
TRANSCRIPT OF

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD MEETING

19 November 1952

Present

Mr. Walter Reid Wolf
Chairman

Lt. General W.H.H. Morris, Jr.

Dr. James M. Andrews

Mr. Robert Amory, Jr.

STATINTL

[REDACTED]

Mr. Matthew Baird

STATINTL

[REDACTED]

MR. WOLF: Gentlemen, we call this meeting to order, and the first item on the Agenda is the "Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board, held 17 October 1952." I believe these Minutes have been distributed. If there are no additions or corrections I would suggest that we approve the Minutes as written.

DR. ANDREWS: Approved.

MR. WOLF: Has anyone any comment? If not they will be considered approved. The next item is listed as "Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the Review Committee of the CIA Career Service Board, held 12 November 1952" marked "attached;" for information." I as Chairman of that group, as well as this one, regret to state that up to this minute I have not read said Minutes nor have I read the transcript, although I attended the last half hour of that meeting. If the members of this Board have no objection I would prefer to just hold . . . as a matter of fact, I don't think we need to take any action. They are simply distributed for information, so I think we can pass that item.

The next item is listed as "Oral reports on the status of: a. the Honor Awards Program." Come in, Bob. You will recall that at a previous meeting we went over the paper. I think it was at the first meeting. We all approved the recommendations of the board headed by [REDACTED] We presented STATINTL the paper to the Director. Subsequent to that Mr. Carey wrote a very able report on the longevity problem. At the second meeting of this Board we discussed it to some extent, and at the request of the Board we withdrew the original paper. In the withdrawal of that paper I had quite a discussion with the General who had signed it but prior to my asking to get it back had crossed his name off, so I am not responsible for his crossing his name off. He had done that before I asked to withdraw that paper.

Our conversation had primarily to do with whatever medal or medals might properly be awarded in this service. I will give you an interim report at this minute. The Director decided that he was only willing to consider requesting authority by Executive Order for the presentation of one medal for the intelligence services to be called something like the National Security Medal for

Distinguished Achievement, said medal to be presented by the President . . . or not in the Executive Order but . . . or the President could issue regulations for the presentation. The Director felt, and I think very properly, that no mention of the DCI or CIA should be in the Executive Order, which I understand becomes public after its issuance, so the Executive Order has been cleared with Roger Jones of the Bureau of the Budget. I think maybe I am overstating when I say cleared. It has been discussed with Roger Jones who raised one or two technical questions which nobody knew the answer to; to wit, his first question was: Under what authority can the President issue such an executive order and authorize such a medal? He stated that in all other cases it was legislative authority, until it was pointed out to Mr. Jones, the General Counsel for the Bureau of the Budget, that there was no legislative action of any kind that could ever be found anywhere covering possibly the Medal for Freedom -- I have forgotten -- or several others, so I am now told Mr. Jones recognizes that legislation will not be necessary, and he would like to discuss it once more with our General Counsel. Then we will probably have the Executive Order sent through normal channels to the White House for approval. We are following that through week by week. We are seeing Roger Jones on our own legislative matters, so it is very easy to keep this thing going, and last week Mr. Staats, the Assistant Director of the Budget, and the General in a conference which I attended agreed we would have a meeting possibly late next week covering all of our legislative problems and liaison with the White House, and this will be a part of it.

STATINTL The Board, who under [REDACTED] leadership worked out the original paper, has been instructed or requested to make a further study in the matter of the longevity awards. At the present time -- correct me if I am wrong -- he has no instructions or requests to try to develop anything further in the way of medals because of the very strong stand the Director took in my conversation with him that he only wanted one medal for this service.

Bob, you may not know that this medal if awarded can be awarded to anyone -- civilian or military -- domestic or foreign -- for distinguished

achievement in the field of national intelligence.

MR. AMORY: Yes, may I ask a question on that?

MR. WOLF: Yes.

MR. AMORY: I am bothered by that because, as I understand that -- correct me, General Morris -- that reminds me of a Distinguished Service Medal or Legion of Merit. It seems to leave out completely the Distinguished Service Cross or Silver Star, which might achieve nothing.

Great gallantry . . . a guy parachutes in . . . he may not find the people he was to look for. It was a damn fine thing and he ought to have something to wear on his breast pocket for it. It is contemplated that it will be like the Bronze Star covering the water front, or we just haven't got a gallantry medal?

MR. WOLF: We just haven't got a gallantry medal, and the Director didn't want to have a bar across it or something indicating gallantry as against distinguished achievement. He wanted one medal, and from his talk it certainly is not to be like the Bronze Star. It is to be awarded for the highest possible achievement in this field.

COLONEL BAIRD: Nothing like the Legion of Merit?

MR. WOLF: Definitely not.

STATINTL [REDACTED] In other words, it would be awarded for gallantry as well as for achievement?

MR. WOLF: Oh, yes, it could be, but his own feeling is this will be about as tight as anything that ever was.

MR. AMORY: Then I think its name should be modified. It should be National Intelligence thing for Conspicuous Gallantry or whatever the achievement was in the national intelligence.

MR. WOLF: Well, the citation can be worded the way we want to word it. Now the name isn't finalized, but the name suggested by the Committee was the National Security Medal for Distinguished Achievement or Distinguished Service.

MR. AMORY: O.K., I just wanted to get that straightened out in my own mind.

MR. WOLF: I have nothing further to report on either of those. Reports have come in on Hazardous Duty and on Promotion Policy. I will come back to those two items if I may.

On the Insurance Study, item e., I will report that one phase of that has been completed; to wit, that part which has to do with hospitalization. The rest of the Study is still in process of being carried on. [REDACTED] have you any other comment on that? STATINTL

STATINTL [REDACTED] Not on the insurance.

