

Moser, M.W.

THE PERSONNEL SYSTEM OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES  
An Analysis and Evaluation of the Foreign Service Officer Corps

by  
Martin W. Moser

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of the University of Maryland in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

1958

Mck  
LD  
3231  
.M70d  
MOSER,  
M. W.  
copied

UMI Number: DP70496

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI DP70496

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

## PREFACE

The administration of American Foreign affairs is a topic of increasing interest today in both academic and governmental circles. There is a growing realization that the end product of foreign policy is largely conditioned by the administrative machinery through which the policy is carried into effect. This study attempts to give the reader a better understanding of the machinery employed in the conduct of American diplomacy by focusing the spotlight on the personnel system of one of our most important agencies in the field of foreign affairs, namely, the Foreign Service of the United States.

The idea of writing a dissertation on this topic was suggested to the writer by Mr. Arthur G. Jones and Dr. Cromwell A. Riches of the Department of State. Mr. Carlisle Humelsine, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, very kindly gave his authorization for the use of Departmental facilities, and permitted the writer to have access to the non-classified files of the Department.

Generous credit should go to Mr. Arthur G. Jones and the members of his planning staff: Mr. James Henderson, Foreign Service officer, Mrs. Mary E. Mulloy, and Mr. Horace Risher Jr., for permitting the writer to share their office space and their invaluable ideas. Without their help and counsel this end product would never have materialized.

The writer would like to thank the following individuals for granting him one or more interviews, and for assisting him to collect and better understand various materials: Mr. William K. Ailshie, Mr. Harold

Chastka, Miss Fairy Cornelius, Mr. Frederick Darnell, Mr. John Finlator, Mr. Robert Freeman, Mr. Harry Hawkins, Mr. Waywood P. Martin, Dr. E. Taylor Parks, Dr. Cromwell Riches, Mr. Robert Ryan, Miss Virginia Sparks, Mr. Charles Vasaly, Mr. William Woodyear, and Mr. George L. Zier of the Department of State; Mr. James Taylor of the Department of Labor; Mr. Fred Rossiter, Mr. Horace Bolster, Mr. George Dietz, and Dr. Eric Englund of the Department of Agriculture; Mrs. Barbara Chalmers of the Foreign Service Journal; Mr. Vic Stapleton of the Economic Cooperation Administration; Dr. Harold Stein, Director, Committee on Public Administration Cases; Dr. Albert C. F. Westfall, Staff member, House Committee on Foreign Affairs; and Mr. Walter Fachler, Director, Foreign Service Review Course, George Washington University.

The writer also expresses his thanks to officers interviewed in the Department of Commerce, the Department of Interior, the U. S. Civil Service Commission, the Mutual Security Agency, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Department of Defense.

The writer expresses his appreciation to staff members of the U. S. Civil Service Commission Library, the Library of Congress, the Department of Interior Library, the Department of State Library, and the National Archives for their invaluable assistance in locating various primary and secondary source materials.

The writer would like to express his sincere thanks to Mrs. Wilbur J. Carr for permitting him to have access to the personal papers of her late and distinguished husband, the Honorable Wilbur J. Carr.

Thanks are also due to Mrs. Walter Farrell, Mrs. Olive Kelley, Miss Margaret Moser, and Mrs. Rosalie Walsh for their indefatigable assistance in typing various portions of the manuscript.

The writer owes a special debt of gratitude to Dr. Franklin L. Burdette, Professor and Head, Department of Government and Politics, University of Maryland, for his invaluable suggestions, criticisms, and inspiration. The manuscript was written under his guidance and direction, and has benefited in every way from his valuable counsel.

In spite of this excellent assistance, the writer must accept full responsibility for all that is here said or left unsaid. He alone is responsible for any errors, either in fact or in judgment, expressed herein.

304	..... BIBLIOGRAPHY	
296	..... CONCLUSION	IX
278	..... RELATED BENEFITS SALARY, ADVANCES, RETIREMENT AND	IIIA
257	..... IN SERVICE TRAINING	IIA
247	..... ASSIGNMENT AND TRANSFER	IA
222	..... AND SELECTION OUT PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, PROMOTION,	A
174	..... THE EXAMINATION PROCESS	AI
159	..... GENERALISTS & SPECIALISTS	III
106	..... RECRUITMENT	II
1	..... HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE	I
PAGE		CHAPTER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

## CHAPTER I

### HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE

The administrative process of any institution is the resultant of many influences. Its present form is a composite of practices both past and contemporary. For that reason it is difficult to understand any administrative system without some appreciation of what it has been, and how it came to be what it is.

The Foreign Service of the United States had its origin in colonial practice. Prior to the American Revolution it was the custom of the several American colonies to send agents to Great Britain to represent their individual interests.<sup>1</sup> The First Continental Congress which met in Philadelphia in 1774 attempted to obtain the services of these colonial agents for the collective cause of independence. Most of the agents declined, and only Benjamin Franklin, Arthur Lee, and William Bollen agreed to serve.<sup>2</sup>

The Second Continental Congress, which assembled in Philadelphia in 1775, appointed a special committee to exercise control over foreign affairs. This was the Committee on Secret Correspondence established by resolution on November 29, 1775.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Francis Wharton, The Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889), II, 3.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>The resolution read, "Resolved, that a committee of five be appointed for the sole purpose of corresponding with our friends in Great Britain, Ireland, and other parts of the world, and that they lay their correspondence before Congress when directed." Benjamin Franklin, Benjamin Harrison, Thomas Johnson, John Jay, and John Dickenson were elected members of the Committee, and Franklin was named Chairman. Secret Journals of the Acts

The first persons chosen to represent us abroad were Arthur Lee, then domiciled in London, and a previous correspondent of the Congress, and C. W. F. Dumas, a Swiss friend, resident at the Hague,<sup>4</sup> Silas Deane was the first diplomatic agent, however, to be sent abroad as a representative of the Congress. Deane was commissioned to go to France ostensibly as an Indian trader, but with secret instructions to ascertain French sentiment toward colonial independence, and to purchase arms and ammunition.<sup>5</sup>

On September 26, 1776, Deane was elected by Congress to serve as a joint commissioner to France with Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson declined appointment and Arthur Lee was elected to serve in his place.<sup>6</sup> The appointment of three commissioners, instead of one minister, to represent us in France, was a mistake that Congress soon recognized and corrected.<sup>7</sup> On October 21, 1778, Franklin was nominated Minister Plenipotentiary to Paris.<sup>8</sup>

---

and Proceedings of Congress, (Boston: Thomas Wait, 1820), II, 5. In April 1777 the Committee was renamed the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence, I, 456. The Committee proved unwieldy and notoriously inept, and was soon superseded by a Department of Foreign Affairs. On August 10, 1781, Robert Livingston was elected its first secretary. Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence, IV, 795.

<sup>4</sup>Lee's instructions were dated December 12, 1775. Dumas' instructions were dated December 19, 1775. Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence, II, 63, 64.

<sup>5</sup>Deane's instructions were issued on March 3, 1776. Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence. Deane had just been defeated in his attempt to win reelection to the Congress. This qualification for the diplomatic service became increasingly common under the Constitution.

<sup>6</sup>Secret Journals, II, 31, 32, 35.

<sup>7</sup>Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence, II, 592, 596, 658, 659.

<sup>8</sup>Secret Journals, II, 103. At first Congress made no attempt to fix the salaries of our diplomatic agents. In addition to actual expenses, each commissioner was to receive a "handsome allowance." Secret Journals, II, 33. In October 1779 Congress fixed the salaries of Ministers at \$11,111. Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence, III, 360.

Against the advice of France, and without regard for prevailing practice, our diplomatic agents were soon dispatched to the other courts of Europe. These states, having not recognized our independence, would not receive our agents, and after numerous rebuffs most of them returned to Paris.<sup>9</sup>

Without doubt, Benjamin Franklin was the most outstanding diplomat of the American Revolution.<sup>10</sup> His extensive diplomatic experience during the colonial period, his broad background in literature, philosophy, and science, and his warm, homespun personality, well equipped him for the delicate negotiations at Versailles. Unfortunately, for the development of the American Foreign Service, the public and a large segment of Congress remembered Franklin for two things: his "republican simplicity" at the Court of France, and his brilliant achievements in diplomacy although "wholly untrained." The first of these beliefs was subsequently utilized by Congress to justify meager salaries and allowances for our diplomatic representatives abroad, while the second fiction became a common rationale for justifying the appointment of untrained individuals to the diplomatic service.

In addressing Congress in 1828 on the subject of retrenchment, Edward Everett took exception to the first of these contentions when he said:

---

<sup>9</sup>Ralph Izard to Tuscany, May 7, 1777; William Lee to Vienna and Berlin, May 9, 1777; Arthur Lee to Madrid, May 1, 1777; and Francis Dana to Moscow, December 19, 1780. Secret Journals, II, 44, 45, 358.

<sup>10</sup>This is the opinion of such scholars as Thomas Bailey, Samuel Flagg Bemis, John W. Foster, John Hay, Elmer Plischke, and Graham H. Stuart. John Adams thought otherwise. Adams believed Franklin "too indolent and dissipated" to be a good diplomatist. Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence, III, 335.

We are always reminded of the republican simplicity of Benjamin Franklin and Livingston at the court of France. Dr. Franklin's simplicity was kept up for about eight years at an aggregate expense of \$122,000 while Livingston in addition to his allowance from the government sunk an estate of \$100,000.<sup>11</sup>

Also, an examination of Franklin's life reveals that he was one of the best trained diplomats to serve his country. Franklin spent more than twenty five years in the field of diplomacy, and over one half this experience was acquired before the Declaration of Independence.<sup>12</sup>

The Foreign Service Under the Articles of Confederation. At the close of the Revolution there were two highly divergent opinions as to the course we should follow respecting our representation abroad. On the one hand were those who believed that the return of peace would call for a "considerable addition" to the number of Ministers and Consuls representing us abroad. On the other hand, a powerful bloc in the Congress thought we should do away with our diplomatic service altogether. For example, on May 23, 1783, Mr. Carroll, seconded by Mr. Williamson, moved that no public minister should be employed by the United States except on extraordinary occasions.<sup>13</sup> Mr. Carroll suggested that his motion would not only be economical, but "would withhold our distinguished Citizens from the corrupting scenes at foreign Courts," and what was of more consequence, would prevent the residence of foreign Ministers in the United States "whose intrigues and examples might be injurious both to the Government and to the people."<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>Register of Debates in Congress, 20th Cong., 1st sess., February 1, 1828, (Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1828), IV, 1305.

<sup>12</sup>Benjamin Franklin, Autobiography, (New York: Heritage Press, 1951).

<sup>13</sup>Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1887), XXV, 967.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

Those opposed to Mr. Carroll's notion suggested that the exchange of diplomatic agents was an established practice of civilized nations, that diplomatists prevented hostile collisions through mutual and friendly explanations, and that a "young Republic ought not to incur the odium of so singular and as it might be thought disrespectful innovation."<sup>16</sup>

Mr. Carroll's resolution was a reply to the "Alexander Hamilton Report" of May 9, 1783, on the conduct of foreign affairs.<sup>16</sup> The Hamilton report favored the maintenance of permanent legations abroad. It recommended that no diplomatic representative of the United States should be higher than a Minister Plenipotentiary. Ministers would receive a salary of \$8,000 per annum. Ministers would be vested with consular powers, and in addition to their diplomatic duties, were to serve as Consuls-General. As many vice consuls were to be appointed as our trading interests would seem to make desirable. Finally, when Secretaries of Embassy were appointed, they were to receive salaries of \$1,000 per annum.

The division of opinion as to the proper employment of a diplomatic service had its genesis in the Revolutionary argument between the Benjamin Franklin school and the supporters of John and Samuel Adams. Franklin favored a diplomatic service established according to international law with one chief executive and one designated foreign representative.<sup>17</sup> The Adams faction favored a series of delegated representatives

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., XXIV, 334-336. Referred to in this paper as the Alexander Hamilton Report, because it originally appeared in his handwriting.

<sup>17</sup>Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence, I, 461.

under strict Congressional control. They were opposed to diplomacy as a system.<sup>18</sup> John Adams advised his fellow countrymen that the undiplomatic approach was usually the most successful.<sup>19</sup> He believed that our foreign relations with other states ought to be free from the artificial shackles which international law had imposed. We should approach other nations solely on the basis of republican simplicity.<sup>20</sup> Diplomats were the playthings of decadent monarchs and repugnant to our institutions.

The Puritan weltanschauung was much better conditioned, therefore, to the military approach. Negotiation and compromise were alien to its system. What we needed in our international relations was a straightforward, frontal attack, and not the devious approach of the diplomat. The justice of our cause would carry the battle. Sam Adams was an excellent example. Adams believed "tyranny must be torn up root and branch."<sup>21</sup> He believed Britain was corrupt and would succumb to a moral crusade. He distrusted France and the other monarchies on the continent. To Sam Adams the issue was plain. One does not negotiate with the devil.

On the other hand, to Washington, Franklin, and those who shared their point of view, the issues were not so perspicuous. They favored the discharge of our international responsibilities through the conventional media

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

<sup>19</sup>"I have long since learned that a man may give offence to a court in which he is sent and yet succeed....No man will ever be pleasing at a court in general who is not depraved in his morals or warped from your interests." J. Adams to Gerry, September 2, 1783, Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence, VI, 670.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., I, 289.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., I, 254. See also Elisabeth Lawson ed., Samuel Adams: Selections From His Writings, (New York: International Publishers, 1946).

of diplomacy. They believed an hour of direct intercourse between responsible Ministers was often worth months of written communications. To them, international relations was a continual resolution of ever present problems among states, and not the absolute solution of major controversies at infrequent intervals. Unfortunately, America's thinking on foreign affairs has been largely shaped by the Puritanical approach of the Adams, instead of the more realistic approach of Washington and Franklin.

Early Constitutional Development. The Constitution of the United States provides that the President "shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint, Ambassadors, other Public Ministers, and Consuls."<sup>22</sup> Over the exercise of this power, no control is given by the Constitution to Congress.

In his speech at the opening of the second session of the first Congress, President Washington brought the subject before the two Houses in the following terms:

The interest of the United States requires that our intercourse with other nations should be facilitated by such provisions as will enable me to fulfill my duty in that respect, in the manner in which circumstances may render most conducive to the public good; and to this end, that the compensations to be made to the persons who may be employed, should, according to the nature of their appointments, be defined by law; and a competent fund designated, for defraying the expenses incident to the conduct of our Foreign Affairs.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Article II, Section 2. The Attorney General of the United States has determined that "other Public Ministers" includes all categories of diplomatic agents. 7 Opinions of the U. S. Attorney General, 193.

<sup>23</sup> Annals of Congress, 1st Cong., 2d sess., January 1790, (Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1834), I, 933.

In the debate that followed this request of the President, the question arose whether it would be better to appropriate one lump sum for foreign intercourse, over which the President would exercise substantial discretion, with Congress simply establishing maximum salary and expense limits, or whether it would be better to permit the Senate to participate in the apportionment of particular salaries. The majority of the House believed that the former course would prove the wiser of the two alternatives.<sup>24</sup> In the first place all factions admitted that the Congress did not at present have the information needed to make such decisions. It was further argued that the money might be wanting during a recess of the Senate, and that it would hardly be expedient to call that body together for such a small matter. It was also judged prudent to leave the amount at the discretion of the President since officers of equal rank might well be compensated with a less sum at some courts than at others. No danger could arise from this executive discretion since the maximum sums would be fixed by law. Mr. Smith believed that a sharing of the power between the Executive and the Senate might "open a door for cabal" if a friend of a Senator were employed on such a mission.<sup>25</sup>

On July 1, 1790, the majority opinion was given statutory effect.<sup>26</sup> The President was authorized to draw from the Treasury a sum not exceeding

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., I, 1081 ff.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., I, 1082.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., II, 2252; 1 U. S. Statutes 128 (1790). President Washington had already made three diplomatic appointments before this bill became law. The designation of the officers was "derived from the Law of Nations and the authority to appoint under the Constitution." 7 Opinions of the U. S. Attorney General, 193, 194.

\$40,000 per annum for the support of the diplomatic establishment. Exclusive of outfits, Ministers were to be allowed a maximum of \$9,000 a year and Charge des Affaires \$4,500 a year. An outfit was not to exceed one year's full salary. The act was limited to a period of two years by general agreement. It was believed the diplomatic service might become unnecessary in future years and Congress did not want to be bridled with a permanent appropriation.<sup>27</sup> The amount of \$40,000 was decided upon on the basis of two ministers and two charge des affaires.<sup>28</sup>

The next law on the subject was passed February 9, 1793.<sup>29</sup> It continued the act of 1790 for another year amending it slightly to provide for a more exact method of settlement. Several similar acts were passed at subsequent sessions of Congress until on May 10, 1800, the first permanent law was enacted.<sup>30</sup> It contained no appropriations. For the first time the appropriations for the expense of intercourse with foreign states was transferred to the general appropriation act.

On May 1, 1810, the act providing for foreign intercourse contained another innovation.<sup>31</sup> Until this time the appropriation acts had contained one item for the conduct of foreign affairs, viz., for the expense of foreign intercourse. From 1810 to 1814 there were two items included

<sup>27</sup> Annals of Congress, I, 1094.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> 1 U. S. Statutes 299 (1793).

<sup>30</sup> 2 U. S. Statutes 78 (1800).

<sup>31</sup> 2 U. S. Statutes 608 (1810).

in the appropriation. One item was for the expense of foreign representation, and the other item was for the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse. The first sum embraced salaries. The second was placed entirely at the discretion of the President, and he was authorized to spend it for such contingent expenses arising from foreign intercourse as he should think just and equitable.<sup>32</sup>

In April 1818 the general appropriation act contained the usual item for the salaries of Ministers, Charges des Affaires, and Secretaries. But unlike prior acts the 1818 bill specified the posts by name.<sup>33</sup> Included also, was the usual appropriation for contingent expenses. From that date until the legislation of 1855 the practice was to provide for certain ministers at certain places. This enumeration did not serve in any way, however, to restrict the Constitutional power of the President to select diplomatic officers of his choosing.<sup>34</sup> Originally, therefore, the whole appropriation for foreign intercourse was placed at the general discretion of the President. After 1814 this carte blanche authority was limited to the contingent fund.

It is not to be presumed that the Congressional hostility toward the diplomatic service disappeared after the adoption of the Constitution.

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> 3 U. S. Statutes 422 (1818).

<sup>34</sup> 7 Opinions of the U. S. Attorney General, 212.

On the contrary, there were long and acrimonious debates. A powerful House minority, led by the capable Albert Gallatin, favored abolishing the diplomatic service altogether.<sup>35</sup>

The major thesis of the Gallatin bloc was that a diplomatic service would involve us in the politics of Europe. For example, Mr. Mason said that from 1776 the foreign diplomatic representatives in the United States had done much more harm to our national interest than our diplomatic agents in foreign states had done good.<sup>36</sup> The foreign diplomats, he maintained, were constantly intriguing to get the United States involved in issues that were basically of no concern of ours.<sup>37</sup>

While the minority favored the abolition of the diplomatic service, they did not favor the dissolution of the consular service. Gallatin believed there was a distinct difference between foreign commercial intercourse and foreign political intercourse, and it was the latter he wished to discontinue.<sup>38</sup> Our commercial intercourse, he believed, could be safely entrusted to our consular officers.<sup>39</sup>

Several members of the minority went so far as to favor the elimination of all forms of government support to foreign intercourse. These members, the representatives of the agricultural areas, reflected the tenor of the Physiocratic thinking of their day. A typical spokesman

<sup>35</sup> Annals of Congress, 5th Congress, 2d sess., VII, 856.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., VII, 1111.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., VII, 856

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., VII, 851

was Mr. Claiborne of Tennessee. Claiborne reminded his fellow Congressmen that agriculture was the leading interest of our country, and required our primary care. Nations resorted to commerce, he argued, not from desire but rather from necessity. So long as we were favored with a sufficient quantity of fertile land, like the French, we should devote our primary attention to the pursuit of agriculture, leaving the smaller commercial interest to shift for itself.<sup>40</sup>

The minority also expressed the fear that the diplomatic service might become a powerful instrument of executive patronage. As such it could be used to bribe members of the legislature into conformity with the President. It was a well known fact, the House was reminded, that the diplomatic corps "was filled by draughts from Congress."<sup>41</sup> By increasing the size of the diplomatic service, therefore, Congressmen were increasing their own chances for an executive appointment. By curtailing the size of the diplomatic service, and eventually doing away with it altogether, Gallatin thought such evil practices could be curtailed, and the integrity of an independent Congress assured.<sup>42</sup>

Mr. Baldwin believed that a curtailment of the diplomatic service had been favored by those who founded the Republic.<sup>43</sup> He said it was the general belief of the Second Continental Congress that the diplomatic service had been overexpanded during the war, and the Congress

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., VII, 1209.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., VII, 851

<sup>42</sup>Ibid..

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., VII, 864.

was taking steps to correct this situation at the close of the Confederation. As diplomatic appointments expired they were not renewed. He well remembered that "clusters of candidates for these appointments, supported by powerful interests and connexions, were uniformly resisted."<sup>44</sup> To his memory all appropriations for foreign ministers were refused at the first session. He added that after President Washington had made his official request to Congress for the establishment of a diplomatic service, he had privately confided to several members of the Congress that he considered the diplomatic service to be of a temporary nature, "respecting the Northern forts and the property that was withheld."<sup>45</sup>

The minority concluded their case by stating that it was foolish to argue that the United States would lose prestige if she were not represented by diplomatic agents at the various foreign courts. Rather, a republic would lose prestige if she attempted to copy monarchical institutions unsuited to the temper of her people. Switzerland, although "in the neighborhood of European princes" maintained no ministers at their courts, yet had the respect of all.<sup>46</sup>

The supporters of the Administration began their rebuttal by stating that it was impossible to separate the commercial aspects of foreign relations from those political in nature.<sup>47</sup> The one set of

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., VII, 1211.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., VII, 871.

problems grew out of the other. Nor would it be possible to call upon our consular officials to handle the political questions that might arise. Consuls were circumscribed in their spheres of activity and in their powers, and were not recognized in the Courts of Europe.<sup>48</sup> While Congress might find such a system repugnant to our institutions, we could not change it by unilateral action.

It was further argued that the President was charged by the Constitution with the responsibility for discharging our foreign interests. If the Congress refused to appropriate money for accredited diplomatic officers responsible to the government, the President would probably appoint spies and secret agents responsible only to himself.<sup>49</sup> By curtailing the diplomatic service the Congress would not insure that our relations with foreign states would cease, only that the participation by Congress in those relations would be curtailed.

Mr. Griswold pointed out that if we did elect not to send Ministers to other countries, that would not prevent other countries from sending their agents to the United States.<sup>50</sup> Since the Constitution gave the President the power to receive ambassadors and other public ministers, Congress was powerless to limit the President in this respect. Mr. Griswold believed the arguments of the Gallatin minority somewhat

---

<sup>48</sup>Ibid. By the term "not recognized" the Members of Congress meant that the Consul had no diplomatic status, and as such would not be received in the Courts of Europe.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., VII, 933.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., VII, 895.

puerile. As one Administration supporter pointed out, their polemics may have been prompted by the fact that one of the ministers to be reduced was a former Administration spokesman in Congress, and the other the son of the President.<sup>51</sup>

While partisan politics did play a very important part in the protracted debate, it is also true that the minority argument was built on ideas originally propounded by John and Samuel Adams.<sup>52</sup> Reinforced by the logic of Washington's Farewell Address and the growing spirit of isolation, they now employed the arguments against the Adams administration. Nor did the arguments die with the early days of the Republic. Until World War II we can find numerous and powerful supporters both in and out of Congress who favored the abolition of the diplomatic service.

Coming into existence under the above circumstances, it is little wonder that at that time no one seriously contemplated the establishment of a permanent, professional, career foreign service. On the contrary, the early legislation covering the diplomatic service definitely favored a very short tenure overseas. The law of 1790 provided each diplomat with a prescribed salary and an outfit not to exceed one year's full salary.<sup>53</sup> The outfit could be paid by the President for any length of service the only restrictions being that it could not be paid more than

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., VIII, 1222. Thomas Pinckney of South Carolina, and John Quincy Adams.

<sup>52</sup> Supra.

<sup>53</sup> Supra.

once for a given mission, and that it could not exceed one year's salary.<sup>54</sup> On his return to the United States the Minister was given an "infirmit" equal to three month's salary. This payment was made on the principle that the officer was to be regarded as continuing in office until a reasonable time had been allowed him to return home and resume his private pursuits.<sup>55</sup> Thus, if a diplomatist were sent as Minister to Paris he received a salary of \$9,000 per annum, an outfit of \$9,000 and on his return to the United States, an infirmit of \$2,250. If the minister served for one year, and then returned home, he received a total remuneration of \$20,250. If he remained at his post for two years he received a total of \$29,250 for his services, or an average of \$14,625 per annum. If he remained at the same post four years, his average yearly income fell to \$11,812.50. Sometimes, as in the case of James Monroe, a diplomat might be shifted from one overseas post to another, qualifying him for an additional outfit. In this manner Monroe collected \$18,000 in outfits in a little over four months.<sup>56</sup> But, generally, it was to the Minister's financial advantage to return home after a relatively short tenure abroad. Since it took the Minister approximately a year to familiarize himself with the general routine of

---

54

1 Opinions of the U. S. Attorney General, 543.

55

2 Opinions of the U. S. Attorney General, 545. Infirmit were first given a statutory basis in 3 U. S. Statutes 501 (1819).

56

Register of Debates in Congress, 20th Cong., 1st sess., February 1, 1828, p. 1305.

the job, to say nothing of the time needed to acquaint oneself with the foreign personalities and the other complex details involved, the Minister usually found it most convenient finally to return home at that very time when his government found it most advantageous for him to remain abroad. This practice of giving outfits and outfits remained in effect until the passage of the law of 1856.<sup>57</sup>

Origin of the Consular Service. The American consular service evolved from the fiscal necessities of the American Revolution. By the treaty of amity and commerce concluded with France on February 6, 1778, the United States first formally recognized the right of consular representation.<sup>58</sup> The treaty granted mutually the right to each nation to appoint in the ports of the other consuls, vice consuls, agents and commissioners. Article 29 of the treaty stipulated that the functions of consuls should be regulated by a particular agreement to be negotiated later. This special agreement defining the functions and powers of consular officers was not concluded until ten years later.<sup>59</sup> Unlike France, and despite the numerous complaints of our political representatives abroad, we did not take immediate advantage of the convention, and continued to be represented abroad in consular affairs by our diplomatic agents.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> 11 U. S. Statutes 36 (1856).

<sup>58</sup> Secret Journals of Congress, II, 59.

<sup>59</sup> The agreement, negotiated by Jefferson, was signed November 14, 1788, and approved by the Senate on July 29, 1789. It was the first treaty approved by that body. 1 U. S. Statutes 106 (1789).

<sup>60</sup> Franklin and John Adams wrote numerous letters to the Congress praying that consular officers be appointed. See Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence, III, 202, 551, 825.

Our first consul, Colonel William Palfrey, was appointed on November 4, 1780, but never arrived at his post since his ship was lost in a storm.<sup>61</sup> Thomas Barclay was commissioned vice consul and sent to succeed him.<sup>62</sup> When it was definitely ascertained that Palfrey was dead, Barclay was elevated to the rank of consul. His exequatur was granted by the French government on October 3, 1782.<sup>63</sup> Barclay thus became our first officially appointed consul.

On October 28, 1785, Congress, acting upon the earlier recommendations by Hamilton and Jay, and against the advice of Benjamin Franklin and John Adams, united the diplomatic and consular establishments.<sup>64</sup> The unification was achieved by conferring the title of Consul General on our Ministers, and where there was no Minister, on the Charge des Affaires.<sup>65</sup> This resolution would not prevent the appointment of purely consular officials in those countries where we had no diplomatic representation. Accordingly, in January 1786 Samuel Shaw, a Boston tea merchant, was elected Consul at Canton, China, and Thomas Randal was elected Vice Consul.<sup>66</sup> Shaw and Randal were to receive no salary, fees, or other emoluments of office, but were permitted to engage in private trade.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., IV, 204, 282.

<sup>62</sup>By coincidence the second British consul to the United States was also named Thomas Barclay. He succeeded Sir John Temple in 1799. G. L. Rives, Correspondence of Thomas Barclay, (New York: Harpers, 1894), p. 95.

<sup>63</sup>Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence, V, 796.

<sup>64</sup>Secret Journals, III, 595; Journals of the Continental Congress, XXIX, 866.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid.

<sup>66</sup>Secret Journals, III, 605, 606; Journals of the Continental Congress, XXX, 28, 30.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid.

Originally, the consular service was established on a salary basis. Palfrey was to receive an annual emolument of \$1,500 "in lieu of all commissions done on account of the United States."<sup>68</sup> The resolution of 1785, however, discontinued all consular salaries. Compensation was then left open to private arrangement between consuls and those who availed themselves of consular services. In subsequent commissions, however, it was expressly limited to such fees or perquisites as should be expressly established by Congress.<sup>69</sup>

On March 16, 1784, on the advice of Jay and Franklin, Congress resolved that "it is inconsistent with the interest of the U. S. to appoint any person not a citizen thereof, to the office of Minister, Charge des Affaires, Consul, Vice Consul or to any other civil Department in a foreign country."<sup>70</sup>

Jay was strongly opposed to any system under which the American consuls would be remunerated by fees which they would collect.<sup>71</sup> In his reports to the Congress dated October 13 and 31, 1785, he said that he did not believe consuls should have any salaries but should be permitted to engage in private trade. In those ports where it was impossible to make a livelihood by means of private trade, Congress should provide a moderate stipend. Under all cases he thought it would be prudent to prevent consuls from demanding fees or other perquisites for their services.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Letter Book MSS, November 4, 1780, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

<sup>70</sup> Secret Journals, III, 451; Journals of the Continental Congress, XXVI, 144.

<sup>71</sup> Journals of the Continental Congress, XXIX, 831-32, 860.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

Franklin was not irrevocably opposed to fees, or to a combination of fees and private trade, if the consuls were American citizens. If they did make fortunes, Franklin believed they would return with them to the United States, and the country as a whole would thus benefit.<sup>73</sup>

Placing the American consular system on a fee or a private trade basis was to be of much more harm to us than to the countries from whom we copied the practice.<sup>74</sup> Those countries had many of their own citizens established in ports abroad who had wide business knowledge and contacts. We had very few. The American who had recently taken up residence abroad desired the consular appointments for the prestige it would lend, and the subsequent advantages in business it might offer. With the help of his friends at home he was generally able to bring about the appointment. Frequently, the fledgling consul was not successful in his business venture and found the emoluments of consular office far less than he was led to expect. Under such conditions, the consul often resorted to practices of a questionable character, which eventually destroyed his value as an official representative of the United States.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup>Letter from Franklin to Committee on Foreign Affairs, May 26, 1779, Wharton, Diplomatic Correspondence, III, 191.

<sup>74</sup>"The Daniel Strobel Report," Senate Report 57, 21st Cong., 2d sess., February 16, 1831. The United States copied its fee system from the Dutch, Danes, Swedes, and Hanseatic towns, who appointed their consuls from among opulent merchants of their respective nations, permanently residing in foreign ports. Great Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, and Russia used a salary system. Senate Report 57, February 16, 1831.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution there was no settled legal basis or policy for consular appointment. The Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, undertook the task of organizing a consular system. During the first three years of his presidency, Washington had appointed 17 consuls and 5 vice consuls, whose remuneration was to be derived from business and fees.<sup>76</sup> Jefferson undertook to define their duties. He instructed them to report concerning American vessels that may have entered or cleared their respective ports, to supply political and commercial information, to report on all military operations in their theatre and, if war looked imminent, to notify American merchants and vessels so that they might be on their guard.<sup>77</sup>

It was not until 1792, however, that a law was enacted providing for the duties of a consul.<sup>78</sup> The duties prescribed by this statute were limited almost wholly to the protection of the interests of American citizens, particularly seamen. It was not until much later that the idea of extending American trade and protecting the government from customs frauds became basic functions of our consular practice. Subsequent acts of 1803<sup>79</sup> and 1825<sup>80</sup> enlarged the duties of consular officers with respect to seamen, vessels, and notarial services, but the act of 1792 continued for more than a half century to be the only law of importance designating consular duties and functions.

---

<sup>76</sup> Foreign Letters, MSS, 399, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> 1 U. S. Statutes 254 (1792).

<sup>79</sup> 2 U. S. Statutes 203 (1803).

<sup>80</sup> Senate Document 57, 21st Cong., 2d sess., 1830.

The growth of trade and the development of commercial intercourse between the United States and foreign nations increased the importance of consular functions. Congress appropriately enlarged the jurisdiction of consuls, but unwisely did not increase control over their conduct. Uniformity in consular practice was completely lacking. Martin Van Buren, Secretary of State under Andrew Jackson, stated that each consul apparently by his personal decision decided how much to charge for a specific consular service, and these charges varied appreciably from consulate to consulate.<sup>81</sup> Jackson, himself, informed Congress that a complete revision of the consular service was advisable and to that end promised to submit later a detailed report carrying his recommendations.<sup>82</sup> The task of preparing such a report fell upon Jackson's new Secretary of State, Edward Livingston, who promptly submitted his report on March 2, 1835.<sup>83</sup> Livingston proposed a salaried consular corps composed of 30 consuls who would receive salaries of \$2,000 each, and 126 vice consuls and agents who would receive salaries averaging \$1,000 each. He condemned the existing fee system as being the major cause of our consular difficulties. "...Our consuls, with very few exceptions," he said, "are commission merchants, anxious like all other merchants to increase their business and obtain consignments....."<sup>84</sup> He believed the consuls

---

<sup>81</sup>Ibid.

<sup>82</sup>James D. Richardson, A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, (New York: Bureau of National Literature, 1897), III, 1117.

<sup>83</sup>Senate Document 83, 22d Cong., 2d sess., March 2, 1835.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

at least, if not the vice consuls, ought to be salaried officers.<sup>85</sup>

Livingston's report on the consular service was an excellent document and although Congress did not see fit to enact its provisions into law at that time it did serve as the basis for all attempts at reform during the next several decades.

Several days before, Livingston had presented a similar report on the diplomatic service.<sup>86</sup> The Secretary decried the low state to which the Service had fallen and believed the major causal factor to be a lack of funds.<sup>87</sup> Livingston cited numerous letters received by the Department of State from our diplomatic representatives abroad complaining of difficulties entailed in attempting to subsist on the annual allowance. John Quincy Adams complained that the salary of a Chief of Mission was insufficient to support a man with a family "not in the style of high official rank, but in the decency becoming a private gentleman."<sup>88</sup> Livingston also cited the utter lack of record keeping in many of the legations and proposed a system for a more orderly maintenance of legation archives. For the first time we find a proposal for a career service. Livingston hoped that a system might be designed in which the young diplomatic secretaries of talent would be able to rise to the top positions in the service.<sup>89</sup> Congress was not

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> House Executive Document 94, 22d Cong., 2d sess., February 7, 1833.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid.

moved by the report, however, and no legislative action was taken to reform the service for twenty years.

During these long years the prospect of establishing a career service was not only remote, it was not even seriously considered. Occasionally, a lone voice cried out for reform, but it was quickly submerged by a rising tide of patronage and spoils. From the beginning, political considerations were the major basis for appointment in either the diplomatic or the consular service. It would be erroneous to assume that the practice was introduced by Andrew Jackson. President Washington wrote:

I shall not, whilst I have the honor to administer the government, bring a man into any office of consequence, knowingly, whose political tenets are adverse to the measures which the general government are pursuing; for this in my opinion, would be a sort of political suicide.<sup>90</sup>

Washington's appointments to the diplomatic and consular services were made chiefly on political and family grounds, precisely as they had long been made in England. Probably, the Federalists did not remove officers for similar reasons because (a) most office holders were appointed by them and (b) the Federalists recognized the English idea of the vested property right of an incumbent.

When Jefferson became President, he attempted to realign the government service so that positions would be about equally divided between the Republicans and the Federalists. Political considerations were also paramount during the administrations of Madison, Monroe, and

---

<sup>90</sup> Letter from George Washington to Timothy Pickering, September 27, 1795, Jared Sparks, ed., The Writings of George Washington, (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1837), II, 74.

the younger Adams.<sup>91</sup> That removals were not more extensive during their Presidential tenures can, in large part, be attributed to the fact that the incumbents, coming from the wealthy seaboard families, largely reflected the political and social philosophies of the aforementioned Presidents. Most of these wealthy seaboard appointees did not share the views of President Jackson. It would appear, therefore, that Jackson was justified in removing those who held "positions of consequence." While this may have been sufficient cause for their removal, however, it did not justify the many incompetent persons who were appointed in their place. There has probably been too much stress placed, however, on the part Jackson played in initiating the spoils system into government. According to the best estimates available, Jackson replaced, during the eight years of his presidency, about one government employee in six, leaving more than 9,000 out of 11,000 undisturbed.<sup>92</sup> The proportion of Jefferson's removals was almost as large.

Those who would censure Jackson usually overlook several salient points. First, it is a common historical vice to judge the conduct of men of earlier times by standards which they did not know. Both the

---

<sup>91</sup>See Thomas Jefferson, The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, 7 vols., Printed by order of Congress, (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1871); Stanislaus Hamilton, ed., The Writings of James Monroe, 7 vols., (New York: O. P. Putnam's Sons, 1900); James Madison, Letters and Other Writings of James Madison, 4 vols., (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1865); John Q. Adams, Diary of John Q. Adams, 1794-1846, (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928).

<sup>92</sup>See J. Spencer Bassett, ed., The Correspondence of Andrew Jackson, (Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1926-35), vols. IV, and V; Marquis James, Andrew Jackson: Portrait of a President, (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1937).

Federalists and the Republicans were committed to the rule of patronage. The spoils system in New York, for example, was not originated by backwoods Jacksonians, but rather by the landed aristocracy. It evolved primarily from the disputes of great family interests. Secondly, it should be remembered that originally the spoils system was a democratic innovation. It swept away the vestige of the hereditary public office along English lines which might otherwise have been adopted. It prevented the creation of vested offices which, over the span of time, become non-existent in function, but increasingly remunerative in pay and perquisites. Finally, the idea of a permanent diplomatic service would have seemed absurd to the Jacksonian democrat conditioned by the idea of backwoods equality. It was his cherished belief that any American citizen, regardless of his education or experience, was just as competent as any other American citizen to fill a position of honor in the government service. The idea of a life long devotion to a single, narrow line of endeavor seemed ridiculous to the versatile pioneer. A good pioneer had to perform a diversity of functions, and a narrow specialist would have found it difficult to subsist on the frontier. This theory, that special training is not required for a successful government career, has profoundly influenced American public life, and is still a point of contention in the Foreign Service today. Ironically, the focus has shifted. It is now argued, by those in control of the Service, that the new recruit must be a versatile, jack-of-all-trades. On the other hand, those outside the Service call for more specialization. In large part, both the old and the new claims for versatility flow from the same fountainhead. The early diplomat,

much the same as the early pioneer, was injected into a simple institutional framework. Success was dependent upon the ability to perform, with a minimum of skill, a wide diversity of functions. When the simple economy of the frontier became a thing of the past, so also did the versatile pioneer. The jack-of-all-trades and master of none gave way to the specialist in industry, business, and agriculture. Now that diplomacy has become an intricate science involving innumerable technical and specialized facets, specialists must also be provided in sufficient numbers if the service is to function at maximum efficiency. As we shall attempt to indicate below, however, this does not imply that the specialists should not have a very broad service outlook. The value of a specialist in the Foreign Service who can only see his one small segment of the overall foreign policy picture is definitely circumscribed. It is difficult to defend the specialist who would advance the interests served by his specialization at the expense of the overall national interest. On the other hand, it is probably also true that the Foreign Service has not yet fully utilized the specialized skills needed in a modern diplomatic service.

The diplomatic service expanded rather slowly. The original appropriation during Washington's first administration was made on the basis of two ministers and two charges d'affaires.<sup>93</sup> In 1802 under Jefferson's administration the total number of diplomatic officers abroad including chiefs of mission, secretaries, and commissioners totaled 18.<sup>94</sup> During Monroe's administration agents were sent to many

---

<sup>93</sup> Opinions of the U. S. Attorney General, 214.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid.

of the new states in South America to ascertain the stability of the newly established governments. These agents were paid from the contingency fund.<sup>96</sup> In 1830 we find only five posts, Great Britain, France, Russia, Spain and Colombia with envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary, and only one, the Netherlands, with a minister. In twelve other capitals the United States was represented by Charge d'Affaires bringing our total number of diplomatic posts to 18.<sup>96</sup> The expenditures for foreign intercourse during the first forty years of the Republic totaled roughly \$14 million or approximately \$350,000 a year.<sup>97</sup>

The first great reform bill for the diplomatic and consular service was introduced into the House of Representatives by Mr. John Perkins of Louisiana in 1854.<sup>98</sup> Perkins had made a thorough study of the foreign service and had received numerous suggestions from diplomatic and consular officers abroad. Through his able advocacy of the measure it was enacted into law on March 1, 1855.<sup>99</sup> The Attorney-General found so many legal defects in the statute, however, that Congress was forced to pass a similar law the following year which excluded these constitutional objections.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

<sup>97</sup> Register of Debates in Congress, April 13, 1832, p. 780.

<sup>98</sup> House Report 348, 33rd Cong., 1st sess., 1854.

<sup>99</sup> 10 U. S. Statutes 619 (1855).

<sup>100</sup>

7 Opinions of the U. S. Attorney General, 215, 267

The law of 1856<sup>101</sup> was designed to gather into one general scheme the large number of unrelated and quasi independent offices, prescribe rules and regulations for their functioning, and to provide a more definite and equitable compensation. It was our first attempt to obtain anything like organization or systematized legislation upon the subject, either in our diplomatic intercourse with foreign nations or in the consular establishment.

The law divided consuls into two classes, and the incumbents in these two classes were to receive salaries ranging from \$500 to \$1,500 in lieu of commissions and fees. The more important consuls, viz., those earning \$1,500 or more, were not permitted to engage in private trade. Those in the lower group were to be paid salaries of \$500 to \$1,000 per annum and were permitted to engage in trade. All consular agents not included in these two salaried groups were to be compensated as before by fees.

Mr. Mason, in attacking the old fee system and championing the substitution of a fixed salary scale, pointed out that such a recommendation had been made by every Secretary of State since Livingston.<sup>102</sup> He believed the fee system to be grossly unfair. While some consuls barely received a living wage, others received more than any other functionary of the Government.

---

<sup>101</sup> 11 U. S. Statutes 52 (1856).

<sup>102</sup> Congressional Globe, 33rd Cong., 2d sess., February 24, 1855, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1855), p. 917.

The abortive act of 1855 limited the appointment of consuls to American citizens. Since the Constitution vests the power to appoint consuls exclusively in the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Attorney General Cushing did not believe Congress had the power to impose any mandatory reservations upon this grant.<sup>103</sup> Consequently, the provision was not inserted in the act of 1858. Congress continued to express dissatisfaction, however, with the number of foreigners who represented us abroad in consular capacities. A part of this crusade for a one hundred per cent American service was probably engendered by an understandable desire on the part of the Congress to make available more consular positions for their deserving constituents. On the other hand, the questionable practices engaged in by these foreign consular agents were common knowledge throughout Europe. Passports frauds were perpetrated so frequently that a popular expression on the continent was that "you can be manufactured an American as low as fifty cents, or if of a higher fabric, for fifteen to thirty dollars."<sup>104.</sup>

One of the most important provisions of the law was that which granted the President the right to prescribe regulations for the duties and functions of diplomatic and consular officers not otherwise forbidden by law. As we shall see, a good deal of the subsequent reform was based upon such executive action.

The act created a new salary scale for our diplomatic officers abroad. Our ministers at London and Paris were to receive annual

---

<sup>103</sup> 7 Opinions of the U. S. Attorney General, 215.

<sup>104</sup> Congressional Globe, February 11, 1855, p. 363.

salaries of \$17,500; those to Russia, Austria, Prussia, Spain, Brazil, Mexico, and China were fixed at \$12,000; all others were to receive \$10,000. Ministers Resident were to receive seventy five per cent of this amount and Charges d'Affaires fifty per cent. Secretaries of Legation could be appointed at the discretion of the President with salaries ranging from \$1,500 to \$5,000 per annum.<sup>106</sup>

The act discontinued the payment of outfits and infits. Mr. Perkins believed the payment for these items to be undemocratic and extremely costly. He pointed out that from 1800 to 1822 approximately one-third of the entire expense of the Foreign Service was for outfits, infits and contingent expenses.<sup>106</sup> From 1840 to 1852 diplomatic expenses totaled \$3,656,202 of which roughly one-sixth was spent for outfits alone.<sup>107</sup> Mr. Perkins also pointed out that the payment of outfits encouraged short tenures overseas. The discontinuance of such payments would encourage longer service overseas and would, therefore, increase the efficiency of the Service. Mr. Badger facetiously disagreed. He pointed out that the sole purpose of the diplomatic service was to provide sinecures for "good fellows" abroad, and since frequent rotations gave more men the opportunity to serve overseas, who could honestly say that the new system would be more efficient.<sup>108</sup>

<sup>106</sup> The salaries were not to begin, however, until the officer had arrived at his post.

<sup>106</sup> Congressional Globe, February 11, 1855, p. 359.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., February 24, 1855, p. 919

One novel feature of the 1856 bill was the provision for twenty-five consular pupils at salaries not to exceed \$1,000 per annum.<sup>109</sup> These pupils were to be appointed by the President after a thorough examination, and would then be assigned to the various consulates as apprentices.<sup>110</sup> After acquiring proficiency in a foreign language and consular practice the pupil would be eligible for appointment as vice consul and consul.<sup>111</sup> This was the first legislative attempt to place a part of the Foreign Service on a career basis. Substantial opposition to the provision was voiced in Congress, many members viewing it as a distinct threat to their own patronage.<sup>112</sup> Consequently, at the next session, Congress not only refused to appropriate money for the salaries of the pupils, but repealed the provision providing for their appointment.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> 11 U. S. Statutes 55 (1856). The term consular pupils (les élèves consuls) first occurs in our diplomatic history in a consular convention concluded in 1853 between the United States and France. The Convention provided that the pupils were to enjoy the same privileges as other consular officials. House Miscellaneous Document 77, 37th Cong., 2d sess., April 1864.

<sup>110</sup> 11 U. S. Statutes 55 (1856).

<sup>111</sup> Ibid.

<sup>112</sup> Congressional Globe, 34th Cong., 2d sess., January 19, 1857, p. 364

<sup>113</sup> 11 U. S. Statutes 160. See also House Executive Document 14, 37th Cong., 3d sess., February 1857. The reasons given by the members of congress for the repeal of the provision were numerous and varied. Senator Quitman believed the diplomacy of the United States should be "the diplomacy of the backwoods" and not that of European-style career diplomats. Other Senators argued that at best it was a system to permit the appointment of incompetent men as consuls, knowing that the consular pupil would do his work for him. Congressional Globe, 34th Cong., 2d sess, January 19, 1857, p. 369.

Several attempts were made to restore the provision for consular pupils in subsequent bills presented to Congress. Secretary of State W. L. Marcy, originator of the expression, "to the victors belong the spoils" was a staunch advocate of career consular pupils.<sup>114</sup> He argued that career subordinates responsible to the Department in Washington would provide an excellent check on the independent politically appointed consul.<sup>115</sup> If the consul were not permitted to choose his subordinates, he reasoned, it would be much more difficult for him to enter into collusion with them for the purpose of committing defalcations. Secretary Cass tried several times to get the provision reenacted but to no avail.<sup>116</sup> In 1859 the House Committee on Foreign Affairs recommended the reestablishment of the corps of consular pupils.<sup>117</sup> Consular pupils were to be at least 18, able "to write a good hand", thoroughly acquainted with arithmetic, American history, geography, English grammar, and bookkeeping.<sup>118</sup> Candidates who presented a facility in one or more foreign languages were to be preferred.<sup>119</sup> Unfortunately, nothing

---

<sup>114</sup> House Executive Document 68, 35th Cong., 2d sess., January 1859.

<sup>115</sup> Letter from Marcy to Hunter, January 3, 1857, quoted in House Executive Document 68, January 1859.

<sup>116</sup> On January 25, 1858, he asked Congress for permission to appoint 20 pupils. On May 11, 1858, he repeated his request reducing the number to 10. House Executive Document 67, 35th Cong., 2d sess., January 25, 1858; House Executive Document 68, January 1859.

<sup>117</sup> House Executive Document 68, January 1859.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

came of these recommendations until 1864, when Secretary of State Seward finally persuaded Congress to provide for 13 consular clerks.<sup>120</sup> Seward' idea that these clerks would form the nucleus of a career service never materialized. Because there was no permanency of tenure in the higher grades of the service the consular clerks were unwilling to accept promotion.<sup>121</sup>

In 1866 the Department of State promulgated an order requiring all applicants for consular positions to present themselves for examination.<sup>122</sup> Although not all the records relating to examinations held under this order can be found, it does not appear that more than one examination was given.<sup>123</sup> Nine applicants presented themselves for the examination and seven were found to be qualified.<sup>124</sup>

In 1871 the first Civil Service law was enacted for the federal government.<sup>125</sup> Shortly thereafter, the President promulgated two

<sup>120</sup> 13 U. S. Statutes 139 (1864). The clerks were to receive salaries of \$1,000 per annum, were to hold office during good behavior, and were not to be removed except for cause stated in writing to Congress. Ten years later their salaries were raised to \$1,200 per annum after five years of service. 18 U. S. Statutes 70 (1874).

<sup>121</sup> Between 1864 and 1896, 64 consular pupils were appointed. Only eight of these clerks were subsequently appointed to consulships. One of the eight was not confirmed by the Senate, and another lost his office in a change of administration. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr. Dr. Carr's papers are located at 2300 Wyoming Avenue, Washington, D. C. The writer was given access to the papers by Mrs. Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>122</sup> Letter from Richard Olney to Grover Cleveland, September 17, 1895. MS, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid.

<sup>125</sup> 16 U. S. Statutes 514 (1871).

executive orders establishing the merit principle in the consular service. The second of these executive orders provided that:

Vacancies occurring in any grade of consulates or clerkships in the Department may be filled either by transfer from some other grade or service, clerical, consular or diplomatic under the Department of State, or by appointment of some person who has previously served under the Department of State to its satisfaction, or by the appointment of some person who has made application to the Secretary of State with proper certificates of character, responsibility, and capacity, in the manner provided for application for consulates of which the annual compensation is more than \$1,000 and less than \$3,000, and who has on examination, been found qualified for the position.<sup>126</sup>

Under this order an examination board was constituted, consisting of three officers of the Department of State.<sup>127</sup> Candidates were examined on the first volume of Kent's Commentaries and upon the "Regulations for the Consular Service of the United States."<sup>128</sup> The system was short lived, however, as Congress soon refused to appropriate money for continuing the activities of the Civil Service Commission. The merit system in the consular service was given up contemporaneously with the demise of the Commission.<sup>129</sup>

Despite these few attempts at instituting a genuine career plan in a segment of the foreign service during the nineteenth century, it is probably fair to say that Congress never seriously considered

---

<sup>126</sup> Executive orders dated April 16, 1872 and March 14, 1873. MS copy in State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>127</sup> Olney to Cleveland, September 17, 1895.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid.

implementing such a program.<sup>130</sup> A career system did not emerge in nascent form in the consular service until the mounting pressure from organized business found a sympathetic and Congressionally powerful Secretary of State in Elihu Root.<sup>131</sup> The career system in the diplomatic service did not become a possibility until much later, although the long reign of the Republican party did permit a few diplomatic secretaries of marked ability to demonstrate the advantages of such a policy. Such a man was Henry White, who was appointed to the diplomatic service in 1863. White determined to prove the possibility and value of a genuine professional career in diplomacy. His long and distinguished service gave the advocates of a career system a concrete example of the benefits to be acquired from continued service. White combined competency with exceptional personal contacts, necessarily utilizing all the political forces at his disposal to remain in office.<sup>132</sup> One inevitably concludes that the so called "career" diplomat before 1924 was only such, because he was, in reality, a better politician than the so-called political appointee who aspired to his place.

