation under Clinton came to visit. This was another

example of how Ambassador Negroponte did things. I believe Negroponte was the official control officer, but I was the *de facto* control officer, so I went to meet Pena's plane at the airport. One of the nice things if you are secretary of transportation is you get your own aircraft; it's small, it's not quite Air Force One, and it isn't as nice as the secretary of State's plane, but it is like a Gulf Stream or something of this sort; sort of top of the line and very nice. In any case, I was meeting his plane at the airport and he was going to be staying at the ambassador's residence. Ambassador Negroponte turned to me and he said, "Stephen, would you mind coming to my residence to brief the secretary?" Of course that's being polite, "Would you mind?" So I said, "Yes sir". So without any preparation we went back to the residence, the secretary washed up and I was sitting on the couch with the secretary of transportation and the ambassador briefing him on the state of the bilateral civil aviation agreement negotiations and the state of the situation on safety and on security. These were not the sort of things where you wave a magic wand and resolve the problems.

Over the time I was in the Philippines we went from a situation where we were working on negotiating a civil aviation agreement until eventually we got a civil aviation agreement. On the safety issue, we got an FAA office opened in the Embassy and we were able to work with the Filipinos on concrete improvements to safety and security; we got both of these improved. I can say that by the time I left, things were much better and I can say that at the time that I left the risk to Americans and others flying in and out of the Philippines was dramatically lower. That was a result not just because of my work on these issues, but from the range of agencies that became involved. But, I played an important role. I suddenly found myself responsible for an issue that was in the New York Times and probably on the front page. In contrast, the work I was doing on telecommunications and energy might have been in the business section. As an economic officer I think that's important but, of course, people possibly getting blown up is more important.

Q: It tends to focus intention on it.

KEAT: The issue of intellectual property rights…

Q: This is all a big one isn't it?

KEAT: As I mentioned the other day when we were talking, I had four main portfolios because two positions were merged together. Quite frankly, I had too much to do, but it made for an interesting time and it kept me very busy. Intellectual property rights was a lobbying effort; that would be the best way of putting it. U.S. firms were concerned that their copyrights and trademarks were being violated; patents were less of an issue in the Philippines. Patents were more of an issue for India and Israel with their large pharmaceutical industries that were making generic copies of drugs produced by U.S. firms. But copyrights and trademarks were definitely issues and, of course, the patent industries want to see good laws everywhere around the world. We were working with the Filipinos to make sure that their laws were in conformity with international conventions and to try to bring them up to the highest standards possible. In general the

United States Trade Representative (USTR), the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) and the Copyright Office push to get countries to adapt intellectual property rights legislation that is better than what is required under international norms. They do that in response, of course, to industry pressure. So we were lobbying the Filipino bureaucracy in terms of what laws we wanted them to be putting forward because this was a country that was a democracy, an imperfect democracy, but a democracy. I was lobbying staffers, members of Congress and senators. I would meet with members of Congress and senators, I met with Senator Macapagal-Arroyo who later became the president of the Philippines; she was the president prior to the current president. Again, this is a sign of how important this issue was. I, a mid-level guy in the embassy, was able to meet with high-level political people to discuss this and it wasn't just because they loved Stephen Keat, it was because they were aware of the interest of the U.S. business community and of higher level people. Ambassador Negroponte would often raise these issues in his meetings.

We pushed the Filipinos to conduct raids; to raid a warehouse that had CDs in it and go and get the CDs to be crushed underneath a bulldozer or something of that sort; to go where trademarks were being violated, to go and to try and get them to take actions. This wasn't as glamorous as the civil aviation work, but it was very important and took a lot of time. The Special 301 process which I described earlier was a lever. One of the things that we would be doing every year is we would be preparing an embassy Special 301 cable to be used in the report. We provided U.S. Embassy Manila's assessment of the situation and then we would be presenting to the Philippine government what the results were; again, using this as part of our lobbying efforts.

One of the other issues I was covering was Subic Bay. As I mentioned, Subic Bay was the former U.S. Naval Base and had become a hub for FedEx but also had become a Free Trade Zone (FTZ). I traveled there and wrote various reports including an unclassified cable on opportunities for investors that was aimed at the Department of Commerce and the business community in the U.S.

Q: The Filipinos were having Subic Bay as I recall as a great place to get your ship redone and it had all sorts of facilities which had been used by the U.S. well some of it because some of it had been pulled away but still have pretty good facilities for naval repairs didn't it?