MR. WOLF: That is on the insurance. I will come back on the others. So I think we can pass that over and report finally on the insurance situation later, but I wanted everybody here to know that at least one phase of it, that having to do with overall hospitalization, is in the works.

The Personnel Evaluation Program is one that has taken many hours of discussion, and we are not prepared to finalize anything yet on that.

STATINTL Now I think [REDACTED] might like to say a word on the other items which I have passed over so quickly -- Hazardous Duty Board and Promotion Policy.

COLONEL BAIRD: Mr. Chairman, can we get one thing on the Personnel Evaluations?

MR. WOLF: Yes, let's take that now and come back to [REDACTED] on the others. STATINTL

COLONEL BAIRD: I think there should be a uniform policy. We may have discussed this and I may have missed it, but it comes up again and again because there is one group in my Training Office, [REDACTED] that helps in the training of the people making out the Personnel Evaluation Report. It is as to whether the employee is shown the report. Now I don't know that there is any uniform policy on that. Have you run across it with the offices? STATINTL

STATINTL [REDACTED] Yes, I do. One office has made it mandatory -- it shall be shown -- except in extremely abnormal circumstances, in which case justification has to be given for not showing it. Another office has made it mandatory that it shall not be shown to anybody. Other offices leave it to the decision

of the supervisor or head of a unit. All offices have found that it must be consistent within certain limits . . . that the policy must be consistent because you can't show it to some and not to others.

COLONEL BAIRD: What was the Charter on that? I am not clear on that. What the General signed off, did that say it would be or would not be, or was it left up to the discretion . . . ?

STATINTL [REDACTED] It was left up to the discretion of the office or the individual.

STATINTL [REDACTED] The form leaves it permissive, doesn't it, Matt?

STATINTL [REDACTED] That is right. The form says, "This has been discussed," but the form makes no reference to whether it has been shown or not shown.

COLONEL BAIRD: The query then is as to whether it should be left just the way it is.

4
MR. WOLF: I think it is a very good question because when I filled out three of said forms and it said at the bottom before a signature, "This has been discussed with the individual concerned," I wouldn't quite know how to discuss a thing like that with the individual concerned without telling him what it was, and I am wondering about the offices that decide it is not exhibited or discussed, or how do they discuss it? I wouldn't know how.

DR. ANDREWS: In my own shop they discuss it when the supervisor puts down there that he has discussed this with the employee. He means that the general weaknesses and deficiencies of the employee have been discussed with him perhaps at great length and very politely and tactfully, not too tersely, and as they are put on the sheet. One of our Divisions, [REDACTED] preferred to have it that way. All the others preferred to make it mandatory within their own . . .

STATINTL

STATINTL [REDACTED] But one preferred to do it the other way?

DR. ANDREWS: And it is very interesting to see the difference in the evaluations that come out because those in [REDACTED] are a great deal more exact and they tell you a hell of a lot more about the people

STATINTL

concerned. So it seems to me there is something to be said for both. I would like to continue within our shop for a little while longer this way and see if something comes out of it because I know my own Career Service Board has taken account of the fact that they are operating different ways in the different divisions and is watching to see what happens.

COLONEL BAIRD: Maybe that is the solution . . . to let it ride for this first go around and see from experience whether it is better to make it mandatory or permissive.

MR. WOLF: I would like to get any comments that you might have, Dick, or Eric, or Bob, on that, General Morris, whether or not anyone has any other comments they would like to make.

GENERAL MORRIS: I have had quite a good deal to do with them. In the Army we don't have to show a man unless it is unsatisfactory, and my experience has been not to show them. It destroys morale, and when you show a man his report, he always figures, "Why don't I get higher." That has been my experience; therefore, I have never shown a report to anyone unless I marked him unsatisfactory, as required by regulations. In a great many cases I don't desire to see the report . . . I mean where a man is marking me. I have found out when you go up to look at them, one of your best friends you found said some little thing about you there, and it makes you as sore as the dickens about it and "Why did he say that about me," although he gave you an excellent or something like that. And I think it is a great morale destroyer. That has been my idea about it. I was going to say on the thing, let it be the way it is, and those that want to show all right and those that don't all right. We have lots of offices that show them, and they have to keep marking everybody high all the time. It has gotten to, as I say, in the Army that when you got superior, which is the highest point, you had to break it down 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. I mean where 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3, and that kind of a man . . . everybody was superior, and that is what happens, and you get down to super-superior.

MR. WOLF: That is very interesting. Dick, have you any thought on that?

STATINTL [REDACTED] This was much discussed in the meetings of the Career Service

Committee when the form was being worked on. My own personal view is that I agree with General Morris . . . that I think it should be left up to the supervisor whether or not he is going to discuss it with the individual. I can see cases where it is desirable to do it where you point out a minor weakness, or even a major weakness if necessary, whereas the man otherwise is good, but I also feel that it is a morale destroyer, particularly when it gets down to this caviling over whether it is just a little bit better than this, and really I didn't do that that you think I did, etc., with the result that you set up a sort of state of mind on the part of a certain type of employee that just isn't desirable to have, I feel. So I would like to see it left as optional.

Mr. WOLF: Eric, do you feel that way or . . . ?

STATINTL [REDACTED] Well, with the very strong stipulation that anything that is unsatisfactory should be shown because we have had problems in the past where someone will be reported to us orally as a submarginal employee, and we will find that he had a highly satisfactory efficiency report the last time it was sent in, and that is very embarrassing.

MR. WOLF: Well, I can confirm the embarrassment on that sort of thing. I agree with you entirely. Bob, have you any comments on that?

