

There were a certain amount of man-year efforts, certain standards of productivity put into history before the subject reorganization. The proposed reorganized Historical Division reflects the same number of man years and ability to continue past standards and productivity. All of our commitments to Chief of Staff and comments to G-1 Board were premised on the foregoing. If we do not hold to them, our commitments break down. In our several Check Sheets to you we detailed the reasons for setting up position, and listed distinct duties and responsibilities and recommended classifications. These were based on the former premises, on our idea of comparable position levels, of past and proposed organization, and any increase and decrease of duties and responsibilities between these comparable position levels. We should establish what are these comparable position levels.

Colonel Connor: Lets take Top Positions first - Hutchinson's.

Miss Rodekuhr: Established as Deputy Chief of Section, and job was Deputy. Also had two major operations reports, Historical Project and Editorial Summation. His job was coordinating work of those projects. In addition two major functions. His major responsibility for equally guiding the two of them and coordinating their work. He made contacts, met deadlines, rush work at present time and created the need for an additional person to handle projects current. You needed an assistant.

Your new organization. A statistical branch from standpoint of top position, supervisory of major projects can be construed to former Chief Historian job. Responsibility is same. Same amount of man-power would be applied to History. Formerly, time of Editorial Analyst working on monograph assignment was supervisors that got assignment in Historical Division. It is no longer coordinating the Summation and workload with job brought about by Summation. One of the number of people supervised; not a controlling factor, the addition of a major project as a responsibility of one person adds to complexity. Those were the things in grading the Deputy of Chief's job. The controlling elements are no longer present. More relief now, more like the Historical Chief's job than former Deputy Chief's job. I don't want to indicate it is on the line, but it is exactly the same job. However, there is a spread between P-5 and P-6. May be there is a difference within the P-6 level. There is a certain amount of difference in extra supervisors generally than was for Deputy Chief of Section. Responsible only to Chief of Section. Deputy does not stand at a CAF-14 or a P-6 level. (Here Miss Rodekuhr read the job description of Deputy Chief of Section)

The five allocating factors in grading a job are:

1. Subject matter or Occupation.
- XX 2. Difficulty and complexity.

3. Non-supervisory Responsibilities.
4. Supervisory Responsibilities.
5. Minimum Qualification Requirements.
(Miss Rodekuhr read subject matter of each of these titles.)

Colonel Unger: The Deputy was charged with planning, coordinating and reviewing many important functions contributing to the History which were not charged to the old Chief Historian. The duties and responsibilities occasioned by recently initiating the Special Projects, did not exist when the old Chief Historian's job was authorized.

Miss Rodekuhr: These are projects that are going to be a part of the History. Chief Historian's job is producing the History of SCAP. Major projects are going to produce monographs of military nature and are questionable as to where they show. Will give a bird's eye view of what goes into the History. This is a necessary part of developing a history. Has been considered.

Colonel Unger: Take actualities. Until recently no special projects had been undertaken, no mention of them in a job description and no historian charged with these monographs. It stands to reason that initiation of these projects will increase the work on Chief Historian.

Miss Rodekuhr: Special Projects are a part of the history. From outside point of view they are part of history to be written, are a standard pattern of the history.

Colonel Unger: We have now reached the time where we must pick up these additional functions. Read from CN SRS to CPS, dated 27 January; re comparison of Deputy Chief's job with proposed Editor-in-Chief; duties of old Deputy and old Chief Historian; and how the sum of the last two, plus those occasioned by initiating of Special Projects, equal proposed Editor-in-Chief's position.

Miss Rodekuhr: We agree several phases are parallel but job classification remains to be allocated.

Mr. Hanna: How does Editor-in-Chief job differ from Chief Historian job?

Colonel Unger: The proposed Editor-in-Chief is charged with the following which were not charged to the old Chief Historian:

(1) Coordination of the historical contributions made by the Editorial, Statistical and Historical Divisions.

