

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SECURITY INFORMATION

Transcript of

Steering Group

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

10 August 1953

Present

Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick

Major General Harold M. McClelland

Mr. Paul E. Eckel

Mr. George S. Meloon

Mr. Eugene B. Wilhelm

Mr. Rudyerd Boulton

Mr. Douglas S. Trabue

Reporter

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SECURITY INFORMATION

834110100

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MR. KIRKPATRICK: There is one matter I would like the consideration of. The Director when he was discussing Agency problems in the Indoctrination Course in May was asked several questions by some of the ladies present as to the possibilities of careers for women in the CIA, and the questioning was rather critical of our efforts in that particular direction, so he referred the matter to the Inspector General. In discussing this problem with him we decided that probably the best thing to do was to set up a panel of women, which we did before he left and had a meeting a week ago Friday. Now in selecting the panel what was done was generally speaking to try and get representation across the Board and not necessarily covering every office but covering most of the offices, and not necessarily covering the top grades but covering grades ranging from grades 9 through 14, so that we had a pretty broad cross section. The Director talked to this group. The first time they met there were 10 of them, and they talked to him also quite freely on the problems of women in the Agency. They also prepared for him just a brief, very brief, statement that he could read before leaving on his trip so that he can discuss the problems of women if he runs into any discussion in the field offices abroad. We have asked this group, which has been designated as a panel from this particular Board, to study the problems of professional and clerical advancement to determine for themselves whether they believe there is any discrimination as such against women for advancing in a professional . . .

The group elected Dorothy Knoelk of Training as Chairman. She called me this morning and said that in making their study they had run into the problem of not being able to obtain all of the statistics they wanted to obtain on women in the Agency, and the exact reason for that is apparent. As you all know, the total number of employees in the Agency is a fairly closely held figure, as closely held probably as it should be, in fact, and I think the Personnel Office is reluctant to spread that particular figure any further, and I believe they are told they can get percentages rather than actual figures. Now the question is one involving both security and Agency policy. We have asked this group to do a job. They really should

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

have figures to do it. The question is whether percentages would satisfy them. The other question is simply giving them the figures they asked for and have them indicate this is a very closely held figure and not to be disseminated outside the group.

They asked first Mr. Blake, and Mr. Blake called me, and I referred them to Mr. Boulton. First they tried it through Miss Bond, and I think she indicated reluctance to give them the figures.

MR. BOULTON: I talked to [] about it just an hour or so ago, and there is no reluctance I know of to give this task force the figures that they need.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: They can have all of the figures? You don't worry about the security aspects?

MR. MELOON: We worry about it. I haven't had any official requests. Miss Bond works in Personnel, and when we first discussed the setting up of the Committee I got together with Miss Bond, and I think that we have worked up enough statistics to satisfy any group, and I was going to send them on to you for your information in connection with this study. I do feel, however, that we ought to have a request either to myself or somewhere along the line rather than have Miss Bond passing out statistics like that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Actually don't you think Rud should be the focal point so you won't be bothered with it?

MR. MELOON: Yes, Rud is in there too. He is now Miss Bond's supervisor, as a matter of fact, and also from the Agency career service standpoint he also was in charge of these statistical programs, so he has everything available to him from that angle.

MR. BOULTON: We can get whatever is appropriate for them, and by that do you mean you want to rule now, Kirk, as to whether they should have these figures or not because those figures are very easy to get because they are standard figures that are made every quarter?

- 2 -

32A110100

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am not worrying about the accessibility of the figures; I am worrying about having the over-all number of Agency employees floating around.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: What level are these people?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: They are all levels actually.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: It seems to me they have been approved to work in the Agency without restriction, and with due caution I don't see any reason why they shouldn't have it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: My reasoning is they have a job, and we should give them the tools to do the job, and it is a very highly classified figure.

MR. MELOON: I think we ought to put a limitation on any dissemination that is made of any report that is put out.

MR. BOULTON: I am getting in touch with Miss Knoelk, and I have already with Miss Bond, to handle the activities of this task force in the same way and with the necessary flexibility that the other task forces of the Board are handled, which will mean . . . there are standard procedures for the filing of reports, and the filing of their minutes, and all that sort of thing. I think we can handle that, Kirk.