Attempts at creating a non-political foreign service, therefore, were not received with enthusiasm in the Congress. In fact, a surprisingly large number of Congressmen continued to advocate the

---

<sup>130</sup> This conclusion is drawn from a careful reading of all Congressional debates and hearings on the diplomatic and consular services during the period 1800-1899.

<sup>131</sup> Infra.

<sup>132</sup> For an admirable biography of Henry White see Allan Nevins, Henry White, (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1930). Some of White's intimate associates were John Hay, Theodore Roosevelt, Edward Phelps, Robert Lincoln, and Whitelaw Reid.

discontinuance of the diplomatic service. Numerous resolutions were introduced into the House and the Senate to achieve this objective, and on several occasions the vote was uncomfortably close. While granting that the President had the Constitutional right to appoint diplomatic officers, the Congressmen hoped to achieve their purpose by refusing to appropriate funds for the support of the diplomatic establishment.

Typical of these attacks on the Service was that of Mr. Lovejoy. On January 19, 1859, he moved, in the Committee of the Whole, to abolish all our diplomatic representation abroad, with the single exception of our minister to Spain, whom one of his colleagues desired to protect.<sup>133</sup> Remarkd Mr. Lovejoy, "The aristocrats of the dinner table might not find places if the law were repealed, but still the country would suffer no detriment."<sup>134</sup> Senator Wade expressed similar views a few years later,

.....if I could have my own way about it I would never have a resident minister abroad. I would abolish the whole of them. I do not think they are of any kind of importance to us. I do not think they do any good in our relations with Europe.<sup>135</sup>

Almost thirty years later we find Congressman Blount, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, expressing a similar view. Diplomats, he said, were needed when the United States was young and had many

---

<sup>133</sup> Congressional Globe, 35th Cong., 2d sess., January 19, 1859, p. 458.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid., p. 459.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid., 39th Cong., 1st sess., May 16, 1866, p. 2618.

problems to solve. Now that we had "finally and satisfactorily settled" all our problems, we could safely dispense with our diplomatic service.<sup>136</sup>

Even those who defended the diplomatic service on the floor of Congress were not overly impressed by the functions it performed. Senator Moran, while pleading for a living wage in those capitals where "we decide to keep representatives,"<sup>137</sup> well summarized prevailing Congressional sentiment with respect to the majority of diplomatic posts. "I do not suppose," he said, "there is a solitary thing done by the minister to Rome at any time, except to introduce Americans to court and kiss the Pope's toe; and so with fifty other missions that we have, scattered in all the Minor Powers both in the Old and the New World."<sup>138</sup>

Senator Crittenden facetiously remarked that, after lengthy research, he had come to the conclusion the greatest task performed by many of our would-be diplomats was that of finding a government to be accredited to after arriving at their "important" posts.<sup>139</sup> To illustrate his point, he proceeded to tell his colleagues about one of our ministers who had been accredited to a South American country. After a long and arduous trip over the Andes, the Minister

---

<sup>136</sup> Congressional Record, 52d Cong., 1st sess., April 26, 1892, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1892), p. 123.

<sup>137</sup> Congressional Globe, February 19, 1859, p. 1149.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid., p. 1146.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., 36th Cong., 1st sess., March 26, 1860, p.1349

arrived at the seat of the government to which he had been accredited. To his chagrin, he learned that there were no officials of the government there to receive him. After a lengthy search, the American Minister located the local Secretary of War, to whom he addressed himself in "peevish" terms. The Secretary responded in like manner and was promptly challenged to a duel by the American Minister. When the Secretary of War failed to appear for the duel at the designated time, the American Minister left the capital in disgust, and returned to the United States.<sup>140</sup>

Nor were these Congressional jibes at the diplomatic service completely unjustified. John Hay wrote from the American Embassy in Vienna, that he had so very little to do that the time hung heavy on his hands.<sup>141</sup> If he were ever elected to the Congress, Hay mused, the diplomatic service would find it most difficult to justify their appropriation requests to him.<sup>142</sup> It is not surprising that this was true. America had not yet become a leading world power, and the national interest was well served by a passive foreign policy which required only a modicum of ability and effort on the part of our diplomatic representatives. The rise of the United States to a paramount position in world affairs completely changed this situation. Now we are required to develop an affirmative foreign policy, and to maintain a highly skilled

<sup>140</sup> Ibid.

<sup>141</sup> Letter from John Hay to John Bigelow, William R. Thayer, Life and Letters of John Hay, (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1915), I, 312.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid.

Foreign Service. But in evaluating the position of the American Foreign Service during the nineteenth century, we should not overlook the relatively unimportant role America played on the world stage during that era.

Throughout the period of our national existence down to 1895, therefore, no real progress was made in providing an orderly system for testing the fitness of persons to be appointed as ambassadors, ministers, and consuls, although the Consular Service had been steadily improving for years. A bill to reorganize the diplomatic and consular services passed the Senate in 1872.<sup>143</sup> The bill was defeated in the House, largely because of opposition to several of its provisions by the Department of State.<sup>144</sup>

Secretary of State Everts paid special attention to the Consular Service. He introduced a system of promotions based on efficiency, made it a rule to appoint men of practical business experience as consuls, and directed them to send frequent communications on commercial topics to the Department.<sup>145</sup>

President Arthur made few changes in consular appointments during his term of office.<sup>146</sup> Consequently, when Cleveland became President,

<sup>143</sup> House Miscellaneous Document 61, 42d Cong., 3d sess., December 19, 1872.

<sup>144</sup> The Department of State especially opposed a provision requiring that all vice consuls should be American citizens. Letter from Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State to N. P. Banks, Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, December 3, 1872. MS, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>145</sup> Letter from William M. Everts, Secretary of State, to James A. Garfield, President of the United States, August 8, 1881. MS, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>146</sup> New York Daily Tribune, June 26, 1885, p. 4.

he found a Service that had been largely recruited from the commercial classes. However, there was still a long way to go before a truly efficient Service could be realized. President Cleveland recognized this point and he emphasized in his message to Congress that the reorganization of the Consular Service was still a matter of "serious importance to our national interest."<sup>147</sup> Congress was not enthusiastic to end one of its few remaining sources of patronage, however, and the spoils system was retained.

Cleveland's successor, President Benjamin Harrison, removed 230 of the 307 Consuls General, Consuls, and Consular Agents.<sup>148</sup> The majority of those whom Harrison retained in office had been appointed by previous Republican Administrations.

In 1895, Senator John T. Morgan of Alabama introduced a comprehensive plan into the Congress for the reorganization of the Foreign Service, and the selection of appointees on the basis of merit.<sup>149</sup> Morgan believed that fitness, rather than failure in other pursuits, or a desire to "go abroad for purposes of travel recreation, or amusement," should determine entry into the Service.<sup>150</sup> When the Senate failed to act on the bill, President Cleveland decided to take action

---

<sup>147</sup> Senate Report 1073, 54th Cong., 1st sess., May 27, 1896.

<sup>148</sup> However, the partial New York Daily Tribune believed the "most competent" Democrats had been retained. Issue of June 5, 1891, p. 6.

<sup>149</sup> Senate Report 1073, May 27, 1896.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid.

by means of Executive Order.<sup>151</sup> His order provided in substance that future vacancies in a consulate or commercial agency where the salary ranged between \$1,000 and \$2,500 were to be filled (a) by a transfer or promotion from some other position under the Department of State of a character tending to qualify the incumbent for the position to be filled or (b) by the appointment of a person not under the Department of State but having previously served thereunder to its satisfaction in a capacity tending to qualify him for the position to be filled or (c) by the appointment of a person who having furnished customary evidence of character, responsibility and capacity and being thereupon selected by the President for examination was found upon such examination to be qualified for the position.<sup>152</sup> These examinations were not general and competitive and no eligible list was kept. Examinations were given by a Board of Examiners consisting of the Third Assistant Secretary of State, the Solicitor of the Department, and the Director of the Consular Bureau after the candidate had been selected,<sup>153</sup> and very few of those designated for examination failed to pass.<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup> Executive Order dated September 20, 1895, MS copy, State Archives, National Archives. A short time before Cleveland issued the order, an editorial in the New York Daily Tribune stated, "We do not attempt to deny that Republican administrators have made a political use of the consular service, although we contend that the spoils principle has never been carried out so flagrantly and wantonly as under the present Cleveland administration." The editorial pointed out that Cleveland had already removed 209 consuls. New York Daily Tribune, January 28, 1895, p. 6.

<sup>152</sup> Executive Order dated September 20, 1895.

<sup>153</sup> Order of the Secretary of State, Richard Olney, dated September 23, 1895. MS copy in State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>154</sup> "Memorandum on Consular Appointments," Unpublished MS, no date, The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

The examination system was so liberal that it was utilized by McKinley to restore the balance in favor of the Republican party. McKinley removed 238 out of 272 salaried consuls.<sup>155</sup> The few remaining consuls were largely the Republican appointees whom Cleveland had retained.<sup>156</sup>

On the other hand, McKinley's Secretary of State, John Hay, championed a genuine merit system. Hay favored retention in office during good behavior regardless of party. He realized McKinley's predicament, however, and even defended the removals. With the Civil Service so rigidly provided for, he wrote a friend, the Foreign Service was like the "topmost rock in the pictures of the Deluge. The pressure for a place on it is indescribable."<sup>157</sup> Hay's inability to win the confidence of the Congress, and his generally weak position politically, prevented him from obtaining concessions from Congress on the merit system. In spite of the constant pressure for appointments, however, his sense of humor did not completely desert him. Once, when hard pressed by a Congressman for a consular position for a constituent, Hay responded that the only position open was Iquique. "Do I understand," he wrote the Congressman, "that the great Commonwealth you so nobly represent wishes to fill it? It brings the pampered occupant something

---

<sup>155</sup> Ibid. These removals included positions of \$1,000 salary and upwards between March 3, 1897, and November 1, 1898.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> Letter from John Hay to Professor G. P. Fisher, July 2, 1902, William R. Thayer, Life and Letters of John Hay, (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1915), II, 191.

like \$800 a year."<sup>158</sup> When the Congressman answered that his constituent would be happy to fill the vacant Mexican post, Hay replied, "....you shall have it....The place is not in Mexico, as you seem to think, but in Chile, and I imagine would best be described by Goldsmith's line: Remote, unfriended, melancholy, slow."<sup>159</sup>

The honor of initiating the first lasting reforms into the Foreign Service probably belongs to Elihu Root, Secretary of State under Theodore Roosevelt. This was the opinion of the man who is often referred to as the "Father of the Foreign Service"....Wilbur J. Carr. In a letter to Root's biographer, Philip C. Jessup, Carr wrote:

I do feel quite strongly....that whatever credit may be given to anyone for the authorship of our present Foreign Service organization should be given to Mr. Root for regardless of what anyone else may have done subsequently, the great achievement was in withdrawing the appointments to the Foreign Service from politics and setting up the beginning of an organization and an administrative system. For all of this he was solely responsible.....<sup>160</sup>

In his quest for reform Root had the support of President Theodore Roosevelt, and the powerful business organizations throughout the country. He also had the services of the able Wilbur J. Carr. The latter became the catalyst through which these and later reforms were carried into effect.

President Roosevelt on November 10, 1905 issued an Executive Order, which Mr. Root had drafted, extending the Cleveland order of 1895

<sup>158</sup>Letter dated March 31, 1900, Ibid., II, 190.

<sup>159</sup>Letter dated April 5, 1900, Ibid., II, 190.

<sup>160</sup>Letter from Wilbur J. Carr to Philip Jessup, November 26, 1935, The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

to the filling of all vacancies in consulates general, consulates, commercial or consular agencies, the salary or compensation of which was not less than \$1,000.<sup>161</sup> The President issued another order on November 10, 1905, also drafted by Mr. Root, providing that vacancies in the office of secretary of embassy or legation should thereafter be filled (a) by transfer or promotion from some branch of the Foreign Service or (b) by appointment of a person of ability selected by the President for examination and found upon such examination to be qualified for the position.<sup>162</sup> In short, the orders issued by Mr. Roosevelt extended the examination system of President Cleveland to the more important consular positions and to the office of secretary of embassy or legation.

Knowing full well that reform by Executive Order only was very tenuous, and perhaps limited to the administration of that President alone, the business organizations, with the full support of Root, began to push for a perpetuation of consular reform by legislative act. Consequently, Senator Lodge introduced several bills into the Senate for the reform of Consular Service. The successful bill was a compromise measure between the desires of the business groups and the wishes of the administration.<sup>163</sup> When it appeared that the bill might be

---

<sup>161</sup> Executive Order dated November 10, 1905, MS copy in State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid.

<sup>163</sup> S. 1345, Congressional Record, 59th Cong., 2d sess., January 25, 1906, pp. 1540 and 1756.

pigeonholed in the House, the various business groups which were then meeting in Washington on the subject of consular reform marched in a body to see Speaker Cannon. The delegation was assured by the Speaker that the bill would be brought to an early vote.<sup>164</sup> Two days later it was favorably reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and later passed almost unanimously.<sup>165</sup> Unfortunately, its original provisions for a merit system were deleted. The Root-Lodge bill enacted into law on April 5, 1906, helped to lay the foundation of a new Consular Service through the enactment of four general principles: (a) it classified the posts in the consular service and placed all officers on a salary basis, (b) it established a modern system of collecting and accounting for fees, (c) it created the position of Consul General at Large and inaugurated the present system of inspection, and (d) it prohibited consular officers from engaging in business.<sup>166</sup> While these reforms were very worthwhile they left untouched the most important facets of a career system: the method of selection of candidates, their tenure of office, and method of advancement in their chosen career. These provisions were left untouched for two reasons: (a) Congressional reluctance to cut off one of the few remaining sources of patronage and (b) the inability of Congress to devise a law which would not run afoul

---

<sup>164</sup> This statement was penned by Carr in the margin of an article he had already published in the Journal of International Law. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid. See also House Report 2281, 59th Cong., 1st sess., 1906.

<sup>166</sup> 34 U. S. Statutes 99 (1906).

of the Constitutional provisions with respect to the President's appointing power. However, President Roosevelt moved quickly to cover the ground upon which Congress had feared to tread. On June 27, 1906, he issued an Executive order prescribing the system of examinations for testing the fitness of applicants for appointment as consuls, requiring that new appointees should enter the Service in the lower grades and that promotion to the higher grades of the Service should be made in an orderly manner on the basis of ascertained fitness.<sup>167</sup> It should be emphasized that the tests were still not competitive and applicants had to be designated by the President before they could be examined. Candidates successfully passing the tests were to be appointed only to the two lowest grades of the Service. Persons serving in the Department of State with annual salaries of \$2,000 or more could be promoted to any grade of the Consular Service above the two lowest grades. All other vacancies were to be filled by promotion from the lower grades of the Service. Political affiliations of candidates were not to be considered and promotions were to be made on the basis of efficiency and demonstrated merit.

However, the real effect of these provisions depended upon the administration in power. Therefore, while the reforms probably marked the beginning of a new era in the Foreign Service, it is not to be assumed that they marked the end of political considerations in the

---

<sup>167</sup> Executive Order No. 469, dated June 27, 1906, MS copy in State Department Archives, National Archives.

appointment and promotion of Foreign Service officers. In fact, while it appears that Root was unreservedly in favor of a career system, Mr. Roosevelt appears to have been somewhat ambivalent in his own feelings. When William Bayard Cutting Jr. wrote to President Roosevelt concerning a position in the diplomatic service, Mr. Roosevelt replied that while he would receive the application, he preferred that Cutting were a "convinced Republican."<sup>168</sup> "...one of the legitimate considerations to be taken into account is, what the man has done in politics," he wrote the youthful applicant.<sup>169</sup> Mr. Roosevelt further advised Cutting that he did not believe in a man taking a secretaryship abroad except for a short time. "I do not think it is a good life for an American to lead, if he tries to lead it permanently," he wrote.<sup>170</sup> Mr. Roosevelt concluded that there were certain exceptions to this rule, such as Harry White and John Riddle, but in the case of one of his own sons he would rather have him take up other work.<sup>171</sup>

President Roosevelt drew a distinction between the "pink-tea type" of diplomat who "merely resides in the Service" and the well qualified officer who was a credit to the Administration. "...if a man is a really good man he will be kept in. A pink-tea man shall stay in or

---

<sup>168</sup> Letter from Theodore Roosevelt to W. B. Cutting Jr., September 13, 1904, Elting Morison, Theodore Roosevelt Letters, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1951), IV, 944.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid.

<sup>170</sup> Ibid.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid.

go out, just as I find convenient. Of course most places at embassies are pink-tea places." 172

On August 15, 1907, Mr. Roosevelt, at the request of Secretary Root, made an appointment in the Department of State which was to profoundly shape the development of the Foreign Service, namely, the appointment of Wilbur J. Carr as Director of the Consular Service. 173 Carr had entered the Department of State as a clerk on June 1, 1892. Ten years later he was named Chief of the Consular Bureau. When Root decided to reform the Consular Service he chose Carr for the job, and gave him extensive authority, equal, in fact, to that of an Assistant Secretary of State. Carr retained this Assistant Secretary level status in the Department through subsequent changes of administration until Franklin D. Roosevelt named him Minister to Czechoslovakia in 1937. During this period the Foreign Service functioned under his guidance, and on every feature of its development his fingerprint appears.

The results of the Root reforms in the Consular Service were so satisfactory that in 1909 President Taft, by Executive Order, applied the same principles of appointment and promotion to the secretaries in the Diplomatic Service. 174 By the end of his administration the principle was adopted of promoting outstanding secretaries to the grade of minister. 175

---

172 Letter from Theodore Roosevelt to Richard Harding Davis, January 3, 1906, Ibid., IV, 1069.

173 All facts relating to Wilbur J. Carr are taken from his personal papers.

174 Executive Order dated November 26, 1909, MS copy in State Department Archives, National Archives.

175 Statement from an unpublished MS entitled, "The Foreign Service, no date, The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

But the battle for a career Foreign Service was only beginning. When the Democrats returned to power in 1913, the Foreign Service was singled out for attack by political leaders from the South, Williams of Mississippi and Johnston of Alabama in the Senate, criticized the egregiously sectional character of the appointments made by Roosevelt and Taft, and demanded drastic changes.<sup>176</sup> In Secretary of State William J. Bryan, the Senators found a spoilsman who was sympathetic to their point of view. On the other hand Woodrow Wilson had been elected on a platform of civil service, and the President was originally determined to keep the career system insofar as possible.<sup>177</sup> As time went on, however, the exigencies of practical politics forced Wilson to yield more and more ground, until eventually most of the Republican appointees had been swept from the Service.

Wilbur J. Carr observed in his diary after Bryan had been Secretary of State for approximately one month:

Bryan is coldblooded about consular appointments--speaks not of efficiency, fitness, or long service, but merely of places for Democrats. No sympathy with long service. Says there are plenty of able Democrats willing to serve who did not have the opportunity.....<sup>178</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> Senator Williams wrote President Wilson that "half a dozen trust-ruled communities" got 50 per cent of the diplomatic patronage, whereas, 10 southern states did not receive a single dollar from the \$485,000 appropriation. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>177</sup> Statement in Wilbur J. Carr's diary under date April 10, 1913. Carr's diary is an excellent source of information on this topic.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid., April 13, 1913.

During the year that followed, Carr's diary contains innumerable references to the notoriously inadequate appointments by Bryan. While his personal dislike for Bryan may have caused him to overstate the case somewhat, Carr believed that the Department was in a perpetual state of chaos during the Secretary's tenure.<sup>179</sup> Carr notes that the French Ambassador Jusserand shared this view. The Ambassador stated to Carr that Judge Moore was the only one with whom he could conduct business in the Department.<sup>180</sup>

It appears that President Wilson, suspecting the damage Bryan was causing to the Service, used Dudley F. Malone, the Third Assistant Secretary of State, behind the Secretary's back.<sup>181</sup> When Bryan would recommend an individual for appointment or promotion, Malone would visit Carr, and take from him all the information that the Department had collected on the prospective candidate. At the President's request, Malone took this information directly to the White House. President Wilson would then review the material and determine whether he thought Bryan's recommendations were justified. Carr felt that Bryan was not aware of this arrangement.

On April 17, 1914, after Bryan had been in office over a year, we find a typical entry in Carr's diary:

Bryan sent for me and wanted to give a clerkship to Representative Connady who he said had stood by him in Connecticut and was the only one from that State who had

---

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., July 11, 1913.

<sup>180</sup> Ibid., May 19, 1913.

<sup>181</sup> Ibid., July 31, 1913.

been faithful throughout the Baltimore Convention, but when I told Cannaday the qualifications needed at Dublin, Bryan said he need not stay longer than necessary, a year perhaps; that he had sent a young man to Mannheim where he had stayed for a while, then he was sent to Paris though he would not remain long. This is apparently a politician's view of a business organization.<sup>182</sup>

Bryan resigned as Secretary of State on June 9, 1915, and was succeeded by Robert Lansing of New York. The new Secretary was the son-in-law of the former Secretary of State, John W. Foster, and like him an international lawyer of repute. Lansing placed the administration of the diplomatic and consular services largely in the hands of Carr and William Phillips, and the reign of spoils which had been accelerated by Bryan, began once more to subside.<sup>183</sup>

One notable piece of legislation regarding the diplomatic and consular services was enacted into law during Bryan's tenure, viz., the Act of February 5, 1915.<sup>184</sup> This Act consisted of four general principles: (a) it provided for the appointment of diplomatic and consular officers to classes instead of to particular posts, (b) it reclassified both the Diplomatic and Consular Service on this basis, (c) it directed the Secretary of State to make recommendations to the President for promotion on the basis of efficiency, and for admission to the lower grades

---

<sup>182</sup>Ibid., April 7, 1914.

<sup>183</sup>Ibid. In fairness to Bryan it should be emphasized that he, much like Andrew Jackson, fell heir to a Service which was largely unsympathetic to the Democratic party. Many of his removals were undoubtedly justified. The chief criticism of his term as Secretary relates to the large number of unqualified personnel whom he appointed.

<sup>184</sup>36 U. S. Statutes 805 (1915).

after examination, and, (d) it extended to the Diplomatic Service the prohibition against engaging in business.<sup>185</sup>

The most important provision in the Act of 1915 was that providing for appointment to a class instead of to a particular post. Until this time in order to receive a promotion, an officer had to be transferred from one post to another. By this Act promotion and assignment were rendered separate and distinct. An officer now could be transferred from post to post without the consent of the Senate, although he still could not change class without being recommissioned with Senatorial approval. This provision was important for it was one of the first steps toward granting the Service autonomous control over its own personnel. Under this provision it would be possible for the Service to assign its better or favored personnel to the key posts, while shunting the lesser qualified political appointees off to the hinterland.

The next important landmark in the history of the Foreign Service was the adoption of the Rogers Act in 1924. Because this Act is looked upon as the cornerstone of the modern Foreign Service, we shall sketch a brief history of the bill before we list its more important provisions.

The "Bryan Era" had convinced the Foreign Service that a career system protected by executive order only, was on a very tenuous basis. Understandably, therefore, the Service desired to perpetuate the Root-Roosevelt reforms by means of legislation. The Act of 1915 was intended as a move in this direction, although opposition by Bryan and a hostile Congress had watered-down the measure substantially. The Department was

---

<sup>185</sup>  
Ibid.

also desirous of securing further improvements in the Service. It wanted to increase the salaries and promotional opportunities of diplomatic officers, to broaden the career opportunities of consular officers, and insofar as possible, to remove the Service from the political arena. The legislation proposed by the Department was not to be a radical departure from the reforms previously effected, but a logical culmination to this effort.

With hard work and the support of the powerful business organizations throughout the country, the Department had been able to obtain several important legislative reforms in the Consular Service. For example, the salaries and perquisites received by a consular officer were much superior to those received by a diplomatic officer. On the other hand, Congressional antipathy toward diplomacy as a system, made reform in that branch of the Service most difficult. Ironically, Congressional hostility toward the Diplomatic Service tended to perpetuate those features of the organization to which the legislative body most strongly objected. Many members of the Congress looked upon the Diplomatic Service as a haven for rich men's sons, and an organization of "pink-tea" boys. Unfortunately, to a large extent this was true. However, as long as the Congress refused to appropriate sufficient funds for the Service, the Department had no alternative but to recruit personnel with independent means. Since a private source of income was not a very good measure of competence, many of the young secretaries recruited into the Service were unqualified for their jobs. Thus, the vicious circle was perpetuated.

The first question before the Department, therefore, was how the Diplomatic Service might be raised to the level of the Consular Service

with respect to pay and promotional benefits. Most of the practical officers in the Department believed this reform could be best accomplished by uniting the two independent services into one Foreign Service. This move would obtain for the Diplomatic Service the support of American business now limited to the Consular Service. These officers believed the support of American business was necessary if any lasting reforms were to be obtained for the Diplomatic Service.<sup>186</sup> Otherwise the Diplomatic Service would have no way of winning sufficient support in the Congress.

The unification of the two independent organizations had been championed by the Consular Service and by various members of Congress for a long period of time. The consular officers were especially bitter over the much lower social status which custom and usage had given to their Service.<sup>187</sup> They favored the creation of a system which would permit consular officers, who had served for long periods of time in unglamorous duties and places, to be rewarded with diplomatic assignments. Many members of Congress also believed that a diplomatic officer would do a much better job if he were grounded in the "practical aspects of American business."<sup>188</sup> For this reason they favored the assignment of all diplomatic officers to consular posts before they embarked on their chosen careers.

---

<sup>186</sup> This was the opinion of such officers as Wilbur J. Carr, J. Butler Wright, and Robert Skinner. See for example J. Butler Wright's memorandum to Secretary C. E. Hughes, May 3, 1922. State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>187</sup> Congressional Record, 67th Cong., 4th sess., February 6, 1923, p. 3147.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid., p. 3143.

It is not to be presumed that the idea of unification was well received in all quarters. A strong clique in the Diplomatic Service, led by such officers as Hugh Gibson, Hugh Wilson, and Alexander Kirk, opposed unification with the Consular Service at any price. These gentlemen objected to the proposed amalgamation of the old services and endeavored to substitute a solution of their own which largely continued the existing state of affairs. In the words of Consul General Robert Skinner, "they sought the financial advantages which the successful bill offered but wished to avoid its administrative consequences."<sup>189</sup>

The first version of the amalgamation bill was drafted by Consul General Robert Skinner, and submitted to the Congress by Representative John Jacob Rogers of Massachusetts in 1919.<sup>190</sup> This draft proposed a single, unified Foreign Service along lines favored by the Consular Service. Rogers sent the bill to the Department of State for comment. Here the bill was promptly buried by officers opposed to the idea of amalgamation. In fact, Rogers later complained to Secretary Lansing that he had been completely ignored.<sup>191</sup>

Mr. Rogers: I have been approached informally several times by men in the Department and have been assured that the letter had been written and was coming the next day, and then two months later I would be assured that the letter had just been written....but seven or eight months have failed to elicit an actual response.

Mr. Flood: Does not that demonstrate that the State Department has not man power sufficient to do the enormous amount of work?

---

<sup>189</sup> Letter from Robert Skinner to Joseph Grew, October 8, 1925, The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>190</sup> Ibid. See also letter from Tracy Lay to Wilbur J. Carr, October 20, 1925. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>191</sup> Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 68th Cong., 2d sess., January 7, 1920, p. 8.

Mr. Rogers: I do not think that in this case it is a question of man power. If I am correctly informed by the gentlemen in the Department itself it is because there has been a difference of opinion among themselves which they have not been able to reconcile.<sup>192</sup>

While in Washington, Hugh Wilson drafted a substitute bill in which the idea of constituting the title Foreign Service officer was accepted, but in which two separate and distinct groups were recognized, namely the Diplomatic and Consular Services. Under the rigid division proposed by Wilson, an officer of one division could not be assigned to duty in the other division without being recommissioned by the Senate.<sup>193</sup>

Mr. Alexander Kirk also drafted a proposal which eliminated the common title of Foreign Service officer, and thus left the two Services virtually as they were, except that transfer from the Diplomatic Service to the Consular Service was possible with Senatorial approval.<sup>194</sup>

It appears that the compromise measure finally agreed to by the Department was drafted largely by Tracy Lay with the help of Wilbur J. Carr.<sup>195</sup> The bill provided for one Foreign Service consisting of two branches, diplomatic and consular. Service was to be on an inter-changeable basis, which was a concession to the demands of the diplomatic clique. The common title of Foreign Service officer

---

<sup>192</sup> Ibid.

<sup>193</sup> "Excerpt from a Memorandum," Tracy Lay to Wilbur J. Carr, May 2, 1920. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>194</sup> Ibid.

<sup>195</sup> This conclusion is drawn after a careful reading of Carr's diary and his other papers relating to this issue.

was to cover both branches. This terminology would have meaning only in the United States, since it was a title that had no standing under the rules of protocol established by the Congress of Vienna in 1815. Foreign Service officers were to be commissioned either as diplomatic or consular officers as before, and these titles would regulate their standing overseas.

No positive action was taken by Congress on the legislation sponsored by John Jacob Rogers during the final days of the Wilson administration. The fate of the bill, therefore, depended upon the support it would receive from the new Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes. Rogers immediately wrote the new Secretary for advice on his bill, but was informed that Mr. Hughes was too deeply immersed with questions growing out of the calling of the Washington Armament Conference.<sup>197</sup> A year flew by. On August 31, 1922, Rogers again wrote the Secretary for his views.<sup>198</sup> The job of drafting a reply to the Rogers' letter fell to Consul General Tracy Lay, who was then on duty in the Department. On October 13, 1922, Hughes approved the letter which Lay had prepared.<sup>199</sup> The bill was now ready to be introduced in a form which would have the support of the Department. Commenting on Lay's letter, Carr noted in his diary:

---

<sup>196</sup>The Consular Service wanted a completely unified, one branch Service along lines proposed by Von Bernsdorf. "Excerpt from a Memorandum," May 2, 1920.

<sup>197</sup>Hughes' reply to Rogers' first letter is cited in Rogers' letter of August 31, 1922. Letter from John J. Rogers to C. E. Hughes, April 11, 1922, MS, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>198</sup>Letter from John J. Rogers to C. E. Hughes, August 31, 1922, MS, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>199</sup>Carr Diary, October 13, 1922.

It is an excellent letter. I was of the belief that he had emphasized too strongly the fact that the corrected bill had been prepared in the Department, but he explained that it became necessary because the President had made the statement in his letter to Lodge and Rogers, and also experience has shown that Congress insisted on knowing the authorization of bills before it. He is entirely correct. It is Hughes' advocacy of the measure that will pass it, not the fact that it is a Rogers or Lodge measure.<sup>200</sup>

Extensive hearings on the revised Rogers bill were held before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, December 11-19, 1922.<sup>201</sup> The bill as amended was reported to the House on January 30, 1923. A brisk debate followed. The opposition to the bill was led by Messrs. Blanton and Connally of Texas. On February 8, 1923, the bill passed the House by a vote of 203-27. On February 13, 1923, it was unanimously reported without amendment by the Committee on Foreign Relations. Caught in a legislative jam in the closing days of the 67th Congress, the bill did not come to a vote before the Senate adjourned. On December 5, 1923, Rogers reintroduced the bill. It was textually identical with the bill passed by the House in the previous session. On February 5, 1924, the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported the bill favorably with amendments. The House passed the measure on May 1, 1924, by a vote of 134-27, after an attempt to recommit the bill to Committee was defeated by a vote of 201-110. Voting with the minority were Tom Connally of Texas and James Byrnes of South Carolina.<sup>202</sup> The bill was reported by the Foreign

---

<sup>200</sup>  
Ibid., October 12, 1922.

<sup>201</sup>  
Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 67th Cong., 1st sess., December 11-19, 1922.

<sup>202</sup>  
Congressional Record, 68th Cong., 1st sess., May 1, 1924,  
p. 7634

Relations Committee on May 13 and two days later passed the Senate by unanimous consent. It received the approval of President Coolidge on May 24, 1924, and went into effect on July 1, 1924.<sup>203</sup>

The members of the House who opposed the bill did so largely on grounds that the Act would effect no real change in the Service. Tom Connally regarded the Foreign Service officer terminology as artificial and meaningless, and characterized the bill as an attempt by the Diplomatic Service to raid the Treasury under the guise of reform.<sup>204</sup> He believed the provisions for salary and retirement benefits were much too liberal when compared with those received by other government personnel.<sup>205</sup>

Congressman Linthicum of Maryland disagreed. He contended that diplomatic salaries were so low that it was practically impossible for married officers to remain in the Service. "Shall our Government be a party to a service which compels celibacy?" He inquired of Connally.<sup>206</sup>

Congressman Blanton referred to the projected nine new classes of Foreign Service officers as "social" classes.<sup>207</sup> The so-called "career ladder", he mused, was actually a "social ladder" designed to permit the New England social climbers to determine their relative rank when queuing up for dinner.<sup>208</sup> He was not surprised that the Committee on

<sup>203</sup> 43 U. S. Statutes 140 (1924).

<sup>204</sup> Congressional Record, 67th Cong., 1st sess., February 6, 1923, p. 3147.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid., p. 3148.

<sup>206</sup> Ibid.

<sup>207</sup> Ibid., p. 3150.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid.

Foreign Affairs supported the bill. "When they go abroad they are treated as lords of the land. They become close, fast friends of the entire service. They naturally feel interested in them."<sup>209</sup> But Mr. Blanton conceded that he could do little to stop the bill, so he would sit down and watch it pass. <sup>210</sup>

The Rogers Act of May 24, 1924, embodied four major principles of reform:

1. It provided for a new and uniform salary scale with a view to eliminating the necessity for private incomes, making it possible to select candidates on the basis of ability alone.
2. It provided for the amalgamation of the Diplomatic and Consular Services into a single Foreign Service on an interchangeable basis. Amalgamation was to relieve the limitations on careers in the Consular Service and effectually coordinate the political and economic branches of the Service.
3. It provided for the granting of representation allowances, which lessened the demands on the private fortunes of ambassadors and ministers and made it practicable to promote a greater number of trained officers to these positions.
4. It provided for the extension of the Civil Service Retirement Act, with appropriate modifications, to the Foreign Service. Until this time the Service had no provision for retirement whatsoever.

<sup>209</sup> Ibid., p. 3160.

<sup>210</sup> Ibid.

Foreign Service officers were divided into nine classes with a salary scale ranging from \$3,000 in class 9 to \$9,000 in class 1. In addition, there was an unclassified grade with a salary scale ranging from \$1,500 to \$3,000. All admissions to the Service were to be at the grade of Foreign Service officer, Unclassified. The number of officers in the top six classes of the Service was limited to a certain percentage of the total number of officers in the Service. Class 1 officers were not to exceed 6 per cent; class 2, 7 per cent; class 3, 8 per cent; class 4, 9 per cent; class 5, 10 per cent; class 6, 14 per cent.

The Rogers Act established a Foreign Service Personnel Board consisting of the Undersecretary of State, two Assistant Secretaries of State, and an Executive Committee composed of three high ranking Foreign Service officers.<sup>211</sup> The Board was to examine the records of all officers in the Service, and before July 24, 1924, it was to submit to the Secretary of State an efficiency rating on each secretary, consul, and vice consul. After the preparation of the initial list, the Board was to submit periodically the names of all officers deemed worthy of promotion. In addition, the Board had power to recommend the lateral transfer of Department of State employees into the Foreign Service, if the State employee had served for a period of five years. The Board could also recommend the assignment of top ranking Foreign Service officers as Chiefs of Mission.

---

<sup>211</sup> Executive Order dated June 7, 1924, MS copy, State Department Archives, National Archives.

The Rogers Act also created a Board of Examiners.<sup>212</sup> Under the provisions of the Executive Order of June 7, 1924, the Board was to be composed of three Assistant Secretaries of State, the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Foreign Service Personnel Board, and the Chief Examiner of the Civil Service Commission. The written examinations were to be prepared by the Civil Service Commission and approved by the Board of Examiners. The scope and method of the examinations were left to the Board of Examiners, but had to include at least one modern foreign language, international law, geography, resources and commerce of the United States, American History, Government and Institutions, History of Europe since 1850, and elements of economics and commercial and maritime law.<sup>213</sup>

The Rogers Act was generally hailed as a great act of statesmanship. However, certain officers in the old Diplomatic Service were strongly opposed to the interchangeability feature. Minister Lewis Einstein wrote to Minister Fred Morris Dearing that the transfer-ability clause in the act would destroy the esprit de corps of the diplomatic service which

---

<sup>212</sup> Ibid.

<sup>213</sup> It appears that examination security was quite lax during the first few years of the Act. The examinations were circulated among the members of the Board by means of the intra departmental mailing system. Unfortunately, a young clerk in the Department, desirous of gaining admittance to the Foreign Service, pilfered the examinations from the out-basket of one of the members of the Board. After making a copy of the examinations, the clerk returned the original papers. He then took his copy of the examinations to a tutor. Several weeks later the tutor informed the Department of the suspected theft. By this time the examination had already been given. Embarrassed Departmental officers were forced to declare the examination void, and to recall the candidates for reexamination. Relevant papers in MS form in State Department Archives, National Archives.

must be protected at all costs. Einstein attempted to rally support for a statutory provision which would protect the right of diplomatic officers to remain in their chosen career.<sup>214</sup>

On the other hand, officers in the old Consular Service believed that the barrier which previously existed between the two branches should be entirely removed, and the diplomatic and consular functions should be combined in the same person wherever possible. As Consul General Robert Skinner expressed the idea:

It would be an act of administrative wisdom to appoint each and every one of the former diplomatic secretaries to consulates, as rapidly as possible, in order to acquaint them in a broad way with the practical duties of a Foreign Service officer as defined by law.<sup>215</sup>

The Department apparently set about to balance the two points of view relative to administrative theory. This action resulted in a series of half measures and grudging concessions. Meanwhile, officers from the old Diplomatic Service had been placed in the key administrative positions in the new Service. From this vantage point they proceeded to administer the Service, in large part, to the advantage of the old Diplomatic Service. Within twelve months 42.8 per cent of all the former diplomatic secretaries were promoted, while there had been promotions affecting only 28.5 per cent of all the former consuls.<sup>216</sup>

---

<sup>214</sup> At the time Einstein was Minister at Prague and Dearing was at Lisbon. Letter in MS form in State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>215</sup> Letter from Skinner to Grew, October 8, 1925.

<sup>216</sup> Ibid.

Consular officers openly expressed dissatisfaction with the administration of the Act. On February 16, 1927, Congressman Edwards of Georgia introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives calling upon the Secretary of State to provide the Congress with information on the administration of the Act.<sup>217</sup> Secretary Kellogg replied on June 21, 1927.<sup>218</sup> Dissatisfied with his reply, Senator Pat Harrison of Mississippi introduced a resolution into the Senate on December 17, 1927, calling upon the Foreign Relations Committee to investigate the administration of the Rogers Act and the Foreign Service Personnel Board.<sup>219</sup> The Senator held up the confirmation of Messrs. Crew and Dawson as a basis for his inquiry. The Senator was particularly interested to see how promotion "stacked up between the two classes of men" and whether there had been "too much promotion from the members of the Personnel Board."<sup>220</sup>

The Committee on Foreign Relations designated Senators Moses, Reed, and Harrison as a subcommittee to investigate the post-Rogers administration of the Service. After extensive hearings, most of them private, to protect the personalities who appeared before the subcommittee, a report was issued on May 3, 1928.<sup>221</sup> In the words of the report, "...the

---

<sup>217</sup> Congressional Record, February 16, 1927, LXVIII, 4012.

<sup>218</sup> Letter from Frank Kellogg to Pat Harrison, June 21, 1927, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>219</sup> Congressional Record, December 17, 1927, LXIX, 785.

<sup>220</sup> Memorandum of telephone conversation between Wilbur J. Carr and Senator Pat Harrison, December 19, 1927. The memorandum was forwarded to Secretary Kellogg. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>221</sup> Senate Report 1069, 70th Cong., 1st sess., May 3, 1928.

subcommittee came early and unanimously to the opinion that the application of the act...had been approached in a manner far at variance from the purpose of the legislation.<sup>222</sup> The report stated that it was the subcommittee's belief that "no inconsiderable number" of diplomatic officers had placed themselves in positions from which they could promote themselves and their friends.<sup>223</sup> In the first two and one half years of the Rogers Act there were 214 promotions. The Committee found that 63 per cent of all the former diplomatic secretaries were promoted, whereas, only 37 per cent of the consular officers received promotions. The report condemned the use of double promotion lists, i.e., one for the diplomatic branch and one for the consular branch. Because of this practice, 43 officers in the Diplomatic Service had been improperly promoted. The subcommittee also decried the cumbersome machinery of the Personnel Board, which it considered inadequate for day to day administration. The subcommittee found that a marked feature in all the promotions was that officers who had served upon or under the Bureau of Personnel had been unduly favored. Eleven officers of the three higher classes in the new Service had been chosen from this group. One officer had received six promotions in a period of eight years.<sup>224</sup>

To overcome these apparent inequities in the administration of the Rogers Act, two very similar bills were introduced, one by Senator Moses

---

<sup>222</sup> Ibid.

<sup>223</sup> Ibid.

<sup>224</sup> Ibid.

and the other by Representative Rogers, on May 3, 1928.<sup>225</sup> No legislative action was taken on these proposals until the Moses-Linthicum Act was enacted in 1931.<sup>226</sup> Before the subcommittee had issued its report, however, the Department had initiated measures to rectify the more glaring inequities in the administration of the Service. Nevertheless, it appears that a genuine amalgamation of the diplomatic and consular services did not take place until the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. And one can find officers in the Department of State today who believe the two services are still searching for a genuine fusion.

Naturally, the passage of the Rogers Act did not change the Foreign Service into a highly competent and well knit organization overnight. The diplomatic branch of the Service was still plagued by the many incompetent political appointees assigned as Chiefs of Mission. Also, not a few of the secretaries in the diplomatic service had been selected on the basis of their personal incomes rather than their personal abilities. Many of these officers, while attempting to do a conscientious job, were simply not equipped for the task.

It appears that Latin America, especially, was poorly served at this time. Francis White, Chief of the Division of Latin American Affairs, wrote numerous memoranda during the 1920's castigating the quality of our diplomatic representation in that area. In one memorandum, White stated

---

<sup>225</sup> Ibid. Senator Moses bill was S. 4382. Senator Harrison stated that the Moses bill would abolish the Harvard clique which controlled the Service. Congressional Record, 70th Cong., 1st sess., May 10, 1928, p. 8307.

<sup>226</sup> 46 U. S. Statutes 1207 (1931).

that it was most urgent that the Ministers to Nicaragua, Honduras, the Dominican Republic, and Panama be removed.<sup>227</sup> White believed our Minister to Nicaragua, Remer, to be the most conspicuous failure.<sup>228</sup> When the President of Nicaragua died, Remer informed the Minister for Foreign Affairs that he (Remer) would not permit the Vice President to take office, unless the Vice President came into the American legation, and in the presence of the American Minister, signed a statement that he was pro-American. Later, the Minister forced the President to appoint a personal friend as a Senator. The appointee was thereafter referred to as the "bayonet Senator."<sup>229</sup>

White believed Minister Morales in Honduras was in the same category as Remer.<sup>230</sup> Morales' brother owned a hotel in Tegucigalpa. Before his appointment as American Minister, Morales had worked there as bartender. Having served drinks over the bar to most of the important members of Honduran society it was understandable that his prestige was practically nil.<sup>231</sup> In addition, Morales' brother had married into one of the leading political families in Honduras. Understandably, the Hondurans did not view the American Minister as completely neutral in the continued revolutions which plagued the small country.<sup>232</sup>

<sup>227</sup> Memorandum from Francis White to Joseph Grew, October 11, 1924, Unpublished MS, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>228</sup> Ibid.

<sup>229</sup> Ibid.

<sup>230</sup> Ibid.

<sup>231</sup> Ibid.

<sup>232</sup> Ibid.

White made the following comment concerning our Minister to Panama:

Dr. South, the present Minister, is a delightful man. He is courteous and respected by Panamanians. He does no work, however, and once stated that he had not written a single dispatch since he had been Minister and did not intend to.<sup>233</sup>

White's comments on our Minister to the Dominican Republic were no more flattering. Mr. Russell had been our representative in this small country for about fourteen years. He was a career man. During this entire period of service, White observed, Russell had been reported drunk seven days a week.<sup>234</sup> Russell was universally hated by the natives, who felt he had brought on the military intervention. White recommended that Russell be removed but very strangely added:

In view of his long service I would suggest that he be given another post where our interests are not so tremendous. He could be sent to Paraguay without doing us any real harm. He could not enhance our prestige, but he can do less harm there than in any other country.<sup>235</sup>

White also believed that the career Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service in Latin America were on the whole quite incompetent.<sup>236</sup> This contention was seconded by Matthew E. Hanna, a Foreign Service Inspector. Hanna wrote to Secretary of State Kellogg, "Of the eleven secretaries I have reported upon in that region, Latin America I cannot conscientiously classify a single one as conspicuous for ability when measured

<sup>233</sup> Ibid.

<sup>234</sup> Ibid.

<sup>235</sup> Ibid.

<sup>236</sup> Memorandum from Francis White to Joseph Grew, July 2, 1924, Unpublished MS, State Department Archives, National Archives.

by a proper standard...."<sup>237</sup> Hanna wrote that our Latin American Service was in such a deplorable state that none of the Foreign Service officers wanted to go there.<sup>238</sup> A year later Hanna's report was no more encouraging. "Our Latin American service," he wrote, "will not attain the high plane of efficiency it should reach until our officers show as much interest in being assigned to it as they now show avoiding it."<sup>239</sup> He believed that the sentiment was strong throughout the Service that an assignment to Latin America carried with it a stigma.<sup>240</sup>

It is not to be implied that all the criticism of our political and career diplomats was centered in Latin America. Complaints were general throughout the Service. Our Ambassador to Italy in 1922 wrote Secretary Hughes that he could not help but feel that he was "running a sick bay for mild psychopathic cases."<sup>241</sup> He believed not one of his three junior secretaries would last a week in a competent business office.<sup>242</sup>

---

<sup>237</sup> Inspection Report from Matthew E. Hanna to Secretary Frank Kellogg, December 28, 1926, Unpublished MS, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid.

<sup>239</sup> Inspection Report from Matthew E. Hanna to Secretary Frank Kellogg, May 7, 1927, Unpublished MS, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>240</sup> Ibid.

<sup>241</sup> Letter from Ambassador Richard W. Child to Secretary Charles E. Hughes, June 1, 1922, Unpublished MS, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid.

Public criticism of the Foreign Service did not completely subside after the passage of the Rogers Act. A good part of the criticism was probably justified, for the ultra-conservative and older members of the Service continued to set the pace. On the other hand, many of the assaults on the Service were unjustified. A good example of the latter were the charges leveled at the Service by New York's Mayor James J. Walker after returning from a trip to Europe in the summer of 1927. Walker made the headlines by accusing the Foreign Service of putting the police on his trail "to get something on the Democratic Party."<sup>243</sup> The Service logically maintained that the request for foreign police protection was a routine security measure.

The next important landmark in the development of the Foreign Service was the passage of the Moses-Linthicum Act which became law February 23, 1931.<sup>244</sup> The Act made slight modifications in the classification of Foreign Service officers, reducing the number of classes from nine to eight. The law raised the maximum salary in class 1 from \$9,000 to \$10,000, and the minimum salary in the unclassified grade from \$1,500 to \$2,500. The Act also provided for automatic salary advances of \$100 to \$200 per annum, to prevent salary stagnation within grade.

The most important provisions of the law, however, related to the changes made in the internal administration of the Service. These provisions represented a belated Congressional response to the report of the

---

<sup>243</sup> A complete discussion of the much publicized trip appears in a memorandum written by Carr for the Secretary of State under date December 15, 1927. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>244</sup> 46 U. S. Statutes 1207 (1931).

Moses-Reed-Harrison Subcommittee of 1928. Elaborate provisions were enacted for the reorganization of the Board of Foreign Service Personnel. Detailed regulations were also prescribed for the compiling and checking of efficiency records. Foreign Service officers assigned for duty in the Division of Foreign Service Personnel were required to be class 1 officers. Foreign Service officers assigned to this Division were not eligible for promotion to the grade of Minister or Ambassador during the period of their assignment, or three years thereafter. Also, officers serving in the Division were to have no authority, except of a purely advisory character, over promotions, demotions, transfers, or separations.

Undoubtedly, the personnel system constituted by the Act was very cumbersome, and unduly circumscribed every personnel action. However, the original bill was even more restrictive. In fact, Assistant Secretary Carr had to threaten a Presidential veto if certain changes, that Mr. Stimson recommended, were not made.<sup>245</sup> Carr, himself, viewed the Act philosophically. Such laws made personnel administration very difficult, he penned in his diary. But these laws did not just happen. They evolved from the necessities of the situation; unsound methods, personal ambitions, and lack of honesty.<sup>246</sup>

Almost simultaneously with the passage of the Moses-Linthicum Act, the Foreign Service began to feel the effects of the severe economic

---

<sup>245</sup> Notation in Carr's diary under date February 13, 1931. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>246</sup> Ibid.

depression that was sweeping the United States and a good part of the world. Compensation of Foreign Service officers was reduced 15 per cent; post and representation allowances were abolished; rent, heat, and light allowances were reduced 65 per cent; promotions within grade were suspended; and by reducing appropriations sharply, Congress made it impossible for officers to be promoted between grades.<sup>247</sup> Income taxes were imposed upon all official incomes earned abroad,<sup>248</sup> Between March 28, 1932, when the last new appointment was made to the Service, and June 30, 1933, there were 65 separations, reducing the total strength of the corps from 775 to 710.<sup>249</sup>

The effect of the depression on the morale of the Foreign Service was naturally very severe. Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers, widow of John Jacob Rogers, maintained on the floor of the House in 1934 that the depression had practically destroyed the high esprit de corps of the Service. She informed the House that certain of our Foreign Service personnel in Canada had found it necessary to accept charity from the Canadian government.<sup>250</sup>

The devaluation of the dollar also hit the Foreign Service very hard. Officers had up to 50 per cent of their salaries wiped out

<sup>247</sup> Congressional Record, February 21, 1934, LXXVIII, 3023.

<sup>248</sup> Ibid.

<sup>249</sup> Ibid.

<sup>250</sup> Ibid., p. 3014.

overnight.<sup>251</sup> In July 1933 President Roosevelt ordered gold to be sent abroad so that Foreign Service salary checks might be converted into foreign currency at mint par.<sup>252</sup> On March 26, 1934, the Exchange Bill was passed.<sup>253</sup> This bill, retroactive to July 15, 1933, provided for the payment of officers stationed abroad in dollars equivalent to the conversion value before the United States went off the gold standard. The first request was for \$7,438,000.<sup>254</sup> By 1935 Congress had restored the 15 per cent salary cut, and again had made provision for post allowances. The Service was now in roughly the same financial position as it was at the time of the passage of the Moses-Lanthicum Act.