MR. AMORY: No, it does no good to just show only when unsatisfactory because you dam all the people you don't want to by a mere satisfactory. That was the kiss of death, as you well know, in many Regular Reserve offices. I think it can be left experimental, but I eventually guess we will get away from showing it to them.

MR. WOLF: Well, then, I think it is the sense of this Board that we carry on as we are. As you all know, one of the reasons why the total program was made as flexible as it was was to give us an opportunity to develop through experience, and I think probably this is the wrong time to make any change. If that is satisfactory, we will . . .

STATINTL

do you want to speak on these other things?

On longevity I would like to.

MR. WOLF: If that report hasn't been distributed on longevity, I would think it might be well and not take the time of this Committee unless you have a report that can be distributed to the Board.

STATINTL

It can be distributed, and I can brief the recommendations in a couple of minutes.

MR. WOLF: Well, I don't like to take unnecessary time of this Board unless we have had an opportunity to analyze something and then come to this Board for decision. I might say that this meeting is not the kind of a meeting that I look forward to because we have not analyzed a number of these things as thoroughly as we want to and are not prepared to come to this Board with a clear-cut recommendation for a decision, which I think this Board is entitled to, from the people who are most concerned, to wit, the Assistant Director for Personnel, the Director for Training, and to a degree myself. I think we ought to be able to present something specific and definite for a resolution at a meeting of this kind rather than to take up something that we haven't had a chance to study. I don't know whether you all agree with that or not, but that is the premise on which we originally planned to have our Review Committee look these things over a week or two in advance, and in that we haven't had a chance to look that over, I think if you don't mind I would just as soon hold it up.

STATINTL

May I ask one question in connection with that? In the Minutes we say these letters are going to be prepared for the Director's signature. Has that been done? What is the status of that?

STATINTL

The list of 120 people is ready. There is a draft of a letter for the Director's signature. There is a list of approximately 120 people on whom such letters can go. That list is not based on predecessors of CIA, namely, OSS, SSU, COI, etc., but it is based on contribution to the national intelligence effort which was agreed at the last meeting. The starting

date for the Longevity Program is recommended as 27 September '47, which is the effective activation date of CIA, and there is a recommendation that additional to these 120 persons the additions to the list be made by the respective Assistant Directors because the records do not exist anywhere short of a survey with each individual as to whether he was or was not involved in the national intelligence effort. The record doesn't exist anywhere; therefore, additions to this list can only be made by the individual Assistant Directors who want letters from the Director to go to that person. That in brief is the recommendation, and it is also the answer to your question.

STATINTL

[REDACTED] Yes.

I have copies of that report for everybody.

MR. WOLF: Is it satisfactory with this Board to have copies distributed, and then if any of us feel it essential to take action before the next meeting of the Board we can take it up on a round robin basis?

COLONEL BAIRD: Mr. Chairman, I hope that will be possible. I couldn't agree more with what you said, but I also think we should be aware of the fact we haven't accomplished too much, and if there is some one thing that we can settle in two or three minutes and say, "Here is one thing that the Career Service Board has done," I would like to do it.

MR. WOLF: I would like to very much. I want to try to avoid making the mistake we made the first time of having something . . . agreeing on it . . . and then finding that we had an able report from another office which was not involved, and as a result of that went back to the Director, withdrew our request, and then went to work on it all over again. I would like to be sure of our coordination before we send anything like this to the Director. Is there any other comment you wanted to make, [REDACTED]

STATINTL

STATINTL

[REDACTED] No, sir.

MR. WOLF: I have passed over, as you noticed, this Hazardous Duty Board and Promotion Policy for the very simple reason that I am personally not prepared to discuss them, and I don't want to waste unnecessary time.

GENERAL MORRIS: Well, it is very short. On the Promotion Policy we got a letter yesterday telling us to make contact with the Deputy Directors, and the Director of Training, and also the Assistant Director for Communications and get their views and then submit a plan, and that is what we are going to do. We just got that letter yesterday, and we will send it out and have a conference on that. That is the status now.

MR. WOLF: In effect after you get the complete and full coordination we felt when we discussed it was necessary before bringing it to the Board.

STATINTL [REDACTED] The Hazardous Duty Board has met and is carrying out the instructions. That is all there is to say on that.

MR. WOLF: Very good. The next item is the "Staff Study from Professional Selection Panel to Chairman, Career Service Board, dated 17 November 1952, to determine the scope of the Panel's responsibilities, (attached); for consideration." That was the substance of the long Review meeting which was held on the 12th of November. I got in on that just at the end, I regret to say, and since which time have not concentrated on it, but it seemed to me that the controversial phases had to do with the Selection Panel being privileged to look at medical records or be briefed on medical records and security information. Matt, you are more up-to-date on this than I am, but so correct me if I am wrong. It seemed to me that was the most controversial point. I think I explained to the Review Group and the Board that as of the present time nobody is privileged to see certain records which we have in the Security Office, nor is anybody privileged to see certain records which we have in the Medical Office without a direct order from the Director of Central Intelligence to either Sheff Edwards or Dr. Tietjen. That is our present situation. I would have to think a long time before I would be willing to ask the Director to change that; however, I do point out to you in so far as Security is concerned that when a Loyalty Board or an Employment Review Board is called and is in operation, said Board is given . . . I won't say complete but . . . I believe practically complete and full security information, and that is under

the orders of the Director, but that whole subject caused so much controversy and discussion that the problem has not been resolved. The Junior Board was requested to continue its consideration of its paper and bring it back for further review. That is the best of my recollection. Would anybody else who was there care to comment on that? Were you at that meeting?