MR. ECKEL: Where do they actually do the work on this? Where do they physically work?

MR. BOULTON: In their own offices.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: They have had a meeting down in the L Building complex the last couple of times. The first meeting was up here. All I know is that I got a complaint from Larocque that Mrs. Davison has been doing nothing but work on this. Maybe we will get a quite effective report.

MR. BOULTON: I am going to meet with the group on Thursday, and I will give them whatever statistics are appropriate and brief them on how to handle it, and I think that ought to take care of it. I do really.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I have a second item that I want to take up, also not on the Agenda, and it is a matter of promotion policy. The question is that

there is more and more confusion apparently by the fact that there is no standard Agency criteria for time in grade. Maybe the answer encourages us to go back to the old days when we had a standard criteria and everybody griped about having a standard criteria.

MR. MELOON: I think they promoted everybody they had in mind when we did away with it, and now they are realizing with nothing to fall back on it is quite bothersome to them having somebody chase them every 20 minutes for a promotion. I frankly feel, and it was brought to my attention rather forcibly when I reviewed the statistics that we have run off as a result of this committee on women, some of the people I noticed on the listing that we had had been promoted, I think, eight grades in the last six years in this Agency. Some of those people whose names I saw on there came in grade 3 and grade 4 and are now grade 12's. We have an alphabetical listing, and I went down there and selected some 20 or 30 names and asked Miss Bond as an adjunct to this survey being made to come up with some case studies on names that I indicated so that we could show this committee of so-called professional women that they weren't being discriminated against, and I also have asked Rud's staff to make a study on the promotions of men around here as well and to bring it to someone's attention and, see if we can't put the brakes on here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What is the general feeling of the Board about a promotion policy of that nature?

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: I think it is essential. They didn't have one in my office so whoever yelled the loudest got the promotions, and they set up time in grade as the guide. You can always make exceptions where a person has been overlooked and you find he is really outstanding and he was taken in at too low a grade because nobody knew him. The norms are calculated each year for grade and time in grade varies by grade; to get higher around 13 and 14 I think it is two years. Now as soon as that word got around, then people quit griping. They figured their norms would bring them up

automatically for consideration.

MR. BOULTON: The norm is based on a number of factors. It is a figure which takes numbers of factors into consideration.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: If they are really outstanding . . . we have one or two cases where they are really outstanding where we didn't stick to the time in grade. It has had a very fine effect on the morale. They have quieted down now, and they know, for example, that when a new one is taken on he goes through the Training School, and then he is sent overseas, and he must perform satisfactorily for 90 days after he gets over there before he gets his 6 if he came in at a 5 or whatever it was. I think it is a must to have a uniform policy because it is not uniform now. There is a certain amount of proselyting going on. I have lost some people to other offices where they have shopped around and, "Sure, I can give a 9 over there." I can't give them that 9 because that means taking them out of order.

MR. While it allays the pressure during the time the time in grade is going on, don't you find though that at the expiration of that time in grade that if the individual doesn't get the promotion, he thinks it is a matter of . . . ?

MR. ECKEL: That was a failing of the old system.

MR. BOULTON: This is not promotion policy; it is promotion control. The policy is that you get promoted when you deserve it, but the control is that you don't get promoted on a completely disorderly basis.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: And a great many, you see, come back from overseas, and they come before the Career Service Board, and this is all explained to them. We have had some resignations where they felt they didn't get promoted soon enough. That suits me fine. I certainly recommend one that is uniform.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Would anybody object to one?

MR. ECKEL: No. May I just state another consideration in this? We have a problem, I think. It has to do with promotion policy of the Junior

Officer Trainees . . . such persons who have not yet been tried under working conditions should be promoted, and the length of time, because some of these people certainly deserve to be promoted while they are yet in training. We are wrestling with that problem now attempting to set up some kind of office policy for persons in training -- promotion policy.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well now the people you are talking about, are they assigned to an office yet?

MR. ECKEL: Not yet only ours.

MR. BOULTON: They are the lower grades are they not?

MR. ECKEL: Yes, they run from 5 through 11.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How long do you keep these bodies?

