

25X1

Approved For Release 2009/01/30 : CIA-RDP80M00596A000400030033-4

Copy 3 of 6

25X1

NSA review completed

1 July 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Acting Deputy to the DCI for the Intelligence Community

FROM: [redacted] Elder  
Executive Secretary, NFIB

25X1

SUBJECT: NFIB Action on Intelligence Definitions [redacted]

25X1

TREA has not reviewed. Processed IAW CIA TREA arrangement letter dtd 4/11/08.

REFERENCE: NFIB-24.1/12, 6 June 1977

25X1

1. [redacted] We have received a resounding nonconcurrence from NFIB in response to certain elements of the memorandum you signed setting forth the DCI's proposed intelligence definitions. OPP put together a useful matrix (attached) that identifies the main problems.

25X1

2. [redacted] The S&T problem will undoubtedly come up at the NFIB on Tuesday during the discussion on the Attachment to DCID 1/2. We would recommend waiting until after that meeting before taking any formal action, but you may want to show the DCI the attached written comments from the members for his information.

25X1

3. [redacted] We will need to close out the action some time, but since the impetus came from the DCI, it will be up to him whether he wants to take up the difference at an NFIB meeting or handle them some other way. We can always hope that discussion at the 5 July meeting will obviate further action.

State Dept. review completed

25X1

Attachment: a/s

JCS review completed.

DIA review(s) completed.

DOE review completed.

NRO review(s) completed.

DHS Review Completed.

25X1

TOP SECRET

[redacted]

**NATIONAL FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE BOARD**

NFIB-24.1/12  
6 June 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: NATIONAL FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE BOARD

FROM

[Redacted]

Executive Secretary

25X1

SUBJECT : Intelligence Definitions

1. The attached memorandum from the Acting Vice Chairman requests you review the statements contained in paragraphs a. through c. The DCI proposes to promulgate these basic definitions in order to standardize terminology through the Community.

NFIB ACTION REQUESTED

2. You are requested to submit your comments and concurrence to the NFIB Secretariat by close of business, 15 June 1977.

[Redacted]

25X1

Attachment:  
As Stated

[Redacted]

25X1

SECRET

**Page Denied**

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Denied

10 JUN 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: [redacted] 25X1  
 Executive Secretary, NFIB

THROUGH : [redacted] 25X1  
 Deputy Director for Intelligence

SUBJECT : Intelligence Definitions

1. The Agency has reservations about the proposed DCI intelligence definitions contained in the 6 June 1977 memorandum from the Acting D/DCI/NI.

2. In Paragraph A, limiting the categories of foreign intelligence to Political, Military and Economic has the advantage of simplifying discussion of the intelligence business but it does not account for major new aspects of intelligence. Scientific accomplishments by the Soviets in the past have had a major impact, for example, quite apart from any distinct military or economic implications.

[redacted]

25X1

3. In Paragraph B, distinguishing between strategic and tactical intelligence based on the organization that collects the information could prove confusing.

[redacted]

25X1

4. In Paragraph C, the categorization of consumers as national, departmental and tactical is likely to become quite arbitrary since consumers of intelligence vary depending on the roles they play in specific situations.

[redacted]

25X1

[redacted]

25X1

**Page Denied**

25X1

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20220

SECRET

June 15, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Secretary  
National Foreign Intelligence Board

BY: *J. Foster Collins*  
J. Foster Collins  
Special Assistant to the Secretary (National Security)

SUBJECT: Intelligence Definitions

REFERENCE: NFIB-24.1/12 dated 16 June 1977, subject as above

The following comments are furnished concerning the definitions contained in reference:

- In order to make the delineation of "consumers" as contained in paragraph C distinct from the definition in paragraph B and more applicable outside the military community, I suggest that "operational" be used instead of tactical.
- Because "the public" often has an interest in and is a consumer of departmental intelligence and even in some cases tactical/operational intelligence, it is suggested that "the public" be deleted from the grouping of national intelligence consumers. The following sentence inserted at the end of the paragraph would accommodate the public consumer. "It is recognized that the public will often be a consumer of national and departmental intelligence and may occasionally be a consumer of tactical/operational intelligence."

SECRET

25X1

- In the last sentence of paragraph C, recommend changing the reference from "Treasury Agents" to "Treasury Representatives Overseas." This change will accommodate the fact that US Treasury representatives overseas include Attaches, Customs officials, IRS representatives, etc. and the term Agent is used for staff personnel only by the Secret Service.

SECRET

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2009/01/30 : CIA-RDP80M00596A000400030033-4



**NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY**  
FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MARYLAND 20755

15 June 1977

25X1

SECRET

MEMORANDUM FOR THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NFIB

SUBJECT: Intelligence Definitions

1. The following comments are provided in response to the Memorandum of the Acting Deputy to the DCI for the Intelligence Community, NFIB 24.1/12, 6 June 1977 same subject.

a. Exclusion of S&T as one of the primary categories would seem to ignore non-military (or "pure") S&T, or force an artificial assignment to Economic. Political, military, economic, and S&T are the conventional subdivisions used in DCID 1/2 and adopted in the National SIGINT Requirements System. I would suggest that those four continue to be accorded recognition.

b. I fully agree with the concept of "continuum." "Tactical" should imply a time-sensitive decision-making application. It would be wrong, however, at least in the case of SIGINT, to equate "tactical" to the organization that collects, or to the "direct control" aspect.

c. The adjective "operational" might be a more useful descriptive term than "tactical" in the examples cited. We should prefer to retain "tactical" in a military context. It should, however, not apply to all military commanders, but only to those who exercise direct command and control over combat units and their supporting forces.

2. I strongly support the idea of the promulgation of standard definitions. Because of the policy inherent in some definitions and the possibility of conflict with other governmental publications, I would urge that they be adopted or changed only after full deliberation.