COLONEL BAIRD: No.

MR. WOLF: You were not, I remember. You were, General, and you were,

STATINTI

8
GENERAL MORRIS: My feeling about this particular thing is the situation is so darned strict now about people coming to the Agency. If the Security doesn't want this man to come in or he can't pass the Medical examination, I would say the Assistant Director won't permit a Board to look at what they have in their records. I would say he is just screened out right there and would not go before the Panel, I mean. Now there are also some personnel things here that personally I think we should screen out and not go before this Panel, this in addition to those two things. When I know a man has applied from the Army . . . an officer who has been Class B over here and nobody else knows it, and I know he has been Class B over there . . . the Army kicked him out . . . what do we want to take him in for? There is no use letting him go before this Panel to see if we are going to take him in. Also we have some lines around here from different personnel offices of the other government agencies, and somebody applies here, and we find out what he has been doing over in that place, and some have very bad records, and my idea is to just screen those people out and not let them go before the Panel at all. That is Personnel's part. The other two -- the Security and Medical -- I don't see how you are going to get around that at all. I say just let them go.

MR. AMORY: I think your statement certainly was not my concept of the problem on what my delegate was supposed to argue about. It isn't a question of the right to look at Security information or to look at the chest X-rays, or something like that. It is merely a right to be informed on marginal

cases in general terms of the criterional grounds on which a rejection was made with the idea of having a second look at this problem, with the possibility that a recommendation might then go to the Director to weigh. Now let me illustrate the statement by two cases. One is a paraplegic. It just so happens when I went out to the West Coast I offered to hire this fellow. I was personally stopped . . . told not to hire this kid who is an able railroad transportation technician just graduated at the top of his class from UCLA. It so happens as a paraplegic he also had two machine gun bullets in the spine. Now obviously he isn't going to pass the medical exam by a damn sight. He is to be in a wheel chair for the rest of his life. I claim it is to the interest of the U. S. Government and CIA that that guy be hired. He would make a wonderful career researcher and is good for 30 or 35 years. Now if Dr. Tietjen can't make an exception I say there has got to be a safety valve somewhere where that fact can be brought out by the AD's and some appeal -- not that that Board would have a right to overrule but to state in memorandum form so it would go through you or otherwise to the Director.

MR. WOLF: There is a procedure at the present time in each case. The Director is the only one at the present time who can overrule the opinion of the Medical Officer and employ or send on foreign duty. When, as, and if a case of that kind comes up, in the past the case has normally -- where there has been a difference of opinion -- been referred to my office. I have gotten ahold of Dr. Tietjen and the officer interested, as I think you will recall, Dick. I have either given my own opinion in relation to the whole, or in one case that I know of took the matter directly to the Director, and a conference was held with the Director and Dr. Tietjen, and later a second conference with the individual concerned, Dr. Tietjen, and myself, and the Director overruled in that case. There is a method of handling it, although I have been maybe a little difficult in saying, "We will take this to the Director" because in my judgment it hasn't been important enough.

Now in a Security case that matter was up again this morning, and we have Employment Review Boards. The Deputy Director is the senior man to appoint an Employment Review Board at any time, just as a Loyalty case. In his absence it falls in my lap. Whenever an individual has requested somebody and Sheff has turned him down, the Deputy DCI can immediately call an Employment Review Board and have that Board make a recommendation to the Director as to whether or not he will sign a waiver. That is the normal procedure. The Director's statement this morning was that his inclination would always be to back his Security Officer, but that procedure was satisfactory and carry on with it at the present time.

STATINTL [REDACTED] What would be wrong with making the Professional Selection Panel the Employment Review Board in these cases?

MR. WOLF: Nothing.

MR. AMORY: Except technically I think you have to amend your regulations.

MR. WOLF: You might have to amend the regulations. You might have to change the form . . . I don't know . . . but it could be merged.

STATINTL [REDACTED] A new man coming in doesn't require the level of consideration that a man does already in the Agency where it is a question of his job at stake and his reputation.

MR. WOLF: It depends a bit on the individual they have asked to have cleared, and this case that came up . . . there were two or three mentioned this morning . . . one was one of the most prominent individuals in the country, and I think it would seem a little disadvantage not to have a very senior review board make its recommendation to the Director, and I think if he was going to consider a Board he would want it.

STATINTL [REDACTED] Walter, if this is the case I think it is, that is going to go to the Director anyway. A man of the experience, age, and stature of this particular individual wouldn't even come within the province of a Selection Panel, would he?

MR. WOLF: Correct me if I am wrong, Bob, but it was expressed this morning there would be an Employment Review Board called to consider the matter with the

Security Officer and then recommend to the Director.

MR. AMORY: Yes, on that one; yes, on that one. I don't think you are talking about the same person.

COLONEL BAIRD: Walter, normally the procedure of an Employment Review Board is not to survey the qualifications of incoming employees.

MR. WOLF: Normally it is not, but it can be used prior to going to the Director and requesting a waiver, which is in effect taking the man in without a full security investigation.

MR. AMORY: Just a minute; let me get this straight . . . without or despite?

MR. WOLF: Without or despite . . . either one . . . but the normal waiver. Certainly this has been my experience. The Director has signed a waiver on individuals.

MR. AMORY: Sure.

MR. WOLF: On some individual's say-so. I mean I have said to him, "I know this fellow is right," and he has signed the waiver. I hope I was right, but I mean I don't think the waiver has been used very much.

MR. AMORY: If we accept this, what possible use does this Selection Panel serve then? I mean the only other concept would be for a fellow who passes all three of these things . . . then we set up another thing. It is like a hot oven back in school days . . . one more crack with the paddle.