MR. ECKEL: Well, that depends. Sometimes we put them for a full year while they are still on the OTR T/O . . . a full year of training in another office. Ting, for example, has had some eight or 10, maybe more, for a period of 90 days, some less and some more than 90 days, during which time they are still on the OTR T/O.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would say I would just be basically opposed to anybody being promoted on the basis of their performance in training. Their performance on the job --

MR. ECKEL: Kirk, you have other persons . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: -- training is a different matter.

MR. ECKEL: That is one category, Kirk, and there is a second category of persons we have in long range language training to be conducted in this country and abroad over a period of two years' time during which time they are entirely under the supervision of Training, and the policy ought to encompass exceptional ability demonstrated during the period of training so that it does not militate against promotion because we retain them in training because they are very capable people.

MR. MELOON: They are --

MR. ECKEL: -- being retained in Training for training purposes.

MR. MELOON: It has been my observation on many of the career trainees

that we brought them in at too high a level in the first place, and there was no place for them to go after one year's training. I am referring specifically to some of those we brought in from the University of Wisconsin. I have one in my own shop who is a 12 now who has been on board here two years and was brought in at grade 9, and we were bringing the other trainees in at grade 5, and I argued at the time they should have been brought in at 7.

MR. ECKEL: We have a rule of thumb now on this I think that passes your shop. If they have a Ph.D. degree and have gone that far in their academic work we bring them in at 9. And less than that with some graduate study we bring them in at 7.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We are getting a little astray from the subject. I think that the answer to the first question before the Board, which was promotion policy, is that we should have an over-all Agency regulation which ties us down. George, will you undertake to get one.

MR. MELOON: Yes, sir, we have it in the mill as of the moment.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Good, that is, standardize it across the board and stop this feeling interofficewise, "Well, maybe somebody in the next office is getting promoted faster than I am because my boss is a stickler for efficiency."

MR. ECKEL: I still would like to go back to the question: Will it encompass the trainees?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would like to examine that, and I think it should be examined a little more thoroughly because there are several factors involved.

MR. ECKEL: If the trainee is not included the tendency will be then on the part of the trainee to want to go immediately into an office whether he is prepared for it or not because his promotion will go along faster.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You have an awful lot of factors here. You are talking about the trainee after you have been with the Agency two years, that

is one problem, and the fellow just on board is another problem. I don't think the fellow just coming on board should even be considered for a promotion for a while.

MR. ECKEL: Not within a period of a year, I agree, and we have not promoted in less than a year.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think rather than prolong this discussion, why don't you put the Office of Training in writing, and we will take it up at the next Board meeting.

MR. ECKEL: It is in the mill.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Now we will talk about your Junior Officers in another context, which is a proposal I have to make to the Board. I have had in the past month a fairly sizeable number proportionwise, and when I state this I am using a slight bit of slide rule technique, and I feel that for every one that comes to see the Inspector General there are 10 that feel the same way in some of these areas, and that is eliminating the hotheads and the wildmen, but the ones that have got an honest gripe, and I have had I would say a very high percentage of these Junior Officers who were brought on in the helicon days of the Agency two years ago when we were going to drop paratroopers all over the world and right every wrong situation, and they are a badly fed up group at the moment. I am talking about mainly the FM group but also the whole Junior Officers' level.

I have had several of them -- a couple of them, in fact -- go to see the Director and then be referred down to me, and they report, and I have reason to believe that their reports are accurate, that the morale on that level is very low and that there are an awful lot of people getting fed up with it, and what I am suggesting is that we might get together a group of these very junior personnel to see what they feel the Agency isn't doing for them that it should. Are there any thoughts on that particular subject?

MR. ECKEL: Have you had similar gripes on the part of persons who have gone to the DD/I side?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not any degree the proportion.

~~SECRET~~
MR. ECKEL: Have you had any?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes, I think we have.

MR. ECKEL: Because I think there is a tremendous difference, and we are getting to the place now where our young JOT's because the word gets around among them just don't want to go to the DD/P side.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, they were oversold on a particular plan, which is partly the Agency's fault, which was beyond the Agency's control at that time, and at that time they were all flocking to the paramilitary side of the house.