(2) The initiation of the Special Projects, and their coordination with the basic monographs. (In substance, all duties others than those pertaining to the preparation of the 50-odd basic monographs). This includes determination of technical

matters on layouts of charts, graphs and tables, Statistical Annex, etc., which must be considered at this time so that current efforts will meet reproduction requirements. Editorial planning and review was definitely charged to the Chief of the old Editorial Division, as was the coordination of the layout of the efforts of the Statistical Division.

Mr. Hanna: Apparently leading up to the point, with these additions and complexities based on productivity, add to importance of job which bears out your contention to a higher grade. Since your Chief Historian has actually moved up to another place on organization chart, we think the addition of those monographs or special projects differ in a material way from the way the history has been going on all this time.

do not

Colonel Unger: We believe it is a true picture to say we want to upgrade the old Chief Historian position. We believe it more appropriate to consider that the old Deputy is simply moved over into the new Historical Division into which all functions contributing to the preparation of the History are now concentrated. We are now at the stage when we must initiate other known projects necessary to complete the History. These Special Projects have a definite bearing and guidance on the basic 50-odd monographs. Certain detailed description on fundamentals common to many monographs will be deleted therefrom and will be treated in the Introductory Monograph (or monographs). These different titles to similar references developed in the several monographs have to be unified or standardized.

A working-index for each monograph to insure continuity and consistency have to be constantly extended. The weight given associated matters in different monographs has to be continually analyzed. Bibliography has to be developed. Indexing of monographs is not only essential to the finished product but is a time-saver in current research. All SCAP's and Chiefs of Sections principal papers have to be located and analyzed as to their incorporation in the History and the relative weight to be given, associated matters in the History. There was a great amount of this basic evaluation work indirectly done for the history in the old days before the Summation was eliminated. The Statistical Annex is quite comprehensive and will include all statistical tables necessary to substantiate and clarify textual treatment. The introductory volume will include, but not be limited to, many monographs treating on a horizontal plane, many of SCAP's activities not covered by basic monographs, such as the Administration of the Occupation, Repatriation, Impact of the Logistical Support of the Occupation on Japan's Economy, Demobilization, The Allied Council for Japan, etc. These monographs will likewise have affect on basic monographs, and cannot be prepared independently.

Mr. Hanna: Your basic monographs go back a little ways before the Occupation?

PRUETT: To the Meiji Era.

Colonel Unger: The complexity and scope of the old Chief Historian position have increased due to initiation of these Special Projects.

Miss Rodekuhr: There is another point. You can go down the line and take the history of any job and find you have a rating of P-6 and find that the work is there, although not being done. Grade was established because that was intended to be the responsibility for the person writing non-military history. Each of them has been responsible for planning and determining the scope.

Colonel Unger: But in this case the cited functions were specifically charged to other than the old Chief Historian. For example, those charged to the Deputy and those to the Chief, Editorial Division.

I feel that the functions in new Editor-in-Chief job are a consolidation of those previously carried by old Deputy, the old Chief Historian and the Chief, Editorial Division, plus those occasioned by initiating the special centralized projects; and that the Editor-in-Chief's job is comparable to the old Deputy's job, rather than the old Chief Historian.

Miss Rodekuhr: In other words, the description isn't the same. In reality a job set the responsibility of new job, it would be very closely written in the same way as that to the history and the Summation. Dropped one of the major projects, and now has only one instead of the two.

Colonel Unger: In reality we are transferring authorized historical functions previously performed outside of the Historical Division (for economy of personnel) into the new Historical Division. The functions of the old Deputy as to the Summation have been dropped-- but the consolidated functions of the Editor-in-Chief are as broad and complexed as those previously performed by the Deputy.

Miss Rodekuhr: Fifty percent of Editorial Analyst work was supervised by the Chief Historian.

Colonel Unger: It appears that the functions of the old Chief Historian's position plus these of the old Deputy and the added functions occasioned by the initiation of Special Projects is comparable in scope and complexity to those of the Editor-in-Chief.

Miss Rodekuhr: I feel that some are temporary, that Special Projects were provided for in Chief Historian's job.

Mr. Hanna: Chief Historian responsible for History in all of its phases. Consideration has been given to all phases of Chief Historian's job as established at P-6 before Deputy was authorized.

