

14 Nov 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Goodwin

This is the first draft of a speech Admiral Taylor is to give in St. Louis on 28 November. Inasmuch as the audience is to be a public one, I thought you might be interested in a copy of the draft. Content leans heavily in a number of places on the US News & World Report Raborn interview.

[Redacted Signature]

Chief, Presentations,
OCI

Ate

(DATE)

FORM NO. 101 REPLACES FORM 10-101
1 AUG 54 WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

STAT

14 November 1966

DRAFT SPEECH FOR DDCI
ST. LOUIS, 28 Nov 66

CHECKS AND BALANCES IN INTELLIGENCE

Last August President Johnson, in a ceremony honoring Admiral Raborn for his services as Director of Central Intelligence, remarked:

"It is the lot of those who direct our intelligence agencies, and those who work for them, that you work in silence, you sometimes fail in silence, and more often you succeed in silence."

Our critics and our detractors, unfortunately, are under no such injunctions. For the most part, they are neither restricted by security regulations, nor circumscribed by knowledge of the facts.

As a result, the Central Intelligence Agency has been blamed, or credited as the case may be, for just about everything that happens anywhere in the world, and I suppose I should be opening with a disclaimer of responsibility, just in case anything catastrophic happens in St. Louis while I am here.

I am on firm ground here in falling back on the reliable old Navy saying, "It didn't happen on my watch." We are in the domestic United States, and CIA has no charter for operations here--they belong to the FBI and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

We have, however, been blamed for a variety of events ranging from the course of a hurricane over Cuba, and the collapse of a bank in Lebanon, to the difficulties of the French in their former African empire, and the seizure by Ghana of a plane-load of diplomats from Guinea.

It is a cardinal rule in the tradecraft of intelligence that you neither confirm nor deny involvement. From time to time, of course, there are events where it may appear both logical and obvious that CIA is involved, and where it would seem relatively harmless to acknowledge responsibility.

The trouble is that once you begin to confirm or deny, you begin to build a pattern. The time will come when, at some critical juncture, your answer or even your silence is going to give the opposition useful information.

This creates problems for the intelligence service of a democracy. Senator Saltonstall of Massachusetts, in a letter to his constituents earlier this year, commented: "We Americans like to know what's going on, but sometimes in the interest of our own security all the facts cannot be made public. Remember, in a free country, when we tell our own citizens we are

also informing our enemies, for they read our newspapers too."

So I am not going to tell you whether CIA did or did not send a couple of hurricanes in the past three years zigzagging back and forth across Cuba, although it appears rather obvious that if we have the ability to steer hurricanes, we could steer them away from Florida and the Gulf Coast.

There has, however, been one persistent line of criticism, originating to a large degree within our own country, that cannot go unanswered. That is the charge that the Central Intelligence Agency constitutes an "Invisible Government," making its own rules and policies, and answerable to no one.

This has been refuted by every President since Mr. Truman, and the actual facts are a matter of open record in the laws of our country.

So, while we are supposed to be the silent service, in this particular matter we can and do speak out, because we can do so without giving anything away to the enemy; because we do not have to violate security to answer; and because we are an instrument of a democracy whose people are entitled to know how they are being served.

We do not make policy; we support the policy of the government and are bound by it.

And we do not carry on operations except at the behest of, and with the approval of, the duly constituted leaders of our government.

Let me dispose first of the charge that the Central Intelligence Agency is under no controls.

The CIA was created by the National Security Act of 1947, which gave the Agency five functions:

- 1) To advise the National Security Council--and of course the President--on intelligence matters relating to national security;
- 2) To co-ordinate all foreign intelligence activities of our government;
- 3) To produce and disseminate finished national intelligence within the government;
- 4) To provide what we call "services of common concern"--functions which serve all of the intelligence elements in the government, but can best be undertaken centrally; and finally,
- 5) To perform such other services as the National Security Council may direct.