There was a good deal of speculation in the Foreign Service when Franklin D. Roosevelt came into office. What course of action would the new President follow with respect to career Chiefs of Mission? What general policy would he pursue with respect to the administration of the Foreign Service?

It was no secret that the political sympathies of most of the career Chiefs of Mission were with the Republican party. Many of them had obtained their appointments during the administration of a Republican

---

<sup>251</sup>Ibid., March 10, 1934, p. 4175. See also Supplementary Hearings on the Department of State Appropriation Bill, Statement by Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, 73d Cong., 2d sess.

<sup>252</sup>Memorandum from Wilbur Carr to William Phillips, July 30, 1933. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>253</sup>48 U. S. Statutes 466 (1934). See also Executive Order 6657, March 27, 1934.

<sup>254</sup>Congressional Record, March 26, 1934, LXXVIII, 5824.

president, and upon the basis of recommendations by key Republican figures.<sup>255</sup> Some like Hugh Gibson were close personal friends of ex-President Hoover. However, Mr. Roosevelt showed a surprising lack of partisanship in making his appointments in the Department of State and the Foreign Service. William Phillips, a "tennis playing" associate of Theodore Roosevelt, and a former Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary of State under Republican Administrations, was named Under Secretary of State. The President appointed Phillips on the recommendation of Charles E. Hughes.<sup>256</sup> Mr. Roosevelt also retained Wilbur J. Carr as an Assistant Secretary of State, and let it be known that it was a "personal" appointment.<sup>257</sup> The President's policy with respect to career Chiefs of Mission was equally non-partisan. Out of the fifteen ambassadorships which he filled, five were chosen from career personnel.<sup>258</sup> Sixteen of the thirty-four legations also were filled with career ministers.<sup>259</sup> Mr. Roosevelt even retained Hugh Gibson and named him Ambassador to Brazil, an assignment which many officers considered to be a promotion.<sup>260</sup>

---

<sup>255</sup>When submitting names of officers deemed worthy of promotion in the pre-Rogers days, the Department always included the names of the candidates' Congressional sponsors. For example, see letter from Frank L. Polk, Under Secretary of State to C. E. Hughes, Secretary of State, May 8, 1922. MS, State Department Archives, National Archives.

<sup>256</sup>Conversation between Louis Howe and Wilbur J. Carr recorded in Carr diary under date March 29, 1933. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>257</sup>Ibid.

<sup>258</sup>Memorandum in Carr papers, no date. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>259</sup>Ibid.

<sup>260</sup>Ibid.

Mr. Roosevelt's major criticism of the administration of the Foreign Service was that the interchangeability feature of the Rogers Act had not been sufficiently implemented.<sup>261</sup> The President said he was not impressed by the argument that those officers who had been in the old Diplomatic Service prior to 1924, and without Consular training up to the time of his election, should be left out of transfers to the Consular Branch, merely because the feeling prevailed that they were not trained for Consular duty. Mr. Roosevelt thought a tour of consular duty would be beneficial to these officers, and, furthermore, "would be good for their wives as well."<sup>262</sup> The President informed the Under Secretary of State, the four Assistant Secretaries, and the Chief of Personnel, that he wanted them to "speed up" the integration of the two Services. He left little doubt that in the future he would be very reluctant to appoint an officer Chief of Mission unless he had already served in a consular capacity.

When Mr. Roosevelt delivered his "speed up" order, approximately one half of the Foreign Service could have been freely interchanged by simple administrative action. On January 1, 1934, out of a total of 702 officers in the Service, 298 or 42.3 per cent held commissions as both diplomatic and consular officers, 49 or 6.9 per cent held commissions only as diplomatic secretaries, and 355 or 50.8 per cent were commissioned

---

<sup>261</sup>Mr. Roosevelt expressed these views on interchangeability in a meeting with State Department officials at the White House on June 28, 1934. See Memorandum of Visit to White House written by T. M. Wilson, Chief of Personnel, Department of State, June 29, 1934. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>262</sup>Ibid.

only as consular officers.<sup>263</sup> By April 1, 1934, the number of officers holding dual commissions had increased to 308 officers out of a total of 697.<sup>264</sup>

Eighteen months after President Roosevelt issued his "speed up" order, Wilbur J. Carr penned the following passage in a letter to his ex-boss, Henry L. Stimson:

Interchanges have been made in accordance with a policy of gradual transition but I do not believe they have been accepted by all of those who are sincerely interested in these matters in the spirit in which they were intended. ....A transfer to the diplomatic branch is a promotion and a transfer to the consular branch is a demotion....a punishment."<sup>265</sup>

There is still an element of truth to Carr's remark. There is substantial evidence that Foreign Service officers who spend the greater part of their careers in consular activities have not been promoted as rapidly as their fellow officers in political affairs. There is also some evidence that the Regional Bureaus have shunted many marginal officers into consular assignments.

Although Mr. Roosevelt appointed a substantial number of Foreign Service officers as Ambassadors and Ministers, it appears that he and his close circle of foreign policy advisors considered most Foreign Service officers as the "pink-tea" variety. Mr. Roosevelt often referred to the Foreign Service as the P. P., that is, the Profession of

---

<sup>263</sup>"The Foreign Service in Transition," no date. Unpublished MS apparently written by Carr. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>264</sup>Ibid.

<sup>265</sup>Letter from Wilbur J. Carr to Henry L. Stimson, December 2, 1935. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

Perfection.<sup>266</sup> Consequently, the President generally by-passed the Service in favor of his personal representatives. On the other hand, when Mr. Roosevelt did employ the services of an individual Foreign Service officer, he was generally very well pleased with the officer's performance.<sup>267</sup>

Mr. Roosevelt effected two changes in the Foreign Service during the 1930's by means of Executive action. The first, an Executive Order issued November 17, 1936, placed a ban on alien marriages in the Foreign Service.<sup>268</sup> The order was deemed to be necessary for a number of reasons. It was believed that too many officers were acquiring a foreign point of view as a result of their marriage to aliens.<sup>269</sup> Such marriages worked at cross purposes with the declared intent of Congress to "Americanize" the Service. Also, until the wife acquired her American citizenship, her alien status might unduly restrict the area of assignment of her husband. Finally,

---

<sup>266</sup> For example, the President wrote Sumner Welles, "You are, Thank God, not a career diplomat, but you may have imbibed enough savoir faire from the P. P. to prepare a brilliant or Rabelaisian answer." Letter from F. D. Roosevelt to Sumner Welles, April 15, 1941, Elliott Roosevelt, ed., F. D. R.: His Personal Letters, (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1947-50), II, 1141.

<sup>267</sup> For example, Charles Bohlen who served as an aide to Mr. Roosevelt at several important wartime conferences.

<sup>268</sup> Executive Order 7497 dated November 17, 1936.

<sup>269</sup> In 1936, of 684 Foreign Service officers, 127 had married aliens. The wife of one officer insisted on being called "Lady Winifred." Her son was heir to an Earldom.

the Department believed that the alien status of the wife might prevent her from effectively participating in the social life entailed by the diplomatic assignment of her husband.

While the reasons cited above constitute a fair basis for the enactment of such an order, it appears that the immediate reason was somewhat different. The order was probably brought about by the marriage of Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen. Mrs. Owen, daughter of William Jennings Bryan, and a former member of Congress, was the first American woman to serve as a Minister Plenipotentiary. Mrs. Owen was appointed by Mr. Roosevelt, as Minister to Denmark. While serving in Copenhagen, Mrs. Owen married a Dane. Her Danish husband was a Captain in the Royal Guard and, therefore, a member of the Royal Household. Under Danish law, Mrs. Owen, now Mrs. Rohde, became a Danish subject. The marriage caused a great deal of concern in the British Foreign Office. A British Report had just recommended that women be made ineligible for appointment to Foreign Service positions. The Foreign Office feared that the British women would use the "Owen incident" to re-open the question of feminism. Consequently, the British ambassador in Washington visited the Department of State and expressed the confidential wish that Mrs. Rohde might soon resign. <sup>270</sup>

---

<sup>270</sup> Carr's diary. Entry under date of July 24, 1936. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

The second Executive Order brought to an end the situation which existed in the Foreign Service between 1927 and 1939, under which the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture maintained independent services overseas.<sup>271</sup> In 1927 Congress had provided for a Foreign Commerce Service under the Department of Commerce, and in 1930 for a Foreign Agricultural Service under the Department of Agriculture. The Department of State fought the creation of these two independent services for many years. After they had been created, the Department of State favored an amalgamation of the two services under its administrative direction. President Roosevelt's Reorganization Plan No. II, of July 1, 1939, provided for the consolidation of the Commerce and Agriculture overseas personnel into the existing Foreign Service.<sup>272</sup> The two departments were guaranteed a substantial voice in both program determination and personnel appointments and assignments.

During the war years from 1939 to 1945, there was a vast expansion in the foreign affairs programs of the United States. Most of these overseas operating programs were highly specialized and required numerous skilled and technical personnel.<sup>273</sup> The Foreign Service had neither the skills nor the number of personnel needed to implement these programs. Consequently, the responsibility for executing these emergency programs was placed outside the Department of State and the Foreign Service.

---

<sup>271</sup>Executive Order 8185, June 29, 1939. Not published separately; Federal Register IV, No. 128, July 6, 1939, 2749.

<sup>272</sup>Public Resolution 20, 76th Cong., 1st sess., July 1, 1939.

<sup>273</sup>For example, the Office of War Information, the Office of Strategic Services, the Lend Lease Administration, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Foreign Economic Administration, and the War Shipping Board.

It soon became apparent, however, that the Foreign Service was not equipped to manage the rapid increase in the number and complexity of its traditional responsibilities.<sup>274</sup> While it might not be fair to say that "the Foreign Service was caught with its striped pants down"<sup>275</sup> it is undoubtedly true that its cumbersome, inflexible personnel system proved largely inadequate when confronted with the emergency situation. Several years later, the Director of the Foreign Service candidly stated that the corps was "undermanned, clogged with deadwood, insufficiently trained, underpaid, inadequately housed and clumsily administered".<sup>276</sup> Certainly these remarks were appropos to the Foreign Service of 1939.

A good part of the blame for this unpreparedness must be shouldered by the Service itself. The archaic thought patterns and guild-like mores that pervaded the top echelons of the pre-war organization, were not conducive to that flexibility of mind needed by the Foreign Service of a great world power. As the Brookings study recently pointed out:

When confronted by the necessity to staff new programs, or to expand the staffs of established programs at new levels of specialization, the managers of the Foreign Service personnel system are under strong statutory and environmental pressures to give first attention to the reconciliation of the inharmonious interests of the permanent career group and the proposed new program staff. In terms of personnel administration the result

---

<sup>274</sup>The Foreign Service was involved in the repatriation of American citizens abroad, the exchange of enemy diplomatic and consular personnel, the control of exports and the policing of the Proclaimed list, the screening of material requirements and a variety of other new activities.

<sup>275</sup>Statement by Congressman Vorys. Congressional Record, 79th Cong., 2d sess., July 20, 1946, p. 9588.

<sup>276</sup>Speech by Selden Chapin entitled, "The Future of the Foreign Service," delivered on January 22, 1946. Printed in Department of State Bulletin, February 3, 1946, p. 1651.

is frequently caution, delay, and a minimum of positive recruitment.<sup>277</sup>

Being cognizant of the aforementioned thought patterns in the officer corps, Assistant Secretary Wilbur J. Carr often expressed grave misgivings about the ability of the Service to meet the challenge of world leadership. In a memorandum to William Phillips, he wrote:

I have very real apprehension that the unforeseen developments in our international relations and the changes in the character and functions that have to be performed by our several missions and consulates may reveal that we have not been able to keep pace ....it will likely be found to be because the men in the Service have thought too much of place and status and what the Service could do for them and too little of what contribution they could make to it and to their Government.<sup>278</sup>

Ironically, it appears that Carr unwittingly contributed to the inability of the Service "to keep pace." For many years, Carr acted as Budget Officer for the Department. In this role he served as chief architect of the Department's annual budget. It was also his job to guide the budget safely through the Congressional hearings. Wilbur J. Carr was very popular and highly esteemed figure on "Capitol Hill." His reputation was built upon integrity and economy. Carr's budget requests were never padded. He always asked the Congress "for just enough when the other Departments were asking for more than enough."<sup>279</sup> But the Appropriations Committees, accustomed to slicing the well padded estimates of

---

<sup>277</sup>The Administration of Foreign Affairs and Overseas Operations: A Report Prepared for the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President by the Brookings Institution, (Washington: Government Printing Office, June 1951), p. 294.

<sup>278</sup>Letter from Wilbur J. Carr to William Phillips, October 28, 1935. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>279</sup>Cordell Hull, The Memoirs of Cordell Hull, (New York: Macmillan, 1948), I, 183.

the other Departments, dealt similarly with the requests of the Department of State. Consequently, the Foreign Service was forced to struggle along on inadequate funds, with the result that it was generally undermanned with respect to personnel.

Many officers in both the Department of State and the Foreign Service were aware that the officer corps was ill equipped to discharge the new responsibilities being thrust upon it. For this reason they favored the creation of independent, temporary wartime agencies to staff the new, technical overseas programs. The personnel systems of these agencies would be independent of the Foreign Service, but the policy reins were to remain in the hands of the Secretary of State. These prescient officers also recognized that the authorized officer strength of the permanent Service would have to be increased by at least fifty per cent if the Service were to do a satisfactory job in its enlarged traditional role. In recruiting these additional officers, it was recognized that, in order to obtain the necessary skills and abilities, entrants would have to be brought into the Service at all classes. Understandably, a large segment of the officer corps was reluctant to alter the status quo of the permanent Service in such a marked degree. Consequently, with a minimum of fanfare, a Foreign Service Auxiliary was constituted in the summer of 1941.<sup>280</sup> The Auxiliary compared roughly with the Reserve components of the United States armed services, permitting the commissioning of a large number of officers, without destroying the regular, peacetime career system.

---

<sup>280</sup> For an informative article on the creation of the Auxiliary see Department of State Bulletin, October 11, 1941, pp. 281-4.

At first, the Auxiliary was used exclusively in Latin America.<sup>281</sup>  
After proving its value in this region, especially in cultural and economic affairs, the Auxiliaries were utilized on a global basis. The Auxiliary grew rapidly. By the end of World War II, there were more officers in the reserve component of the Service than in the regular officer corps.<sup>282</sup>

There was a natural fear of the new component by the members of the regular Service. The "regulars" reasoned that the "reserves" might be blanketed into the Service at the end of the war. Most of the Auxiliaries had not been recruited at the bottom grades. Also, the regular officer corps had remained relatively static during the wartime period. Consequently, the regulars viewed the reserve officers as a distinct threat to their career opportunities.

The passage of the Bloom Bill of May 3, 1945,<sup>283</sup> partially resolved the dilemma of what should be done with the Auxiliary. During the war many of the Auxiliaries had performed high grade administrative and fiscal work necessitated by our increased overseas programming. However, the regular Service structure made provision for only two types of employees: regular officers and clerks. It was believed that a special category should be created for the new administrative and fiscal groups. The idea was given Congressional expression in the legislation of May 3, 1945. A new Administrative and Fiscal class was created to occupy the limbo between the regular officers and the clerks. In a short time, a large percentage of the Auxiliaries had transferred into this new group. The wartime reserve was on its way to a speedy liquidation.

---

<sup>281</sup>Ibid.

<sup>282</sup>At that time there were 970 Auxiliary officers and 820 regular officers.

<sup>283</sup>Public Law 48, 79th Cong., 1st sess., May 3, 1945.

The Bloom bill also made provision for a Reserve component in the Foreign Service, in which qualified specialists could serve for a period of four years. Conversely, the Act provided that Foreign Service officers might be "lent" to other government agencies. Finally, the Act removed the percentage limitation on the number of officers in any given Foreign Service class.<sup>284</sup>

During the war the Department had also taken an important step toward strengthening the administration of the Foreign Service. On January 15, 1944, it created the Office of Foreign Service Administration.<sup>285</sup> The Office gathered under one roof the various functions relating to the administration of the Foreign Service, and provided a structure through which more efficient administrative techniques could be employed. In addition, a Planning Staff was created. This Staff, which later became the Division of Foreign Service Planning, was responsible for the preparation of much of the postwar innovation in the Foreign Service personnel system.<sup>286</sup>

At the close of World War II the manpower problem in the regular Foreign Service officer corps became critical. With recruitment of class 6 officers practically cut off during the war, and with the wartime Auxiliary being rapidly liquidated, immediate steps had to be taken to increase the number of personnel in the Service. On July 3, 1946, Congress authorized the appointment of not more than 250 additional officers to all

---

<sup>284</sup>Supra.

<sup>285</sup>Department of State Order 1218, January 15, 1944. On May 6, 1944, the name of the office was changed to the Office of Foreign Service.

<sup>286</sup>"Report on Organization for Personnel Administration for the Department of State and the Foreign Service," Unpublished staff study, MS, April 8, 1949. Department of State, Office of Personnel.

classes of the Foreign Service officer corps.<sup>287</sup> That Act provided that 120 of these officers would be brought into the Service in fiscal 1947. To insure that the lateral appointments would not restrict the promotional opportunities of officers already in the Service, Congress increased the authorized strength of the officer corps from 1160 to 1280.<sup>288</sup>

Although many officers and a few Congressmen viewed the Manpower bill as a return to the spoils system, and a severe blow to a genuine career service, neither of these fears had any real basis in fact. The officers brought into the Service under the provisions of the Act were highly qualified individuals. They were appointed only after an elaborate screening process. The application form, itself, ran to 19 pages. In addition, there was an oral examination wherein the Service could easily eliminate any candidate whom it believed unqualified. As a further guarantee, the administration of the Act was largely placed in the hands of an ultraconservative Departmental officer, Joseph Coy Green. Mr. Green did his job so thoroughly that he soon became known as the "Foreign Service Protector."<sup>289</sup>

The next important step in the development of the Service was the adoption of the present organic law, the Foreign Service Act of 1946. The chief architects of the Act were a small group of Foreign Service officers working under the supervision of the then Director of the Office of the Foreign Service, Selden Chapin.<sup>289</sup>

---

<sup>287</sup>60 U. S. Statutes 426 (1946).

<sup>288</sup>Ibid.

<sup>289</sup>For an excellent account of the drafting and passage of the Act see Harold Stein, The Foreign Service Act of 1946, (Washington: Committee on Public Administration Cases, 1949). A summary of the Stein analysis is also known as appendix VII-C of the Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Foreign Affairs.

In the initial planning stages the Director favored the (a) retention of the career system with provision for the recruitment of specialists who would not be a part of the regular career service; (b) promotion up or selection out after a prescribed time period; (c) guaranteed percentage of the Chief of Mission posts and the Assistant Secretary positions; (d) development of a "separate" Office of Foreign Service under the supervision of a Director General.<sup>290</sup>

At the same time, the Bureau of the Budget, with its anti "closed-career" orientation, recommended that the Foreign Service should be amalgamated with the Departmental Service.<sup>291</sup> The Foreign Service was strongly opposed to this proposal, whereas certain top Departmental officers viewed the proposal favorably. For several months Chapin's chief job consisted of convincing his superior officers, on the Departmental side, that the amalgamation proposal was not a wise one.

The planning for the post war Service was interrupted at the close of World War II by the increased day to day activities in the Department resulting from the general demobilization of the wartime foreign affairs agencies. Certain of the wartime emergency functions were transferred to the Department of State for completion and liquidation. The most important of these new duties were the liquidation of the lend lease program and the sale of surplus property located abroad.

On August 31, 1945, the Department inherited over 10,000 employees

---

<sup>290</sup>"A Single Service Under the Secretary of State: A Study by the Office of the Foreign Service," known as the Foster-Chapin Report, Unpublished MSS, October 1944, Department of State, Office of Personnel.

<sup>291</sup>See "The Organization and Administration of the Department of State," August 1945, Unpublished MS, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President. A copy of this report is in the files of the Department of State, Office of Personnel.

from several wartime emergency agencies. The most notable of these agencies were the Office of War Information, the Office of Strategic Services, and the Office of Inter American Affairs. The Department was also to assume responsibility for continuing the specialized, operational activities commenced by the wartime emergency agencies.

Although the Department readily assumed the responsibility for continuing the substantive programs involved in the transfer, there was a tendency to view the employees of these agencies as displaced persons. Consequently, the Foreign Service planners tended largely to ignore the careers of the specialized personnel when designing their new organization. Only the strong protests of Departmental officers, such as William Benton and Will Clayton, brought about a somewhat amended version of the original Chapin draft.<sup>292</sup> Benton threatened to fight the bill on "Capitol Hill" unless certain concessions were made. After Chapin had yielded on several of these points, Benton agreed to testify in favor of the legislation.<sup>293</sup>

The Bureau of the Budget objected to the detailed character of the legislation.<sup>294</sup> The Bureau especially disliked the minute spelling out of each phase of personnel activity. Budget officials realized that the detailed legislation would give the Service practically an autonomous personnel system. Unfortunately, the relations between the Bureau of Budget and the Foreign Service were not conducive to compromise. Chapin misunderstood the Bureau's role in legislation. He even asked the State Department's Legal Adviser for an opinion to see if the Bureau had the

---

<sup>292</sup>Stein, The Foreign Service Act, pp. 50-56.

<sup>293</sup>Ibid., p. 63.

<sup>294</sup>Ibid., p. 80.

right to interfere in this instance.<sup>295</sup> On the other hand, the Bureau<sup>39</sup> began an all out campaign to have the legislation derailed. Specifically, it objected to the provisions that tended to build up the separatist character of the career officer corps and impeded administrative control by the Secretary of State. The Bureau favored (a) an immediate amalgamation of Departmental and Foreign Service personnel; (b) continuing recruitment at all levels; and (c) a basic equalization of pay at home and abroad with extra allowances for service overseas.

When Chapin carried his bill to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, he did so with a great deal of trepidation. He soon discovered, however, that the Subcommittee designated to examine the bill was wholly on his side. The prevailing sentiment of the Subcommittee was that there had been too great a legislative abdication during the New Deal, with the result that too much discretion had been lodged in the hands of administrators. Consequently, the members of the Subcommittee were happy to see Chapin's detailed piece of legislation. Also, the Subcommittee felt that if the various provisions of the Act were not minutely spelled out, the Appropriation committees would write their own requirements into the annual Appropriation Act. Such action would naturally lessen the power the Committee on Foreign Affairs.<sup>296</sup>

Personal reasons among members of the Subcommittee were also important. To Mr. Richards, the bill was a project of two South Carolinians, Secretary Byrnes and Assistant Secretary Russell. To Judge Kee, the bill was an Administration measure. To Mr. Vorys, the bill was a career Foreign

---

<sup>295</sup>Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>296</sup>See Reorganization of the Foreign Service, House Report 2508, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 1946.

Service measure, a group the Republican Congressman had championed for almost twenty-five years.

With gentle urging from Chapin, the Subcommittee rode roughshod over the objections raised by the Bureau of the Budget. When the bill emerged from the full Committee, the Service had won a complete victory.

The bill sped through the House, passing by unanimous consent, but it came close to defeat in the Senate.<sup>297</sup> The bill was placed on the Consent Calendar. However, several Senators were opposed to passing such an important measure without a full scale debate. Luckily for the Service, Secretary Byrnes returned from the Paris Conference in July 1946. Chapin's bill had been sponsored by Assistant Secretary of State Donald S. Russell, a law partner of Byrnes, who had entered the Department as a special favor to the Secretary. The fact that Russell had backed the bill was sufficient for Byrnes.<sup>298</sup> The Secretary immediately went on record as favoring the legislation and got in touch with the recalcitrant Senators. A few days later the bill was passed by unanimous consent.<sup>299</sup>

The Bureau of the Budget still had one final trump card to play---a Presidential veto. Angered by Chapin's "undiplomatic" approach to its objections to the bill, several members of the Bureau advocated this drastic step. But once more luck was with the Service. For several reasons a veto appeared untenable,<sup>300</sup> Byrnes had publicly supported the

---

<sup>297</sup> See Congressional Record, 79th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 9585 ff. and 9609 ff.

<sup>298</sup> Stein, Foreign Service Act, pp. 23 and 146.

<sup>299</sup> Public Law 724, 79th Cong., 2d sess., August 13, 1946.

<sup>300</sup> Stein, Foreign Service Act, p. 146.

91

bill in Congress, and a Presidential veto by Mr. Truman would appear as a repudiation of the Secretary. Such a repudiation would have been especially severe at that time, because the Secretary was engaged in delicate negotiations in Paris. Also, the bill was left in the hands of Acting Secretary Acheson. Mr. Acheson was a close friend of James Webb, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Acheson, aware of Byrne's support of the bill, probably exerted some pressure on Webb to accept it. On August 13, 1946, the President signed the enrolled bill, and it became law the following November.

The Foreign Service Act of 1946 as Amended superseded the Moses-Linthicum Act as the organic law of the Service.<sup>301</sup> The Act provided for a marked increase in pay and allowances, and established the basic structure which now prevails in the Service. It provided for two career services: one for regular Foreign Service officers, and the other for Staff officers and employees. The Act also made provision for the temporary employment of specialists for periods not to exceed four years as Foreign Service Reserve officers.

The history of the Foreign Service since 1946 has been marked by several major developments. On the substantive side, the significant change has been in the number and kind of overseas programs. On the administrative side, the notable developments have been (a) the constant pressure for a complete amalgamation of the home and field services of the Department of State, and the Department's response thereto; and (b) a reexamination of the entire concept of career staffing versus program staffing.

Since World War II, the conventional diplomatic and consular functions

---

<sup>301</sup>For a complete examination of the revisions made see 22 U. S. Code 801-1158.

have changed both in volume of activity and in the kinds of services rendered. The increased programming, especially in the economic and military fields, has necessitated a marked increase in economic and political reporting. A foreign policy can be no stronger than the intelligence upon which it is based. Consequently, the Service has been required to expand both the volume and scope of its traditional functions of analysis, reporting, negotiation, and representation.

At present, the total number of Foreign Service posts is 297.<sup>302</sup> Of these, 58 are Embassies, 14 are Legations, 53 are Consulates General, 126 are Consulates, 29 are Consular Agencies, 7 are Political Adviser's offices, and 10 are United States Information and Education offices only.<sup>303</sup> The posts vary in size from two persons in the Consulate at Guaymas, Mexico, to 681 at the Embassy in Paris.<sup>304</sup> The total number of posts may be categorized as follows with respect to number of personnel:<sup>305</sup>

<u>Number of Posts</u>	<u>Complement</u>
69	1-5
101	6-25
68	26-75
29	76-150
30	150 and over

In addition to the increase in its traditional duties, the Service must also coordinate the activities of the many specialized programs which are being conducted by the United States on a global basis. It is not within the scope of this paper to evaluate the need for these programs.

---

<sup>302</sup>Department of State, Office of Personnel, "General Information," Unpublished MS prepared for the Bureau of the Budget, October 1951, p.17.

<sup>303</sup>Ibid.

<sup>304</sup>Ibid.

<sup>305</sup>Ibid.

It would appear, however, that, as the outstanding world power, we must either provide leadership for the free world, or relinquish our paramount position. It is also true that the affirmative policy of a leader requires much more planning and ingenuity than the passive policy of the follower. Consequently, we can probably expect a continued expansion in our foreign affairs staffs both at home and overseas, for some time to come.

We do not have the opportunity here to list all of these many specialized programs. Perhaps a few examples will suffice to show the changes which have taken place in the field of diplomacy. The increased emphasis on defense makes it necessary for Service personnel to devote a sizable number of man hours to multilateral security agencies, such as the United Nations, the Organization of American States, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Also, the Mutual Security Act of 1951 makes the Chief of the United States diplomatic mission responsible for the coordination of all United States government representatives in his country.<sup>306</sup> The Point IV program, now operating in 33 countries, requires the services of over 2,000 employees.<sup>307</sup> The International Information and Educational Exchange program has almost 9,000 employees.<sup>308</sup> These two programs alone require the recruitment of thousands of specialists and technicians far removed from the conventional fields of diplomacy. In short, the substantive side of foreign policy has undergone a complete metamorphosis since the tranquil pre-World War II days.

In the past several years there has been a quickened interest in the

---

<sup>306</sup>Public Law 165, 82d Cong., 1st sess, 1951, secs. 503 and 507.

<sup>307</sup>"General Information," p. 9.

<sup>308</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

administrative aspect of foreign affairs. One need only survey the mounting literature in the field to realize the importance that is now attached to policy execution.<sup>309</sup> As the chief organ in the conduct of our overseas policy, the Foreign Service has naturally been the fulcrum upon which the criticism has turned.

The first elaborate postwar study of the Foreign Service, aside from those studies made in connection with the legislation of 1946, was that of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government popularly known as the Hoover Commission.<sup>310</sup> Probably the most important and undoubtedly the most controversial proposal made by the

<sup>309</sup> See for example Elmer Plischke, Conduct of American Diplomacy, (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1950); James L. McCamy, The Administration of American Foreign Affairs, (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1950); Kurt London, How Foreign Policy Is Made, (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1949); Paul Hoffman, Peace Can Be Won, (New York: Doubleday, 1951); Wallace J. Parks, United States Administration of Its International Economic Affairs, (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1951); The Administration of Foreign Affairs and Overseas Operations: A Report Prepared for the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President by the Brookings Institution, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951); Governmental Mechanism for the Conduct of U. S. Foreign Relations, (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1949); Report to the President on Foreign Economic Policies, (Gray Report), (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950); Partners in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, (The Committee on Public Administration Cases, 1949); Commission on Organization in the Executive Branch of the Government, Foreign Affairs, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949). In addition, there are the many unpublished studies prepared by the Department of State in connection with its personnel planning program. One of the best of these is "Facts and Issues Relating to the Amalgamation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service," 2 vols., December 20, 1949, Unpublished MSS, Office of Personnel, Department of State. This report was prepared under the direction of Arthur G. Jones, Department of State. See also the very voluminous periodical literature on the subject.

<sup>310</sup> Hoover Commission, Foreign Affairs.

Commission with respect to foreign affairs was that the personnel in 95  
the permanent Department of State establishment in Washington and the  
personnel in the Foreign Service, above certain levels, should be amal-  
gamated over a period of a few years into a single foreign affairs agency  
obligated to serve both at home and abroad.<sup>311</sup> The Hoover Commission found  
that the existence of two separate services (a) was a source of serious  
friction, inefficiency, and inequity; (b) resulted in Foreign Service  
people losing contact with American conditions; (c) resulted in Depart-  
mental people failing to acquire the necessary knowledge of foreign  
countries; (d) created two overlapping administrative hierarchies; and  
(e) resulted in the Foreign Service being largely a self administered  
organization.<sup>312</sup> The Commission pointed out that such a division of  
personnel had been abandoned in all but a handful of countries.<sup>313</sup>

The Commission set down some general principles that were to be  
responsible for the amalgamation. Members of the unified service were to  
pledged to serve at home or abroad, consolidation was to be mandatory but  
gradual, all members of the consolidated service were to have equal status  
in every way, the new service was not to be self administered, personnel  
were to be recruited into the new service at all levels, specialists were  
to have equal opportunities with generalists in every respect, and the  
reserve officer category was to be retained.<sup>314</sup>

In its report on foreign affairs, the Hoover Commission viewed amal-  
gamation only in terms of the Department of State. In a later report on

---

<sup>311</sup>Ibid., p. 61.

<sup>312</sup>Ibid., pp. 61-63.

<sup>313</sup>Ibid., p. 62.

<sup>314</sup>Ibid., p. 64.

overseas affairs, the Commission favored the creation of a unified agency embracing all governmental personnel involved in foreign affairs. This new organization would make possible the creation of a corps of career men trained in foreign administration as distinguished from training for a diplomatic job.<sup>315</sup>

The Department of State established an Advisory Committee in January 1950 in order that the Secretary might be apprised how the recommendations of the Hoover Commission could best be implemented.<sup>316</sup> The chairman of the committee was James H. Rowe, a former member of the Hoover Commission. The other two members of the commission were Robert Ramspeck, chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and William De Courcy, a career Foreign Service officer.<sup>317</sup>

The Committee filed its report on July 30, 1950.<sup>318</sup> It recommended that a single but flexible personnel system should apply to all people under the control of the Secretary of State.<sup>319</sup> The single service was to be administered initially outside of civil service.<sup>320</sup> The new service

<sup>315</sup> Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Overseas Affairs, (Washington: Government Printing Office, March 1949).

<sup>316</sup> Analysis of the Personnel Improvement Plan of the Department of State, A Report prepared by the Department of State for the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Committee Print, (Washington: Government Printing Office, April 1945), p. 48.

<sup>317</sup> The staff director was Mr. William F. Howell, on loan from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

<sup>318</sup> An Improved Personnel System for the Conduct of Foreign Affairs: A Report to the Secretary of State by the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Personnel, (Washington: Department of State, August 1950).

<sup>319</sup> Analysis of Personnel Improvement Plan, p. 27.

<sup>320</sup> Ibid., p. 28.

was to be based on the career principle, whereby permanent employees normally came in at the bottom grades and, on the basis of demonstrated merit, advanced to the top positions in the Service.<sup>321</sup> On the other hand, to insure the flexibility needed in an expanding foreign affairs system, the new Service should not hesitate to recruit specialized personnel at all levels, so long as recruitment was "properly geared to a qualifying process."<sup>322</sup>

The Rowe Committee envisioned a unified service consisting of three groups: alien employees, consular agents, and a Foreign Affairs Service.<sup>323</sup> The last named group would be divided into a foreign affairs officer group and a foreign affairs clerical and technical group. The officer category would "include generalists and program or functional specialists, but would exclude technicians in a narrow sense."<sup>324</sup>

Candidates for the new Foreign Affairs officer group would be recruited on the basis of a rigorous and comprehensive written, oral and physical examination.<sup>325</sup> The Committee recommended that the present examining system should be modified to permit more weight to be given to the specialized aspects of foreign affairs, such as economics and agriculture.<sup>326</sup>

The Rowe report received a mixed reaction in the Department. In general it can be said that Departmental officers were much more sympathetic to the proposals than their Foreign Service colleagues. The

---

<sup>321</sup>Ibid., p. 29.

<sup>322</sup>Ibid., p. 35.

<sup>323</sup>Ibid., p. 29.

<sup>324</sup>Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>325</sup>Ibid., p. 33.

<sup>326</sup>Ibid., pp. 33-34.

Employee Attitude Survey conducted at that time revealed that 55 per cent<sup>28</sup> of the Departmental officers viewed amalgamation as "very desirable," whereas only 33 per cent of the Foreign Service officers fell into the "very desirable" category.<sup>327</sup> On the other hand, only 11 per cent of the Departmental officers queried viewed amalgamation as either "somewhat" or "very" undesirable, whereas 35 per cent of the Foreign Service officers fell into these two groups.<sup>328</sup>

After studying the Rowe report, the Department issued its own directive "to improve the personnel system in the Department of State and the unified Foreign Service."<sup>329</sup> In many ways the directive might be best described as a "watered down" version of the Rowe Committee report. The Department agreed with the Rowe Committee that the two services should be more closely integrated, but it was "not convinced that complete integration is either desirable, or practicable."<sup>330</sup> In order to facilitate the limited integration which it supported, the Department agreed to liberalize the Foreign Service lateral entry provisions for a period of three years. The Department also maintained that it would strengthen the Foreign Service by a policy of more positive recruitment, by a more effective utilization of the exchange program, and by the recruitment of persons qualified and willing to serve abroad for Departmental positions for which dual service is desirable. The Department believed that most of these objectives could be obtained through administrative adjustment, although it also felt that it would operate under a definite handicap without certain amendments to

---

<sup>327</sup> Ibid., Appendix D, pp. 51 ff.

<sup>328</sup> Ibid.

<sup>329</sup> Ibid., pp. 1 ff.

<sup>330</sup> Ibid., p. 8.

the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

Consequently, through Congressman Richard of South Carolina, the Department has introduced "A Bill to Amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, As Amended, And For Other Purposes."<sup>331</sup> The new bill provides that there will be nine classes of Foreign Service officers, including the class of career minister, instead of the present seven classes.<sup>332</sup> This change is in accord with the provisions of the Secretary's personnel improvement directive. The Service contends that experience has demonstrated that there are too few classes in the Foreign Service officer category to maintain a rational, orderly promotion system. The average period of service before promotion is so long that morale is unnecessarily depressed.<sup>333</sup>

The bill reduces the number of classes in the Staff corps from 22 to 13, and increases the number of classes in the reserve from 6 to 8.<sup>334</sup>

---

<sup>331</sup>H. R. 5273. Introduced by Congressman Richards of South Carolina into the House of Representatives, October 15, 1951.

<sup>332</sup>See "Explanation of Proposed Amendments to Foreign Service Act of 1946," Office of Personnel, Department of State, mimeographed, no date. The explanation of each amendment is attached to the draft of the bill.

<sup>333</sup>Infra.

<sup>334</sup>Foreign Service Reserve officers are appointed or assigned by the Secretary of State to serve for non consecutive periods of not more than four years each. They must have outstanding qualifications of a specialized character. They are appointed or assigned to any one of six Reserve officer classes corresponding to those of regular Foreign Service officers. While on active duty they receive the same pay, allowances and privileges accorded to Foreign Service officers. Because of their specialized backgrounds, most Reserve officers serve as attaches or in similar capacities.

Foreign Service Staff officers and employees include all American personnel who are not in the Foreign Service officer or Foreign Service Reserve officer category. Included in their ranks are administrative officers, certain highly skilled technicians, clerks, couriers, secretaries, and translators. For purposes of pay and promotion, Staff personnel are divided into 22 classes. The top pay in the Staff corps, however, is much lower than the top pay in the Foreign Service officer and Reserve officer corps. Since many Staff personnel do the same work as Foreign Service

The proposed salary rates for each of the top eight classes (excluding career minister) in the officer corps, the Reserve corps, and the Staff corps are identical. It is believed that this new salary alignment will eliminate causes of friction, will facilitate transfers from the Staff corps to the Foreign Service officer group, and will facilitate the classification of positions in the Foreign Service.

Under the proposed legislation, a person appointed as a Foreign Service officer may receive basic salary at any one of the rates of the class to which he is appointed. At present, all appointments to the officer corps between classes 1 through 5 must receive salary at the minimum rate of that class, whereas appointment to class 6 may be at any one of the rates provided.<sup>335</sup> This new provision is intended to facilitate lateral entry into the Foreign Service by permitting the oral examining panels to appoint candidates "at an appropriate class" without a reduction in salary.

The proposed legislation would also: (a) make the Foreign Service officer corps eligible to receive a salary differential not exceeding 25 per cent of basic salary for service at extraordinarily hazardous or difficult posts; (at present, this differential is limited to members of the Staff corps). (b) would increase the maximum period of service of a Reserve officer from four to seven years; (c) would increase the maximum period of service of a Foreign Service officer assigned to other agencies from four to five years; (d) makes provision for the temporary appointment

---

officers or Reserve officers at less pay, there is a certain amount of friction between the groups. The selection out principle applied to Foreign Service officers is not applied to Staff officers and employees. Members of the Reserve and Staff corps participate in the Civil Service Retirement System.

<sup>335</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 413.

of Foreign Service officers to a higher class under certain provisions; (e) extends the selection out process to class 1 officers; (f) limits the amount of selection out benefits payable to persons so retired.

Officials of the Bureau of the Budget have privately expressed dissatisfaction with the Secretary's "Personnel Improvement Program." Bureau officials look upon the Department's cautious and half-way approach as prima facie evidence that the career officer group is attempting to scuttle the amalgamation program. The Bureau favors a complete amalgamation of the home and field services of the Department of State within a reasonably short period of time.<sup>336</sup>

On the other hand, the Department underlines the Rowe Committee recommendation that integration should not be pursued with "ill advised haste."<sup>337</sup> The Department feels that experience gained from implementing a limited amalgamation will provide the basis for determining, at some future date, what further steps, if any, it will be practicable or advisable to take.<sup>338</sup>

It appears that the Department of State's philosophy of amalgamation is much narrower than the philosophy held by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department tends to view the main foreign affairs integration issue as a Departmental-Foreign Service problem. On the other hand, the Bureau views the problem as one of government-wide proportions.<sup>339</sup> While recognizing the primacy of the Department of State within its own major purpose

---

<sup>336</sup>Statement based upon interviews with several officers in the Bureau of the Budget.

<sup>337</sup>Analysis of Personnel Improvement Plan, p. 45.

<sup>338</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>339</sup>Brookings Institution, Administration of Foreign Affairs and Overseas Operations, p. 298.

field, the Bureau feels that foreign policy has outgrown the Department. The Brookings survey points out that in September 1950 there were 43 agencies of the United States government carrying on activities overseas.<sup>340</sup> These agencies employed 74,879 civilian personnel of which only 15,812 were employees of the Department of State or the Foreign Service. The Department of Defense employed 51,204 of the total number of overseas personnel, or approximately two out of every three.<sup>341</sup> Consequently, the Bureau believes that any genuine planning in foreign affairs administration will have to be conducted on a government-wide plane.

The question arises as to what the Department's proper role should be in the conduct of a government-wide foreign policy. The Brookings report considers this question and concludes that the Department should not take over all foreign affairs work but "should perform major policy and operating functions within its own major purpose field."<sup>342</sup> The Report rejects the idea that the Department should not be given responsibility for the operation of overseas programs.<sup>343</sup> In fact, the Report concludes that special purpose agencies for the conduct of foreign affairs should be created only in "rare instances."<sup>344</sup> The survey hints, however, that eventually it may be desirable to create a new Department of Foreign Affairs modeled after the Department of Defense.<sup>345</sup>

---

<sup>340</sup> Ibid., p. 244.

<sup>341</sup> Ibid., p. 248.

<sup>342</sup> Ibid., p. XIX.

<sup>343</sup> Ibid.

<sup>344</sup> Ibid.

<sup>345</sup> Ibid., p. 112.

In the field of personnel administration the Brookings report favored the creation of an expanded and simplified foreign affairs personnel system "inclusive of all, or nearly all, civilian foreign affairs staffs at home and abroad."<sup>346</sup> The Report viewed the proposed amalgamation of the home and field forces of the Department of State as the first stage in such a program. The survey did not favor either career or program staffing per se, that is, it did not favor the one to the exclusion of the other. Rather, the Brookings study concluded that a successful personnel system in the foreign affairs field would judiciously blend the two concepts into a balanced approach.<sup>347</sup> To aid in the creation of the new foreign affairs personnel system, the Brookings survey favored the appointment of an administrative assistant in the Executive Office of the President who would devote himself to an intensive study of the problem for a period of one to three years.<sup>348</sup>

In the preceding pages we have attempted to sketch the evolution and development of the various personnel practices and concepts in the Foreign Service officer corps. In the following pages we will attempt to analyze and evaluate the specific personnel policies as presently employed in the officer corps. Before we begin that analysis, however, it may be helpful to outline briefly the machinery through which the contemporary personnel policy is carried into effect.

The Foreign Service of the United States is directed by and is responsible to the Secretary of State. The Service is administered by

---

<sup>346</sup>Ibid., p. 325.

<sup>347</sup>Ibid., p. 324.

<sup>348</sup>Ibid., p. 312.

104

the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration under authority delegated to him by the Secretary of State.<sup>349</sup> The Deputy Under Secretary develops and executes personnel policies and programs through the medium of the Office of Personnel.<sup>350</sup> The Office of Personnel consists of (a) the Office of the Director, (b) the Division of Departmental Personnel, (c) the Division of Foreign Service Personnel, and (d) the Foreign Service Institute.

The Director of the Office of Personnel is served by a Special Assistant on operating matters, a Planning Adviser on long range planning, and an Executive officer on matters relating to internal administration. Personnel plans, policies, and regulations are prepared in the Office of Personnel. The Planning Adviser to the Director is responsible for developing overall personnel improvement plans and personnel legislation.

The Division of Foreign Service Personnel is responsible for developing and maintaining current personnel policy for overseas personnel management. The Division approves the classification of positions, approves appointments and assignments of Foreign Service officers below class 3, and approves and authorizes leave, travel, and related expenses.

The statutory interdepartmental Board of the Foreign Service advises the Secretary of State on major matters of personnel policy concerning the functions of the Foreign Service.<sup>351</sup> The Board is made up of three

---

<sup>349</sup> Until 1949 the Service was administered by the Director General of the Foreign Service, who was a career Foreign Service officer. Legislation of that year placed the administration of the Service in the hands of the Secretary of State, and legally ended the situation under which the Service was self administered. Public Law 73, 81st Cong., 1st sess., May 26, 1949.

<sup>350</sup> This sketch is based upon material found in the Foreign Service Manual, I, Part IV, secs. 330-335.

<sup>351</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 211.

Assistant Secretaries of State, the Director General of the Foreign Service, and representatives from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, having comparable responsibilities in their respective Departments. The statutory Interdepartmental Board of Examiners, constituted in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State, is responsible for the recruitment and testing of Foreign Service officers. <sup>352</sup> The Board of Examiners discharges these operating functions through a Secretariat headed by an Executive Director. The Secretariat is attached to the Office of Personnel. Finally, the statutory Foreign Service Institute is responsible for the development and execution of government-wide policies and programs relative to training in the field of foreign affairs. <sup>353</sup>

---

<sup>352</sup> *Ibid.*, sec. 212.

<sup>353</sup> *Ibid.*, sec. 701

## CHAPTER II

### RECRUITMENT

Recruitment may be defined as that process through which suitable candidates are induced to compete for appointments to the public service. In the Foreign Service, recruitment is fundamental to the success of the career program. Unless able and qualified candidates are induced to present themselves for consideration, no amount of subsequent high level administration will produce a superior Foreign Service.

Unfortunately, most governmental agencies have taken a negative approach towards the recruitment of personnel.<sup>1</sup> The primary role of the Civil Service Commission was conceived originally as one of "keeping the rascals out" of the public service. It was wrongly assumed that if the rascals were kept out, if political favoritism were prevented, the more qualified individuals would automatically gravitate towards the public service. Recruitment became a passive concept, and there were few attempts to improve the positive standards of public personnel administration. This passive concept was not so harmful when our government performed a minimum of functions, and specialization was the exception rather than the rule. A negative government requires only integrity and consistency in its officials, whereas, a positive government requires a continuing supply of invention and suggestion.

---

<sup>1</sup>For background see J. Donald Kingsley, Recruiting Applicants for the Public Service, (Chicago: Civil Service Assembly, 1942); Lewis Meriam, Personnel Administration in the Federal Government, (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1937); Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel, Better Government Personnel, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935); W. E. Mosher and J. D. Kingsley, Public Personnel Administration, 3d ed.; New York: Harper, 1950); U. S. Civil Service Commission, History of the Federal Civil Service: 1789 To The Present, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1941).

A dynamic recruitment policy is particularly important in the American Foreign Service. The career concept in the officer corps presupposes that the positions of command and leadership will be filled generally by promotion from within. It was once said of Napoleon's army that every foot-soldier carried a marshal's baton in his knapsack.<sup>2</sup> The same is also true of the Foreign Service. Every fledgling Foreign Service officer is looked upon as a potential Career Minister.<sup>3</sup> Not all will reach the coveted top rung of the Service, but all will have an equal opportunity to demonstrate their capacity for increased responsibility. Unless the Service is able to develop strong and imaginative leaders through its career program, the Department of State will not have achieved its fundamental objective.

The recruitment process involves much more than direct contact with potential employees. Broadly conceived, it involves the elimination of unfavorable attitudes of the public towards careers in the government service, and the substitution of more favorable opinions. More specifically, it necessitates the knowledge of personnel needs in terms of numbers, categories, levels, and types of employees. It presupposes a very close relationship between the recruitment and the selection processes, if these two functions are under the control of different bodies. It entails an effective use of all the media of information, press, radio, television, and motion pictures. It involves contacts

---

<sup>2</sup>Statement by John W. Davis before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, cited in Congressional Record, 67th Cong., 4th sess., February 6, 1923, 3157.

<sup>3</sup>U. S. Department of State, The Foreign Service Manual, (Washington: Government Printing Office, revised to May, 1962), I, Part IV, 112.

with college presidents, Congressmen, business leaders, and the various fraternal and social organizations. In short, it consists of the constant formulation of dynamic and positive plans for attracting more qualified individuals to public employment.

Before the recruitment process can begin, the offices responsible for this activity must be apprised of the quantity, quality, and specific types of employees they are to recruit. In the Department of State this determination is an integral part of the budget process.<sup>4</sup> Each September the field posts submit estimates of their personnel needs for the coming fiscal year.<sup>5</sup> These estimates are referred to the Regional Bureaus of the Department for review and evaluation.<sup>6</sup> In discharging this function, and thereby establishing definite personnel staffing plans for their particular geographic area, the Regional Bureaus attempt to work closely with other offices which have a legitimate interest in overseas operations.<sup>7</sup> This process involves a continuing liaison with numerous inter and intra departmental agencies. The staffing reports go from the Regional Bureaus to the Department's Office of Budget and Management where they receive a final check before being submitted to

---

<sup>4</sup>Information on the recruitment process in the Foreign Service is based largely on personal interviews with Mr. Frederick Darnell, Budget Officer, Foreign Service Personnel; Mr. James Henderson, FSO, Office of Personnel; Dr. Cromwell Riches, Executive Secretary, Board of Examiners; Mr. George L. Zier, Recruitment Branch, Foreign Service Personnel. An unpublished manuscript, "Information on Specific Personnel Processes: Recruitment," (Office of Personnel, 1951, mimeographed), was also of value. This manuscript was prepared at the request of the Bureau of the Budget.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

the Bureau of the Budget.<sup>8</sup> There they are integrated into the Administration's overall foreign policy program. Lengthy Congressional hearings follow in which bureau, office, and division chiefs must be able to defend their particular requests for personnel.<sup>9</sup>

Following the enactment of the annual budget, and the apportionment of funds, each of the Regional Bureaus determines the number of positions it will need, and the types and levels of work to be performed.<sup>10</sup> These requests are submitted to the Division of Foreign Service Personnel and form the basis of its future personnel actions.<sup>11</sup> Since overseas programming is not a static concept, changes in country operations inevitably arise, calling for a concurrent expansion or contraction of personnel. For this reason the Field Operation Branch of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel is organized on a regional basis, and maintains a close relationship with its substantive counterpart.<sup>12</sup>

With the exception of alien employees, the Division of Foreign Service Personnel has action responsibility for filling specific positions.<sup>13</sup> The division determines the qualitative standards for filling

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

positions in the Service, and also determines whether a position will be filled by outside recruitment or by promotion from within.<sup>14</sup> In both of these determinations the division is advised by the appropriate regional bureau. If outside recruitment is deemed advisable in the Staff or Reserve branches, the Recruitment Branch of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel is advised of the number, kind, and quality of the employees needed.<sup>16</sup> The recruitment of Foreign Service officers, however, is vested exclusively in the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service.<sup>17</sup>

The members of the Board of Examiners are named by the Secretary of State and include the Director General of the Foreign Service, the Director of the Office of Personnel of the Department of State, the Executive Director of the Board of Examiners, the Chief of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel of the Department of State, the Chief Examiner of the Civil Service Commission, and one officer each from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce and Labor.<sup>18</sup>

The Board of Examiners meets five times a year.<sup>19</sup> The operating functions of the Board, including recruitment, are performed by a Secretariat under the direction of the Executive Director of the Board.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, Public Law 724, 79th Cong., 2d sess., sec. 212; U. S. Department of State, "Announcement 779," 1946

<sup>19</sup> Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, Executive Secretary, Board of Examiners, personal interview.