Colonel Unger: It is believed that old Deputy job is comparable with new Chief's job when analyzed by duties and responsibilities.

Miss Rodekuhr: Five points used in job classification. (These were repeated).

Colonel Unger: As I feel that difficulty and complexity of proposed Chief's job is comparable to that of old Deputy's job, I feel that the new and old historian jobs are comparable as there has been no change in assigned duties and responsibilities. (Here was read job description of proposed historian's job of July 1948). In both cases the historian is given a monograph assignment, in about five days presents and discusses proposed outline of same with immediate supervisor; supervisor reviews monograph and passes his thoughts on to historian, who from then on, is on his own. P-5 set up for historian to get maximum high standards and productivity. However, our tabulation is slightly off on this point; we should have recommended half the historians for P-5, and the other half as P-4 for a more comparable production capacity to the old organization. The P-4 could be provided periodic supervisor (not given P-5s) as was done with the Editorial and Research Analysts--thus not violating "equal pay for equal work."

Miss Rodekuhr: We could not pay 1/2 and 1/2. We have accepted your organization. Miss Kiredjian and you discussed more branches. Don't believe we would have any complaint to make if you should break down your branches, say 3 instead of 2, or 4 instead of 3. That is up to you because of responsibility of scheduling work. Positions we have been studying are basic historians and supervisors as established. If work is charged and you have 4 branches, then it would be possible, 16 people in 3 branches.

Under this organization you have a historical supervisor for 7 historians. Many reasons why historians should be P-4; 14 jobs, assignment of monograph, and shifting historians from one panel to another.

Colonel Unger: What are your specific reasons justifying the writer's position being downgraded from P-5 to P-4?

Miss Rodekuhr: The P-5 was established back in 1945 when we had four historians subject to assignment of any of the 54 monographs. CPS was mistaken in assigning, thinking we had specialists. Since that was an erroneous assumption, they were carried as P-5 all along.

Colonel Unger: P-5 jobs were surveyed by CPS many times subsequent to the initial classification-allocation.

Miss Rodekuhr: Last time I can think of was in July 1948.

Colonel Unger: (On subject of temporary Historians, read conclusions of Joint CPS-SRS Conference, July 1948: -- after acknowledging that flexibility existed in assigning monographs to writers--CPS stated that it had no intention of reanalyzing Historian P-5 job with an idea of downgrading.)

Miss Rodekuhr: Believe that the thought was, if permanent organization remained and temporary historians were eliminated you would have a Chief Historian and 6 writers. Cannot justify P-5 for these jobs today.

Colonel Unger: There seems to be a variation of divergence in interpretation of regulations as applied to key historian position-classifications.

Chief Historian is charged with preparing a history of about 378 pages; his source data is firm and is not comparable in scope or complexity with the SCAP nonmilitary history. There are employees working on unit history and section history, whose ratings are equal or higher than allotted to SRS. Classification of key historical positions in headquarters of Germany and Austria occupation forces, and in the Antilles Command.

Miss Rodekuhr: Austria P-6 and Germany P-7.

Colonel Unger: Antilles Command has a P-6 and several P-5's for preparing a history whose scope and complexity would not be imagined as comparable to General MacArthur's History.

Miss Rodekuhr: I am certain we have no historian jobs set up to write unit histories. G-2 has a P-7, but I prefer not to get into too much discussion on that. I did not grade it personally but know a little bit about the G-2 history.

Colonel Unger: We feel that the Nonmilitary History of SCAP will be very important to the Supreme Commander--and that we should consider it, at least of equal importance to other occupation histories.

Miss Rodekuhr: As to historians, if we admit an error, and we do admit the error in our interpretation, but we are still faced with the standards and I feel there is not much opportunity for deciding whether the jobs should be P-5 or P-4 levels. It is very difficult for us to justify unless we see organization charts and job descriptions.

Colonel Unger: If there is an element of doubt I think we should assist rather than hinder a SCAP activity. I would like to discuss CPS's broadening the provisions of "Competitive Level" which automatically favors SRS to lose the services of 4 of its 5 top key-employees. (Here Colonel Unger read Inclosure A.)