In the "Cold War" which has existed for even longer than there has been a CIA, we face an enemy adept at conspiracy and subversion, with worldwide

clandestine assets, skilled agents, and no compunc-
tions about undermining or overthrowing any government
which resists the spread of Communism.

In order to counter these efforts, there are
going to be occasions when it will be necessary for
the United States to take covert or clandestine action.
This is not necessarily because the United States
would be ashamed of either the objectives or the
methods. It is primarily because it sometimes takes
clandestine methods to beat clandestine methods--just
as a killer submarine is one of the best weapons to
use against another submarine.

This is the shadowy, twilight zone of government
operations that Congress had in mind when it directed
the CIA to perform "such other services" as the
National Security Council might direct.

Our critics would have you believe that ever since
Congress gave CIA this authority in 1947, we have done
as we pleased, without regard to official policies or
objectives of the United States government, and some-
times in diametric opposition to those policies.

Whenever the CIA carries out a covert operation
overseas, it is with the prior approval of an Executive
Committee of the National Security Council. This com-
mittee has had various names and various incarnations

through the years, but essentially it is chaired by the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, representing the President. He meets once a week--or more often if necessary--with the Director of Central Intelligence and representatives of the Secretaries of State and Defense--normally the Under Secretaries or Deputy Under Secretaries of those two departments.

Each and every operation which the Agency is going to conduct overseas, whether it is political, psychological, economic, or even paramilitary, is presented to this committee. It either wins the approval of the committee, or it does not take place.

When covert operations are approved in advance by representatives of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, it is obvious that these operations are not going to be contrary to or outside of the guidelines established by United States Government policy.

In the field, CIA's overseas personnel are subordinate to the US ambassadors. We complement and supplement the "country team" approach of the Embassy to official US activities, and we operate with the foreknowledge and approval of the Ambassador. In a military theater of operations, our people in effect

become a service component under the control of the Theater Commander.

Another form of prior approval for our operations is the requirement that we obtain the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Specific individuals of that Bureau have been given full clearance to inquire into all of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in detail, and believe me, they make full use of that authority.

In addition to such prior approvals, there are other elements of the executive branch which have the same full clearance to monitor our continuing operations, and conduct post-mortems on those which have been completed. Some of these have been ad hoc groups--the Clark Committee and the Doolittle Committee, Hoover Commission Task Forces, and several special investigating bodies for specific purposes. On a permanent basis, all of the intelligence operations of the US Government are under the continuing scrutiny of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, formed in January 1956 under the chairmanship of Dr. James Killian of M.I.T., and now headed by Mr. Clark Clifford. This is a very knowledgeable and distinguished board of private citizens appointed by the President. It meets for

two or three days every six weeks to examine--in depth and detail--the work and the progress of the entire US intelligence program. The present membership includes General Maxwell Taylor; Ambassador Robert Murphy, the former Under Secretary of State; Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., the former Secretary of the Army and Director of the Budget; retired Admiral John Sides; Professor William Langer of Harvard; Mr. Gordon Gray, former Special Assistant to President Eisenhower and onetime president of North Carolina University; Dr. William O. Baker of Bell Telephone Laboratories; Dr. Edwin Land, head of the Polaroid Corporation; and Mr. Augustus Long, formerly the top executive of the Texas Company.

These gentlemen also constitute sub-committees to carry on continuing investigations of our operations, and our successes and failures in obtaining intelligence.

So we are under effective control by the Executive Branch--of which we are a part--and whatever you may have read to the contrary, we are also under the continuing scrutiny of the Legislative Branch.

Ever since CIA was first established, the Director of Central Intelligence has been authorized and in fact instructed by the President to make

complete disclosure of CIA activities to special subcommittees in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Congress, after all, brought us into being by legislative act, and has created very select subcommittees of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate to hear these reports. Incidentally, Senator Symington is a member of the Senate group.