GENERAL MORRIS: When this thing was set up by the Director, he approved grades 7 to 11, junior grade people that have passed everything else. They then make a final passing on this man into the Agency. It is based on what they have in the State Department, etc., of a panel . . . of new people coming in. Now that one point you brought up there about a paraplegic, etc. We had a man the other day. The Doctor comes in and tells us he is all right to be hired departmentally but not to go overseas, but you can't have too many of those people because everybody in this Agency ought to be qualified to go overseas. You probably want to rotate after while people going overseas, and you can't have a CIA filled up with a lot of people that can't go.

- 14 -

MR. AMORY: I don't think I would buy that. I agree that maybe 80%, but a very substantial minority . . .

GENERAL MORRIS: I don't mean a few, but a lot you don't want.

COLONEL BAIRD: You have well in the hundreds of people in the DD/I complex . . . of people that don't.

MR. AMORY: Yes, translator and people like that.

COLONEL BAIRD: I would like to speak briefly on this. I have sat as an advisory member, I think, on every meeting of the Selection Panel, and I would like to commend them on the zeal with which they have attacked their problem, and they in my humble opinion can serve the Agency to good purpose by backing up the Assistant Director of Personnel, backing up the Security Officer, backing up the Medical Officer, backing up the DD/A by withdrawing from one individual that aspect of infallibility which one individual shows if he turns down a man or accepts a man.

8
The spirit with which the Panel was created . . . it seems to me that if five people were chosen and they were chosen by the three Deputies to represent areas of experience in the Agency . . . all areas of experience in the Agency are represented by those five people . . . remembering I am not a voting member at all and just sit as an advisory member . . . they are mature people; they are people of integrity . . . and if I were a Personnel Director, or the Assistant Director for Personnel, or the Security Officer, I would welcome such a Panel advising on controversial cases in the Agency. Now advising is all they can do. They can't make a decision, but it seems to me that we have precedence throughout the nation for selection not being left in the hands of one individual. It is true in the Army; it is true in the Navy, Air Force; it is true in the State Department; it is true in every university which selects for scholarships. We use it in our own Agency, and I say that to me they can serve a very useful purpose. Now whether they should be given the authority to pass upon Security and Medical turndowns is something, it seems to me, for this Board to decide. I would hate to see the Panel washed out.

They are in the Career Service Program, and to me they can do a very useful . . . they can contribute to the Agency . . . but I think if you just make the determination as to whether they should or should not concern themselves with Security and Medical turndowns they can go ahead and do a good job.

8
DR. ANDREWS: I feel the same way, Walter. The Employment Review Board might very well serve for very senior individuals, but, as you say, it has been very rarely if ever they have taken any action on someone who wasn't already on duty here. I am concerned about the people grades GS-9, GS-11, GS-13, and I have sat in on an awful lot of Loyalty Review Board cases, and about 50% of them I would say were sheer nonsense -- somebody had bought a book from the Washington Bookshop or something. Now I have to assume that if that had been known before the person came on duty here he wouldn't have gotten in. You may want to hire somebody GS-7 - GS-11 because of his linguistic knowledge, his specialty in one way or another, and to have him washed out perhaps because as a part of his studying of Slavic languages he knew somebody who was a member of the Washington Bookshop . . . and it can happen that way . . . I know, therefore, I would feel a lot happier if it were possible for a Board of this sort to sit on it. And I don't see from the Medical standpoint or Security, if these people took only those cases that are brought to their attention . . . I don't mean they are to consider every reject . . . but only when the AD or man who recruited him says, "Wait, that person may be only a 7, but he is important for other reasons; therefore, we would like an independent body to look at it." It seems to me that would be a very useful safeguard to all of us.

I think I have been told that those cases that come up to the Loyalty Review Board are things brought to their attention after they are in.

MR. WOLF: I don't think that is entirely true.

STATINTL [REDACTED] Colonel Edwards has no discretionary authority. That is by legislation.

STATINTL [REDACTED] This is the Civil Service and the --
-- fact they bring members of the Washington Bookshop before

the Loyalty Review Board is not his discretion.

MR. WOLF: I think what is in your mind is Sheff might very properly say in his investigation . . . assuming that this individual is a member of some organization on the Attorney General's List . . . "If he is employed this will result in a Loyalty case."

DR. ANDREWS: So we don't employ him.

MR. WOLF: I think there have been many cases where the individual has been employed with full knowledge that it would result in a Loyalty case. There have been many cases, no doubt, where the decision has been made not to employ him because why have more Loyalty cases. I am sure that has been true on both sides. My own feeling is that this requires a little more thought and a little more study, and as much as I would like to accomplish something, I would personally prefer to hold this one off until the next meeting for final decision. I believe we can resolve the problems we are faced with.

COLONEL BAIRD: Before we leave it, Walter, may I see if we can again get going and see if this won't satisfy everybody for the moment? This is a proposal that I suggest you send to the Chairman of the Selection Panel.

"1. For the time being the CIA Career Service Board does not wish the Professional Selection Panel to give consideration to individual cases of applicants who have been flatly disqualified for employment from any one of the three offices -- Security, Medical, or Personnel." -- for the time being because we can't decide otherwise yet, as you say.

"2. The Board recognizes that the Panel cannot implement at this time all phases of the Selection program specified in CIA Notice [REDACTED] STATINTL It does, however, desire that the Panel should give priority to" -- and just three things -- "the formulation of criteria concerning overall suitability to work in CIA on a career basis." We would like to have that; we all want that. "b. Examination of individual cases of applicants or trial service employees without respect to grade where doubt is cast on the suitability to work in CIA on a career basis as a result of development of administrative or marginal information by the three offices mentioned above -- Medical, Security,

and Personnel -- and the Office of Training." That is to take in the trial period of employees before that is up -- the 12 months are up -- so that a training evaluation -- if they have taken training -- can be considered.