Before we can determine whether an individual can be considered in a competitive level we must find out what specific duties and responsibilities of that position are, and then apply the subject individual's known accepted qualifications against those specified duties and responsibilities.

Mr. Hanna: Generally speaking, you are right. In the first place, our interpretation in the application of those regulations which you read a little while ago are not being adhered to as closely as they are written there. We feel we are having a regular clam bake out here, and the regulations as you apply them in the States are not normally for use out here. We have taken this stand, that in the States that all people in particular grades and types of work are considered for reduction in force; but here we have narrowed down to one area, to individual sections, and in one section broken down to divisions so that our area is broken down. In determining of a group of employees as to who is to be separated we feel termination or interchangeability of jobs, if you could switch those incumbents. Those two people should be considered together. Those incumbents, their nature of position we could narrow down to one specific individual. (1) The help management. (2) It takes away this huge area where you might have to consider one for separation. For example, two clerk-typists, etc.

Colonel Unger: We were advised that CPS had established the broad interpretation of "competitive level" without any discussion with SRS as to its effect on our organization. It is necessary that the qualifications of a specific individual be considered against the requirements of the job before he can be placed in that competitive level. We have 5 people we should consider to see if they meet that requirement of the top historical position. One is eminently qualified for, and has been approved by CPS the duties and responsibilities proposed in that job; he has general background knowledge of the history of the Orient before and during the war, and detailed knowledge concerning all activities subsequent to the Surrender; he is also well qualified to determine technical reproduction requirements so same can be applied during current preparation. The others are eminently qualified in certain fields, but have not the proven qualifications to meet all the requirements of the position. It appears unnecessary, and perhaps harmful to the historical mission, to place all these people in that competitive level before their qualifications for the requirements thereof have been fully considered.

Mr. Hanna: We felt that because you were doing away with the old organization and setting up a new organization what we should do for you was to write our letter in such a way so you could hand-pick your people, let those go you don't want and retain those you want.

Colonel Unger: Under the interpretation CPS gave us, we will automatically lose 4 of our five key individuals. This will leave us to direct the history as Chief, one employee, recently assigned, who has yet to prove he has qualifications to meet the requirements of the position; and one historian to assist him who has had some experience in coordinating the historical efforts of the Editorial and Research Analysts working in the Social and Political field. CPS advised that Hutchinson could not qualify for the Chief, Historical Division under their broad concept of "competitive levels." Wildes had 8 retention points and Linzel 11, but CPS said adjustments could be

made so Wildes could get the job. That would leave Linzel for a P-4 job, which she couldn't be expected to take. Battistini will not take a P-5 job. Ivory a P-6 Statistician in Korea, now a P-5 Chief Statistician, could not, under CPS's interpretation, be considered even for a P-4 Statistician. Of these 5 people outstanding in their field; Linzel and Hutchinson have been associated in the preparation of the History for 3 years, and the last 17 months had sole over-all responsibility for directional and editorial planning, coordination and review, are losses. Battistini had done superior work as a historian for about one year and is qualified for higher responsibilities, but will leave if only offered a P-5 job. Wildes has been with us a short while, has excellent qualifications as a historian, but no proven qualifications for the other requirements remain available. As previously stated, Ivory is forced out with no replacement in SRS for Chief Statistician job of the 26 employees recommended for the 26 positions in the new organization; 16 would be downgraded; the 10 not involved in downgrading are the clerk-typists and the editorial research analysts. This would, in effect, sabotage the continuing economic preparation of the history.

Mr. Hanna: That is what Colonel Connor had in mind. These points you just brought out emphasizes quite strongly and your particular mission given much consideration.

Colonel Unger: My Statistician was a P-6 in Korea and took a P-5 here and was downgraded to a P-4. He would have been thrown out of a job because according to CPS ^{competitive-level ranking} he is not qualified for continuing the duties and responsibilities he has been carrying. That leaves us a veteran, who is not qualified, but who must be considered under what I believe is illogical CPS application of "Competitive Level".