MR. BOULTON: They have also been jostled a little bit more down in the DD/P areas than in the DD/I from a personnel handling point of view, I think.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, if there are no objections I think then I will try and constitute a panel, and then I will get Willet Eccles to give me a hand on these youngsters. I think just to give a sounding board among themselves will help that. They will come up with just a statement of the problems facing them.

MR. ECKEL: Yes, sir.

Kirk, in connection with this promotion policy I agree with your suggestion there should be an over-all Agency policy, but touching on that, there is another problem which we are all going to feel very strongly in the not too distant future, and that is the rigidity of your grade system. Regardless of whether you slow this thing down, you are still going to face the inevitable in two, three, or four years, and I talked to Red White about it some time back, and I doubt if anything has happened. If we could evolve some kind of a technique whereby you would have in effect three grades pay within those grades accordingly of a Senior Intelligence Officer, Junior Intelligence Officer, and whatever you want to call the third, and each office would be assigned some Senior Intelligence Officers, and some Junior, and you have an awful lot more flexibility. You could put a 16 in a 14 slot and something of that sort. You could move people around

~~SECRET~~

to beat the band. I don't know what your legal Civil Service technicalities are.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I have been around it at least four times in the last seven years.

MR. BOULTON: The legislative task force is making another tour at the moment.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The only way we can change that system today is by legislation.

I have never heard an argument that goes against that from a practical point of view.

MR. MELOON: I could fill that thing full of them.

I would like to have a chat with you sometime at our quote leisure.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You will need it because I haven't had the bugs taken out of that from my point of view.

MR. MELOON: I think I can take them out for you.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I hope that by mid-September we can wrap up a lot of these things. How is the Insurance Task Force going Rudyerd?

MR. BOULTON: Very well. The Legislative Task Force will have a paper for the Agenda of this group next week provided you clear it, Kirk, which is not a threat, but it will be available.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But it is a road block.

MR. BOULTON: It will be available for next Monday.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Fine. Let's get down to the Agenda then.

MR. MELOON: I would like to ask one question before we get down to it. Does the Career Service Board as such have a budget?

MR. BOULTON: It has no budget and has no T/O.

MR. MELOON: You see, I am being forced to absorb the cost of that insurance study on my next budget, and not only that, I have to absorb the Personnel of if we start reimbursing for beginning

July 1 on, and I have got some pretty close to \$100,000 to absorb in that budget, and I don't feel I can pay for that insurance study unless we get some relief somewhere along the line.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let me talk to Red about that because the DD/A was the one that said, "Oh, we can take care of that, you see." Now the Professional Selection Panel paper.

MR. BOULTON: That is the only thing on the Agenda.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Has everybody read this now?

[] I have an extra copy of this.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: General, what comments have you got on this paper?

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: Well, I think this is a very fine paper. As long as we have got this legislative problem with the veterans it is almost unworkable in my office, and I think it can be worked all right here in Washington, but the people who are overseas now that State Department requires Foreign Service people three years, and my people will be over three years. The recruits go through a six to eight months training course, and then they are two or three months trying to get []

[] so their year is approaching, and we see nothing . . . So that the one year provisional period is just not workable. If we could get rid of that veterans' preference thing and do as they suggested here, set up the provisional period varying with the . . . whether he is just a radio operator, or a cryptographer, or whether he is something aimed at being an officer, I think it is good. It might be that we are getting the Professional Selection Panel and this Board into a little bit too much of the administrative . . . I am not sure about that.

I think the idea behind it is very good. You practically commission them. I think that the office head has been ignored a little bit here. For example, on page 5 -- I am not trying to go through the thing at all --

"Recommendations of the Office Career Service Board shall be referred by the Executive Secretary of the CIA Career Selection Board to an Examining Panel for review." I don't know whether that was intended to ignore the office head or not. I wonder whether or not all people or whether the

office head's recommendation of a man for permanent employment is enough. They either are or are not with me, and if they are not, then I take steps to separate them and they would never come up to a Professional Selection Panel.

