

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

NANCY TUMAVICK

*Interviewed by: Ann Van Dusen
Initial interview date: June 19, 2023
Copyright 2024 ADST*

This oral history transcription was made possible through support provided by U.S. Agency for International Development, under terms of Fixed Amount Award No. 7200AA21FA00043. The opinions expressed herein are those of the interviewee and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development or the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Childhood in Cicero
2. Joining USAID as an IDI (1969)
3. First assignment: Thailand (1970-1975)
4. Liberia, land of liberty (1975-1978)
5. Return to D.C. and the Bangladesh Desk (1978-1982)
6. Indonesia (1982-1986)
7. Tunisia (1986-1990)
8. Pakistan (1990-1993)
9. Back to DC (1993-1995)
10. USAID after USAID (1995-2018)

INTERVIEW

Q: Today is June 19 and this is our first interview with Nancy Tumavick. Nancy, welcome. Let's start at the beginning. I know that you had a very international family, so could you talk about your parents and grandparents and where you grew up?

Childhood in Cicero

TUMAVICK: Certainly, and thank you. My childhood was actually rather unremarkable. I was a single child born in 1947 to a well-educated couple later in their lives. My mother was a middle school teacher, and my father was a lawyer. He served as a lieutenant in the

Navy in World War Two and in retrospect he suffered from what we now recognize as PTSD (Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder), basically never recovering and totally ruining his career. So, we lived in a rather dirty blue-collar neighborhood in the infamous Chicago suburb of Cicero. It was known as Al Capone's town in the 1920s. It was also the home to Kropp Forge, a major steel producer and a major polluting industry. And I always joke, it took me years afterwards to learn to trust air that I could not see, touch, and smell.

Q: Was your dad a presence in your life or was he so incapacitated by PTSD that he really did not play a major role in your growing up?

TUMAVICK: Well, we lived together, my parents and I, but he was pretty much in absentia. It was my mother who raised me and guided me.

Q: So, he was trained as a lawyer but never was able to practice it?

TUMAVICK: Well, actually he did practice—misused the funds that were given to him by clients and eventually was officially disbarred from the legal practice.

Q: What a shame. And your mother, you said, was a middle school teacher?

TUMAVICK: Yes, in the public school system she taught seventh and eighth grade social studies some thirty-six years.

Q: Did you have other family around—aunts, uncles, grandparents?

TUMAVICK: Oh yes. My exposure to what was considered foreign cultures and foreign languages began at birth. My paternal grandparents were Lithuanian immigrants, the term used was DPs, Displaced Persons, and they basically spoke no English. My maternal grandmother lived with us. She was totally bilingual, Czech and English, since she was brought to the U.S., as I understood, as a toddler. When my mother returned to teaching when I was about three, four, my grandmother really raised me on a daily basis. So, I would accompany her to the Bohemian butcher and Bohemian bakery, to her Czech social gatherings and to wakes and funerals, and at all of those locations only Czech was spoken. And while a little unusual for our neighborhood, there were virtually no children on the city block where we lived for the longest time, so I had no playmates until a new European family moved in some three, four houses down from us. They turned out to be an immigrant family from Sicily who spoke no English. The youngest child was a girl my age, so we became fast friends and I had to pick up some basic Italian.

Q: So at that point I'm counting four languages that you were exposed to. Czech, Italian, and English.

TUMAVICK: And Lithuanian.

Q: Right. What brought your grandparents over, I'm guessing probably in the teens or twenties. What was happening in Europe?

TUMAVICK: I'm not sure I can fully answer that question. My grandmother was brought over at the end of the 19th century and I'm not sure the reason for her family's immigration. The Lithuanian grandparents were rather interesting. He came across the ocean first and worked to earn enough money and then literally bought himself a bride from the village that he came from, and she was twenty years younger than he. So, there was a tremendous age difference between them. But they were farm folk.

Q: Right. Did they stay in touch with relatives back in the old country? Or when they came did they just cut their ties with eastern Europe?

TUMAVICK: Actually, I remember going to the post office with my Czech grandmother periodically to mail packages to Czechoslovakia. I never quite understood what was inside them, why she was sending them, but she stayed in touch, clearly.

Q: Interesting.

TUMAVICK: On the part of my paternal grandparents, I simply don't know.

Q: So, you're an only child and for a certain period of time in your early years there were no kids around. You obviously got very comfortable being around adults, I would guess.

TUMAVICK: Exactly. I was an adult by the age, my mother said, of about five.

Q: Interesting. What was school like? Did you go to the same school where your mom taught?

TUMAVICK: No, she was in the public school system, and I was sent to the parochial school. So, when I began school, it was located a half a block down the back alley from our house. I was able to walk by myself. It was a small parochial school, Saint Valentine's, that was managed by Catholic nuns whose roots were firmly planted in Poland. So, in self-defense I had to learn to speak and understand some Polish and made sure I indulged in their folk dances and Christmas traditions, right? So that was another language.

Q: There you go, that's language number five. Now, did the children in the school have as diverse a background as you had?

TUMAVICK: They were predominantly I'd say Polish background, second generation.

Q: Which is still a very strong cultural influence in Chicago today, I think.

TUMAVICK: Indeed. So, I was raised eating Polish sausages and beef tongue and pierogi, all the eastern European delights.

Q: Right. Well, I'm curious, was the Catholic school considered a better school than the local elementary school or were your parents just committed to a Catholic education for you?

TUMAVICK: I think the latter. The public school system—just like the Catholic or private system—depended upon the individual teacher in terms of the quality of the education that was provided.

Q: Right. So, you talked about your neighborhood as being Al Capone's neighborhood, was there violence that you witnessed as a young child?

TUMAVICK: Well, in a couple of different ways. Cicero was a racist community, if you will. So, it was one of the largest towns in the U.S. at the time, the population was something like 70,000, but it was a lower-class Eastern European ghetto, so to speak, with a mélange of Czech, Polish and Lithuanian immigrants. Cicero was the site of an intense race riot in 1951, and its residents were widely known to be hostile to blacks. I recall that we drove past an apartment building still smoldering from where a black family had been burned out only a couple of days after moving in.

We were not tolerant of people of color. But the other interesting thing was every other year or so there were tremendous floods, and everyone went out into the street with brooms to try to clear the drains, and there was one man I recall—a huge Italian guy, who lived down the block—Uncle Joe. Uncle Joe would be the leader in getting all these drains cleared and streets cleared. And then one day there was an article on the front page of the Chicago Tribune that a body had been found in the trunk of a car in downtown Chicago. It turned out to be Uncle Joe. He was evidently involved in some gangster activities and crossed wires with someone. But on the streets themselves we were quite safe. My mother had no fears of me going to the corner store or library or walking blocks to a friend's house.

Q: Fascinating. So, did you go to high school there? Were you taught by nuns, and did any of them recognize you as a special child or take an interest in you? Do you remember being singled out in any way?

TUMAVICK: In grade school, no. They treated everyone equitably, except of course the little boys who were always a discipline problem.

Q: And high school?

TUMAVICK: My mother wanted me to continue with a Catholic education rather than going to the local school where there were a lot of gangs. Not necessarily the violence that we see today, but nonetheless not a school that she would like me to attend. There was nothing in the direct area where we lived in Cicero or even in a couple of suburbs further west, so I was enrolled in Nazareth Academy. It had been a boarding school, but it was just winding down and accepted only day students. It was a private school in a

western suburb, La Grange Park. So, I was bussed ten miles each direction every day for four years.

Q: You said your mom wanted you to do that. Did you have an opinion at that point, or did you just trust her judgment, or did it not matter what you thought that's where you were going to go?

TUMAVICK: No, I think I was in agreement with her. The idea of getting out of this blue-collar neighborhood I found very appealing. To get an education with girls who were mostly a higher class than we were, I viewed it as an opportunity.

Q: Right. So, you were aware of class differences when you went. Girls can be pretty nasty in their teenage years, did it work out okay?

TUMAVICK: Yes, I didn't have any problems. There were actually two other girls from Saint Valentine's grade school that also bussed with me. So, I wasn't alone in that sense. And the girls, with minor exceptions, were welcoming.

Q: Was there a teacher that stands out in your memory of your high school years or anything other than your amazing background that predisposed you to look at an international career?

TUMAVICK: Well, the assumption was I was going on to college, so one was expected to take either Latin or Greek as the foreign language. And that was not my interest at all. So, I caused a bit of chaos when I decided I was going to take Spanish. And I do remember my Spanish teacher. She was not a native Spanish speaker, but a very dramatic woman. She just made the language come alive. She was wonderful. She was not a nun. It was a mix of nuns and lay people teaching. The four years of Spanish then gave me a firm grounding in romance languages. When I went on to college and minored in French, I found it relatively easy.

Q: Right. You had no interest in pursuing any of your East European languages that you'd acquired?

TUMAVICK: Well, my vocabulary was a child's vocabulary. So, it wasn't a question of really building on it. I much preferred going into what I considered to be a modern language.

Q: Right. Did the Italian that you picked up by your friendship with the Italian family help you with Spanish when you studied it? Because in a sense you'd heard romance languages earlier.

TUMAVICK: Right. I think it helped me with creating an appropriate accent, a good accent. I've always had that in many languages. The principle was, if you don't say it properly, don't say it at all. My older daughter, Alexandra, follows that same principle.

Q: Well, that's certainly the French attitude towards non-native speakers. But your MLAT score (Modern Language Aptitude Test) must be off the charts.

TUMAVICK: Well, I seem to remember Mary Kilgore sitting next to me taking the MLAT test, and I think both of us scored very highly, yes.

Q: I would guess so. So, other than your Spanish teacher there wasn't any history teacher or other teacher that pushed you to think about a world beyond Chicago?

TUMAVICK: I don't remember any particular influence in high school among the teachers. One of the other influences was my uncle, my mother's brother, who moved from Chicago to the West Coast when I was very young. I didn't know him very well, but he was the one who rather opened my eyes to the wider world. He eventually served as the West Coast manager for Cunard steamship lines. I recall at the age of four or five receiving postcards from him because he was traveling on business to Europe, the Caribbean, the Pacific. So, by the time I completed high school I just knew that I was going to have an international career, but I had not yet put a definition to it. I wasn't sure what that meant.

Q: Right. Did your parents have any opinions about what your career would be or only that you needed to have one?

TUMAVICK: My father felt rather strongly that I should stay in Cicero. Occupation wise I don't think he had any particular focus for me. So, because of my poor relationship with him, if he said I should stay in Cicero, the one thing I wanted to do was get as far away from Cicero as possible. I wanted to go to college either on the East Coast or the West Coast. Georgetown University, for example, with which you've been associated. They had an international curriculum. But my mother decided—and she was financing my education—that I would be allowed to go anywhere within a 200 mile radius around Chicago. By default I wound up at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, which was my parents alma mater. Both of them attended U of I (University of Illinois).

Q: I'm just curious, did she want you nearby because the world is a scary place or because she wanted you to come home frequently?

TUMAVICK: I think it's because she wanted to make sure that she still was in close contact with me. So, yes, I would come home for holidays, or she could come and visit.

Q: Right. And you did come home to visit, and she did come to see you?

TUMAVICK: Yes. And we had the routine Sunday night phone call that seems to be the habit among college students.

Q: Right. At least until social media has changed all that. But that was the check-in, right?

TUMAVICK: Yes.

Q: So, what did you think of University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign? It's a big school.

TUMAVICK: Well, when I was there it was some 32,000 students. And I was doing very well. I was in seminar classes with full professors my freshman year. I was in the school of commerce as a business management major. But socially, coming from twelve years of catholic education I just found myself not comfortable. To put it to the extreme, it was sort of me and 32,000 atheists. It was a lonely period in my life.

Q: You'd been in an all-girls school, and this was co-ed. You had been in a relatively small school and this was a monster school. And you had had a Catholic education and religion probably played no role in the whole university system.

TUMAVICK: Precisely.

Q: So, you were doing well but it just didn't feel right for you. So then what?

TUMAVICK: So, I had a high school classmate, a very good friend, who went to Saint Louis University, a Jesuit institution. I went down to St. Louis to visit her a couple of times and I found the whole environment just so inviting, so relaxed. It was a university of some 12,000 students, but the actual number of resident students was more like 2,500. You had the opportunities afforded by a large university, but you also had a smaller group with which you associated. I decided I would prefer transferring down there, and my mother agreed.

Q: Now, when you got to the university, the Vietnam War was raging, and the Civil Rights movement was in full gear. Did those affect what was happening on campus in any way or was that really a coastal phenomenon?

TUMAVICK: I think it was more an East Coast kind of response. It's not that we weren't aware of the war, in fact my senior year there were several of my male friends—classmates—who were clearly conscientious objectors and one or two wound up in the Peace Corps just to avoid being drafted. Because to them either that or cross the border into Canada.

Q: Right.

TUMAVICK: I really wasn't aware of a school-wide anti-war, anti-Vietnam movement. That came later when I went to grad school outside of Boston.

Q: Right. And you were still a commerce major when you transferred?

TUMAVICK: When I transferred, yes. Business management. And it was an interesting situation. I had always been an excellent student, that wasn't the problem, but at the end

of the first semester of my sophomore year I was straight As in everything I was taking, even accounting for heaven's sakes, but I was getting a C in my economics class. So, I went to talk to the professor—it was a survey class—and I asked him what I could do to try to get this grade up because I was not comfortable with my low grade. And he hemmed and he hawed, and I pushed him, and he finally said, women should not study economics. I mean this is not what you want to tell me, right? So, I knew the dean of the school quite well. As a transfer student he had been quite welcoming to me, so I bee-lined to his office, and I asked the dean personally if there would be any problem with me changing my major. He said he didn't think that would be an issue, what did I want to change it to? And of course, I said, economics. But in retrospect that was really a very important decision because in those days women did not study economics. There were not a lot of us in that class. So, what that did for me later, including going on to graduate school, was to give me a bit of a distinguishing factor. A female economist was very impressive in those days.

Q: Well, you're right. I think that's probably changed over the decades, but it was a field that women didn't go into, and I think it was in part because of the low expectations of women as mathematicians. But did the head of the department hold it against you that you doubled down on his dare?

TUMAVICK: Well, I was his at that point, he had to deal with me.

Q: Right. And obviously you pulled your grades up. Were there any other professors who stand out in your memory of the time there?

TUMAVICK: There was an older Jesuit priest at the law school. I was very active throughout high school and into college participating in musicals. Musical comedy performances. I was a dancer. (Very early on I was told to mouth the words, don't bother singing.) The stage where we performed at Saint Louis University was actually located in the law school. So, in coming and going I got to know some of the law students. And this one professor whose name I cannot remember, became an informal mentor for me. It was really random because I was not at law school, and it took his time and patience. But he coached me. I was very impressed by that.

Q: Right. Did you consider becoming a lawyer or going to law school?

TUMAVICK: Yes, from a very early age, actually. I decided I wanted to compensate for my father. So, as a child I was exposed to all kinds of legal terminology and discussions and I did consider it for a while but that would not have taken me overseas, which was my objective.

Q: Right, and that continued to be your goal, to get overseas, right?

TUMAVICK: Exactly. In fact, between my junior and senior year at college, through a friend of my mother's at the Continental Illinois Bank in Chicago, I secured a summer internship in Europe. What was called a *stagiaire* (intern) at the Societe Generale de

Banque in Brussels. My first overseas experience. We were a group of about 30 “foreigners” from various universities. At that point I was French fluent. There was no question about it, I was comfortable in the language. My first post was as a teller, sitting on a high chair at a window at the first drive through bank in Brussels that serviced the fledgling European Union. My only problem in languages has always been counting and numbers. So, that tellership position didn’t last very long. They moved me, thank goodness, to the international division where I did translations for English banking journals. The senior staff at the bank were very gracious and invited me to dinner with their families once they realized I could socialize in their language. Just walking down the cobblestone streets and through the parks going to and from work was wonderful. That exciting experience further confirmed for me that I wanted an overseas career whatever that might be.

Q: No kidding.

TUMAVICK: On long weekends I traveled with other students to London or Paris or elsewhere in Belgium. Later in the summer down all the way to Venice.

Q: Right. What an eye-opener for you. So, coming back to the university after your eyes had been opened, you probably wanted to wrap up as quickly as possible and get on with your career or graduate school maybe.

TUMAVICK: I would require a graduate degree in some sense because my undergraduate academics didn’t have anything to do with international work.

Q: Right. Did the bank in Brussels offer you a job or were the stagiaires (interns) just not considered fair game for recruitment?

TUMAVICK: In those days the internship was not to lead to a bank position. It was simply, I think, sort of a welcoming to foreigners to be introduced to bank business in Europe. So, none of the students went on to actually fill bank positions there.

Q: Alright, got it. So, you went back and graduated with a degree in economics and with your eyes open to the world, what’s next?

TUMAVICK: I graduated Cum Laude from university in 1968 with a major in economics. Well, I was planning on applying to a variety of universities, including Georgetown and Santa Clara, to do graduate work. And I don’t know how exactly—I don’t think it was through my professors—I found out about The Fletcher School of Tufts University outside Boston. I applied and I was accepted. So, it was rather magical as far as I was concerned.

Q: And that was a time when scholarships were much more available for people working on foreign languages or working on international degrees. I don’t know whether you had one or whether you had to work through graduate school, but it was a time I think when we were encouraged to look at international relations programs.

TUMAVICK: Well, I was a good student, I may not have been the outstanding student—but scholarships were available to those students who showed need. I was an only child, my parents owned their home, they owed no debt, so that made me eligible for a loan, not a scholarship.

Q: Got it. So, The Fletcher School.. Finally, you got to the coast.

TUMAVICK: Exactly. I was ecstatic of course. And it was under the influence of a professor, Bob Marr, who had lived and worked in India, that I actually wound up with a degree in development economics. He was another mentor for me. We had long discussions about what it meant if I decided to actually go into international development work, such as State Department or USAID (United States Agency for International Development), UN (United Nations), and he wanted to impress upon me the fact that it wasn't a job, it was a choice of lifestyle. Once you dedicated yourself to it, you were into a whole different community, a whole different world. And rather than frighten me, which might have been his intention, I don't know, it excited me.

Q: So, had he served in any of those institutions? Did he speak from a point of knowing what it was like being in public service internationally?

TUMAVICK: I think he may have worked with the Asian Development Bank overseas. But he was one of the few who actually had experience in the developing world. A lot of the professors at that point of time—it's changed now, of course—were focused on Europe or perhaps Latin America to a certain extent.

Q: Interesting.

TUMAVICK: But in retrospect it was quite an experience for me. I was by far the youngest student in the graduate school. Even then there were a lot of mid-career people who were there. I was a bit over my head, I thought, in the academic studies, although I succeeded in getting my degree. As well I had no experience in the developing world, so I remember having to really concentrate to absorb all kinds of information, such as remembering that Uganda was in East Africa and Ghana was in West Africa. While some of my mid-career classmates had actually been there.

Q: Fascinating. So, the Fletcher master's program had a development track, but that wasn't the major focus, right? They were sending people to businesses or maybe the State Department for diplomatic work, but the development track was relatively new, wasn't it?

TUMAVICK: Correct. And at that point a lot of the students, whether American or foreign, were out of the diplomatic corps. Some business, yes, but it wasn't until later that Fletcher developed its strong curriculum in business. One of my—he was not my classmate, but he was there the same year I was—was Terry Myers.

Q: Really?

TUMAVICK: And he had just completed months of research work in Kenya for his PhD. So, there was a group of us graduating that year that eventually wound up working for USAID.

Q: So, there's nothing like an AID (Agency for International Development) person to be a convincing recruiter, so did Terry encourage you to look at AID or did it just seem like the most wonderful and exotic career, and you wanted to go for it?