And "c. Recommendation to the appropriate authority for the disposition of each case so examined." Back to the AD, or back to Security, back to Personnel.

Lastly, "the Board desires the Panel to report to the Board at its next meeting progress made in carrying out the above objects." That puts them back in business, and I don't think at this moment . . .

MR. WOLF: I would subscribe to that.

GENERAL MORRIS: I have one thing on that thing, Mr. Wolf. What the Director authorized was up to grade 11 inclusive. It didn't have all grades.

COLONEL BAIRD: I know it didn't, General, but I merely say that to . . .

GENERAL MORRIS: Well, here is the point I want to make. When you come to the Secretary of State and he has this Panel, it is only for those new people going to the Foreign Service. Now somebody is being appointed in the State Department in a high position. There is no Board sees him. He appoints him.

STATINTL [REDACTED] Well, the Manpower people came in as high as FSO-1, and they went before a board.

MR. WOLF: That is right . . . Foreign Service went before a Board . . . those coming in from the Manpower Act . . . right up to the very top.

GENERAL MORRIS: But that thing was approved that things be taken up only authorized to grade 11.

MR. WOLF: I think this Board makes recommendations, and in the light of what Dr. Andrews has said, if I remember correctly, you were very much interested in people coming in grade 11, 13, etc.

DR. ANDREWS: My primary concern on this controversy is the people in the lower grades, Walter.

MR. WOLF: Yes, but there are some on the other hand, and, Bob, I think your concern . . .

MR. AMORY: You don't hire a Ph.D. fellow less than a 12, 13, or 14.

MR. WOLF: Therefore, I would recommend we go along with that and recommend that we amend that provision and make it right up through grade 15.

COLONEL BAIRD: Well, if you let them start with this they can go to work.

MR. WOLF: That is right. How do the rest of you feel on that?

STATINTL [REDACTED] I will go along with Matt's proposal.

DR. ANDREWS: So will I.

MR. AMORY: Then what do we do a month hence?

STATINTL [REDACTED] Get a report of experience from the Panel as to what it has found out after it has been in operation.

MR. AMORY: What they are being assigned to do is not pertinent to the problem that we are now postponing.

8 MR. WOLF: Well, we can carry on with our normal procedures and come to this Board with a recommendation as to whether or not the present procedure be adjusted and the present regulation be changed by recommendation to the General after further study.

COLONEL BAIRD: May I speak to Bob's question?

MR. WOLF: Yes.

COLONEL BAIRD: I would think if the Panel were in operation, in 60 to 90 days hence they report back to the Career Service Board on the procedural progress. If they come up and say, "We don't feel we can discharge the function that the Career Service Board has set up for us on the one-way valve," I think you will have an experience factor to give weight to their considerations. But now there is an underlying thing that shouldn't be in the record.

STATINTL [REDACTED] is the advisory member for Security. Dr. Tietjen is the advisory member for the Medical Office. I think they will give the Board all that the Board wants . . . I mean the Panel. I honestly do. They will not disclose sources. They will retain the security that is necessary but can still give the Panel enough for the Panel to come up with a recommendation which should carry weight. Now if in the course of experience it becomes apparent that

the Panel is not being given information, that decisions are being made where in the minds of the Panel information is being withheld that is pertinent to a decision, I think they will come back to the Career Service Board and say, "You can't function on this basis."

MR. AMORY: Does your Charter there direct them to pay any attention to people who don't get through? You might read the pertinent part to me there.

COLONEL BAIRD: "For the time being the CIA career Service Board does not wish the Professional Selection Panel to give consideration to individual cases of applicants who have been flatly disqualified for employment by any one of the three offices -- Security, Medical, or Personnel."

This is just what I think personally . . . having worked with these people in the meetings . . . we have worked I guess 15 hours on this subject . . . that the Security Office, and the Medical Office, and the Personnel Office are going to give the Panel all that they really need.

MR. AMORY: Well, in other words, the key words there are "flatly disqualified." Now here is the hiring thing down here. Down here you are flatly disqualified and borderline cases they have wrestled around with in their offices. They will toss out, for instance, formal discussion with the Board. That is a negative way to get around it.

COLONEL BAIRD: Well, Bob, I know it is difficult. That is why I wanted it kept off the record, if possible, but if we can give the benefit of the doubt that the people that are going to be on this Panel are people of good will, as well as the other characteristics I spoke of, I think they will bring borderline cases that otherwise they would have flatly turned down. I think we will get some of these rejection cases on which there is any shadow of doubt, and the Security Office will say, "Here is a case incidentally that we would normally turn down, but we would like to have you people kick it around and see if you people can back us up or not."

MR. WOLF: Isn't it reasonable to assume that when the office concerned has been notified that there has been a turndown and there is a strong feeling

on the part of the head of that office, he can request . . . ?

COLONEL BAIRD: Walter, I think that is again the way it will work, that the AD will request that the case be referred to the Selection Panel, and I doubt that Security, Personnel, or the Medics would refuse to accede to that request and say, "No, you don't take it to the Selection Panel; take it to the Director."

MR. WOLF: Well, the normal procedure, as I say, is that any AD or any office head is privileged at any time if there is a refusal from Personnel, from Medical, or from Security to bring the matter to the Director, and in the majority of cases they are brought to me through my office to the Director so that . . .