MR. BOULTON: I think the view of the Panel was that if you were going to make such a selection that it was both the Panel's responsibility and also it was necessary to the Panel to review unsuitable cases. Otherwise it wouldn't have both sides of the picture and, therefore, it felt that all persons should be selected, including those on whom you as head of the office would recommend against.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: I don't object to it, but I don't think I would recommend anybody I wasn't willing to go to bat for. I wouldn't object to that, but I don't know how you are going to get around this present one year provisional period and make it amount to anything for me.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: George, can the Director waive that on his own -- the one-year provisional period? Can he establish his own provisional . . . ?

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: He can, but the Veterans Preference . . . well, after a year you really have a job of getting rid of somebody.

MR. BOULTON: In some cases it is the day you hire him you can't get rid of him if he spent the one year trial service period in some other Agency in the same kind of work.

MR. MELOON: Even coming on here within a month you have to follow the procedure on his case.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: It has made me look pretty carefully when I pick up a veteran. If I don't pick up a veteran and pick up draft bait, then I am in trouble there.

MR. BOULTON: The Legislative Task Force is recommending that action be taken to remove this one year block, but only legislation can do it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think your lawyers are going to tell you that legislation isn't necessary and the Director has the power now.

They think it is unwise to do that because of the pressure that is being built up, and charges will be made that we aren't using the

~~SECRET~~

Director's authority as intended. I know John Warner feels pretty strongly that the Director's authority was not given to him for that purpose. It was given to him for security-type cases, and that while there isn't anything in writing, more or less the wording of our law is precisely the same as the State Department's was, whenever that was enacted, and that was clearly given to the State Department only for security-type cases. So while in theory the Director could use that, the feeling is that it would be most unwise to do that for any number of cases.

MR. MELOON: I think it would take legislation if we were to set up a probationary period for a veteran and to dismiss him upon the termination of that period, or any time during that so-called period, without using the Director's authority. However, of course, the Director does have a right to terminate anyone's services, but if we were to separate him for failure to qualify during the trial period, it would take legislation to do that. I don't think you will ever get it through.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What is the percentage of veterans in the Agency -- 80% to 90% or something like that, isn't it?

MR. BOULTON: The intake now is a little less than 50% of veterans. That is on a one month sample which we have made.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Does that include women?

MR. BOULTON: Yes, it includes all persons.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What about males?

MR. MELOON: About 80% of the males within the Agency are veterans.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: Almost every applicant I have who is a radio operator or cryptographer is a veteran.

MR. BOULTON: I think you could put it this way. Even though the one year period is unsatisfactory for your purposes, General, and for the DD/P also, which has two year tours of duty which they would like to use as consideration, this is workable within that frame of reference, within the one year period, this proposal of the Panel.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: I don't think it is, not if it is carried out as

strictly as it says here that "the Examining Panel shall consider all pertinent information concerning the employee, in possession of the Personnel Office, Security Office, Medical Office, Office of Training and the Operating Offices. The Examining Panel shall interview the employee, and his supervisor when appropriate."

MR. BOULTON: There aren't very many people who get overseas under a year.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: Oh, yes.

MR. BOULTON: Well, there may be in your shop, but in the DD/P it is less and less.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: More than half of my office is overseas.

MR. MELOON: One big block I find, Kirk, in talking about three year trial period, and then Office of Training comes in and says that we would like to promote these people during a year of training. How are we going to throw that man out if we promoted him three times during the trial period?

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: In the Air Force upon graduation from flying school he is made a second lieutenant, and then there is an automatic block promotion. I don't know whether it is three years first lieutenant, but it is probably faster now, and then you can require him to show cause why he should not be separated, and he appears before a -- I forget what they call it now -- review board of some kind.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We might set that up as an exception on the first promotion. Generally speaking nobody would have more than one promotion before coming up for his career approval.

MR. WILHELM: Our feeling was that until we can get over this legal obstacle at least anything would be better than what we are now doing. We have people going into the 12th and 13th month and then decide they are going sour. In the 11th month we could have gotten rid of them in a hurry.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Paul, do you have any comments on the paper itself?

MR. ECKEL: I think the paper in the main is good with the exception of this rather knotty problem.

824110100

MR. KIRKPATRICK: George?

MR. MELOON: No.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Gene?

MR. WILHELM: No.