TUMAVICK: Well, I decided to examine options. At first, I considered continuing at Fletcher for that second year, for that MALD (Master of Arts in Law and Diplomacy), which was a fuller graduate degree. But the reality was that I couldn't afford to carry the burden of an additional loan. I had already passed the Foreign Service exam, but I decided to look at other options. The idea of just being a raconteur of the times at some Embassy did not carry a lot of appeal. I wanted to be involved in actually making a difference. So, each spring Fletcher invited recruiters on campus to talk to students, whether they were after the first year, after the second year, or as a PhD. I remember clearly that in the year 1969 the oil companies were actually prohibited from recruiting at Fletcher, and that was because they refused to interview women. I found that very interesting.

Q: No kidding. It's a reminder of what those years were like.

TUMAVICK: Right. So, I was courted by two banks for their international departments, Continental Illinois in Chicago and Morgan Stanley in New York. Both provided me with trips to their respective headquarters and I was offered jobs by both of them. But in the course of my trip to the headquarters, I was obviously targeting the international division. I had the opportunity to speak to people in those divisions. While they were all enthusiastic about their jobs, the one thing in response to my question was that women were not being assigned overseas. The banks, for whatever reason at that point in time, just thought it inappropriate for women to be representing the banks in foreign countries. Something I couldn't quite understand, and no one could explain to me. So, that became a bit of a dead end.

Q: Right. Well, this is going to be really fascinating for people listening to and reading the transcript because you're bringing up all the constraints that women faced as late as 1970 and later. And we've come a long way, but you tend to forget all the extra hurdles that women had in launching their career.

TUMAVICK: Precisely.

Q: So, at least public service was open to women, and we'll get later to constraints that even AID posed for women in the early days, but there you were. Had you passed the Foreign Service exam for AID or State Department?

TUMAVICK: At that point it was just for State Department. USAID did not depend upon the Foreign Service exam, or any other exam, for recruitment.

Q: Okay. So, when you found that the banks weren't going to give you the international life that you wanted, did you return to look at State Department?

TUMAVICK: No, actually I was approached first by the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), which I seriously considered because that eventually would have meant me being a spy, I thought, which sounded very exciting. But in terms of what they were actually offering me it wound up being two years if not longer in training in headquarters, as they put it, sitting on the beautiful Potomac River.

Q: Right, and at that point you'd had a lot of schooling. You'd been sitting and studying for a long time. But I imagine your language skills were among the things they were interested in exploiting.

Joining USAID as an IDI (1969)

TUMAVICK: Correct. That and the economics in terms of being an analyst. The second offer that came from the public sector was from USAID. In discussion with the recruiter on the phone, I decided, okay, I think this sounds like what I want to do. In the phone conversation that day—they called me—they offered me a program economist position in New Delhi. And I thought, hmmm, India, and asked if I could give it thought overnight. The next day before I called them back to accept, they called me and said, we have a much more exciting prospect for you, two years in Washington, DC. I asked what happened to the job in India. Oh, that's no longer available. Alright, so I thought, I'll just go ahead and take my chances. But this was probably the first of many interesting experiences in my USAID career with the inscrutable personnel system. How could a position be offered to me one day and be gone the next? I did find out afterwards that it was Bob Rucker who was assigned to India and probably a wise decision because he was a far more analytical economist than I was.

Q: What was the program in India at the time? There were long periods of time when AID had nothing going there.

TUMAVICK: No, at that point in time it was a very large program. I can't remember the numbers.

Q: Yeah. Maybe Food for Peace.

TUMAVICK: Yes. And it was before we started to back off and develop a different relationship with India. It was still a development program at that point as far as I recall.

Q: Interesting. Okay, so they came back to you and offered you something you didn't want, which was two years in Washington. How did you handle that?

TUMAVICK: Correct. One of the intriguing features was that I as a one-year master's graduate who was being offered a position as an intern, the IDI (International Development Intern) program at that point in time, with the same entry-level, the same salary as Christina Hussey, later Christina Schoux, who had just completed her two-year program at Fletcher, and also the same level and salary as Terry Myers, who had just completed his PhD.

Q: Did you know that at the time, or you figured that out afterwards?

TUMAVICK: I found out afterwards, and I thought to myself what a good decision I had taken, right? All three of us—Christina, Terry, and I—plus a classmate Jane Loos entered the program in the fall of 1969. There were, if I remember correctly, about thirty-six in that IDI class, of whom six were women, including the three of us coming from Fletcher. The drop-out rate among the men actually turned out to be significant when they discovered they were being assigned to Vietnam and they had absolutely no interest in that assignment.

Q: They didn't assign any women to Vietnam?

TUMAVICK: Not that I recall, no.

Q: Nancy I'd love to have you describe what the IDI program was like because people say, oh, we did it right back then and we wish we were still doing the IDI program the way we did in the early days. Could you just take five minutes and talk about what was involved in getting you ready to go overseas.

TUMAVICK: There was an initial program of some three months where we were not in our assigned back-stop offices, but rather had joint programs. Some of them were rather academic in nature, some were about the institution itself, others were social kinds of sessions, getting to know each other, challenging tasks and chores, working together as teams. So, three months is a long time compared to now—I don't think there is anything now similar to it.

Q: I don't think so either. So, when you joined the IDI program you already had an assignment, you know where you were going, is that right?

TUMAVICK: Correct.

Q: But it wasn't going to be India and it wasn't going to be the two years as a program economist in Washington?

TUMAVICK: I would be an assistant program officer in Washington.

Q: Okay, so you were an assistant program officer so you must have known at least what office you were going to be going to, but you had the opportunity to go look at other

offices, and obviously AID was also looking at you to find the best fit. But you knew you were going to be a Foreign Service officer; this was not civil service.

TUMAVICK: Correct. Then came a stroke of serendipity. Jane Loos and I and another Fletcher graduate woman rented a house together in Georgetown through the three months of IDI training as a class. Jane had become enamored with another IDI, Michael Feldstein, and they decided to marry. I was one of the first to know that. The policy in those days—it wasn't changed until two or three years later—was that Foreign Service officers were not allowed to be a tandem couple. One of them had to resign.

Q: Guess who.

TUMAVICK: Right. Beforehand, however, I knew about this happening, and she introduced me to her office director, Gordon Pierson, who was Office Director over Southeast Asia minus Vietnam. That included Thailand. He was delighted to accept me in her place for the position in Bangkok, as assistant program officer. He just made it happen. There was no question that the personnel office had any influence one way or the other, which was intriguing.

Q: Yes, I think at that point office directors had a lot of clout in assignments and of course he was a very forceful figure.

TUMAVICK: Before going overseas I did spend time in Washington and got to know some of the notables. Worked with Brad Langmaid, Mary Huntington, Gerry Donnelly and Dale Pfeifer.

Q: Right. Amazing names and of course when you got to Thailand there were even more classics, I think.

TUMAVICK: Oh yes.

Q: I don't know whether Carol Peasley was there when you were there, maybe a little bit later, but that was a very big program in the early 70s.

TUMAVICK: Indeed, it was. But I was fortunate because based on my MLAT score I was able to take two months of Thai language training before I left.

Q: Okay, that's language number 6 if I'm counting correctly. Amazing. How far did you get with Thai, were you able to use it when you got to Bangkok?

TUMAVICK: Oh yes, very definitely. I'll talk later about my IDI program in Bangkok because I remember it very clearly. I spent considerable time up country which sharpened my colloquial Thai. It was easy since I often traveled with non-Americans, just Thai staff and counterparts. Anyway, to end this chapter, if you will, at the end of March 1970 I boarded my flight to Bangkok having just turned twenty-three.

Q: Oh my gosh. So have you always been youngest in whatever cohort you're in and did you feel young in any way or were you accepted as a peer even with people who were much older, doing the same assignment?

TUMAVICK: I've always explained to people when they say, what do you mean you're only twenty-three? I skipped kindergarten. When my mother took me to grade school to enter me into kindergarten the good nuns said, oh but she's not of the age yet. So, I stayed home an additional year and when my mother took me back the following year, they looked at me and said, oh she's much too tall for kindergarten. So, I was placed in first grade. But I was always a year younger than everyone else in my class no matter when throughout my life.

Q: Interesting. But you didn't feel in any way intimidated by your elders, I assumed?

TUMAVICK: No, I charmed them, they accepted me.

Q: And they didn't just pat you on the head and say great.

TUMAVICK: If they did, they lived to regret it.

Q: What an amazing path to AID. So, you were very focused on an international career from very early on. Looking back on it, it looks like it was all inevitable, but there clearly were intersections in the first twenty-three years where it could have gone in a very different direction. I mean, had the banks seen the wisdom of assigning women overseas I suspect you would have done it.

TUMAVICK: Probably so.

Q: If the CIA didn't require the first two years sitting on the beautiful banks of the Potomac you might have ended up there. But how lucky for AID that that worked out.

TUMAVICK: And I never for a moment regretted my decision.

First Assignment: Thailand (1970-1975)

Q: Today is July 24 and we're starting our second conversation with Nancy Tumavick. When we stopped Nancy had just arrived in Thailand as an IDI preparing for a series of rotations. So, Nancy, let's take it from there. What was Thailand like at the time and your program?

TUMAVICK: When I arrived at post in Bangkok work-wise I already had in hand the plan for the IDI rotational assignment. As was the approach in those days, it had been negotiated based on my preferences before I departed Washington. In those days IDIs were meant to serve in rotational assignments for a full two years before assuming an actual position in the mission. The USAID mission at that point was still called U.S. Operating Mission, USOM. Rather amusing, since with the proper intonation in Thai,

usom could be directly translated as a place to have it fixed. So, the Thais were not pleased with the change of name to USAID.

Q: Right. Was it because of the military that it had that title, operating mission?

TUMAVICK: I don't have a clue. It had been that in the field since the beginning. Anyway, the USAID mission at that point had a budget of 20 million dollars and the staff was probably the largest after the USAID presence in Vietnam. There were some 300 American Foreign Service officers—not PSCs (Personal Service Contractors), not consultants but actual Foreign Service officers—including a cadre of rural development officers and engineers assigned up country. The American direct-hire Foreign Service staff included—this is out of the 300—a few women officers and three secretaries—in those days they were proper secretaries. The female officers included the regional legal advisor, Betty Boorady, a public health advisor, and me.

As planned, my first rotational assignment was three months in the rural development office, working with Paul Daley, who was an experienced rural development officer and a really excellent mentor. He fully supported my interest in spending as much time in up-country Thailand as possible traveling with him and his senior female Thai staff member, Kannika, who was a charming young woman and whose company I really enjoyed. While not advertised as such, a portion of the U.S. portfolio was directly linked to the U.S. efforts to suppress the spread of communism in Southeast Asia from Vietnam and Cambodia and Laos. It was a pacification program, writ large, in addition to more traditional development programs in agriculture, health, population, education, and public sector development. We did not support the private sector in those days. It was only recently that USAID in Washington had successfully negotiated eliminating covert CIA agents serving on USAID staff anywhere in the field. It was justifiably viewed as potentially jeopardizing the safety and credibility of the USAID staff overall.

Q: Right. There was the whole Asia Foundation debacle where it was being used as a front for the CIA

TUMAVICK: Yes. There were multiple ways that the CIA inserted themselves in operations, no question about it. With my enthusiasm for the rural areas, I spent a considerable amount of time in north and northeastern Thailand, which bordered the politically sensitive areas of Southeast Asia. So, in the course of three months I visited multiple northern provinces in Thailand. We spent time in rural areas in Lampang, Loei, Phitsanulok, Chiang Rai and Chiang Mai to monitor a variety of development activities. Some of them were rather unusual. We visited cattle ranches, for example, where we were providing semen to upgrade breeds through artificial insemination. We delivered generators to provide various villages electricity for nighttime entertainment. We visited Thai provincial headquarters to coordinate social sector programs with the Thai authorities.

Q: So, at that time the rural areas were not electrified, is that correct?

TUMAVICK: That's correct. It was all lanterns.

Q: And no tourism too, I imagine.

TUMAVICK: Very little tourism. Well, not in the northeast, that's for sure. It was too treacherous. But when you went to the larger towns there were generators. Chiang Mai had electrification at that point in time as well. But when you were out in rural areas you were out in the dark at night. And I particularly recall one trip to Loei province where we were accompanied by a Thai security force in potentially dangerous territory. At a certain point in the road, I remember the vehicle stopped so that all of the men, including Paul, could access and load their rifles in anticipation of an attack from the communist sympathizers. It was an interesting combination of effort to curtail the spread of communism. But we also enjoyed dinners a couple nights at the U.S. air base in the northeast at Udon Thani, from which bombers were based for attacks on Vietnam. At that point there were some 50,000 U.S. troops stationed in Thailand, predominantly up-country at the bases.

Q: Did the military either help or get in the way of AID efforts in the rural areas or were they really separate and focused on their own mission?

TUMAVICK: They were separate except we exchanged briefings periodically on our operations and theirs to keep track of any problems in the rural areas. So, we coordinated with them informally.

Q: Okay, got it. But very different from what happened much later in Afghanistan or Iraq.

TUMAVICK: Yes, clearly. We didn't have any joint operations. At least in Thailand. Of course, we did in Vietnam at that time.

Q: Right. Well, I was just reflecting on a program of twenty million dollars and three hundred direct-hire staff. That's when AID had the luxury of being able to train IDIs for two years without beggaring every other program.

TUMAVICK: And very limited institutional contractors. So, we had our technical expertise in house, which of course later was not the case.

Q: Right. I think people reading this oral history will be amazed how different the situation was. But back to rural Thailand.

TUMAVICK: Well, that three month rotational assignment was over too fast as far as I was concerned, but there was the sequence that each IDI had, and my second rotation was in the office of the mission director. So, I replaced the previous IDI, Dave Frederick. It was a rather challenging situation. The mission director, Rey Hill, came to AID directly after serving as a Ford Foundation director in Iran. A very skilled diplomat and development person, but he was not really familiar with USAID policies and procedures. He and the USAID deputy director, Fred Simmons, were not a compatible leadership

team. I wound up periodically in the middle. One of my daily tasks, for example, was to arrive in the office by 6:30 AM to pick up the cable traffic—remember, no computers in those days—and to ensure that the director reviewed the important cables before his deputy could remove them from the stack. It was an awkward situation. So, at six each morning I was on the way to the office in my orange MG Midget convertible, stopping at a particular vendor to pick up a pack of Thai fried doughnuts on route.

Q: Wow. But let me just highlight there, you drove yourself around, there was no security system or issue about your being able to drive around town.

TUMAVICK: Oh no, no problem whatsoever. All of us had our own vehicles and we lived in houses and apartments all over Bangkok. I don't remember any of the Americans having drivers. Maybe some of the institutional contractors did, but we did not. So, to continue, that was an era in our foreign assistance where institution building and hands-on development programs definitely took precedence over policy dialogue, per se. The Institute of Public Administration in Thailand was probably the second established with American assistance after the earlier one in Korea. With our financial support we instilled the policy, if you will, of professional public service training. I recall how impressed I was when Jerry Wood, shortly after I got there, received the Order of the White Elephant directly from the hands of the king in gratitude for his role in IPA's development (Institute of Public Administration).

Q: Interesting.

TUMAVICK: Likewise, the family planning program in Thailand was one of the first to receive major USAID investment and one of the most successful in the 1970s. Another colleague and friend who stands out in my memory is Mechai Viravaidya, who had just begun his career with USAID when I arrived. He moved on to be a well-known popular late night Thai radio host.

Even though he was not a medical professional, he took up the cause for family planning and was later referred to as Mr. Condom. He would show up at government meetings distributing condoms to everyone. He established an NGO (non-governmental organization) to support family planning. Based on his public image he later became famous in Thailand as a national hero in the war against AIDS, leading what I understand to be one of the world's most successful campaigns against HIV infection. But I digressed. Back to the story. What was meant to be a three month rotational IDI assignment in the director's office stretched over six months since Director Hill decided I was an asset to his front office for special assignments. It was an absolutely ideal IDI learning experience. I attended all the weekly senior staff meetings, reviewed and edited documents, including everything for the director's signature, and was able to continue my up-country travels to report back to him on whatever topic he wanted to examine.

Q: Right. And you were also playing sort of shuttle cock between the director and the deputy.

TUMAVICK: Exactly.

Q: There must have been some awkward times, even if not confrontation. But it was an important experience to have early on, I imagine. Probably not the last time.

TUMAVICK: To avoid the conflict?

Q: Right. It was the full six months that you were doing the rotation?

TUMAVICK: Yes. And the director and his wife, who were an older couple, treated me like a daughter. Since I stood out as a single woman Foreign Service officer, who spoke Thai, they often included me in their professional social gatherings. But there arrived a point in time for me to move to the program office to complete my IDI program before I actually took up the permanent assignment as an assistant program officer. It was not an easy transition from my position of stature and access in the director's office. The tasks that were being assigned to me were, I thought, inconsequential and definitely not challenging. I realized that I would be three layers down from the director of the program office, reporting to individuals that I did not particularly admire or respect.

Then came that serendipitous event that made all the difference to my future: an American Embassy cocktail party. In the course of the evening, I met Bob Halligan, who everyone remembers I'm sure, who was serving as the program officer for the USAID regional mission (RED), headquartered in Bangkok but managed separately from the bilateral Thai mission. At that point in time the regional mission had its own unique portfolio of budgetary support, specifically to Southeast Asian organizations. They include the Mekong Committee (Bangkok), the International Rice Research Institute (Philippines), the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO), the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT), the Colombo Plan, the International Water Management Institute (Sri Lanka) and others. So, it was quite a panoply of projects. The RED director was Lee St. Lawrence, and the staff consisted of fifteen white guys at the very point in time that the State Department and USAID were beginning to seek diversity in their workforce, specifically to add female officers. So, Halligan recruited me on sight for the evaluation officer position because that's what they had available and presumably I could not do a lot of damage in that internal function.

Q: So, the offer came at the cocktail party or shortly thereafter?

TUMAVICK: Oh, at the cocktail party. So, it was an irresistible offer even though it was fairly obvious that I was to be their token female officer. But I was befriended and supported not only by the sole American Foreign Service secretary, Margey Barone, but also by the handful of female Thai secretary administrative assistants. I was the only officer who spoke Thai, and they found that charming.

Q: I'll bet they did. But the pressure to diversify, did that come after the WAO lawsuit? I mean, was there some sort of push from Washington saying we've got to do this, or was it just they're realizing the common sense of diversifying?

TUMAVICK: I think there was—I don't know if it was formalized or not, but it certainly was a trend at that point in time. You didn't have a lot of women, as long as you had one or two you were relatively safe. And don't forget, this came around the same time when the State Department policy with regard to tandem couples came into play. It was movement in the right direction.

Q: Right. Got it. So, did the mission put up a fuss when you moved over to the regional mission or did they accept that during these training rotations that was up to you?

TUMAVICK: I'm not sure. I think it was negotiated. I know the mission director had no objection to it, so if he didn't take issue to me moving over to RED, nobody else really would. And I was supported as well by Ed Perkins, the deputy executive officer, in the USAID Bangkok mission. Many would remember Perkins. A very large, very striking, good-looking Black American, who later in his career moved on to be an ambassador, as a matter of fact.

Q: He is well remembered and admired.

TUMAVICK: So initially I filled the role of evaluation officer at RED, which is fairly pedestrian since it was a very high energy operation and they were not going to put a lot of effort into formally looking backwards, but rather absorbing lessons they learned and always moving forwards. So, I don't think my work for the first few months was of terribly high value to anyone except to check the box that they had done an evaluation. But the officers were constantly on the road to these eight Southeast Asian countries in which these projects were located. Over the course of my first year I gradually developed into a surrogate, if you will, for several of the senior officers.

When David Steinberg, who managed the regional research program was in demand elsewhere or was on home leave, I covered his portfolio. I was assigned a coordination role with the Mekong Committee to plan for the construction of the proposed Vientiane dyke on the Mekong River. Robert Jacobs, a wonderful man, a university professor from southern Illinois, who Lee St. Lawrence had recruited, managed the SEAMEO education portfolio. He needed assistance in covering a variety of strategy planning sessions, operational meetings, across the eight member countries. I served in that role. Between mid 1971 and the end of 1975 when I left Bangkok I was also constantly on the road. If it was Monday it could have been Jakarta for a SEAMEO meeting. Maybe Thursday in Vientiane on Mekong business, perhaps moving on to Los Baños in the Philippines the following week to discuss terms of the grant to IRRI (International Rice Research Institute). It was amazing how that role developed for me.