KEAT: That might have been, but the Federal Express hub I mentioned before was more important as were various manufacturing sites in the FTZ. …Okay, the first thing they had reliable electricity which made Subic a good place for manufacturing. They had a separate telecommunications regime from the rest of the country so you could make calls internationally at a lower cost, making Subic a good place for back offices, a good place for call centers. Also, because of the whole infrastructure of the base, Subic was a good place to live, it was comfortable; the water was safe to drink and so on. Many Taiwanese investors came to Subic, for example, Acer the computer company was doing assembly there. Subic Bay was moving forward and the U.S. was interested in it for FedEx and other U.S. firms. Richard Dick Gordon was the head of the Subic Bay Metropolitan Authority. He was a dynamic guy with young people around him who were all interested

in making things work. It was a shame that a later president , President Joseph Estrada, set back Subic's economic progress. Estrada was then forced out of office. He was a former movie actor who had played tough guys in films and gangsters. His administration was extremely corrupt and they replaced Gordon at Subic Bay and the people who he put there ran it into the ground. I'm not really sure what it's like today. I haven't heard anything about Subic Bay recently, but it was one of the success stories during the Ramos period. Under Ramos there were certainly great problems of corruption, but there also was a feeling of hope in the country. I believe now, again, with the new president Aquino there is again a feeling of hope in the country. I've read in the paper that the Philippine economy is doing very well and it is one of the fastest growing in Southeast Asia today; it's a place with great possibilities.

Q: Were there many sort of former petty officers and all that, Americans, around there using their skills or not?

KEAT: Well, not necessarily in Subic Bay, but you have a lot of Americans in the Philippines and some of them are former military. Many because they had married a Filipina. One of the big divisions in Philippine society is a big male/female division. There is a big male/female division everywhere in the world, but the stereotype of the male Filipino is that he is shiftless, drinks a lot, and gambles away any money that he is not spending on drinking. Of course, it's unfair to many hardworking Filipinos but that is the stereotype. The stereotype of the female Filipina is that she is hardworking, religious, doesn't drink, etc. There is an element of truth behind these stereotypes. It is very rare for a male Filipino to marry a non-Filipina while it is very common for Filipinas to marry non-Filipinos and that was because they often view the non-Filipinos as being a much better catch. So you marry the petty officer, he's a guy with a steady job. He is imperfect like all of us, but he's got a good job and he is not gambling away every penny that he earns and so on. You would very often see American men married to Filipinas; it would be much more rare to see the opposite. I hope this isn't stereotyping because of course, broad generalities are not fair.

In terms of my life in the Philippines, in a different way I did end up marrying someone there, so you can say I was partially fitting into this stereotype of Americans marrying local women, but I wasn't marrying your typical Filipina; I ended up marrying an ethnic Chinese which gave me a bit more insight into how the ethnic Chinese view things. Because of my intellectual property rights portfolio, I went to a reception given by Microsoft met a woman whose family was involved in both the selling of legitimate software and also the computer business. They had a range of other businesses, but she was there because of the family software connection. We ended up dating and eventually ended up getting married, this was a contrast with the ethnic Filipina where an American husband would be viewed as a great catch. Her family was not particularly happy about her dating me and even less so about the idea that we would be getting married.

Q: The Chinese, of course, are not ones to move outside of their ethnic circles, if they can help it.

KEAT: Yes. I think now these many years later they have accepted me, but certainly at that time their overall enthusiasm for their daughter getting involved with me was relatively low, but we did it anyway.

Q: Did you see there, I'm thinking of people in the time of the Marcos', the social life was almost dangerous professionally because of the desire for visas, the desire for influences and the society was almost smothering in its intensity.

KEAT: Well it was more of a problem for people working in the consular section. I know we had in the time I was there one consul general who had to leave under a cloud and there were a number of other people who behaved in a way that raised questions, but then State sent us a very good consul general, Kevin Herbert, who was largely brought in to clean things up.

Q: Do you know where he is now?

KEAT: I think he's retired and working as a WAE.

Q: What's his name?

KEAT: Kevin K-E-V-I-N, Herbert H-E-R-B-E-R-T.

Q: H-E-R-B-E-R-T

KEAT: And I think his wife is working at FSI.

Q: Okay, I'll look for her.

KEAT: Yes and make sure you let him know that I spoke well of him. He is a very nice guy, looks a lot like Alan Alda; that is not important, but was interesting. Again, I believe one of the reasons I believe he was brought in was to clean things up. Another person working in the consulate was Ray McGrath, now head of the office of Cuba affairs. Ray was straight-laced and hard-working (and still is) and I think they had a lot to do to clean things up.

Q: I was consul general in Seoul and I had my problems.

KEAT: I think having been a consular officer in the Dominican Republic where I experienced the problems in a very direct way and then having been in the Philippines where I was an economic officer, I can say it affects you, all this pressure from people who want to get visas. If you are single you can't just assume that a woman is interested in you because you are handsome and charming. Maybe you are just a visa to the U.S. That actually helped with the woman I ended up marrying: she already was a U.S. citizen so I wasn't worried that I was just a ticket to the USA.

Q: Was this sort of pressure on the embassy discernible as far as either for visas or for influence or not?

KEAT: We constantly had people who would want us to help them get visas. I did my best to avoid getting involved with that and again I think a lot of this was because I had been a consular officer. I hated my year as a consular officer in the Dominican Republic; it was very difficult work and it was also work that I was not suited for. But it is good to have all officers serve a consular tour to t make you a little bit more sensitive as to what it's like to be the visa officer and what it's like to have somebody from the political or econ sections putting pressure on you to issue a visa to somebody who is not really qualified. So I did my best to avoid that; I was willing to provide information but I wouldn't say this person is a contact. I know this person is doing this, this and this, I was willing to convey information about what I knew, but I didn't want to go and put pressure on them to issue a visa to somebody for any reason. I tended to leave that for the head of section, if he wanted to do that.