[] Red White said he couldn't go along he felt with the very last part of the paper which provides for 50 examiners. He felt that the problem of standardization of setting up a series of criteria which would be uniformly interpreted and insure, therefore, some equitable treatment to all people coming up before the three-man group -- eight-man group -- that whatever the size of the Panel -- will be drawn from these 50 people -- would pose the problem of uniformly applying criteria.

MR. BOULTON: Who would do the examining then?

[] I was just going to say . . . I have to confess he didn't come up with any alternative or alternate arrangement. I don't think he yet felt he was ready to come up with a suggestion or alternative. Perhaps he had in mind a permanent body of examiners. I don't know.

MR. ECKEL: This gives diversification. I thought it was a very good point.

[] As you know, I participated in this particular paper, so that wasn't my own view.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: It will be a diversity.

[] I think what it does pose though is the problem of having some criteria . . .

MR. WILHELM: You do have appeals to the top board.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: In the Air Force they have a board of officers on each base.

MR. BOULTON: On page 5, paragraph 6, "each Examining Panel will have a non-voting member of the Selection Board's Secretariat which will be the common denominator for insuring the standards are uniform."

MR. ECKEL: That would probably give the desired continuity.

[] Wasn't there some thinking we would have to get out criteria, etc.?

MR. ECKEL: You still have this large segment to handle here, haven't you?

MR. BOULTON: That is another job for the present Board as soon as it gets out of this.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: It seems to me that this Examining Panel is going to be a rubber stamp in most instances because you will take the recommendation of the office head. Where you find an office head that gets out of line . . . On those borderline cases there is right of appeal. I think in most cases you look at it and say that everything is fine and won't have to do a lot of examining in getting the man.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, of course, there I differ with you because I think that really the most important part of the Panel is getting the man before them if possible.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: I am talking about people who can't get back here at the end of a year, and about half of my people would be in that category. And I think we can get around that one. I think getting them to come before the Panel . . .

MR. BOULTON: I think the examination might be shoved up in say about nine months . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Give them a provisional before they depart and then make a confirmation action on the record at the end of the year. That would take care of that for the time being until we get legislation to change it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: They look fine going out, and you can't tell about them. They get into some kind of trouble.

MR. MELOON: I don't think the fact that we select career service is going to eliminate some of the troubles they are getting into today.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: They know they are under scrutiny, and then when it is something like going through OCS.

MR. BOULTON: I think the Panel felt the fact they have to appear

before the Board is going to focus their attention to the fact this place means business.

[] Red had one other comment to make and that was in respect to the procedure the Office Boards would engage in in looking . . . or the supervisor's own comments and evaluations . . . and then making a recommendation in turn to the DCI . . . an Examining Board . . . that the Office Boards should in every case avail themselves of information that Personnel, Medical, Security, or the Office of Training had. I know that the Panel anticipated that when we wrote this up and said that "recommendations of the Office Career Service Board" -- it is paragraph VIII, subparagraph 3 -- "shall be . . ." No, it is subparagraph 2, "The Office Career Service Board shall review the recommendation in the light of all available information concerning the employee and make a recommendation to the CIA Selection Board that (a) the employee be appointed as a member of the Career Staff, or (b) the employee be separated." General, wasn't that your recollection of what we had in mind?

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: Yes.

[] I assured Red that was the case, and he felt it would not be good for the Office Board to make a recommendation and then, to have that reversed on the basis of information which it could have had but didn't avail itself of.

MR. WILHELM: Our point is they should have every point we can give them.

[]: Now maybe it should be spelled out to provide that, I don't know.

MR. SHELDON: I think from the DD/I point of view it is practical. You referred some time back to the possibility of collapsing the number of boards in various areas. That would have an effect.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes, I think . . . I hadn't intended to raise it until the whole Board met, but just to start thinking on that, it is my

~~SECRET~~ INFORMATION

feeling that we have too many Career Service Boards which has the effect of wasting executives' time and spreading the number of support personnel in order to make them all work. Now I think you can't do it by rule of the thumb. The nice way to do it would be to say that there would be a DD/P, DD/I, DD/A, Training, and Commo Career Service Board. That would be five to cover the Agency. But I do think that at a very early date we should look at this whole problem and see if we can't without having any effect -- and I don't think it will have effect at the lower levels -- see if we can't combine some of these boards.

