

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant to the DD/I (Planning)

SUBJECT : Contribution on US Intelligence -  
Long Term Comparison Project

1. I think you're off to a very good start and at this stage I'd best confine my remarks to comments on the general approach of the paper and the structure of your outline. First a couple of knit-picks about the scope of the paper:

a. Your first sentence should be corrected to read:  
"An intra-governmental task force under the NSC Planning Board is currently examining trends in the relative power position of the US and USSR and of the Free World and the Sino-Soviet Bloc over the next decade."

b. Line 8 should be changed to read: "...has asked us to consider the US and Allied intelligence apparatus...."

2. As you will see in the attached statement of "General Guidance to Contributors" this paper will have to be restructured somewhat if it is to fit into the general context of this exercise. Rather than focusing almost entirely on intelligence devices, processes, and developments the paper should be directed toward certain broad categories of things we need to know about the outside world which are of national security importance i.e., information which would enable us to more accurately assess Soviet Bloc power relative to our own and that of the Free World; information which would enable us to exercise our influence more effectively abroad against the backdrop of the Soviet challenge; information which would contribute to the cohesiveness of Western power etc. In brief we must ask what broad categories of critical questions will intelligence be most concerned with through 1965 and through 1970. Most of these broad questions could be found in the list of topics covered by NIEs over the past two or three years. For example:

a. Soviet Bloc Capabilities for Strategic Attack.

What anticipated intelligence developments will have the most critical bearing on our knowledge of this subject e.g., aerial photography; inspection associated with disarmament or with cessation of nuclear tests; is it likely

-2-

that COMINT will help etc. A section on this question would also include a judgment as to how much better our information will be and in what respects. It should also include a judgment as to the most likely critical deficiencies in our knowledge during this period.

b. Early Warning.

- (1) All-out nuclear war.
- (2) Limited war.

(the approach on this question would be similar to that suggested for a. above)

3. As one line of approach I suggest you consider preparing your paper in two parts. Part I would deal with anticipated improvements and shortcomings in intelligence devices, processes, and in the system generally over the next ten years. This section would focus on the most significant anticipated developments i.e., those things which will result in a marked difference in our ability to do the intelligence job. In this part of the paper, whenever appropriate, I suggest you give alternative answers under statement of conditions or assumptions e.g., I understand that the pace of developments in certain types of listening devices is in large part a function of the availability of funds. Much of the material required for Part I is of the sort which you already have in your first draft; however, I feel we should try for a little more precision -- precision of the kind I am sure you will come up with during your discussions with the experts.

Part II would relate these developments -- covered in Part I -- to the most critical categories of national security questions on which intelligence might provide assistance as indicated in my paragraph 2 above. Subsections of Part II would spell out the most important of these questions and would discuss very briefly the anticipated developments in the field of intelligence which would have a bearing on the ability of intelligence to provide answers to these questions. Finally each subsection should indicate what deficiencies will remain.

[Redacted Signature Box]

STAT

Director  
NSC/PB Task Force  
Long Term Comparison Project