Q: Right. Well at that point you didn't have family, you were sort of free to travel, but it sounds exhausting. Not only free to travel, but it sounds like maybe you loved it. You wanted to travel and see all these places, so you were maybe an eager volunteer for these regional assignments.

TUMAVICK: It was exhilarating. And as you say, I had no husband, I had no children, so no obligations, and the fact that I was given a lot of responsibility. I mean I was what, twenty-four at the time, twenty-five.

Q: Right. What was it like showing up as a twenty-four year old woman representing the U.S. government to high-level officials, whether private or government. Did they basically say, alright, if she's got the hat, she's the one we're going to deal with, or did you get some pushback?

TUMAVICK: No pushback and as a matter of fact I was very welcome. There was quite a difference between the countries in those days as to the number or proportion of female public servants versus male. In Malaysia, very conservative, very few women, even in the education sector. Whereas in Indonesia and Thailand and Singapore, Philippines, quite a good percentage of women. So, it was not as if being a female was a problem. My youth they quickly forgot about. I recall I went down to Singapore for the Colombo Plan meeting where we were meant to pledge a contribution for the coming year, and the American ambassador in Singapore was the actual designated representative on behalf of the U.S. government, so he was not pleased to see this young female show up to be his assistant in this regard. It was a full day meeting and for the first couple hours in the morning questions were being raised of him or points were being made with which I knew we did not agree, so I kept writing notes and passing them to the ambassador so he would say the right thing. So, by the afternoon he disappeared. He designated me the U.S. representative.

Q: Well, there you go.

TUMAVICK: Some of the travels were actually dangerous. Again, very interesting for me, exciting. Overland travel was not possible or practical in many cases going from one country to another. For example, when a SEAMEO meeting was scheduled in Phnom Penh, in Cambodia, the security situation there was already rather difficult. The trip had to be by air. When we were approaching the airport, we realized the plane was intentionally spiraling in to land to avoid the ground gunfire.

Q: Wow.

TUMAVICK: These are not military planes that we're traveling on, right? They're commercial carriers. To review progress on the Nan Ngum Dam in up-country Laos—the first hydropower dam built on the Mekong River—we traveled by helicopter, with the assistance of the CIA, which at that point was conducting what was called the Secret War in Laos. Travel to Saigon was a bit more pedestrian, a lot more commercial traffic, a lot of military air traffic due to the heavy American presence. Walking the streets and sidewalks, fenced with endless barbed wire, was definitely disconcerting. This was a wartime environment.

Q: Right. Out of curiosity, did your colleagues in AID support the war in Vietnam? Did you even talk about it?

TUMAVICK: Actually, we did not. But there were several older officers in the regional office, and they were fairly conservative, and I would assume in retrospect that they had no problems with the war. A couple of the younger officers might have, but it was not a point of discussion, it was a situation with which we had to live.

Q: Did you have any dealings with the AID mission in Vietnam or were they a self-contained universe and did not require regional support?

TUMAVICK: Well, don't forget, you're thinking about regional offices as support functions. Our function was not support, our function was management of projects, and those projects were specifically regional in nature. We would certainly consult with them and brief senior managers in the bilateral missions out of courtesy, but our portfolios were entirely separate. We provided additional contributions to the host country. So, I think that we were viewed as value added.

Q: Got it. And I think that's a very useful distinction, because you're right, I was thinking of it as a support function and not as a regional project management activity. Your description of the airplane spiraling in, I also saw it in Cairo back in the day too. You wanted to spend as little time over as little land as possible. Pretty frightening.

TUMAVICK: Yes. But again, for me, I had no responsibility except for myself, so it was an adventure.

Q: Right. Did your family visit you? Did they worry about you? I mean, you were pretty young.

TUMAVICK: Well, I was an only child and my mother taught full time and my father took part time jobs after having lost his law practice. He had no interest in traveling after his experience in World War Two. My mother did come out to visit a few months after I arrived, and she realized that I was in a very comfortable position. I had a wonderful apartment, good friends, so she left satisfied that I was safe.

Q: Got it. You were talking about these incredible regional projects that played such an important development role later on. For example, IRRI, the Rice institute in the Philippines, it must have been early days for it.

TUMAVICK: Yes. It was. I think that was one of the projects that we actually inherited when RED was established. Others we created. So, it was a mix. But as I mentioned, although the project portfolio was totally independent of the bilateral missions, we routinely scheduled courtesy calls with the mission director and program officer in countries where we had USAID missions, Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam, Laos. It behooved us, we decided, to brief them on the RED projects to get in their good graces and have their support. But it was also through those courtesy calls that I came to be known by senior managers throughout Southeast Asia, which served me very well in the years to come.

Q: I'm sure that's right and it certainly gave you a view of different missions and different mission staff and must have helped while you thought about what your next step was going to be.

TUMAVICK: Exactly. I gained a familiarity with the country situations, the environment, the culture, and the mission. So, it provided a good basis for making some decisions. Later when I moved to the Indonesia mission for a full posting, I already knew Jakarta, I had a sense of the people, so it was comfortable.

Q: Right. And at that point, if you can think back, did you assume that your career would continue to be in Asia, or did you make no assumptions about what came next?

TUMAVICK: I was open. I enjoyed the Buddhist society. After six years in Southeast Asia, you gain a comfort level. The body language as well as the actual language of the people, the food, the music, entertainment, the temples.

Q: Right.

TUMAVICK: But I was willing to go wherever.

Q: Right. Obviously you traveled a lot for work and were able to take holidays as well, I imagine? So, you did have a fair amount of opportunity for tourism?

TUMAVICK: Oh yes. First trip was down to Singapore, but that was actually a second choice. We had gotten tickets—a girlfriend and I—to go to Siem Reap in Cambodia and we bought the tickets in March to go in July. The Cambodian government then proceeded to close Siem Reap to tourists because of the increased communist presence there. We went to Singapore instead. Then I developed a relationship with another USAID assistant program officer, Jonathan Sperling, who transferred to Bangkok after his first posting in Nairobi. We traveled extensively in the region. First to Burma, which was fascinating. Tourists were very limited—foreigners could not get a visa for more than one week. You had to be out of the country when that visa expired, or you were in trouble. So, we did a whirlwind trip to Pagan and then to Inle Lake.

Spent a Christmas in Darjeeling which was lovely although fairly basic. Other trips included Nepal, to spend time in Kathmandu and upcountry. In the early 1970's the tourists were predominantly hippies wandering aimlessly in and out of the back streets of Kathmandu. There were also a few elite European travelers on expensive guided tours. Jonathan and I also drove through Malaysia, and on another occasion flew down to Sarawak for exposure to a very different culture. We visited French archeologist friends in Phnom Penh although at the time it was a treacherous situation. I recall rounding a corner to return to their house to come face to face with a young teenage boy pointing his rifle at us. We survived.

Jonathan and I married in August of 1975. It was through a boarding school classmate and good friend of Jonathan's that we were introduced to various levels of Thai nobility. Nid Pibulsonggram, married to an American woman, was the youngest son of the Thai military officer and politician who served as the Prime Minister of Thailand for some 16 years between 1938 and 1957. Nid's mother officiated at our small Buddhist wedding which was followed by registration at a Thai town hall and then a tremendous reception at the historic Oriental Hotel. We remained close friends with Nid and his wife Pat as he served as Ambassador to the United Nations, Ambassador to the U.S. and eventually Thailand's Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Q: I hope you have pictures.

TUMAVICK: By this time the State Department personnel policy, as I mentioned, had changed and tandem Foreign Service officers were legitimized. Jonathan and I were actually one of the two first tandems in USAID, the other being a fellow Fletcher classmate, Christina Hussey, and Bill Schoux.

Q: And this was what, '76? '75?

TUMAVICK: '75. Since our respective tours were due to end late in '75 we thought ahead about looking for joint assignments, but that was not an easy process. The cadre of female GS (General Service) employees in personnel in Washington were not accustomed to dealing with tandem couples, and I think they found us a needless complication to their work. An offer came from the mission director in Laos, Charles Mann, who knew both of us and our work. But unfortunately the offer was forcibly rescinded. When Laos fell to the Pathet Lao at the end of '75 the mission was closed, and Americans were evacuated. So that option was no longer on the table.

Q: Right. So, was there a bidding process or were you waiting for the Washington poobahs to tell you where you were going?

TUMAVICK: Really the latter. Theoretically there was a bidding process, but it was rarely followed in those days, so while all of this was going on, our searching through contacts, Jonathan received a cable from the Monrovia mission, asking when he was arriving because personnel had evidently assigned him to USAID Liberia a few weeks before that and nobody bothered to tell him.

Q: Wow. Okay.

TUMAVICK: We decided to go ahead and play their game. He departed for Monrovia, and I remained waiting for a position to open for me. Meanwhile, really interesting, Jonathan went to a regional meeting in Senegal where there were people in from Washington, including Assistant Administrator for Management, Charles Mann. He wanted to know where Nancy was and Jonathan explained the situation. Mann gets on the phone, calls personnel, and says to post me to Liberia. I was posted immediately. I packed out and left for Liberia two months later for assignment as evaluation officer. Of

course, I was fully qualified having filled that role for almost five years, but with a surprisingly different portfolio.

Q: So basically, it was serendipity that Charles Mann was at the meeting and asked Jonathan what happened to you, but no one else was speaking up or noticing that they had a missing evaluation officer without an assignment.

TUMAVICK: It took someone like Mann and his stature to just make it happen. The vagaries of the personnel system, yes!

Liberia, land of liberty (1975-1978)

TUMAVICK: I had never stepped foot in Africa so this was a momentous move for me. Having heard so much enthusiastic discussion about Kenya, I was looking forward to the assignment. However, as I discovered over the three year posting, and to substantiate what a colleague claimed, “this is a country where God got tired.” Of the 60 some underdeveloped or mis-developed countries in which I have lived for years or worked short term, in a whole variety of geographic locations including countries throughout sub-Saharan Africa, this is the only one to which I would never return. As opposed to my very clear memories of the years in Bangkok and my postings subsequent to Liberia, the three years in West Africa are all rather blurred. They fall into the category of detached vignettes rather than a continuum of development experiences or professional development.

But on with the history. Just before I arrived, in time for Thanksgiving dinner in 1975, USAID Administrator Daniel Parker paid a somewhat unexpected visit to Liberia. The US Government’s interest in Liberia was linked less to development objectives but rather to security interests. Liberia served as a geographic tri-angulation point for US submarines in the south Atlantic Ocean. We evidently wanted to show the flag to President Tolbert. Parker’s focus during his visit was on the education sector, such that existed, and he left behind commitments for USAID investment in education. Unfortunately, the Mission did not have an education officer nor anyone who even had the vocabulary to “speak” education. Based on my extensive experience with SEAMEO in Bangkok I was designated the Education Officer for purposes of project development. We crafted a rather flexible scope of work for the Harvard Institute of International Development (HIID) team which appeared a few months after my arrival. Director Stan Siegel named me the team coordinator for their sector assessment and project recommendations. We were guided by HIID to focus on primary education, teacher training, and vocational education.

Q: Was HIID already working in country? How did it get involved?

TUMAVICK: We acquired the services of the senior three person team, headed by Dr. Noel McGinn, through an existing AID/Washington umbrella contract which allowed buy-ins. Given that the mission was fulfilling a personal commitment made by the Administrator, we received priority attention. Do not recall that any of the three had ever

previously worked in Liberia. It was an amusing experience for them I am sure. I vividly remember the four of us walking around the large conference table collating a couple dozen copies of their final report. The Liberian in charge of the mailroom and reproduction center could not be trusted with that task since he was barely literate.

Reliable statistics were somewhat elusive but something like 24% of primary school aged children were actually attending school with attendance skewed to Monrovia and a couple minor towns. We decided to focus on the main Kakata Teacher Training Institute, financial support for the national primary education budget, and a somewhat unsuccessful effort at vocational education. The process did allow me to travel upcountry to the extent that was possible. There was virtually no road network. The only public paved roads were in Monrovia itself and between the city and the airport. Travel by air domestically meant short takeoff and landing (STOL) planes with use of grass landing strips at random Missionary compounds.

Q: Sounds a bit scary!

TUMAVICK: Actually, the STOL feature, including the small size of the plane, caused no anxiety compared to flying in a helicopter in Laos in communist infested territory. A few public post-secondary institutions existed but the quality of education was far less than acceptable. Cuttington College, an upcountry Missionary institution, was probably the only post-secondary institution of any value so that was worth a trip.

Q: Did missionaries play a major role outside the capital? Do you remember which groups were there?

TUMAVICK: In the mid-1970's more than 85% of the population of 1.6 million was rural. A significant portion of the education and basic health facilities in rural areas were provided by missionary groups. Cuttington College was founded by the American Episcopal Church but I do not recall the others.

Recall driving through a couple of dusty towns and being impressed by the fact that there were virtually no signs....the bulk of the population was illiterate so there was no need. Should note that our "houseboy" was in the third year of high school, taught in English, but had difficulty assisting our illiterate cook in writing the food shopping list...for example he could not spell "bred."

In pursuing ideas on vocational education, a totally new concept in the public sector, I was led to visit Bong Mines which was probably the largest single overseas German investment at that time. The contrast with the rest of the country was stark. Our plane landed on a paved runway, offices and residences were constructed of brick and arrayed in a huge compound with paved streets lined with street lamps. All of the senior and middle management level were German. Food and supplies were flown in from Germany. The training center for Liberian workers was equipped with the latest in technology and spotless. It was clear that the value of the iron ore that was extracted justified a huge

investment. It was also clear that this was not a model for any public sector investment in vocational education in Liberia, clearly unaffordable.

Q: Did Germany have any aid programs as well, or was it a private investment? What other donors, if any, were there at that time?

TUMAVICK: I do not recall any German aid programs, per se, but they may well have provided some health care and basic education to the families or communities of their mine workers in the Bong Mine area. Much later, in my post-USAID career when I worked with Abt Associates, I recall a Shell Oil Company conference in the Hague that I attended with George Laudato. One of the discussion points was the extent to which the company would/should provide healthcare to African communities in the areas surrounding Shell Oil operations. I suspect this is still a question for foreign companies working in developing countries.

The public education sector had not been neglected. Rather, it had never been developed. Liberia had two distinct black populations plus a small foreign community of Lebanese, Italians and enterprising West Africans who ran the commercial sector. Our landlord, El Haji Sekou Kabah, was an elegant French speaking Guinean who acquired antiques which he shipped to Europe for sale. He drove one of the six lavender Porsches in the country. There were about 200 elite Liberian families that ran the country, descendants of the African slaves returned to Africa by President Monroe. The majority of the population consisted of tribal groups pushed from the surrounding countries, with the exception of the Vi which was the only indigenous tribe. The Americo-Liberian families basically reproduced in Liberia the system of servitude they had experienced in the U.S. but this time they were the masters. Their children were sent to the U.S. or Europe or other African countries to be educated. Education of the natives was not of their concern.

In the course of my three years, one of my main counterparts was the President's daughter, Christine Tolbert, who was the Deputy Minister of Education. She was strong-willed and with a racist attitude. Most memorable was our meeting to determine the following year's USAID contribution to the public sector primary education budget. In negotiating the USAID contribution, in which she proposed to go from 24% of primary education students in school one year to 100% the following year, we reached a serious disagreement. No logic to that proposition....not enough schools, not enough teachers, not enough books and materials. Recall her clearly challenging me in a shout...."Why won't Whitey let me do what I want!."

Q: Did the project go forward in some form? Were you optimistic? And were there any other donors involved in this or other sectors, or was the US alone?

TUMAVICK: Yes, we provided a percentage of the annual budget for primary school education, but something more like anticipating a realistic 5% increase in primary school enrollment the following year. It was not easy to be optimistic about the development agenda in Liberia. (The USAID dashboard currently shows that some 28% of primary age students complete primary school.) The only other donor that I recall had an interest in

the education sector were the Brits. In fact, the British Ambassador requested that I meet with him to discuss a proposal that he had recently received from the Ministry of Education for vocational education. It was very well written since it was the precise proposal that had been written by the HIID team.

There were others associated with the USAID Mission that had a much less negative attitude than mine. Roger Simmons was the Chief of Party for the Institute of Public Administration accompanied by his wife, Emmy Simmons who, as I recall, was completing her Ph.D. They had come from an assignment of a few years in Nigeria and were sympathetic to West Africans and understood the cultures. Likewise, Dick Goldman, the Agricultural Economist posted to the Mission, had recently served in Liberia in the Peace Corps and brought a wealth of experience. I simply did not share their understanding, tolerance or optimism.

While my major responsibility was the education sector for the first couple of years, parallel to that were rather random project evaluation responsibilities. It was decided that an evaluation of our support to the John F. Kennedy Hospital in Monrovia was due. There was a clear problem of high death rates which initially were attributed to a poor level of medical expertise. What the evaluation exposed was a situation difficult to resolve. The Liberians in the rural areas, where most of the country lived, first sought care through traditional medical practitioners, then proceeded to basic government or missionary health clinics. When those failed, patients were brought to the Kennedy Hospital at which point they were virtually terminal. It would take significant time to improve basic health services and change that behavior.

Q: Was our support for the Kennedy Hospital basically budget support, or was there participant or other training as well?

TUMAVICK: My memory is rather vague in this regard. From what I do recall, the US financed the construction and equipment for the hospital and perhaps a period of budgetary support. There was also a medical technical assistance team but I'm not sure how extensive the participant training was.

The most refreshing assignments during the posting in Monrovia were out of the country. In the early days, the Mission also had responsibility for the USAID programs in the neighboring country of Sierra Leone which had a far more successful British colonial heritage of development. Even though there were some of the same tribes, such as the Mende, once you crossed the Mano River border between the countries, the environment was palpably different and encouraging. USAID was financing a rural road construction project in Bo implemented by Save the Children. The project was well designed and being implemented on schedule. No issues compared to the experience in Liberia. We were also recruited for a two week TDY in Mali, Jonathan as acting Program Officer and me to assist in the evaluation of the Livestock Development Project. It was an interesting assignment especially to be exposed to the contrasting French colonial heritage. What I recall most clearly is the fresh French baguette for lunch each day along with the

excellent freshwater smoked trout and the fact that my French fluency served us very well.

Entertainment in Liberia was up to your own imagination. The ocean was treacherous with an extreme undertow so swimming was not really an option. The Embassy tennis courts were reserved by Embassy staff before we at USAID had an opportunity so we resorted to playing British squash. There were no theaters and only a couple of restaurants, one Lebanese and one Italian. There were a couple tables of bridge players that got together every few weeks. We socialized mainly with Americans and a group of Europeans. It was clear that it was no place to start a family as we had anticipated. To amuse ourselves, having inherited a German Shepherd from a departing USAID officer, we proceeded to breed her and successfully produced a litter of nine pups most of which had to be put down due to serious dysplasia.

Q: Other than not being very generous with their facilities, how were relations with the Embassy? Were there any political crises while you were there, or even any sense that the system was unraveling?

TUMAVICK: Relations with the Embassy were cordial and productive. In general, the Embassy staff along with the USAID staff were simply looking to make the best of a posting that would be better once it was completed. Interestingly enough, I recall no indication of “restless natives” or the imminent coup.

In 1978 we departed post after three years, earlier than expected, to return to the US since my mother was diagnosed with terminal cancer. Two years after our departure, in 1980, the coup was staged. Historians have argued that a series of complex events led to that event. The first of which was the imbalance of power between the native population of Liberia and the Americo-Liberians. Many of our well educated Minister counterparts were taken down to the beach, tied to posts and shot. That was just a block from where we had lived.