COLONEL BAIRD: I would think in 99 cases out of 100 if they referred it to the Panel -- and the Panel is composed of the men I hope it is composed of -- the cases will not get to the Director. They will be satisfied with the result . . . the recommendation . . . of the Panel, but that is . . . I don't think we will know until we have had some experience in this thing and we probably come up with a more intelligent reaction.

MR. WOLF: Is there any objection to carrying on this way for the next . . . ?

GENERAL MORRIS: I have the objection about going above grade 11 because the Director only approved that for the Career Service Board to take up, and I think a mountain is being made out of a mole hill on the thing. The average has only been about one per month. Whenever it has been brought up, the Assistant Director he would say, "All right, the man is out." There is only an average of about one per month.

MR. AMORY: A great many though, General Morris, I don't think every reached you or Walter. I mean they are turned down, and then I have to spend a morning over in "L" Building with Sheff or something, and I just don't think it is a very efficient way for us to get our key people. I mean what happens is that there is development of standards of exceptions.

GENERAL MORRIS: Here is one thing about it I think we all forget. This is a CIA, and on security if there is any question about a man's security at all, I say "Don't hire him". It is not a question of giving him a square deal necessarily.

MR. AMORY: I never am talking about that. I am talking about giving the Government a square deal. Where you have the only guy -- for instance, here is a case where Sheff after four hours of argument has gone along with us. He will be the only guy in CIA when he comes aboard, which I assume he will now, which has ever personally been negotiated with . . . It seems to me he is quite a positive asset, and CIA is the loser -- not the gainer -- by saying, "Oh, he played craps in [REDACTED] with a couple of guys we don't like very much," but his assets are so great. It is a question of striking a balance in each of those cases, and God knows the people that Dick [REDACTED] has to hire . . . I don't know how in the hell you do it.

STATINTL

STATINTL DR. ANDREWS: That is a point; I hadn't thought of that.

MR. WOLF: That is a subject we don't need to go into here -- and I might add both Eric and Dick -- because we are involved in that up to our necks anyway.

I think we are getting a little bit away from the policies that were discussed again as recently as this morning by the Director and by Allen when it was clearly stated that in the event of such a question a Personnel Review Board could properly be appointed to make any recommendation it cared to make to the Director. You were there, Dick. You were, Bob.

MR. AMORY: Yes.

MR. WOLF: The Director stated, "My inclination will be to follow the Security Officer, but go ahead and have the Personnel Board present its recommendations." So I think the Director has at the present at least resolved the question of policy that he is willing to have somebody take a second look on that.

On the question of grade up to 11, all this Board is privileged to

do is to recommend to the Director that it be up through 15. Now if it is the sense of the group that it is not necessary to do that, that is one thing. If the general opinion is that if we are going to do it, we better do it right through 15, I would like to know whether we would like to take that action, and so recommend to the Director, and have this Board cover everything. Personally I don't see much sense in leaving out the few remaining grades.

GENERAL MORRIS: It isn't except this thing started -- this idea -- the fellows were going over to Matt's school -- young fellows that were coming in for a career, and I mean that is the way it was written, and that thing was approved by the Director.

MR. WOLF: Yes, but that was a recommendation that we made to the Director.

GENERAL MORRIS: Yes, up to grade 11 the recommendation.

COLONEL BAIRD: Elevens don't come into the school.

STATINTL [REDACTED] Recommend to grade 11 is correct, but it wasn't for the purpose of Matt's . . .

GENERAL MORRIS: I may have read that into it, but I understood that was the case.

MR. WOLF: Well, unless there is a serious objection to increasing it by the few grades, is it the opinion of this Board that it would be wise to recommend that it be all inclusive up through a grade 15? That seems to be . . .

STATINTL [REDACTED] I doubt if we will find too many people up to grade 11's that the Agency can't get along without. I mean if they are unique they will probably be above 11's. We will have to raise it to 15's or above if there is any . . .

MR. WOLF: We have a special board on super-grades, so I don't think we need get into the super-grade question at all.

STATINTL [REDACTED] I certainly recommend that it be made up to 15's then.

MR. WOLF: Are you willing to go along with that recommendation, General, or would you rather not?

GENERAL MORRIS: I dissent on it, and, of course, that was on that particular thing that wasn't authorized for us to take up. That is the only reason on that. And then I want to also point out that it means that the people who are 12's, 13's, 14's, 15's, after they have been cleared by the Personnel those people have to go before this Board. This is what happens.

COLONEL BAIRD: No, only controversial cases.

GENERAL MORRIS: Oh, the Board takes up all these other things that aren't controversial.

COLONEL BAIRD: No, sir, the Board is not going to.

GENERAL MORRIS: But up to 7 to 11 they take them up to approve them.

COLONEL BAIRD: They can't do that. That is why I have written in here that "the Board recognizes that the Panel cannot implement at this time all phases of the Selection Program specified in CIA Notice [REDACTED] What they were asked to do they can't do now. They are trying to do what they think they can do, which is a service to the Agency. If the Career Service Board says, "Well, look, we want you to do these things; we want you to have testing in the field and interview" -- interview is what this said -- "each 11 down" . . .

25X1A

STATINTL [REDACTED] That is why it was limited to the 11 because of the interview, and the interview is impractical and can't be done, and that is one of the things which the Board cannot implement at this time.

MR. WOLF: I am basing my suggestion here on the report written by Colonel Baird which changes the original overall implementation of the job and reduces it to a size which looks practical at this time, and I agree with Eric [REDACTED] that if we are going to do it at all this way, we ought to be all inclusive. I don't see that it would be as effective without the higher grades, and it is only in those cases that are referred to in this memorandum.

COLONEL BAIRD: There is no point in their going into every case that is an obvious and shut case.