<sup>20</sup> U. S. Department of State, "Announcement 780," 1946

Organizationally, the Secretariat is attached to the Office of Personnel.<sup>21</sup>

In practice, the inter-departmental Board of Examiners has been a facade, and the actual power of the Board has been vested in its Secretariat, or more specifically in its Executive Director.<sup>22</sup> There are several reasons why this is true. In the first place, it is generally true of interdepartmental committees that one department must either assume primary responsibility for the formulation and execution of policy, or face the possibility that no one will accept responsibility for executing the functions assigned to the Committee. In the case of the Board of Examiners this primary responsibility rests with the Department of State.<sup>23</sup> Also, one individual in the department of primary interest is usually delegated or assumes chief responsibility for designing and carrying out the functions assigned to the Committee. In the case of the Board of Examiners this individual until recently was its Executive Director, Mr. Joseph C. Green.<sup>24</sup> If the individual designated is industrious, conscientious, and strong-willed, he may play the decisive role in the formulation and execution of the committee's policies.

---

<sup>21</sup>"Information on Specific Personnel Processes; Recruitment."

<sup>22</sup>Information on the operation of the Board of Examiners is based largely on personal interviews with Dr. Cromwell Riches, Executive Secretary, Board of Examiners; Mr. James Taylor, representative of the Department of Labor, Board of Examiners; Mr. Fred Rossiter, representative of the Department of Agriculture, Board of Examiners; the "Minutes of the Meetings of the Board of Examiners," (Unpublished MSS, Board of Examiners, 1946-1951), and other reports and papers from the current files of the Board of Examiners.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

In addition, it is often true, that although the other members of the interdepartmental committee, especially those outside the department of primary interest, are conscientiously interested in the workings of the Board, usually they have neither the time nor the information to participate actively in its affairs.<sup>25</sup> Of course, few would advocate the participation of an inter-departmental committee in the day to day aspects of administration. But all too often an interdepartmental committee is presented with a fait accompli on major aspects of policy. While other members of the Committee may not agree with this policy, they usually find their position too isolated, or their own departmental duties too strenuous, to assume an attitude of strong opposition.<sup>26</sup>

The Board of Examiners is assisted by an Advisory Committee on Foreign Service Examinations.<sup>27</sup> This committee is composed of distinguished individuals from the fields of education, personnel administration, and psychological testing, who advise the Board of Examiners on problems arising in connection with recruitment and selection.<sup>28</sup> In practice, the Advisory Committee's functions have been more theoretical than real. The Executive Director of the Board of Examiners chooses the members of the Advisory Committee and also serves as its chairman.<sup>29</sup> It

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

could be reasonably assumed, therefore, that the members selected to the Committee largely share the point of view of the Director. In practice, the point is of little consequence. The Committee meets once each year and forwards its recommendations through the Executive Director to the Board of Examiners.<sup>30</sup> The recommendations are turned over to the Board Secretariat for appropriate action, which means they will receive such attention as the Executive Director deems appropriate.<sup>31</sup> As chairman of the Advisory Committee the Executive Director can "water down" such proposals as do not meet with his own major premise, and as Executive Director of the Secretariat he can further control their effect. The Advisory Committee has made several recommendations for two or three consecutive years, but no genuine action has been taken upon them.<sup>32</sup>

The Foreign Service Act of 1946 provides that the Board of Examiners shall operate in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State and "under the general supervision" of the Board of the Foreign Service.<sup>33</sup> The Act gives the Board of Examiners specific authorization to provide for and to supervise all examinations given for entry into the Foreign Service officers corps.<sup>34</sup> Departmental regulations

---

<sup>30</sup>  
Ibid.

<sup>31</sup>  
Ibid.

<sup>32</sup>  
Ibid.

<sup>33</sup>  
Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 212.

<sup>34</sup>  
Ibid.

also vest in the Board the responsibility for the recruitment of Foreign Service officers.<sup>35</sup> The Act implies that the Board of the Foreign Service will establish principles of broad policy with respect to recruitment and selection for the guidance of the Board of Examiners,<sup>36</sup> however, such policy has emanated almost exclusively from the Secretariat of the Board of Examiners.<sup>37</sup> The Board of Examiners tells the Board of the Foreign Service what they have done after it has been completed, instead of receiving actual guidance from them.<sup>38</sup> When this issue was raised in 1948, during a meeting of the Board of Examiners, it was decided that the relationship between the two boards would be established in the following form, "The Board of Examiners will keep the Board of the Foreign Service currently informed of its actions."<sup>39</sup>

Policy with respect to the recruitment and selection of Foreign Service officers has been largely shaped, therefore, by the Secretariat of the Board of Examiners, and until very recently by the ex-Executive Director of the Board, Mr. Joseph C. Green.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, I, Part IV, sec. 122.33. U. S. Dept. State, "Announcement 780," 1946.

<sup>36</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, Sec. 212. See also Department of State, Manual of Regulations and Procedures, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949, Looseleaf), Department Regulation 182.7.

<sup>37</sup> Statement by Mr. James F. Taylor, Chief, Foreign Service Division, Department of Labor representative on the Board of Examiners, personal interview.

<sup>38</sup> "Minutes of the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service," (Unpublished MS, Board of Examiners, October 14, 1948). The same might also be said with respect to the past relationship between the Board of Examiners and its Secretariat. Most actions taken by the Executive Director in the past appear to have been largely independent of any policy guidance from the full Board.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Statement by Mr. James F. Taylor, personal interview.

Mr. Green was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1887.<sup>41</sup> A graduate of Princeton University, he later spent ten years on its faculty, serving as an Assistant and an Associate Professor of History. He joined the Department of State in 1930, and a year later was named Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Foreign Service Examinations, a position he retained until he was named Minister to Jordan on June 3, 1952.<sup>42</sup> After serving with distinction in numerous Departmental assignments, he was named Executive Director of the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service in 1946. A conscientious, hard working officer, he followed in the footsteps of Wilbur J. Carr,<sup>43</sup> and is chiefly responsible for the standards of recruitment, and selection in the Service today. Like the illustrious Dr. Carr, Mr. Green has done much to set the tone of the Service over a period of years.

The Recruitment Process: Class 6 Officers. The recruitment of Foreign Service officers can be broken into two major categories. First, the recruitment of young men and women at least 20 and under 31 years of age for appointment at the bottom or entering grade, class 6.<sup>44</sup> As would be expected, the major source of class 6 recruits is America's colleges and universities. Second, the recruitment of lateral appointees to the intermediate and upper grades of the Service under the provisions of

---

<sup>41</sup>U. S. Department of State, Biographic Register of the Department of State, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951), p. 178.

<sup>42</sup>Dr. Cromwell Riches was named Executive Director June 10, 1952.

<sup>43</sup>Supra.

<sup>44</sup>Regulations of the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service for the Conduct of Examinations for Appointment of Foreign Service Officers," effective June 15, 1948, (Board of Examiners, revised to April, 1952), sec. 8.

<sup>45</sup>Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, Executive Secretary, Board of Examiners, personal interview.

section 517 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.<sup>46</sup> The requirements of that section limits the recruitment of these officers to personnel of the Department of State or the Reserve or Staff branches of the Foreign Service.<sup>47</sup>

As we have indicated previously, the ability to attract a large number of able and qualified applicants for positions in the Foreign Service officer corps is a prerequisite for the successful operation of the career system. If the candidates who present themselves for examination are a small and mediocre group, no selection process or subsequent training or promotion program will turn them into a capable corps of officers. On the other hand, if the Board is able to attract a large number of highly qualified applicants, and then by means of modern examination techniques to select the upper ten to twenty per cent of these officer candidates, the Service will remain a strong and vital organization.

Unfortunately, the number of applicants presenting themselves for the class 6 examination has shown a marked decline in recent years, as can be seen on the following chart.<sup>48</sup>

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of class 6 candidates</u>
1946	2954
1947	1288
1948	1141
1949	1128
1950	807
1951	680

<sup>46</sup> 60 U. S. Statutes 1008 (1946).

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> In 1951, only 56 candidates for class 6 officer positions passed the written examination although an additional 97 candidates passed all except the language examination and may still qualify. Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

In order to determine the basic causes for this decline in class 6 applicants, the Department circulated a questionnaire among the various colleges and universities throughout the country.<sup>49</sup> On the basis of over one hundred replies the following reasons were cited: the excessive time period between initial designation and eventual appointment, the disturbing effects of the draft, the tightness of the labor market owing to a high level of industrial activity, the intense criticism directed against the Department by Senator McCarthy and other individuals and groups in recent years, and the relative ease with which appointments can be obtained in the foreign service of other departments.<sup>50</sup> To these reasons can be added the decline in the number of college graduates in the past several years, and the decline in the percentage of veteran students composing college graduating classes.<sup>51</sup> The first of these last two reasons becomes important when we realize that the average number of officers presenting themselves for class 6 examination between 1936 and 1942 was approximately 500 a year.<sup>52</sup> A good part of the increase in the 1947-49 period, therefore, probably can be attributed to the bumper crop of college graduates during those years.<sup>53</sup> The percentage of veterans may be important in that it

---

<sup>49</sup> "Information on Specific Personnel Practices: Recruitment."

<sup>50</sup>  
Ibid.

<sup>51</sup>  
U. S. Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1951, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951), pp. 120-121.

<sup>52</sup>  
Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

<sup>53</sup>  
In 1930 there were 122,488 college graduates in the United States. The number increased to 164,943 in 1938 and 271,019 in 1948. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1951, p. 118.

has been determined that successful Foreign Service candidates tend to be much more traveled than the unsuccessful candidate or the average American, particularly, in travel overseas.<sup>54</sup>

In order to reverse the downward trend in class 6 applicants, the Board of Examiners has taken several positive steps to intensify recruitment.<sup>55</sup> For example, a major objection voiced against the present recruitment procedure relates to the excessive delay between initial designation by the Board of Examiners and eventual appointment to the Service.<sup>56</sup> At present, a candidate must make application for appointment no later than July 1, of the year in which he desires to take the examination.<sup>57</sup> The written examination is taken in September, and, if the candidate is successful, the oral examination follows in the Spring.<sup>58</sup> Until recently, even after passing the oral examination the candidate might find that he had a long wait before being given an actual appointment.<sup>59</sup> The Board is now studying various ways by which this time period might be substantially reduced, and in addition, has taken steps to obviate the importance attached to the delay.<sup>60</sup> Until 1952 in order to be designated for examination the candidate had to be at least 21 years

---

<sup>54</sup> The number of veteran enrollees in American colleges and universities declined from 1,021,038 in 1948 to 572,307 in 1950. Ibid., p. 120.

<sup>55</sup> Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>56</sup> "Information on Specific Personnel Practices: Recruitment."

<sup>57</sup> Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 3.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., sec. 4.

<sup>59</sup> Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

of age.<sup>61</sup> Most candidates have completed college at this age and want to settle down and get started on their careers. Consequently, they are reluctant to become involved in an elaborate selection process which will extend over a period of approximately one year. Cognizant of this fact, the Board recently lowered the minimum testing age to 20.<sup>62</sup> This will permit the average college student to take the examination during his last year in school, and, if he is successful, he will be processed and ready for appointment upon graduation and his 21st birthday.<sup>63</sup>

The Department has also been active in holding regional conferences at various universities throughout the country to acquaint the representatives of American colleges and universities with the personnel needs of the Service. During 1951 five Departmental conferences held at Washington, Chicago, Haverford, Cambridge, and Nashville were attended by over 150 representatives of American colleges and universities.<sup>64</sup> In addition, the Department has attempted to obtain the services of one interested faculty member at each school and university to serve as a liaison officer between the Service and the school. The faculty member encourages qualified students to apply for the Foreign Service Examination, and acquaints the student with the advantages of a Service career. In 1952

---

<sup>61</sup>Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 8.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid.

<sup>64</sup>Other conferences were planned for Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles and Austin but had to be abandoned for lack of staff. Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, personal interview.

the Department had the services of 595 liaison officers in 361 colleges and universities.<sup>65</sup>

Finally, the Department has begun to distribute more adequate informational material on the Foreign Service. In April, 1952 the Department published a revised pamphlet, The U. S. Foreign Service: A Career for Young Americans.<sup>66</sup> This readable booklet is a marked improvement over the drab recruitment literature previously published by the Board of Examiners. At present, this written information is made available to universities, members of Congress, post offices, regional Civil Service centers, and the Veterans Administration. The Board hopes to supplement this information with speakers within the limits of its available budget and manpower, and has already taken some steps to this end.<sup>67</sup>

Critique of Class 6 Recruitment Policies. Two major criticisms can be directed at the class 6 recruitment policies of the Board of Examiners. In the first place, after due consideration of the obvious limitations of budget and manpower, the observer is led to conclude that the recruitment policy pursued by the Board has been much too passive. In the second place, the observer is led to the conclusion that the Board has had a tendency to restrict its recruitment area by discriminating against certain groups, namely, women, Negroes, and Jews.

no elaboration

---

<sup>65</sup> Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

<sup>66</sup> U. S. Department of State, The U. S. Foreign Service: A Career for Young Americans, Publication 4559, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952).

<sup>67</sup> Statement by Dr. Riches, personal interview.

In times past, little emphasis was placed upon the recruitment aspect of personnel administration in the federal government.<sup>68</sup> It was believed that if incompetent political appointees were kept out of the Service, a sufficient number of competent individuals would automatically present themselves for examination. In many ways, those who designed the recruitment policies of the Foreign Service during the nineteenth and early twentieth century were justified in holding such beliefs. The needs of our Service both in terms of numbers and specialized abilities were few. If the Service could recruit men of limited imagination who would keep out of trouble and consistently discharge the minimum of political and social duties assigned to their posts, the government was satisfactorily although not brilliantly served. Today, this concept is no longer sufficient. As a world power and a world leader we need a Foreign Service adequate in number and diversified in abilities and skills. Honesty and devotion to duty are no longer sufficient qualifications in themselves. The new Service needs highly qualified men with superior insight and intuition, men capable of continually formulating and executing affirmative policies in a dynamic world society.

In order to obtain a sufficient number of individuals with these capacities and skills, the Foreign Service must design a positive recruitment policy, and prepare to compete with industry and the various professions and vocations for its personnel. Today, such a policy is

---

<sup>68</sup>  
Supra.

more important than ever before. At the time when the United States is being clothed with innumerable new responsibilities, the Department's prestige is at low ebb, and the labor market is especially tight. It would appear, therefore, that a successful recruitment policy is not only necessary to obtain a superior Foreign Service, but is needed to preserve the national interest itself.

Competition for the superior college graduate has become especially keen during the past decade. In recent years private industry has discovered that it must have a positive recruitment policy of its own if it is to obtain superior personnel.<sup>69</sup> It is estimated that more than a thousand companies send representatives directly to colleges and universities for recruitment purposes, and that many times that number seek graduates through correspondence or telephone requests.<sup>70</sup> One recent survey showed that 75 per cent of those companies having over 1,000 employees carry on special college recruiting programs, while 30 per cent of the smaller companies have like programs.<sup>71</sup> Since the colleges and universities are the major source of recruitment for class 6 officers, this increased competition from industry, coupled with the increased demands of the Service, superimposed on the smaller college classes of today, means that the Board's old policies of attracting capable college graduates must be injected with new vigor, or new policies must be designed to take their place.

---

<sup>69</sup>  
Infra.

<sup>70</sup>  
Bureau of National Affairs, Techniques of College Recruiting,  
(Washington: Bureau of National Affairs, 1951), p. 1.

<sup>71</sup>  
Ibid., p. 2.

The Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Personnel pointed out that the two factors college seniors consider most important in choosing a job are salary and promotional opportunity, and in both these respects they believed private industry was much superior.<sup>72</sup> There is good reason to believe that the Foreign Service can offer the college graduate today, salary and promotional opportunities that would compare favorably with those offered by most private industries.<sup>73</sup> In addition, the Service can provide highly competent individuals with unexcelled opportunities for security, interesting associations, opportunity for personal development, and opportunity for public service, those factors which college seniors consider of next most importance in choosing a career.<sup>74</sup> But the college senior must be acquainted with these advantages if they are to influence his career plans. Several class surveys conducted by the writer have shown that an insignificant fraction of the total number of qualified college seniors in his classes had any knowledge of the general outline of a Foreign Service career, whereas, practically all of these students had a fairly accurate picture of career opportunities in the armed services. It was also discovered that most of the students who had a knowledge of the career opportunities in the Foreign Service obtained this information and interest from sources outside the Board of Examiners. Unquestionably, the

---

<sup>72</sup> Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Report on Federal Personnel, Appendix H, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949), p. 7.

<sup>73</sup> Class 6 officers begin at a minimum salary of \$3993 per annum. In addition they receive very liberal allowances. Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, secs. 412, 415, 901. See also The Foreign Service Manual, I, Part IV, secs. 221.2, 320, 331, 334 and 340.

<sup>74</sup> Report on Federal Personnel, Appendix H, p. 7.

recruitment policy of the Board of Examiners had been much too passive. The Secretariat, under Mr. Green, did little to encourage qualified graduates to take the examination. A radical change of thinking on recruitment policy must take place in the Board Secretariat, therefore, if the Foreign Service is to remain the central organ in the conduct of our foreign policy.

Several techniques could be employed by the Department to strengthen its positive recruitment policy with a minimum outlay of time, money and personnel.<sup>75</sup> Since the colleges and universities are the major source of recruitment for class 6 officers the effort should be concentrated primarily in this area. The Board should encourage officers who are assigned to specialised training programs at various American universities to discuss the advantages of a Service career to groups at the college, and to counsel prospective candidates. Officers in the field should be encouraged to write brief articles for publication in hometown or college newspapers. These articles would be divorced from policy and would deal with some of the interesting experiences the officer has had in the Service. Officers returning from the field on home leave, especially the younger officers, should be encouraged to give several lectures to school and fraternal groups. In addition, the Department should send six to ten young officers on annual college recruiting tours of three to four weeks. In this time 120 to 160 colleges could be canvassed. Because of the direct examination between positive recruitment and the

---

<sup>75</sup> Between the time when this chapter was first drafted in October, 1951, and the time when the paper was completed in June, 1952, the Board of Examiners had already initiated some of the policies suggested here.

number of qualified candidates presenting themselves for examination, recruiting tours of this nature will not only attract a much larger number of class 6 candidates, but will tend also to broaden appreciably the regional basis of the Service, and make it more representative of America.

Activities of this type not only stimulate interest in the Service by potential officer candidates, but more broadly conceived tend to eliminate unfavorable attitudes of the public toward careers in the government service, thereby raising the prestige value of these careers. Graduation from either West Point or Annapolis requires a great deal of ability, energy, and determination, but the prestige attached to success in the academies is so great that there is always an abundance of applicants. The prestige of a Foreign Service career is already high in informed quarters. Better employment of informational media will tend to catholicize this prestige, and increase the number of qualified applicants for class 6.

Initial reform in the Foreign Service was obtained largely through the efforts of the various business groups in the United States.<sup>76</sup> During the "Carr Era" the working relationship between the various chambers of commerce and similar groups of business and professional men and the consular service was very close and cordial.<sup>77</sup> Today this relationship is much less pronounced, and the observer cannot help but conclude that the Department could maintain a much closer liaison with

---

<sup>76</sup>  
Supra.

<sup>77</sup> The Personal Papers and Correspondence of Wilbur J. Carr, MSS.

the various business and fraternal organizations. The same is also true of the functional organizations representing labor and agriculture. Through the medium of these groups the overall prestige of the Service can be raised, and the search for qualified class 6 applicants facilitated.

The Department's proposal to reduce the time lag between initial designation for examination and eventual appointment also should aid the recruitment process. The present process is so time consuming that numerous candidates drop out before completing the cycle. In fact, a very large percentage of the eligible candidates drop out between initial designation and the written examination. In 1948, for example, 2,015 applications were received for designation.<sup>78</sup> Of these, 1,960 were designated to take the written examination.<sup>79</sup> However, only 1,165 of those designated appeared for the examination, or approximately 59 per cent of those designated.<sup>80</sup> Since it can be presumed that many of these applicants dropped out because they had already found satisfactory employment, the Board's decision to lower the minimum designation age to 20 to permit candidates to take the examination during their last year of college, should eliminate many of these withdrawals. It may be advisable for the Board to permit applicants to take the examination if they are 20 years of age or if they have completed three years of work at an accredited college or university. This would permit the able nineteen year old student to qualify as well, and then it would be up to the oral

---

<sup>78</sup>Minutes of the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service," October 14, 1948.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid.

examining panel to determine whether the candidate was mature enough for appointment on graduation, or whether he should be deferred for a year. The deferred student might be encouraged to pursue graduate or language and area studies during this year of waiting, and, therefore, be much better prepared for his career in the Service.

Although the Department of State overtly maintains a policy of non-discrimination in its personnel policies, there is substantial evidence to support the contention that sub rosa discrimination against certain groups, namely, women, Negroes, and Jews, has been practiced for a long time.<sup>81</sup>

In March 1952 there were only 21 women in the Foreign Service officer corps, and this number in itself represented a rapid increase since 1947.<sup>82</sup> One of the feminine officers, Dr. Frances E. Willis, Counselor of Embassy at Helsinki, has reached class 1, and two others have reached class 2.<sup>83</sup> Women are permitted to take the written examination on the same basis as men, and the statistics of the Board of Examiners reveal that a higher percentage of women attempting the examination pass than is true of men.

Originally, after the passage of the Rogers Act in 1924, the policy of Secretary of State Hughes was to bring women into the Service on the

---

<sup>81</sup> This statement is based on extensive interviews with personnel officers in the Department of State, with officers in the Foreign Service, and with officers in the Departments of Labor and Agriculture.

<sup>82</sup> In 1947 there were five women in the Foreign Service officer corps. Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

<sup>84</sup> In 1948 and 1949, 135 women took the examination and 15.6 per cent passed. Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

same basis as men.<sup>85</sup> Powerful spokesmen in the old diplomatic service were opposed to such a policy and they registered their opposition in strong terms. Typical were the following objections raised by Hugh Gibson:

Joe<sup>86</sup> says the Department's policy is to apply exactly the same examination tests to women as to men and to take in those who pass the exams. He says this policy was formulated by Mr. Hughes and that it must be carried out. Without being contentious, I can't see that there is anything sacred about the orders of anybody on a matter of this sort or that these orders are unchallengeable....As nearly as I can make out we are now going on the theory of the feminists that women are entitled to recognition and to as many places as they can secure by passing examinations. It seems to me that is proceeding on the wrong basis.....<sup>87</sup>

Gibson favored a moratorium on feminine appointments "until we can form some idea of their usefulness."<sup>88</sup> Gibson sent this letter to Assistant Secretary of State Castle who forwarded it to Secretary of State Kellogg with the observation, "I have shown it to Bill Phillips<sup>89</sup> who says that he agrees to the limit."<sup>90</sup> The Secretary of State penned, "I agree", at the bottom of Gibson's letter and returned it to Castle for appropriate action.<sup>91</sup> The lone dissenter at this time

---

<sup>85</sup>Infra.

<sup>86</sup>Probably Joseph Grew, then Undersecretary of State.

<sup>87</sup>Letter from Hugh Gibson to W. R. Castle, August 7, 1925, (Unpublished MS, Department of State Archives, National Archives). Gibson at that time was Minister to Poland.

<sup>88</sup>Ibid.

<sup>89</sup>Then an Assistant Secretary of State.

<sup>90</sup>Letter from Hugh Gibson to W. R. Castle.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid.

was Assistant Secretary Carr who objected to the promulgation of such a policy. Dr. Carr believed that the Board of Examiners could eliminate most all of the women by "legitimate" means, and he resented Gibson's insinuation that he (Carr) was not using the Board of Examiners to give the Foreign Service "that protection which may properly be extended through the Board of Examiners."<sup>92</sup>

Officers in the Department of State who were queried by the writer readily admitted that there has been a reluctance to admit women to the career service.<sup>93</sup> Nor can the logic of their objections to female officers be lightly dismissed. It is maintained that too many feminine officers resign in order to marry when they are becoming of the greatest value to the Service, and this seriously disrupts the career program. On the other hand, if the married female officer becomes the "breadwinner" and attempts to take her husband with her from post to post a good deal of public criticism might be generated.<sup>94</sup> Furthermore, it is argued, the employment of women at Foreign Service posts is limited by custom and religion, by hardship and sanitation, and by the inherent nature of the duties. For example, certain foreign countries are opposed to the employment of women in certain capacities. Also, the natural conditions prevalent in certain countries are such that minimum health and sanitation

---

<sup>92</sup> Carr's remarks were addressed to Castle and were attached in memo form to the Gibson letter.

<sup>93</sup> They also believe this prejudice has been declining significantly in recent years.

<sup>94</sup> While not a career officer, our present Ambassador to Denmark, Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, poses such a problem.

cannot be provided. Finally, women find it difficult to perform certain consular duties, such as inspecting merchant seamen aboard ship. In spite of these objections, valid as they are, it would appear that the Foreign Service officer corps could much better utilize the services of women. The armed services have already destroyed many of the myths concerning the limited usefulness of women as commissioned officers. Today women are serving with distinction in many vital roles in the army, navy, and air force.

In justice to the Department it should be pointed out that there appears to be much less discrimination against women Foreign Service officers in recent years. In fact, one can discern a positive effort in many sectors of the Department to attract more feminine candidates for the officer corps. The Service points with pride to Frances Willis, FSO-1, to prove that women can reach the top rungs of the career ladder. Naturally, a few isolated cases do not prove a general theory, and the consensus of those interviewed in the Department of State was that the Department "had to prove" that such a feat was possible, and the dependable but colorless Dr. Willis, with few departures from conformity and fewer Service enemies, was a logical choice. Nevertheless, it appears that women can look forward to career opportunities in the Service with much more enthusiasm than was warranted previously.

At present, there are approximately seven Negro officers in the Foreign Service officer corps,<sup>95</sup> and it is unquestionably true that in

---

<sup>95</sup> Personnel are not categorized according to race, creed, or color on official records. The approximate number was given to the writer by an officer in the Office of Personnel. See U. S. Civil Service Commission, Rules, sec. 4.3; Executive Order 9346 dated May 27, 1943; and memo from N. S. Riemer to A. G. Jones, "Discrimination," (Unpublished MS, Office of Personnel, October 18, 1949).

the past the Foreign Service has not viewed the recruitment of Negro officers with enthusiasm. In the four examinations for the officer corps held between September 1948 and October 1951 not a single Negro candidate passed the written examination.<sup>96</sup> It might be implied from this statement that Negroes have not been kept out of the Service, but rather, that they have not been able to demonstrate sufficient qualifications for careers in the Service. It is true that the number of American Negroes qualified by education and experience is much less than the number of American whites. There are many well qualified Negroes, however, who would make excellent career officers, and there has been very little effort in the past to encourage them to apply for designation.<sup>97</sup> An officer connected with the Board of Examiners has suggested that the lack of successful Negro candidates on the written examination may be explained by the fact that the more qualified Negroes have been reluctant to apply for positions in the Service, believing their chances for eventual appointment were very meager. This officer believed that the Executive Director of the Board of Examiners had never "gone out of his way" to change this impression. The Secretariat of the Board of Examiners sinned, therefore, more by omission than by commission. Also, until very recently, Negro officers have found themselves rigidly circumscribed with respect to both assignment and promotion.<sup>98</sup> The Negro officer generally could look forward to assignments in Haiti, Liberia, and similar posts. Promotion was very slow. Today, one can discern a more progressive attitude

---

<sup>96</sup>Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>97</sup>Ibid.

<sup>98</sup>Statement based on interviews with officers in the Office of Personnel.

toward the recruitment of Negro officers. The Department recently employed a consultant to advise them on the better utilization of Negro manpower.<sup>99</sup> The consultant and the Executive Secretary of the Board of Examiners already have had several discussions concerning the development of more positive techniques for recruiting Negro officers.<sup>100</sup> The Executive Secretary recently visited Fiske University to encourage qualified Negro students to apply for the Foreign Service examination, and plans trips to several other Negro universities in the near future.<sup>101</sup> In addition, several Negro officers in the Service are now assigned to the more desirable posts, and the former policy of assigning Negro officers to "Negro posts" appears to be disintegrating.

There is an acute need in the Service today for qualified Negro officers. At posts in the satellite countries and in the Far East, qualified Negro officers, in addition to their other abilities, would be of inestimable value in helping the Service counter Communist propaganda relating to American racial discrimination. In addition, because of the general suspicion of white men in the Far East, our Negro officers might be much better equipped to win the confidence of the oriental people.

It would be more difficult to prove the case of Jewish discrimination, although officers in the Department admit that such prejudice was unquestionably present in the minds of many individuals who have played key roles in the administration of the Foreign Service. On the other hand,

---

<sup>99</sup>Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid.

members of the Jewish faith such as Louis G. Dreyfus Jr. and Louis Halle Jr. have served on the oral examining panels and have played important roles in the conduct of our foreign policy.<sup>102</sup>

Historically, the question of prejudice or suspected prejudice has always been a very difficult one for the Department to ignore. For example, the appointment of G. Howland Shaw as Chief of Foreign Service Personnel was delayed for a long period of time because Shaw was a member of the Roman Catholic faith, and it was contended that this would make his actions with respect to assignment and promotion suspect by the non-Catholic members of the Service.<sup>103</sup>

In the past five years there appears to be a significant decline in these various types of discrimination, and we would conclude that the recent personnel changes on the Secretariat of the Board of Examiners will further alleviate the charges of prejudice that have been lodged against the Foreign Service. We do not imply that the Secretariat consciously discriminated against any race, creed, or color, but the Executive Director was in search of "representative Americans" and his personal definition of the term often limited his field of choice. Perhaps that is what a high Departmental officer meant when, in seeking to justify Mr. Green's nomination as Minister to Jordan, he told a Congressional group at a closed hearing, "After all, he kept the Service pure."<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup>Dreyfus is a Career Minister in the Foreign Service. Halle is a policy level officer in the Department of State. Department of State, Biographic Register, pp. 127, 187.

<sup>103</sup>The Personal Papers and Correspondence of Wilbur J. Carr, MSS.

<sup>104</sup>Statement quoted from a personal interview with a reliable government official.

Final recommendations to improve the recruitment of class 6 officers relate to suggested structural changes in the recruitment hierarchy. The following suggestions are made:

1. In order to serve better the overall needs of the government in overseas operations, the Board of Examiners should receive genuine policy direction from the Board of the Foreign Service.

2. The Board of Examiners should function as a genuine inter-departmental agency with a free exchange of ideas. The Board should exercise greater control over the Secretariat in matters of policy than it does at present. Broad policies should be determined by the Board of Examiners and should be executed by the Board Secretariat.

3. To permit a more liberal exchange of ideas in the meetings of the Board of Examiners, it is suggested that the Executive Director of the Board be a non-voting member.

4. The Executive Director of the Board of Examiners or any other member of the Board Secretariat should not be permitted to sit on the oral examining panels. This would eliminate the charge that the one "permanent" member of the examining panels exerts undue influence on the ad hoc members.

5. The members of the class 6 oral examining panels should be selected by the Secretary of State on advice from the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service. Previously, the Executive Director of the Board has played too important a role in selecting these deputies. The public should be liberally represented on the oral examining panels, and several of the deputies should be women.

6. The present Advisory Committee on the Foreign Service Examinations appears to be of little value in its present form and could be discontinued without prejudicing the recruitment or selection program. If the Advisory Committee is continued, its members should be chosen by the Secretary of State on advice from the Board of the Foreign Service.

7. The Executive Director of the Board of Examiners should not serve as a member of the Advisory Committee if it is continued, although the records of the Board should be made available through him to the Committee.

The Recruitment Process: Lateral Appointments: General. The normal method of recruiting new personnel into a career service is at the bottom or entering level. Few people advocate a completely closed career hierarchy, however, believing such a system might not be able to provide necessary flexibility in times of stress.

Entry into the Foreign Service officer corps is primarily at class 6, the lowest level. However, section 517 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 permits persons to be appointed to classes 1 through 5, provided they have completed at least three years of service (four years if under 31) in the Department or Foreign Service preceding appointment, and provided they can pass the examinations prescribed by the Board of Examiners of the Foreign Service for the class for which application is made.<sup>105</sup>

The Department of State is committed to the principle that these lateral entrants under the provision of section 517 should be restricted

---

<sup>105</sup>  
60 U. S. Statutes 1008 (1946).

in number in order to maintain the career principle of filling vacancies by promotion from within.<sup>106</sup> Consequently, in normal times, the number of persons entering the Service by way of the regular 517 lateral entry route is insignificant.<sup>107</sup> Excepting lateral appointments under the provisions of the Foreign Service Manpower Act,<sup>108</sup> between November 1946 when the Foreign Service Act of that year took effect, and June 1948 only six lateral appointments had been made.<sup>109</sup> In fiscal year 1949, eight appointments could have been made to classes 1 through 4, but only five were made.<sup>110</sup> The same year ten appointments could have been made to class 5, but none of the ten applicants were successful.<sup>111</sup> Between July 1, 1946, and January 1, 1952, only 23 appointments were made to all classes under the regular 517 program.<sup>112</sup>

At present a somewhat liberalized policy is being followed with respect to lateral appointments. Both the Hoover and Rowe Commissions recommended that the personnel in the home service of the Department of State in Washington, and the personnel in the Foreign Service should

---

<sup>106</sup> U. S. Congress, House, An Analysis of the Personnel Improvement Plan of the Department of State, Prepared for the Use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs by the Department of State, 82nd Cong., 1st sess., April 26, 1951, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951), p. 17.

<sup>107</sup> Infra.

<sup>108</sup> 80 U. S. Statutes 426 (1946).

<sup>109</sup> U. S. Congress, Analysis of the Personnel Improvement Plan, p. 35.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid.

<sup>112</sup> Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

eventually be amalgamated into one integrated Foreign Affairs service.<sup>113</sup> Although the Department of State has not accepted the recommendations of these committees in toto, it has begun a limited integration of the home and field services on a voluntary basis, through the medium of a gradual expansion of the Foreign Service officer corps.<sup>114</sup>

The Department scheme will operate approximately on these lines. After appropriate study, dual-service positions will be identified in the Department of State. A dual-service position is a departmental position for which overseas experience is believed to be "essential or desirable."<sup>115</sup> Also, a careful study will be made to determine which of those jobs now held by Foreign Service Staff officers could be more efficiently filled by members of the officer corps.<sup>116</sup> Gradually, over a period of three or four years, the Foreign Service officer corps is to be expanded through lateral entry and more vigorous recruitment at the class 6 level, so that eventually all of the dual-service and more important staff positions will be filled by members of the officer corps.<sup>117</sup> In order to

---

<sup>113</sup> U. S. Department of State, "An Improved Personnel System for the Conduct of Foreign Affairs: A Report to the Secretary of State, August, 1950, (Office of Personnel, Photo-Offset, 1950), p. 11. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Affairs, Task Force Report, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949), p. 124.

<sup>114</sup> U. S. Congress, Analysis of the Personnel Improvement Plan, p. 3.

<sup>115</sup> "Identification and Staffing of Departmental Position for which Overseas Experience is Essential or Desirable." May, 1952, (Unpublished MS, Office of Personnel, mimeographed).

<sup>116</sup> "Memo from William Howell to H. P. Martin," March 27, 1950, (Unpublished MS, Office of Personnel, typewritten).

<sup>117</sup> "U. S. Congress, Analysis of the Personnel Improvement Plan, p. 10.

permit the officer corps to expand rapidly to a size adequate to staff these new responsibilities, initial emphasis is placed upon the recruitment of personnel already in the Department of State or in the Reserve and Staff branches of the Foreign Service.<sup>118</sup> These personnel have been invited to compete for positions in the expanded Foreign Service under somewhat liberalized provisions for lateral entry under section 517 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.<sup>119</sup> Under the regular provisions, as promulgated by the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, lateral entrants are limited to a small percentage of the annual vacancies in the Service, and, in addition, must be judged to possess the "background and demonstrated ability such as to make them compare favorably with the best officers in the corresponding classes of the Service."<sup>120</sup>

Under the liberalized provisions promulgated by the Board of Examiners on April 25, 1951, new regulations will be in effect until June 30, 1954.<sup>121</sup> These temporary regulations provide that officers who demonstrate their qualifications satisfactorily in examination may be appointed to the Service without regard to quota, and, in addition, the officer appointed need only compare favorably with the average officer in the corresponding class of the Service.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

<sup>119</sup> See U. S. Department of State, Departmental Announcement 91, April, 1951. U. S. Department of State, Foreign Service Circular 69, April, 1951.

<sup>120</sup> Regulations of the Board of Examiners, secs. 9-10.

<sup>121</sup> See Regulations of the Board of Examiners, Temporary Provisions, effective April 25, 1951.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., secs. 9-10.

The liberalized lateral entry program is not in any way a negation of the career principle. In fact, the many officers to be appointed under the liberalized provisions will not restrict promotion of officers already in the Service, whereas, those few appointed under the provisions of the regular 517 program do restrict these promotions. Under the liberalized program, the permanent size of the Foreign Service will be increased and that of the Department of State decreased, each time a lateral transfer is made.<sup>123</sup> Under the regular administration of the 517 program, the permanent size of the Foreign Service is not increased. Rather, the lateral appointee fills a vacancy that could otherwise be filled by promotion from within.<sup>124</sup>

(a) The Regular Lateral Entry Program. Through December 31, 1951, a total of 188 lateral appointments had been made to the Foreign Service.<sup>125</sup> These appointments included those made under the regular 517 program and those made under the temporary provisions of the Manpower Act of July 3, 1946.<sup>126</sup>

At the close of World War II the manpower problem in the Foreign Service officer corps became critical. With recruitment of class 6 officers practically cut off during the war period, and with the wartime Auxiliary due to expire in a short time, immediate steps had to be taken to increase the number of personnel in the Service. On July 3, 1946,

---

<sup>123</sup> Department of State, Questions and Answers on Personnel Operations Under the Secretary's Personnel Improvement Directive, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951), p. 27.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid.

<sup>125</sup> Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

<sup>126</sup> 60 U. S. Statutes 426 (1946)

Congress passed the Foreign Service Manpower Act authorizing the appointment of not more than 250 additional officers to all classes of the Foreign Service officer corps.<sup>127</sup> This temporary provision was to remain in effect for a period of two years and expired in 1948.<sup>128</sup> Before the Manpower Act expired, 165 officers had been selected from 2,452 manpower candidates from a variety of governmental and non governmental sources.<sup>129</sup>

Section 517 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 provides that a person who has not served in class 6 may be eligible for promotion to classes 1 to 5 inclusive, if he has passed such examinations as are prescribed by the Board of Examiners, and if he has rendered at least four years of actual service immediately prior to his application, in the Department of State or in the Staff and Reserve branches of the Foreign Service, except that the service requirement will be reduced to three years if he has reached his thirty-first birthday.<sup>130</sup>

Until the establishment of the liberalized provisions on April 25, 1951, the requirements established by the Board of Examiners to implement the provisions of section 517 for lateral entry were so restrictive, that very few candidates were able to enter the Foreign Service by this route. Candidates for appointment to classes 1 to 4 inclusive are not permitted to exceed five per cent of the annual vacancies in each class or one,

---

<sup>127</sup>Ibid.

<sup>128</sup>"Final Analysis of Appointments Made Under the Manpower Act," October 14, 1948, (Unpublished MS, Board of Examiners, typewritten).

<sup>129</sup>Ibid.

<sup>130</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 517.

whichever is greater.<sup>131</sup> In addition, the candidate must possess the background and demonstrated ability to compare favorably with the best officers in the corresponding classes of the Service.<sup>132</sup> This determination is to be made by the panel of deputy examiners appointed by the Board of Examiners to conduct the oral examination of the candidate.<sup>133</sup> Since each successful candidate fills a position which otherwise can be filled by promotion from within, the panels have not been particularly anxious to find the applicant qualified. The Board's requirement that the candidate must compare favorably with the best officers in the class for which he applied is a highly subjective determination and can be used to exclude all but a handful of applicants. As one panel member expressed it:

A candidate may be approved for a given class, only if...he would be among the best career officers already in that class. This is a matter not so difficult to determine in most cases as it might at first appear to be. Usually the candidate's qualifications for the career service are so doubtful that it is impossible for the panel to conclude that he must be considered the equal of the top men in the class for which he applies. Most of these candidates should consider themselves fortunate to be recommended by the panel even for a lower class in the career service.<sup>134</sup>

Candidates for appointment to class 5 under the regular lateral entry program are required to be between 25 and 34 years of age, to have rendered at least four years, or if they were over 31 years of age, at least three years of continuous service in the Department or the Foreign

---

<sup>131</sup> Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 10.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., secs. 4, 10.

<sup>134</sup> Fred W. Brown, "Oral Examination of Candidates for the Foreign Service," July 25, 1949, (Unpublished MS, Board of Examiners, typewritten). Mr. Brown is a retired civil servant and has served as a Deputy Examiner.

Service or both, with efficiency ratings of "Excellent" or "Very Good" for each of those years.<sup>135</sup> The class 5 candidate is required to pass the regular class 6 written examination and in addition, is required to score in the upper one-third of a scale of 21-points in an oral examination.<sup>136</sup> Only the ten highest ranked candidates possessing qualifications such as to make them compare favorably with the best officers in class 5 are to be certified for appointment to that class.<sup>137</sup> Candidates not so certified but otherwise eligible are to be certified for appointment to class 6.<sup>138</sup>

Under the liberalized procedure, the candidate for class 5 must still pass the written examination, but is only required to be in the upper half of the 21-point scale, be the approximate equivalent of the average officer in the class, and he may be appointed without reference to any quota.<sup>139</sup>

Under the provisions of the Foreign Service Manpower Act and the operation of the regular 517 program, 188 lateral appointments were made to the Service between June 1948 and January 1952.<sup>140</sup> These applicants were drawn from all regions of the United States, with the heaviest concentrations in the middle Atlantic, and the north central states. These two regions, comprising 15 states, and accounting for 42.9 per cent of the population in 1950, accounted for 60.1 per cent of the total number of lateral appointees during the above period.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup> Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 9.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid.

<sup>139</sup> "Regulations of the Board of Examiners, Temporary Provisions," effective April 25, 1951, (Board of Examiners, 1951), sec. 9.

<sup>140</sup> Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid.

There were several significant changes in the source of recruitment of lateral appointees between these years vis a vis regular class 6 appointees. In the first place, the predominance of Harvard, Princeton, and Yale graduates was not as great. The three schools provided 32 of the successful candidates, more than any other three schools, but only 16.9 per cent of the total number of appointees.<sup>142</sup> During the same 1946-1952 period, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale provided 26.3 per cent of the successful class 6 officers.<sup>143</sup>

The concentration of successful lateral entrants in a handful of schools also was not as pronounced. Twelve schools, which accounted for exactly 50 per cent of the total number of successful class 6 candidates during the 1946-1952 period, were responsible for only 41.5 per cent of the successful lateral entrants during a similar period, and 21 schools which accounted for 65.1 per cent of the successful class 6 applicants during the period 1952-1951, and 57.2 per cent of the successful candidates during the 1946-1952 period, were responsible for only 48.4 per cent of the successful lateral entrants during the 1946-1952 period.<sup>144</sup> The 188 lateral appointees during the 1946-1952 period were drawn from 91 American universities and one foreign university.<sup>145</sup>

The contrast between successful candidates coming from urban states as opposed to rural states is appreciably less marked in the lateral appointees than in the class 6 appointees. Five urban states accounting

---

<sup>142</sup> Ibid.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid.

for 32.3 per cent of the total U. S. population in 1940,<sup>146</sup> and 32.1 per cent in 1950,<sup>147</sup> were responsible for 51.0 per cent of successful class 6 officers between 1937-1949 and 42.9 per cent between 1946 and 1952.<sup>148</sup> These same states accounted for only 31.9 per cent of the lateral appointees during the 1946-1952 period.<sup>149</sup> On the other hand, the 19 predominantly rural states in the 1940 census with 23.9 per cent of the population,<sup>150</sup> provided 9.2 per cent of the successful class 6 officers between 1937 and 1949 and 15.7 per cent between 1946 and 1952, and were responsible for 15.4 per cent of the lateral entrants during the 1946 to 1952 period.<sup>151</sup>

Of the 188 lateral entrants appointed to the Service under provisions of both the Foreign Service Manpower Act and section 517 from 1946 to 1952, 109 (58 per cent) were drawn from government service, and 79 (42 per cent) were recruited from private employment.<sup>152</sup> The Department of State provided 26 of the lateral appointees recruited from the government service, and other government agencies contributed the remaining 83.<sup>153</sup> Two

---

<sup>146</sup> Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1951, pp. 30-31.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid.

<sup>148</sup> Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid.

<sup>150</sup> In the 1950 census these rural states had 23.8 per cent of the total U. S. population. Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1951, pp. 30-31.

<sup>151</sup> Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid.

professions, business executives and educators accounted for 58.2 per cent of the total number of entrants recruited from private employment.<sup>154</sup>

The lateral entrants appointed during the 1946-1952 period were a very well educated group. All of the 188 had had some college training, 93 per cent held a Bachelor of Arts degree or its equivalent, and 59 per cent had pursued studies on a graduate level.<sup>155</sup>

There is one marked difference in the regional backgrounds of officers born in the United States and recruited via lateral entry and their fellow officers who entered the Service via class 6. Forty per cent of the class 6 officers appointed during the period 1946 to 1952 were recruited from northeastern states, viz., New England and the Middle Atlantic states, whereas only 29 per cent were recruited from middle western states.<sup>156</sup> In the recruitment of lateral entrants during the same period, these figures are exactly the reverse, the northeastern states providing 29 per cent of the successful candidates and the midwestern states providing 40 per cent.<sup>157</sup> An examination of table A will show that a good part of the drop by the northeastern states was centered in New England although the Middle Atlantic states also registered a decline. It will be remembered that the percentage of lateral entrants coming from "Ivy League" or New England quality schools was significantly smaller than the percentage of class 6 recruits coming from these schools and this may explain a part of the decline.<sup>158</sup> As the

---

<sup>154</sup> Ibid.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid.

<sup>158</sup> Supra.

Department expands its positive recruitment policy, more qualified applicants will present themselves from the other regions of the country, and it is probably safe to conclude that the monopoly position held historically by the northeastern states will rapidly disintegrate.

TABLE A

Recruitment Sources by Region---Entrants to  
Foreign Service Officer Corps 1946-1952\*\*\*

<u>Region</u>	<u>Class 6 appointees</u>		<u>Lateral appointees</u>		<u>Percent of total</u> <u>U. S. population, 1950</u>
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Northeast	254	40	52	29	26
New England	68	12	9	5)	6)
Mid Atlantic	166	28	43	24)	20)
South	114	19	38	21	31
Midwest	169	29	70	40	30
Far West	<u>70</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>13</u>
Total	587*	100	178**	100	100

\* 33 officers were born abroad making a total of 620

\*\* 10 officers were born abroad making a total of 188

\*\*\* Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel, Department of State.

(b) The Liberalized Lateral Entry Program. To facilitate a limited amalgamation of the home and field forces of the Department of State, officers and employees of the Department and the Foreign Service recently were invited to compete for appointment in an expanded Foreign Service officer corps under liberalized lateral entry provisions.<sup>159</sup> Any officer or employee of the Department of State, the Foreign Service Staff corps, or the Foreign Service Reserve who could meet the eligibility requirements was permitted to apply.<sup>160</sup> To expedite the amalgamation of the two services, the deadline for filing applications under the liberalized provisions was set at November 1, 1951.<sup>161</sup> All examinations under the liberalized program must be completed within a three year period,<sup>162</sup> and this early closing date gives the Department a firm basis for scheduling examinations and planning other aspects of the overall program.

The eligibility requirements for filing were as follows: the applicant must have been an American citizen for at least ten years, if married he was required to have an American spouse, his efficiency rating in the Department during the three or four year period of immediately prior service must have been, before January 1, 1951, "Very Good" or "Excellent" and after that date, "Satisfactory" or "Outstanding". If applying for class 5 the applicant must have been at least 25 and as of July 1, 1951 under 34. To apply for class 4 or higher, the candidate must have been at least 31 and as of July 1, 1951, under 53.<sup>163</sup>

---

<sup>159</sup> Supra.

<sup>160</sup> Supra.

<sup>161</sup> Regulations of the Board of Examiners, Temporary Provisions, effective April 25, 1951, sec.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid.

A candidate meeting these minimum provisions could apply for any class for which he considered himself eligible.<sup>164</sup> The candidate must be able to convince the oral examining panel, however, that he possesses qualifications equal to the average officer in that class.<sup>165</sup> In order to facilitate this determination, the Department established a list of average age and experience tables for officers in all classes of the Service, projected on known data and anticipated promotions to April 1, 1951.<sup>166</sup> The tables follow:

Age of the Foreign Service officer category

Class	Average of oldest 10%	Classes 1-6	
		Average Age of class	Average Age of Youngest 10%
1	59.4	51.1	43.8
2	59.0	48.0	38.6
3	57.7	43.6	34.4
4	53.0	38.3	30.1
5	40.9	33.2	28.3

Experience of Foreign Service officer category

Class	Average length of experience of most experienced 10%	Classes 1-6	
		Average length of experience of class	Average length of experience of least experienced 10%
1	33.5	25.25	16.9
2	33.9	21.60	11.9
3	33.6	17.37	8.6
4	26.8	11.63	5.3
5	13.0	6.39	3.8

The examining panels are also guided by these data in recommending the class to which a successful candidate should be appointed, although

---

<sup>164</sup> Ibid.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid.

<sup>166</sup> "Department of State Announcement 91, Announcement of Examinations for Appointment as Foreign Service Officer", (Office of Personnel, 1951).

the quality and level of the applicant's experience and the versatility of his interests are considered of more importance than the time factor.<sup>167</sup> Only in very exceptional cases, however, will a candidate be recommended for a class if he is younger than the average age of the youngest ten per cent in that class, or less experienced than the average length of experience of the least experienced ten per cent in that class.<sup>168</sup> Under these provisions it would be very difficult for a young man in his early thirties who has qualified as a GS-15 under Civil Service, to be recommended above class 4 by the oral examining panel. This would amount to a reduction of approximately four Civil Service grades. The Foreign Service believes it is justified in pursuing such a policy in regard to lateral entrants for two reasons. First, Civil Service appointments are made to individual positions whereas Foreign Service appointments are made to a level of responsibility. An officer well qualified to serve at a high level position in a "narrow specialty," may not have the necessary background and experience to serve in a variety of assignments at that high level. Consequently, he must be assigned to a level of responsibility commensurate with his overall abilities.<sup>169</sup>

Second, because of the level type of promotion in the Foreign Service, an officer has less chance for rapid promotion, since he must be annually ranked and must compete for promotion against all officers in his class. The time and experience minimum is an attempt to reconcile the two dissimilar systems, and establish an equitable basis for resolving complaints

---

<sup>167</sup> Department of State, Questions and Answers on Personnel Operations, p. 14.

<sup>168</sup> Ibid.

<sup>169</sup> Statement by James Henderson, FSO, Office of Personnel, personal interview.

from both sides.<sup>170</sup> In spite of these minimum requirements it is still possible for a superior officer with exceptional qualifications to be appointed to a class higher than his minimum age and service qualifications might warrant, but these appointments are to be most exceptional.<sup>171</sup>

The Department of State received a total of 2,150 applications for lateral transfer under these liberalized provisions. The total number of applicants can be broken down according to the class for which they applied as follows:<sup>172</sup>

Class	Number
1	67
2	273
3	436
4	886
5	249
No class indicated	<u>239</u>
Total	2150

By January 1, 1952 only 40 of these candidates had been examined with the following results:<sup>173</sup>

Class	Examined	Approved for class for which designated	Approved for next lower class	Not approved for appointment
1	2	1	1	0
2	5	1	3	1
3	13	2	5	6
4	20	10	0	10
5	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	40	14	9	17

---

<sup>170</sup> Department of State, Questions and Answers on Personnel Operations, p. 8.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid., pp. 8,14.