Return to D.C. and the Bangladesh Desk (1978-1982)

TUMAVICK: When I returned to Washington in the fall of 1978, my assignment had been predetermined. Theoretically, there was a bidding system but it seemed only to function when it pleased the powers that be or at the convenience of the personnel system. I was moved into the Near East Bureau as the Office Director for Turkey, Portugal, Cyprus and Italian earthquake reconstruction. While it sounds impressive, it was not exactly the development portfolio to which I had become accustomed. It was predominantly ESF financing with predetermined funding commitments.

The Mission in Turkey had just closed out with only the Population Officer Ernie Popp remaining for residual programs. I joked that my main responsibility was deciding the color of the \$300 million check that was cut to cover the U.S. base rights agreement. The Mission in Portugal was a handful of competent officers and FSN staff and their task was establishment and funding of a Foundation for vocational education to leave as the

American legacy. The Mission in Cyprus was, likewise, very small and remained only to offer assistance to those displaced in the never-ending dispute between the Greek and Turkish populations. In that regard, my daily annoying task was to field the stream of phone calls from activist members of the Greek diaspora taking issue with the weak American political position and lack of financial support for their displaced relatives in Cyprus. The Italian earthquake reconstruction program consisted of one USAID engineer in Italy overseeing the work and financing.

Within the first couple of months I realized that this meaningless Office Director assignment was simply not the way that I wanted to invest the next four years of my life in D.C. The lack of substantive work or decision-making reflected the character of the Near East Bureau management at that time. It was run by a misogynist triumvirate consisting of the Assistant Administrator Joe Wheeler, Al White and Sy Taubenblatt. My presence allowed them to check the box on diversity of women in management roles.

Q: Wasn't this shortly after the WAO (Women's Action Organization) ruling that, in theory, opened up more opportunities for foreign service women?

TUMAVICK: It may have been in response to that ruling but I was not tracking at that time.

I gathered my strength and made an appointment with Wheeler to discuss releasing me to another Bureau. The outcome was reasonable enough. I agreed to remain for one year, during which time I was allowed to travel, after which I was free to take a position with another Bureau.

My first escape was to Turkey where USAID had financed an earthquake reconstruction project implemented by Save the Children. Although there was no indication of performance issues, the project had never been evaluated so the Bureau agreed for me to do some reconnaissance. In January 1979 I was on route to Ankara. My first appointment was with the fairly new American Ambassador Ronald Spiers who eventually became the Under Secretary of State for Management. When he learned that I was headed to Van, a Kurdish Province in the far eastern part of Turkey, he promptly offered to escort me. We would travel in his personal plane, accompanied by his bodyguard. It offered him a rare opportunity so soon to see that part of the country. From my perspective, with the purpose of my trip being to conduct a basic review of the construction project, it was not terribly successful. I was absorbed into his agenda and attention to the project became peripheral. However, Spiers was already an experienced diplomat and provided me with excellent briefings on the Turkish political and social situation and insights into Kurdistan where few Americans ventured.

Q: Did you encounter Ambassador Spiers later in your career?

TUMAVICK: Unfortunately I did not. I remained overseas during his tenure with State Department in D.C. My second escape was to Portugal later that year. It was merely an introductory trip to learn about the progress on development of the Foundation and to become acquainted with the American and FSN staff. It was difficult to accept Portugal, a western European country, as a USAID recipient although there was a portion of the

country that was rural and fairly underdeveloped. But, just as with Turkey, our funding represented a portion of the US payment for base rights in the Azores. Hospitality on the part of the Embassy and USAID staff was warm and welcoming, the scenery breathtaking, the food excellent and the endless glasses of vintage port amazing. Wheeler was true to his word and I was released in the fall of 1979 to join the Asia Bureau as the Bangladesh Desk Officer. A real development agenda.

Q: And, I imagine, a real sense of “coming home” to Asia.

TUMAVICK: Yes and no, Ann. The Asia Bureau was a comfortable home base for certain. But South Asia was a very different world, culturally far apart from Southeast Asia where I had spent my first 6 years overseas. But moving to that position would not happen for another three months. At that point in time USAID had installed a three month academic program, designed and managed by Dick Blue, to enhance the development knowledge and skills of mid-career level officers.

Q: I believe this was one of Administrator Doug Bennett’s signature programs.

TUMAVICK: Indeed it was. An inspired move to the benefit of the USAID staff and the Agency itself. I was selected to participate. We were relieved of all office responsibilities and participated full time in lectures, class work, analysis and offsites. The most serious of offsite experiences for this class of participants was in Bolivar County, Mississippi. It represented a development challenge in the U.S. which resembled those that we might encounter in the developing world. The issue was serious unemployment, especially among the predominantly black American community, following the collapse of the cotton economy. In coordination with the County authorities, we spent two weeks in interviews, analyzing the economy and the employment generation opportunities.

Q: I had no idea that this initiative included practical field work in the US! Perhaps it was only for former IDIs?

TUMAVICK: To my memory, it included a wide variety of Foreign Service and GS employees. I even recall an American participant from UNDP, so even more inclusive. Although it was an excellent learning experience, I have no idea if and how our recommendations were acted upon. Over the course of my USAID career, I found it regrettable that we were not offered the opportunity to return to the countries in which we served to evaluate first-hand the programs that we had designed and implemented. Lost opportunity.

In January 1980 I moved into the Bangladesh Desk Officer position. The Office was headed by a fairly senior GS officer, Joan Koe Dudik Gayoso. I supervised a staff of four, Mel Chapman and one other junior officer and two secretaries including Albertine Leach who later moved to the Asia Bureau Assistant Administrator’s suite. While we had a vibrant health and population program, the portfolio was heavily skewed to agriculture and rural development, running the gamut from agriculture policy, research, extension services and training.

Compared with my tasks in the Near East Bureau, the work was challenging and fulltime. It involved coordination and negotiation on behalf of the Mission with other USAID Bureaus, State Department and US Department of Agriculture. Schedules needed to be set for program and project reviews. The Mission in Bangladesh was large so there were always vacancies for which I helped recruit and then briefed officers on their way out to post, including Dennis Zvinakis and Carol Carpenter-Yaman. The Mission budget and portfolio were significant and thus subject to constant scrutiny by Washington staff. I needed to keep track of the latest detractors, spend time with them, and alert the Mission to issues. Training the Mission Director, Frank Kimble, also took effort. He was an exceptionally talented man but previously had served in the Latin America Bureau where, at that time, Desk Officers tended to serve only as mail drops so to speak. Eventually Kimble learned to appreciate me far more in the design and defense of his portfolio and the topics of our weekly phone calls became much more substantive. I also gained ready access to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Fred Schiek, an excellent officer.

By far the most high-profile program in the portfolio was food aid. U.S. food aid to Bangladesh evolved in phases over time. Before my involvement, the first phase involved the provision of wheat, mainly for emergency relief to avert famine. The second phase began in 1978 with evolution from a Title I loan program to the first PL 480 Title III Food for Development agreement. While continuing to provide foodgrains to augment domestic supply, the development purposes were to promote domestic production, stabilize the consumer market, and contribute to the creation of a national foodgrain security system. The Bangladesh Title III program was unique. It was focused on macro level policy reforms with no programming of local currency sales proceeds in those early days. (Against Kimble's objections, late in 1982 USAID Washington insisted on installing a monitoring system but I left the desk shortly thereafter and never tracked the impact.)

Q: Was there concern that the money was disappearing or being used inappropriately?

TUMAVICK: Exactly, even though there was no evidence beyond, perhaps, some pilfering. But the program in Bangladesh was unique for that feature and inevitably left USAID/Washington, USDA, and probably even some on the Hill a bit uncomfortable. The amount of money and product involved just left it open to suspicion.

In early 1981, about six months after my older daughter Alexandra was born at Georgetown Hospital, I ventured on an introductory trip to Bangladesh. The Program Officer, Larry Crandell, served as my control officer and he and his wife also offered me hospitality. Even on the trip in from the airport and on the streets of Dhaka I was impressed by the mass of humanity that swarmed the streets and then realized that I was only viewing half of the population since there were no women in sight. That perception would change later, however, when I spent time upcountry where the figures you saw working the fields in that season were virtually all women. Crandall had planned a rather intensive schedule for my 10 days, replete with a visit to each and every policy that we supported in Dhaka.

My first couple of days were spent in the Mission holding discussions with the front office and the various American staff members. Very rich conversations. as I recall, especially with the head of the Agriculture Office, an agricultural economist Chuck Andholt. At the end of our conversation he noted that the following day he was heading up the river to a research station in Khulna and invited me to accompany him. I accepted. In spite of the fact that the ancient paddle wheel boat, laden mainly with families, left the dock so late that we spent a few unexpected night hours stuck on a sandbar, the three-day trip really introduced me to Bangladesh. The road network was limited and mostly paved with bricks, a labor-intensive technology at best. The entire countryside was marked by poverty with little food in the markets except for rice, some of which we had probably provided. However, the Bangladeshi officials and research station staff were an impressive, committed group who I admired for their commitment.

Q: You mentioned the Research Station. Was the US supporting research on new varieties of grains or new farming techniques? And were other donors involved?

TUMAVICK: That particular research station was working on the introduction of new high-yielding varieties of rice coming out of the International Rice Research Institute at Los Banos, Philippines which I had visited years earlier. While there were probably other donors providing assistance to other areas of the agriculture sector, I never had the opportunity to meet with them.

Besides the heavy workload on the desk there were always entertaining vignettes. At one point USDA had an over -supply of rice and was attempting to foist it on Bangladesh instead of the normal wheat shipments which did not “compete” with the rice grown in country. Kimball was furious and decided to vent with a phone call to me at 3:00 AM one night. I learned some new four letter words before I decided the connection was broken. Mid-morning on many work days I had a drop in visitor, Bill McKinney, who was the India Desk Officer. We compared notes on work but his real interest was my stash of snacks in the bottom drawer of my desk. Then there was one amazing coincidence which would never happen today with computers and online banking, neither of which existed then. In the weekly call, the Deputy Mission Director requested that I contact his Chicago bank since his salary deposits seemed to have been substantially reduced. In fact, I had noticed during the last couple of pay periods that my salary deposits to that same bank, Harris Trust, were much higher than expected. Somehow our deposits had been switched. No problem. I phoned my woman banker, a good friend, and requested the correction be made. Solved.

In 1982 when the four year posting to D.C. was soon coming to an end, Dudik Gayoso successfully bid on another position and was replaced as Office Director by Jim Norris, a Foreign Service Officer and superb economist. The difference was dramatic in terms of the knowledge and experience that he imparted as well as a collaborative management style. The only event that stands out during that period was the senior level review meeting to approve the major Bangladesh Fertilizer Project. Thankfully, it was the first and only time that I encountered John Bolton, then head of the PPC Bureau, whose

participation was memorable. His appearance was chaotic, the only apparent reason for being there was to disrupt. It was time to move on.

Q: Did John Bolton want to stop the fertilizer project, or just show that he could? I didn't remember him going to many project reviews. But that reminds me that the Administration changed while you were the Bangladesh desk officer. What were some of the changes that happened to the Bureau or its programming after that transition?

TUMAVICK: Believe Bolton wanted to flex his muscles rather than actually having any plans to curtail the project, which did get approved. He burst into the conference room half way through the meeting, gave a 10 minute monologue while he stood at the end of the table and then promptly departed. Yes, we moved from the Carter Administration to the Reagan Administration while I was on the desk. Which also brought Peter McPherson in as the USAID Administrator. He was such a rational and reasonable individual I cannot imagine there being any dramatic changes in that first year or so of his holding the office. However, memory does not serve me well in that regard.

Indonesia (1982-1986)

TUMAVICK: The Mission Director in Jakarta, Bill Fuller, personally interviewed and recruited my husband to be the new head of his Program Office. Suspect that Fuller, fresh from the Ford Foundation, was a bit disappointed to find that it was a tandem package deal. In struggling to find me a slot, I was plugged into the Private Sector Officer position, actually reserved for Terry Myers, until a more suitable one was identified. Assistance to private sector development was a very new endeavor for the Agency and there were many skeptics and few qualified officers. Having taken leave from USAID to engage in private sector work in South Africa for a period of time, Terry was one of a few.

Q: Private sector development was one of the signature new programming initiatives during the Reagan years, wasn't it.

TUMAVICK: Indeed, it was a Reagan administration initiative, Ann. One of the skeptics, as I recall, was Jim Norris who counseled against my getting involved with the program in Indonesia. Took several years for many in the Agency to adjust to the new approach. By the early 1990s, however, when we moved into Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, our programs were no longer managed under agreements with the governments but rather through NGOs and private sector partners.

Language training preceded our departure for post. State Department Foreign Service Officers were provided a full time 52 weeks at the Foreign Service Institute with a combined program of language and studies in politics, economics, culture and current events to prepare them for the assignment in Jakarta. USAID Foreign Service Officers were entitled to 12 weeks of Bahasa, sink or swim. There were only four USAID officers in the class: Bob Clark, my husband and me, and Eric Loken. Clark, a seasoned

Controller, was to fill the Deputy Mission Director position. After 12 weeks, Loken and I achieved a respectable FSI level of 3/3. He was subsequently posted to Sri Lanka instead.

Transition from one posting to another was not particularly difficult for a tandem couple but 2 year old Alexandra was now part of the family and that required additional care and planning. As would become routine over the next ten years, my husband went in advance to identify suitable housing and hire household staff. We followed a month later after packing out and arranging for our house rental.

When I arrived at post, it was announced that I would be working in the Agriculture and Rural Development Office headed by Doug Tinsler who had been in my IDI program when I joined USAID in 1969. My portfolio would consist of several major projects: Uplands Development on Java, which was moving into design of a second phase, Integrated Rural Development on Sulawesi, and the small scale irrigation project, Sederhana (word for simple or basic), with funding for some 2,000 project sites on the outer islands across Indonesia including some very remote locations.

USAID had staffed up for the USAID Mission in Vietnam and then, as I had encountered previously, when the country collapsed to North Vietnam in 1975, USAID made an effort to retain some of those staff who were not exactly development experts. It took me only a couple of months to resolve the issues with the Sederhana project which had been managed by one of the Vietnam holdovers. When I turned to the design of the second phase of the Uplands project, it was announced that the project was being assumed by another Vietnam veteran, Frank Gillespie, who had just arrived at the Mission. Glad that I maintained my flexibility in those days.

In the course of my repair of the Sederhana project implementation, it became clear to me that USAID could play an important role in the development of small scale irrigation in Indonesia, specifically at sites off Java. (The Javanese were masters at irrigation and the World Bank was financing major systems on Java through the typical World Bank approach of establishing a parallel Ministry of Public Works.)

Q: Can you say a bit more about the World Bank approach as contrasted with USAID's? Did you ever collaborate with the World Bank in this or any other of your projects?

TUMAVICK: There were a couple of differences in our programs but they were complementary rather than conflicting. In Indonesia at that time the World Bank was pouring huge amounts of money into the irrigation sector to finance major systems for improved rice production on Java. USAID's focus was on smaller systems on the outer islands, where water supply was more limited, to allow for double cropping of a variety of crops. Secondly, USAID worked through government offices with less experienced and certainly less well paid civil servants. We hoped that our upfront engagement with the small farmers would result in greater sustainability and serve as a model for future work. The Bank was powerful enough to simply establish a separate entity, not connected to the government, to engineer and build systems. Those were really one time endeavors.

With regard to other donors, I should note that a couple of years after my major new irrigation project was begun, the Mission's annual budget was cut significantly. If I recall correctly, in order to assure successful completion of the project it was handed over to the Asian Development Bank to complete financing and to manage oversight of implementation. (USAID used a similar handover approach to other donors in the early 1990s in Pakistan when that Mission was closed down.)

Previously USAID had partnered with the Ministry of Agriculture which was not a particularly strong or influential Ministry. The systems we financed were being constructed by the Ministry of Public Works (MPW) through their Provincial offices and basically without consultation with the farmers who needed the improved water supply. It was a mistake to assume that the MPW and their engineering prowess were being effective. So I switched our focus to a partnership with the MPW, previously judged to be the villains. In fact, the engineers welcomed our engagement.

Q: So your counterparts were in the Ministry of Public Works, not the Ministry of Agriculture? Again, were any other donors involved in this program?

TUMAVICK: Our main counterparts were in Public Works but we also insisted on collaboration with Agriculture since increased water supply offered the opportunity to multi-crop and the agriculturalists would have provided guidance and advice on selection and techniques for new crops. Based on the good connections of Fuller and Michael Morfit, the Ford Foundation supplemented our work in farmer engagement.

In addition to the Sederhana project manager, the staff that I supervised consisted of four engineers, three FSNs and one American, Al Newman, who was relatively new to USAID. They were a capable group and enthusiastic about my proposal for a new irrigation project. As important was the arrival at post of an IDI who was assigned to my office, Diana Putman, who was a Ph.D. anthropologist with experience working in the agriculture sector in the developing world. This core group and I crafted a project proposal, or whatever that initial document was called in those days, for consideration by the Mission review board. I made it clear that if we were meant to be influential players we needed a substantial budget and the Mission Director approved the \$100 million that we proposed for what would come to be called the Small Scale Irrigation Management Project (SSIMP.) The basic principle was that development of small scale (up to 2,000 hectares) irrigation systems needed to engage the community of farmers from the earliest design stage. They were the ones knowledgeable about the terrain, the rainfall patterns, the cropping systems and the equitable distribution of water supplies.

Q: I imagine having an anthropologist on the team was very helpful. Did the embassy engage in any way?

TUMAVICK: Yes, Putman's involvement was important to assure that the engineers were constantly reminded that the irrigation systems were simply a tool to improve agricultural production, livelihoods and nutrition. With an investment of this size and the politically interesting geographic focus (off Java) the Mission Director would have sought concurrence from the Ambassador to proceed in the first place. We also provided periodic

briefings to the Economics Officer and I recall that he participated in one of our pre-project implementation workshops in Jogjakarta. However, in those days, while USAID Missions were part of the country team we had a stronger independence from other US government agencies which, over time, deteriorated.

As with many Mission Directors, Fuller wanted to assure that someone he respected and trusted was engaged in development of a project of that size and significance. Michael Morfit joined our design team as a very valuable contributor. He had already spent a few years in Indonesia with the Ford Foundation before joining the Mission as a PSC. Afterwards he went on to an illustrious career with USAID and Georgetown University. I chaired the in-house project development team, which had an amazing range of skills and experience. We crafted a scope of work and procured the services of a design team from the Colorado Institute for Irrigation Management (CIIM).

While waiting for the CIIM team to arrive, I took the opportunity for a field trip to the project in Sulawesi. And I was more than excited to be on the road again. The day-long trip to arrive at the project site involved an early morning flight to Bali, transfer to flight to Ujung Pandang, now Makassar, then an 8 hour road trip to the central Sulawesi project site. It was a classic integrated rural development project of that era with all of the ingredients: rural road construction, small scale irrigation systems, improved seed and fertilizer inputs, storage and processing facility and marketing systems. Once again, after I left Indonesia, I never had the opportunity to reflect back on whether the project really succeeded. But the giant tiger prawns that I brought back in my hand luggage from Ujung Pandang were truly memorable.

After initial consultations with the MPW officials in Jakarta, the CIIM team headed out to the islands which were the territory in which the design team proposed to focus. I accompanied them along with the MPW officials, all male trip companions which was never an issue for me. Familiar travel route, leaving Jakarta early morning to transit Bali across the continental divide for Lombok, Sumbawa and then West Timor. Our target was areas that could only single crop, mainly rice, with the potential for double or even triple cropping. The team was excellent and produced a design that was reviewed and accepted by the Mission and our Government of Indonesia counterparts.

Q: I think Indonesia became self-sufficient in rice around that time.

TUMAVICK: Meanwhile, management by Gillespie of the design of the follow-on Uplands Development Project on Java was not moving forward as planned. The Office Director Tinsler asked me to resume responsibility and I declined. I was summoned to the office of Deputy Director Clark to try to convince me. After an extended conversation I made clear that I was not interested in repairing the issues that had been generated through incompetence. Not my problem. Besides, I had other more important responsibilities. I was pregnant with my second daughter, Victoria, and anticipated a few months away from the office. In fact, the Mission was very family-friendly. There were three of us American female officers who were pregnant at the same time, including the Regional Legal Advisor Lisa Chiles.