MR. BOULTON: We are working on some formula if you would like it next week.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If you will have it when the Board meets as a whole we will put that on the Agenda, and each man can pass the word back that those are the lines which we are thinking, and the day to strike for this freedom is early before entrenched bureaucracy gets to it and then we can't do it.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: My Career Service Board has a strength of around 1200 and spends two afternoons a week. Let's see, they are making job assignments and reassignments, which is personnel work, but I have no communicators in the Personnel Branch, and I just don't know how you can manage people. Now DD/P has what -- people, something like that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is about right, I guess.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: That is going to be one hell of a job for one Board.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But, you see, actually we have some very strange organizational peculiarities about CIA today because we have one division in DD/P area which is bigger than about seven offices combined in the other areas, so, as I say, your formula is going to have been uneven.

MR. BOULTON: We have a toe hold on one which is very tricky, and I refuse to divulge what it is until we work a little longer on it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But that is a fact. Do you have any questions?

[] Sir, I am afraid not. I was asked to represent Mr. Helms at this meeting, and I am not in a position, sir, to make any DD/P comments on the paper.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, the feeling then with one or two exceptions is that the paper is acceptable. What does Colonel White want us to do about the 50 examiners?

[] I don't know.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Tell him we will be glad to consider his alternative.

MR. BOULTON: Would you want to consider this by the full Board at a Thursday meeting?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Put it on the Agenda in this fashion that it will be considered if somebody wishes to raise the point about it. Otherwise it will be considered approved with the exceptions as noted.

MR. BOULTON: Good, and we will start to work on regulations to put this into effect if possible.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes, now there is one other thing which I would like to mention which is not in the formal stage yet but which is nevertheless a major factor, and something which I consider part of the real heart of the Career Service problem, and that deals with the subject of hardship cases in the Agency, and this is probably obvious: A great number of these find their way to the IG. Now the Agency has no legal way of handling the case of an employee who gets into difficulties through circumstances beyond his own control, and I think that is the criteria which we have to observe in these cases at the present time. It ties in with our Legislative Task Force because that is an important part of the legislation that we want to retain, but I don't think we will have too much difficulty obtaining it, although the temper of Congress most recently has been critical of even . . .

Two impartial and objective task forces working on that subject came up with strong recommendations that they were a major part of your military career system. After lengthy discussion with the Director, and with the

~~SECRET~~
SECURITY INFORMATION

DD/A, and with the Comptroller, and with the General Counsel the decision that has been made on hardship cases is simply that we will endeavor to establish a foundation to assist CIA personnel who get into hardships beyond their control. I don't want to take too much time on it this afternoon, but I would like you to think about it because I will have to raise it at the next meeting of the Board, and we will circulate a paper on the subject in advance. There are many aspects to these hardship cases, and I feel very strongly personally that the Agency's success in handling them has a very definite effect on the individual's desire and performance as a career employee. If the Agency can help a man out, and if all of the people of the Agency know if they get into difficulties the Agency is going to be behind them, we are going to have a much better career service than we are going to have if they feel, "If I get into difficulties I am just going to be told that is tough." I would like to describe two or three of these hypothetically from actual case histories.

I sound like an FBI radio program, but there is the case of one of our officers overseas whose child became seriously ill with a very desperate disease, and the doctors in the area in which he was located indicated that the best medical attention was in the United States. They also indicated to the effect that they felt there was some urgency in the matter. If the child didn't have early medical attention from qualified physicians the disease might get out of hand. You can imagine the personal anguish of not only this officer but his wife, and the actual fact was that the Agency could do nothing to return him to the United States until his tour of duty was up legally. Now there was a slightly illegal aspect to it from the point of duty. He could be ordered home for consultation and ease it up that way, but to order him, and his wife, and his child home at Agency expense for consultation, etc., was practically out of the realm of consideration. The Director would be in very dangerous legal grounds to sign off such an expense.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Case 2 is somewhat similar circumstances in which the officer's wife was injured in an accident overseas, and medical attention was not available in the area. She had to be flown to another area for medical attention at quite considerable expense, something which only a man with independent means could afford to meet. The Agency couldn't do much to help. You can spell these right on down the line, but you will note that the two cases I cite, and the many more that could be cited, almost are all cases of circumstances beyond the individual's control.