Mr. Hanna. Veterans take a preference over material factors was decided by Congress and thrown in the hands of CPS for administration and the way laws are written make it practically impossible to do other than carry out the instructions.

Colonel Unger: CPS does not have to, nor should, broaden a competitive level that necessitates consideration of employees not having qualifications to meet job requirements. "Pete" you take the responsibility on your shoulders if you say that a certain statistical analyst is qualified for the job as Chief Statistician.

Mr. Hanna: We take into consideration one other point. Probably would not have come out in just this way. We would investigate by taking papers to Colonel and asking him if Webber has the qualifications. We take group of people and lump them and before any RIF takes place, we analyze each person. From the people who received that letter, you can hand-pick the people you want.

Colonel Connors: Those are all taken from the record here, and that is all we have to go on.

Colonel Unger: That may be so, but CPS already told us that Ivory was out and we would have to accept a statistical analyst, unqualified for the requirements. This is the first time SRS has heard of your new interpretation for application of "Competitive Level" and is exactly what it should have been in the first place.

Colonel Connors: Cannot understand why it was not done.

Miss Rodekuhr: Many of these points were discussed on Wednesday, and some discussed this morning.

Mr. Hanna: Do you feel that most of these points are clarified today?

Colonel Unger: Yes, many of them.

Colonel Connors: Want all of them clarified today.

Colonel Unger: All we want to do is keep best personnel and maintain them on the job insofar as regulations will permit. (Read from Regulations). Also, I was forced to feel that some of us had failed to fully abide by agreements and procedure established in our July 48 conference. It would be most helpful if you would show me your determination of position-assignments before we finalize this matter.

Miss Rodekuhr: Tentative organization chart with proficient people presented to Colonel Unger.

Colonel Connors: Can you prepare by tomorrow?

Miss Rodekuhr: Yes. If we can agree, we can accept the reassignment in no time. Will be a matter of making reassignments and adjustments.

Mr. Hanna: Colonel Unger could make known in the meantime the availability of positions to employees.

Colonel Unger: We have very well qualified P-5 historians. What are your opinions about our retaining their service?

Miss Rodekuhr: Of all the people, some will have to take a loss: Linzel, Habel or Cagle, McDonald, Daugherty - in P-5 positions (Historian). CAF-10, four in various states in administrations of downgrading. They lose about \$300 a year.

Colonel Unger: Everything permissible under regulations should be done to prevent unnecessary loss of qualified people.

Mr. Hanna: We have a certain responsibility toward employees and would like to permit Miss Rodekuhr to leave her door open for individuals to discuss any problems. In this particular case, we will be glad to discuss any question more than generously.

NOT SENT

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS
FAR EAST COMMAND
SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS

*Discussed with
Common who suggested
Joint Conference
which was held
26 Jan*

CHECK SHEET

(Do not remove from attached sheets) Col. C.H. Unger: 26-5382

File No:

Subject: Request Review of Classification Allocations

Note No.

From: SRS

To: G-1

Date: 24 January 1949

1

1. On 30 October 1948, SRS received a new manning level involving a reduction of 17 DAC spaces. Initial action taken by SRS to implement the reduction is indicated in CN SRS to G-1, Subject: Manning Level, SRS, dated 17 November 1948. Upon implementation by CPS of pending separation requests and final action in Mr. Erickson's case, SRS's actual strength will be within its new authorized manning level.

The 41 employees who received reduction-in-force letters on 27 Nov 48 were advised that if impossible to offer them a position by 28 December 1948, their active service as a Department of the Army employee of the Far East Command must terminate not more than 90 days from receipt of that notice. It has been impossible to date to offer positions to these employees as positions and position-classifications for the new Historical Division have not yet been established. This has created a very bad morale-situation for these employees in view of their current "stateless" status and their future questionable status.

2. Positions in the Historical Division have not been established due to the undersigned being unable, in the absence of requested information, to concur with CPS's initial classification-allocations which were from 1 to 3 grades lower than those of previously authorized position-levels with comparable duties and responsibilities, except for clerk-typists positions. A number of these downgraded classifications were arrived at without discussion with the undersigned or his personnel coordinator.