The SSIMP project design moved ahead on schedule but the size of the project meant it had to be reviewed and approved in Washington. Since I was no longer able to travel, we selected Diana Putman to get on the plane to D.C. to participate in the review and defense of the project. Given her area of expertise, that guaranteed that the project was presented as a major support project for small farmers off Java rather than the construction project that it actually was. SSIMP was approved. My Bahasa language skills served me very well including in the startup workshops that we sponsored in a couple of the provinces.

Q: It sounds as if you made a number of trips to the project sites. Were there ever any security concerns?

TUMAVICK: When traveling upcountry, the only security concerns related to a vehicle being washed away when fording a river or the vehicle slipping off one of the narrow winding roads on the side of a cliff. Compared to my earlier experience in Northeastern Thailand or later especially in Pakistan, travel in Indonesia was never marred by political, insurgent or other security concerns. Since I always traveled with Indonesian counterparts who knew the territory, their local connections served us well. The fact that I was a sole woman in the company of a group of men was never a problem. Probably needed to be more concerned about pickpockets or thieves in Jakarta than upcountry.

While there were very competent Indonesian doctors in Jakarta, the Embassy's judgment was that the hospitals and their staff were not competent enough to deal with any complications of the newborn. So routinely, American women associated with the Embassy were sent to Singapore to give birth which involved a few steps in advance to meet that Government's regulations. While the regulations were established to assure no Tamil or Malay women could claim citizenship for their child, it was even-handedly applied to European or American women as well. The Ministry of Social Services required a signed certificate that the child born in Singapore was not entitled to claim citizenship. A month in Singapore walking the streets and enjoying the food was a bonus as far as I was concerned. My second daughter, Victoria, was delivered safely and enjoyed her first plane trip back to Jakarta at 2 weeks of age. I still have her first diplomatic passport with a photo taken when she was two days old.

Q: What were maternity leave benefits like in the mid 1980s?

TUMAVICK: Good question but not sure I can answer correctly. Do not recall there being any maternity leave benefits. However, besides an occasional mental health day, I never used sick leave so had accumulated enough days to cover the three months of leave that I took. In the field, the Missions were always family friendly so if I had needed or wanted to use annual leave to extend the time out of the office that would not have been a problem.

A few months thereafter, we accepted a tandem assignment to Tunisia and made the move in mid-1986. With minor exceptions, the experience in USAID/Indonesia would leave fond memories of colleagues and their families including Gordon West, Dennis

Zvinakis, and Ron Greenberg. The farewells by both the Mission and the government counterparts were noteworthy. In particular, I recall the event to mark my departure sponsored by the Minister of Public Works, attended by all of his staff with whom I had worked. In his closing comments he praised my performance as one of the most collaborative foreign engineers with which his staff had worked.

Q: Very nice! Can you say anything about relations with the embassy? Was there a hands-off agreement between the mission and the embassy at that time? I imagine you also had some very experienced and competent FSNs working in your program. Did you get to know them and their families well?

TUMAVICK: I believe that I already answered the question about Embassy relationships. I could add that the USAID Mission was co-located with the Embassy and other agencies in a huge walled compound in the middle of the city but not in the commercial area. Since there were no restaurants within walking distance, for convenience almost everyone would lunch on the compound at either the American or Indonesian cafeterias. This provided ample opportunity to propose informal get togethers to chat over lunch with Embassy or other agency colleagues about development affairs.

Actually, socializing with the three FSN engineers on my staff was not easy. They were self-effacing and had limited English language comfort levels. One was a very observant Muslim and the other two were Christian. None of the wives spoke a word of English. Except when we traveled together, which I encouraged, social occasions were very limited. However, my older daughter Alexandra did provide an opportunity. Two of the engineers had daughters just about the same age so I would invite them to the house for playdates or her annual birthday party. My daughter spoke Bahasa and was delighted to spend time with girls her same age.

Tunisia (1986-1990)

TUMAVICK: The USAID Mission in Tunis was technically a “close out “Mission by the mid-1980’s. Mission Director Jim Phippard, a Regional Legal Advisor, was assigned the posting to assure a measured and complete close out process. Leases on houses were not being renewed as staff departed, aging vehicles were not being replaced, and new FSN staff were not being recruited. Apparently Congress decided otherwise and earmarked an additional \$20 million a year in ESF funding.

Q: Do you have any idea why Congress earmarked additional funds? Were there any directives that came along with the funds; and did you get CODELS?

TUMAVICK: Although I am speculating, since the budget action was taken before my involvement, the decision could have been based on the politics in the region. We were on good terms with Tunisia and wanted it to remain that way in light of what was happening in Lebanon. I recall no directives whatsoever which was refreshing. No CODELS that I recall.

The Mission needed new, experienced staff to manage the sudden reversal in the program closeout and my husband and I were a perfect choice for the positions. Jonathan filled the Program Officer slot and I was made the head of the newly formed Projects Office. Since the Mission was too small to warrant a Deputy Mission Director, we took turns serving as Mission Director when Phippard was out of country. In fact, shortly after our arrival he and his wife, a State Department Foreign Service Officer, departed for a few weeks of holiday and we were left in charge of the Mission.

We arrived in August 1986 in the middle of Eid al-Fitr when the whole world was shut down for a week of celebrations so we had some time to settle in. Politically, and from a security perspective, it was a tense time especially for Americans. After being driven out of Lebanon in the 1982 Lebanon War, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) moved its headquarters to Tunisia. A planned attack on Israel by PLO troops based in Tunisia early in 1985 was thwarted by the Israelis who then retaliated by bombing the PLO headquarters in Tunisia in late 1985 killing or wounding a couple hundred.

It was fairly widely believed that we Americans had provided intelligence to support the bombing so the situation was tense, which led to interesting vignettes. Since we were informed in advance that no used cars were available on the market, we brought a new Peugeot down from France when we transited Europe and retained the French export license plates for security in Tunis. We switched to our diplomatic plates when we traveled outside of Tunis. When Yasser Arafat was in Tunis, his office space was inconveniently located next to our drycleaner a couple blocks from our house. I refused to recognize the legitimacy of them blocking curb parking and was approached by two men in black leather jackets, hands in pockets. I responded to them in English which of course they did not understand. I opened the trunk, took out my clothes, grabbed the hand of 7 year old Alexandra and marched into the dry cleaners.

The American Ambassador, Peter Sebastian, born in Germany and an accomplished linguist, was an old style European diplomat. He entertained graciously and lavishly in his stark white residence that sat high on a hill overlooking the Mediterranean. He was recalled a few months after our arrival and replaced by Ambassador Robert Pelletreau, an extremely skilled diplomat accredited to both the Government of Tunisia and the PLO. It was believed that he was the US interlocutor with Yasser Arafat whose primary residence was in Tunis. USAID had very little interaction with Pelletreau himself except at diplomatic social events that he hosted.

But that Embassy transition was minor compared to changes in the USAID Mission Director position in the course of our four year posting. Phippard departed in 1987 and was replaced by Fritz Weden, a very capable and experienced USAID manager with absolutely no foreign language capability. Between two of our exceptional FSN staff members, Salah Mahjoub in my Projects Office and Mohammed Abassi in the Program Office, we were able to bolster his efforts in communicating with our senior Tunisian counterparts who spoke no English. However, two years later he was assigned as Mission Director to Cairo and replaced by George Carner, a multi-lingual officer who was committed to redesign the portfolio that we had just put in place. We suffered that fourth year under his sheer arrogance.

Q: So, 3 mission directors in 4 years! Can you describe the program George Carner wanted to launch? Was it a move away from private sector development?

TUMAVICK: No, it was not a program to move away from private sector development, but rather changing specific objectives, mechanisms and counterpart agencies. While that sounds rather benign, do not forget that it took us two years to negotiate the agreements that were about one year old. Just totally disruptive.

But I digress. In 1986 when we arrived, to make the development situation even more challenging, the hard core socialist Tunisian economy had tanked. The country was broke. It went into negotiations with the IMF as well as the World Bank for financial support which meant meeting strict benchmarks for a transformation of the economy to the private sector which was virtually non-existent with the exception of crafts. The government had to stop inefficiently producing shoes and refrigerators and fertilizer and move out of the hotel business. Since neither the IMF nor the World Bank had offices on the ground in Tunisia to manage the transition, the USAID Mission moved into that role.

The Mission Director, Phippard at that time, was of the old school and had difficulty relating to a program to support the private sector. But that changed with our arrival and assessment that we had a crucial role to play. The closeout portfolio was very traditional in character consisting of projects such as rangeland management, potable water, agriculture research, and a fledgling population planning project. In close collaboration with our Tunisian counterparts in the Ministry of Planning and Ministry of Foreign Affairs we designed new projects going forward, specifically to provide technical assistance to support their commitments under the agreements with the World Bank and the IMF.

One challenge was to identify an appropriate advisor with actual experience in privatization, with French and Arabic language skills, and immediate availability. We Americans had no such experience. Anyone from France was unacceptable to the Tunisians in light of the colonial heritage. As if by magic, our support office in Washington found a Lebanese-Canadian who, at the age of 32, had recent privatization experience in Montreal, was fluent in both languages as well as English, and was very enthusiastic about the position in Tunis. Since the agriculture sector was a major target, we also acquired a team of rotating short-term experts from Abt Associates under management of Sherrie Rassas who was based in Tunis. Every Friday afternoon a few of us would gather under leadership of our Private Sector Officer Mark Karns. The advisor to the Ministry of Agriculture would update us on which government company was ready for sale to the public. The following Monday our privatization expert would literally shuffle the files of the known candidates to assure that company file was on the top of the pile for priority consideration. It was just that easy. Using that informal system, In the course of my four year posting, we marched on through companies producing seeds, fertilizer, tractors, farm equipment, etc.

Q: How did the privatization work (better than in Russia, I assume). Who purchased the companies? Incidentally, was there any foreign investment at the time?

TUMAVICK: Definitely worked better than in many countries, Ann, including Russia. We departed post before we witnessed the full impact. In the agriculture sector, the valuation of companies was done quite well with assistance from our advisors. As the economy had eroded over the years, there was not sufficient public sector budget to replace worn out equipment or update facilities. So the market value of many of the companies was quite low, allowing for Tunisians to purchase them. There were also joint ventures mainly with European companies. There was a limit, which I cannot recall precisely, to the percentage of foreign ownership to assure control remained in the hands of Tunisians. This was specifically in the agriculture sector and other areas such as hotels may have differed. What did strike me was the lack of bribery and corruption compared to other countries in which I had worked. Favors might be exchanged but rarely money in those days.

While the socialist economy had proven a disaster for Tunisia, the basic social sectors had done well under the 30-year rule of the aging and senile President Bourguiba. Although the population was predominantly practicing Muslim, women were treated equally and with respect. Several of my senior level Ministry counterparts were female. Coming from countries where female literacy rates were still struggling, it amazed me to find, for example, some 85% of the female population had completed primary school and were literate. Reasonable health care was available universally and our revamped Family Planning project exceeded expectations under the enthusiastic and very skilled management of Diana Putman who had followed me from Jakarta.

One long term project that we continued to finance was the Technology Transfer Project, a rather unique participant training project that sponsored 400 Tunisian students in engineering sciences at U.S. Universities. The total cost was \$40 million of which 50% was financed by the Tunisian Government. The reason that it was unique was that USAID financed undergraduate studies, a practice that we had eschewed years before in other countries. The TTP, like our other projects in Tunisia was ESF-financed which gave us the leeway to support the program which was viewed as very valuable by the Tunisians. One senior counterpart openly claimed this was the most important investment that USAID made.

Q: Can you say a bit more about the participant training project? Did you have trouble getting students to return? Did you track them to find out whether they were employed and using their education?

TUMAVICK: Scholarship funding included travel expenses to encourage students to return to Tunisia on holiday each year and to maintain relationships with their family and friends. Again, we departed post while most of the students were still in school in the U.S. or had only recently completed their degree studies so too early to track the percentage of no-returns or employment rate. The students were required to sign a commitment letter to return to Tunisia and work for a period of time or repay the scholarship.

We also worked collaboratively with the co-located USAID Regional Housing Office headed by David Olinger whose staff included future senior managers Alexi Panehal and Sonja Hammam who were, of course, all handpicked by Peter Kimm who only recruited the best. Their urban development program included assistance to municipalities in the design, management and funding of sorely needed urban infrastructure which in Tunisia focused on upgrading deteriorated roads. My staff worked with them in designing a Food for Work program to pay the road workers. The program also helped to ease unemployment and the accompanying tension in urban areas which had developed in recent years when the economy had suffered. The program also provided me with the first opportunity to meet with Kimm on his swing through the region and, interestingly enough, we got along splendidly which served me well years later when I returned to Washington.

Another vignette regarding security. Alexi, Sonja and I, along with a few female Embassy staff members all had young children at post, many of them too young to attend school. The head of our Embassy security office was a very conscientious officer but there was a policy he attempted to install which did not please us. He judged that our houses would be more secure if our day time and night time Tunisian guards were rotated among the American residences so no guard would become too familiar with routines and schedules of any single household. The last thing that we mothers wanted was a new face routinely on the compound who our children did not know. Our day time guard, Mohammed, was exceptionally good with the girls. He played a small flute, did really artistic sketches, and lifted them up to pick fruit from our numerous fruit trees. He also spoke reasonably good French so we could communicate easily. Needless to say, with the senior female workforce against the proposed change, the Regional Security Officer did not stand a chance.

Finally, one of the most memorable events in our assignment to Tunisia was the visit of the USAID Assistant Administrator for the Middle East and North Africa, Julia Chang Bloch. She was scheduled to arrive from Frankfurt on Sunday, November 8, 1987. The Program Office was in charge of scheduling and supporting her visit. In the middle of the night we received a phone call from Abassi to deliver the news that late Saturday night President Bourguiba had been removed from power by his prime minister, Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, and under house arrest in his residence in Monastir. The next few hours were spent in furious communications with Bloch in Frankfurt and USAID and State Department in Washington. The question at hand was not one of security but rather diplomatic relations—would a visit by so senior a USG official as Bloch be interpreted as acceptance of the undemocratic transition to a new Tunisian leader.

We never knew the rationale behind the decision but Bloch arrived in Tunis on schedule later that day and the three day visit went exceptionally well. She was articulate and knowledgeable, and absolutely charmed our Tunisian colleagues. The only awkward moment always came when she seated herself on the soft leather couch in a Minister's office and the skirt of her Chanel suit slid up a bit too high. I planned and accompanied her to a project site specifically selected for its proximity to well known Roman ruins at

Thuburbo Majus which we visited. We also enjoyed providing hospitality to her very young but very intelligent and articulate assistant, Liz Cheney.

Q: It sounds as if you really enjoyed this posting. What was the schooling situation for your children? Were you able to travel in the country without a security detail? Finally, did the French have an aid program there at that time? Were there any other development donors with which you worked, or only with the World Bank?

TUMAVICK: Yes, it was an enjoyable family post in spite of the economic turmoil and the security issues. The State Department sponsored a very small American curriculum elementary school of under a hundred students of which only about half were American. The remainder were a combination of Europeans and Middle Easterners. The principal was a Mormon, a wonderful older gentleman who had dispensation from his church from proselytizing. My older daughter Alexandra began in the second grade with 7 male classmates. Younger daughter Victoria attended a British pre-school. By the time that we departed both of them were French fluent and the older one had begun Arabic.

Whether on business or on family holiday, upcountry travel in Tunisia did not require a security detail. There were no threats to Americans or foreigners in the rural areas. However, compared to Southeast Asia, the Tunisian countryside was actually rather boring. With the exception of the dramatic Mediterranean coastline the remainder of the country was arid with miles and miles of scrub desert and olive trees with a few denuded mountains in the distance. The Romans had used Tunisia as their breadbasket and slowly turned the land over to the Sahara which continues to encroach on the fertile northern area. The one positive and interesting result was that today Tunisia can boast some of the best preserved Roman ruins in the world due to the aridity, lack of environmental degradation and a very small population.

Any other bilateral donors were few in number and with very small programs that were coordinated by the UNDP which did maintain an office in Tunis. I remember it well since the Director had been a classmate of mine at The Fletcher School and a good friend with whom we socialized. Somsai Norindr was, at the time, the only Laotian passport holder in the entire United Nations system.

Pakistan (1990-1993)

TUMAVICK: The tandem assignment to Islamabad was quite unexpected. The announcement came through a phone call from George Laudato, the Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Bureau, then from Jerry Jordan and then from Jim Norris. It was a posting not welcomed by my husband but there were few overseas choices for a couple who were now both in the Senior Foreign Service and had no interest in returning to Washington. At the age of 43 I was being offered a Deputy Director slot in the second largest Mission in the world working for Jim Norris who I knew and admired. In parallel, Jonathan would become the Deputy Director for the Mission to Afghanistan which was also located in Islamabad. That was a Mission operating in exile since no official Americans were allowed to enter Afghanistan.

My daughters and I arrived in Pakistan in September 1990 on direct transfer, with my husband to follow a few weeks later after consultations in Washington. We transited Karachi and were met at the airport by a Pakistani staff member who expedited our arrival flawlessly. That night we spent at the USAID guest house, one of five that we operated in the country at that time. After a morning flight up to Islamabad we were delivered to our spacious permanent residence, neighbors of John Swanson and his family. The following morning the personal driver, who was assigned to me for the entire tour, delivered us to the Mission which was co-located with the Consulate, a few miles from the Embassy. We were admitted by the receptionist to whom I introduced myself as the new Deputy Director. An older man with reasonable English, he still misunderstood me and insisted that the new DD (he) had not yet arrived at the office. Once clarified, I was guided up three stories to the front office and warmly welcomed by Director Jim Norris, the American secretary Anne Mayhew and my Pakistani secretary Akhtar Qureshi.

Q: This can't have been the first time that being a young attractive female prompted skepticism about your official title! How did you deal with it (humor? patience? etc!)

TUMAVICK: I do smile but I do not have a great sense of humor, Ann. Purse strings seems to me to be the answer to your question. Whether in Indonesia, Tunisia or Pakistan, once the counterparts, at whatever level up to Ministers, realized that their obtaining US funding depended upon cooperation with me and the Mission staff there was no issue. However, there were a few occasions in my career, where being a young female placed me in uncomfortable situations. In Pakistan the case in point was the Minister of Education who, only when my husband was out of town, would call and invite me to lunch. Assumed that our phone was being tapped. Thankfully the lunch was always with another woman guest, a very attractive Irish BBC correspondent who always accompanied me when I departed. The Minister's wife, not a very attractive woman. later served as Pakistan Ambassador to the U.S.

The USAID Mission to Pakistan was huge as was the building complex to accommodate the staff. The staff consisted of some 60 American FSOs, over 600 FSNs, and dozens of American PSCs and TCNs located predominantly in Islamabad but also in small satellite offices in the four provincial capitals of Lahore, Karachi, Peshawar and Quetta. In addition, the Embassy allowed us to have in country on any given day up to 100 institutional contractors, a limit fully tracked and enforced. I recall interesting situations where we were obliged to send out of country a couple of long term contractors on TDY or leave to accommodate the arrival of a couple of critical short term consultants. The staff of the USAID Mission for Afghanistan was additional and subject to their own limits.

Q: It sounds like musical chairs! Why was the embassy so fastidious on this point?

TUMAVICK: In 1979, Islamist students and locals, incited by Iranian propaganda, stormed the U.S. embassy in Islamabad and burned it down in an apparently coordinated

attack. At least one American woman, a colleague of mine, was raped. So the answer seems to be that we remained duly cautious. Keeping the numbers under control would be the way to assure an orderly evacuation was possible which we see later turned out to be the case.