Now it is my feeling that when we ask people, as we are going to do and are doing in certain areas, to serve anywhere in the world we want them to, to take any job we want them to take and to have a dedication to duty beyond and above any other Government agency, that we simply have to get behind them on these cases.

The other factor is that the average individual has enough self respect and pride that when he gets into a circumstance like this he doesn't want everybody and his brother to know about it, and he wants to go to his boss assuming his boss can handle this without it being circulated around the Agency that John X has been assisted by the Agency, and, therefore, his self respect suffers, and he is not going to stay with an agency where that is true because he wants to hold his head up among his associates. The consequence is that we have got to establish a system where the individual gets helped, doesn't feel that he has become a charity case, maintains his self respect, and can have it done efficiently and promptly with due consideration for all of the factors involved. Now we are admitting that the Agency cannot help anybody today, and that is the only quick solution that we can get, and the Director is insistent upon a quick solution. In several cases he has actually said, "I am going to put up the money myself," and I have said, "No, you can't do that because it is the Agency that has to help him, and whereas there would be no question about the appreciation due you, and there would be no question about your motives in so doing, we will simply have to get the Agency on the ball to do that."

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Mr. Wolf started before he left the idea rolling of establishing a foundation. I don't like the word foundation actually because I think that implies eleemosynary symptoms, but for want of a better word, I will use it, in which we would get some of our friends and some of our wealthy alumni to contribute, and in which the Career Service Board would then examine aspects within the Agency for obtaining more money to put aside say a kitty of anywhere from \$10,000 to \$25,000 that could be used, the formula being used to do this and along the following lines:

General Counsel first surveyed it with the Internal Revenue Bureau, and after lengthy discussions they came up with the general conclusion that any contributions made to such an organization could be tax deductible. We are going to get an outside lawyer to go into it too using the Commerce clearing house and any other sources he wants to to make sure that is true because we wouldn't want to embarrass any of our rich friends and be told it was just one type of individual and it couldn't be tax deductible. That was the major factor involved. We have asked a group of our alumni, and I have particularly in mind Wolf, Loftus Becker, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and a few others like that in New York to serve as a Board of Trustees and Supervisors and have a completely independent foundation, and I have recommended further that they establish as their working group so-called under them a very senior body in the Agency, probably as an adjunct to this Board, to sit on these cases with the assurance that the cases would be handled by this body. The information of the cases they handled would be kept right in that group, and there would not be general dissemination of the information. Where the Career Service Board comes in is first in its relation to this group, which should be close, and, secondly, in seeing what we can do within the Agency to acquire and put money into the foundation. Now there are two aspects. One is the . . . I don't like to use the word kickback . . . that isn't legal, but what is it -- the profits of GSI, Government Services Incorporated?

MR. MELOON: Yes.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think there is \$2,500 now available, and so that is part that will go in, and then it has been suggested that there will be some sort of a purchasing pool established to purchase items for Agency employees at somewhat of a discount, and the pool itself makes profit on the difference between the discount and the cost of the item. There are quite a number of different methods used. The military services have their own system, I think, which even helps in educational matters.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But this is now in the mill, and I just report it to you for your information with the statement that at the next meeting of the Board itself it will be brought up for full discussion, and any ideas that can come from the way the military handles it would be very helpful.

GENERAL MCCLELLAND: I think they got funds from PX's. They have a large fund, and they send children of deceased airmen to school where the widow can't support them. They don't take care of hardship cases. They don't have hardship cases. They can bring a man back anytime, and NATS flies them for free, and they have pretty good hospitals overseas. I am not sure that we have taken advantage of that in all cases. We had a boy out in [] whose mother was dying, and he needed \$1300 for his round trip, and the Credit Union couldn't take care of it, but we found out that [] he could come back [] to the nearest stop to his home.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, generally speaking, when we get those we try to handle them that way, but we can't handle all of them that way. It is a very serious problem, and I consider it most important from a long-term career service point of view.

Are there any other comments or questions? If not I thank you, gentlemen, and we stand adjourned.

... The meeting then adjourned at 1705 ...

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~