

~~SECRET~~  
CONFIDENTIAL

14 April 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Director *WJC*

SUBJECT : Critique of Reorientation and Supervisory Responsibilities (RSR) Program

1. Although I am mentioning only items with which I found fault, my reaction to the Program was certainly not negative. On the whole I considered the Program very worthwhile and well done. Below are a few comments.

2. General Comments:

a. I sensed in the whole presentation a somewhat defensive tone as regards coming out openly and saying that the Agency is a group of way-above-average people doing largely unique work in a very unusual environment. We still seem to shrink away from the concept that we should be better than other agencies if we are to carry out our mission. Because of the nature of our work Agency management must insist on far higher standards than those in any other government agency. We must have a code of ethics that is far more demanding than that imposed upon other government employees. We must not be satisfied that our supervisors be as good as other supervisors. They should be the best. *Good.*

b. I believe the keynote of the RSR Program should be that we are a unique organization of generally superior people doing critical work, and therefore Agency management must expect Agency supervisors to adhere to ethical and professional standards more demanding than in any other agencies. Not one person said that working in CIA is a privilege and not a right, and that being a privilege more will be expected. Let's try to be the best and not apologize to anybody for it, and let's not even consider giving in to practices accepted by some government hacks in other agencies (overtime for every second of extra work, sick leave whether you're sick or not, etc.). *Agree.*

c. In connection with the above paragraph I heard [redacted] and Mr. Baird say there seemed to be a little too much This document part of classified integrated file. NAME CHECK required prior to individual classification action.

BOX NO. 3 FLD NO. DOC. NO. 3 NO CHANGE  
CLASS/CLASSIFIED TO: IS S C RET. JUST. 22  
REV DATE 1/4/88 REVIEWER 0899 TYPE DOC. 02  
REV COORD. AUTH: HR 70-3  
C

~~SECRET~~  
CONFIDENTIAL

GROUP 1  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

~~SECRET~~

of the Harvard Management Course in some of the talks of the Program. Because of our uniqueness we should develop management techniques that suit us and are not lifted from techniques that the Harvard Business School prescribes for the Coca-Cola Company and U. S. Steel. This is all part of our desire to shrink away from the "elite" concept.

*Concern*

d. It seemed to me there was too little during the Program on the obligations that a supervisor has to develop his subordinates into the best possible assets from the Agency's point of view.

*Good*

e. More should be done to link the various talks together so that there is a running continuity to the whole Program. This could be done by the Program secretary making appropriate remarks before and after each talk, by having the lecturers summarize what has come before, or by a series of visual aids pulling the Program together.

*Good*

f. There could have been more in some of the lectures to the effect that a supervisor must always be on the lookout for ways to save money and make his shop more efficient.

*Yes*

### 3. Comments on Specific Talks:

a. Dr. Tietjen's talk: There was too little here on the obligation that a supervisor must feel in regard to the health of all his subordinates. If one of his employees is overworked, tired, or worried it is up to the supervisor to spot this and see that the man gets time off or the medical help he needs. It should be stressed that this is for the sake of efficiency and not a bleeding heart approach.

b. Mr. Fuchs' talk: Mr. Fuchs suggested that individuals who are in debt and generally not reliable should not be allowed to handle Agency money. To me the implication of this is (and I'm sure it was not so intended) that it's O.K. if these unreliable people should be tempted by money some place else (the Soviet Embassy for instance). If an Agency employee is so weak or disorganized that he is tempted to steal money then he shouldn't be in the Agency at all. As a matter of fact the least harmful thing he could do is to pick up some of Bob Fuchs' loose money; this is certainly better than taking money from the Soviets in return for favors. As soon as a supervisor

~~SECRET~~

even suspects that one of his employees might be tempted to misuse funds, he is a candidate for selection out. Here's an example of our being willing to accept standards that make us just another government agency.

c. Mr. Echols' talk: Mr. Echols covered a lot of useful ground. There was too much for people to remember, and there should be some sort of a summary made of this talk as well as of the other talks. His presentation on how to get rid of marginal employees served a very useful purpose.

25X1A

d.  talk: There was still not sufficient warning against telling all to former employees.

*Agree.*

4. The Seminar: This was good and served one very useful purpose: it gave a lot of people a chance to see some top Agency men in an intimate give-and-take situation, discussing information of vital interest to everybody. It went down well with everybody I talked to.

25X1A9a