

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : CHIEF, ICAPS

DATE: 28 September 1948

FROM : [REDACTED] 25X1A9a

SUBJECT: Functions of ICAPS

*Re: Reorganization of ICAPS.
covering Memo of Sept 16^E*

1. In order that the efforts of the Agency representatives assigned to ICAPS may be more fruitful and productive, I believe that it is very pertinent for us, at this time, to examine into the current responsibilities of the Interdepartmental Coordinating and Planning Staff.

2. Under the National Security Act of 1947, the Director of Central Intelligence is charged with the responsibility "of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several government departments and agencies in the interest of national security." Under such broad authority, several specific duties are enumerated, the second of which reads as follows:

"(2) to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;"

3. Even though it has been mentioned that ICAPS was originally established as a planning unit to set up CIG, I feel that the functions of interdepartmental coordination and planning go far beyond this initial field. "Planning and coordination" is a continuing type of activity which may become progressively more important when an organization is established and operating. *- Believe chiefly on working levels pz*

4. I have frequently stated that I do not believe that ICAPS can carry on its coordinating function in a vacuum. The individuals of ICAPS must constantly get around within their own agencies and within the various organizational levels of CIA to find out what the problems are. Under its present weak enumeration of functions, the operating problems and difficulties will not voluntarily "walk in the door" for ICAPS attention.

5. The question does present itself as to what ICAPS members can do when problems are presented to them since the functions of inspection to substantiate all aspects of a situation and of follow-up to determine whether directives are "lived up to" are not within the scope of ICAPS activities today. This discussion, I believe, leads us, logically, to two basic questions which must be considered:

- (1) Do problems exist today in the intelligence field of interdepartmental coordination and planning?
- (2) If such problems do exist, what is the manner in which the Director of Central Intelligence should attempt to staff his organization to examine the problems, to formulate recommendations for solution, and to see to it that the proposed solutions are complied with?

6. I think it would be somewhat presumptuous for us to decide that all problems in the field of interdepartmental intelligence coordination have been solved by the issuance of NSCID's and DCI's. Difficulties in this field of varying degrees of complexity are arising from day to day, and even though IAC agency representation and liaison have been well established at the operating level, I contend that the Director of Central Intelligence has need for individuals on his immediate staff whose views would not be biased by the operating responsibilities of any particular office. Whenever in the past I have visited offices in CIA or in the intelligence organization of the Department of State, I have invariably received this view from people at the working level. For ICAPS members to act in this capacity, they should, of course, be bolstered by positive directives issued by the Director of Central Intelligence, so that they would not have to feel apologetic about speaking to any of the individuals in the various operating offices.

7. As to the question in 5 (2) supra, we must approach the situation by recognizing that there is in existence today a triple-headed problem involving ICAPS, the Executive for Administration and Management, and the Executive for Inspection and Security. If ICAPS is to do the kind of task which I feel is necessary, steps should be taken to eradicate the foggy "no-man's land" of thinking that exists today regarding the three activities just mentioned. I have never been sold on the reality of the division in the field of coordination between so-called coordination within CIA on substantive intelligence problems and coordination between the various IAC agencies. Neither have I been convinced of the value of the decision which places the function of making "inspections to ascertain the manner in which intelligence activities are being performed at certain installations" under the Office for Inspection and Security. The formulation and issuance of a directive by the National Security Council or by the DCI is a job only half done. The important phase is the inspection and implementation to see that the policies enunciated in the directives affect organization procedures and practices in the manner in which they were intended. The instructional directive for this type of work is contained in paragraph 2 of NSCID No. 1 dated 12 December 1947, in which it states:

"...the Director of Central Intelligence, or representatives designated by him, by arrangement with the head of the department or agency concerned, shall make such surveys and inspections of departmental intelligence material of the various Federal Departments and Agencies relating to the national security as he may deem necessary in connection with his duty to advise the NSC and to make recommendations for the coordination of intelligence activities."

This work can best be carried on by the IAC agency representatives comprising the staff of ICAPS.