<sup>172</sup> Statistics compiled by the Office of Personnel, Department of State.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid.

Although it is too early to draw any definite conclusions, on the basis of this small sample and previous lateral entry statistics, we can presume that appreciably less than half of the total 2,150 candidates will be approved for appointment.<sup>174</sup> Probably, no more than 600 to 700 candidates will eventually become Foreign Service officers.<sup>175</sup> Although the Department of State has not completed its study of dual service positions, a preliminary estimate set the figure at approximately 1,500 jobs.<sup>176</sup> This means that the Foreign Service will eventually be called upon to staff 1,500 additional officer positions, approximately 600 to 700 of which will be filled by lateral entrants from the Department. The additional 800 to 900 positions will be filled by more intensive recruitment at the class 6 level. With the interest in class 6 appointments on a rapid decline in recent years, the Department will have to step-up its recruitment policies to an unprecedented level. If the Department is still unable to attract a sufficient number of well qualified class 6 recruits, it would appear that it will have to turn elsewhere for its officers. The most common suggestion is that the Department should extend its liberalized lateral entry

---

<sup>174</sup> By June 1952 approximately 120 candidates had been examined. Of these, about 60 have been rejected, about 30 have been approved for the class for which they applied, and about 30 have been approved for the next lower class. Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>175</sup> This figure is based on the consensus of Departmental officers who were interviewed. Many Departmental officers expressed surprise that there appears to be little or no planning with respect to the total number of officers to be recruited laterally, or the total number to be recruited to any particular grade.

<sup>176</sup> U. S. Congress, Analysis of the Personnel Improvement Plan, p. 10. Several officers in the Department of State expressed the opinion, however, that the amalgamation plan would never be carried into effect on this scale.

policy to all departments of government.<sup>177</sup> The Department has objected to this suggestion on grounds that not enough is known of officers of other departments, and that given time it can satisfactorily recruit sufficient officer strength from the conventional lateral entry and class 6 sources.<sup>178</sup>

Strong objections were voiced by Foreign Service officers during the planning stages of the liberalized lateral entry program. The "regulars" feared that the influx of new recruits into the Service at the intermediate and upper grades would seriously restrict their chances for promotion, and jeopardize the career concept. Actually, the promotional opportunities of the Foreign Service officer are not at all restricted by the program, but in many ways will be improved.<sup>179</sup> Lateral entrants to the middle and upper grades only restrict promotional opportunities in a static Service. If the Service expands in total number as rapidly as the lateral entrants are brought into the hierarchy, the chances for promotion remain theoretically unchanged. If the Service expands more rapidly than the total number of lateral entrants recruited and the resulting slack must be filled by stimulated recruiting at the class 6 or entering level, the chances for promotion of the officers at all levels of the Service are definitely improved. On the basis of the figures we have projected above,

---

<sup>177</sup> The Departments of Labor and Agriculture especially favor such a proposal. Statement based upon interviews with several policy level officers in each of these departments.

<sup>178</sup> Statement by Mr. James Henderson, FSO, personal interview.

<sup>179</sup> Statement based upon personal interviews with Mr. Arthur G. Jones and Mr. James Henderson, Office of Personnel.

it would appear that this latter alternative will be true, and the "regular" will be advantaged promotion-wise if the program is carried into full effect. As an added bonus, the Department made provision for a more liberal promotion policy for officers in the Service during 1951-1952, so that approximately one half of all officers in classes two through six were promoted between January 1951 and February 1952.<sup>180</sup> In addition, there will be additional promotional opportunities if the Congress adopts the Department's plan to increase the number of Foreign Service officer classes from six to eight.<sup>181</sup>

Candidates for appointment to the Foreign Service under the liberalized lateral entry provisions are examined before a panel of five members drawn from a list of twenty persons appointed as deputy examiners by the Executive Director of the Board of Examiners.<sup>182</sup> The list includes five Foreign Service officers, seven Department of State officers, four officers from other federal agencies, two retired civil servants, and two retired businessmen. As indicated in another part of this paper the men selected are very well educated, most have received their educations in the "quality" schools, with a preponderance of deputies coming from Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. The Executive Director of the Board of Examiners and his chief assistant are included in this list and serve as members of the examining panels. If an applicant feels that any one of the deputy examiners is prejudiced against him he may so inform the Board of Examiners, setting

---

<sup>180</sup> Ibid.

<sup>181</sup> Ibid.

<sup>182</sup> Ibid.

forth the reasons for his belief, and the Board will then make arrangements to assure that other deputies are assigned to the applicant's examining panel.<sup>183</sup>

---

<sup>183</sup> The List of Deputy Examiners was increased to 26 officers in May, 1952. After the "resignation" of Mr. Green as Executive Director of the Board, the new six Deputy Examiners were chosen by the full Board of Examiners by formal vote. The original list of twenty Deputy Examiners selected by the Board of Examiners may be found in U. S. Dept. of State, Employee Bulletin, IV, No. 5, (Washington: Government Printing Office, July 1951).

TABLE B  
Source of Recruitment--State of Origin  
Lateral Appointees to Foreign Service Officer Corps\*

<b>New England</b>		<b>West South Central</b>	
Connecticut	2	Arkansas	1
Maine	0	Louisiana	1
Massachusetts	4	Oklahoma	4
New Hampshire	2	Texas	7
Rhode Island	0		<u>13</u>
Vermont	<u>1</u>	<b>Mountain</b>	
	9	Arizona	2
<b>Middle Atlantic</b>		Colorado	0
New Jersey	10	Idaho	0
New York	24	Montana	0
Pennsylvania	9	Nevada	0
	<u>43</u>	New Mexico	2
<b>East North Central</b>		Utah	3
Illinois	17	Wyoming	0
Indiana	5		<u>7</u>
Michigan	3	<b>Pacific</b>	
Ohio	6	California	6
Wisconsin	6	Oregon	0
	<u>37</u>	Washington	5
<b>West North Central</b>			<u>11</u>
Iowa	6	<b>South Atlantic</b>	
Kansas	6	Delaware	1
Minnesota	6	Dist. of Col.	2
Missouri	8	Florida	0
Nebraska	2	Georgia	2
North Dakota	3	Maryland	6
South Dakota	2	North Carolina	1
	<u>35</u>	South Carolina	1
<b>East South Central</b>		Virginia	5
Alabama	2	West Virginia	0
Kentucky	1		<u>18</u>
Mississippi	1	<b>Other Countries</b>	
Tennessee	3	Belgium	1
	<u>7</u>	China	2
<b>Territories</b>		France	1
Puerto Rico	1	Italy	1
		Mexico	1
		Philippines	1
		Syria	1
		Trinidad	1
			<u>9</u>
Grand total 188			

\*Covers lateral appointments under the Manpower Act and under Section 517 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 through December 31, 1951. Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel, Department of State.

TABLE C  
 Source of Recruitment--Previous Employment of  
 Lateral Appointments to Foreign Service Officer Corps\*

Government Service	Number	Percentage
State Department	26	13.9
Other Agencies	<u>63</u>	<u>44.1</u>
Total	109	58.0
Private Employment		
Authors, editors, reporters	7	
Bankers	8	
Business Executives	23	
College heads, professors, teachers	23	
Economists	3	
Engineers	2	
Lawyers and judges	6	
Technical Consultants	<u>7</u>	
Total	79	42.0
Grand total	188	100.0

\*Covers lateral appointments under the Manpower Act and under Section 517 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 through December 31, 1951. Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel, Department of State.

TABLE D  
Source of Recruitment of Class 6 Appointees  
from January 1, 1946 to December 31, 1951\*

New England		West South Central	
Connecticut	10	Arkansas	6
Maine	2	Louisiana	2
Massachusetts	45	Oklahoma	12
New Hampshire	2	Texas	<u>11</u>
Rhode Island	4		31
Vermont	5		
	<u>68</u>	Mountain	
Middle Atlantic		Arizona	3
New Jersey	20	Colorado	6
New York	108	Idaho	3
Pennsylvania	58	Montana	5
	<u>166</u>	Nevada	0
		New Mexico	0
East North Central		Utah	1
Illinois	36	Wyoming	<u>1</u>
Indiana	5		19
Michigan	13	Pacific	
Ohio	26	California	39
Wisconsin	17	Oregon	2
	<u>97</u>	Washington	<u>10</u>
			51
West North Central		South Atlantic	
Iowa	17	Delaware	0
Kansas	4	District of	
Minnesota	18	Columbia	13
Missouri	16	Florida	7
Nebraska	7	Georgia	16
North Dakota	4	Maryland	9
South Dakota	6	North Carolina	7
	<u>72</u>	South Carolina	4
		Virginia	9
East South Central		West Virginia	<u>4</u>
Alabama	0		69
Kentucky	6		
Mississippi	5		
Tennessee	4		
	<u>15</u>		

#### Other Countries

China, France (5 each) Canada, Germany, Philippines, Japan, Rumania (2 each)  
Belgium, Belgian Congo, England, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, Lebanon,  
Mexico, Nicaragua, Russia, Scotland, Union of South Africa (1 each)

\*Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel, Department of State.

TABLE E

Foreign Service Officers  
Level of Educational Achievement of Appointees\*

Class 6 Appointees	Number	Percentage
Post Graduate	197	31.8
Graduate	398	64.2
College Education without degree	<u>25</u>	<u>4.0</u>
	620	100.0
Lateral Appointees		
Post Graduate	111	59.0
Graduate	64	34.0
College Education without degree	<u>13</u>	<u>7.0</u>
	188	100.0

\*Covers class 6 appointees from January 1, 1946 through December 31, 1951 and lateral appointees under the Manpower Act and under Section 517 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 through December 31, 1951. Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel, Department of State.

## CHAPTER III

### GENERALIST V. SPECIALIST

The discussion of recruitment would hardly be complete without a more extensive survey of the generalist v. specialist controversy in the Foreign Service officer corps, and the resulting arguments with respect to the advantages and disadvantages of career v. program staffing. The Foreign Service has long favored the recruitment of young officers, with broad backgrounds, who are capable of developing into potential leaders. In recruiting these young officers, the Department attempts to select individuals who are adaptable to all kinds of work, rather than the individual who has acquired a high degree of specialization in one field. On the other hand, the Civil Service has pursued a policy of recruiting personnel at all ages and grades, the major qualification being ability to perform a specific job at a specific time. The main elements of the career concept in the Foreign Service are:

1. recruitment of young men and women, mostly college graduates, at the beginning of their careers, for a life-time tenure;
2. planned and rather slow advancement to the higher grades on the basis of demonstrated performance and merit;
3. very limited recruitment of officers to the intermediate and higher grades of the Service;
4. the willingness and ability to serve in any geographical area or functional specialisation;

5. the development of a high *savoir de service* with resulting guild-like mores and traditions.

Under this career concept the Service is not interested in recruiting persons who are highly specialized on one narrow line of work. Rather, they prefer to recruit persons with good general backgrounds, who are capable of acquiring necessary specialization during their tenure in the Service.<sup>1</sup> The Foreign Service justifies this recruitment concept on several grounds. In the first place, the Service points out that it is required to staff approximately 300 posts scattered throughout the world. Many of these posts are in out-of-the-way places and have complements of two to five officers.<sup>2</sup> The Foreign Service officers assigned to these posts, therefore, must be able to discharge a wide variety of functions. If an officer is highly specialized in one narrow line of work, the Service argues that it cannot assign him to a small post. Consequently, the mobility of personnel needed, if the Service is to discharge its functions efficiently, will be unduly restricted.

The Department also believes that a policy level officer in the Foreign Service should be able to place all facets of government activity in proper perspective. The officer should be able to view his assignment not as an end in itself, but as a means of achieving overall foreign policy objectives. The Service believes the best way for an officer to acquire this broad view is to serve in a variety of assignments and posts.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of State, *Foreign Service Manual*, I. Part IV, sec. 112.

<sup>2</sup>*Supra*.

<sup>3</sup>*Infra*.

As such, the officer will see a much larger part of the "big picture" and will not become unduly engrossed in his own small segment.

The Department also points out that many of the positions in the Service, although very important, are in unhealthful areas of the world, and the work that must be performed is routine and boring. The only way the Service can get highly competent people to staff these unattractive positions is to guarantee them a chance for promotion and better assignments in the future, provided their initial service is highly satisfactory.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the Department favors 1) the recruitment of officers who, within a reasonable period of time, will be able to staff any position in the Service, and 2) the maintenance of a relatively closed career hierarchy.

The critics of the Service argue that the Department's concept is unrealistic and out of date. They maintain that the Foreign Service could afford to recruit "general" officers when American foreign policy was simple and required only a minimum of specialization. The "specialists" see an analogy between the influence of the American frontier in our history and the generalist concept in our Foreign Service. When the economy of the American frontier was very simple each individual was a Jack-of-all-trades. In order to survive, he had to be able to perform a variety of functions. He could not afford to be a specialist. However, with the advent of modern technology, the economic and social system of the frontier became increasingly complex, and the generalist had to give way to the specialist. Although reluctant to do so at first, the frontier

---

<sup>4</sup>See "Briefing Statement for Mr. Humelsine's Use in Connection with Bureau of the Budget Hearings on Proposed Foreign Service Legislation," July 31, 1951, Unpublished MS, Office of Personnel, Department of State.

generalist soon realized that his interests were much better served by the new division of labor. The specialists maintain that the same is also true in foreign policy. The development of modern technology and the intricate economic and social system which it entails, necessitates a foreign policy geared to these complexities. Consequently, specialists must be recruited in numbers sufficient to protect the national interest.<sup>5</sup> The specialists believe that it is impossible for an officer to acquire the necessary skills on the job, and he must therefore bring them with him into the Service.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, they favor a liberalized system of entry into the career Service at the intermediate and top grades.<sup>7</sup>

The Service opposes any permanent liberal lateral entry program believing it will destroy the career concept.<sup>8</sup> It argues that officers will not be willing to come into the Service at the entering grade and serve for long years in hardship posts in order to win promotion if "outsiders" who have not served in these capacities are to be permitted to come in at the higher grades. The Department contends that if it is given sufficient time, it will be able to develop general officers who will be competent to staff any of the permanent specialized programs.<sup>9</sup> In the short run, the Department believes the Foreign Service Reserve can be employed as an effective instrument in program staffing.<sup>10</sup> The Reserve affords the technical

---

<sup>5</sup>See Brookings Institution, Administration of Foreign Affairs and Overseas Operations, p. 14.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>See "Briefing Statement for Mr. Humelsine," July 31, 1951.

<sup>9</sup>Statement by Mr. James Henderson, FSO, Office of Personnel, personal interview.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

expert an excellent opportunity to serve overseas for periods up to four years without committing him to a life-time career in the Foreign Service. At the end of his tour of duty, the Reserve Officer either can return to his specialized field, or he can attempt to obtain a permanent position in the Foreign Service under the provisions of Section 517 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. The Department feels that the staffing of specialized programs with Reserve officers affords another advantage. The Reserve officer fresh from industry, the professions, or another government agency, will bring the expertise and point of view of the profession or specialization with him. If he remains in the Service longer than four years, the Department believes he may lose a good deal of his expertise and become of less value as a technical consultant.<sup>11</sup>

The specialists consider the Department argument to be largely unrealistic. They maintain that we need numerous specialists, and that we need them now! We do not have the time to permit the Service to develop experts over a long training period. They believe that it is unrealistic to expect an officer, well established in another Department or agency, to up-root himself, in order to take an extended tour of duty in some unhealthful area of the world. They point out that both before and after World War II, the Foreign Service was completely unprepared to staff the various specialized programs developed in the field of foreign policy,<sup>12</sup> in spite of the fact that the reports of Foreign Service officers for a

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Statement based upon interviews with several officers in the Bureau of the Budget.

long period of time, had indicated the necessity for such program staffing.<sup>13</sup> For this reason, the Foreign Service had to be by-passed in carrying out most of the new programs which took place after the war. The specialists feel, therefore, that if the Foreign Service is to maintain its place as the central organ in the execution of American policy, it must begin to recruit personnel with specialized qualifications, for Class 6, and at the intermediate and upper grades.

The generalist-specialist argument has been especially bitter in the past with respect to the handling by the Department of the interests of the other government agencies in the field of foreign affairs. The Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor have felt that the officers in the Foreign Service responsible for the discharge of their specialized interests have been particularly discriminated against by the Department of State with respect to promotional opportunities. The Department of Agriculture has been especially bitter in this respect during the past decade. Agriculture maintains that their attaches have been compelled to forsake their agricultural specializations and become diplomatic dilettantes instead, in order to qualify as "general" officers and thereby win promotions.<sup>14</sup>

The Department of Agriculture feels that the agricultural attache should be permitted to remain in his agricultural specialization and to

---

<sup>13</sup>  
Supra.

<sup>14</sup> Statement based upon an interview with Mr. Fred Rossiter, Associate Director, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

advance to the top rungs of the career ladder without becoming involved in the other innumerable facets of foreign policy.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, the Department of State believes that it is impossible for an officer who has spent his career in one narrow specialization to have the versatility and the broad point of view needed to discharge the responsibilities of a top position in the Foreign Service.<sup>16</sup> In the past, therefore, a Foreign Service officer with a preliminary specialization in agriculture has found it necessary to be rotated among other political and economic activities, in order to insure his opportunity for promotion.

The Department of Labor, to a lesser degree, has had the same problem with respect to its attaches. However, the Department is not opposed to a labor specialist being given experience in other fields.<sup>17</sup> In the first place, labor cuts horizontally across the embassy, covering political, economic, and informational activities. A labor man cannot be expected to understand contemporary developments in his field unless he sets them into the proper political and economic context. Particularly is this true of an assignment to a labor government such as Norway, or England until the last election. In the second place, the labor man, in branching into the political and broader economic fields, will carry a "labor orientation" with him.<sup>18</sup> Over the long haul, therefore, a sizeable number of ministers, counselors, and other policy making officials in the field of foreign

---

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> Statement by Mr. James Henderson, personal interview.

<sup>17</sup> Statement by Mr. James Taylor, Department of Labor, personal interview.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

affairs may be ex-labor men. The Department of Labor believes they would be well served by such a development.<sup>19</sup> The Department of Labor would like to see about six of its attaches, in the more important labor capitals, be named Counselor of Embassy for Labor Affairs.<sup>20</sup> They also would like to place an observer on the Staff boards.<sup>21</sup> But in general, it can be said that the objections voiced by the Department of Labor are not as strong or as numerous as those voiced by the Department of Agriculture.

While a great deal of friction originally existed between the Department of Commerce and the Foreign Service, it appears that these two organizations have, in large part, been able to resolve their differences.

Several officers in the Department of Agriculture indicated to the writer that they believed the friction between the Departments of State and Agriculture has been greatly over emphasized. Undoubtedly friction exists between the two agencies. The very composition of a democratic state composed of innumerable competing economic and social groups requires it. Only in a totalitarian state where all opposition has been ruthlessly stamped out do we find a lack of opposition and a resulting lack of friction. The officers interviewed believed that practical politics is responsible for at least a part of the friction. Several years ago the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations received a substantial slash in funds. The reason, a certain member of Congress

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

believed the Department of State and the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations were too friendly. This entry indicated to the Congressman that the Office was probably conceding too much to the "world view" of the Department of State, and too little to the domestic interest of American agriculture. Thus, it appears that Agriculture must voice a few complaints, if for no other reason than to reassure the Congress that it is properly protecting the interests of the American farmer.

A good part of this problem, therefore, arises from the fact that the Department of Agriculture must serve two masters. On the one hand, the Department must serve domestic agricultural interests in the United States. On the other hand, Agriculture must participate in an overall foreign policy of which agricultural interests are only one segment. For example, let us suppose the United States has a bumper crop of some saleable agricultural commodity. The reports of the agricultural attaches reveal that there is a market for this commodity-excess in country "X", and that the United States could dump this excess there at a profit to the American farmer. However, there are other considerations. The Department of State has spent years building up a market for this commodity in country "X" for country "Y" in order to stabilize the economies of both nations. The dumping of the commodity by the United States in country "X" would undercut "Y"'s market. Under these conditions, should we benefit the American farmer, or benefit the overall objectives of our foreign policy? Many members of Congress from agricultural areas would have one answer, whereas, officers in the Department of State would probably have another.

There has also been a great deal of criticism advanced with respect to communications from the Agricultural attaches in the field to the home

office. These communications are channeled to Agriculture through State. Agriculture receives roughly 30,000 reports a year from overseas, and most of these reports come from the attaches.<sup>22</sup> Many of these reports have appeared to the Department of Agriculture to have been unnecessarily delayed, although they grant that the delay may be attributed to weakness in technical machinery, rather than a deliberate policy delay by State. Several officers of the Department of Agriculture who were queried stressed the point that they favored the reports coming directly to Agriculture, with a copy to State, in order to facilitate the meeting of Department of Agriculture publication deadlines. Policy-wise, they believed it made little difference how the reports were channeled. Nevertheless, a new agreement on communication procedure was evolved between the two Departments in 1951.<sup>23</sup> The writer believes that much of the discussion re communications is brought about by Congressional fear that the "internationalists" in State may quash market reports which may be beneficial to domestic agricultural interests.

The agricultural attaches themselves are not especially keen to see the present reporting system change, fearing that a direct relationship with their home office may cause them to be at odds with the Chief of Mission. For example, it has been suggested that Agricultural attaches

---

<sup>22</sup>Statement by Dr. Eric Englund, Department of Agriculture, personal interview.

<sup>23</sup>Memorandum of Understanding Between the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture. A draft copy of this agreement and the correspondence relating thereto is in the office of Mr. Fred Rossiter, Department of Agriculture. See also Improving and Strengthening Foreign Agricultural Relations, House Report 966, 82d. Cong., 1st sess., 1951.

should seek markets and sell commodities on the order of the Dutch attaches. The American attache feels that activities of this type could create friction between himself and the Chief of Mission with a resulting drop in his efficiency rating. The simple answer to this dilemma appears to be a better integration of substantive policy at the plane where it should be integrated, viz, at the Assistant Secretary level.

A good deal of the generalist-specialist friction appears to be generated by a few die-hards on both sides. In recent years the Department of State has taken a much more progressive attitude toward specialists in designing promotion policy. However, the Department's recruitment of specialists is still very inadequate. Nevertheless, progressive Department of State officers realize that they must develop much more realistic recruitment policies with respect to specialists at the entering and intermediate grades. On the other hand, officers in the Department of Agriculture are fully cognizant that simple supply and demand has ceased to function in agriculture, and a thorough understanding of a nation's politics is a necessary prerequisite to an understanding of its agricultural policy.<sup>24</sup> These Agricultural officers would like to see their attaches have the following qualifications: born and bred on a farm, a major in agricultural at a good university, graduate work in agricultural economics with a minor in international relations, and the potentiality for development. These attaches would go into the Foreign

---

<sup>24</sup>Statement by Dr. Eric Englund, personal interview.

Service at the entering grade, would remain in their general field of specialization, and would progress over a period of years to the top positions in the Service.<sup>25</sup>

The Department of Labor believes they will eventually require about fifty labor attaches to meet their needs. They would prefer that about twenty-five of these attaches were Foreign Service officers and the remaining twenty-five Foreign Service Reserve officers. Labor believes such a distribution between temporary and career officers will best serve their needs and the needs of the Foreign Service.<sup>26</sup>

The one point that the writer found unanimity on in his interviews with officers of the Departments having interests in the field of foreign affairs, was a general dissatisfaction with the present class 6 examining system. Most of the officers interviewed favored the adoption of the option-type examination system as recommended by the Rowe Commission.

There has also been a great deal of discontent voiced in regard to the administration of the examining system for places in the Foreign Service under the liberalized lateral entry provisions. It is no secret in State that the "Departmental" side of the Regional Bureaus has been very unhappy at the treatment many of their administrative officers have been receiving at the hands of the oral panels. In fact, the pressure which the administrative side of the Regional Bureaus brought upon the

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Statement by Mr. James Taylor, personal interview.

Deputy Undersecretary for Administration was probably responsible, in large part, for his decision to make a top level personnel change in the Secretariat of the Board of Examiners. Counter pressure brought upon the Deputy Undersecretary for Administration by the Foreign Service probably forced him to cushion the impact of the change by giving it the appearance of a "promotion". The surprising opposition offered by the House of Representatives to the "promotion" gave evidence that Congress has not been especially pleased with the administration of the lateral entry program.

On the other hand, it is also true that many of the administrative personnel in the Department of State have become so engrossed in paper-pushing, that it has become an end in itself. They are out of contact, in many cases, with the substantive aspect of foreign affairs. A virile Foreign Service needs officers capable of fusing administrative technique with substantive knowledge. The oral examining panels must determine whether the officer does possess these abilities. If he does, he should be admitted to the Service without reference to the many pseudo qualifications which the Service has erected. It is believed that the personnel change initiated by the Deputy Undersecretary for Administration will tend to lessen the personality clashes between those to be examined and the oral examining panels. The additional proposal made here to exclude any members of the Secretariat of the Board of Examiners from sitting on the oral panels should further reduce this friction.

Probably the solution to the generalist v. specialist argument lies somewhere between the arguments advanced by the extremists on both sides. The Department of State must begin to recruit specialists on a much

larger scale. This does not mean that the specialists recruited should not be required to have a government-wide orientation. The Department appears to follow the premise that a high degree of specialization in one field precludes a candidate from having a Service-wide point of view. We do not believe that this necessarily follows. It is altogether possible that a "general" officer with a broad academic background and a wide variety of work experience will be very narrow and bigoted, whereas, a highly specialized officer may be able to see each segment of government policy in its true perspective.<sup>27</sup>

A large percentage of the needed specialists can be brought into the Service at the bottom or entering class, especially if the present class 6 examination is modified. The other specialists needed must be recruited at the intermediate and top grades. This does not mean that the career concept in the officer corps should be discarded. In fact, we believe that a career system is necessary if the Service is to retain the more qualified officers after the boyish thrill of overseas service has worn off. However, a well planned lateral entry program, geared to a proper qualifying process, will not destroy the career system in an expanding service. Lateral entry only inhibits promotion unnecessarily in a static service, and, we have good reason to believe that the Foreign

---

<sup>27</sup> Numerous examples come immediately to mind. The personnel on the Planning Staff in the Office of Personnel, with whom the writer was associated for several months, impressed him as being highly skilled in their more narrow specializations. However, these officers never appeared to lose sight of the much broader administrative pattern. Each officer appeared to combine ability and foresight to a remarkable degree.

Service will be increasing both in size and in functions in the foreseeable future. In fact, we might say that only a narrow, restrictive point of view on the part of the Service itself, will prevent this expansion. It is ironic that many of the most progressive minds in the field of foreign affairs become unduly conservative when any innovation is proposed with respect to the organization of the Foreign Service. Perhaps, a "general" Foreign Service officer should be defined as one who can be very narrow when regarding his own Service. It does appear that whenever a new program is advanced with respect to the organization of the national government for the conduct of foreign affairs, there are many Foreign Service officers who immediately begin to look for reasons why it will not work, instead of attempting to develop a constructive plan which will carry the innovation into effect. Unless the Foreign Service is able to achieve the flexibility of mind and structure necessary to execute the increasing responsibilities which are being thrust upon it, the Service will be relegated to a secondary position in the conduct of our foreign affairs. Because we believe the Foreign Service should be the central organ in the conduct of our foreign policy, we also believe that it is necessary for the Service to effect the suggested changes.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE EXAMINATION PROCESS

Examinations for the selection of Foreign Service officers can be divided into two major categories. First, the examinations given for the selection of officers at the bottom or entering grade, namely, class six, and second, the examinations given to applicants desirous of entering the Service at the intermediate or upper grades under the lateral entry provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.<sup>1</sup>

In the selection of officers for class six, the Department of State is primarily concerned with determining whether the candidate has such qualifications and aptitudes as would indicate ability to develop, eventually, into a first rate Foreign Service officer.<sup>2</sup> Testing is designed to ascertain, therefore, not a particular specialization, but all around ability and promise.<sup>3</sup>

The selection process for junior officer candidates falls into two well defined stages. First, is a series of competitive written examinations to determine the candidate's broad intellectual capacities,<sup>4</sup> and second, a personal interview before an Examining Panel designed to determine the candidate's suitability for the Service in respect to character, personality, and proficiency in the use of modern foreign languages.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Foreign Service Act of 1946, secs., 516-517.

<sup>2</sup>Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, I, Part IV, sec. 112.

<sup>3</sup>Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 3.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., sec. 4.

The written examination is given annually in September at approximately 15 Civil Service examining centers throughout the country, and at American diplomatic and consular posts abroad.<sup>6</sup> The oral examinations for those candidates who successfully pass the written examination are held the following January through June in Washington, D. C.<sup>7</sup>

The Written Examination. In order to take the written examination a candidate must be designated by the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service.<sup>8</sup> At this time the Board determines whether the applicant meets the minimum requirements for entrance into the Service as defined by law and various Departmental regulations.<sup>9</sup> To be designated an applicant must be at least 20 and under 31 years of age as of July 1, in the year in which the examination is taken.<sup>10</sup> He must be an American citizen and have been such for at least ten years.<sup>11</sup> If the candidate is married his spouse must be an American citizen.<sup>12</sup> The deadline for application for designation is usually July 1 of the year in which the examination is to be taken.<sup>13</sup>

The written examinations are designed to test the candidate's intelligence and the quality of his education.<sup>14</sup> They ordinarily consist

<sup>6</sup>U. S. Department of State, The U. S. Foreign Service, p. 20.

<sup>7</sup>Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 3.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., sec. 2.

<sup>9</sup>Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>10</sup>Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 2.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., sec. 2. See also Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 515.

<sup>12</sup>Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 2.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., sec. 3.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

of a number of separate tests taken over a period of several days. In 1951 there were four general examinations and three special examinations.<sup>15</sup>

The general examinations covered the following: ability to read the English language with comprehension and reasonable speed, range and breadth of vocabulary, mathematical and statistical determinations, scope and accuracy of factual information, and ability to express oneself in written English.<sup>16</sup> The special examinations were in history and government, elementary economics, and modern languages.<sup>17</sup> Each part of the examination is weighted as follows:<sup>18</sup>

First General Exam: Part A (2 hours) Ability to read the English language with comprehension and speed.	4 pts.
First General Exam: Part B (45 minutes) vocabulary exam: 100 words.	1 pt.
Second General Exam: (1½ hours) Statistics and Mathematics.	2 pts.
Third General Exam: (2½ hours) Range and accuracy of factual information.	3 pts.
Fourth General Exam: (3 hours) Ability to express oneself in written English.	4 pts.
First Special Exam: (1 hour) Government and History.	3 pts.
Second Special Exam: (3 hours) Economics.	3 pts.
Third Special Exam: (1½ or 3 hours) Modern foreign language (s).	weighted separately

---

<sup>15</sup> Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>16</sup> U. S. Department of State, Preparing for a Career in the Foreign Service of the United States, Publication 3997, Department and Foreign Service Series 20, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950), p. 3.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

A candidate must obtain a weighted grade of 70 or higher on the first six examinations, and a grade of 70 or higher in the modern foreign language examination.<sup>19</sup> If the candidate makes a passing grade on the first six examinations, but fails to make a passing grade on the examination in modern languages, he may be reexamined in modern languages the following spring.<sup>20</sup> If he scores 70 or higher on the reexamination he then proceeds to the oral examination.<sup>21</sup> In some cases, candidates failing the language examination will still receive appointments as class 6 officers, if the Board of Examiners believes the candidate can acquire the necessary language proficiency within two years after initial appointment.<sup>22</sup> If the officer does not measure up in this respect after the two year trial period, he will be separated from the Service.<sup>23</sup>

Tests, are graded on a relative basis. Usually, the top 20 per cent in each exam group will receive grades of 70 or higher.<sup>24</sup> The candidate's grades on all six parts of the examination are then averaged, and, because the same people will not always be in the top 20 per cent, approximately 16 to 18 per cent will be judged to have passed the written examination.<sup>25</sup> If the number passing is deemed too large or too small the overall number

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

can be adjusted by adding or subtracting the marginal cases. The examinations are graded by the non-profit Educational Testing Service of Princeton, N.J., University on a contract basis.<sup>26</sup>

The qualification standards for the written and oral examinations are prescribed by the Board of Examiners with help from an ad hoc Advisory Committee composed of distinguished individuals from the fields of business, education, and government.<sup>27</sup> Over the years certain criteria have been established by the Board of Examiners to serve as guide posts for the operation of the Foreign Service officer examination. With respect to education, a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is usually required if the candidate is to successfully negotiate the written examination,<sup>28</sup> while a college degree is NOT a mandatory requirement. Statistics show that the overwhelming percentage of successful candidates are college trained. Of 2,288 candidates passing the written examination during a recent ten year period, 52.2 per cent had done work at a graduate level, an additional 38.8 per cent had a Bachelor of Arts degree of its equivalent, 9.1 per cent had attended college but did not have degrees, and an insignificant .3 per cent had no college training whatsoever.<sup>29</sup> During the period 1946-1951 the Department appointed 620 class 6 officers. Practically all were college graduates (96 per cent) while approximately one-third (31.8 per cent) had pursued graduate studies.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>Contract SCC 2578, "Contract Between the U. S. Department of State and the Educational Testing Service," June 30, 1950, (Board of Examiners, Current Files, NS).

<sup>27</sup> "Foreign Service Examinations," (Unpublished NS, Board of Examiners, Current Files, December 1, 1950, typewritten), p.2.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

A general outline of the subject matter included in the written examination has already been indicated. It will be noted that the greatest emphasis is placed upon the ability to read the English language with speed and comprehension and to write it with clarity and precision. Considering the conventional functions of the diplomatic service, viz., negotiation, representation, and reporting, it is easy to see why so much emphasis was placed upon these qualities in designing the entrance examination. Since the successful diplomat of today must go far beyond these conventional functions, there are those who, while recognizing the importance of oral and written English fluency, wonder if too much emphasis has not been placed on this quality at the expense of other abilities of equal or greater importance. This question is moot and will be discussed in detail below.

In addition to the emphasis placed on the importance of the English language, the written examination presupposes a knowledge of economics such as can be gained from an introductory course in that field, a knowledge of American history and government such as can be gained from an introductory course in those subjects, and the ability to read at least one of the following foreign languages: French, Spanish, Portuguese, German and Russian.<sup>31</sup>

The Board of Examiners believed that the examination is constructed so that it does not place too much emphasis on factual information, professional or vocational specializations, or specially designed curricula of certain schools.<sup>32</sup> The Board contends that only 1/20th of the written

---

<sup>31</sup>"Information on Specific Personnel Practices: Examination," (Department of State, Office of Personnel, 1951, mimeographed).

<sup>32</sup>Statement by Dr. Crosswell Riches, personal interview.

examination viz., the third general examination, is based primarily on factual information.<sup>33</sup> In addition, since the Board believes that the Service should attract able men with a wide variety of interests, it attempts to design the qualifying examination so that specialization need be no more than that of an undergraduate major in a department of one of our better universities.<sup>34</sup> Since the examinations are not primarily factual nor geared closely to any particular academic discipline, the Board maintains that candidates who have been out of school for a number of years will not be at a disadvantage as opposed to a candidate who has just completed college. The Board contends that their examination statistics indicate that the percentage of recent graduates and the percentage of persons who have been out of school for several years who pass the examination are about the same.<sup>35</sup> Finally, the Board does not recommend any schools to students who indicate a desire to prepare for a career in the Foreign Service, nor do they recommend any particular curricula.<sup>36</sup> The Board points with pride to the fact that the 620 class 6 officers appointed during the period 1946 through 1951 were drawn from 167 colleges and universities throughout the nation, and included persons from every conceivable undergraduate major.<sup>37</sup>

The Oral Examination. The general criteria established for the oral examination turns on the personal factor. The purpose of the examination is to explore and appraise the background and experience of the candidate,

---

<sup>33</sup>Department of State, Questions and Answers on Personnel Operations, p. 13.

<sup>34</sup>Statement by Dr. Crosswell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

to determine the versatility of his interests, to assess his capacity for development, to test his fluency in the use of spoken foreign languages, and to evaluate his suitability as a representative of the United States.<sup>38</sup>

More specific criteria are personal integrity, emotional stability, adaptability and resilience, ability to assume responsibility, ability to withstand the effects of isolation, and the ability to remain cool and self confident in the time of crisis.<sup>39</sup>

Oral examinations are conducted by Panels of Deputies appointed by the Board of Examiners.<sup>40</sup> Deputies are drawn from all walks of life and include active and retired Foreign Service officers, government officials from the Department of State, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor and the Civil Service Commission, and distinguished individuals from business and the professions.<sup>41</sup>

Candidates appearing before the oral examination panels are judged "Passed with Distinction", "Passed", "Deferred", or "Failed".<sup>42</sup> Candidates adjudged "Passed with Distinction", or "Passed" proceed to the physical examination.<sup>43</sup> The physical examination is the approximate equivalent of that given to candidates for enlistment in the United States Army. If the

<sup>38</sup>Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 4.

<sup>39</sup>"Criteria for the Conduct of Oral Examinations for Class 6 Foreign Service Officers," (Unpublished MS, Board of Examiners, Current files, December 1, 1950).

<sup>40</sup>Board of Examiners, "Foreign Service Examinations," p. 2.

<sup>41</sup>For example, see the list of twenty Deputy Examiners chosen by the Board of Examiners in July 1951. The list appears in the Department of State's Employee Bulletin, IV, no. 5, July, 1951.

<sup>42</sup>Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 8.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.

candidate successfully negotiates the physical examination and meets the strict requirements of security, he then becomes eligible for appointment to the officer corps.<sup>44</sup> The rating of "deferred" is given to those candidates who, while generally qualified, lack one particular characteristic or trait which the panel believes can be acquired with practice or experience.<sup>45</sup> For example, one recent candidate made a good general impression, but showed a noticeable weakness in the geography and economics of the United States. The Board advised the candidate to take a trip across the United States and learn more about his own country.<sup>46</sup> The "Deferred" candidate may take another oral examination after the expiration of one year and before the expiration of two years.<sup>47</sup> In exceptional cases the one year waiting period can be waived.<sup>48</sup>

Constructing the Written Examination. The examinations for admission to the Foreign Service officer corps are designed under the supervision of the Secretariat of the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service.<sup>49</sup> In matters of general testing policy the Board of Examiners has the advice of the Advisory Committee on Foreign Service Examinations, whose members assemble once each year to evaluate the testing policy of the Board of Examiners and to make recommendations for its improvement.<sup>50</sup> On matters

---

<sup>44</sup>Candidates who successfully pass the oral and physical examinations are placed on the Eligible List in their order of excellence. Candidates are appointed from the list as openings become available, and after all candidates from any previous Eligible List have been offered appointments. Statement by Dr. Crosswell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 8.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.

<sup>49</sup>Supra.

<sup>50</sup>See annual "Report of the Advisory Committee on the Foreign Service Examinations," (Unpublished MSS, Board of Examiners, Current Files, 1946-1951).

of advice relating to the technical aspects of the examination, the Board of Examiners may call upon the Educational Testing Service at Princeton, New Jersey, a non-profit organization which assists the Board with the examinations on a contract basis.<sup>51</sup> In practice, the Educational Testing Service prepares the first part of the First General examination, the entire Second examination, the entire Fourth General examination, and supervises the item writing for the modern language tests.<sup>52</sup> The Vocabulary examination, the Third General examination, and the First and Second Special examinations are prepared by the Secretariat of the Board of Examiners.<sup>53</sup> The Educational Testing Service grades the examination papers, employing subject matter specialists to grade the essay examinations.<sup>54</sup>

The Secretariat, under the supervision of the Executive Director, assists the Board of Examiners in the formulation, coordination, and administration of all matters pertaining to the written and oral examinations for admission to the Foreign Service.<sup>55</sup> More specifically, the Secretariat is charged with the preparation of the written examinations, the supervision of their printing, adequate publicity to insure that interested individuals are informed, the supervision of all arrangements in the United States and abroad for the actual conduct of the written and oral examinations, the supervision of the scoring, grading and averaging of the written

<sup>51</sup>Supra.

<sup>52</sup>Educational Testing Service, Annual Report to the Board of Trustees, 1949-1950, (Princeton, N. J., Educational Testing Service, 1950), p. 61.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid.

<sup>55</sup>Board of Examiners, "Foreign Service Examinations," p. 2.

examinations, the handling of all necessary correspondence and the interviewing of prospective applicants and candidates, liaison with the Committee on Revision of the Foreign Service Examinations and the College Entrance Board, liaison with universities and colleges which educate candidates for the Foreign Service and maintenance of the records of the Board of Examiners.<sup>56</sup>

The examining and selection process of the Foreign Service is one of the most frequently criticized facets of personnel policy in the Department of State. It is also a policy that is most staunchly defended by those responsible for its execution.

Some of the specific criticisms that have been voiced against the examination process are these:

(1) The selection process seems to favor individuals who have attended a handful of universities, particularly Harvard, Princeton, and Yale.

(2) The present examining system gives insufficient weight to the social sciences and to specialization in economics, agriculture, labor problems and public affairs. Despite the high degree of specialization needed for the conduct of foreign affairs today the Department still holds to the concept of an undergraduate major specialization.

(3) Insufficient attention is paid in the written and oral examinations to the scientific assessment of those qualities of personality relating to the emotional stability and adaptability of personnel.

(h) Facility in written and oral English is overemphasized at the expense of other equally important abilities.

---

<sup>56</sup>Department of State, "Announcement 780," (1946).

(5) Too much emphasis is placed upon factual information, especially factual information obtainable in the broadly classical type of curriculum.

(6) All regions of the country are not represented in equal proportion to their population. The northeast and especially New England tends to be overrepresented at the expense of the south and the midwest.

(7) The group of junior officers appointed by the Department are not broadly representative of all segments and levels of American life. The Board of Examiners' concept of the "average American boy" is too narrow a determination.

(8) There is too great a time lag between the time the written examination is given, and the time the final appointments are made.

(9) Language aptitude testing should be added to the tests presently given in modern foreign languages.

(10) The oral examination is employed as a technique for excluding qualified women from the Service.

Tendency to Favor Particular Universities. The charge has been made that the selection process for the Foreign Service officer corps has a tendency to favor a handful of universities, particularly, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. Statistics collected by the Board of Examiners would seem to lend some credence to this accusation. During the period from July, 1946 to December 31, 1951 a total of 620 officers were appointed to class 6.<sup>57</sup> Of this number 59 had attended college at Harvard, 144 had attended Princeton, and 50 had attended Yale, making a total of 163 representatives from those three schools.<sup>58</sup> This constituted 26.3 per cent of the total

---

<sup>57</sup>Based upon statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

<sup>58</sup>ibid.

number of officers appointed during this five and one half year period. In the 1949 examination, the three schools contributed 30.7 per cent of the successful candidates.<sup>59</sup>

During the same 1946-1951 period, twelve universities accounted for exactly 50 per cent of all successful candidates.<sup>60</sup> On the basis of a more extensive survey between the years 1932 and 1950, it was discovered that 21 schools have contributed 63.1 per cent of the successful class 6 candidates.<sup>61</sup> During the 1946-1951 period, these same 21 schools accounted for 57.2 per cent of all successful candidates.<sup>62</sup>

The Board of Examiners attempts, in several ways, to minimize the importance attached to the fact that a large number of successful foreign service officers come from a handful of schools. In the first place, they point out that while it is true that Harvard, Princeton, and Yale have contributed about one-fourth of the successful class 6 officers during the period from July 1946 to December 1951, it should also be pointed out that the total number of 620 class 6 officers recruited during this period came from 167 different colleges and universities.<sup>63</sup> Some of the typical smaller

---

59Ibid.

<sup>60</sup>The schools were Harvard (59) Yale (50) Princeton (44) California (30) Chicago (25) Georgetown (20) George Washington (18) Columbia (17) Stanford (14) Wisconsin (13) City College of New York (11) and Dartmouth (9). Based on statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

<sup>61</sup>The schools were Harvard, Yale, Princeton, DONT, California, Chicago, Columbia, Stanford, Georgetown, Wisconsin, George Washington, Brooklyn, Cornell, Virginia, Dartmouth, NYU, Minnesota, Michigan, Harvard, Williams, and Pennsylvania in that order. Based on statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

62Ibid.

63Ibid.

schools represented included Albion, Beloit, Bowdoin, Earlham, Emory, Olivet, Ursinus, Wellesley, and Wooster. One small school, Haverford, contributed 5 of the successful candidates during this period, while during the longer 1932-1950 period, Haverford contributed 20 successful candidates.<sup>64</sup>

Probably the chief reason for the predominance of a handful of schools in the Foreign Service is that a large number of qualified candidates from these schools attempt the examination. One might logically ask why a large number of qualified graduates from certain schools take the Foreign Service examinations while only a few qualified graduates from other large universities apply. There are probably several good explanations for this phenomenon. In the first place liaison of the unofficial variety between officers of the Department of State is undoubtedly much closer with certain schools than with others. Many members of the faculties of these schools have served in or have been advisers to the Department of State. On the basis of this experience they are acquainted with the opportunities afforded by a career in the Foreign Service. Consequently, they can be counted on to encourage their qualified graduates to apply for designation. Because the recruitment policy of the Foreign Service until recently was very passive, such contacts were, and still are, of inestimable value in getting qualified graduates to apply. Evidence is lent to this hypothesis by recent trends in Foreign Service recruitment. It has been noted that as positive recruitment efforts are stepped up in a particular area, or as more personal contacts are made with professors in an area, the number of successful candidates from the region also increases.<sup>65</sup> For example, in the examinations given for the

---

<sup>64</sup>ibid.

<sup>65</sup>Statement by Dr. Crosswell Kiches, personal interview.

officer corps in September, 1951, for the first time, an "outside" school provided more successful candidates than one of the "Big Three"--- the University of California providing more successful candidates than Princeton.<sup>66</sup> The writer believes that the large number of successful candidates from Harvard, Princeton, and Yale, both in total number, and in proportion to the unsuccessful candidates from these schools, can be largely explained by the fact that professors at these schools, who are interested in the future of the Foreign Service, encourage their better students to apply and perhaps discourage the unqualified. On the other hand, many students who take the examination from other schools do so on a chance basis and without adequate preparation.<sup>67</sup> Also, many highly qualified students at these underrepresented schools do not apply because they are uninformed about the Foreign Service.<sup>68</sup> Positive recruitment will not only increase the total number of officer candidates, therefore, but over a period of time it will probably lead to a more equitable distribution of the Service on a regional and school basis.<sup>69</sup>

Although the writer believes the Department's past policy of passive recruitment best explains the concentration of Foreign Service officers in certain schools and geographical regions, other equally plausible explanations have been advanced. It is argued, for example, that the Foreign Service is in search of quality, and it is unquestionably true that there is an appreciable qualitative difference among our schools of higher

---

<sup>66</sup>Ibid.

<sup>67</sup>Dr. Crosswell Riches told the writer that he believed this was a reasonable hypothesis.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid.

learning. Therefore, the better schools will have the most successful candidates. It is true that certain schools provide the student with a better background in the subjects embraced in the Foreign Service examinations, although this would hardly explain the disproportionate number of appointees from these schools.<sup>70</sup>

The very high percentage of Foreign Service officers coming from business and professional families (55 per cent ) as opposed to farm families (2.5 per cent) might also help to explain the predominance of the schools which in large part draw their students from the business and professional classes.<sup>71</sup>

One observation that might be made by way of seeking an explanation is that the oral examining panels may be unconsciously partial to their alma maters. The former Executive Director of the Board of Examiners, himself a Princeton man, seems to have had a proclivity for selecting fellow "Ivy Leaguers" to sit with him on the examining boards. For example, the twenty Deputy Examiners appointed by Mr. Green in 1951 to conduct the oral examinations under the liberalized lateral entry program included Homer W. Byington Jr., Louis G. Dreyfus Jr., and Norman Burns from Yale, Maxwell Hamilton, Edward T. Wailes, Livingston Merchant, and Mr. Joseph Green from Princeton, and Louis Halle Jr., Harry C. Haskins,

---

<sup>70</sup>The Board of Examiners has discovered that the ratio of successful candidates to unsuccessful candidates from Harvard, Princeton, Yale and several other schools is somewhat higher than the average for all schools. The Board hesitates to release these figures feeling that some people may draw unjustified conclusions from them to the effect that they indicate that some schools are better than others or that one can receive a better education for the Foreign Service in some schools than in others. Because some schools may be represented in the exams by their top students and other schools by their low average students, such a conclusion would not be justified. Statement by Dr. Crossell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>71</sup>Based on statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

and Geoffrey Lewis from Harvard.<sup>72</sup> In short, of the twelve examiners chosen by Mr. Green from the Department of State and the Foreign Service, ten had received degrees from Harvard, Princeton, or Yale. The two non-"Ivy League" appointees from the Department held Ph. D.'s, Dr. Crosswell Riches, the Executive Secretary of the Board of Examiners received his doctorate from John Hopkins University and Dr. William C. Johnstone Jr., received his doctorate at Stanford.<sup>73</sup>

The fact that a high percentage of Foreign Service officers are drawn from Harvard, Princeton, and Yale, and that a sizeable majority of officers are drawn from relatively few of our universities, does not in itself constitute an evil. There is no evidence that Harvard, Princeton, and Yale produce uniform attitudes toward life and politics any more than do the other universities in the United States. The percentage of political progressives, conservatives, and middle-of-the-roads is probably about the same at Harvard as it is at any of our large cosmopolitan universities. Unless graduates of other universities are plainly discriminated against in favor of Harvard, Princeton, and Yale graduates, the number of successful candidates coming from any particular university does not appear to be especially important. The important consideration is the type of individual that the Foreign Service selects. The Foreign Service attempts to recruit young men who conform to certain well-defined specifications.<sup>74</sup> The man who possesses these qualifications might be found at any of our institutions

---

<sup>72</sup>Department of State, Employee Bulletin, IV, no. 5, July, 1951.

<sup>73</sup>Department of State, Biographic Register, pp. 63, 66, 127, 178, 187, 188, 196, 230, 264, 303, 369, 451. In fairness to the Executive Director, however, it should be pointed out that the Department of State is as heavily weighted with graduates of certain schools as the Foreign Service, and it is often difficult to find qualified Deputy Examiners who are not graduates of these schools.

<sup>74</sup>Infra.

of higher learning. The important thing is to assess the qualifications that the Service considers of most importance and to decide whether or not these are the characteristics we believe a representative of the United States should possess.

Characteristics of Junior Officers Selected. The typical successful class 6 Foreign Service officer candidate is a college graduate approximately 25 years of age.<sup>75</sup> About one out of three has pursued graduate studies. The majority of successful candidates were born in the large, metropolitan cities of the United States, and a disproportionately large number have come from the east and west coast at the expense of the south and the midwest.<sup>76</sup> The typical officer comes from a higher income family and has had much more foreign travel and foreign education than the average American. More successful candidates have attended school in France, England, and Switzerland than the large schools in the midwest, and a large number have attended private preparatory schools, although in recent years these past two percentages have shown a significant decline.

State of Origin. The 620 class 6 officers appointed during the period January 1946 through December 1951 came from all regions of the country, while 33 of the appointees were born abroad.<sup>77</sup> The 507 officers born in the United States during this period can be categorized by place of birth as follows:<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup>Based on statistics provided by the Board of Examiners.

<sup>76</sup>However, during the recent period, 1946-1952, the number of successful class 6 candidates provided by the midwest has been in about equal proportion to its share of the total U. S. population. Ibid.

<sup>77</sup>Based on statistics provided by the Office of Personnel

<sup>78</sup>Ibid. Population figures were taken from U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1951.

