

Posted by [REDACTED]@ 2008-09-30 12:28:03

Tags: technological obsolescence

Mood: okay

(U) In what year was this statement made?

~~(S//SI//REL)~~ "There is a consensus of managers who agree that a number of employees have passed their prime or have reached a technologically obsolescent state. These employees are generally in the higher ages and grades and have over 20 years of service."

(U) UPDATED: Answer will be posted on THURSDAY. :)

made with [cross-post.user.js](#)

1427 [REDACTED]@ 2008-09-30 12:30:55

(U) My Guess

(U) 1965

1428 [REDACTED]@ 2008-09-30 12:44:48

(U) I agree with 1965. It would have to have been before EEO law regarding age would have made the "passed their prime" remark discriminatory. Or at least I'd hope it was before that.

written with [Text Helper](#)

1429 [REDACTED]@ 2008-09-30 13:06:05

Don't Know But My Guess...

~~(S//SI)~~ Hmmm, Google did not bring anything back for that phrase, so it is probably not in digital text. So it is probably more recent verbal statement, or a print statement older than 1992. While I think there is something to be said about the 1960s for this statement, I am going more recent and verbal. I'm thinking it is 1998 and Lt Gen Kenneth A. Minihan. I'm guessing this is referring to employees who learned SIGINT in an era of single channel push to talk radios and 30 channel multichannel, then found the idea of learning about IP technologies just was not their cup of tea.

1431 re 1430 [REDACTED]@ 2008-09-30 14:21:16

Aw, c'mon. You're off by at least 400 years! The wheelbarrow was introduced in Europe sometime during the 1220s CE.

1434 re 1429 [REDACTED]@ 2008-09-30 14:33:36

Re: Don't Know But My Guess...

(U) I'm thinking that it was fairly recent as well.

1435 [] @ 2008-09-30 15:25:12

(U) Every year

1436 [] @ 2008-09-30 15:30:03

Cohort Passed their Prime

My first guess is the employees subject to this opprobrium probably were the cohort assembled early in WW-II. As many of these were already government employees (civilian or military), I would estimate the date of the remark at late 1950s.

My second guess would be the cohort that ballooned for the Korean War, and the date of the remark would be in the mid 1960s to early 1970s.

And my third guess for the date would be in the late 1970s to early 1980s, when the Vietnam War cohort was so large and occupying so many of the higher positions that it was sometimes said only half in jest that the only way to get a promotion was to catch your boss alone in the parking lot and kill him, thereby freeing up his billet.

1437 re 1436 [] @ 2008-09-30 16:09:09

Re: Cohort Passed their Prime

...the only way to get a promotion was to catch your boss alone in the parking lot and kill him, thereby freeing up his billet.

"You know what they say, Captain--you die, and we all move up in rank."--Ensign Pavel Chokov (mirror version), late 1960s or late 23rd century (depending on your point of view)

1441 [] @ 2008-09-30 17:12:27

(U) IANACAO

(U) Why is this S//SI//REL? Seems like U//FOUO under the personnel exemption.

1442 re 1441 [] @ 2008-09-30 17:13:37

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U) That is the classification of the document the quote comes from; the document pre-dates portion marking.

1443 re 1441 [] @ 2008-09-30 17:14:33

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U) Even more precisely, that is modern translation of the classification given on the document.

1444 re 1443 [] @ 2008-09-30 17:15:03

(b) (3) -P.L. 86-36

1444 re 1442 [redacted] @ 2008-09-30 17:43:03

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U) Now I'm intrigued. Can you give us the classification authority or derived from block for the document?

1445 re 1444 [redacted] @ 2008-09-30 17:47:19

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U) The document does not have that information on it! :)

1446 re 1442 [redacted] @ 2008-09-30 17:51:28

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U) Also, I would love it if you could figure out when portion marking began and add it to [redacted]

1447 re 1446 [redacted] @ 2008-09-30 18:04:32

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U) That shouldn't be too hard to do, I'll put it on my list. :)

1448 [redacted] @ 2008-09-30 18:22:41

I'm going to guess 1919 and given your last comment, I'm going to guess it's a Soviet Document (possibly Lenin?).