Since I had worked for Norris previously in Washington, albeit for a brief period of time, my move into the Deputy Director slot was smooth and efficient. My predecessor, Paul Gaudet, had evidently spent a substantial portion of his time drafting and finalizing the periodic performance reports for the 10 Office Directors that he managed. That was not a limited role that I was prepared to follow. I readily accepted Norris's proposal that we evenly divide the portfolio between us for more focused attention and management, although I would remain the rating office for all of the Directors except for the Regional Legal Advisor. However, to assure we both were cognizant of issues and opportunities across the entire portfolio, there was a fixed weekly front office schedule of meetings with each Office that we both attended if available. It was a formidable group of professionals of whom several would eventually become Mission Directors: Anne Aarnes, Pat Peterson, Jock Conly, David Sprague, Linda Martin, Gordon West, Tom Rishoi, Marcy Buchan, John Martin, Gene George, plus the RLA Mark Ward. (There was also an enthusiastic young American local hire PSC in the contracting office, Maureen Shauket.)

Q: What a training ground for future USAID leaders!

TUMAVICK: Those were halcyon days, Ann. That incredibly competent group of officers always made me look good! What I did offer, however, was strengthening the link between and among them. Through the weekly meetings and sessions in between, I kept informed of what was going on across the portfolio. In addition, every few weeks I invited 3 of the senior officers on a rotational basis to join me for lunch when we would informally share information on program success or challenges in counterpart relationships, GOP policies or nitty gritty implementation problems. Everyone benefited, including me.

The project portfolio was vast, diversified, and operating with over a \$600 million pipeline and an annual operating expense budget of \$12 million. While my specific program focus was on agriculture, engineering, education and training plus oversight of the contracting and the executive office functions, I engaged across the portfolio. With that level of resources available the Mission was equipped to successfully spearhead policy level initiatives with our Government of Pakistan (GOP) counterparts at both the national and provincial levels. Reduction of the agriculture input subsidies, which mainly benefitted the wealthy and politically powerful large landowners, was one target. Percentage reductions on fertilizer, for example, were negotiated annually. If the national government met all the targets, the \$100 million was a cash transfer to the benefit of the GOP coffers. However, if the targets were not met, the funds were lost to the GOP and used instead in a Commodity Import Program (CIP) to the benefit of Pakistani private sector companies. In the years I was at the Mission, the GOP normally received a portion of the cash transfer for having met a subset of the established targets.

Q: Out of curiosity, do you think policy conditionality (if that's what it's called) is an effective strategy? Or only when there are substantial resources at play?

TUMAVICK: That is a difficult but interesting question. I speculate that it would vary from country to country based on a variety of factors. Yes, whether the resources in play are substantial is one factor. It could also depend upon the level of political influence we and our direct counterparts can bring into play at the particular time that we are attempting to encourage those policy changes. How radical a change and our proposed timing could make a difference to its acceptance. There are probably other factors to which more experienced economists or sector specialists, in particular, could contribute.

One target was encouraging the GOP to relinquish some of its burdensome responsibilities which could be assumed by the private sector. The Water and Power Development Authority (WAPDA), established in 1958, had grown over the decades into a massive organization employing hundreds of thousands across the country. It was the power generation, transmission and distribution which could no longer keep up with the demand particularly from industry but also agriculture and urban sectors. Our investment was relatively modest in staff time and expert consultants to convince the WAPDA authorities, including Director Daud Baig, to pilot a contract with a private sector company to build and operate a generation station near Karachi.

Q: How did you ensure that the contracting process was fair and open?

TUMAVICK: I cannot fully respond since it was in process when I departed Pakistan. However, my understanding was that a Joint Committee of Pakistanis and Americans was established to assure fair and open competition in the contracting process both for design and construction.

Our investments in education were numerous and widespread with a focus on teacher training, female education and infrastructure. We supported the establishment of the Lahore University of Management Sciences, a private sector institution financed by a wealthy Lahore businessman Babar Ali, as well as the Agriculture University in Peshawar under the Ministry of Agriculture. We had very active involvement in developing the curriculum and teacher training programs for female primary education in the Northwest Frontier and Balochistan provinces including mobile teacher training units to reach more remote areas.

These were just a sample of what the portfolio contained. We were the main donors in support to family planning and maternal and child health. In the engineering arena, we worked with the Ministry of Public Works on design and installation of a maintenance system for secondary roads which also included pilot road construction to improved standards. For political and security reasons, USAID was directed to finance a three hundred kilometer stretch of road in a remote area of Balochistan to assure GOP access near the coastline. We financed and trained staff for a chain of agricultural research stations in at least one province. Etc, etc, etc.

But I do need to digress since these were tumultuous times for the world and for the Pakistan Mission. My family was on Christmas leave in the States at the end of 1990. The Gulf War had begun in August 1990 with Operation Desert Shield and phase two Operation Desert Storm would begin in January 1991. Cautionary voluntary evacuations of official Americans and families from various posts in the Middle East and the subcontinent had already been taking place over the few weeks before we returned to post. I recall clearly that we landed in Islamabad on a Monday morning, January 14 and by the following day were instructed to set aside airfreight at our residence and to pack suitcases, in case of evacuation. By Wednesday, the Embassy had intelligence of credible threats directed at the 600 student American International School which was promptly closed. At 5 am on Thursday, January 17 the message came over the radio from the marine guard at the Embassy that we would be picked up at our house in an hour for transport to the Embassy and then on to the airport for a 10 am evacuation flight.

Q: Both you and your husband were instructed to evacuate?

TUMAVICK: Not exactly. The USAID Afghanistan Director, Bob Bakely, advised my husband never to return from our Christmas R & R in the States. My Mission Director Jim Norris encouraged me to return to post -- so very mixed instructions. In the end, I needed to evacuate my young daughters and my husband was told no reason to stay.

Evacuation did not go as smoothly as one would have wanted. At 10 am we were still gathered at the Embassy waiting for transport which eventually appeared around noon...a conspicuous caravan of twelve blue buses with some 280 family members and their luggage that wound its way to the airport. We were ensconced in the Haj terminal, which was surrounded by heavily armed Pakistani military guards, where we waited to board a Pakistan International Airlines 747 close to 5pm. As we learned later, the Embassy had difficulty in arranging an American evacuation plane and settled at the final moment on PIA with a crew who believed it was a standard commercial flight. We departed Islamabad without a flight number and without a clear destination. However, additional time had been needed to negotiate clearance for overflight of Russian airspace, to avoid Afghanistan, so we knew that we were initially headed north.

Then an interesting personal role evolved. As we were boarding, the Embassy announcement came over the loudspeaker that this was a non-smoking flight. Immediately I was beseeched by about 20 adult smokers, since I was one of them, and who I reassured all would be arranged if they just proceeded to board calmly. Watching as passengers filed passed me, the situation became clear. The Embassy had not designated anyone to be in charge. I was the senior official on the flight so after we reached cruising altitude, I subtly assumed charge. To give thought to the task, I spent a bit of time in the cockpit having a cigarette along with the captain and his crew. Over the next hour I relocated passengers to accommodate six smoking seats at the rear of the plane and then settled down for the flight. Another six hours and we were descending to land at Heathrow Airport which was closed to normal commercial traffic and surrounded by tanks in response to the outbreak of the Gulf War. We were one of three planes allowed to land but required to park a distance from the terminal. Those passengers under

medical care of the Embassy nurse on board were bused to the terminal for medical checks while the rest of us remained on board. After the plane was refueled a few hours later we proceeded to taxi and takeoff accompanied by jet fighters on each wing for the final portion of the trip to our destination, Kennedy Airport.

Q: In the retelling you seem very calm. It must have been terrifying. Did you have to deal with panicked children or family members? Also, what were FSNs told about your departure/return...if anything?

TUMAVICK. It was a relatively calm evacuation, Ann, probably because whatever the perceived threat it was not tangible for us. There were no mobs surrounding us or anyone being physically threatened. Most of the children had family and friends on the flight. The flight was in the middle of the night so everyone slept during the majority of the flight. I have no idea what the FSNs were told. Half of the Mission Foreign Service Officers and all dependents had been evacuated from Pakistan.

Once we settled our daughters with their grandmother in rural Long Island, we reported to USAID Washington charged with establishing our respective shadow Missions. In the face of these rather traumatic circumstances, my priority was given to meeting the personal needs of families especially for those who left behind one of the parents. Then the barren Rosslyn office space that we were allocated had to be furnished and equipped for the 50 technical and program experts out of both Missions, a process skillfully managed by two of our Executive Office staff, Ellen Hays and Faith Schaeffer. Within a couple of weeks we had determined work priorities, set the agenda, and were fully functional in concert with the Mission in Islamabad.

That was also a tumultuous time for the U.S.-Pakistan relationship which created a new challenge for the Mission. After 10 years of occupation, in early 1989 the Russians pulled out of neighboring Afghanistan. Charlie Wilson's War had ended. U.S. assistance to Pakistan suddenly came under scrutiny. Since the 1985 Pressler Amendment, most economic and military assistance to Pakistan required annual certification by the president that "Pakistan does not possess a nuclear explosive device and that the proposed United States assistance program will reduce significantly the risk ..." In 1990 Pakistan was no longer needed as a critical platform for the U.S. efforts against the Russians. President Bush would cease certifying and the USAID program was to be terminated.

Q: So the Pressler amendment had already kicked in when the evacuation happened?

TUMAVICK. Actually it was the lack of the ability to certify in accord with the Pressler Amendment that kicked in. I vaguely recall that it happened simultaneously with the Gulf War.

At first we naively assumed that meant no additional funds and we would be allowed to utilize the funds already obligated but that was not the case. In negotiations with the Hill, in which I immediately became the on site spokesperson for the Mission, we argued to retain a level of funding for a responsible close out process.

Q: Which congressional offices were your main interlocutors? And how closely did you work with (and were supported by?) the Administrator's office and Legislative Affairs?

TUMAVICK: Although I no longer remember those details, the list of projects which we judged important to be completed totaled some \$200 million and we eventually had half of that approved mainly for social sector projects in health, education, environment, and agriculture. It was devastating. In the beginning of April 1991 evacuees were allowed to return to post but a few FSOs returned only to pack out and move to the next assignment.

Q: Did you return to Pakistan that April? Were you involved in securing onward assignments for your FSOs?

TUMAVICK. We did return in early April. It was less a question of securing onward assignments for the Americans than providing assistance for our huge Pakistani staff in determining their future. Our Executive Officer, John Martin, did an excellent job in chairing the Mission committee to design a three-day session, mainly for the Pakistani staff, that was run by the consulting firm TRG headed by Ed Salt. The session helped the staff explore options as they moved forward in crafting resumes, considering retirement, possibly establishing a business. It was well conducted and well appreciated.

The front office continued a positive attitude since there was still substantial work to be done and the staff worked assiduously to implement the projects in the closeout process. As an alter-ego to the Mission Director, I had already routinely served as Mission Director in his absence. I negotiated programs and agreements up to and including Ministerial levels, served on the American Ambassador's senior working group, and represented USAID to the World Bank, other donors, the press and international organizations. I took full advantage of the preference that Norris had for policy discussions and socializing in Islamabad so I traveled widely in Pakistan for program monitoring, negotiations, and public relations at the provincial levels.

In the course of my tour I managed to spend time in all four provinces mainly in the rural areas. The trips were extremely well planned by the American and Pakistani staff who took turns accompanying me. In Sindh province the most memorable few days were spent with USGS staff in the scrub Thar desert that straddled the India-Pakistan border. We were deep drilling to locate and estimate gas reserves which have since been very successfully exploited. In Punjab province a couple of days were spent in 50°C weather visiting rural maternal and child health care centers and checking condom supplies in small kiosks. More noteworthy were trips in the other provinces, where far more conservative Islam etiquette prevailed. In Balochistan, where we were sponsoring a conference on female education, the provincial Minister of Education and I sat in the back seat of his sedan from his office to the conference site. To assure there was no wrong impression, he carefully placed his AK47 between us on the seat as a visual divider.

Q: This was all before the evacuation, I assume? Or were you able to travel to project sites throughout your tour?

TUMAVICK. My travel was both before and after evacuation and the Mission closeout process. The Tribal Areas located on the border with Afghanistan were more dramatic and fascinating. The target of our trip was girls' schools for which we supported teacher education. South Waziristan, years later to gain attention as the Al Qaeda hideout, had a population of about 300,000 which varied significantly depending upon the grazing season. We visited the sole girls' high school in the entire province with about a dozen students. Virtually none of them were from the area but rather daughters of senior Pakistani military officers stationed there. To assure that I did not attract attention and endanger our group, for the first and only time in my tour I wore the traditional Pakistani man's "shalwar kameez." The landscape on our road trip was harsh and dry with miles of nothing except periodic enormous high-walled compounds from which the women and girls rarely, if ever, escaped. In public areas outside the compounds, including the small market towns, there were no women ever in sight.

With the inevitable closing of the Mission both American and Pakistani staff were gradually being reduced. Then came the unexpected announcement that Norris was being transferred immediately to head the newly established Mission in Moscow, and was to be replaced by John Blackton. I would serve as Acting Mission Director for a few months before the new Director's arrival. Blackton's reputation within USAID of being a domineering sociopath was disconcerting to say the least. After the first couple of relatively calm weeks under his leadership, one or another of the Office Directors would be in my office daily asking for my intervention with the Director to reverse some irrational or disruptive program decision he had taken.

Q: What was John Blackton's agenda, as far as you could tell? How did he want to redirect the program and did he have support from AID/W or the Hill?

TUMAVICK. It was unclear what his agenda was. However, if I recall correctly, he was educated on the subcontinent at one of the Missionary boarding schools as a child. He had a tremendous affinity for the subcontinent and the people. He wanted to sustain our US assistance program and was willing to undermine the US policy for the Mission closeout. His disruptive approach to the ongoing program and projects was just in his nature. He also had a tendency to create facts in the middle of his public presentations. To that point, Blackton rose to the attention of the Embassy when he evidently made statements picked up by the Pakistani press that he would assure that the USAID program continue, quite contrary to the stated US policy decision.

With that kind of erratic behavior, so different from his predecessor, it was inevitable that he and I would have a parting of the ways. While my family and I were in the States on home leave in the summer of 1993, the call came from George Laudato informing us that we were being reassigned to Washington effective immediately. It was a relief. I returned to Islamabad with my daughters to pack out, do the needful with personnel reports, and enjoy a round of farewell dinners and events given by the World Bank, Pakistani counterparts, and USAID friends and colleagues. USAID Pakistan closed a few years after our departure.

Q. You mentioned the World Bank. Were there other major donors, and were any of them able to pick up some of the USAID portfolio? Also, I can imagine that dealings with your Pakistani counterparts became fraught. Did they hold out hope that USAID would remain and reengage?

TUMAVICK. I recall the Mission senior staff investing time in successfully wooing other donors to assume the funding and management of programs that we had nurtured, such as female education, population planning, agriculture in the Northwest Frontier Province, and the Environment Center headquartered in Islamabad. I departed before all of the negotiations were confirmed but various donors stepped into the void including the Asian Development Bank, the British and the Japanese. The Pakistani counterparts were quite accepting of our departure and, as individuals, quite congenial in the process. US and Pakistan had been unreliable partners in the past so it was no real surprise to see us close out in early 1995 as I recall....and then to open the USAID mission to provide foreign aid 7 or 8 years later when it behooved the US to do so.

Back To DC (1993-1995)

TUMAVICK: Having earlier reviewed the USAID cable listing the available overseas positions, my older daughter had a distinct preference for Costa Rica since she had not yet acquired Spanish language skills. Not to be. The bureaucracy decided it was appropriate for a senior tandem couple to spend time at headquarters, especially given the demand for our skills in the recently formed Eastern Europe Bureau and Former Soviet Union Task Force. The adjustment for the family was not difficult since we had recently purchased a larger house in McLean, Virginia, in one of the best public school districts in the country. Given the liberal sponsored visa policy for Foreign Service Officers, we had one of our Pakistani household staff accompany us to assist with the settling into the house and the new routine.

Q: Out of curiosity, how long was your Pakistani household help allowed to remain with you? With your new demanding job and travel, I can imagine how difficult managing family and job responsibilities must have been.

TUMAVICK: The understanding was that the visa for Samson (Christian Pakistani) was attached to our tour in the U.S. so that would have been four years. There were a couple of reasons that we selected him. First, he was our chauffeur and we envisioned the need to assist with driving our daughters as needed. He had previously served as household help so able to assume many tasks and chores in the house. Secondly, he had reasonably good English so could be somewhat independent.

Although this pre-retirement period in Washington headquarters was only a brief two years, as the following narrative will indicate, the time was packed with an incredible number of challenges. Initially came the more mundane. While I was offered no choice, the assignment as Office Director in the Eastern Europe Bureau for the social sector programs suited me. Memories of those first few months are vague. There were capable Officers that headed my Divisions, such as Tina Cleland for health and Ron Greenberg

for environment, who supervised a combination of direct hire and numerous Personal Service Contractors. The challenge for me during those first months was adjusting to a very different development agenda and management structure in several ways.

As an economist by education, I had the need to understand the context in Eastern Europe of inefficient mis-developed economies that had been established over the decades in the region. We were operating under the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 whose primary goal was to promote democratic and free market transitions in the former communist countries of Eastern Europe, enabling them to overcome their past and become reliable, productive members of Western democracies. That was a lot to swallow. Further, USAID along with myriad US Government Departments and Agencies had programs operating in the target countries under a State Department Coordinator, Ambassador Ralph Johnson. While negotiations among the US Agencies were tedious, Johnson was a seasoned diplomat and skillfully managed the process. I was grateful that he and I established a good relationship.

At the beginning, USAID and other USG programs were all designed and managed out of Washington. A large number of exceptional USAID officers were drained from developing countries to meet the challenge of a new world. USAID representatives in the field were positioned within the Embassies. In the absence of actual USAID Missions, my staff members were constantly on the road providing needed technical services. The majority of our funds were not flowing through negotiated agreements with governments, as with most USAID countries, but rather by grants and loans to non-governmental organizations and to fledgling private sector entities. Another contrast was that we were dealing with networks of highly educated counterparts as opposed to the populations in the traditional under-developed countries.

Besides my responsibilities as an Office Director, I was tapped to become the liaison and negotiator with some of the other USG Agencies outside my technical portfolio. One of the more interesting tasks was getting the Department of Labor under control. Our USAID representative in Hungary, David Cowles, requested assistance in assuring he was kept informed of their TDYs, contacts, and activities. My role was to charm one Ambassador John Ferch who was in charge of international programs at Labor. Ferch was a high profile individual who was removed from his post having served only one year 1985-1986 as Ambassador to Honduras in the politically charged era of the Nicaraguan contras. It took a couple of luncheon discussions but I managed to gain his cooperation.

Then there was another ad hoc assignment for me. Toward the end of 1993 USAID proposed and gained approval for the combination of the Former Soviet Union (FSU) Task Force with the Eastern Europe Bureau. Sensible decision since both of those entities were addressing the same post-Soviet Union challenges. I was recruited to be one of the five members of the working group to design the integration of some 260 staff members into a single Bureau. During the weeks of deliberations, I worked closely with another member, Jerry Jordan, and developed both a genuine respect for her professionalism and a lasting friendship. Our work was completed in time for the new Bureau organization to be formalized in early 1994 as the Europe and Eurasia Bureau (E & E). I was named

Office Director for Energy, Environment, and Municipal Affairs covering the 28 countries in the region with a staff of about 60 professionals.

Q: How many of these professionals were USAID direct hire? I suspect you had to do some major recruitment from the outside and from other agencies.

TUMAVICK: About a third of my staff were Direct Hire and two-thirds mainly PSCs and a couple of PASA employees. There was no recruitment necessary since virtually all of the E & E staff were already in place when we combined the Eastern Europe Bureau with the Task Force.