Place of birth of class 6 officers appointed  
between July 1946 and January 1952

<u>Region</u>	<u>Number of officers from region</u>	<u>Percent of total officers from region</u>	(1950 census) <u>Percent of region pop. to U.S. pop.</u>
New England	68	12	6
Middle Atlantic	166	28	20
North Central	169	29	30
Southern	114	19	31
Western	<u>70</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
Total	587	100	100

The above figures show that while all the regions of the country were represented during this period, the northeastern states contributed much more than their share in proportion to their population as of 1950. On the other hand, the south contributed much less than their share, and the midwest and far west were about correctly represented. New England was especially overrepresented. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts with 3.1 per cent of U. S. population in 1950 contributed 45 officers, or 7.6 per cent of the total number of successful applicants, more than any other state except New York.<sup>79</sup>

On the basis of a much longer survey, the northeastern states and the western states have provided a disproportionate share of successful class 6 officers, whereas, the south and midwest have been conspicuously underrepresented. Between 1932 and 1950, although the northeastern states represented 29.4 per cent of the total U. S. population in 1940, they contributed 51.2 per cent of the successful candidates.<sup>80</sup> The far west with 10.5 per cent of the total population had 13.2 per cent of the successful

---

<sup>79</sup>Ibid.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> The Midwest had 30.9 per cent of the total population but only 22.1 per cent of the successful candidates.<sup>82</sup> Finally, the south with 27.5 per cent of the total population accounted for only 13.4 per cent of the successful applicants.<sup>83</sup>

There are several reasons which might explain the disproportionate number of officers coming from the eastern and western seaboard. In the first place, most Foreign Service officers appear to be drawn from the urban-industrial states, while very few come from predominantly rural states. Between 1937 and 1950, five states which accounted for 32.3 per cent of the population in 1940, and 32.7 in 1950, contributed 51.0 per cent of the successful class 6 officer candidates.<sup>84</sup> During the more recent 1946-1951 period, the twelve states (including the District of Columbia) with the highest urban concentrations, had 49 per cent of the total United States population in 1950 and contributed 61.5 per cent of all successful class 6 candidates.<sup>85</sup> On the other hand, during the 1937-1950 period, the 19 predominantly rural states in the 1940 census had 23.9 per cent of the total U. S. population, (23.8 in 1950 census), but provided only 9.2 per cent of the successful candidates.<sup>86</sup> In more recent years, the disproportion between the urban and rural states used in the 1937-1950 study has become significantly less marked. During the 1946-1951 period the aforementioned 19 rural states accounted for 15.7 per cent

<sup>81</sup>Ibid.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid.

<sup>85</sup>Ibid.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid.

of industrial states had declined to 42.9 per cent.<sup>87</sup> It is significant to note that during the decade 1940 to 1950 urban population in the U. S. rose from 74 to 96 million, whereas, rural population fell from 57 to 54 million.<sup>88</sup> As the rural areas become more industrialized and commercialized, and the number of their foreign born increases, this disproportion will probably become even less marked. In the census of 1950, the proportion of the population which was urban varied from about four-fifths in the northeast to less than half in the south.<sup>89</sup> As we have already shown, the northeast is also the most overrepresented region in the Foreign Service, while the south is the most underrepresented.

Urbanization, commerce, and the high percentage of foreign born residents in New York probably account for the fact that although the state represented about 9.8 per cent of the total United States population in 1950, it contributed 18.8 per cent of the successful class 6 candidates between 1946 and 1952.<sup>90</sup> Other urban areas similar to New York such as Boston, St. Louis, San Francisco, Buffalo, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Chicago were also overrepresented in proportion to their population during this period.<sup>91</sup>

Another very important factor in explaining the disproportion between

<sup>87</sup>Ibid.

<sup>88</sup>Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States

<sup>89</sup>Based upon an estimate given to the writer in a personal interview with an officer in the joint Bureau of the Census-Library of Congress census project located in the Library of Congress.

<sup>90</sup>Based upon statistics compiled by the Office of Personnel and upon the Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1951.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid.

regional areas, although not a causal factor per se, relates to the number of persons taking and passing the examination per million population from each regional area. Between the years 1937 and 1952, the far west led in the number of persons attempting the examination per million population with 13.3, and also led in the number passing per million population with 2.48, or expressed another way, 18.6 per cent of all applicants from the far west passed the examination.<sup>92</sup> In the midwest, 6.9½ persons attempted the examination for every million of total population, and 1.25 per million or 18.0 per cent passed.<sup>93</sup> In the northeast, 12.7 persons per million population attempted the examination and 2.20 per million or 17.3 per cent passed.<sup>94</sup> In the south, only 4.36 persons per million attempted the examination per million population, and 0.66 persons per million population or 15.1 per cent passed.<sup>95</sup>

The smaller number of persons attempting the examination from the south and midwest represents a combination of factors including, the isolationist and provincial spirit in those areas, the lack of urban industrial areas comparable to the northeast, the small percentage of foreign born, and, finally, and perhaps most important, the lack of a positive recruitment policy by the Department of State in those areas coupled with a general lack of liaison of the unofficial variety between officers of the Department of State and members of the faculties of the institutions of higher learning in these regions. As the Department increases its positive recruitment

---

<sup>92</sup>Based upon statistics compiled by the Board of Examiners and upon the Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1951.

<sup>93</sup>Ibid.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid.

<sup>95</sup>Ibid.

effort in these areas these regional differences will probably disappear or at least become much less pronounced.<sup>96</sup> The smaller number of candidates per million population taking the examination from the south is due in part to the position of the Negroes in that area. The smaller percentage successfully passing the examination in the South may be attributable, in part, to the less highly developed educational system in that area. It could also represent the Department's inability to attract the more qualified southern college graduate, who, because of the Department's passive recruitment policy, has been unaware of the advantages offered by a career in the Foreign Service.

Occupation of Father. On the basis of a study of the occupations held by the fathers of candidates successfully passing the Foreign Service examination between 1940 and 1952 the following facts emerge: 29.7 per cent of the fathers were in business, 23.7 per cent were in the professions, and 3.3 per cent were in other executive positions. Skilled labor accounted for 18.2 per cent, manual labor 9.4 per cent, and clerical 11.0 per cent. Farmers constituted 4.7 per cent of the total.<sup>97</sup>

Personal Characteristics. The oral examinations are designed to determine a candidate's suitability with respect to physical appearance, diction, character, personality, earnestness, initiative, imagination, and general adaptability for the Foreign Service.<sup>98</sup> At best, the determination of such qualities is a highly subjective evaluation. In practice, each member of the oral panel evaluates the candidate on the basis of certain

---

<sup>96</sup>Supra.

<sup>97</sup>Based upon a statistical sample provided by the Office of Personnel.

<sup>98</sup>"Criteria for the Conduct of Oral Examination for Class 6 Officers," December 1, 1950.

indefinable criteria which he has established in his own inarticulate major premise. To know the criteria which the panels use to judge a particular candidate, therefore, we would have to know the content of the Deputy Examiner's major premise when a particular candidate appears before him. Until his recent resignation, the most important member of the oral examining panels was the Executive Director of the Board of Examiners, Mr. Joseph C. Green. Mr. Green has very definite opinions as to those qualities which a fledgling Foreign Service officer should possess. In his mind is a picture of a representative American boy, conforming to a definite pattern, and, during his tenure as Executive Director, he labored assiduously to insure that our representatives overseas would conform to this ideal.<sup>99</sup> Few question his sincerity, his diligence, or his devotion to duty. Some doubt arises whether the officer candidate should have to conform to some stereotyped pattern, however, at the expense of qualifications which are of equal or greater importance. The views of Mr. Green are emphasized here, because, in playing the decisive role in establishing the criteria on which the class of candidates have been judged in the oral examination, through his paramount position on the Board of Examiners and the Advisory Committee on Foreign Service Examinations, and, by helping to execute this policy as a Deputy Examiner on the oral examining panels, he has been able to exercise substantial influence over the opinions of his colleagues, and over the final decision of the oral examining panels.<sup>100</sup>

No one doubts that the individual Mr. Green selected was well qualified,

---

<sup>99</sup>Based upon the opinion expressed by a substantial majority of the officers interviewed who have worked with or who have personally known Mr. Green.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid.

when judged by the criteria the ex-Executive Director had established in his own mind. But doubt is expressed whether many of those candidates whom Mr. Green excluded were not equally or more competent. The Board of Examiners maintains that they are interested in recruiting junior officers with all around ability and promise as opposed to the recruitment of specialists.<sup>101</sup> An analysis of the written examination would indicate that the Board of Examiners considers the best test of "all around ability" to be the candidate's proficiency in a wide range of acquired knowledge, plus the ability to express a part of this acquired knowledge in clear, concise English. If an officer candidate is to be successful, therefore, he must evidence familiarity with a broad range of subjects. Whether a minimum of acquired knowledge in a wide range of fields does indicate all around ability and promise or a broad Weltanschauung better than a high degree of competence in one field is moot. We shall discuss this issue in more detail when evaluating the content of the examinations.

In addition, the candidate must be "thoroughly American" in temper, outlook, and personal values.<sup>102</sup> In any nation the determination of the "representative" citizen has to be highly subjective, and in the United States, a nation which prides itself on the diversity of its ethnic, religious, racial, and occupational groups, the determination is particularly difficult. In spite of broader criteria established by way of definition, a careful reading of the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Examiners, and the minutes of the meetings of the Board of the Foreign Service, coupled with numerous interviews with present and past members of the Board of Examiners leads one to conclude that a "thoroughly American" candidate is

---

<sup>101</sup>Department of State, Preparing for a Career in the Foreign Service, p. 13.

<sup>102</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

one who, aside from being attached to the principles of the Constitution, is somewhat of a factual dilettante in the history, government, geography, and economics of the United States.<sup>103</sup> In short, the representative American to Mr. Green is one who has acquired a "classical" knowledge of America, or to put it bluntly, "the" representative American is Mr. Green. The Department of Agriculture takes exception to this concept of one "thoroughly American in temper, outlook, and personal values." As one Department of Agriculture official expressed it:

The Department of Agriculture believes that a competent fellow who understands how to milk a cow, who understands the workings of the American private farm system, who can vividly describe a 4-H club meeting, is just as qualified a representative of America as the fellow who can tell you the date on which California was admitted to the Union.<sup>104</sup>

The writer realizes that he has not done justice to the more complex arguments of both sides in the brief remarks he has made here. In this facet of the argument, however, the position of the Department of Agriculture appears to be well taken. A person with a vast book-knowledge of America does not necessarily understand the spirit and temper of its people better than one equipped with fewer facts but superior intuition.

The individual with proper avoids falsity, an excellent Latin school education,

---

<sup>103</sup>The Minutes of the Board of Examiners are on file in the office of the Board Secretariat. The writer was permitted to read those issues dealing with the Foreign Service examination between 1946 and 1951. The Minutes of the Board of the Foreign Service are on file in the office of Mr. Gerhard Dressler. Although the writer did not have the advantage of meeting Mr. Dressler, he did read all copies of the Minutes between 1947 and 1951. Since the Minutes of the Board of the Foreign Service discussed personalities presently in the Department, they are not otherwise cited in this paper.

<sup>104</sup>Statement by Dr. Eric England, Department of Agriculture, personal interview.

and the ability to describe America in minute detail, does not necessarily understand America. In fact, Thorstein B. Veblen, one of the keenest students of late nineteenth century America, had a much clearer picture of the United States than most of his contemporaries because he was raised outside the pale of classical orthodoxy. In all events, it would be most difficult, if not absurd, to say that there is one best prototype of "representative American."

The Board of Examiners also places substantial emphasis on the social adequacy and personal mannerisms of the candidate presenting himself for examination. One candidate was recently deferred because his "speech did not appear to be the speech of an educated man." Mr. Green pointed out that the candidate "consistently qualified statements with the phrase, 'Sort of', and on one occasion used the expression, 'Better man than me.'

Personal appearance is also an important consideration in the oral examination. While the Board has not defined what it means by acceptable and unacceptable appearance, some light is shed on this topic in the Recruitment Manual compiled by the Department of State to serve as a guide for the recruitment of Foreign Service personnel, excluding regular officers, at overseas posts. A few quotations from this manual may suffice:

It should be the general objective of the employing officers to select individuals whose physical characteristics and general appearance are such that they will be representative of the average American individual insofar as possible. Conservative dress is desirable, and extreme deviations from appropriate dress may well be rejection factors.....<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup>"Recruitment Manual for Foreign Service Posts," First Draft, (Recruitment Branch, Division of Foreign Service Personnel, 1951), p. 22. When the writer read this manual it was still in manuscript form. Other qualities to be sought in the ideal Foreign Service recruit were listed as follows: Applicants were not to be "bullish or showoffish."

By "normal" appearance we refer to individuals who are not extreme in any way. Abnormalities in height, weight, or general appearance are more noticeable at a Foreign Service post where the number of Americans are limited. Such abnormalities may attract undue attention.....<sup>106</sup>

The Oral Examination. The Advisory Committee on Foreign Service Examinations, a group of distinguished authorities in the fields of education, personnel, and testing, which is chosen and chaired by the Executive Director of the Board of Examiners to review the work of the Board each year and make recommendations for improvement, has consistently suggested that the oral examinations might be modified to advantage.<sup>107</sup> In 1948 the Committee suggested that the present oral examining system, while it is a satisfactory means for assessing the visible qualities of personality, does not provide a means for revealing the underlying attributes of personality which may be determining factors in the success or failure of the Foreign Service officer.<sup>108</sup> The Committee recommended a further study of the British House Party system, the somewhat similar system employed by the Office of Strategic Services during World War II, and the more recent techniques devised by American psychiatrists and psychologists for assessing character traits.<sup>109</sup>

---

(p.22) but were to be "normal, decent, average Americans" (p.22). They were to have "good grooming" which included hair, nails, makeup, cleanliness, and the condition of the applicant's clothing" (p.22). They were to have a "thorough schooling" in the "American way of life" (p.20) and were to be free of any "foreign customs, attitudes, ideas, sympathies..." (p.22).

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>107</sup> "Report of the Advisory Committee on the Foreign Service Examinations," (Unpublished MSS, Board of Examiners, 1946-1951).

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., November 15, 1948, p. 2.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid.

The British House Party and the Office of Strategic Service system of oral interview are based on the assumption that the type of oral interview now employed by the Foreign Service is at best an examination of the automobile in the showroom, whereas newer systems are designed to test the car under actual driving conditions. In addition to the visible qualities of personality, the British and O. S. S. systems attempt to determine such qualities as initiative, imagination, ability to perform under stress, intuition, and leadership.<sup>110</sup>

Selecting junior officers equipped with an abundance of initiative and leadership appears to be especially important in a career system. Too often a career system has a tendency to generate a strong gravitational pull toward conformal mediocrity, which dulls initiative, discourages leadership, and strengthens the belief in a do-nothing policy as the safest course of action. Such a gravitational pull is particularly strong in the Foreign Service today. The McCarthy blunderbuss has increased the tendency for officers to avoid making decisions or strong recommendations, or to avoid choosing sides whenever and wherever possible.

The Board of Examiners or, more accurately, its ex-Executive Director did not believe that it would be particularly wise policy to attempt to change the selection procedure in order to obtain junior officers of outstanding initiative. The ex-Director's reasons for taking such a position are well summarized in the following paragraph from one of his unpublished reports:

---

<sup>110</sup>Information on the British House party system was obtained in a personal interview with Mr. Jones, Administrative Officer, British Embassy, Washington, D. C. Information on the Office of Strategic Service System was obtained from Lt. Edward Schein, Research Psychologist, U. S. Army, now stationed at Harvard University.

It might be dangerous to attempt to overcome defects caused by the nature of the profession, by a change in the selection procedure. For example, it is possible that Foreign Service officers develop a high degree of caution in their statements concerning political or economic problems because of the extent to which their opinions and decisions are subject to review. However, if the examination system attempted to select individuals with the outstanding initiative and independence of thought and action, these individuals might quickly become unhappy in the Service and might disrupt the Service to such an extent as to seriously interfere with its proper functioning.<sup>111</sup>

Such a position seems very difficult to defend under the present conditions of foreign affairs. During the nineteenth century, when conditions existed which made it possible for America successfully to pursue a policy of isolation in her relations with foreign powers, we could afford the luxury of a simple, negative foreign policy. Under those conditions we needed little more than integrity and consistency in our foreign agents abroad. Today, cloaked with the mantle of world leadership, it is impossible for us to approach foreign policy with a simple or negative point of view. We must have an affirmative policy designed and executed by officers who are capable of best utilizing all facets of the nation's potential. Such a policy calls for officers with a superabundance of leadership, initiative, inventive genius, and independence of thought. For, although we desire "consistency" in the objectives of our foreign policy, we must avoid day-to-dayness in our policy-formulating and policy-executing officials. The foreign agents of a world leader in a dynamic global society must have that flexibility of mind which permits them to grasp the relative changes in a shifting power calculus

---

<sup>111</sup>"Memo of Action Taken by the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service on the Preliminary Report of the Advisory Committee on the Foreign Service Examinations," December 12, 1946, (Unpublished MS, Board of Examiners, typewritten), p. 8.

and to design, overnight if necessary, new techniques which will better serve the national interest. Such qualifications are of particular importance in a career service whose members, not only carry a predetermined policy into effect, but actually hold many of the key positions in the formulation of that policy.

Objections to the Written Examinations. Numerous objections have been voiced against the content of the Foreign Service written examinations.<sup>112</sup> Probably the chief objection is that the examination places too much emphasis on the broadly classical type of knowledge, and does not place enough emphasis on knowledge of a specialized type. The modifications most commonly suggested follow the pattern of the Rowe Commission recommendations.<sup>113</sup> The Rowe Commission advocated a comprehensive selection process at the entrance level, which would include rigorous written, oral and physical examinations. The written examination would be divided into two parts. The first part would be a general examination designed to test the broad capacities and potentialities of the junior officer. The second part would be composed of a series of specialized examinations in economics, agriculture, public affairs and administration. The candidate would be required to pass the general examination, and one specialized examination which he would elect, in order to become eligible for the oral examination and eventual appointment. In February 1951 the Advisory Committee on Foreign Service Examinations added its approval and recommended that the Board of Examiners consider the possibility of

---

<sup>112</sup>See for example Analysis of Personnel Improvement Plan, pp. 33-34.

<sup>113</sup>Ibid., p. 34.

adding special examination options in law, history, economics, agriculture, labor, and commerce.<sup>114</sup> The then Executive Director of the Board of Examiners opposed such special options on grounds that they impose additional qualifications and serve to complicate the recruitment of Foreign Service officers rather than to simplify it.<sup>115</sup>

It appears that a good part of the argument stems from the generalist-specialist controversy. Those who favor the addition of options in special fields believe the present examination system is designed too much along classical lines, and does not give sufficient credit to the person who has acquired a specialization. The proponents of the "specialization" school maintain that the general type of examination was satisfactory when the United States could afford the luxury of a simple, passive foreign policy, but argue that the complex foreign policy of today, generated by a complex economic and social system and an advanced stage of technology, requires numerous specialists. General officers are becoming as obsolete as the frontier general store and for much the same reason. Specialization must be encouraged at an early age if the Service is to be adequately and competently staffed.

On the other hand, the Board of Examiners believes that the candidate should concentrate on laying a broad foundation for his future development during his undergraduate years, and he should shy away from specializations which will unduly deter him from the broader intellectual pursuits.<sup>116</sup> The Board believes that specialization built upon a weak understanding of

---

<sup>114</sup>"Report of the Advisory Committee on Foreign Service Examinations," February 1, 1951, p. 7.

<sup>115</sup>Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>116</sup>Ibid.

underlying social forces may be quite harmful, since the immature student may formulate opinions on subjects before he is qualified to do so, and these early prejudices may handicap his future intellectual development.<sup>117</sup> The Board believes that early specialization built on a narrow foundation causes an officer to see such a small segment of the cultural whole that he invariably loses sight of the end objectives of the Service, and his own narrow specialization becomes an end in itself.<sup>118</sup>

Actually the two views are not so far apart as would first appear. With few exceptions, those who carry the banner of specialization admit that the federal Civil Service has overworked the concept. Many Civil Service classification series are so narrowly defined today, that the average worker is often out of touch with the objectives of his division much less the objectives of the department. The "specialists" readily agree that a government-wide philosophy is of great value if the officer is eventually to occupy a position of responsibility and command.<sup>119</sup>

The "generalists" on the other hand recognize the importance of specialization to the success of a modern foreign service. One fact that is little realized is that the overwhelming percentage of Foreign Service officers are specialists in their own right. After the fledgling officer has been given an opportunity to acquaint himself with the various duties and functions of the Service, he will probably find himself attracted to one facet of the work. He may specialize in consular work, in a particular

---

<sup>117</sup>Ibid.

<sup>118</sup>Ibid.

<sup>119</sup>Mr. Horace Risher, a leading authority on Civil Service classification in the Department of State, told the writer "Most Civil Service job series are so narrowly defined today, and the person sees such a small part of the big picture, that it has become most difficult to build a Department wide esprit de corps."

geographic area, or in one of the many functional fields. While he will be occasionally rotated to another area to permit him to reorient himself to overall objectives, the major part of his Service time will be spent in one specialized field. A recent check of 200 Foreign Service officers with 20 or more years of service showed that they had spent approximately 85 per cent of their Service time in one specialized field.

The major question to be determined is: Does the present testing system obtain for the Foreign Service, officers of broad world views, sufficiently specialized, and in sufficient quantity and quality to meet the needs of the Service? We might also inquire whether the option system advocated by the Rowe Commission and the Advisory Committee on the Foreign Service Examinations could not be so devised that it might also select junior officers of equal potential for development and equal perceptive insight.

Content of the Written Examination. The first part of the written examination consists of approximately one dozen texts, each followed by questions based upon its content.<sup>120</sup> The candidate is to answer each question on the basis of what is stated or implied in the text. A correct response counts a plus one, an incorrect response a minus  $\frac{1}{4}$ , and an omitted response zero. The test is designed to test the ability of the candidate to read rapidly with accuracy and comprehension. Exhaustive research into the value and validity of the U. S. Air Force Qualifying Examination AC-10-B, which was given to thousands of potential Air Cadets during World War II, showed that of all types of verbal items which were tried out for use in the examination, the reading comprehension items

---

<sup>120A</sup> sample copy of the examination may be found in Department of State, Preparing for a Career in the Foreign Service, pp. 21-92.

proved to be the most useful for predicting the criterion of graduation or elimination from pilot training.<sup>121</sup> Data provided by factorial analysis indicated that the reasoning processes in reading were largely responsible for the positive correlation between the reading comprehension items and the pilot criterion.<sup>122</sup> It was discovered that those reading items based on passages relating to mechanical devices and airplanes were most likely to be correlated with success in the flight training program.<sup>123</sup> It is probably much more difficult to determine criteria for success in the diplomatic service than for success in a flight training program, since the skills and abilities needed in the former are much easier to define. Being both an art and a science diplomacy requires a multitude of skills and virtues.<sup>124</sup> On the other hand, the Board of Examiners believes that the tendencies which have contributed to the lack of success of officers in the Foreign Service are essentially the same as those which contribute to lack of success in most lines of human endeavor, particularly in the professions.<sup>125</sup> These deficiencies include: lack of industry, lack of sound training, neurotic tendencies, objectionable personal habits and

---

<sup>121</sup>Frederick B. Davis, The A.A.F. Qualifying Examination, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1947), p. 73.

<sup>122</sup>Ibid.

<sup>123</sup>Ibid.

<sup>124</sup>In fact, one may reasonably ask if present day diplomacy is a single profession, or a heterogeneous group of professions. This is important to the testing process for if the positions grouped together are too heterogeneous, or if the field of work is too poorly defined, no type of test can be expected to yield a prediction of job performance.

<sup>125</sup>"Memo of Action Taken by the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service on the Preliminary Report of the Advisory Committee on Foreign Service Examinations," December 12, 1946, p. 8.

"even drunkenness or downright dishonesty."<sup>126</sup> Because it is difficult to establish narrow criteria for the successful Foreign Service officer, it is also difficult to establish positive correlations on certain factors which are emphasized in the reading comprehension tests. The texts do contain an excellent selection of types of reading materials on which the Foreign Service officer will spend a large percentage of his time. Included for comprehension and analysis are tests on political, economic and social trends, treaties, labor and industry analysis, and international adjudication.

Probably the one part of the Foreign Service examination that has received the most adverse criticism is Part B of the First General Examination, the vocabulary examination. This test consists of 100 words which the candidate is to define by selecting the correct word or phrase out of the four items placed in block-form beside it. Correct responses count plus one, incorrect responses a minus one-third, and omitted responses count zero.

The criticisms directed against this section of the examination relate to (a) the difficulty index of the words selected; to the beliefs that (b) there is little positive correlation between success on the vocabulary examination and success as a Foreign Service officer, (c) that the examination favors the "cramming" type of preparation and (d) that the examination favors the classically trained scholar at the expense of the specialist.<sup>127</sup>

Undoubtedly, the words selected are very difficult as the following few examples selected at random will indicate: acerbity, anile, caudal,

---

<sup>126</sup>Ibid.

<sup>127</sup>Based upon the consensus expressed by officers interviewed.

chelonian, deme, feckless, hagiographic, heteroclite, hieratic, laodicean, orotund, otiose, postiche, and tergiversation. The difficulty of a particular item in a relatively scored examination is not an important consideration per se. The important considerations are the reliability of the items, i.e., the ability of the item to measure a person's abilities in a constant way, the validity of the items, i.e., the ability to differentiate between those who are desirable and those who are undesirable for the Foreign Service, and face validity, or the appearance of validity to the person taking or considering taking the examination.

The vocabulary section of the examination was a pet project of Mr. Green, and he and one of his associates devoted approximately three weeks each year to the construction of it.<sup>128</sup> Mr. Green believes that the vocabulary examination is of great value in determining the breadth and quality of a candidate's education.<sup>129</sup> A part of his belief in the importance of vocabulary to success in the Foreign Service might be explained by the fact that the Executive Director was for a period of five years an editor of Webster's New International Dictionary,<sup>130</sup> and etymology has been one of his hobbies.<sup>130</sup>

Mr. Green has consistently defended the value of the vocabulary section to the overall examination. He points out that no candidate is expected to know the meaning of all of the 100 words. Of the 1141 candidates who took the examination in September 1948, one had a raw score of 83, one of 80, one of 79 and one of 76. These four candidates were given grades of 100

---

<sup>128</sup>Memorandum from Joseph C. Green, Board of Examiners to Howard K. Travers, Career Minister, re Foreign Service Examination, First General Exam, Part B," August 19, 1949, (Unpublished MS, Board of Examiners, typewritten).

<sup>129</sup>Ibid.

<sup>130</sup>Department of State, Biographic Register, p. 176.

per cent. A raw score of 69 was the equivalent of a 90, a raw score of 59 was the equivalent of a grade of 80, and a raw score of 49 was equivalent to a grade of 70. It was possible to pass the examination in 1948, therefore, by knowing approximately fifty per cent of the total number of items.<sup>131</sup>

Mr. Green further maintains that the selection of the words to be included on the examination is based upon a careful study and analysis of the results of the examination in previous years.<sup>132</sup> Indices of reliability and difficulty are determined for each item. The formula used for this determination is:<sup>133</sup>

$$\frac{N_t}{N_t} = P > M_{vt} + \sigma_{vt} \times = \Delta$$

$$\frac{(M_+ - M_{vt})}{\sigma_{vt}} \left( \frac{P}{2} \right) = r_{bis}$$

P and  $\Delta$  are indices of difficulty and  $r_{bis}$  is an index of the reliability of an item. Reliability can be defined in several ways but is used here to express the degree to which a particular item tends to discriminate between the good candidate and the poor candidate.<sup>134</sup> Words that are missed by an equal number of good and poor students are considered to be non-discriminatory, and an attempt is made to select some words that will be known by 90 per cent of the candidates, and some by 10 per cent of the candidates with a proper distribution curve between them. If, after the annual analysis, an item does not appear "reliable," i.e., if it were

<sup>131</sup>Memorandum from Joseph C. Green to Howard K. Travers," August 19, 1949.

<sup>132</sup>Ibid.

<sup>133</sup>Ibid.

<sup>134</sup>This is a very unusual definition of reliability and it appears that the word validity should have been employed, however, Mr. Green's definition is used here because the above is a summarization of his explanations.

missed by as many candidates who made good scores on the overall vocabulary examination as made poor scores, then it will not be used on a subsequent examination. Reliability scores of below .20 are considered to be unsatisfactory, between .20 and .29 weak, between .30 and .39 satisfactory, and .40 and above, good to excellent. In the 1947 examination the following results were achieved on the 100 vocabulary items: 9 were unsatisfactory, 9 were weak, 14 were satisfactory, and 68 were good to excellent.<sup>135</sup>

Studies made by the Board of Examiners indicate that the vocabulary test tends to have a high correlation with success on other parts of the examination. The vocabulary examination has a satisfactory degree of validity, therefore, when measured against the internal criteria of the test. Of more importance is the existence of a positive correlation between the vocabulary examination and an independent external criterion such as success in a Foreign Service career.<sup>136</sup> Unfortunately, no such data are available. In 1946 the Advisory Committee on the Foreign Service Examinations suggested that the Board of Examiners make an analysis of the relationship between success in the Foreign Service examinations and in various parts of the examination, and success in the Foreign Service.<sup>137</sup> After some research, the Board decided that such a correlation would be

---

<sup>135</sup>"Memorandum from Joseph C. Green to Howard K. Travers," August 19, 1949.

<sup>136</sup>Before the validity of a test for predicting job success can be established, an independent measure of job success must be available. One can resort to a variety of statistical maneuvering with scores on a test and never fully establish its validity if an independent criterion is lacking.

<sup>137</sup>"Questions of Fundamental Policy Concerning the Foreign Service Examinations," December 6, 1946, (Unpublished MS, Board of Examiners, typewritten).

of little value. It was discovered that most successful candidates who were admitted to the Service were bunched in the 70 to 80 bracket, and there was not enough of a test score difference among successful candidates to establish positive correlations.<sup>138</sup> However, the ex-Executive Director believes that there is a positive correlation between vocabulary and breadth of education, and vocabulary and executive ability, both qualities considered by the Board to be of the inestimable value to a successful career in the Service.<sup>139</sup>

On the other hand, those who object to the vocabulary examination present strong arguments. They point out that one important element to be considered in any examination is its "face validity". An examination should look practical to the competitors and appear reasonable in view of the job duties and responsibilities. Most competitors will see little correlation between the difficult verbal items included in the examination and success in a Foreign Service career. The antipathy generated by such a test, in combination with its very dubious validity when measured against an external criterion, makes it of very doubtful value.

There is the final criticism of cramming. Some observers believe that it is possible to prepare for an examination of this type by an intensive building of passive vocabulary. As such, the test would be a measure of rote learning and not general competence.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup>Statement by Dr. Cromwell Riches, personal interview.

<sup>139</sup>"Memorandum from Joseph C. Green to Howard K. Travers," August 19, 1949.

<sup>140</sup>George Washington University offers a summer "cram" course for individuals preparing for the Foreign Service examination. Over a four year period, the school has had about 50 per cent of its cram course students pass the written Foreign Service examination, as opposed to a general average of about 16 per cent. Because it is impossible to say whether the cram course attracts an average sample of candidates, no definite conclusion can be drawn with respect to the value of cramming,

It is also believed that the vocabulary examination favors the student with classical training in the humanities as opposed to the student in the more specialized fields of knowledge. If this part of the examination is to be continued, the Board of Examiners would do well to examine the possibility of designing a vocabulary examination that will measure one's background in the physical, natural and social sciences as well as one's ability in etymology per se.

The second general examination consists of statements and questions based on maps, charts, tables, and factual summaries. The candidate answers the questions by choosing the one correct response from the multiple answers provided. The examination is designed to test the ability of the candidate to interpret statistical charts and graphs and to arrive at simple mathematical conclusions. The relationship between comprehension of this type of data and actual work in the Service is apparent. A good part of consular duties involves the interpretation of statistical data and the construction of charts, graphs, and tables. Modern intelligence reporting, and the reporting that is done in the specialized fields such as economics, agriculture, labor and scientific advancement involve the ability to handle statistical information with reasonable speed and facility.

The third general examination tests the candidate's range and breadth of factual information in the fields of literature, philosophy, fine arts, physical and biological sciences, agriculture, mathematics, history, government, economics, international law and relations, geography, sociology, and anthropology. No student is expected to know the answers to all of the

---

but it does appear that cramming is beneficial. Based upon an interview with Mr. Walter Fachler, Director, Foreign Service Review Course, George Washington University, August 1951.

questions, and the examination is arranged so that the candidate may quickly identify and select those parts of the various fields of knowledge in which he feels most competent. In fact, one of the important facets of this part of the examination is its ability to determine whether a candidate has the ability to distribute his time judiciously.

The fourth general examination tests the ability of the candidate to express himself in written English. In general, the candidate is required to discuss the implications of two given statements and to present summaries of two long reports. In both the discussions and the summaries the candidate is limited to a maximum number of words.

The two special examinations in history and government, and in economics are subjective in nature. The candidate selects topics from various options presented to him and composes brief essays discussing the concrete issues presented in the selected topics. The examination in history and government is designed so that the candidate can select questions dealing solely with the United States if he prefers.<sup>141</sup>

The special examination in modern foreign languages tests the ability of the candidate to read French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, or Russian. The language test is graded separately, and an absolute score of 70 per cent is needed to pass it. A candidate may offer two languages if he prefers. If he makes an unsatisfactory grade in the second language offered he will not be disadvantaged. Should he make a creditable score, that is, a grade of 60 or above, he will be advantaged. The examination

---

<sup>141</sup>The special examinations are designed by the Board of Examiners and not by the Educational Testing Service. They are graded by subject matter specialists employed by the Educational Testing Service. Each year the graders evaluate the content of the special examinations, and inform the Board of Examiners of any criticisms they might have. One specialist in economics has continually criticized the special examination in this field.

tests vocabulary and reading comprehension, and is of the objective, multiple choice type.

Examinations for Lateral Entrants. While we have emphasized the examinations for applicants for class 6 or the entering grade, the Board of Examiners is also responsible for the competitive examinations given to qualified candidates who desire to enter the Foreign Service at the intermediate or upper grades. We have already discussed the general procedure for bringing these lateral entrants into the Service in the chapter on recruitment and we will limit our discussion here to the type of examinations they are expected to pass.

Applicants for class 5 under the regular 517 program and under the temporary provisions of the "liberalized" lateral entry program must pass competitive written and oral examinations and a physical examination. <sup>11/2</sup>

The written examination and the level of achievement on it will be the same as for regular class 6 candidates. Candidates successfully passing the written examination will appear for oral examination before a panel of five deputy examiners appointed by the Board of Examiners.

Candidates appearing before the Board of Examiners will be rated on a 21 point scale and will be adjudged "passed with distinction", "passed", "deferred", or "failed". If the candidate is applying under the provisions of the regular 517 program, he must be among the maximum of ten candidates adjudged to be in the upper one-third of the scale of 21 points in order to be certified for class 5. If the candidate is not so adjudged but meets the other requirements of the Board of Examiners, he may be certified for class 6.

---

<sup>11/2</sup>The following discussion is based upon the Regulations of the Board of Examiners, Regular Provisions effective June 14, 1948 and Temporary Provision effective April 25, 1951, sec. 9.

Applicants for class 5 under the liberalized lateral entry provisions who have successfully passed the written examination and who receive a score "above the mid-point of the 21-point scale" are certified for appointment to class 5. A candidate who does not receive an oral score above the mid-point of the 21-point scale but who is judged "passed with distinction" or "passed", may be certified for appointment as a class 6 officer.

Candidates for appointment to classes 1 through 4 under both the regular and the liberalized lateral entry provisions receive an oral examination before a panel of five deputy examiners, and must also demonstrate some facility in the use of a foreign language. The oral examination for these classes is a full appraisal of all information available on a particular officer. The officer's efficiency records in the Department or in the Reserve or Staff branches of the Foreign Service, the written opinions of his present or former supervisors and colleagues, and his complete personal qualification and security record are made available to the oral panels in the form of a summary prepared by the Board of Examiners. After the panel has had a chance to study this information the candidate appears for a personal interview lasting from an hour to an hour and a half. The candidate is questioned by the panel on matters in which his experience, interests, and education would seem to evidence some measure of competence. The candidate is also expected to show a satisfactory knowledge of the history, government, economy and geography of the United States. In addition, the candidate is expected to demonstrate that he has a normal language aptitude and the desire to learn a foreign language. If he has lived abroad in an area where a foreign language is spoken, he will be expected to demonstrate some oral and aural facility in that language. If he has not lived abroad, he will be expected to translate simple passages from the foreign language which he selects.

Candidates for classes 1 through 4 under the provisions of the regular 517 program and under the temporary provisions of the liberalized lateral entry program will be rated by the oral panels on a 21-point scale and will be adjudged "passed with distinction", "passed", "deferred", or "failed". Candidates under the regular 517 program must receive scores in the upper one-third of the 21-point scale to be eligible for appointment. In addition, the number of candidates appointed for each of the four classes is not to exceed five per cent of the annual vacancies in each or one, whichever is greater. Candidates must be certified as comparing favorably with the "best officers in the corresponding classes of the Service." Candidates whose experience and qualifications were not adjudged sufficient to warrant their appointment to the class for which they applied may be certified as eligible for the next lower class if the oral panel so determines, with the exception that no candidate may be certified as eligible for class 5 unless he has successfully passed the written examination.

Candidates for classes 1 through 4 appearing under the liberalized lateral entry provisions will be adjudged on a similar 21-point scale, but need only receive a score above the mid-point of the scale, and a grade of "Adequate" in the language examination in order to be certified for the grade for which they applied. Whereas, the candidate under the regular 517 program must possess in the aggregate the background and demonstrated ability to make him comparable to the best officers in the class for which he is applying, the candidate under the liberalized provisions need only compare with the average officer in the designated class. Candidates who receive scores above the mid-point but do not pass the foreign language within a period of one year. In addition candidates who are adjudged to be insufficiently qualified for appointment to the class for which they applied, may be designated for the next lower class if the

panel believes their qualifications are sufficient to warrant appointment to that class, and if the candidate has indicated a prior willingness to be considered for the next lower class. The provision that no candidate may be appointed to class 5 without passing the written examination, however, is equally applicable under the liberalized program. No applicant will be offered an appointment to a class more than one class below the one for which he applied. The examining panels are not to be informed of the candidate's willingness to accept an appointment to a lower class in order that his chances of being appointed to a higher class will not be prejudiced.<sup>143</sup>

In all oral examinations given to candidates desirous of entering the Service by means of the lateral entry provisions, a good deal of emphasis is placed upon the candidate's versatility, his capacity for development, the suitability of his personality, and other abilities considered to be especially important to success as a Foreign Service officer.

#### Recommendations for the Class 6 Exam.

1. We would agree with the Department of State that the class 6 examination should be designed to select men for the Service with a broad point of view and a government-wide orientation. We do not agree, however, that ability to evidence a limited knowledge in a wide variety of fields necessarily indicates that the successful candidate has a broad point of view, or the necessary insight and intuition to place events in their

---

<sup>143</sup>All lateral appointments are required by law to be made at the lowest salary step in the grade to which the candidate has been appointed. Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 413. This has caused a great deal of difficulty in carrying out the provisions of the liberalized lateral entry program. Often, a Departmental officer has the alternative of applying for one Foreign Service officer class in which he will be substantially advantaged salary-wise, or applying for a lower class in which case he will be substantially disadvantaged.

proper perspective. We would agree that an early academic specialization upon a limited background can be dangerous to future intellectual development. But it is also true that a man can be highly specialized in one field, not have a smattering of knowledge in numerous others, yet be able to recognize the proper role of his specialization in a complex cultural whole.

2. We would favor a two part written examination designed on an option system similar to that recommended by the Rowe Commission. The first part of the examination would consist on questions designed to test the candidate's ability to reason, think, and express himself clearly. Parts of the present examination which place a premium on "cramming", such as the vocabulary examination and the third general examination should be eliminated. Statistics kept for the Foreign Service "cram" course at George Washington University for the last three years reveal that approximately 50 per cent of the graduates of the "cram" course have passed the written examination as opposed to an average of roughly 16 to 18 per cent of all candidates. The examination should be designed to lessen the advantage of this type of preparation. The second part of the examination would consist of options in agriculture, labor relations, economics, public affairs, and related fields, designed not only to test the candidate's factual knowledge and general competency in these fields, but also to test his ability to integrate his specialized knowledge into overall government policy.

3. We would recommend a thorough revision of the present oral examining system for class 6 officers. The present system should either be replaced or supplemented with the group type of oral as employed by the British Foreign Office and the now defunct Office of Strategic Services.

The oral examination could also be advantaged by adding a Rorschach or a similar personality test analysis to the other data collected for the examining panels. Candidates who are successful on the written examination could be given the Rorschach examination, and the results of the personality inventory would then be made known to the panel by the qualified psychologist or psychiatrist who would sit with the panel.

## CHAPTER V

### PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, PROMOTION AND SELECTION OUT

The keystone of any successful career system is a well designed promotion policy. If competent young men are to be attracted into the Service and kept there, if their abilities are to be fully developed and utilized, a system of progressive advancement must not only be incorporated into the personnel structure, but the individual must feel that the system so constituted is both fair and impartial.

The normal route to the top rungs of the Foreign Service career ladder is by way of periodic in-service promotions.<sup>1</sup> Young men of broad general competence are brought into the Service at the bottom or entering grade and progress over a period of years to the more responsible positions. While a few mature individuals of especial competence are infused into the career hierarchy at the intermediate and upper grades, these lateral appointees are the exception rather than the rule, and in normal times their entrance is restricted to a certain maximum number determined by regulation.<sup>2</sup> Because a great deal of the success of the career system in general and of the morale of Service personnel in particular is geared to the operation of the promotion system, we shall examine the general principles of that system in the Foreign Service, as well as the existing machinery for carrying that policy into effect.

Promotion in the Foreign Service is solely on the basis of merit and demonstrated ability. Political considerations whether they be the extra-

---

<sup>1</sup>Supra.

<sup>2</sup>Regulations of the Board of Examiners, sec. 10. Undoubtedly, in-service politics are still an important consideration in "getting ahead." Legislation cannot change human nature.

Service "party" type, or the intra-service "friendship" type, are not to be considered.<sup>3</sup> In addition, an attempt is made to place the determination of merit on a completely objective basis, and thereby provide a truly scientific and equitable promotion system.

In the promotion of a Foreign Service officer, therefore, the emphasis is placed upon his performance record.<sup>4</sup> The efficiency record or dossier is an accumulation of all available and pertinent information concerning a particular officer which the Department has been able to gather from a variety of sources.<sup>5</sup> One very important part of the dossier is the efficiency report.<sup>6</sup> Each supervisor under whom an officer has served records his rating of the officer's performance on a form specially prepared to eliminate a good part of the human equation. These completed forms become a permanent part of the officer's record.<sup>7</sup> It is a common belief that these efficiency reports constitute the sole basis for promotion. Actually, they are only one fact, although an important one, in the overall rating process. In addition to these supervisory ratings the promotion panels have at their disposal important data from other sources which weigh heavily in the final ranking assigned to a given officer. For example, there are the end user reports. Each Foreign Service officer in the field is responsible for a number of reports which are sent to the Department of State or to other executive agencies. The quality of the reports submitted is assessed by the end user, and these evaluations become

<sup>3</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 621.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., sec. 623.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., sec. 601.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., See also Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 571.1.

<sup>7</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 611.

a permanent part of the officer's dossier.<sup>8</sup> In addition there are the evaluations submitted by the Foreign Service Inspection corps. The Foreign Service Act of 1946 provides that each post and the personnel at that post shall be examined in a substantially uniform manner at least once every two years.<sup>9</sup> The inspectors are officers who have been carefully selected for this type of work and their thorough and objective reports are of great value. Finally, there are the innumerable bits of unsolicited information concerning the performance of a particular officer which come into the possession of the Department from time to time. The unsolicited items will vary appreciably. It may be a letter of commendation from the President of the United States, or a letter of complaint from some private citizen who feels his interests were not properly served by a particular Foreign Service officer overseas.<sup>10</sup>

In addition to the record of performance, the officer's dossier also contains a record of his specialized qualifications. If the officer has attended a language and area course, has acquired a proficiency in a functional specialization or has pursued work at one of the armed service staff schools, he receives due credit for this specialization.<sup>11</sup> It would be difficult if not impossible to enumerate all the factors which are considered in the promotion of a particular officer. Suffice <sup>it</sup> to say, the determination does not rest upon the judgment of any one man, no matter

---

<sup>8</sup>Statement by Mr. Charles E. Vasaly, Assistant Chief, Performance Measurement Branch, Division of Foreign Service Personnel, personal interview.

<sup>9</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 681. See also Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 133.3.

<sup>10</sup>Statement by Mr. Charles Vasaly, personal interview.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

how competent that individual's judgment may be.

Even though a mass of objective data is acquired and made available on any particular officer, the promotion system may still go awry if a competent and objective technique is not devised for weighing and analyzing this information, so that all officers of a given class may be rated on a relative basis, and promoted according to their standing in relation to the other officers in their class. It would appear that the Foreign Service has developed an excellent technique for insuring that the officer's record will be fairly and objectively considered, whenever he is being judged in competition with his fellow officers. Promotion in the Foreign Service is made on the basis of annual recommendations of the selection panels composed of officers from the Department of State, from the public, and from other government agencies.<sup>12</sup> The selection boards evaluate the dossiers of all officers who are eligible for consideration for promotion and assign each officer to a relative ranking in his class.<sup>13</sup> A number of officers in each class are then recommended for promotion.<sup>14</sup> On the basis of these recommendations, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, promotes those officers deemed worthy of advancement.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>The Selection Boards are chosen by the Secretary of State with the advice of the Board of the Foreign Service. Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 623.

<sup>13</sup>"Selection Board Ratings for 1950," Foreign Service Personnel Circular No. 33, February 15, 1950, (Division of Foreign Service Personnel, mimeographed).

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 623.

Performance Measurement. Probably the most important part of the Foreign Service officer's dossier is his annual efficiency report. By the term efficiency report we mean a periodic, orderly, factual, written analysis and evaluation of the officer's past performance and future potential based on personal observation of his work, conduct, skills and character.<sup>16</sup>

The primary purpose of the efficiency report is to assist the Department in the efficient utilization of its manpower.<sup>17</sup> Although we have referred to the efficiency report above primarily as a tool for implementing an orderly and equitable promotion policy, its importance to the overall personnel policy is much more basic. In fact, it is undoubtedly true that the promotional aspect of the supervisory rating has been markedly overemphasized to the detriment of the more important roles such a report should play.<sup>18</sup> The report can be a very effective instrument in determining assignments, transfers, in-class-promotions, training assignments and separations, however, of even more value to an effective personnel policy is the utilization of the report as an effective instrument of supervisory practice. If an officer does have certain deficiencies and weaknesses which are apparent to those who supervise him, he should be regularly apprised of these shortcomings so that he may attempt to remedy them and

---

<sup>16</sup>"Efficiency Reports on Foreign Service Personnel," Foreign Service Personnel Circular No. 54, August 16, 1950, (Division of Foreign Service Personnel, mimeographed).

<sup>17</sup>"Efficiency Reports on Foreign Service Personnel," Foreign Service Personnel Circular No. 98, May 9, 1952, (Division of Foreign Service Personnel, Government Printing Office, photo-offset, 1952), sec. 3.

<sup>18</sup>Statement by Mr. William B. Woodyear, Chief, Performance Measurement Branch, Division of Foreign Service Personnel, personal interview.

become of more value to the Service. Needless to say, a supervisor should not limit his constructive criticisms of an officer to the moment when it becomes necessary to submit the officer's efficiency report. Supervision is a continuing activity, and subordinate personnel must be constantly guided if their best performance is to be obtained. The junior officer should be given a clear understanding of the duties and responsibilities he is expected to undertake, and should be frequently informed by the supervisor as to how well he is "measuring up." The submission of the annual report does give the supervisor an excellent opportunity, however, to discuss at length the strong and weak points of a given officer, and thus give the junior officer a chance to determine periodically how well he is developing in his chosen profession. It is surprising how seemingly innocuous "faults" may prevent an officer from getting ahead in the Service. Because these "faults" are of a minor nature it is altogether possible that the officer concerned is completely unaware that they are detrimental to his career prospects. An officer in the Department of State closely connected with performance rating for many years remembered the case of one officer whose annual efficiency rating was substantially lowered every year because the officer concerned wore a type of mustache that made him appear somewhat ludicrous to his fellow officers. Unfortunately, the officer was apparently unaware of the feelings of his colleagues. Quite a few years passed before one of the officer's supervisors chanced to comment on the mustache. The officer expressed surprise that the mustache had caused so much comment and agreed that it would be to his advantage to remedy the situation. While it is not to be implied that minor foibles of this variety are generally deterministic in an officer's career, it is true that personal idiosyncrasies in every profession and vocation have often had a detrimental effect on personal

advancement. By being frequently informed of his strengths and weaknesses an employee will be better able to serve himself and the Service of which he is an important part. In the past, however, there has been altogether too little emphasis placed upon the efficiency report as an instrument of management which will benefit both employer and employee. All too often it has been regarded solely as a determining basis for promotion, a field in which its usefulness is definitely circumscribed.

The importance to the career system of objective supervisory reports cannot be overemphasized. Properly prepared and effectively employed they are of inestimable value in personnel utilization. On the other hand, if the reports are improperly prepared or ineffectively employed they can seriously impair Service morale, and, by generating a type of fear psychosis, they may stunt initiative and actually impair efficiency.

The Foreign Service officer's efficiency report is prepared by a person designated by the principal officer.<sup>19</sup> Normally, the officer designated will be the person immediately responsible for the work of the officer being rated.<sup>20</sup> The report is then reviewed by a reviewing officer designated by the principal officer.<sup>21</sup> The reviewing officer usually will be the highest ranking officer at the post who has adequate personal knowledge of the officer being rated.<sup>22</sup> The reviewing officer may concur in the report, may file a disagreement with one segment of the report, or may prepare an independent report.<sup>23</sup> He is not entitled,

---

<sup>19</sup>Personnel Circular No. 98, May 9, 1952, sec. 6.1.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., sec. 6.2.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

however, to change the original report.<sup>24</sup> At the larger posts, review panels are to be established. These panels will review the efficiency reports prepared on all subordinate officers to insure that the Department's instructions are followed in a uniform way. The panels may not change any of the efficiency ratings submitted to them, but they may attach a statement of their reactions to the report before submitting it to the Department.<sup>25</sup> Principal officers are also responsible for conducting courses for all rating officers to insure that they understand the spirit and letter of the Department's performance rating program.<sup>26</sup>

The regular efficiency report for an officer is submitted to the Department by the first of July of each year.<sup>27</sup> Interim reports must be submitted if the person supervising the position is transferred, if the person being rated is transferred, or if the person being rated makes a major change in the duties which he performs.<sup>28</sup> The interim reports are not required if the changes enumerated take place two months prior or two months after the date for filing the regular reports.<sup>29</sup>

Officers are rated on a specially constructed efficiency rating form copied in large part from one used by the armed services. The form is designed to reduce the personal bias of the rating officer as much as possible, although it should be pointed out that no efficiency rating system now in use can claim to be an infallible tool for measuring employee

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., sec. 6.3.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., sec. 6.4.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., sec. 7.11.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., sec. 7.2.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

performance. Regardless of the form employed, a rating will be of little value if the person filling the report does not do a conscientious job. But it is also true that the personal equation of the rater can be reduced through the utilization of the proven techniques of modern psychology, and the present effort to achieve some measure of scientific objectivity in the ratings appears to be a marked improvement over the system formerly employed by the Service. In the State Department archives one may find a series of efficiency ratings submitted during the late 1920's which present a very interesting contrast to the system now in use. The reports at that time consisted largely of a narrative appraisal of the officer being rated, and an adjectival evaluation of certain enumerated characteristics including overall performance. One report submitted by a chief of mission on the counselor of the Embassy appeared largely to be an appraisal of the counselor's wife.<sup>30</sup> About one-third of the narrative section of the report was devoted to a description of her "charm and good taste", another one-third to the way in which the couple entertained, and the final one-third to an expression of appreciation for the way in which the counselor and his wife aided the Ambassador in his personal affairs. The counselor's abilities in representation, reporting, and negotiation were not mentioned in the report. The two bachelor officers attached to the Minister's staff were dismissed in a few lines apiece.