*B K Buffum, Deputy Director*  
for LEW ALLEN, JR.  
Lieutenant General, USAF  
Director

25X1

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2009/01/30 : CIA-RDP80M00596A000400030033-4



DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
THE DIRECTOR OF INTELLIGENCE AND RESEARCH  
WASHINGTON

SECRET

June 16, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR:



25X1

National Foreign Intelligence Board  
Central Intelligence Agency

SUBJECT: Intelligence Definitions  
(NFIB-24.1/12 - 6 June 1977)

While we agree that intelligence definitions need greater standardization and more universal acceptance, we wonder whether the definitions proposed may not go too far toward eliminating fine distinctions that have both utility and validity. We therefore suggest that an ad hoc group be set up under NFIB to consider the proposed definitions and report to NFIB their implications for the Intelligence Community's work.

*Harold H. Saunders*  
Harold H. Saunders

SECRET

U-2090/DP-1 (Policy)/H. Tessandori [redacted] ceh/14 June 77 JUN 20 5 14 PM '77 14 JUN 1977

25X1

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DEPUTY TO THE DCI FOR THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

RECEIVED  
DCI/IC REGISTRY

SUBJECT: Intelligence Definitions

1. DIA and the Services share the DCI's concern that existing intelligence definitions and interpretations of various intelligence terminology inhibit community activity and understanding. A recent DoD effort was initiated to correct this situation by the submission of twenty-two intelligence-related definitions to amend JCS Pub 1, Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms. DoD is directed by the Secretary of Defense to recognize officially these terms, (DoD Directive 5000.9, 20 August 1959).

2. DIA and the Services appreciate the DCI's attempt to clarify intelligence community terminology. However, it was concluded at the Military Intelligence Board meeting 13 June that we are bound to operate within the parameters of the existing definitions contained in JCS Pub 1. Should the DCI desire to gain JCS approval of intelligence community definitions or modify present definitions, DIA would be willing to sponsor such change. To concur or non-concur in specific DCI proposals, apart from the JCS review process, is believed inappropriate at this time.

3. Selected JCS Pub 1 definitions are submitted for your consideration in the enclosure.

SIGNED

Enclosure  
JCS Pub 1 or  
DIA Submission

B. R. Irmen  
Vice Admiral, USN  
Acting Director

Coord  
DR Copy  
US-4  
DP-1 (Policy) R/F  
DP-1 (Policy) S/B

**Page Denied**

(S) NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

16 June 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE BOARD

SUBJECT: Intelligence Definitions

REFERENCE: NFIB-24.1/12, dated 6 June 1977, Subject as Above

The NRO believes there is some risk in removing Scientific and Technical Intelligence (S&T) as one of the basic categories of foreign intelligence. Relegating S&T to subdivisions of Political, Military, and Economic Intelligence categories may have important consequences. For example, a major technological surprise could have strong implications regarding the country's political stance, military balance, and economic status. Alternatively, an item of S&T interest which is considered minor in one category could have far reaching implications in other categories. Maintaining S&T as a discrete category could insure that all categories (political, military, and economic) assess the impact of a scientific or technological development on its own merit.

The NRO also believes that the categorization of intelligence by collector, tactical or strategic, is not as useful as having the user of the intelligence determine its categorization. For example, a tactical field site can intercept an enemy radar emission and use it for tactical purposes. The same data can be relayed to a strategic user for strategic purposes or data base update. Similarly, a national or strategic system can make the same intercept and relay the information to both strategic and tactical users. The real problem, however, aside from the question of just the definition per se, lies in the fact that decisions have and will continue to be made on the older, more conventional definitions.

The NRO concurs in the categorization of consumers as described by the DCI. It is noted that this categorization parallels the proposed Senate Bill's wording of the National Intelligence Act of 1977.

[Redacted Signature]

Charles W. Cook  
Acting Director

25X1  
NRO

25X1

25X1

TOP SECRET

25X1



UNITED STATES  
ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

1 6 / A

JUN 27 1977

[Redacted]

25X1

National Foreign Intelligence Board  
Intelligence Community Staff  
Washington, D. C. 20505

Dear

[Redacted]

25X1

This letter is in response to your memorandum, NFIB-24.1/12, dated June 6, 1977, with enclosed memorandum from the Acting Vice Chairman. I share Mr. McMahon's interest in achieving clarity of definitions of commonly used Intelligence Community terminology.

Referring specifically to Mr. McMahon's memorandum, I concur in substance with the language of paragraphs b. and c., but disagree with the substance of paragraph a. I believe that Scientific and Technical (S&T) Intelligence is not a subdivision of Political, Military, or Economic Intelligence, just as Economic Intelligence is not a subdivision of Political or Military Intelligence. I do not concur that giving S&T Intelligence separate status has served to create overlaps and confusion and point to a historic record of significant contributions to the national intelligence effort by the scientific and technical segment of the Intelligence Community and the enhancement of those contributions since S&T activities were accorded unique status, resources, and separate organizational identity within the Intelligence Community.

I feel that the body of foreign intelligence knowledge falls into four interrelated, interdependent and mutually supportive categories and that these are: Political, Military, Economic, and Scientific and Technical. An integration of knowledge from all four areas is essential to the production of national intelligence on any given geographic area as well as on any functional area.

Sincerely,

*for*  
*Edelman*  
Edward B. Giller  
Senior Intelligence Officer

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 10/12/2001 BY 60322 UCBAW/STP

SECRET

EXEMPT FROM AUTOMATIC  
DECLASSIFICATION  
AUTOMATICALLY  
R. E. Chapman  
IMPDET  
GROUP 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12  
EXCEPT WHERE SHOWN OTHERWISE

25X1

25X1

**Page Denied**

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Denied