

AA-Intro?

No Objection To Declassification in Full
2010/08/31 : LOC-HAK-430-4-1-8

THE SECRETARY

REFER TO DOS

11/6/74

Mr. Secretary,

For your information only.

LSE

DOE REVIEWED 16 JUN 2010

NO OBJECTION TO DECLASSIFICATION

[Handwritten signature]

*of Dixie Lee
Ray*

DOS REVIEWED 01 JUL 2010

NO OBJECTION TO DECLASSIFICATION

No Objection To Declassification in Full

2010/08/31 : LOC-HAK-430-4-1-8

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

11/3/74
Sunday pm -

Dear Brent

Thanks again for your call
this morning - I appreciate your
kind words. In the attached comment
I + I make clear my worries
about the new Bureau. It's too important
not to set it up right - and I fear
that unless it's restructured it will
be buried in the morass of bureaucracy.

Additionally there are the personal
problems. They may seem trivial to
some - but to me they are very
real. Hope this is helpful

Cordially - Ditz

COMMENTS ON "ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW BUREAU OF OCEANS AND
INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS" IN THE
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Careful examination of the March 9, 1974 Action Memorandum (S/S 7401800) approving the new Bureau leads me to conclude that there is a wide disparity between the responsibility of the new Bureau and its authority.

In short, I believe that important though the task is, the great expectation and high hopes to ". . . develop a comprehensive and coherent policy in the fields of oceans, environment and scientific affairs . . ." cannot be achieved unless the proposed organization and the degree of authority are both modified. My reasons for this conclusion are as follows:

1. Organization

No Objection To Declassification in Full 2010/08/31 : LOC-HAK-430-4-1-8 old

Bureau of Scientific and Technological Affairs plus the special assistants and their staffs for Fisheries and Wildlife, Environment and Population Affairs. To this core is added certain other topics including Conservation, Health, Weather, Space Technology, Atomic Energy, Advanced Technology, and Energy R&D. There is also "Other" and "Related Matters".

These subject areas are lumped into three units, each headed by a Deputy Assistant Secretary, 1) Oceans and Fisheries, 2) Science and Technology, 3) Environment and Population. The organizational logic appears to be based on a Congressional decree that there be a Deputy for Oceans and Fisheries, and a Department decision that a total employment of 70-90 persons for the Bureau merits three Deputies. I do not find any consideration of the kind of management structure best suited to attaining the Bureau's objective. It appears, rather, to be a hodge-podge of existing offices and units. It is not comprehensive, and it lacks internal coherence.

2. Overlapping Functions and Competing Responsibilities

Although one might assume that a new Bureau for Science and Technology designed to " . . . establish a focal point . . . as well as coordinate policy responsibilities between the Department and other governmental departments and agencies" would bring together most if not all the major State Department science programs and responsibilities, that is apparently not the case. There are many areas of overlap. They have built-in potential for conflict or disagreement. In the area of oceanography and fisheries, for example, responsibility for the Law of the Sea Conference resides elsewhere . . . yet it is the resources of the sea, both organic and mineral, that are fundamental to resolution of how nations behave on the high seas and where the limits of territorial waters lie. Another good example is food. Responsibility for food

No Objection To Declassification in Full 2010/08/31 : LOC-HAK-430-4-1-8¹ different

offices and bureaus. Food is not mentioned as being included in the new science bureau. But it is fatuous to expect that a coherent, comprehensive policy on health and population can be developed independently from a food policy. And what is the future of the Food for Peace program? This humanitarian plan was possible at a time when the United States had enormous grain surpluses. That situation no longer obtains -- nor will it again in the near future.

The problem with responsibilities that are divided and scattered among different parts of the Department is two-fold. First, there is the very real difficulty of vested interests -- no bureaucracy willingly retrenches or gives up any of its authority. Second, neither the new Bureau nor its Assistant Secretary has any more clout than existing, already established units. Resolution of vested interests among equals means that everyone keeps what he has.

3. Personnel and Space

Most important, in the area of personnel, is that a new Assistant Secretary must be able to bring in or appoint people whom he knows and trusts to the key positions. Unless the responsible official can name his immediate staff he starts off with an instant handicap. The Action Memorandum makes no provision for this.

It appears that the persons to be assigned to the new Bureau now occupy office space on five different floors in different wings of the building. Such a situation is not tolerable. It doesn't matter where the new Bureau is located, in the basement or a converted warehouse -- it is imperative that they be housed together -- in contiguous space. No coherent policy will emerge from a staff scattered through-out a very large building.

No Objection To Declassification in Full 2010/08/31 : LOC-HAK-430-4-1-8

4. Budget

In the real world, and even in a bureaucracy, you can do what you can pay for. The official who has no budget, no control of funds for his programs, has no authority.

The approved Action Memorandum states (p. 4) ". . . Except for international fisheries, responsibility for the preparation and presentation of budget requests to the Congress, funds management, and other administrative, management, and support activities would remain with IO and other bureaus currently carrying out these functions . . ." and (p. 9) "The new bureau will be able to initiate its operations on the basis of the positions and funds allocated to it through the reorganization of existing bureaus and offices. The new Assistant Secretary should have an opportunity to assess both its priorities and resource needs based on his experience during FY 1975 before additional resources are requested."

- 4 -

With respect to the latter quotation, the FY 1976 budget will be locked up before a new Assistant Secretary is confirmed. Unless special provisions are made, one could anticipate 18 months operation without a proper budget (6 months of FY 75 and all of FY 76). Nor is it reasonable to expect existing bureaus and offices to give up funds to the new bureau. The earlier quotation (from p. 4) is ominous. Anyone familiar with the Federal bureaucracy would be foolish to accept a position with such fiscal constraints.

Finally, may I reiterate my firmly held conviction that science and technology are matters as important in today's world as political, economic, and security affairs. The knowledge and understanding of nature, including its features, products, and physical laws, and the skill, engineering, and management talent needed to apply processes that create both energy and useful materials comprise the foundation on which western civilization rests. No modern industrialized nation can survive without a high degree of sophisticated engineering, and no developing nation has hope for a better life except that it is based on science and technology. I also am convinced that in the United States the political and economic role of science is neither properly understood nor effectively used. Science could be a potent tool of governmental policy both domestically and internationally, but at present it is not. Perhaps the new Bureau will help -- but only if it is freed from the problems enumerated above.

November 3, 1974