I proceeded with a unique experience in the Agency, that of personally approving the three Division Chiefs as well as my Deputy Office Director. After privately conducting interviews of several candidates I was pleased with the final selection which was an exceptionally strong professional team: Bob Ichord (the Agency's Mr. Energy himself), Ron Greenberg (experienced environment officer), Dianne Tsitsos (personally endorsed by Peter Kimm) and Jim Bever as my Deputy who brought knowledge and experience from the FSU task force. Tom Dine, the political appointee who was named Assistant Administrator for E&E, ran an interesting morning senior staff meeting which was heavily focused on the latest Hill gossip and Dine's next round of meetings. It was only thanks to the skilled and diplomatic Bureau Program Officer, Carlos Pascual, later Ambassador Pascual, that we had a few minutes devoted to actual program and budget issues. My supervisor was the career Deputy Administrator Barbara Turner, with whom I had worked previously, who was known for her high performance expectations and sometimes for her overbearing management style. She was essential to assure that the Bureau was kept together and moving forward.

Q: What an amazing team you had! Did Tom Dine play a central role in dealing with the hill, the White House, or other government agencies?

TUMAVICK: His main strength and a large portion of his time was spent dealing with the Hill and the media. Working with the other agencies fell mainly to his senior staff, such as myself, since those relationships required knowledge of program and technical detail which was not his forte. To acquire some basic knowledge of the region and our programs, as well as to earn credibility within the Bureau, I took to the road. As I had done in Pakistan, I assigned responsibility to my Division Chiefs to propose the agenda and the destinations. In lieu of a comfortable initial trip to Prague, for example, I decided to meet the challenge and scheduled the first overseas trip to Almaty with Tsitsos where it was still the dead of winter. The main event was the Regional Strategy Workshop convened by the ultimate of USAID "cowboys" Craig Buck who headed the Regional Mission for the five countries of Central Asia. He evidently decided not to rent an apartment as living quarters but simply rotated through rented hotel rooms from one of his countries to the next. Since our reservations at a proper hotel were usurped by participants in a major United Nations agriculture conference, Tsitsos and I wound up in very basic rooms on the fourth floor of a rundown office building which we discovered, by late night knocks on the door, was the specific floor that accommodated a brothel operation. I remember very little of Buck's Regional Strategy Workshop.

Q: Describe Almaty at that time. I was there in 1994 and recall no street lights, only 1 or 2 restaurants (mainly Korean) and USAID working out of one of the few hotels (also Korean).

TUMAVICK: Yes, your memory is correct, Ann. Almaty was bleak and gray with government buildings very Soviet in character and all accentuated by the winter weather. I do not even recall where we took our meals such as they were. While I was accustomed to a huge and diverse program from my time in Pakistan, this new array of projects in my \$650 million portfolio included some very unusual challenges. For example, the Municipal Division included massive privatization of housing across the region with probably the largest program in Ukraine. Elections had brought about a younger generation of municipal leaders who did not wait for the disorganized Parliament to bless their decisions. With our technical assistance they proceeded to move ownership of huge blocks of apartment buildings across the major urban areas into private hands.

Meanwhile, one of the outcomes of a 1992 summit meeting between the United States and Russia was an agreement by the US to facilitate the return and demobilization of troops from the Baltic nations to Russia by providing housing for thousands of demobilized Russian officers and their families. After a pilot construction program in 1994 it was decided to divide the \$160 million budget between new construction of some 2,500 units and, to meet a tight resettlement schedule, to finance Vouchers for 2,500 units available on the market in various municipalities. Given the amount of funding involved and the need to expeditiously complete the demobilization, the program had high visibility on the Hill and required Tsitsos to provide detailed reports in person on its progress.

Under the Energy Division, the myriad projects included improved performance of electric generation and distribution, installation of electric meters in private apartment blocks in Eastern Europe, staged privatization operations of the Czech Power Authority including management of the reduced employment impact, and efforts to reduce use of lignite coal which had dire effects on air quality in many Eastern European countries. The most exceptional policy work by Ichord was in the nuclear arena in the wake of the Chernobyl disaster in 1986. He represented the USG at the donor discussions for plans and financing of human resettlement, regional mitigation measures and a decommissioning schedule for the nuclear operations.

One of the most memorable of my challenges, however, derived from the work of the Environment Division. The vast majority of the funds allotted by the SEED Act and other legislation flowed through USAID to other US Agencies so we had influence over the programs, timing and amounts of funds as negotiated and finally decided by the State Department Coordinators. Delegations of authority to some of the recently established field Missions were slow in evolving so the E&E Bureau Offices had to serve as advocates for Mission positions in this process. The Assistant Administrator for International Affairs at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Bill Nitze took issue with some of our interventions related to their program for Russia. By 1993 we already

had a Mission in place in Moscow under the Director Jim Norris, a long time colleague and friend whose position I respected and wanted to support. To smooth the relationship with EPA, I decided to focus my Division Chief Greenberg on management of his programs and staff and to leave the inter-agency politics to me.

This involvement with EPA led to life in the fast lane for me. In early 1993, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin decided to establish a commission on economic and technological cooperation, with our Vice-President and the Russian Prime Minister to serve as Co-Chairs. The Gore–Chernomyrdin Commission was born and began to have a life of its own. Multiple US Agencies were involved but not USAID for some unknown reason since we had the funding and a major engagement with the various technical areas not just those in my purview.

Q: I am pretty sure USAID was at the table in some of the bilateral commissions.

TUMAVICK: You are correct that USAID was involved at the working level of some of the technical Committees but not at the policy level. USAID was not invited to sit at the table with Gore and the various Secretaries when they gathered. We were at a distinct disadvantage.

Through my EPA counterpart on the Russia program, Gary Waxmonsky, I was able to gather information on the Commission's agenda and schedule of meetings. Since no one else in the Bureau had knowledge or responsibility for the liaison function with the Commission, I simply decided to fill that role myself. A month or so later I finagled a seat for Dine at the conference table with Vice President Gore in the Old Executive Office Building, prepared his detailed talking points and accompanied him to the meeting. Since the meetings rotated between D.C. and Moscow, six months later I organized Dine's participation in the next session in Russia. Obviously he was delighted.

Since the Commission had multiple working groups which corresponded to many of the E&E Bureau technical office portfolios, including agriculture and health, my knowledge of our USAID programs expanded beyond my Office Director responsibilities. My Bureau special assignments increased accordingly. When the HHS Department proposed health activities in Russia that ran counter to the Mission's policy and objectives in the health sector, I was summoned to a three person meeting with Leon Fuerth, the National Security Advisor to Gore. After a rather tense session with Fuerth and the HHS officer, I managed to secure agreement on a compromise that satisfied all parties.

Q: Do you remember what the issue or resulting compromise was?

TUMAVICK: The issue was the HHS was holding meetings and deciding on support programs without any reference to the USAID Mission. The Ministry of Health officials were divided in their policy initiatives and HHS was planning to support an individual or two whose views were in direct opposition to the Mission's views. The compromise was to have a Mission representative participate in all of the HHS discussions with the Ministry. Which led in turn to the next Bureau challenge for me. As I mentioned previously, budget and program authorities and approvals in the E&E Bureau were concentrated in USAID headquarters in those early days. As Missions were established in

the field and more fully staffed it was time to shift those authorities to the field. Moscow was an excellent example of a Mission prepared to gain autonomy. Since the Mission already had in place both an environment officer and a municipal development officer, I worked with them to delegate the authorities and to provide the appropriate independence. We documented the successful process that was gradually adopted by the other E&E Bureau Offices.

Following my firm belief that anyone posted to D.C. needed to get out to the field to more fully appreciate the program progress and the challenges, during the two year period I traveled extensively based on the three sector areas that I managed. Travels included multiple trips to Russia, Ukraine, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Serbia, Poland, and Romania in addition to several of the European donor countries.

Q: Much travel on old Aeroflot planes???

TUMAVICK: Thank goodness as little as possible. In fact, the only travel on Russian aircraft that I recall was between Kiev and Moscow. Besides very uncomfortable seating, the one aspect that struck me was the absence of any announcements as opposed to the reassuring, sometimes irritating, chatter by flight attendants on European airlines. Strange silence which left me wondering whether I was even on the correct plane.

In early 1995 one of the most memorable trips was for quite a different reason. Ambassador Richard Shifter at the OEOP, a pre-World War II German immigrant with whom I had become familiar in my Bureau inter-agency work, decided to take a trip to Western Europe. He was concerned that our assistance programs had focused too tightly on development of the private sector in many countries and neglected the social sectors managed by the governments. We needed to “put a human face” on our assistance. On a Friday afternoon I was informed by Barbara Turner that, in self-defense, the Bureau needed a representative to accompany him and that would be me since I had developed a very positive relationship with Shifter. That Sunday night I was on the plane with Ambassador Shifter, Ambassador Ralph Johnson and a former Ambassador to Hungary along with a State Department note-taker.

Q: I think Shifter was a special assistant to the NSC at that time.

TUMAVICK: Correct. It was not a trip designed by a woman. It would be a five day trip to four countries. All of the Ambassadors were true gentlemen who took turns assisting me with my luggage. When we arrived in London on Monday morning we were escorted to the American Embassy where, on arrival, we were each handed a towel and bar of soap to shower and change in the men’s locker room before our meeting with DFID. By train we moved to NATO headquarters next where, based on our advance individual NATO “Cosmic Clearance”, we were able to participate in sessions with the Polish military delegation. We then moved on to Bonn by train during which Shifter reflected on his air drop into the Ardennes during the war. After consultations with the Germans in Bonn, we proceeded to a luncheon with Ambassador Holbrook at his residence. The expansive residence was filled with treasures he had acquired in Southeast Asia such as the two 10

foot standing Buddhas in the foyer. While the conversation around the elegant table was congenial enough, it was clear that one thing that exceeded Holbrooke's power was his ego. The final leg of our trip was by air to Budapest where we were entertained by the US Ambassador at dinner which included another guest of honor, George Soros. I was never sure what this entire trip accomplished if anything.

But then the beginning of the end of my DH career. In 1993, Administrator Atwood had named Larry Byrne to be head of the Management Bureau. He stood just about 5 feet. Wore suspenders rather than a Napoleonic waistcoat. Even in the brief periods when I served as E & E Acting Assistant Administrator or Deputy, I managed not to incur his wrath so I was more fortunate than others in the Agency. Among his unfortunate new policies and systems was his some \$60 million installation of the Phoenix financial system which was a disaster. Another was his draconian decision to immediately cease the annual extension of dozens of SFS Officers who had exceeded their time in class. I had no issue with the policy in general. The vast majority of those officers were older white men eligible for retirement who were blocking upward mobility of a younger, more diverse and well qualified group of officers.

Q: Do you know how many were TICed out as a result of this policy? One result, I know, was the increasing need for "rehired annuitants" and contractors to fill in? A very expensive – not to mention short-sighted -- policy.

TUMAVICK: I would say something like 40 each of the two years would not be far wrong. However, the following years, if not decades, the Agency paid the price of decimating the ranks of those experienced senior officers in the brief period of two years. The cadre of mentors was lost. My husband, Jonathan Sperling, was terminated in 1994. As far as I know, there were two women, Christina Schoux (fellow Fletcher graduate and 1969 USAID IDI) and myself who were caught in the "no exceptions" Byrne policy. In 1995 I was forcibly retired from the SFS since I was ranked number 5 in promotion order to SFS (Senior Foreign Service) but only 4 promotions were available. With 26 years of service, at the age of 48, I was on a full annuity.

As an interesting vignette, there was a safety net that I was offered. The informal USAID network recognized that it was Blackton's scathing personnel review that prevented me from the promotion. The four year term of the Mission Director in Morocco was ending and Blackton craved that position as his next posting after Pakistan. Through informal USAID channels I was offered that Directorship in Rabat to save me temporarily from retirement. Unfortunately, my husband staunchly refused to be a Mission Director's spouse and also refused to have my daughters accompany me. End of option. But justice did prevail for Blackton. In an unusual move, a very qualified officer but an SES, Michael Farbman, was nominated and appointed through some of our quiet lobbying with AFSA to avoid any protest.

Q: Do you have a picture from your farewell party? That would be fun to include!

TUMAVICK: While I do not have a photo of the actual party, I do have the photo of our staff that Jim Bever organized and will provide.



In September 1995 my Office Deputy Director Bever organized an exceptional farewell party as well as a group photo of my staff by the State Department photographer. I vacated my office and moved to a three month basically home based retirement program which was in place at that time. It was joint with the State Department so, in my opinion, mainly for State officers to provide time and assistance with crafting resumes and making contacts with potential employers. What are the employment options for a retired mid-level Political Officer? I attended a few of the guidance sessions and completed my resume in a couple of days. For a period of three months, as long as I checked in periodically, I was a free agent.

In the middle of my three month “paid vacation” came the request from Carol Peasley, Deputy Assistant Administrator in the Africa Bureau, to head a four person management assessment team headed to Nairobi to evaluate the options for combining duplicative support services for USAID/Kenya and the Regional East Africa Mission. Irresistible. I had never been to East Africa. So I spent two weeks in Nairobi managing a capable team of professionals, exploring craft shops, and enjoying the game park. Working with

Director George Jones at the Bilateral Mission and Director Keith Brown at REDSO/ESA we recommended several measures to combine functions of the Controller's Office, Executive Office, and Contracting Office. I was long gone before the formal decisions to combine those functions were eventually made.

Q: Lots of people in USAID knew what a valuable resource they were losing! I imagine you had multiple offers?

TUMAVICK: Less than a month after I retired, In the midst of December 1995 planning for Christmas, Barbara Turner contacted me about a next assignment. That began my 20 year post-retirement engagement in development which is the subject of the next and final chapter.

USAID after USAID (1996-2018)

TUMAVICK: My Foreign Service career with USAID was followed by another 20 years of work mainly with USAID in D.C., in overseas Missions or with contracting firms and NGOs producing work for USAID. After two decades in the bureaucracy I was provided the freedom to decide what, when and where I would engage. It was an exciting and fulfilling part of my career. Since my last years with USAID as a career FS officer were spent in the E & E (Europe and Eurasia) Bureau, the initial interest came from those colleagues and Missions where I was well known. Beginning in early 1996 I began a series of consultancies for USAID Missions in Bosnia, Lithuania, Czech Republic, Kosovo and Ukraine.

By far the most unique and challenging was Bosnia. Two years after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, Yugoslavia began to fall apart with four of the six republics—Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Macedonia---separating from Yugoslavia between 1991 and 1992. Each secession was contested, with the most horrific destruction and violence occurring in Bosnia-Herzegovina with a large Muslim population. When the war there finally ended in November 1995, the U.S. provided a third of the NATO peace-keeping force of some 60,000. In addition, President Clinton pledged \$600 million in reconstruction funds, two thirds of which were allocated to USAID.

With the lack of available senior USAID officers after the “blood bath” in the mid-90s, Barbara Turner asked that I head the five-person design team for a \$200 million private sector development program. The stellar group included Jean Lange, Brian Kurtz, Lawrence Camp and, for a part of the time, a new GC recruit Vicky Moore to keep us on the straight and narrow. So two months after retirement I was on a flight headed to Zagreb, with a ground stop in Vienna where I changed \$6,000 to Deutschmarks, the only currency valid in Bosnia at the time. After a delightful two days in Zagreb sight-seeing and craft-shopping our names rose to the top of the waitlist for the final leg of the trip. In the middle of the night, Jean Lange and I found ourselves strapped into troop seats on the next United Nations C130 headed for Sarajevo.

The landing was a bit disconcerting since there were no landing lights and the deserted airport was surrounded by endless sandbags behind some of which were Bosnian soldiers on guard duty. Since no vehicles were allowed on airport grounds we traipsed a few blocks with multiple pieces of luggage (we had to bring our own office supplies) until we found the Embassy car. The brief ride on a major boulevard to the hotel was eerie. No vehicles, no people and block after block of windowless and scorched highrise buildings. At the Holiday Inn we again dragged luggage to the rear of the hotel since the front entrances were directly on the notorious “sniper’s alley” and were still sealed.

As opposed to the quiet ride from the airport, the lobby, bar and restaurant were jammed with people checking in and then relaxing over food and drink. We had to pay for three nights in cash in advance after which the cost of the room would increase every few days. The Holiday Inn was an upscale hotel constructed for the 1984 Winter Olympics and we did have electricity, hot water and CNN. To get to our suite of rooms all we had to do was take the elevator to our floor and follow the bloody footprints which were not yet removed. For the first few nights the windows in the room were covered with plastic with a blue UN insignia, later replaced by glass that was a valued imported commodity. Lange and I shared the suite which was two hotel rooms separated by what would become our team conference room including for early morning planning sessions with everyone in robes. The newly arrived Mission Director, long time colleague Craig Buck, made clear that there was no desk room in the Embassy space during the day for the team to use computers or phones. Whatever our daytime meetings generated in questions or requests to Washington we managed by a 11:00 pm dark and dreary walk to the Embassy building. The first few nights of sleep were interrupted by the explosion of gas canisters ignited by Serbs forced out of the area directly across the river from the hotel. And a couple of mornings I was awakened by helicopters floating past my third floor room to patrol sniper’s alley. I waved.

Q: You must have been at least a little terrified much of the time, and I am sure fielding questions from home about your safety. How did you cope? Were you always confident that it would all work out?

TUMAVICK: Actually, I found the whole episode quite exciting, Ann. We were so focused day and night on the design of the project that there was not a lot of time or energy to feel anxious or fearful. Even wandering out late at night to work at the embassy instilled no fear. The Bosnians in the ministries and banks, those that we encountered in daily life and the small group that the mission director Craig Buck had hired all had a renewed sense of life and purpose. A wonderful, grateful people. I communicated daily with my family so that also helped me reflect on the positive side of the contribution that the team was targeting.

With the advance work the team had done in Washington, we had generated a concept for the program. Support to rejuvenate the Bosnian private sector quickly meant the design of a low cost loan program for small and medium size enterprises both to generate employment opportunities and to manufacture export-oriented products. With three month-long TDYs between February and May of 1996 the team interviewed the major

Bosnian players that would be involved including the Central Bank, multiple commercial banks, the Investment Agency, other donors and a sample of small and medium enterprises. We were limited to conducting our dealings in Sarajevo since the area around the city had been planted extensively with land mines by the Serbs.

There were two unique hurdles to overcome in the design process. First, USAID worked under the constraint of the requirement to conduct a pre-project implementation Initial Environmental Assessment for any projects involving potential environmental impacts. The most promising of the Bosnian industries that we needed to support included leather tanning, finished wood products and livestock which all had environmental implications. To move the loan funds expeditiously, we needed to have the requirement for pre-project approval to be waived. To our knowledge that had never been done, ever. I convinced Turner to appeal in person to the White House CEQ (Council on Environmental Quality) for a waiver which she did successfully. We built in an environment expert as part of the project to assess each loan as part of the approval process.

Secondly, the question of moving dollars to Deutschmarks to be used for the individual loans. I recall having to intervene personally with J.P Morgan in New York to reach agreement on this happening in coordination with the U.S. Treasury. In the final project implementation, millions of dollars were channeled through a German bank to Bosnian commercial banking networks.

With these two issues resolved, the result was the Bosnia Reconstruction Finance Facility (BRFF) approved at an increased value of \$275 million. The first funds flowed to Bosnian companies the summer of 1996 which was an unheard of period of six months between the start of design and start of implementation. When later evaluated the program was declared an incredible success. The Washington Post article a couple of years later noted that repayments were at about 96% which was virtually a new track record among USAID loan programs targeted at small and medium enterprises.

Q: That's an amazing success! I assume there were some investments that weren't as successful. And how did you cope with the issue of corruption, kick-backs and self-dealing, which I assume were present.

TUMAVICK: Based on the very small percentage of loan defaults, the vast majority of the local enterprises must have been successful albeit to different degrees. With regard to corruption I also assume there was some involvement. However, like most of the project designs with which I dealt in my career, I never knew how well implementation proceeded except for the end of project evaluation. There was really no opportunity to return to the country and personally view the outcome on the ground.

Moving forward, my next consultancy was with the Mission in Lithuania headed by colleague and friend Ron Greenberg. It was not a remarkable task to assist in revising the Mission's strategy but I was intrigued by spending a couple of weeks in Vilnius to learn further about my father's heritage. Neither was that remarkable....dreary weather and dreary people just as I anticipated.