Subsequent discussions requested by the undersigned have failed to date to reduce the wide divergence of opinion between CPS and SRS as to:

- a. The comparable position-levels of echelons of SRS which previously contributed to the preparation of the history with positions in the proposed Historical Division.
- b. The difference in specified duties and responsibilities in these comparable position-levels justifying proposed classification downgrading.
- c. The interpretation of regulations pertaining to "competitive levels" as applied to the current reduction-in-force procedure.
- d. Apparent divergence of interpretation of regulations in past and proposed positions with comparable duties and responsibilities as well as in key positions in other historical projects in this headquarters; also, according to what is believed to be the best information available in this headquarters, the apparent inconsistency between the application of regulations to key positions in the proposed Historical Division and their application to comparable positions

(D)

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS
~~FOR EAST COMMAND~~
SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS
CHECK SHEET

(Do not remove from attached sheets)

File No:

Subject: Request Review of Classification Allocations

Note
No.
1
Cont'd

From: SRS

To: G-1

Date: 24 January 1949

in the Germany and Austria Occupation headquarters and in the Antilles Com-
mand.

e. The effect implementation of CPS's proposed classification-alloca-
tions will have on position assignments, as well as on the productivity, standards
and efficient continuity of the Supreme Commander's history of the Occupation.

CPS stated that every consideration has been given to possible
adverse effects of proposed downgrading as a result of this reorganiza-
tion and, that in actuality, only four employees would be subject to
downgrading from P-5 to P-4.

SRS assumes in the absence of information to the contrary, that
the above refer to four P-5s slated for historians. However, in-
dependently of and in addition to the aforementioned downgrading, the
services of four of the five employees deemed eminently qualified for
the top five positions will, without a doubt be lost to SRS in the
immediate or near future, as will the services of other trained and
qualified professional and key clerical employees assigned to or slated
for positions which have been downgraded.

Two of the five employees slated for the top positions have carried
the entire responsibility for over-all directional and editorial plan-
ning and review for over 17 months and have been associated in the
preparation of the History for nearly three years; one of these will be
an automatic loss and the other an undoubted loss under CPS's proposed
action. The third employee in this category, who has been in charge of
the extensive and technical statistical treatment of the history for
over six months and is the only qualified employee in SRS capable of
continuing this phase of the project, will be an automatic loss. The
remaining two employees in this group, one of which will be an undoubted
loss, have eminent records as historical writers and are best qualified
of available employees to provide the high-level professional supervi-
sion essential to insuring the necessary standard of the fifty-odd mono-
graphs, in which capacity they have been functioning for over two months.

3. Should the undersigned be correct in his contention that the above indi-
cated losses are not necessitated by regulations, and in his studied conclusions
as to immediate and near future losses, it is believed that the best interests of
this headquarters, the rights of employees as understood by the undersigned, and
the effective and economical continued preparation of the history are unnecesar-
ily and seriously jeopardized.

*Journal
concerns
columns
have been
inserted*

**GENERAL HEADQUARTERS
FAR EAST COMMAND
CHECK SHEET**

(Do not remove from attached sheets)

File No:

Subject: Request Review of Classification Allocations

Note
No.

From: SRS

To: G-1

Date: 24 January 1949

I
Cont'd

4. In order to decide the correctness of either CPS's or SRS's contentions as noted in paragraph 2 (or make necessary adjustments as may be indicated) and to permit completion of action referred to in paragraph 1 without delay, it is recommended:

That the entire matter referred to herein be reviewed by the Functions and Control Committee or any other impartial agency as deemed appropriate.

cc: CPS

-----C. H. U.-----

27 January 1949

COMPARABLE POSITION LEVELS

(Duties and Responsibilities Summarized)

Previously Authorized

Deputy Chief of Section (CAF-14) 15 July 1948:

1. Works within broad policies established by Section Chief.
2. Maintains liaison with staff section when difficulty is encountered by workers.
3. Coordinates recommendations by Chief of Editorial, Statistical and Historical Divisions.
4. Schedules workload among Editorial, Statistical and Historical Divisions.
5. Reviews from the Chief-of-Section level for over-all Occupation perspective the Divisions' (Historical, Statistical and Editorial) projects for complete, comprehensive and accurate information, high literary standards, and for consistency with SCAP's attitudes and interpretations, and SCAP's reports and records.
6. Must possess general knowledge, education and ability to coordinate and review the work projects of the Editorial, Statistical and Historical Divisions; ability to plan, organize and direct programs of reporting and recording; and ability to insure production.