Also, as you may have surmised from my reference to the Bureau of the Budget, our operations sometimes require some money. Our headquarters are in Langley Virginia, not at Fort Knox, and our appropriations have to come from Congress, like those of all government agencies.

We are not going to hand out free information to the opposition, so our funds are lumped in--we hope inconspicuously--with appropriations for other agencies. They are discussed in full, however, with special subcommittees of Senate and House Appropriations. These gentlemen are also authorized complete access to all of our operations. After they have scrutinized and approved our requirements, they then see to it that my salary is not inadvertently eliminated by somebody who may believe he is only reducing the Federal Government's consumption of paper clips or carpeting.

Some of the confusion over CIA's relations with Congress arises from the fact that these special subcommittees, and only these--about 25 legislators in all--have been cleared by the President to inquire in detail into all of our activities and operations.

We will, of course, brief any congressional committee having a jurisdictional interest on our substantive intelligence from all over the world. In 1965, for instance, there were about 20 such committee hearings--and some of them ran as long as three full days. We also brief individual congressmen frequently at their request.

But discussion of CIA activities, methods, and sources is another matter. It involves the lives of people who work with us, and the efficacy of our methods. National Security Council directives specify that these matters will be discussed only with the special subcommittees designated for these purposes. This is not arbitrary or bureaucratic; it is simply recognition that the risk of inadvertent disclosure rises with the number of people who have access to sensitive information of this type.

Where disclosure is authorized, it is complete. In 1965, for instance, in addition to those 20 hearings or substantive intelligence, the Director or his senior

aides met a total of 34 times with the special sub-committees to keep them informed on the operations of Central Intelligence.

So much, then, for the charge that CIA is under no controls and that nobody in Washington is told what CIA is doing.

As for the charge that CIA makes policy, let me say flatly that intelligence is an instrument of policy, not a source. We serve the people who actually make the decisions. Our role is to supply the information, the evaluation, and the estimates they need to reach an informed decision.

Intelligence, you know, is really an everyday business, not confined to governments. When Mother listens to the weather forecast and then makes Junior wear his rubbers or galoshes to school, she is using an intelligence estimate to arrive at a policy decision.

The Cardinals and Charlie Winner may think that they are going over the scouting reports in preparation for next Sunday's game at Dallas. In our language, they are examining current intelligence on the capabilities and intentions of the enemy, in order to formulate contingency plans for the outbreak of hostilities.

Now, the weather bureau will talk in terms of the likelihood--the probability--of rain or snow. I leaves the decision on rubbers or galoshes up to Mother.

Similarly, that scouting report will deal with possible weaknesses or vulnerabilities of the Dallas Cowboys, and warn about the nature of their principal threats. The decision on how the Cardinals are going to cash in on the information is left up to the coach.

It is the same in government, and intelligence.

It is fashionable, when we speak of our national strategy, to refer to "options," or "alternatives." This is the "in" way of saying that you should never paint yourself into a corner. It means that whenever the President is called upon to make a policy decision, he must always have two or more realistic choices.

The role of intelligence is to provide the President and his advisers with factual, and above all objective, information. This is the information which in the first place determines whether the options are, in fact, realistic, and then enables the policymaker to compare his options and make an informed choice.

If the organization which gathers the information becomes an advocate of one particular option, one proposed course of action, then the intelligence which

it provides is necessarily suspect. It is no longer acceptable per se as objective. Whether or not the depth of partisan advocacy consciously or unconsciously builds a self-serving bias into the intelligence reporting, the decision makers must take this possibility into account.

That is the reason why CIA is not engaged in policy formulation, would not want to be, and would not be allowed to be.

Information--the collection, analysis, and evaluation of information, as accurate and as comprehensive and above all as objective as possible--is our business.

If we become advocates of policy, we lose our credibility, which is our most useful asset in serving the government.