The efficiency form used in the rating of Foreign Service officers was completely revised in May, 1952.<sup>31</sup> Part I of the new report consists of a listing of the duties performed by the officer being rated, either

---

<sup>30</sup>The Counselor later became one of our outstanding Ambassadors.

<sup>31</sup>The form now employed is FS-315, revised May 1, 1952, superseding FS-315, revised July 1950.

In a supervisory or a subordinate capacity, in the following fields:

political, economic and commercial, consular, administrative, and information and education. Each field is further subdivided into its major functional aspects. For example, the political field is subdivided into reporting and negotiation, and the consular field is subdivided into passport and citizenship, notarial, visa, protection and welfare, veterans' affairs, invoices and shipping. Beside each of these functions the rater is to evaluate the level of performance of the officer being rated in terms of six levels. Six represents the highest level of performance and one the lowest. Until May 1952, Part I consisted of forced choice descriptive phrases arranged in a series of blocks.<sup>32</sup> In each block the rater was to choose the one phrase which best described the officer being rated. For example, a block might have read as follows:

- a) He is persevering
- b) He is too much an individualist
- c) He is a good dancer
- d) He is very punctual

The rater was to make his choice on the basis of typical performance and not on the basis of an isolated example, and, in addition, was to choose that item for which there was a good deal of affirmative evidence, and very little negative evidence.<sup>33</sup>

Substantial objection was voiced against this part of the performance rating form by officers in the field.<sup>34</sup> Rating officers complained that the process was too complicated and too confusing. In addition the Department of the Army, after having pioneered in this type of form, began to

---

<sup>32</sup>See Department of State, "Foreign Service Efficiency Report," PG-315, revised July 1950.

<sup>33</sup>Personnel Circular No. 54, August 16, 1950, Attachment A, sec. 3.2.

<sup>34</sup>Statement by Mr. William Woodgear, personal interview.

question seriously its validity.<sup>35</sup> Consequently in May 1952, the Foreign Service discontinued the forced choice descriptive phrase section and substituted the present Part I.

Part II of the revised form consists of eight personal qualities which the rater is again to measure in terms of six levels. The eight personal qualities are: character, ability, conduct, quality of work, industry, experience, dependability, and general usefulness. Each of these qualities is defined in the instructions which accompany the report. For example, general usefulness is defined as, "General utility to the post involving not only the performance of his assignment but especially his willingness and ability to help others in an emergency or when otherwise required."<sup>36</sup>

Part III consists of a similar six level evaluation of thirty specific factors which relate to the officer's knowledge, performance, and personality traits. These include such factors as knowledge of the Foreign Service, understanding of political factors, understanding of economic factors, effectiveness of oral expression, judgment, tactfulness, adaptability, cost consciousness, and good manners and politeness.

In Part IV the rater is to provide the Department with an objective report relative to the language proficiency of the officer being rated. All languages of which the officer has some knowledge are placed under one of the following headings: none, beginner, limited, useful, fluent, and bilingual. Each of these categories is minutely defined on the rating form. The category "none" is included in case the officer has made no attempt to acquire facility in the local language of the post.

---

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Personnel Circular No. 98, revised May 1952, Attachment A, sec. 3.3.

Part V consists of an over-all evaluation of the officer's performance during the rating period. The rater is instructed to place an (X) beside one of the following statements:

performance in many important respects fails to meet requirements

performance meets most requirements but is deficient in several respects

performance clearly meets all requirements

performance clearly exceeds basic requirements

performance in every important respect is superior and there is no weakness in any material respect

performance in every respect is outstanding and there is no weakness in any respect

If either the top or the bottom level is selected, the rater must justify the designation in an accompanying essay.

In order to provide the Department with a complete description of the officer's competence and value, Part VI provides space for a narrative evaluation of certain factors of paramount importance in successful Service performance. This narrative evaluation is to be based on a list of suggested topics, and could be of immeasurable value as an instrument of personnel management. The narrative is to contain the reactions of the officer being rated to his assignment, his colleagues, and to the rating itself. It is to contain recommendations with respect to training needed by the officer, the level of work he may be expected to perform, and whether the rating officer would "urge" his promotion.

The regulations governing performance rating require that rating supervisors discuss, with the employees they rate, the general content of their efficiency reports and counsel them with respect to their inadequacies as well as disclosing to them those factors in which they are considered to

be adequate or outstanding.<sup>37</sup> If a Foreign Service officer desires to see his efficiency rating, the principal officer must make available an oral summary of all performance material maintained at the post.<sup>38</sup> If the principal officer prefers he may even show the employee a copy of the report itself, although the officer has the right only to demand a summary.<sup>39</sup> Because Foreign Service rating officers and their subordinates must often live close together in isolated posts it is not believed wise or desirable to make it mandatory that the complete report be divulged.<sup>40</sup>

After the reports are prepared and reviewed they are submitted to the Division of Foreign Service Personnel, Performance Measurement Branch. Here the reports are reviewed and analyzed and made a part of the permanent record of the employee.<sup>41</sup> Efficiency reports are "end user" products for the Performance Measurement Branch and appropriate notations may be made in the rating officer's dossier indicating the quality of the reports which he has submitted.<sup>42</sup> If a rating officer's reports are considered inadequate, biased, or incomplete they may be returned to him, or other appropriate action may be taken.<sup>43</sup>

While the efficiency rating devices employed by the Department of State for its Foreign Service officers are designed to assist the rating

<sup>37</sup> Personnel Circular No. 98, revised May 1952, sec. 11.11.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., sec. 11.12.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., See also Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 612.

<sup>40</sup> Statement by Mr. William Woodyear, personal interview.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Statement by Mr. Charles Vassaly, personal interview. See also Personnel Circular No. 98, revised May 1952, sec. 8

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

officer in maintaining objectivity, they are not in any way substitutes for sound judgment. In the final analysis, the success of the rating program depends upon the conscientious appraisal and analysis by the rating officer. As modern psychology develops new and better techniques for measuring performance the rating devices employed by the Foreign Service will undoubtedly be improved. It is probably safe to say, however, that no rating technique will ever relieve the supervisor of his responsibility for correctly evaluating the employee's effectiveness. The important thing is not how well the rating officer can arrive at some absolute figure of employee performance, but how well this information can be employed to the mutual benefit of the supervisor and the subordinate.

The Selection Boards. Promotions in the Foreign Service officer corps are made on the basis of recommendations by carefully chosen "selection panels," and upon an evaluation of all information available on a particular officer.<sup>44</sup> There are three selection panels which meet annually to rate the performance and recommend the promotion of Foreign Service officers.<sup>45</sup> Selection Board "A" consists of four officers of the class of Career Minister and two public members. This board rates the performance of all officers in classes 1 and 2 and recommends promotion to class 1 and Career Minister. Selection Board "B" consists of two Foreign Service officers of class 1, two of class 2, and 2 public members. It rates the performance of all officers in classes 3 and 4 and recommends promotions to the next higher grade. Selection Board "C" is composed of one Foreign Service officer of class 1, one officer of class 2, two officers of class

---

<sup>44</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 623.

<sup>45</sup>Statement by Mr. Charles Vasaly, personal interview.

3, and two public members. It rates the performance of all officers in classes 5 and 6 and makes recommendations for promotion to the next higher class.

The Foreign Service officers selected to serve on the boards must have superior service records.<sup>46</sup> They must not have served during the two previous rating periods, and they may not be subject to a recommendation for promotion by the board on which they serve.<sup>47</sup> Insofar as it is possible and practical, all the major geographic areas and all the major functions encompassed by the Service are represented on the boards.<sup>48</sup> For example, the four officers serving on Selection board "A" might include a Career Minister who has spent most of his career in political affairs of the Far East, a Career Minister serving as Consul-General in one of the larger posts, a Class 1 officer serving as Counselor of Embassy in Europe, and a Class 1 officer serving as Counselor for Economic Affairs.

The public members of the selection boards are chosen by the Board of Examiners from all the various professions and vocations, the only limitation being that they cannot be active employees of the United States government.<sup>49</sup> Observers from the Department of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor may sit with the Selections boards, have access to their records, and participate in their deliberations. The observers may not participate, however, in the voting of the boards.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.

<sup>49</sup>Statement by Mr. William Woodyear, personal interview.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid.

The Selection Boards meet annually and perform two major functions. First, they rate the performance of each officer in the Service and assign to him a relative standing; and, secondly, they make recommendations for promotion. While no general announcement of ratings is made, individual officers may receive their percentile score by requesting it in writing from the Performance Measurement Branch.<sup>51</sup>

The ratings assigned by a Selection Board are not absolute judgments of officer performance. Rather, each officer is given his relative standing with respect to the other officers in his class.<sup>52</sup> He may be informed that he is among the top ten per cent of the officers in his class or, contrariwise, in the bottom ten per cent. The low rating is not necessarily damaging.<sup>53</sup> Since an officer is judged in relation to the other officers in his class, he may be promoted one year with a score in the top fifteen per cent of his class, yet the next year find himself rated in the bottom fifteen per cent of his new class. Competing against a more experienced group he may find that his relative ranking declined even though the quality of his work did not. If the officer receives successive ratings in the lower part of his class, however, his career prospects would appear limited. A continuously low ranking does not necessarily indicate a degree of incompetence, but it does mean that the majority of officers in the class have demonstrated a greater potential for development. If an officer receives three successive ratings in the lower ten per cent, or if he fails to win promotion within a period of

---

<sup>51</sup>Personal Circular No. 33, February 15, 1950, sec. 5.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., sec. 3.1.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., sec. 3.2.

ten years, he is separated from the Service.<sup>54</sup> This process is known as selection out, and will be treated in more detail below.

The number of promotions recommended by the Selection Boards depends on a variety of factors. One important limitation is that the number of officers in any grade above class VI is restricted by regulation. For this reason before a promotion could be made from class IV to class III there would have to be an opening in class III. The boards must consider, therefore, the number in each class and the rate of retirement, resignation, and separation.<sup>55</sup> Regardless of vacancies, however, only those officers who have clearly demonstrated their ability to discharge greater responsibility are promoted.<sup>56</sup>

In order to be eligible for promotion an officer must complete a certain minimum period of service in his old class.<sup>57</sup> This minimum period of service is made mandatory so that an officer will have served enough time in the class for fair evaluation of his record, and also by way of compromise between promotion on sheer efficiency as opposed to sheer length of service. The minimum period in class varies from year to year, and may be waived altogether in cases of extraordinarily meritorious service.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, secs. 633, 634. See also Department of State, Foreign Service Regulations, (Washington: Government Printing Office, Looseleaf to February 1952), sec. 102.636.

<sup>55</sup>Statement by Mr. William Woodyear, personal interview.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid.

<sup>57</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 622.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid. A very interesting example of waiving the time limit for extraordinary service involved the promotion of Mr. Engert, our representative in Addis Ababa in 1936. The State Department opposed the promotion believing it would come too soon after Mr. Engert's previous promotion, but the press brought so much pressure on the President in Engert's behalf, that Mr. Roosevelt ordered the Department to make the promotion. The Personal Papers and Correspondence of Wilbur J. Carr, memorandum MS, dated May 9, 1936.

As a rule the minimum period in a class is from one to three years, while the average number of years spent by an officer in a class, between promotions, is a little over three years. As can be noted on the following chart, the average time spent in a class since World War II is becoming progressively longer, while the percentage of each class receiving promotions is somewhat larger.<sup>59</sup>

	Percentage Promoted By Category FSO 2-5	Percentage Promoted By Category FSO 6
1947	19	22
1948	10	21
1949	18	24
1950	16	30
1951	25	41

  

	Average number of years in class FSO 2-5	Average number of years in class FSO 6.
1947	1.8	*
1948	3.0	*
1949	3.2	2.8
1950	3.4	3.1
1951	3.9	3.4

Because complaints have been voiced on both counts in the past, the Selection Boards are instructed to 1) give full weight to officers who are essentially specialists and 2) place primary emphasis on more recent performance.<sup>60</sup> With respect to the first point, the Department of Agriculture has long complained that its attaches who are essentially specialists have not been advanced as rapidly as attaches who have become officers in a more generalized sense, nor as fast as those officers who have served in the more conventional categories. However, the Department of Agriculture does not feel that this policy was pursued by the past two

---

<sup>59</sup> Statement by Mr. William Woodyear, personal interview.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

Selection Boards.<sup>61</sup> Also, quite a few of the Foreign Service officers interviewed during the course of this project, expressed the idea that it is often difficult to "get out of the doghouse" after having once committed an indiscretion. One top ranking officer said, "While I believe our Selection Board system is the most equitable technique yet devised, it is probably true that there has been a tendency in the past to place too much emphasis upon a single black mark and to overlook the contributions which the officer has made since that time."<sup>62</sup>

The general consensus of observers both in the government and out is that the promotion system employed by the Foreign Service is the most equitable and objective they have observed.<sup>63</sup> Being the creation of fallible human beings it is, of course, far from perfect. Undoubtedly, there has been discrimination against particular groups in the past. Officers who are essentially specialists and consular officers have labored under certain difficulties, and it is also true that until recently there has been a reluctance to promote the few Negro officers in the Service.<sup>64</sup> When contrasted with the haphazard promotion policy

---

<sup>61</sup>Statement by Mr. Fred Rossiter, Associate Director, Bureau of Foreign Agriculture Relations, Department of Agriculture, personal interview.

<sup>62</sup>This statement was made to the writer by a Foreign Service officer with over twenty years of service; and was confirmed in an interview with several other officers who cited specific cases.

<sup>63</sup>The writer discovered that this opinion was shared by people who otherwise were strong critics of the Service.

<sup>64</sup>The continuing arguments between the Consular Bureau and the regional bureaus over personnel decisions is a case at point. Most officers still consider a consular assignment a demotion because of the promotional difficulties involved. Pressure exerted by the Department of Labor has probably assisted Negro officers to win deserved promotions. The Department of Agriculture has continually battled with State over the promotion of Agricultural Attaches.

employed by most of the other government agencies, or with the highly unsystematic policy employed in a large part of the Foreign Service itself as late as 1945, however, the present promotion policy of the Foreign Service is in a class by itself.<sup>65</sup>

Addenda to FM. The Foreign Service Act of 1946 makes no provision for the temporary promotion of Foreign Service officers. In a reasonably stable Service the lack of such a provision is not of particular importance. If an officer is temporarily assigned to a higher salaried position he knows that future Selection Boards will take this fact into consideration and his chances for a permanent promotion are thereby enhanced. In a period of rapid expansion, however, the career officer finds himself, more often than not, supervising innumerable specialists who have been brought in from outside the Service who are receiving salaries much higher than his own. The Department believes such a system can be very detrimental to Service morale, and in October 1951 Mr. Richards of South Carolina introduced legislation into the Congress designed to meet this type of situation.<sup>66</sup> Under the proposed provision officers assigned to a position which is classified at least two classes higher than the class in which the officer is regularly serving would receive temporary promotions "to a higher class." Upon completion of these duties, the officer would then revert to his permanent grade. Such a provision already exists in other government career services composed of commissioned officers. Both the Public Health Service and the armed services make provision for temporary

---

<sup>65</sup>A Department Officer recalled that records and communications re promotion were so unsystematic before Mr. Humalins's arrival in the Department, that a dead staff employee received a Foreign Service promotion after the war.

<sup>66</sup>The bill H. R. 5273 was introduced into the House of Representatives on October 15, 1951 by Congressman Richards of South Carolina and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

promotion.<sup>67</sup> The Department anticipates that no more than 75 officers would ever be given temporary promotions at any time.<sup>68</sup>

Selection Out. Provision is made by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 for selecting out of the Service those officers who fail to qualify for promotion within a given time period or who are consistently rated among the least capable officers in their respective classes.<sup>69</sup> In assessing the fairness of such a provision we must keep in mind the underlying career concept of the Service. This concept necessitates the retention of the more capable officers in the Service, and their advancement to positions of responsibility and command within a reasonable period of time. If the middle range of the career ladder are clogged with officers who are unable to advance to the top, the opportunities for promotion of the capable junior officers are unnecessarily inhibited. Selection out is designed to force a more rapid rate of attrition and thereby bring to the top officers still in the vigor of youth, receptive to new ideas, and capable of exercising the responsibilities entailed by command positions.

At present the selection-out process applies to all Foreign Service officers between classes 2 and 6.<sup>70</sup> Legislation now pending before the Congress would extend selection out to class 1 as well.<sup>71</sup> The Selection

<sup>67</sup>"Explanation of Proposed Amendments to the Foreign Service Act of 1946 as Amended," October 1951, (Unpublished MS, Office of Personnel, mimeographed), p. 24.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid.

<sup>69</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, secs. 632, 634. See also, Department of State, Foreign Service Regulations, sec. 102.635.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid.

<sup>71</sup>Will to Amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as Amended, and for other Purposes, (Department of State draft, October 1951), sec. 633.

Boards have consistently recommended such a procedure, believing it to be a logical extension of the present policy.<sup>72</sup>

Selection out is an integral part of the promotion system, therefore, and operates through the mechanism of the Selection Boards. Specific regulations governing the execution of the policy are promulgated by the Department of State.<sup>73</sup> At present, officers in classes 2 through 5 who do not receive promotions within a period of ten years or who are rated in the lowest ten per cent of their class by three successive Selection Boards are retired from the Service.<sup>74</sup> Class 6 officers are considered on probation during the entire period of service in that grade. If they are not recommended for promotion by three successive Boards they are separated unless they receive the same rating as an officer in the class who was promoted, in which case their records are reviewed by a fourth Board.<sup>75</sup>

Selection out is not a new idea in career systems, and a somewhat similar policy has been employed by the United States Navy for many years. The present Foreign Service system differs in detail from its armed service counterparts, and in many ways appears more equitable.

Under the present Navy system an officer must serve a minimum period in grade to become eligible for promotion. If he is considered for promotion upon becoming eligible, and is twice rejected, he is separated from the Service. Often there are no vacancies for which an officer can be considered, in which case he is not disadvantaged. Premature considerations re-

---

<sup>72</sup>"Explanation of Proposed Amendments to the Foreign Service Act of 1946," p.26.

<sup>73</sup>Department of State, Foreign Service Regulations, sec. 102.635. Also based upon personal interview with Mr. William Woodyear.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

sulting in rejection are not counted toward separation.<sup>76</sup>

If an officer in the United States Army is judged to be in the bottom four per cent of his grade on the basis of an annual evaluation he comes before a review board. If the review is unfavorable the officer is separated from the Service. Approximately one-half of the cases reviewed result in separations.<sup>77</sup>

Since the selection out system first went into effect in the Foreign Service in 1949, 43 officers have been separated, and an additional 13 officers are expected to be selected out during 1952.<sup>78</sup> The following table shows the breakdown of these officers by class and year:

<u>Class</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1951</u>	<u>Total</u>
2	1	0	1	2
3	2	0	2	4
4	1	0	7	8
5	0	0	7	7
6	10	6	6	22
	<u>14</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>43</u>

It will be noted that 22 or approximately one-half of the officers selected out were class 6 or probationary officers. On the basis of the figures given for the first three years of the system and the projected figures for 1952 we can say that approximately one per cent of the total number of officers have been selected out each year. This is about one-half the rate of attrition for selection out in the officer corps of the United States Army.<sup>79</sup> Since one-half of the Foreign Service percentage consists of probationary officers wherein we would expect the heaviest

---

<sup>76</sup>Statement by Mr. Charles Vasaly, personal interview.

<sup>77</sup>ibid.

<sup>78</sup>Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel.

<sup>79</sup>Supra.

selection out, it does not appear that the system is exceptionally severe.

Foreign Service officers in classes 2 or 3 who are selected out are entitled to receive retirement benefits under the provisions of the Foreign Service retirement plan.<sup>80</sup> Officers in classes 4 and 5 receive one-twelfth of a year's salary at their then current salary for each year spent in the Service. In addition, they are entitled to a refund of all contributions made to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund with interest at 4 per centum, except that in lieu of such refund they may elect to receive retirement benefits on reaching the age of sixty-two.<sup>81</sup>

Although numerous criticisms have been voiced against the selection out process it appears to be both fair and equitable. Separations made under its provisions are based upon the objective recommendations of the impartial Selection Boards. Nor can complaint be raised against the prohibition restricting in class service without promotion to a period not to exceed ten years. Such a period appears to be a reasonable time in which to display one's abilities. The fear has been expressed that the ten-per cent rule might eliminate officers who, while relatively less capable than their fellow officers in that class, are still capable of discharging the duties of their present or higher grade at a high degree of proficiency. Fortunately, this hypothesis is one capable of pragmatic

---

<sup>80</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 633.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, sec. 634. The framers of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 assumed that payments under the provisions of section 634 would not exceed one year's salary, on the theory that officers selected out would be in the lower age brackets. Actually, officers selected out have been among the older officers. In the legislation introduced by Congressman Richards a clause has been inserted to limit these payments to a maximum of one year's salary. A Bill to Amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946 as Amended, sec. 634.

test and the Department feels that, for the ten per cent provision has not had this effect.<sup>82</sup> On the contrary, the Department of State feels that selection out has so far had a tendency to eliminate mediocrity and thereby create a more virile service.<sup>83</sup> Should the ten per cent provision ever become restrictive in that sense, the Department would then be free to remove it. On the basis of present evidence it appears that a change in the selection out procedure is not called for at this time.

---

<sup>82</sup>Statement by Mr. William Woodyear, personal interview.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid.

## CHAPTER VI

### ASSIGNMENT AND TRANSFER

The assignment and transfer of Foreign Service officers are important cogs in the development of a genuine career system. A career service necessitates the development of a versatile and specialized group of officers capable of assuming increasing responsibilities. This versatility and specialization can best be acquired through training and a well planned rotation of work assignments. At the same time the Department must staff approximately 300 posts scattered throughout the world, varying both in size and scope of duties and, in addition, must meet a variety of other obligations peculiar to their own personnel. Thus, the assignment and transfer policy, while a most important instrument of good personnel management, is to a great extent shaped by forces outside management's control. For that reason, it is impossible to plan any particular officer's career in vacuo. Consequently, each Foreign Service officer must agree to accept general overseas service, and to be transferred and assigned to any post as the needs of the Government may require.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to the scope and magnitude of the Department's world wide coverage, there are several other important factors affecting transfers and assignments of particular officers. First, there is the statutory requirement that all personnel must be returned to the United States at periodic intervals for leave,<sup>2</sup> and, in order that the officer does not

---

<sup>1</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, secs. 511 and 514; Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, secs. 140, 141, 142.

<sup>2</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 933; Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 430.

lose contact with American institutions and ideals, the additional requirement that he spend at least three of his first fifteen years in the Service in the United States.<sup>3</sup> Second, adverse environmental factors at "hardship" posts necessitates the transfer of officers to less onerous environments at periodic intervals. Third, the Department must conserve both travel funds and transit time by combining transfers with home leave trips. Fourth, many of the posts are unsuitable for families and small children. Fifth, the international situation may change overnight, requiring the Department to shift a large number of officers to an area of the world previously covered by only a few officers. Sixth, officers may resign or be selected-out, requiring officers in other areas to be sent to replace them. Seventh, language and area officers with highly specialized training must be used primarily in their area of concentration, limiting their availability for assignment to other geographic areas.

In addition to developing an officer's versatility through a well planned inter post assignment policy, the Department must also plan the development of his skills and abilities through equally well thought out intra post assignments.<sup>4</sup> During the junior officer's first years in the Service, an attempt is made to rotate him from job to job at his post of assignment, in order that he might acquire experience in a variety of functions. In the past few years, however, the great increase in functions performed by the Service, combined with a moderate increase in personnel, has forced the junior officer rotation plan to be abandoned at many posts.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 572; Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 144.6.

<sup>4</sup>Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 142.52.

<sup>5</sup>Statement by Mr. James Henderson, FSO, Office of Personnel.

Assignments and transfers are determined by the Division of Foreign Service Personnel.<sup>6</sup> Initial transfer schedules are worked out by the Division every three months with respect to known vacancies, while new vacancies are filled on an ad hoc basis.<sup>7</sup> The regional bureaus are consulted when changes in personnel are anticipated in their area.<sup>8</sup> The Appointments and Assignments Board, a sub-board of the Board of the Foreign Service, consisting of representatives of the Department of State, Commerce, Labor, and Agriculture, reviews the proposed transfers of officers, and may make recommendations to the Director of Personnel if not satisfied with any of the Division's determinations. "Appeal" may be carried to the Board of the Foreign Service in cases of disagreement.<sup>9</sup>

A major criticism leveled at the assignment and transfer policy of the Service by its critics is that the average assignment to a particular geographical area is too short to assure effective productivity. Between 1946 and 1951 the average tour of duty was about two and one half years in a particular country.<sup>10</sup> This tour was followed by home leave and re-assignment to another post. The critics argued that two and one half

---

<sup>6</sup>Department of State, Manual of Regulations and Procedures, Vol. II, Organisation, January 1950, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950), sec. 233.

<sup>7</sup>Officers are permitted to express their preference as to assignment on the first of April of each year. Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 142.33.

<sup>8</sup>"Appointments and Assignments Board," memo from A. G. Jones to A. E. Weatherbee, April 4, 1952, (Unpublished MS, Office of Personnel, typewritten).

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel.

years has not sufficient time for the officer to acquire a feeling for the country and be able to employ this newly won knowledge to the advantage of his country. On the contrary, as soon as the officer becomes proficient he was transferred to another post. On the other hand, the Department argued that personnel should not be assigned too long in a given country in order that their career development would not be interrupted, and that personnel should not be expected to remain longer than two years at a hardship post.<sup>11</sup> In 1951 the Department partially resolved this difficulty by establishing the following transfer policy: In the case of non hardship posts the tour of duty is to be two consecutive two year assignments, with home leave after the first assignment, and home leave and transfer after the second.<sup>12</sup> In the case of hardship posts the tour of duty is to be restricted to one two year assignment, with the provision that officers might, of their own choice, volunteer to return to the hardship post after the first two year hitch.<sup>13</sup> This longer tour of duty will permit officers to discharge their duties more efficiently since they will be better acquainted with the customs and mores of the people, and will have better official and unofficial contacts.

The fact that the average tour of duty before 1951 was only two and one half years should not lead one to believe that a Foreign Service officer divides his time in the service in better skelter fashion among the various geographical areas. Instead, the officer spends the greatest part of his Service time in one geographic area. For example, a study made in 1949 of a group of 31 Foreign Service officers whose average

---

<sup>11</sup>Department of State; Foreign Service Manual, sec. 112.11.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., sec. 112.22.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., sec. 112.2.

length of service was 23 years, revealed that these officers had spent 70 per cent of their total time in the field in one of the four broad geographic areas.<sup>14</sup> In addition, this field service specialization was supplemented by an average 3.3 year tour of duty in Washington, most of which was devoted to work directly related to the geographic specialization.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, the statistics made available in several studies do reveal that on a more narrow regional basis e.g., eastern Europe, western Europe, etc., specialization is not as pronounced.<sup>16</sup>

A recent study of the length of service at hardship posts between 1945 and 1951 based on the dossiers of 800 officers shows that 60 per cent of the group had not served at hardship posts over that period, while 40 per cent had such service averaging 21 months for each hardship post tour of duty.<sup>17</sup> Only seven per cent had served more than three years at hardship posts during that time.<sup>18</sup> The Department believes that this brief tenure of service can be partially explained by the large number of officers that had to be withdrawn on an emergency basis from certain areas of the world because of the present international situation.<sup>19</sup>

Section 572 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, requires that every Foreign Service officer spend at least three of this first fifteen years in the Service in the United States. This provision has been a very difficult one for the Department to comply with for several reasons. First, the curtailment of recruitment of class 6 officers during World

<sup>14</sup>Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

<sup>19</sup>Statement by Mr. James Henderson, FSO, Office of Personnel.

War II dovetailed with a sharp increase in the number of functions performed by the Service immediately following the war, meant that all available officers had to be assigned to the field. Second, the difficulties with Russia since the end of World War II, and the beginning of the Korean War have kept the country in a state of quasi-emergency. Consequently, the Service has been obliged to recall some of its experienced officers to Washington where their counsel was most needed, in spite of the fact that these officers may have already completed their required period of service in Washington.<sup>20</sup>

A study made in 1951 of officers in the Service on that date in classes 1 through 5 who entered the Service between 1935 and 1948 showed that almost 60 per cent of the officers who entered the service between 1935 and 1940 have completed at least three years of service in the United States, and approximately 75 per cent of this group have completed at least nine months of service in the United States.<sup>21</sup> Of the group entering the Service between 1941 and 1944, approximately 50 per cent have completed their three year American tour. Since these officers still have five to eight years before they will complete their first fifteen years in the Service, it is expected that most of these officers will meet the statutory requirement.<sup>22</sup> Finally, of those entering between 1945 and 1948, approximately 15 per cent have met the requirement, and with 9 to 12 years to go before the deadline is reached, probably all of this group

---

<sup>20</sup>Departmental Officers expressed the opinion to the writer that the proposed amalgamation of the home and field forces may also account for the transfer of many of these officers to the Department in Washington. The Service desires to be well represented in case of a "show-down".

<sup>21</sup>Based upon statistics provided by Office of Personnel.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

will meet the requirement.<sup>23</sup>

The Department believes that the officer is of the greatest value in Washington after he has completed seven to ten years of service in the field. It is to be expected, therefore, that most officers will be assigned to the Department while they are in classes 3 and 4.<sup>24</sup>

The present liberalized lateral entry program heralding a limited amalgamation of the home and field forces will permit a much fuller compliance with the statutory requirement. Almost all the officers recruited from the Department will have three years of service in Washington, and as these officers go into the field, a greater percentage of present officers can be brought back to Washington.

Critique of the Assignment and Transfer Policy. Considering the multitude of problems with which the Department has had to contend, it appears that the assignment and transfer policy of the Service has been utilized rather effectively as an instrument of career development. An objection frequently voiced with respect to the present scheme relates to the Department's reluctance to permit officers to serve for long periods of time in a particular country. The Department believes that protracted service in one country prevents an officer from acquiring the broad background and versatility he will need to fill the top rungs of the career ladder. Consequently, it favors relatively frequent transfers. On the other hand, the critics contend that the present rotation plan prevents the Department from developing genuine country experts and results instead in the development of the dilettante type of regional specialist. They

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>However, it is also Departmental policy to attempt to have officers in Classes 6 or 5 spend one year in the Department at the end of their third year and before the end of their fifth year of service. Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 144.6.

maintain that foreign policy is such a complex field today, that the mastery of even one country far transcends a single specialization. In fact, they believe it would take the Department's concept of a "general" officer to become a "specialist" in any one of the 70 odd countries with which we maintain diplomatic and consular relations.

The Department points out that sheer service alone will never make one a specialist in a country or region. An officer may remain in country "X" for 20 years, and possibly have a less thorough understanding of its political, economic and social trends than a fellow officer there on his first tour. While long service at a particular post may have great value in the case of one officer, it may work as a severe disadvantage in the case of another. Reassignment is sometimes desirable for the fact of change itself. Persons who work together for too long a period of time may develop a stagnation of thought or may develop personality conflicts which will prevent them from doing their best work. The Department feels that the rotation of officers among different assignments and posts enables them to develop versatility through a better knowledge of all facets of their work, to generalize points of view which might become narrow within the confines of a single assignment, and to equip them for increased responsibility. Also, frequent reassignment will permit the Department to blend age and experience with youth and enthusiasm, and thereby present a stable yet vigorous service.

Undoubtedly, the Department has had a tendency to under emphasize specialization of any type in the past and the assignment and transfer policy has been disadvantageously affected thereby. On the other hand, the Department's arguments cannot be overlooked, and must weigh heavily in the development of any assignment and transfer policy. It would appear that the Department should refrain from establishing any rigid policies in

this respect, and should approach each individual, as far as possible, as a separate case. The policy should be designed in first instance to benefit the government and in second instance to benefit the individual. With this criterion in mind, each case could then be decided upon its own merits.

Another problem confronting the Department stems from the attempts by the Regional Bureaus to compartmentalize the Foreign Service. There has been a growing tendency for each Regional Bureau to consider its personnel problems in vacuo. In fact, it has been facetiously said that we have not one but four Foreign Services.

Unquestionably, the Regional Bureaus occupy the paramount position in the Department with respect to both policy and the administrative machinery necessary to implement their policies. Since each Regional Bureau is desirous of executing its policies to best advantage, there is necessarily a great deal of competition among the Bureaus for the top flight personnel in the Service and in the Department. Occasionally, one of the geographical areas is able to gain a dominant position with respect to the other regional and functional groups and, through the technique of placing members of their clique in key personnel positions, they are able to direct personnel policy to suit their own needs and purposes. While this may appear desirable from their own point of view, it of course, can be very harmful to overall departmental objectives.

At present, the "Russian clique" enjoys this favored position in the Department.<sup>25</sup> Foreign Service officers heading the group such as George Kennan, the present Ambassador to Moscow; Charles Bohlen, Counselor of the

---

<sup>25</sup>The term "Russian clique" is used here to refer to those officers who have spent a large part of their careers in Eastern Europe. The term in no way implies a proclivity for Russia or Russian policy.

Department, and H. Freeman Matthews, the Deputy Undersecretary wield enormous power in the Department. Another of their number, Elbridge Durbrow, is chief of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel.<sup>26</sup> Pressure exerted by the group to favor their "special interest" is strong, and in part justified by the present world situation, and equally strong pressure must be exerted by other interested inter and intra departmental groups in order to maintain an equitable distribution of top flight personnel in the Department. In this respect, the Appointments and Assignments Board has played a vital role. This inter-departmental group, a sub-unit of the Board for the Foreign Service, reviews all personnel actions, and insofar as possible, insures that all geographical and functional groups are fairly represented. While it is hard to justify the participation of an interdepartmental Board in day to day personnel activities, it also appears that such a procedure is necessitated by the situation we have described.

---

<sup>26</sup>In May 1952 a persistent rumor was that Mr. Durbrow would soon be given a new assignment.

## CHAPTER VII

### IN SERVICE TRAINING

Employee training may be defined as the process of aiding employees to gain effectiveness in their present or future assignments by means of developing appropriate habits of thought or action, special skills, knowledge and attitudes.

An effective in-service training program is particularly important in the Foreign Service. While it is very important that each Foreign Service officer have a broad general background in American life, customs, and traditions, plus the potentiality for growth and development, the Service must at the same time be able to provide a variety of high grade technicians and specialists. If the fledgling Foreign Service officer does not have these specialized skills when he enters the officer corps, and the tendency is to recruit candidates who lack specialized skills, then needed specializations must be developed on the job. Critics of the Service believe that much more can be done by way of attracting qualified specialists into the service at the entering grades and providing them with the opportunities needed to advance to the top rungs of the career ladder.<sup>1</sup> If the Foreign Service were to make it easier for qualified specialists to enter at the bottom grades and advance to positions of responsibility, however, there would still be many jobs whose unique qualifications could not be met through outside recruitment. The combination of technical skills and administrative abilities needed by certain officers place them in a class apart. For example, it would be most difficult to find a young man or woman with graduate level work

---

<sup>1</sup>Supra.

in economics and, in addition, proficiency in the Siamese language. Nor would it be easy to find qualified political analysts with fluency in Swahili or Singhalese. If the Service is to have necessary flexibility, therefore, regardless of the initial recruitment policy pursued, an adequate in-service training program must be provided.

Training in the Foreign Service is centered around the Foreign Service Institute which was established on March 13, 1947, upon the authority granted by Congress in the Foreign Service Act of 1946.<sup>2</sup> The Institute operates at the graduate level and, in addition, provides a variety of technical services.

In-service training in the Foreign Service predates the establishment of the Institute by approximately forty years.<sup>3</sup> In 1907 new consular officers were given a brief period of training after their appointment and before being sent to the field. A similar course was established for fledgling diplomatic officers in 1909. After the passage of the Rogers Act in 1924, providing for the interchangeability of diplomatic and consular officers, a Foreign Service Officers Training School was established to provide new officers with basic orientation and training. Advanced training of a select few officers was obtained at that time by detailing them to the graduate schools of selected universities.

The Foreign Service Institute is headed by a Director appointed by the Secretary of State.<sup>4</sup> Under the Director are four Assistant Directors. Each Assistant Director supervises one of the four schools which compose

---

<sup>2</sup>The Foreign Service Act of 1946, Title VII, sec. 701.

<sup>3</sup>For a brief historical account of the Foreign Service Institute see Department of State, The Foreign Service Institute, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949).

<sup>4</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 702.

the Institute.<sup>5</sup> These schools are: Basic Officer Training, which provides newly appointed class 6 officers with a three months course designed to prepare them for initial field duty; Advanced Officer Training, which provides graduate level work for officers in specialized fields: Management and Administrative Training, which attempts to improve management responsibilities and skills; and the Language Training, which offers instruction in thirty-six foreign languages.<sup>6</sup>

Considering the variety of personnel for whom training must be provided, and the time allotted by the Department to achieve these skills, it is necessary for the Institute to provide a broad and flexible curricula.

Much of the training afforded Foreign Service officers is offered at the Institute itself, both on a part-time and a full-time basis.<sup>7</sup> The Institute has also established training programs at the various Foreign Service posts.<sup>8</sup> Language training, in particular, is made available through this medium. Finally, under section 573 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 officers and employees may be assigned for instruction "at or with public or private nonprofit institutions; trade, labor, agricultural, or scientific associations, or commercial firms."<sup>9</sup> Under this provision the Institute frequently assigns selected officers to universities for an academic year to study advanced economics and especially

---

<sup>5</sup>Statement by Mr. Robert B. Freeman, Director of School of Management and Administrative Training, Foreign Service Institute, personal interview.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 512.4.

<sup>9</sup>See also Department of State, Foreign Service Regulations, sec. 102.480.

difficult languages, to other Departments of the government for intensive training programs, and to the staff and command schools of the armed services.<sup>10</sup>

In-Service Training at the Institute. Newly appointed Foreign Service officers are assigned to the Foreign Service Institute for a three month orientation course.<sup>11</sup> The program has two major purposes; to indoctrinate the new officer with a government-wide approach to international affairs, and to provide him with the specialized skills and instructions he will need on his first assignment.<sup>12</sup>

In addition to the orientation program officers may be assigned to one of the specialized courses offered by the Institute and lasting from two to twelve weeks.<sup>13</sup> For example, there is the U. S. Information and Education program, a two weeks course which delves into the theories and practices of psychological warfare, propaganda, and related subjects, or the now defunct German Kreis officer program, which attempts to acquaint the young officer with the specific duties and functions of a High Commission resident officer.

In addition to this preliminary training, opportunities for advanced instruction are provided for selected officers at various stages in their careers and on a voluntary basis. Between July 1948 and January 1952, 1031 officers received specialized training at the Institute, universities, other government agencies and the armed service colleges.<sup>14</sup> The types of

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 521.

<sup>12</sup>Statement by Mr. Robert Freeman, personal interview.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel.

specialized training received by these officers included the following:

(a) Intermediate Course in Foreign Affairs: This is an intensive three months survey of the social sciences with the purpose of giving the officer who has completed his probationary period in the field, principles and techniques which will aid him in developing into a more useful career officer. It includes a thorough examination of the means and ends of American foreign policy, the techniques and objectives of intelligence analysis, and similar topics. Actually the three months of intensive study put in at the Institute are only one part of the overall program. The full plan calls for the three months of classroom instruction to be followed by training details in the Department of State, the whole program constituting a basic year in the United States. Between July 1948 and January 1952, 38 officers received this course of instruction.<sup>16</sup>

(b) Diplomatic and Consular Practice: This twelve weeks course is given four times yearly. The course of study is taken by Staff and Reserve officers as well as the regular officer and is geared to be of value to one undertaking new duties or to an experienced officer needing training in a specialized facet of consular work. Between July 1949 and January 1952 359 trainees had completed this program.<sup>17</sup>

(c) War Colleges: A few top ranking officers are selected each year to attend the various staff colleges of the armed services. This is a reciprocal program with selected officers of the armed services being

---

<sup>15</sup>A brief outline of the content of each of these courses may be found in "Information on Specific Personnel Processes: Training," (Unpublished MS, Office of Personnel, 1951, mimeographed).

<sup>16</sup>Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

eligible for advanced courses at the Foreign Service Institute. Under this program Foreign Service officers of class 3 or higher may be assigned to the National War College. Assignments may also be made to the Air War College, the Army War College, the Naval War College, the Imperial Defense College, the Industrial War College or the Canadian National Defense College. Between July 1948 and January 1952, 86 officers had received or were in the process of receiving training in the staff colleges of the armed services.<sup>18</sup>

(d) Advanced Management: During this same period, 167 officers completed the nine week course in principles of effective management. This program, given at the Institute, includes such courses as international conference procedure, responsibilities of a country desk, and a seminar in improved management.

(e) Language and Area Study: One of the most important contributions an effective in-service training program can make is the training of specialists who are somewhat unique to the Service. The expanded participation of the United States in world affairs not only in the traditional fields of reporting, representation, and negotiation, but in numerous functional fields as well, necessitates a sizeable increase in the number of language and area specialists in the Foreign Service. Not only is the United States actively represented in many more nations today than ever before, but the increase in functions performed with respect to these nations means that today we may have to provide thirty or forty language and area specialists where before one reasonably competent translator would have sufficed.

---

<sup>18</sup>ibid.

Language and area specialists cannot be developed overnight.<sup>19</sup> The specialist must possess complete facility in the use of the language both in its spoken and written form. This necessitates not only an excellent command of the foreign language but an equally excellent fluency in English. The language and area specialist must also acquire a thorough knowledge of the customs, traditions, and socio-economic thought patterns of the peoples in his area of concentration, and be able to relate these different value standards of the foreign culture to the value standards of our own people. Needless to add, such a proficiency can only be obtained after years of concentrated effort, and not all who spend the time and energy to acquire such a skill are mentally and emotionally equipped to achieve success. The Foreign Service estimates that it takes from two to five years to develop a Russian specialist with the average being close to the latter figure.

The Russian specialist is first assigned to a post in his area of specialization. After his period of service there he returns to the United States where he undergoes an intensive six month study of the Russian language at the Foreign Service Institute. After successfully negotiating this hurdle he is assigned to a university for a year of language and area study. This is followed by an assignment to the Army's Detachment "R" at Regensburg, Germany, for approximately one year of intensive study. On the completion of this training the officer is assigned

---

<sup>19</sup>The following discussion of language and area specialists is based upon personal interviews with Mr. Harry C. Hawkins, Professor, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, at that time Director, Foreign Service Institute; Mr. Robert Freeman, Foreign Service Institute; and several unpublished staff papers on training in the Office of Personnel. See also Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 542 ff.

to Russia or to other countries where his language and area training can be used to great advantage.

Since it does take a long time to train a language and area specialist, and because the changing currents of international relations can radically alter the requirements for such officers in a particular area almost overnight, it is difficult for the Service to predict its future needs with any degree of certainty, or to have an adequate supply of such officers available at any given moment. It is probably safe to predict, however, that the Department will need an increased number of such specialists in all areas of the world during the coming decade. Russian specialists are a case in point. At the end of World War II there were very few qualified language and area specialists for the Soviet sphere, in all not more than 14.<sup>20</sup> Today about 50 members of the Foreign Service have completed over a year of training in the Russian area, and about 35 of these are considered to be sufficiently qualified to serve in Moscow.<sup>21</sup> The Service believes that this number should be increased to approximately 300, and plans are underway to provide training opportunities for approximately 60 officers a year.<sup>22</sup>

How are officers selected by the Department for this specialized training? In the first place, all officers who undergo specialized training in economics, language and area, or military-politico studies do so on a voluntary basis. The Service believes that it would be foolish to force an officer to enter a specialized training program if he does not have the desire and the aptitude to complete such a course of training.

---

<sup>20</sup>Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

The position is well taken. Most of the languages studied, for example, are very difficult to master and take a substantial amount of time and effort on the part of the trainee if he is to become proficient in their use. If the trainee does not have the aptitude nor the strong personal motivation needed to accomplish the task, his assignment to such a program will be an inefficient and foolish employment of personnel.

There are several reasons why the young Foreign Service officer is hesitant to volunteer for a specialized course of training. Probably the major deterring factor is the fear of the young officer that the specialized training will make him a marked man and adversely affect his assignment and promotion opportunities. Many of the specialized language and area studies will involve subsequent assignment to hardship posts.

A hardship post is one that is located in an area of the world where climate, housing, health, and personal convenience can in no way compare with posts in the more industrialized areas of the world.<sup>23</sup> During his career in the Service an officer expects to serve his fair share of time at the hardship posts, but expects his fair share of service at the more healthful posts. An officer who specializes in Mongolian fears a long period of service in the Far East with no compensating benefits to his family and himself.

Some officers also complain that the acquisition of a narrow speciality may limit their promotional opportunities in a service which places primary emphasis upon general capacity. It is also claimed that it is such more difficult to receive recognition for outstanding service in the out-of-the-way posts than to receive recognition for similar service in London or Paris.

---

<sup>23</sup>Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 372.2.

A final complaint on the promotion level is that officers fear that if they are assigned to specialized training programs it will be difficult for Selection Boards to evaluate their records while they are in training and they may be passed over for promotion.

Finally, complaints are voiced on the short run financial difficulties involved. The training program involves a short term residence of approximately one year in a university area or in Washington, where such factors as cost of quarters and similar expenses may work an economic hardship on the trainee. Formerly, per diem payments were made to the trainee during the period of such study, but in 1950 the Bureau of the Budget instructed the Department to discontinue such payments if the period of training exceeded three months.<sup>24</sup>

Under these circumstances it appears that the Department must establish an adequate system of incentives if a sufficient number of qualified officers are to be encouraged to volunteer for these training programs. The Department has already made some progress along this line, but a good deal remains to be accomplished. After the per diem payments were discontinued in 1950, the Department substituted a within-grade salary increase for each six months of time in training.<sup>25</sup> The Department is also considering a special post allowance which would be paid to the officer in assignments requiring the utilization of his particular language and area specialization.<sup>26</sup> In addition, the Department is attempting to restore the old per diem payments.<sup>27</sup> These steps are undoubtedly in the

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., sec. 541.4.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., sec. 542.5.

<sup>26</sup>Statement by Mr. Robert Freeman, personal interview.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

right direction and will ameliorate any short run financial difficulties which such a program of study may involve, but they do not touch the long run complaints with respect to promotion and assignment. The Department must strongly emphasize, therefore, that the young officer who completes a course of specialized training will not be disadvantaged with respect to promotion and assignment. Selection Boards have been instructed to give full weight to officers who are essentially specialists or who are undergoing specialized training.<sup>28</sup> It may be advisable to instruct Selection panels that between two officers of equal competence, the officer who has completed a specialized course of instruction requiring considerable time, effort, and ability should be given preference. Of course, no such arbitrary rule can settle the question. Officers may justly complain that it is much more difficult to win recognition in the areas in which they will be primarily assigned, and they will not be considered to be "of equal competence" with the officer who has performed more generalized functions in the politically active areas of the world. The assignment problem may be mitigated, in part, by longer and more frequent assignments to the political bureaus of the Department in Washington. Also, the Department can and probably will assign officers with Near and Far Eastern specializations to those European countries having extensive interests in those areas. The Department has continuously emphasized that the "Mongolian specialist" will have an opportunity to serve a fair share of time in the more desirable posts. On the other hand it remains true that his chances for assignment in the more popular areas probably will be less frequent and less prolonged than his colleague who has specialized in these areas.

---

<sup>28</sup>Statement by Mr. James Henderson, Office of Personnel.

The assignment problem can probably best be solved by offering the officer compensating incentives such as more rapid promotion, post bonuses, and per diem payments during the course of study.

The assignment "problem" that we have discussed here raises the question as to what extent officers who have been given special training have been used in their field of training. Since 1946, a total of 209 officers have received training in advanced economics, in politico-military studies at the armed service colleges, and in language and area specialization.<sup>29</sup> Of the 35 officers who have received advanced economic training, 26 are presently assigned to economic duties, 7 are assigned to duties in which a knowledge of economics is very valuable, while 2 officers have resigned.<sup>30</sup> In January 1952, nine officers were in advanced economic training.<sup>31</sup> Of the 35 officers already trained, 19 were assigned to economic officer positions in the Foreign Service and 7 were doing similar work in the Department of State. The 7 officers in related work were serving in political officer positions in which a knowledge of economics was essential. Four of these officers were overseas and three were assigned to the Department.<sup>32</sup>

It is more difficult to determine precisely the boundaries of a politico-military specialization. Of the 69 officers who have received training in the staff colleges of the armed services between July 1946 and January 1952, the Department of State believes that all of them are doing work in which they can directly or indirectly use their staff college

---

<sup>29</sup>Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

training.<sup>33</sup> With the increased emphasis in foreign affairs on security through adequate and integrated military forces, this type of training will become increasingly indispensable for a large number of Foreign Service officers.

During this same period, 105 officers have been trained in the language and area field.<sup>34</sup> Of these, 95 are assigned to positions in the area in which they specialized, seven officers are detailed to work related to their field of specialization, and three officers are doing work entirely unrelated to their course of training. Of the 95 officers assigned to their area of specialization, 58 have been assigned to the country or countries of their specialization, 24 are assigned to countries closely related to the field of specialization, and 13 are doing work in the Department in their area of specialization.

The 105 language and area specialists may be categorized as follows:

Far East 45 (including 7 now in training) Chinese 22,  
Japanese 11, Korean 2, Vietnamese 1, Indonesian 6,  
Mongolian 1, Siamese 1, Burmese 1 (Resigned 7)

Near East 35 (including 6 now in training) Hindu-  
stani 11, Arabic 16, Turkish 5, Persian 2

Europe 47 (including 15 now in training) Russian 31,  
German 16

German In addition to the above officers who have received concentrated

study in specialized language and area fields, the Foreign Service Institute has also offered class instruction in 41 separate languages. Between July 1, 1946 and December 1, 1951, 2140 students received this type of instruction.

---

<sup>33</sup>Based upon a survey made in January 1952 by the Office of Personnel.

<sup>34</sup>The following statistics on language and area studies were provided by the Office of Personnel.

Evaluation of Foreign Service Training. The Foreign Service has few peers in the federal government with respect to its in-service training program. With the Institute as the nucleus, and with a well planned training program utilizing the facilities of the universities, armed service staff colleges, and the other government agencies, the Department of State has made giant strides in its attempt to provide the Foreign Service with the specialized skills needed to conduct our foreign affairs. Considering the unprecedented expansion in the number and type of services which the Department has been called upon to perform in foreign areas, the achievements of the Institute in preparing personnel for the performance of these tasks is the more remarkable. As would be expected, this rapid expansion of the training program has placed innumerable pressures upon the Institute, and problems have arisen which must be solved if the Service is to continue to receive the maximum benefit from its training program.