1449 [redacted] @ 2008-09-30 18:25:27

(U//FOUO) I vote mid- to late 60s. The "passed their prime" is shamefully dated, "obsolescent" is old school and "consensus" wasn't a buzzword until the 60s, I think. Starting elementary school in the 70s I am not totally sure of that, mind you.

1451 re 1441 [redacted] @ 2008-09-30 21:57:23

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U) The classification could be legit. Assuming the worst case -- that it is an evaluation of the capabilities of the cryptologic system from someone who "should know" -- it reveals potential weaknesses to adversaries. it could cause serious harm to the US Government: thus SECRET//COMINT.

(C//REL) If the quote is coming from a senior agency official in a context where it was not expected to be released, it could be taken as an accurate assessment. If I were an adversary with access to such an evaluation and comment, I could accelerate my rate of communications technology investment as one way to deny the US government access to my information. It could also allow me to accept the risk of dispersing communications to wider elements with lower grades of crypto than if the comment, in a similar context, were "Our workforce has not been complacent about the march of technology; with a

(b) (3) - P, L, 86-36

serious effort devoted to training, our experts of the last decade's technology are now experts in the current's." [REDACTED]

1452 re 1451 [REDACTED] @ 2008-09-30 22:01:03

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U) I'd buy SECRET based on that reasoning, but I don't see the COMINT.

1453 re 1452 [REDACTED] @ 2008-09-30 22:17:33

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U?) If it's referring specifically to NSA, then it is identifying a cryptologic weakness --> COMINT. I'm assuming that the classification of classifying cryptologic weaknesses/vulnerabilities as COMINT is UNCLASSIFIED.

(U) I agree, though, that the COMINT is iffy: it may not reach the level of specificity that usually triggers COMINT.

1454 re 1453 [REDACTED] @ 2008-09-30 23:31:40

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U) I dunno, reading through the COMINT classification guide leads me to disagree.

(TS//REL) [REDACTED]

(TS//SI//REL) [REDACTED]

(U) Ultimately, I think this might all just fall under A.1 because no particular modes of communication or adversaries are mentioned, which would make it UNCLASSIFIED.

(U) And yes, I picked those examples just so that I could set the classification of the paragraphs to a known level :)

1456 re 1442 [REDACTED] @ 2008-10-01 11:01:28

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U/FOUO) As I recall portion marking started in the late '70's, so I'd say this quote was from the mid '60's.

1457 re 1449 [REDACTED] @ 2008-10-01 15:40:17

(U) Based on the semantics, that's what I thought, too.

(b) (3) - P.L. 86-36

(b) (1)
(b) (3) - 50 USC 3024(i)
(b) (3) - P.L. 86-36

(b) (3) - P.L. 86-36

1458 [redacted]@ 2008-10-01 15:42:22

(U) There are a number of good guesses. If someone happens to have hit on the correct answer, it would be kinda fun to take the responses and create a quick poll.

1461 re 1456 [redacted]@ 2008-10-02 09:47:20

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U//~~FOUO~~) Portion marking in reporting started in the late 70s; portion marking of other documents definitely came later.

1462 [redacted]@ 2008-10-02 11:33:28

(U) It was 1973

(S//~~SL~~//~~REL~~) This quote was taken from the April 1973 "Inspector General Report of Interviews with Top-Level NSA Executives". The report was classified SECRET HVCCO, and I did not want to put it through declass before posting to the journal, hence the clearly too-high classification.

(S//~~SL~~//~~REL~~) The quote was part of a section recommending a mandatory retirement age and/or a RIF program "to rid the Agency of its incompetents, misfits, and complacent, older employees".

(U//~~FOUO~~) Found in the NSA Archives [redacted] in the process of research for an article on all the various performance appraisal systems the Agency has experienced. I hope the article will be finished in the not-too-distant future, but I keep running across new stuff to read. :)

1467 re 1466 [redacted]@ 2008-10-02 17:24:21

(U) Gosh, I suspect they are long gone, but it would be funny! :)

1474 re 1461 [redacted]@ 2008-10-06 15:12:25

Re: (U) IANACAO

(U) For what it's worth, President Carter introduced the requirement for portion marking in his executive order (EO) regarding protection/classification of national security information in 1978. This requirement was absorbed by subsequent EOs, including the current one, EO 12958, signed by President Bush in 2003.

(b) (3) - P.L. 86-36

(b) (3) - P.L. 86-36