Then came Prague! Previously I had a brief visit to Prague with Bob Ichord to meet with the Director of the Electric Power Agency but it was all work. In 1997 Mission Director Jim Bednar, another colleague and friend, was faced with closing out the Mission. Multiple successful programs could proceed under the management of notably capable Czech counterparts. However, he was faced with simultaneously closing out our involvement in the projects, celebrating the successes with public media and events, while losing both American and Czech staff who were moving to their next postings and jobs. As Program Closeout Coordinator over a period of six months of short-term consultancies I designed and managed all non-programmatic aspects of the closeout. This process included media events and ceremonials for senior US and Czech officials, design and production of a 50-page commemorative brochure for both American (in English) and Czech (in Czech) audiences, and oversight of a video production for Czech television. It was a totally new territory for me but the Czech Mission staff members were very capable and cooperative. Just like Bednar, my maternal heritage was Czech so they appreciated my interest and effort even though I had no language skills besides perfect pronunciation of menu items in the restaurants.

Included in my responsibilities was making all arrangements for high level USAID officials to mark the Mission closure. First, there was the visit of Assistant Administrator Tom Dine and his wife. I found out later that he was planning ahead for his next position as Director of Radio Free Europe based in Prague. The Continental Hotel staff already knew me well through my multiple visits. They were totally cooperative in assuring that no chemical cleaners were used in their room due to Mrs. Dine's serious allergies. I interviewed private drivers for their visit and did a trial run with one of them for a few hour trip to the town of Caslav, located in an agricultural area in Bohemia, to search for graves of my Czech ancestors. One wing of my mother's family turned out to be landed gentry honored in a small mausoleum that stood out in an otherwise modest rural cemetery.

The briefing book that I prepared for Dine's visit served as an excellent draft version for the subsequent more ceremonial visit of Administrator Brian Atwood a few weeks later. The significance of my work was that I was setting Bureau precedents for the subsequent series of gradual closings of our Missions in the more advanced economies in Eastern Europe over the next few years.

Q: Out of curiosity, did you agree that close-out was the right thing to do there? Many close out situations engendered a lot of bad feelings and second-guessing.

TUMAVICK: Since this was the only close-out in which I was personally involved, not sure that I can provide any comparisons. Perhaps some of the USAID mission staff were disappointed, but the Czechs that I encountered in my drafting of the close-out brochure were well educated, competent and motivated to move forward with the initiatives we helped undertake. I think that it was time.

The pace of assignments never seemed to end. Next, I was recruited by yet another colleague and friend, Steve Hadley, for a two year contract of intermittent work with the

Mission in Kiev. As Senior Advisor to the USAID Mission's Private Sector Development Program from 1997 to the end of 1999, I focused on program strategy and management. I spent a month each quarter in Kiev. Flight would arrive mid-afternoon, I was met and driven to my apartment for that month's TDY, deposited my suitcase and proceeded to the office. Hadley would define what my interesting assignment was that round. I crafted Mission policy papers for the Gore-Kuchma Commission, one of the development commissions co-chaired by Vice President Gore. I worked on issues critical to the National Security Council and State Department including progress in agricultural land privatization and a legal framework for business development. While providing counsel to other portfolio managers as requested, a major focus was development of the new agricultural strategy.

During my tenure Greg Huger and Chris Crowley each served as Mission Director and Earl Gast was the stellar Program Officer. Rebecca Latorraca was a brand new PSC in the Program Office. The Mission did not lack for highly qualified officers. However, due to the concern about lingering radiation from Chernobyl, no children were allowed at post so, in general, recruitment of FS Officers for the Mission was not easy. There were always a string of short-term retirees such as myself at post so the social life was quite enjoyable. Most evenings there was a group of us headed out to dinner together. When Sherry Grossman's lengthy TDYs overlapped with mine we would spend endless hours wandering the city to discover its offerings. In addition, David Black kept his pulse on new disco openings. Each Saturday night after my arrival a group of us would meet at the Gast's apartment at 11 PM to head off to his latest discovery for a few hours of dancing. The Mission's Ukrainian staff was relatively young, well-educated and sociable so a contingent would often join us including an exceptional professional, Victoria Marchenko, with whom I stay in touch.

Q: Did you or did mission staff socialize with Ukrainians? I would love to know what Kiev was like in that first decade of independence!

TUMAVICK: Those are two different questions, Ann. Let me begin with comments on the second one. My first visit to Kiev was in 1994 when I was still an office director in the ENE bureau and on TDY to discuss the portfolio of energy, environment and municipal affairs. Kiev was bleak. The USAID mission offices were dingy, my hotel might have been assigned a one star rating, and the house that Anne Aarnes and David Sprague and their children occupied was truly a cottage. Food was scarce. I do not recall going to any restaurants and the bread lines at the shops were long. The Ministry of Health had daily postings advising which market foods to avoid due to possible contamination from Chernobyl—deer meat or mushrooms or greens from the forest.

Pace ahead to 1999 when I was engaged in my post-retirement consulting work in Kiev. Over those five years, life had changed dramatically. There was a vibrant daytime and nighttime life on the city streets. There were numerous brightly-lit grocery stores with shelves replete with local and imported goods. Markets were well-plenished with fresh fruit, vegetables, meat and fish. Our group of short-term USAID consultants could choose from numerous good restaurants for dinner. When Dick Dangler and I co-hosted

our traditional Sunday brunch, I no longer had to carry the bagels, lox and cream cheese from the States. During that period I had also befriended Grace Warneke, daughter of former US ambassador George Kennan, who worked for Winrock. We also co-hosted dinner gatherings with excellent foods available on the market. Truly saddens me to think about the fear that must exist now in Kiev and in the country.

You asked about socializing with the FSNs. As I noted, a few would join us for our midnight disco parties. Personally, my socializing with FSNs was done at the USAID mission. With the wonderful new quarters the mission occupied, weather permitting, we would always have morning coffee and lunch together on the patio. In between, since I was also a smoker, we spent periodic time on the balcony during the day chatting about whatever. There were also dinner invitations from the American staff which usually included FSNs.

My consultancy was completed in the fall of 1999. Then came the offer from Assistant Administrator Emmy Simmons and her deputy, David Cowles, to serve as Director of the Office of Emerging Markets in Global Bureau's EGAD Center. This would be an interim position while Steve Hadley completed the War College to assume the position in mid-2000. The staff of 15 professionals provided both intellectual leadership and support services to the Agency's field staff on a worldwide basis in the areas of privatization, financial services, business development, macroeconomic analysis and legal and institutional development under the innovative SEGIR program. Quite a broad portfolio. In addition, the Office was engaged in strategic planning in new areas for USAID of globalization, trade and investment, workforce planning and competitiveness. The staff included some exceptional technical experts and economists like Jim Elliott. However, it also had a group of renegades unaccustomed to being properly managed so that provided a challenge.

The most exciting aspect was the opportunity that evolved to work with the Agency Counsellor, Ambassador James Michel, who assumed the lead Agency role in the trade and investment arena. There were multiple USG agencies involved in trade relationships with developing countries and coordination did not come easily. Michel included me in all of the important sessions whether with the USG players or the World Bank or other donors. When he found out that I had invested 10 years of my USAID career in Southeast Asia, he nominated me to serve on the U.S. delegation to UNCTAD X in Bangkok in February, 2000. An amusing part of my role was as translator for him with the Thai and Indonesian delegations. Based on my performance and the relationships that I developed, subsequently I served as head of the U.S. delegation to the May, 2000 OECD Workshop in Paris on Trade Capacity Building.

Then began the endless offers of consulting positions with private sector firms or non-profits that already serviced USAID or were hungry to do so. From the fall of 2000 through the end of 2018 I worked with 16 "beltway bandits" under contracts ranging from one month to two and half years. While most of the work involved business development and proposal preparation, there were challenging organizational

development assignments for some of the firms and Missions. Will only relate a few of the more interesting assignments that stand out in my memory.

The very first contract was in the OD (organizational development) category working for George Laudato, the incredibly successful Director of Abt Associates International Health Area. He needed counsel and advice in the expansion and reorganization of his 200-person staff. Some of the innovations were as basic as a mandatory 15 minute morning meeting for the 3 senior managers, including Nancy Pielemeier, to share information and plans across their portfolios. I also created the new senior supervisory position of Practice Manager. In a five month pilot run, I served as a Practice Manager over six international health projects which included projects for Armenia, Dominican Republic, Bill Gates Foundation, Kazakhstan Oil Consortium, and Private Sector Marketing. It served as a reorganization model for the area operations overall.

In 2003, for the first time in my career, I served as a Chief of Party. USAID retiree John Dumm, head of Pathfinder International, recruited me to lead a \$100 million USAID Global Health Bureau project. Catalyst Consortium was focused on reproductive health with a core Washington-based technical staff of 24 professionals and oversight of five field offices and programs in 15 countries in Latin America, Middle East, South and Southeast Asia. My predecessor apparently lacked management skills. It required that I establish a new organization structure, recruit a more professional management team, devise an appropriate planning and evaluation system and install new management and budgeting systems for the Consortium. Unfortunately, I came to grief after about 8 months. The USAID Division Chief overseeing the project, one Maureen Norton, was a bit of a disorganized control freak. Although we met monthly to review and to agree on budget and staff allocation, a week or two later she typically dealt directly with one of my staff to revise the allocations based on her most recent thoughts and dreams. I departed without regret.

The next position was the only long-term full time job that I held in the private sector...IBM Consulting Services. In 2002 Congress passed the rather complex Sarbanes-Oxley Act. The bottom line for PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC) was the decision to retain its accounting and auditing business and to divest itself of the management consulting business by sale predominantly to IBM. That PWC consulting portfolio was servicing numerous US Government agencies and lined up with IBM's existing USG clientele with the exception of USAID. I was recruited by IBM as a Strategic Planner for the International Financial Institutions Practice to enhance their working knowledge of USAID and to build that portfolio. I was brought to their attention by J Wright who had worked for me in the USAID Emerging Markets Division as a AAAS economist.

In retrospect, the two years, January 2004 to March 2006. was the equivalent of working on a Master's Degree in corporate America. Rather eye-opening experience. Wright and I developed a partnership in the design of a strategy for IBM business development efforts with USAID and other International Financial Institutions including the World Bank and the Millennium Challenge Corporation. IBM offerings relevant to development assistance needs included supply chain management, workforce development, and e-governance.

We helped design and launch international seminars, workshops and conferences in the areas of macroeconomics and financial services, including with Brookings. Our consultations included trips to USAID Missions which meant reconnecting with several colleagues. In Jordan we spent time with Diana Putman and Mission Director Anne Aarnes. The well-timed trip to Cairo allowed me to attend the wedding of Carlton Bennett and Karen Hunter who celebrated under huge tents in the shadow of the pyramids. In Pakistan, unfortunately, I was informed that the Director Lisa Chiles was not available.

However, there were two procurements that we pursued that finally convinced me that IBM Consulting Services in the Americas was simply not positioned for pursuing work in the development arena. First, the bid for the \$7 billion HIV/AIDs proposal from USAID which was called “Supply Chain Management.” With no concept of what that project actually entailed (going the last mile) the division of IBM responsible for SCM was at work for weeks before involving our International Practice. We finally convinced them they needed to partner with development consulting firms to understand the totality of the contracting scope. I successfully recruited USAID retirees George Laudato at Abt Associates and Barbara Kennedy at RTI to join the IBM consortium. Since my supervisor had never experienced the developing world, with Abt assistance we put together a trip to Zambia and South Africa during which she gained an appreciation of our working world. In the end, IBM invested some \$2-3 million in preparing the bid but lost to a Booz-Allen consortium spearheaded by Don Pressley that proposed an innovative financing mechanism along with the critical consulting services that went that last mile.

Wright and I brought the second and final development procurement to be pursued by IBM Consulting Services, a far more modest \$150 million World Bank initiative to establish a new IRS in Pakistan. Identification of that opportunity was pure serendipity. We were headed to Pakistan on a fishing expedition, so to speak, and spent time preparing in D.C. including consultations with USAID and the World Bank. Standing on a street corner at a red light across from the World Bank building, I was greeted warmly by the World Bank director in Islamabad, home on leave, who was a close colleague from my days in Pakistan when he was their chief economist. He expressed an enthusiasm for IBM bidding on the IRS package and, before the light turned green, committed to setting a meeting for us with his Deputy Director in Pakistan to pursue the opportunity.

Our first appointment in Islamabad was a warm welcome at the World Bank offices where we had more detailed discussions of the loan package. Within a couple of hours we were headed to a priority appointment with the Pakistan Secretary of Finance and his senior staff. There was no hesitancy on the part of the government that favored a collaboration with IBM to establish the new national IRS system. So funding from the World Bank was available and the Pakistan officials were enthusiastic. The complication arose within IBM. From our hotel rooms at the Serena Hotel, we engaged in a five hour conference call with IBM representatives in Europe, Middle East, Pakistan and the U.S. to define the roles of each IBM subsidiary for provision of hardware, software, and consulting services. In the end, our investment of time came to nothing. The problem was

the IBM lawyers who simply could not rationalize a single procurement working across IBM subsidiaries in different parts of the globe.

Q: Bureaucracy wins again!

TUMAVICK: Within a month or two, IBM Americas decided to divest itself of the USAID portfolio as being an impossible work space. The diminished practice was sold to Abt Associates but neither Wright nor I conveyed since Abt had its own business development team. I received the standard three month severance pay plus a \$3,000 allowance for retraining, whatever that might be. Decided on an intensive one on one French language course at the Alliance Francaise in D.C. to refresh my skills. Not having a full time job was relaxing. At that point I decided to accept only short term or part time consultancies, so from January 2007 through December 2018 I worked mainly on USAID proposals for consulting firms and NGOs but also for four USAID Missions and one AID/W Bureau. Was cautious to avoid any conflict of interest since there were several periods where I was simultaneously under contract to USAID and one or more consulting firms.

One prime example entailed multiple trips to Pakistan under different auspices even though my knowledge and contacts were about a decade out of date. Academy for Educational Development (AED) was considering a proposal on a large education contract in the country. I was recruited by Patrick Fine, recently retired from USAID, who headed the Global Education Division at AED. The task was to spend a week or so walking around the various Ministry of Education offices and private sector schools in Islamabad to gather information on the procurement and to elicit opinions on whether AED would be competitive. My detailed report was well received. (I should note that Fine threatened not to sign my travel voucher unless I agreed to be a candidate for the first Board of Directors of the just established USAID Alumni Association....and I was elected.)

Shortly after the work for the Education Division I was recruited by AED's Rural Development Division to work on a USAID proposal for a \$350 million Pakistan Tribal Areas Project. Interestingly enough, I was the only member of the proposal team who had actually visited the Tribal Areas which provided a certain credibility. We had a very strong proposal. However, USAID decided to divide the contract between northern and southern tribal areas so the AED portion was \$175 million for the north. Then the negotiations began with USAID over the person to fill the Chief of Party position. AED was extremely conscientious in recruitment and proposed the best qualified COP candidate. The USAID Deputy Director in charge of the Afghan support program, Ed Birgells, rejected him after which he rejected the next three COP candidates as well. In the end we were coerced into accepting Birgell's candidate who wound up being accused of bribery and corruption. The ensuing major controversy between USAID and AED did not go well. After decades of being one of USAID's major implementing partners, AED crashed and closed its doors.

Q; If you have more to say about AED's demise and the role of USAID in it, it would be very interesting as there is still tremendous reticence on the subject!

TUMAVICK: The details are rather vague by now. Not sure who actually blew the whistle. I do recall that there were newspaper articles about the IG investigations and the lawsuits against AED. I believe that AED still held the agency contract for development resources which was then canceled. Recall the hearsay that the AED founder and president, Steve Moseley, had a meeting with the Administrator in which Moseley did not behave himself. I knew him casually over the years and he could be a very strong-willed individual. He evidently did not elicit any sympathy from the Administrator. Also recall that a major portion of AED's portfolio was sold to FHI 360 and the relevant staff was hired by FHI as well. Those are all the bits and pieces that I remember.

After a brief hiatus I returned to my real joy and that was working in the field with the USAID Missions. A series of Mission Directors recruited me to assist with specific issues at hand but also valued my perceptions of overall operations and recommendations for improvements. Dale Pfeiffer in Kosovo needed assistance in the design of the new Five Year Strategic Plan. Anne Aarnes in Pakistan sought advice on scaling up the staff, defining their roles and required qualifications. Between the TDYs to Islamabad I was designated as the Mission representative on the USAID/Washington Task Force for Afghanistan and Pakistan headed by Jim Bever. Jim Bednar in Sri Lanka wanted advice and guidance on program, organization and staffing related to the three year funding surge as the program moved from relief to development efforts in the northern and eastern provinces of the country. Diana Putman in the Democratic Republic of the Congo sought creative ideas in the awkward situation of a large budget of which some 80% was for population and health with underfunded competing needs in education, private sector development and especially governance. Peter Malnik next door in Rwanda requested that I lead a six person USAID direct hire team in the field assessment of the Mission's internal support functions, organization and staffing to assure requirements were being met to launch the new Country Development Cooperation Strategy. The challenge was managing a team that included Nancy Eslick, Frank Young, and [Nimi Wijesooriya](#), not exactly a shy group of officers.

Q. This sounds exhausting! Did you take a break between assignments? Did you turn any assignments down?

TUMAVICK: With some exceptions, I was able to pace my assignments to suit my personal needs and family schedule. For example, during the two years in the late 90's when I worked one month each quarter in Kiev, in between those TDYs I might accept a couple months working on a proposal for one of the consulting firms, or not. Depended upon the season of the year as well. In the autumn I wanted maximum flexibility to enjoy my favorite season.

There were some countries where I simply refused assignments, such as Liberia and Haiti, which I viewed as hopeless cases and a waste of my time and energy. One sector which I avoided was health and population. After my months with Pathfinder on the

USAID-financed project, I was on the Global Health bureau list of consultants. I turned down dozens of their offers over the years since my strength is management skills while the perceived need was often for technical skills.

The final USAID work was in Washington for a few years as a part time Senior Policy Development and Capacity Building Advisor in the Bureau for Food Security. While intellectually stimulating, it was boring and the atmosphere in the Ronald Reagan Building was stultifying. As many of the USAID retirees have done, I turned to volunteer work. Currently I am a Board member for the Congo Education Partners, a relatively new non-profit established to assist a technical college in the depths of the Congo rainforest. Thanks to Patrick Fine's recruitment a decade before, I remain active in the USAID Alumni Association where I have twice served on the Board of Directors and currently hold the position of Senior Advisor for Communications with oversight of the website and the monthly UAA newsletter. Keeps me engaged in the development issues and in socializing with a multitude of colleagues acquired over the decades. And, as other retirees, there is now time to devote to my husband, EPA retiree Gary Waxmonsky, my daughters and my two granddaughters.

Q: Nancy, what an amazing career. What are your thoughts on the skills, knowledge and temperament needed to be successful in the development field and in the development bureaucracy? Are there any opportunities you wish you had had, or wish you hadn't pursued? USAID is fundamentally different from when you and I joined it. Where do you think it is headed? Finally, I am so glad you have time now to enjoy your family. You have earned it!

TUMAVICK: When I am asked, Ann, my response is always the same. It was a fantastic career and I savored every day of almost 50 years. USAID is not the same organization that I joined in 1969 but, of course, the developing world and the global context has also changed. While relevant skills and knowledge are still important characteristics of the USAID professional staff, in my early decades creativity was highly valued as well. It appears to me that the restrictions placed by Congress, the Administration and the Agency's own bureaucracy tend to limit the extent to which creative solutions are possible.

Finally, I want to express my sincere gratitude to you, Ann, for your enduring patience over the year that it took me to painfully complete my personal history. Your questions were thoughtful, and responding was sometimes a challenge. but they always provided me the opportunity to reflect more deeply on the high and low points of my career.