The first problem the Institute has had to contend with in planning the Department's training program is a problem all government agencies must consider, that is, the sufficiency of personnel and funds. While the Institute should not attempt to duplicate the services which may be better and more economically provided by other agencies, it is also true that its present staff is understrength. The Institute should maintain a small cadre well acquainted with the needs of the Service, as opposed to a large permanent faculty, for this system, in addition to being more economical, will also be more flexible, and, therefore, will better lend itself to the changing requirements of the Service. On the other hand, a small, highly competent, permanent faculty is needed, and it is difficult to find personnel with the necessary expertise, and to hold them,

in the present labor market. If these personnel are to be recruited and retained, adequate salaries and career opportunities must be provided. This will necessitate an increase in the funds allotted for Institute personnel during the coming years.

Closely related to the increase in staff is the need for a much larger and much more important increase in services. If the Institute is to become a government wide center for training in foreign relations, it must broaden the scope of its curricula and provide more adequate means for a larger percentage of the Foreign Service officers to share in its training functions. Numerous specializations have become increasingly important in the past several years, specializations not generally provided by our institutions of higher learning, yet of the utmost importance to the wise and efficient discharge of our responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs. Such subjects as multilateral negotiation, conference procedure, civil affairs, international security administration, foreign economic administration, intelligence techniques and analysis, psychological warfare, and economic and technological planning of the Point IV variety are only a few of the subjects needing additional emphasis. There has been some argument as to how much the Foreign Service should become involved in program planning and operation as opposed to their traditional functions of representation, negotiation and reporting.<sup>35</sup> We believe in one unified Foreign Service capable of discharging a variety of services in the foreign field. Even if the more restrictive premise is accepted, however, it would be impossible for the Foreign Service officer to do a good job in any of his traditional tasks without some knowledge of the specialized fields referred to above. Consequently, the scope of study

---

<sup>35</sup>Supra.

afforded by the Institute must be greatly expanded.

The Department is also aware that more adequate techniques must be devised to make the services of the Institute available to a larger percentage of its officers than are now able to profit by them. In part, this can only be solved by an increase in the number of Foreign Service officers. At present the Department finds itself sorely pressed to meet the requirements of program staffing with the number of available officers. Under such circumstances it is difficult to take an officer out of the field and assign him to a training program. A part of this training need can be met by providing officers with the opportunity for off duty study at their post on the order of that afforded by the armed services. Unfortunately, the dispersal of personnel makes any elaborate off duty training program impractical except at the larger posts, and the smaller posts will have to be serviced by more extensive use of correspondence courses and training materials of that type.<sup>36</sup> The basic problem of formal training can only be solved, therefore, with an expansion of personnel which would permit the number of man years devoted to training to be considerably increased.

Probably the most pressing present problem, as we have indicated above, is that of interesting a sufficient number of qualified officers to volunteer for the specialized courses of instruction particularly in the language and area field. The Department's policy of insisting upon volunteers appears to be a wise one and should be continued. We have

---

<sup>36</sup>The Institute does select and edit for distribution to all posts, outstanding articles from books, periodicals, and Institute lectures. These articles help the Foreign Service officer keep abreast of recent developments in the numerous fields comprising the social sciences. Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 531.21.

already referred to a number of incentives which might be used to make these assignments appear more attractive to qualified officers. In addition, a good part of the problem can be alleviated if the Department will follow more realistic policies with respect to initial recruitment of persons with specialized qualifications both on the entering level, through a modified form of the conventional examining system, and in the intermediate grades through a more liberal lateral entrance policy.

The Department recognizes the need for a more adequate technique of determining the chances of success of those officers volunteering for specialized courses of training.<sup>37</sup> It has been suggested that the Department might do well to require a language aptitude test in lieu of an actual test in a foreign language as a prerequisite for entrance into the Service. Such aptitude testing would also be of service in determining the selection of officers for specialized language and area programs.<sup>38</sup> It should be emphasized, however, that the mere aptitude for languages is not in itself sufficient qualification for undertaking such a course of study. The Department is not attempting to develop interpreters per se, but officers who will be able to use their newly acquired language facility as a tool for better understanding peoples whose culture, customs, value standards, and so forth are quite different than our own. Just as everyone who speaks English is not an authority on America, neither does fluency in Thai necessarily indicate an understanding of Siamese problems. Yet there has

---

<sup>37</sup>Statement by Mr. Harry Hawkins, personal interview.

<sup>38</sup>At present, the officers selected are usually in class 5 or 6. The candidate's superior officer must certify that the applicant has displayed an aptitude for learning foreign languages. Final selection rests with the Chief of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel, Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 542.21.

been a marked tendency in the past, in many quarters, to confuse these two quite distinct qualifications. The recent occupation of Germany provides an excellent example. During a year of teaching in Germany, the writer was impressed by the large number of personnel in policy making position whose sole qualification appeared to be fluency in the German or Russian language. While policy making officers should have a knowledge of the language of their area of specialisation, it is also true that other qualifications are of more importance. Tolerance, instruction, a good fund of knowledge, and a broad view of world affairs are only a few of the many prerequisites the officer should have if his language training is to be of maximum value.

Much more can be done in the Foreign Service to provide in-service training by means of work rotation for junior officers. The junior officer, in order that he might acquire a broad understanding of world affairs, should have a variety of work experience during his initial years in the Service. Specialisation in his major field of endeavor should come later. In order to provide the junior officer with this training by job rotation a well planned program of job assignments must be devised. Many officers interviewed expressed the belief that job assignments tended to be based too much on the exigencies of the moment at the expense of a well planned career development program. The Department attributes this failure to excessive work load demands which require that officers be sent where most needed. In spite of this fact, it is probably true that much more could be done in way of long range planning. Also, much better plans of work rotation on the post level could be developed.

Although the shifting sands of foreign policy make it impossible to project any long range personnel blueprints with much chance for successful prediction, the Department is attempting to develop such plans on a three to five year basis.<sup>39</sup> Such a policy appears very desirable and will help the Service better to prepare for new and increasing responsibilities.

A word might be said here regarding the advisability of creating a Foreign Service Academy, although this proposal, which has been made on numerous occasions, is concerned with pre-service training vis a vis in-service training. Since the passage of the Rogers Act in 1924, numerous plans have been submitted for the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy modeled after the armed service academies at Annapolis and West Point. Assistant Secretary of State Wilbur J. Carr strongly opposed these proposals on the grounds that it would hinder, not help, the recruitment of qualified officer personnel.<sup>40</sup> Carr believed such a proposal to be most undemocratic and feared that it would have a tendency to accentuate the caste concept in the officer corps. Carr had the backing of the Department in these views. The proposal is not dead, however, and received a good deal of attention during the discussions over the Foreign Service Act of 1946.<sup>41</sup> The Department rejected the idea at that time in favor of the Foreign Service Institute. The prevailing Department philosophy was that the Service would be better served if the fledgling officers were drawn from a variety of university backgrounds with Service

---

<sup>39</sup>Statement by Mr. Robert Ryan, Assistant Chief, Division of Foreign Service Personnel, personal interview.

<sup>40</sup>The Personal Papers and Correspondence of Wilbur J. Carr.

<sup>41</sup>See Congressional Record, 79th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 9585 ff. and 9609 ff.

training being restricted to in-service study of the type described in this chapter. The Academy concept still has substantial support in many quarters. For example, in 1947 the legislature of Oregon presented, through Representative Lowell Stockman, a memorial to the United States Congress, praying for the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy. Stockman introduced H. R. 1770 which would have provided a diplomatic academy on the order of West Point or Annapolis.<sup>42</sup> In 1949 Representative Thomas J. Lane of Massachusetts introduced a similar proposal into the House.<sup>43</sup> In 1950 Representative Mack of Washington introduced a bill "to create a Foreign Service Academy on the order of West Point." Mack's diplomatic "cadets" were to be between 21 and 25 years of age, and were to have completed at least two years of college. Appointments to the academy were to be made by Members of Congress. Each member of Congress was to have not less than one appointee in the academy at any one time. The initial enrollment was to be approximately 500.<sup>44</sup>

The Department of State strongly opposes the idea of a diplomatic academy.<sup>45</sup> The position appears to be well taken. The establishment of such an academy would be a great expense and we have no proof that it would provide better junior officers than these now recruited. The United States is blessed with a multiplicity of excellent institutions of higher learning. Inasmuch as no one has been able to set down

---

<sup>42</sup>U. S. Congress, Congressional Record, 80th Cong., 1st sess., March 21, 1947, p. 2387.

<sup>43</sup>Congressional Record, 81st Cong., 1st sess., February 28, 1949, p. 1621.

<sup>44</sup>Congressional Record, 81st Cong., 2d sess., July 5, 1950, p. A-6237.

<sup>45</sup>A few leading Foreign Service officers such as George Kennan, our present Ambassador to the Soviet Union, favor the proposal.

definitively the qualifications possessed by a successful diplomat, except that they are usually the qualities possessed by successful people in other lines of endeavor, it is difficult to say that the universities cannot produce young men qualified by background and schooling for positions of eventual responsibility in the Foreign Service. In fact, since the Service should be representative of all segments of American life, and should be composed of officers with a broad world view, the creation of a Foreign Service Academy would probably have the opposite effect and would further separate the Foreign Service officer from the temper of the people.

## CHAPTER VIII

### SALARY, ALLOWANCES, AND RELATED BENEFITS

Salary. The salary and classification structure in the Foreign Service differs markedly from the system employed by the Federal Civil Service.<sup>1</sup> In the Federal Civil Service, a basic salary attaches to a position which in turn is occupied by an individual. A job study is made and the various functions to be performed by the person holding the position are analyzed. For example, a secretary may perform the following four functions: typing, shorthand, information, and filing. The difficulty and responsibility of each of these functions is compared with certain pre-determined standards and the job is then allocated to a particular grade. The person who fills the position receives the grade allocated to it. The basis of the Civil Service system is equal pay for equal work, and promotion along well defined occupational lines.

In the Foreign Service, officers are assigned to a class instead of to a particular post or job.<sup>2</sup> Salary is based upon the class the officer

---

<sup>1</sup> Background information on classification and salary plans in the federal service was obtained from U. S. Civil Service Commission: Personnel Classification Division, "History of Position Classification in the Federal Service, 1789-1941," Compiled by Ismar Baruch, (Washington: Civil Service Commission, September 1942, mimeographed); "Manual of Policies and Procedures: Classification Branch," (All orders of the Division of Departmental Personnel re-classification, Department of State, 1946-1951); "RIF Code, Department of State, General Schedule, March 23, 1951, superseding issuances of October 17, 1950, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951); and interviews with Mr. Horace Risher, Office of Personnel, and Mr. Harold Chastka, Division of Foreign Service Personnel.

<sup>2</sup>The Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 511.

is in and not upon the classification plan.<sup>3</sup> Promotions are made from class to class on the basis of service and merit.<sup>4</sup> Positions at posts are classified in accordance with a position classification plan developed and administered by the Department, and assignments are made to a level of responsibility generally commensurate with the class of the officer concerned.<sup>5</sup> In order that promotions may be made on a Service-wide basis, the Civil Service concept of equal pay for equal work is not strictly followed.<sup>6</sup>

The Foreign Service system, therefore, is much more flexible than its Departmental equivalent. The Department has virtually complete autonomy in classifying Foreign Service positions, whereas, Departmental positions are classified according to standards prescribed by the U. S. Civil Service Commission, which may also review Departmental determinations.<sup>7</sup> The Department feels that the peculiar conditions attaching to employment in the Foreign Service necessitates a very flexible classification system.<sup>8</sup> The geographical dispersion of the 300 Foreign Service

---

<sup>3</sup> "Report of Committee Study on an Integrated Salary Schedule for the Foreign Service," (Gill, Kendzie, Nelson study), April 11, 1951, (Unpublished MS, Department of State, Office of Personnel, typewritten).

<sup>4</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 621.

<sup>5</sup> Statement by Mr. Harold Chastka, personal interview.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Section 446 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 exempts the Foreign Service from the Civil Service Classification Act, viz., 54 U. S. Statutes 1212 (1940).

<sup>8</sup> Statement by Mr. Horace Risher, personal interview.

posts and the necessity for conducting a career system, requires a classification system and salary schedule tailored to the peculiar needs of the Service.

The salary schedule. There are seven classes of Foreign Service officers including the class of Career Minister.<sup>9</sup> The per annum salary of a Career Minister is \$14,300.<sup>10</sup> The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes are as follows:<sup>11</sup>

Class I:	\$12,800	13,200	13,600	14,000	14,300	
Class II:	\$11,130	11,150	11,500	11,850	12,200	12,550
		12,700				
Class III:	\$ 9,130	9,430	9,730	10,030	10,370	10,630
		10,930				
Class IV:	\$ 6,963	7,263	7,563	7,863	8,163	8,463
		8,763	8,863			
Class V:	\$ 5,313	5,513	5,713	5,913	6,113	6,313
		6,513	6,713			
Class VI:	\$ 3,993	4,193	4,393	4,593	4,793	4,993
		5,093				

Foreign Service officers appointed to Class VI may be appointed to any of the in-step rates provided for that class.<sup>12</sup> Appointment to any other class in the Foreign Service must be made at the minimum rate

---

<sup>9</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 412.

<sup>10</sup> Public Law 301, 82d Cong., 1st sess., October 24, 1951. See also Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, I, Part IV, sec. 221.2.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 413.

provided for that class.<sup>13</sup> The class of Career Minister was created to permit Foreign Service officers to serve as Chiefs of Mission or to serve in comparable positions without losing their commissions as Foreign Service Officers. If a Career Minister is serving as Chief of Mission, however, he receives the salary that attaches to the mission.<sup>14</sup> Missions are divided into four classes for salary purposes:<sup>15</sup>

Chief of Class I mission receives \$25,000 per annum.

Class II - \$20,000 per annum.

Class III - 17,500 per annum.

Class IV - 15,000 per annum.

If within three months of the termination of his service as Chief of Mission a career Minister has not been reassigned as Chief of Mission or reassigned in another capacity, he is retired from the Service.<sup>16</sup>

The positions to which a Foreign Service officer can be appointed which are deserving of the rank of Career Minister are: all Chiefs of Mission, Deputy Chiefs of Mission at large or key posts; certain key Consuls General; Deputy Assistant Secretaries of State or higher, and a few other key political advisory positions.<sup>17</sup> Career Ministers are appointed by the President on the basis of recommendations provided by the Secretary

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., sec. 431.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., sec. 411.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., sec. 519.

<sup>17</sup> The list of positions was provided to the writer by the Office of personnel.

of State, acting in concert with the Board of the Foreign Service.<sup>18</sup> No person is eligible for appointment to the class of Career Minister who is not a Foreign Service officer.<sup>19</sup>

Foreign Service officers who have been in a class for nine months or more, whose performance meets the efficiency standards of the Foreign Service and who have not yet reached the highest rate for their class, are given an "in-class" increase at the beginning of each fiscal year.<sup>20</sup> Additional step increases may be awarded for special accomplishment.<sup>21</sup> If a Foreign Service officer maintains sustained performance for at least 3 months which not only meets the highest attainable rating, but merits distinction among those persons receiving such ratings, or if he initiates a new idea, method or device which will improve the public service or provide for more economical operation thereof, or performs a special act deserving of great distinction, he may receive an additional step increase. An additional step increase is given to each Foreign Service officer upon completion of a six month unit of full time language and area study or its equivalent in part-time study under the direction of the Foreign Service Institute in Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Mongolian, Annamese, Siamese, Malay, Burmese, Tamil, Persian, Turkish, Arabic, Russian, Finnish, Greek, Rumanian, Hungarian, and other languages of comparable difficulty.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 502.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., sec. 518.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., sec. 625.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid. See also Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, I, Part IV, sec. 542.

Critique of salary and classification plan. The Bureau of the Budget has long advocated a uniform salary schedule for all employees in the Federal Civil Service.<sup>23</sup> Consequently, the Bureau has been exerting pressure to have the Foreign Service adopt the salary schedule and classification plan now employed by the great majority of federal agencies. The Department has objected to the Bureau's proposal, maintaining that the unique problems encountered in staffing a world wide Service necessitate a salary and classification plan suited to its needs. The Department does not believe that the Civil Service schedule, as it now stands, is well adapted to these needs.<sup>24</sup> While one can sympathize with the desire of the Bureau of the Budget to institute a uniform salary and classification plan which will facilitate inter and intra departmental transfers, - one can not, on the other hand, sympathize with the growing tendency of administrators to desire uniformity for uniformity's sake. It would appear that the salary and classification system to be employed by any government agency should be one that is best designed to meet its peculiar needs. Undoubtedly, the classification system as it is now employed in the Foreign Service is much too formless, but on the other hand, the classification system employed by the Federal Civil Service appears to be much too rigid. Some sort of a compromise between the two systems would probably be desirable, and will probably be evolved within the next few years.

---

<sup>23</sup>Statement by Mr. Horace Risher, personal interview.

<sup>24</sup>Statement by Mr. A. G. Jones, Office of Personnel, personal interview.

Another objection which has been voiced is that the present number of classes in the Foreign Service is not sufficient to provide a well-defined promotion program. Under the present class structure, with the exception of advancement of Class VI officers to Class V, the average period of service before promotion is about four years. This long period of time between promotions when compared with the more frequent promotions of Civil Service employees in comparable positions has a very depressing effect on Foreign Service morale. Legislation introduced into the congress by Representative Richards in October 1951 would increase the number of classes, including Career Minister, from 7 to 9.<sup>25</sup> The Department believes that such a schedule would afford an opportunity for more frequent promotions and better Service morale.<sup>26</sup> The Richards bill would also decrease the number of Staff positions in the Foreign Service from 22 to 13.<sup>27</sup> The first eight Staff classes would be the equivalent of the first eight Foreign Service grades excluding the grade of Career Minister.<sup>28</sup> It is believed such a realignment of classes will lessen the objections previously voiced to the effect that staff officers were doing the same work as Foreign Service officers but receiving less remuneration, and also facilitate the intra-Service transfer of personnel.

---

<sup>25</sup> A Bill to Amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, HR 5273, Introduced into the House of Representatives by Congressman Richards, October 15, 1951.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

Allowances. The Foreign Service Act of 1946 authorizes the Secretary of State to prescribe specified allowances to Foreign Service officers stationed abroad.<sup>29</sup> The need for these allowances is occasioned by problems peculiar to residence abroad, or essential to the proper discharge of the representation activity.

Post allowances are provided Foreign Service officers at posts where the cost of living, other than quarters, is higher than in Washington, D. C.<sup>30</sup> The amount of this allowance varies with the living costs of the post, and the salary and family status of the officer. The allowance is designed to permit the officer to serve overseas at no greater financial burden than that incurred on similar assignment to the Department. The cost of living differential at each of the Foreign Service posts is determined by the Allowance Branch of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel on the basis of approved statistical procedures. The differential provided is a percentage of the officer's spendable income, that is, the officer's take home pay less savings.<sup>31</sup> In 1951, 130

---

<sup>29</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, Title IX, sec. 901.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. See also Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 320. In 1952, posts were divided into 16 classes for the purpose of granting post allowances. Officers at class one posts received an additional 5 per cent; officers at Class 16 posts, an additional 120 per cent. Department of State, Standardized Government Civilian Allowance Regulations, (Washington: Government Printing Office, December, 1948, with supplements to May, 1952).

<sup>31</sup> For example, an officer receiving a salary of \$4,500 in Washington, D.C. would be expected to use \$3,600. If he were assigned to a post in a Class 9 area, where the Allowance Branch has determined the cost of living to be 50 per cent higher than in Washington, D.C. he would receive \$5,400. All determinations are made on the basis of data provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Foreign Service posts were receiving differentials. Over 100 of these 130 posts received differentials less than 25 per cent, while eight received differentials higher than 50 per cent.<sup>32</sup>

Quarters allowances are paid to officers abroad who are not provided with Government owned or leased quarters.<sup>33</sup> This allowance covers rent, heat, light, and fuel, and varies with the officer's rank and family status.<sup>34</sup> The allowance does not cover "grey market" deals which must be made in many posts in order to obtain the house from the landlord, or costs involved in restoring houses in uninhabitable condition.

Transfer allowances are paid to officers being reassigned from a post within one climatic zone to a post within a different climatic zone.<sup>35</sup> There are three major climatic zones established for this determination, frigid, temperate, and tropic.<sup>36</sup> The payments are very small, however,

<sup>32</sup> Based upon statistics provided by the Allowances and Differential Branch, Division of Foreign Service Personnel.

<sup>33</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 901.

<sup>34</sup> Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, sec. 320. See also Department of State, Standardized Allowance Regulations, Al, Cir. 8, sec. 3.1, June 15, 1949. Posts are categorized into five classes for quarters allowances. Class I posts receive the smallest allowance; Class V posts the largest. Class I includes such posts as Sucre, Bolivia; Baffin Island, Canada; and Dakar, F. W. Africa. Class II includes such posts as Edinburgh, Scotland and Port Said, Egypt. Class III includes such posts as Nice, France, and Brazzaville, F. Equatorial Africa. Class IV includes such posts as Bordeaux, France, and Tunis, Tunisia. Class V includes such posts as Rio, London, Paris, Rome, Vienna and Sydney.

<sup>35</sup> Department of State, Standardized Allowance Regulations, Al, Cir. 8, sec. 6.1, June 15, 1949.

<sup>36</sup> Zone I (frigid) includes such posts as Calgary and Montreal, Canada; Moscow, U.S.S.R.; and Mukden, China.

with a maximum of \$200 being prescribed.<sup>37</sup>

Separation allowances are paid to officers who are compelled by reason of "dangerous, notably unhealthful, or excessively adverse living conditions at his post abroad" to maintain his wife and minor children elsewhere than in the country of assignment.<sup>38</sup> The maximum separation allowance is approximately \$2,500 and the minimum \$2,200, based on the cost of food and shelter for the wife and minor children.

Foreign Service Staff officers and employees can also receive post differential allowances.<sup>39</sup> These are payments made because of extraordinarily difficult living conditions at certain posts. These differentials range from 10 per cent to 25 per cent of basic compensation and are applicable to about 30 per cent of the posts in the Service. At present, Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers do not receive post differentials when assigned to hardship posts. An amendment included in H. R. 5273, a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Richards on October 15, 1951, to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, would make these two presently excluded groups eligible for such payments.

---

Zone II (temperate) includes the United States and such posts as Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; and Akita, Japan.

Zone III (tropic) generally includes posts in Latin America, Africa and Southeast Asia.

<sup>37</sup> Maximum payments are made on transfers from posts in the frigid zone to posts in the tropical zone or vice versa. The smaller payments on transfers to or from a temperate zone. No transfer allowance is payable by reason of transfer to the United States, but the United States is in Zone II for transfers to other zones.

<sup>38</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 901. Department of State, Standardized Allowance Regulations, Al, Cir. 1, December 1, 1948, sec. 7.2. Some typical separation posts in 1952 were Saigon, French Indo China; Rangoon, Burma; and Godthaab, Greenland.

<sup>39</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 443.

An official residence allowance is made available to the principal officer at each Foreign Service post.<sup>40</sup> This allowance is to compensate him for unusual housekeeping expenses incurred in his official capacity, that is, expenses he would not incur if he were at the post in another capacity.

A representation allowance is made to permit chiefs of mission and other key officers to be reimbursed for expenses incurred in the furtherance of official and cultural contacts.<sup>41</sup> If such allowances were not provided, only people of independent means could afford to serve their country in such a capacity. Representation allowances are made by the Department on a post basis, and then further subdivided to cover a part of the costs of key personnel on an equitable basis.<sup>42</sup> A strict accounting of these funds is enforced by the Department. In 1949 and 1950, representation allowances covered approximately two-thirds of the total cost of representation, the difference being made up by Foreign Service officers from their personal funds.<sup>43</sup> In the past three years approximately 1550 officers have had to pay about \$350,000 per annum in excess of the representation appropriation.<sup>44</sup> If pro rated equally this would

---

<sup>40</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 902.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., sec. 901; See also Department of State, Standardized Civilian Allowances, Al, Cir. 8, June 15, 1949, sec. 8.1.

<sup>42</sup> Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, secs. 343 and 344.2.

<sup>43</sup> Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

amount to an average of only \$225 per officer per annum, a not excessive assessment. However, officers at certain posts such as London, Paris, Rome and Rio de Janeiro, must absorb a disproportionate share. Added to these official representation expenses are the personal entertainment costs of the officer which, as a member of the diplomatic colony, are unavoidably high. These personal expenses are paid entirely by the officer concerned.

The representation allowance is intended to assist officers in covering, in whole or in part, three major types of representation activity, namely, contact, protocol, and presentation.<sup>45</sup> Contact involves the entertainment of foreign personalities to facilitate the performance of official duties. Protocol involves the observance of traditional entertainments, such as a reception on the fourth of July, or the laying of a wreath upon the tomb of a foreign dignitary on appropriate occasions. Presentation involves the entertainment connected with presenting newly arrived and prominent Americans to foreign governments in order to expedite or facilitate their missions. For example, in July 1951 the American Ambassador in Rome entertained Margaret Truman at a dinner and luncheon, held a buffet supper for the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, entertained three groups of visiting Americans carrying letters of identification from Congressmen, gave a reception for a group of Texas Club Women and the Democratic Study group, and held several receptions and functions attended by foreign personalities only. During the same month, the American Ambassador in Paris was

---

<sup>45</sup> Department of State, Foreign Service Manual, secs. 341.1, 341.2, 341.3.

host to ten different groups of Americans, each of which had to be entertained with an appropriate dinner and reception. During Thomas E. Dewey's recent trip through the Far East, the American Consul General at Singapore entertained the governor at a dinner to which 225 guests were invited. This was the third large affair the Consul General was required to give for American groups in the space of a few weeks. In fiscal 1952, the appropriation for representation allowance totaled \$675,000.<sup>46</sup>

Leave. Foreign Service officers are entitled to receive annual leave computed on the following basis. Officers with less than three years of service receive one-half day of annual leave for each pay period served.<sup>47</sup> On this basis, officers in this group are entitled to 104 hours or 13 days of annual leave for each year of service. Officers with more than three but less than fifteen years of service are entitled to three-fourths of a day of annual leave for each pay period.<sup>48</sup> Consequently, officers in this category receive 160 hours or 20 days of annual leave each year. Finally, officers with more than fifteen years of service are entitled to one day of leave for each pay period.<sup>49</sup> Officers in this group are entitled, therefore, to 208 hours or 26 days of annual leave each year. The maximum accrual of annual leave is 480 hours or 60 days.<sup>50</sup>

In addition to his annual leave, each Foreign Service officer may accrue home leave in the amount of five work days for every four months

---

<sup>46</sup>Based upon statistics provided by the Office of Personnel.

<sup>47</sup>Foreign Service Manual, I, sec. 432.1; see also Department of State, Circular Airgram, January 11, 1952. A pay period is two weeks.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., sec. 432.6.

of service outside the United States.<sup>51</sup> Therefore, at the end of his regular two year tour of duty overseas, an officer is entitled to 30 work days of home leave. As a rule, the Department grants an officer 45 work days of home leave at the end of a two year tour of duty.<sup>52</sup> Since the officer may have only accumulated 30 days of home leave, the extra 15 days must be made up from the officer's annual leave. For that reason most Foreign Service officers usually will save some of their annual leave each year to be applied to home leave. There is no limit to the amount of home leave that can be accrued.<sup>53</sup> Transit time to and from the United States is not counted as leave time.<sup>54</sup>

Finally, all officers, regardless of years of service, may accrue one half day of sick leave for each pay period.<sup>55</sup> Consequently, each officer is entitled to thirteen days of sick leave each year.

Medical benefits. The Foreign Service Act of 1946 authorizes the Secretary of State to pay the cost of the treatment of any illness or injury received by a member of the Foreign Service in the line of duty, if it is not the result of "vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part."<sup>56</sup> The authorization is only applicable if the injury or illness occurs abroad.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., sec. 451.1.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., sec. 452.1.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., sec. 451.1.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., sec. 461.5.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., sec. 442.

<sup>56</sup> Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 941.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid. Since the employee is not covered while on duty in the

The Department has established fifteen health units overseas, two under the supervision of a doctor and the others under public health nurses.<sup>58</sup> In addition, smaller units are supplied with drugs and first aid kits. If an officer's injury or illness cannot be treated at his post, he may be moved to a satisfactory place for hospitalization. In such cases the Department pays the costs involved.<sup>59</sup> At present, dependents of American citizen personnel while assigned abroad, are not covered by the medical benefits of the Foreign Service Act.

Retirement. Foreign Service officers are covered under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System and not under the regular Civil Service system.<sup>60</sup> The separate Foreign Service fund was established originally by the Rogers Act of 1924.<sup>61</sup>

Foreign Service officers contribute five per cent of their basic salary to the fund.<sup>62</sup> Salaries in excess of \$13,500 are considered as \$13,500 for the purpose of all computations under the system.<sup>63</sup>

---

United States, he usually joins the Foreign Service Protective Association, the Blue Cross, or one of the other group hospitalization plans available.

<sup>58</sup>Department of State, Office of Personnel, "Specific Personnel Practices: Medical Services," October, 1951, mimeographed.

<sup>59</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 942.

<sup>60</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, Title VIII, sec. 801.

<sup>61</sup>43 U. S. Statutes 144 (1924).

<sup>62</sup>Foreign Service Act of 1946, sec. 811.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid.

The annuity of a participant is equal to two per cent of his average basic salary for the five years next preceding his date of retirement, multiplied by his total years of service, not exceeding 30 years.<sup>64</sup> The present maximum annuity, therefore, is 60 per cent. At present, each year of service spent at an unhealthful post counts as  $1\frac{1}{2}$  years of service.<sup>65</sup> Provision is made for reduced annuities for surviving widows, or other designated beneficiaries acceptable to the Secretary of State.<sup>66</sup>

The interest paid on monies in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability fund is 4 per cent per annum.<sup>67</sup> The compulsory retirement age for Foreign Service officers is age 60, with the exception of Career Ministers in which case retirement is mandatory at age 65. Officers may retire after twenty years of service provided they have reached the age of fifty years.<sup>68</sup> Retirement for disability is possible after five years of service.<sup>69</sup> If the disabled officer has had less than twenty years of service, his annuity will be computed on the basis of twenty years.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., sec. 821

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., sec. 853.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., sec. 821.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., sec. 863. Statement by Mr. James Henderson, Foreign Service Officer, personal interview.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., secs. 631-632.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., sec. 831.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid.

The Hoover and Rowe Commissions both recommended that Foreign Service officers, Foreign Service Staff officers, and Foreign Service Reserve officers should be placed under a single retirement system.<sup>71</sup> At present, the last two groups are covered under the Civil Service system. The Department of State is interested in having Foreign Service Staff and Reserve officers covered into the Foreign Service System. On the other hand, the Bureau of the Budget has advocated that the special Foreign Service System should be discontinued and all government employees should be covered by one general retirement and disability system.<sup>72</sup> The Department feels that the nature of a Foreign Service Career necessitates an independent retirement and disability system.<sup>73</sup> The Department points out that Foreign Service officers spend the greater part of their lives as expatriates. Consequently, at the time of retirement they find themselves unable to enjoy many of the advantages which have accrued over a period of years to government employees who have spent their lives in the United States. For example, Foreign Service officers generally are unable to buy a home in the United States before retiring and this fact adds an increased monetary burden to their post-retirement lives. Also, the Department believes that the Foreign Service officer is disadvantaged in being unable to make contacts which may lead to post-retirement employment; by the difficulty of accumulating savings because of the high cost

---

<sup>71</sup> Hoover Commission, Foreign Affairs, p. 65; Rowe Committee Report, p. 33.

<sup>72</sup> Statement by Mr. James Henderson, personal interview.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid. See also "Briefing Statement for Mr. Humalsine's Use," Memo from Jones to Scott, July 31, 1951.

of living overseas; by an inability to make and supervise his investments while overseas; and by the possibility of contracting disease and disability through service overseas. In addition, there is the need for early retirement for Foreign Service officers. Early retirement is desirable to permit the young officers to come to the top of the career ladder while they are in the vigor of youth, and to permit the older officers who have spent the greater part of their lives as expatriates, to spend their declining years in the United States. While the Department strongly advocates the continuance of an independent Foreign Service Retirement system, they are also willing to make changes in that system which will further harmonize it with the present Civil Service plan.<sup>74</sup> For example, the Department is willing to see the present officer contribution be increased from 5 to 6 per cent, and the present interest rates be decreased from 4 to 3 per cent. The Department would also like to see the maximum payment increased from 60 to 75 per cent. This maximum payment under the proposal would be obtained after  $37\frac{1}{2}$  years of service.<sup>75</sup> Changes in the retirement system are being delayed pending the results of an extensive study of all government retirement systems by the Bureau of the Budget.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup>Ibid.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid.

## CONCLUSION

Objectivity," wrote Frederick L. Schuman, "...is not to be had by avoiding verdicts or shunning expressions of preference. It consists rather of interpreting facts within a frame of reference broader than the facts themselves."<sup>1</sup> It is in this spirit that we have attempted to survey the personnel system of the American Foreign Service. Wherever the facts have seemed to warrant innovation, we have expressed such a preference. For the same reason, on other occasions, we have supported a retention of the status quo.

In concluding our study we would like to underline a few general principles based upon the preceding research. It is always questionable to generalize with respect to a complex institutional framework such as we have in the field of foreign affairs. However, certain conclusions appear obvious, and we feel justified in drawing attention to them at this point.

Before we talk about the Foreign Service in particular, however, it appears desirable to make a few remarks about foreign affairs in general. For during the past decade several profound changes in the substance of foreign policy have necessitated a reorientation in our thinking with respect to the role of the American Foreign Service.

Since World War II, the United States has exchanged her status as a peripheral power for a vital central position. There is good reason to believe, however, that the United States has reached this position of

---

<sup>1</sup>Frederick L. Schuman, International Politics, 4th ed., (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948), p. 1.

physical maturity without an accompanying metamorphosis in its mental posture. Nowhere is this intellectual lag more pronounced than in the field of foreign affairs. As people are wont to overlook the ramifications of industrial, agricultural, and union concentration on our once simple economy, so also they are accustomed to viewing the conduct of our foreign affairs through the eyes of our illustrious forefathers.

The admirable Brookings study has expressed the belief that the administrative problems encountered by the United States today in the conduct of her foreign affairs bulk larger and more difficult than those of the entire federal government during the mid-1930 New Deal days.<sup>2</sup> Yet there is a shocking amount of unconcern for these problems on the part of the Congress, the public, and surprisingly, the Foreign Service itself.

The Congress, historically oriented toward ignoring foreign affairs agencies, has been slow to appropriate sufficient funds for an effective overseas organization. As Professor McCamy has pointed out, the Department of State is still next to the smallest old-time department of Government with only the Department of Labor having a smaller number of personnel.<sup>3</sup> Yet the increase in the volume, and scope of the Department's foreign affairs functions has dwarfed the increase in the functions and responsibilities of the other agencies.

In the early days of the Republic, America was well served by a simple, passive foreign policy. Our peripheral position, combined with our seemingly endless resources and the "British Century" in Europe, not

---

<sup>2</sup>Brookings Institution, The Administration of Foreign Affairs and Overseas Operations, p. 1.

<sup>3</sup>James L. McCamy, Administration of American Foreign Affairs, p. 38.

only made a policy of isolation possible, but highly desirable. During these relatively halcyon days our diplomatic representation abroad was largely pro forma. The government demanded only consistency and integrity in its officials abroad. If they could stay out of trouble and discharge their limited political and social obligations with reasonable skill and adroitness, the national interest was well served. The advent of modern technology and scientific achievement, combined with the rise of America to a central position in world affairs, and the resulting complex of political and social relationships, necessitates a reexamination of our foreign policy. Thrust into a position of leadership, the United States can no longer rely upon the negative policy of a follower. The national interest demands an affirmative policy designed by men qualified by imagination and specialized skills.

In relation to this new role the present Foreign Service is both undermanned and underskilled. This is not to say that the personnel in the Foreign Service are not competent, loyal, well trained individuals. In fact, probably no profession in the United States has a higher average level of performance. But the patent fact is that the Foreign Service has neither a sufficient number of personnel, nor a sufficient number of officers with specialized skills to discharge its increased responsibilities.

In part, the responsibility for this unpreparedness rests with the Congress, which has been reluctant to spend public funds to maintain a still closer liaison with "outsiders". Many members of the Congress continue to view the Foreign Service as the "pink-tea brigade," a charge which was often justified in the past. Suspicious of foreign affairs in

general, these Members of Congress are also suspicious of the agencies which are responsible for the discharge of our overseas responsibilities. Consequently, they are not especially eager to strengthen our foreign affairs machinery.

A large part of the blame, however, must be shouldered by the Service itself. Many of its officers have attempted to build a twentieth century Foreign Service upon the foundation of nineteenth century thought patterns. These officers still look upon their role as one of representation, negotiation, and reporting at the government level. Actually modern diplomacy has far transcended these traditional limits.

The Service places too much emphasis on developing the traditional "general" officer, who, within a short period of time, can be expected to discharge any activity or function in the field of foreign relations with reasonable skill and dexterity, as opposed to the highly skilled specialist. The Service justifies this policy on grounds that it is necessary (a) to give the officer corps necessary mobility to staff a variety of large and small posts, (b) to develop a broad, government-wide orientation in the officer, (c) to permit a Service-wide promotion policy, and (d) to develop necessary executive abilities in junior officers. All of these ends are very desirable. However, we believe these objectives are not inconsistent with much greater specialization in the officer corps. As in the medical profession, there is room for both "general practitioners" and specialists. It is a fallacy to believe that executive ability or a broad point of view can be achieved only through general practice. A "general" officer can be narrow in his views, and a specialist quite broad, or vice versa. Also, in a large Service, mobility of personnel will not be unduly inhibited by

increased specialization. Even if it were, however, all would agree that the national interest should take precedence over the interests of the Service.

Specialists must be brought into the service in much larger numbers, preferably at an early age and at the bottom two grades. If they show sufficient ability they should be permitted to progress to the top of the career ladder while remaining in their primary field of specialization. The recruitment of these specialists will not inhibit the mobility of the personnel system if the Service is expanded to a size sufficient to staff its increased responsibilities. We believe that the officer corps in an adequate foreign affairs service should number 3,000 officers by January 1954 and 5,000 officers by January 1956. These additional officers would be recruited through both lateral and basic officer sources. In the recruitment of lateral entrants the Department should not be limited to employees of the Department of State or other components of the Foreign Service. Rather, recruitment should be opened up to all governmental and non-governmental sources.

There is another change that has taken place in the substance of foreign policy which has greatly altered the traditional role of the diplomat. Conventionally, diplomacy has been viewed as the art and science of conducting relations among sovereign states. As is true in traditional international law, individual citizens have been regarded not as subjects of diplomacy, but as objects of diplomacy. There is evidence that this concept is changing both in the field of international law and in the field of diplomacy. The new technological assistance program is a case in point. The Point IV plan involves dealings with peoples more than with formal government authorities. It is probably fair to say that diplomacy will become more of a functional operating system and less of a

formal representation system in the future. The diplomacy of the nineteenth century has often been referred to as the "striped pants" variety - the diplomacy of the second quarter of the twentieth century as the "shirt sleeves" variety. It appears that we may be on the threshold of a new age in diplomacy, the "pick and shovel" variety. Such a change will necessitate an even larger number of specialists and technicians in our foreign affairs service.

We should emphasize again that we do not believe the specialization premise in any way obviates the necessity for a career service system. However, to permit the Service to have necessary flexibility, program staffing and liberal lateral entry will be necessary on a continuing basis for some time to come. But in an expanding service these two concepts do not unnecessarily curtail promotional incentives or destroy the career system. As the Service expands, lateral entry will probably become less and less necessary. Specialists will be moving up in increasing numbers from the bottom ranks to staff the responsible positions in their fields. It should be remembered that the critics of the Service rarely attack the career system as such. Rather, they object to the inability of the career system to provide necessary program specialists, as well as that flexibility of mind needed in the Foreign Service of a great power.

The necessity for a trained foreign affairs staff is obvious. The notion that a wide-awake, average American can do anything is flattering to the American pride, but is not conditioned to serve the national interest. In every line of effort—professional, commercial, or industrial—it is thoroughly understood that one cannot obtain the necessary technical equipment through mere general experience or by reading instructions. There are thousands of items of necessary information which

are a part of the common knowledge of men whose lives are entirely devoted to a class of work which cannot be obtained by anyone who is suddenly introduced from the outside. Consequently, the Service must create a genuine career service system in which generalists, specialists, and broad gauge technicians can be integrated into a smoothly functioning organization.

To achieve such a Service the Department of State will have to devise a truly positive recruitment program. We believe positive recruitment will not only obtain for the Service highly qualified personnel for all facets for the field of foreign affairs, but it will also make the Foreign Service much more representative of the American people. We favor the continuance of a high standard of selection. The examining system, however, should be employed as a tool for determining fitness, and not as a guild-like fetish. Both the oral and written parts of the examination for class 6 officers can be modified to advantage. We favor an amalgamation of the personnel of the Department of State and the Foreign Service below the rank of Assistant Secretary. In completing the amalgamation process we believe Departmental officers should play a much larger part in the execution of that program. Amalgamation has been dominated to a large degree by the career Foreign Service officers or personnel favorable to their vested interest. After amalgamation is complete, we feel that Foreign Service officers should occupy Assistant Secretary positions only in rare cases. It is not wise to have substantive policy reins in the hands of a relatively closed career group. We believe the somewhat different career concept of the Foreign Service vis a vis the federal Civil Service justifies a separate system of promotion, classification, pay, and retirement in the Foreign Service.

The Foreign Service should remain the central executing agency in American foreign affairs. The retention of that position will involve innumerable new problems, innovations, and responsibilities. But we believe the Service will be equal to the challenge.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Source Materials

#### Manuscript Collections

Carr, Wilbur J. The Personal Papers of Wilbur J. Carr. Washington: Unpublished MSS, 1892-1939. The collection includes the greater part of Mr. Carr's official and personal papers covering the period of his service in the Department of State. A voluminous diary which covers the greater part of this period was of particular value. The collection is in the home of Mrs. Wilbur J. Carr, 2300 Wyoming Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.

U. S. Department of State. Department of State Archives. Washington: National Archives, 1792-1937. Includes personnel administration papers on the Diplomatic and the Consular Services before 1924, and on the Foreign Service after that date. Personnel papers weak until 1909. Collection under 120. decimal series is particularly strong on the adoption and administration of the Rogers Act. The Letter Books and the Appointment Papers were also helpful.

\_\_\_\_\_. Department of State Current Files. Washington: Unpublished MSS, 1944-1952. The chief files consulted were those in the Office of Personnel. They provided a valuable source of statistical information and contained many valuable personnel planning papers.

#### Government Publications: General

Annals of Congress. Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1789-1850.

Congressional Globe. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1833-1873.

Congressional Record. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1874 to date.

Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1937.

Opinions of the United States Attorney General. Washington: Government Printing Office, Volume 1 to date.

Register of Debates in Congress. Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1789-1850.

Richardson, James D. A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents. New York: Bureau of National Literature, 1908.

Secret Journals of the Acts and Proceedings of Congress. Boston: Thomas Wait, 1820.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1951. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951.

U. S. Department of State. Biographic Register of the Department of State. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951.

Foreign Service Handbook: Classification Standards: Administrative. Lithographed, Department of State, February, 1950.

Foreign Service Manual. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951.

Manual of Regulations and Procedures. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949.

U. S. Congress, House of Representatives. Hearings on the Diplomatic and Consular Appropriation Bill. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1912 to 1924.

House Committee Reports and Documents on the Foreign Service of the United States. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1830 to date. A complete collection of these documents is in the Library of Congress.

U. S. Congress, Senate. Hearings on the Diplomatic and Consular Appropriation Bill. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1912-1924.

Senate Committee Reports and Documents on the Foreign Service of the United States. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1830 to date. A complete collection of these documents is in the Library of Congress.

U. S. General Services Administration. Federal Register. Washington: Government Printing Office, various issues.

#### Government Publications: Specific Subject

Adkins, Dorothy C. Construction and Analysis of Achievement Tests. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1947.

Analysis of Personnel Improvement Plan of the Department of State. A Report Prepared for Use of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by the Department of State. Committee Print, 82d. Cong., 1st sess., April 1951.

Brookings Institution. The Administration of Foreign Affairs and Overseas Operation: A Report Prepared for the Bureau of the Budget Executive Office of the President. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951.

Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Report on Federal Personnel, Appendix H. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949.

\_\_\_\_\_. Foreign Affairs. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949.

\_\_\_\_\_. Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Affairs: Task Force Report. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949.

Davis, Frederick B. The AAF Qualifying Examination. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1947.

Partners in Progress: Report of the International Development Board. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951.

Report to the President on Foreign Economic Policies. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950.

Rowe, James H. Jr., Robert Ramspeck, and William E. De Courcy. An Improved Personnel System for the Conduct of Foreign Affairs: A Report to the Secretary of State by the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Personnel. Washington: Department of State, August 1950.

U. S. Civil Service Commission. Selecting Supervisors. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951.

U. S. Department of State. Questions and Answers on Personnel Operations Under the Secretary's Personnel Improvement Directive. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1951.

U. S. Department of State. The U. S. Foreign Service: A Career for Young Americans. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952.

#### Published Papers and Correspondence

Adams, Charles F. The Works of John Adams. 10 v. Philadelphia: Little, Brown & Co., 1850-56.

Baker, George E. ed. The Works of William A. Seward. 5 v. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1884.

Barrett, John S. ed. Correspondence of Andrew Jackson. 7 v. Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1926-35.

Bryan, William J. and Mary Baird Bryan. The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan. Philadelphia: United Publishers of America, 1925.

Curtis, George W. The Correspondence of John Lathrop Motley. 2 v. New York: Harpers, 1889.

- Hamilton, Stanislaus, ed. The Writings of James Monroe. 7 v. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1900.
- Hendrick, Burton Jr. Life and Letters of Walter H. Page. 3 v. New York, Doubleday, Page, 1922-25.
- Hull, Cordell. Memoirs of Cordell Hull. New York: Macmillan, 1948.
- Huntington-Wilson, Francis Mairs. Memoirs of an Ex-Diplomat. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1945.
- Jefferson, Thomas. The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. 7 v. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1871.
- Johnson, Elliot. The American Diplomatic Code 1778-1834. 2 v. Washington: Jonathan Elliot, 1834.
- Madison, James. Letters and Other Writings of James Madison. 4 v. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1865.
- Morison, Elting, ed. The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt. 4 v. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Roosevelt, Elliot. E.D.R.: His Personal Letters. New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1947-1950.
- Seymour, Charles. The Intimate Papers of Colonel House. 4 v. New York: Houghton-Mifflin 1926-1928.
- Thayer, William Roscoe. Life and Letters of John Hay. 2 v. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1915.
- Wharton, Francis, ed. Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889.

#### Secondary Source Materials

##### Books

- Ashton-Gwatkin, Frank T. The British Foreign Service. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, no date, c. 1950.
- Bailey, Thomas A. A Diplomatic History of the American People. 4th ed. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1950.
- Barrows, Chester L. William M. Everts. Chapel Hill: North Carolina University Press, 1941.
- Beaulac, Willard. Career Ambassador. New York: Macmillan, 1951.
- Bemis, Samuel Flagg, ed. The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy. 10 v. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1927-29.

- Bernstorff, Count Johann von. My Three Years in America. New York: Random House, 1936.
- Caldwell, Lynton. The Administrative Theories of Hamilton and Jefferson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.
- Callieres, Francois de. The Practice of Diplomacy. London: Constable, 1919.
- Childs, James Rives. American Foreign Service. New York: Henry Holt, 1948.
- Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada. Employee Training in the Public Service. Chicago: Civil Service Assembly, 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Oral Tests in Public Personnel Selection. Chicago: Civil Service Association, 1943.
- Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel. Better Government Personnel. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935.
- Davis, Frederick B. Item Analysis Data. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1946.
- Educational Testing Service. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees, 1949-1950. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1950.
- Fitspatrick, J. C. ed. Autobiography of Martin Van Buren. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1920.
- Foster, John W. A Century of American Diplomacy. New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1900.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Diplomatic Memoirs. 2 v. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Practice of Diplomacy. New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1906.
- Francis, David R. Russia From the American Embassy. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1921.
- Guilford, Jay P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936.
- Hoffman, Paul. Peace Can be Won. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1951.
- Hunt, Gaillard. The Department of State of the United States. New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1914.
- James, Henry. Richard Olney and His Public Service. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1923.
- Jessup, Philip C. Elihu Root. New York: Doid-Head, 1936.

- Johnston, C. E. Job Analysis, Job Evaluation and Merit Rating. Scranton, Penna: International Textbook Co., 1945.
- Jones, C. L. The Consular Service of the United States. Philadelphia: Cooperative, 1906.
- Kingsley, J. Donald, et al. Recruiting Applicants for the Public Service. Chicago: Civil Service Assembly, 1942.
- Lay, Tracy. The Foreign Service of the United States. New York: Prentice Hall, 1928.
- London, Kurt, (with the help of Kent Ives). How Foreign Policy is Made. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1949.
- Mathews, J. M. American Foreign Relations. New York: Century Co., 1928.
- McCamy, James L. The Administration of American Foreign Affairs. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1950.
- Mee, John F. ed. Personnel Handbook. New York: Ronald Press, 1951.
- Meriam, Lewis. Personnel Administration in the Federal Government. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Public Personnel Problems. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1938.
- National Business League of America. Pointed Paragraphs on the Merit System vs. the Spoils System in re the American Consular Service. 5th ed. Chicago: Stromberg Allen, 1909.
- National Civil Service Reform League. Report on the Foreign Service. National Civil Service Reform League, 1919.
- Nevins, Allan. Grover Cleveland. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1933.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Henry White. New York: Harpers, 1930.
- Nicolson, Harold G. Diplomacy. New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1950.
- Parks, Wallace J. United States Administration of its International Economic Affairs. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1951.
- Petrie, Sir Charles. Early Diplomatic History: 1492-1713. New York: Macmillan, 1949.
- Flichke, Elmer. Conduct of American Diplomacy. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1950.
- Pensonby, Arthur. Democracy and Diplomacy. London: Methuen, 1915.

- Poole, DeWitt C. Conduct of Foreign Relations Under Modern Democratic Conditions. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924.
- Satow, Sir Ernest. A Guide to Diplomatic Practice. 3d ed., 2 v. London: Longmans Green, 1932.
- Sparks, Jared, ed. The Writings of George Washington. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1837.
- Stein, Harold. The Foreign Service Act of 1926. Washington: Committee on Public Administration Cases, 1949.
- Stuart, Graham H. American Diplomatic and Consular Practice. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Department of State: A History of Its Organization, Procedure, and Personnel. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949.
- University of Michigan. Human Relations Program of the Survey Research Center. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1950.
- Van Dyne, Frederick. Our Foreign Service. Rochester, New York: Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Co., 1909.
- Wellesley, Sir Victor. Diplomacy in Fetters. London, Hutchinson, 1944.
- White, Leonard D. Government Career Service. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.
- Wilson, Hugh R. Diplomat Between Wars. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Diplomacy as a Career. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1941.

#### Periodicals

All articles indexed in Poole, W. F. and W. I. Fletcher. Poole's Index to Periodical Literature, 1802-1906. New York: Peter Smith, 1938; Nineteenth Century Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, 1890-1899. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1944; Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature. Minneapolis and New York: H. W. Wilson, 1900-1952; International Index to Periodicals. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1920-1952; and Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Supplement. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1907-1920 under the headings, "U. S. Diplomatic and Consular Service," "U. S. Foreign Service," and "Diplomatic and Consular Service" were consulted.

**Newspapers**

**New York Daily Tribune. 1860-1901.**

**New York Times. 1897-1947.**

**Washington Post. 1902-1925.**

**Washington Times. 1904.**