If the policy makers permit us to take part in policy formulation, they must start by discounting the objectivity of the intelligence we furnish them. Any advocate of an alternative course of action can provide information to support his proposals, but at this point the information becomes an argument, not an objective appreciation of the facts and the probable consequences.

By the National Security Act of 1947, the Director of Central Intelligence is the principal intelligence

adviser of the President. He reports to the National Security Council, which in effect means that he reports to the President. He is not beholden to any other department of the Government. Even in the National Security Council, he is an adviser, not a member.

In the minds of the Congress, this was the only sensible way to establish the CIA and the position of Director, because it is the only way to give the President, who must make the ultimate decisions, an adviser and a source of information completely divorced from the competing and sometimes parochial views of the advocates of alternate choices.

This principle does not require the checks and balances that I have listed which monitor the covert operations of the CIA, because it is a principle which has been welcomed and implemented by every man who has held the office of Director of Central Intelligence.

This has been attested to in public by every President, and by officers at the cabinet level who would be the first to complain if it were not so.

There is one concept which operates as a control mechanism in this respect, and that is the concept of the intelligence community.

You may never have read of the intelligence community--it doesn't fit into a headline as easily as CIA, and it doesn't have the same juicy appeal to the information media. If there were no intelligence community, however, the CIA might never have been created to coordinate its work.

Obviously, the function of intelligence in the United States Government did not begin with the Office of Strategic Services in World War II. Intelligence is one of the oldest professions, dating back at least to Noah and the airborne reconnaissance mission he launched from the Ark. In our own country, George Washington found spies to be not only necessary but exceptionally useful during the Revolutionary War.

Down through the years, there have been intelligence components in the Navy, the Army, the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, even in such comparatively prosaic offices as the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce.

These intelligence agencies, however, existed primarily to serve the needs of their particular departments. As a result, there has been a natural tendency for their interests and their competencies to be somewhat parochial. Some departmental intelligence was originated by diplomats or economists who

might be unfamiliar with weapons. Other departmental intelligence may have come from military attaches who were more conversant with the order of battle or the various types of fighter aircraft than they were with political or economic developments. But this specialization was not the main weakness.

The significant failing of such an apparatus lay in the possibility that one of the intelligence components might --by unilateral decision--consider a given piece of information too marginal, too unimportant, to be passed along to the decision makers, or even laterally to the other intelligence components.

One of the lessons we learned from Pearl Harbor was that information must not only be exchanged and coordinated among all of these disparate intelligence elements, but that there must be a clear responsibility for bringing that intelligence to the attention of all of the men in our government who need to know it.

As a result, the men who make the decisions for our national government today want what we call national intelligence. This is the agreed synthesis of all the intelligence available to the government from all possible sources, analyzed against all of expertise and all of the background information we can bring to bear.

The National Security Act of 1947, which created the Central Intelligence Agency, did not put the State Department, or the armed services, or the commercial and agricultural attaches, out of the intelligence business. Instead, it rounded up all of the intelligence assets available to the government, and established the Central Intelligence Agency to coordinate the work of this intelligence community.

Mr. Helms has the title of Director of Central Intelligence, not only Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. He is the principal intelligence officer of the Government, and when he reports to the President, or the National Security Council, he is delivering the intelligence developed by all of the assets of the CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, Navy, Army and Air Force intelligence, and the intelligence components of the Department of State, the FBI, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

This is what we mean by the intelligence community. When finished national intelligence goes forward, it is the agreed and considered evaluation by all of these components--or at least if there has been disagreement, the dissenting views are set forth in footnotes for the guidance of the policymaker.

I should add that except for the representatives of CIA, the members of this community come from departments and agencies which have a legitimate role in policy formulation. When they act as the intelligence community; however, they are under strict injunction to come up with an objective and impartial appreciation of the intelligence picture, the interpretation of its significance, and the estimate of possible future developments.