Q: You were part of the economic section?

KEAT: Yes.

Q: Who was the head of the economic section at that time?

KEAT: At first it was Donald F. McConville, a member of the senior Foreign Service, an older guy; I think that was his last tour. He was married to a Korean woman; he had served in Korea before. He was smart, a bit disorganized but understood the issues fairly well. His deputy was Anne Derse, who ended up replacing him as economic counselor; she came in I believe as an O-1. I don't know if she got promoted while she was in the Philippines or afterwards but in any case she went into the economic counselor job because she had impressed Ambassador Negroponte and also the DCM. She was a very hard working person and she later became an ambassador. I saw she just retired now. She was ambassador to Azerbaijan and then Lithuania

Q: Her name is…

KEAT: Derse, D-E-R-S-E.

Q: D-E-R-S-E, and her first name?

KEAT: Anne, A-N-N-E. We had two Clinton visits at the time I was there and she was heavily involved with them. The first visit was an APEC meeting in, I think it was Indonesia. In any case, it was one of the neighboring countries and President Clinton came to Manila after. Then we had the APEC meeting in the Philippines. Anne Derse was responsible for organizing our participation in the meeting; whether she technically had the title of control officer or whether that was given to the ambassador or the DCM she, in effect, was the one who ran everything. Warren Christopher gave her an award, for her work on the meeting. To have the Secretary of State handing you an award with

the ambassador there and with the entire embassy watching is obviously a fairly prestigious thing.

Anne Derse was a very ambitious, hard-working person and put in long hours., She was married to a Foreign Service officer who was also and O-1; he was head of the political section and this was his second tour in the Philippines. He had come to the Philippines early in his career and was a very pleasant guy. Unfortunately, he ticked out; his time in class or time in service came due. That happened either right after the Philippines or shortly thereafter.

Q: Ticked out you mean time in class.

KEAT: Yes. Under the Foreign Service regulations they restrict how long you can stay in the Service. While she was able to continue, she became ambassador, and she had also gone to Iraq in the early years of the U.S. involvement after the invasion. I believe he was able to go there also working on sort of a contract basis. When Anne Derse replaced Donald F. McConville as econ counselor, a FS)-01 by the name of Don Cleveland came in as the new section deputy.

Don was a very pleasant guy, married to an Australian woman. He had been DCM in Trinidad before coming to Manila. He got to be DCM in Trinidad because a political appointee, I think a former Congressman, was ambassador. When the existing DCM rotated out, the ambassador wanted Don as his DCM even though he wasn't at the appropriate rank. The ambassador got his way. When Don came to the Philippines it was a bit awkward, because he had been a DCM, admittedly at a smaller place, but now he was deputy in the econ section. I think that was difficult for him. But he was married, as I said, to an Australian, and the Philippines was close to Australia so she could go home and visit and they were happy with that. I believe this was his last post before his time in class came up and he was out of the Service.

Q: Well this is probably a good place to stop at this point I think and is there anything else we should cover in the Philippines?

KEAT: Just that it goes over into the next post which was Uruguay. The one thing I would mention in terms of the whole process of getting assigned to Uruguay. It was a stretch assignment into one of the most desirable postings in Latin America. People loved to go there because of its low crime, because it's a very educated pleasant place to live. I was looking to continue with an overseas assignment.

My former girlfriend, now wife, was pregnant and giving birth to our first child. My first son was born in the Philippines. I was looking for an assignment, considering a whole range of places, Ethiopia, different places in Latin America, different places in Asia. Unfortunately, for that small part of the Asian bureau (EAP) where I was working, the part that dealt with Indonesia, Philippines, Malaysia and other neighboring countries, had no positions that were coming open that would have been appropriate for me. Given the Balkanization of EAP, I was not given serious consideration for places like Korea and

Japan. I might as well been working for the European bureau as far as they were concerned; I wasn't part of their mafia. My CDO, career development officer, had recommended that I apply for this job in Montevideo. While I did so, I wasn't really hopeful of getting it. The deputy chief of mission in Montevideo, Nancy Mason, called Ambassador Negroponte to ask about me and he gave a glowing recommendation. Because of his recommendation I was assigned to go to Montevideo.

There was a shootout, and I will explain what that is in a second, between myself and a more senior officer whom the bureau didn't want for the job, but who was of the appropriate rank and was an economic cone officer. A shoot out is when you have two people bidding on the same job. One has been assigned, but the other is challenging the basis for assigning the other to that position. The challenger is saying that the assignments panel should give them the assignment based on regulations or other criteria they assert is being violated. In any case, I won the shootout, something I attribute to Ambassador Negroponte's intervention.

Q: Great, so we will pick this up when you went to Montevideo.

KEAT: I was in Montevideo from 1997-2001.

Q: Okay, we will pick it up then.

KEAT: Okay.