GENERAL MORRIS: Everybody feels the ones that are approved will go before the Panel, but you have never acted on any of them yet.

COLONEL BAIRD: Don't look at me. I am not . . .

GENERAL MORRIS: Well, that is the case on the thing.

COLONEL BAIRD: They are doing what . . . As I say, the Panel is made up of damn good people in my estimation. They are doing what they think they can do to make a contribution to the Agency. I just happen to agree with them as an advisory member of the Panel. They have gotten to the point that they need some guidance now. I recommend this as a form of guidance -- certainly interim -- until experience has shown what we really do want them to do.

STATINTL [REDACTED] Matt, if they stayed in session eight hours a day six days a week, how many cases could they go into thoroughly -- about three a day?

COLONEL BAIRD: That is the point. Historically, Walter, the Working Group that I wasn't a member of, but having sat with [REDACTED]

STATINTL

STATINTL [REDACTED] and Dick, they envisaged that ultimately the Career Service would mean bringing in young people. Well, we haven't gotten to that point yet. We are still hiring laterally, and until such time as the ceiling forces us to bring in 99% of our people -- come in as young people -- in the Agency and are pushed up, they can't implement this. I think they can implement what they were expected to do at some later date, or beef them up and make the Selection Panel a permanent panel that does nothing but sit.

MR. WOLF: I think that we might decide whether we are going to present this recommendation or not as the case may be. It seems to be that the majority of this Board is in favor of carrying out Colonel Baird's recommendation, and with General Morris holding on his point.

GENERAL MORRIS: I will hold on my point; it is only to a grade 11.

MR. WOLF: I think we want to record, and then we will so present it that way.

GENERAL MORRIS: Yes, sir.

MR. WOLF: I think because our time is pretty well up there is no use in going into a general discussion of the problems of the Career Service program. We have plenty.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1A

[REDACTED] We have enough unresolved right here.

MR. WOLF: And then there is an item called "New business," and I will ask if anybody would like to bring up anything right now that is important to bring to this Board?

COLONEL BAIRD: Walter, I want some guidance going back to the same Career Service proposal. Well, anyhow, with regard to training trainees so and so, and so and so, all new personnel recruited to fill positions in the Agency be required to go through a training program in order to give them an adequate basic intelligence background. Exceptions may be made for individuals who have had previous high level intelligence experience. I have a draft of a regulation which would cover that plus the curriculum for the basic course which is not presently given; in other words, we already have the basic courses for the clandestine offices. If possible, I would like to give these to the members of the Board. The curriculum for the course has already been coordinated with all offices of the DD/I. They have incorporated their suggestions. It has been given to Red White. If possible, however, I would like to get some authority. Specifically, I would like to ask the Board if they would let me work out the details for implementation with the DD/A inasmuch as it is a training and a personnel function really -- to get it implemented rather than to wait for another meeting.

MR. WOLF: I would be very glad to put that up to the Board as Chairman of this Committee, and if the Board so decides I would be very glad to carry it out. Is there any comment? If not . . .

COLONEL BAIRD: I will give it to you anyhow to read, assuming that you will come back to me with any suggestions on the draft.

MR. WOLF: As I understand it, Matt, your suggestion is that this Board authorize you to implement this through my office, work it out with me, and my only other question, this is a proposed regulation?

COLONEL BAIRD: This implements what I consider was my mandate to go ahead and set up a basic training course for all employees.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
- 26 -

CONFIDENTIAL

MR. WOLF: There is a paper called "Basic Intelligence Course," and then on top of that there is a paper called, "Regulation."

COLONEL BAIRD: Well, the "Basic Intelligence Course" is the new course.

MR. WOLF: Now did I understand that has been coordinated?

COLONEL BAIRD: That has been coordinated with the DD/I because the DD/P people would not take that course. They would take the basic courses which are already offered with continuing modification by the Office of Training.

MR. WOLF: Right.

MR. AMORY: I would like to make one comment. As I understood . . . 240 hours is 6 weeks, isn't it?

COLONEL BAIRD: Right.

MR. AMORY: I don't know where in this paper there is any evidence of it -- and I doubt if there is -- but I remember my interest in this was the part based on the fact that this clearance through Secret would take place prior to clearance through Top Secret so that the six weeks would not be all lost time. I don't mean that in a derogatory sense . . . but delayed time in getting the guy to his desk.

COLONEL BAIRD: That is in here, Bob.

MR. AMORY: Well, it just says cleared through Secret, but I think the DD/A's Office or I&S should undertake to expedite that Secret clearance, and time and again Sheff has said it takes just as long to clear a guy through Secret as it does through Top Secret, and we have to gain this time somehow or other if we are not going to have too long a lead time from the time we put our finger on a good boy until we get him working for us.

COLONEL BAIRD: That is one of the details I thought would be under the DD/A procedure.

MR. AMORY: I was just commenting, but that was one of the things I thought would be worked out on this.

MR. WOLF: Is it satisfactory to this group that Colonel Baird's suggestion be carried out?

GENERAL MORRIS: Yes, sir.

CONFIDENTIAL

9 [COLONEL BAIRD: It is the understanding there will not be any final decision, but I would like not to waste a month. So when you come to the next Board meeting . . . and you aren't ready to make up your minds . . . I am assuming at the next Board meeting we will be able to.

MR. WOLF: Right.

5 [[REDACTED] Mr. Wolf, may I distribute this longevity recommendation? 25X1A

MR. WOLF: By all means. It is much better than sending it all around. If there is no other new business I would suggest that we call the meeting adjourned.

25X1A [REDACTED] Thank you.

... The meeting adjourned at 5:10 P.M. ...

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~