

New U. S. Jobs Went to Half Of State Department 'Risks'

Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 23—The State Department's list of employes separated from its service as security risks in 1953 was disclosed today. The list involved 590 persons, of whom

eleven had been held disloyal.

Action against seven of the eleven was originated during the Truman Administration.

Ten others were accused of fraud or dishonesty in making up their personnel records.

On the other hand, 291 of the 590, almost half of the total, had been transferred to other government jobs, apparently with records clear enough to keep them employed in Federal establishments.

The State Department report, submitted after Representative John J. Rooney, Democrat of Brooklyn, had threatened to withhold appropriations unless a breakdown was given, also showed that among the 590:

¶Resignations, for reasons not given, had numbered 188.

¶Fifty employes had been separated through economy reductions in force.

¶The temporary employment of thirty-six had expired.

¶Four had retired.

¶Ninety-nine involved "homosexual deviations" as the principal factor, and 278 similar cases were under investigation with no determinations yet made.

The State Department report indicated that in seven Government departments and agencies employing more than 760,000 workers, separations under the security risk Executive Order of President Eisenhower that became effective last July numbered at least 1,057. Loyalty, it appeared, was involved in forty of the cases.

New Breakdown Promised

In the background was a phase of the President's Message on the State of the Union last month in which he indicated that 2,200 persons had been separated from Government service as security risks under that Executive Order.

Some Republican spokesmen interpreted this to mean that most if not all of those separated were subversives. Democrats demanded a breakdown, and one, breaking causes for separation into four general categories, was promised.

Today the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to conduct an investigation into the "security risk" separations. Special attention, it was indicated, would be given those who had moved into other Government positions. Hearings were scheduled to start next Tuesday.

Before this investigative move, Democrats of Appropriations subcommittees of the House of Representatives had voted to get their own breakdowns of reasons for separations. As spokesmen from departments and agencies appeared to request funds for the fiscal year to start July 1, they have peppered them with demands for specific information on "security risk" separations from jobs.

In the transcript made public today the principal witness in this field was Scott McLeod, administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. He

Continued on Page 12, Column 5

291 OF 590 'RISKS' GOT NEW U. S. JOBS

Continued From Page 1

contended that the purpose and operations of the State Department's security risk program had been misinterpreted. He explained:

"Under the [Eisenhower] Executive Order, when a person's case was evaluated under the old Truman loyalty-security order [of 1947]; it must be re-evaluated under 10450 [President Eisenhower's Executive Order]. So to set up the machinery on this phase, we took those cases which had previously been through the old process and scheduled them for readjudication under this new order.

"When any person left the department, for whatever reason, who was on that list, we notified the Civil Service Commission that this unresolved security-integrity question existed in order that any other Federal agency which might employ that person would be aware of this situation and would inquire into it with respect to the sensitivity of the job he was to be assigned to.

"This is meant to be, and in my judgment is, justification of the fact that the department in reporting these figures to the Civil Service Commission, reported people who left the service by whatever means, which included transfers.

"That has been subjected to attack as a dishonest reporting device. I do not defend it. I can only explain it."

In stating the Eisenhower Executive Order contained "more stringent" standards "than ever experienced before," Mr. McLeod contended that its purpose also had been a mere security risk order: it was a "security and integrity" order, he said.

"The investigation attempts to look into a man's background up to the day when you evaluate his security potential * * * On the basis of the information you

have * * * you attempt to project into the future a judgment as to whether or not he is potentially a security hazard," he declared.

"I make this point because you cannot prove how this fellow is going to act in the future. This is a human judgment. It is not susceptible to proof, because it involves future acts.

"I think frequently the public gets the impression that the security program is designed to somehow punish a man for what he has done in the past. This is not the purpose of this program. It is an attempt to project into the future what the pattern of behavior and conduct of this individual will be, from what he has exhibited in the past, and whether or not that is likely to be a danger to the Government."

Mr. McLeod testified that after consulting a dictionary he had found the best definition of "security" to be "freedom from exposure to danger."

The New York Times

Published: February 24, 1954

Copyright © The New York Times