Currently Proposed

Editor-in-Chief (CAF-14) 4 January 1949:

1. Works under general direction of Section Chief.
2. Consults with staff sections.
3. Coordinates recommendations for changes in policy.
4. Determines allocation of workloads among the major branches of the Division (corresponds to old Editorial, Statistical and Historical Divisions).
5. Reviews monographs for consistency between the Social and Political Panel and the Economic Panel (corresponds to efforts of old Historical Division) and with the Statistical Annex (corresponds to old Statistical Division) and official statements, and reports, press releases, and other media reflecting SCAP's attitudes and interpretations (corresponds to combined effort of old Editorial and Statistical Divisions).
6. Must possess expert knowledge and skill to direct, coordinate and review the various aspects of the history; must exercise a high degree of originality in interpreting and converting general over-all objectives and policies into specific activities and in approving recommended plans and procedures of incumbent's staff (corresponding to the chiefs in the currently authorized organization); and in insuring achievement of Division's missions.

Incl 1

DECLASSIFIED E.O. 12065 SECTION 3-402 / NNDG NO. 775015

27 January 1949

POSITIONS RESPONSIBILITIES

1. In connection with the History, the old Chief Historian had the following major responsibilities:

a. Assignment of monographs to writers, review of progress made on monographs and final editing of monographs prior to submission to Chief of Section.

b. Submission of recommendations to Chief of Section regarding treatment of new topics in the History, but not responsibility for final determination thereof.

2. The old Deputy Chief's position included the following responsibilities:

a. Coordination of effort of Editorial, Statistical and Historical Division toward the history (which included, in addition to reviewing monographs for editorial style and editorial correctness of contents by the Chief Editor, and the comments of the Economic Editor, the Chief Statistician and the Assistant Executive Officer, the preparation of all tabular and graphic presentations to be included in the History).

b. The formulation of plans and assignment of responsibility for, and initiation of essential centralized projects for the history, including:

(1) Introduction Monograph

(2) Survey for determination of appropriate treatment of

(a) Principal public papers of SCAP and SCAP Section Chiefs.

(b) JCS Directives to SCAP and basic pre-surrender international agreements dealing with Japan (Potsdam declaration, Cairo declaration, Moscow Communiqué, etc).

(3) Working bibliography for preparation of the history, and bibliography to be printed as part of the history.

(4) Index to the History.

(5) Survey of printing requirements and facilities.

c. Determination of policy and means of implementation thereof (which formerly was done principally by Chief of Section).

d. Final review of Historical monographs for the Chief of Section, to insure consistency between matters recorded in the history and the treatment previously accorded those matters in official SCAP publications (the Summations, Operations Reports, Official statements of SCAP, etc.)

e. Final review of SCAP's Operations Reports.

Incl 2

3. The recommended Chief Historian position includes the following responsibilities:

a. Coordination of effort of the two major branches producing monographs (which represents approximately the effort under the control of the old Chief Historian); the Statistical effort of the Statistical Branch (which corresponds in scope, complexity and degree of responsibility to that of the old Statistical Division, except that the difficulty of work is increased since the monthly flow of information, formerly received for the Summation, has stopped); the Special Projects (plans for which were under development by old Deputy--not old Chief Historian) coordination of editorial and analytical review of monographs (which includes review and comments by the chiefs of the four major branches of the Division); the establishment of plans and procedures and determination of requirements (in terms of materials, facilities and time) for printing the completed History, and adapting current procedures to such plans so as to facilitate preparation of the History for final reproduction; and review of SCAP's Operations Reports (never a responsibility of old Chief Historian).