The intelligence community includes enough of these non-CIA elements so that, in any policy dispute, it is virtually certain to have representatives from agencies on opposite sides of the fence, and this in turn provides the safety mechanism that I mentioned. With the opposing sides represented, it is inconceivable that there would not be a vociferous and audible complaint if the finished national intelligence were not completely objective with regard to the impending policy decision.

Finally, if I may, I would like to devote a few moments to the men who make up the Central Intelligence Agency.

The fact of the matter is that James Bond and his colleagues of the spy movies and spy novels never worked there.

A commentary in the London Economist last month, discussing the British intelligence service, made my point pretty well with this summary:

"Modern intelligence has to do with the painstaking collection and analysis of fact, the exercise of judgment, and clear and quick presentation. It is not simply what serious journalists would always produce if they had time; it is something more rigorous, continuous, and above all operational-- that is to say, related to something that somebody wants to do or may be forced to do."

Our appetite for information is catholic and enormous. Our basic background information on foreign countries, compiled in what we call the National Intelligence Surveys, already adds up to more than 10 times the size of the Encyclopedia Britannica.

Much of this is hardly secret, covering such prosaic matters as economic statistics, legal codes, sociological conditions, and transport facilities. The information has to be on hand against the contingency that Country X, seemingly remote and of little current concern to our national security, may some day erupt onto our list of critical situations. Against that day, we must have not only the information, but the experienced and knowledgeable experts to interpret and apply it.

Take French Somaliland. After the recent riots there, President De Gaulle announced that French Somaliland should have the right to decide between remaining under French rule, or becoming independent. Is this of no concern to us? Ethiopia and the Republic of Somalia have each announced that if France sets its Somalis free, either Ethiopia will seize the area to keep it out of Somali hands, or vice versa. Now, the United States has a very close relationship with Ethiopia, and the Soviet Union trains, equips, and advises the Somali armed forces. This raises the possibility of a direct confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union at some time in the future, so it behooves us to know the depth and capacity of the Djibouti harbor, the terrain in the hinterland, the efficacy of the railroads, and the composition of the population, today.

The result is that the CIA employee is a much more academic man than the public realizes. We may have a few men with the debonair aplomb of Napoleon Solo, but we have more than 800 senior professionals with 20 years or more of intelligence background. Three quarters of our officers speak at least one foreign language. About 15 percent have graduate degrees. Six out of every 10 of the analysts who have

direct responsibility at headquarters for analysis of a foreign area had lived, worked, or traveled abroad even before they came to CIA.

When you combine all of the years required for graduate study, foreign experience, and then add 10 to 15 years of intelligence work, it adds up to an impressive depth of knowledge, competence, and expertise at the service of our government.

We could easily and adequately staff the faculty of a university with our experts, and in a way, we do. Many of those who leave us join university faculties, and others take leaves of absence to teach, and renew their contacts with the academic world.

I have discussed with you how the Central Intelligence Agency serves the government, how it is controlled, and briefly, what manner of man works there, and I have left to the end one final question--Why? For the answer, let me call in a couple of outside witnesses:

Last winter, Secretary of State Rusk told a press conference, "I would emphasize to you that CIA is not engaged in activities not known to the senior policy officers of the Government. But you should also bear in mind that beneath the level of public discussion, there is a tough struggle going on in the

back alleys all over the world. It is a tough one, it's unpleasant, and no one likes it, but that is not a field which can be left entirely to the other side. And so, once in a while, some disagreeable things happen, and I can tell you that there is a good deal of gallantry and a high degree of competence in those who have to help us deal with that part of the struggle for freedom."

In April, 1965, President Johnson put it this way: "We have committed our lives, our property, our resources and our sacred honor to the freedom and peace of other men, indeed, to the freedom and peace of all mankind. We would dishonor that commitment, we would disgrace all the sacrifices Americans have made, if we were not every hour of every day vigilant against every threat to peace and freedom. That is why we have the Central Intelligence Agency."