


THE CREATION OF
THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY:

FOUNDING DOCUMENTS

FOUNDING DOCUMENTS



A BILL

To promote the national security by providing for a National Defense Establishment, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Defense, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Defense Establishment, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Defense Establishment with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

That this Act may be cited as the



The Creation of the Intelligence Community:

FOUNDING DOCUMENTS

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office

Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov

Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800

Fax: (202) 512-2104

Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

ISBN 978-0-16-090937-5

COPY

Table of Contents

Mission Statements	i
The Founding of the Post-WWII US Intelligence Community	1
The Cornerstone Box	4
Central Intelligence: Origin and Evolution	5
Milestones in the Creation of the US Intelligence Community.....	19
Selected Intelligence Documents.....	22

MISSION STATEMENTS



The Historical Collections Division (HCD) of CIA's Information Management Services is responsible for executing the Agency's Historical Review Program. This program seeks to identify and de-classify collections of documents that detail the Agency's analysis and activities relating to historically significant topics and events. HCD's goals include increasing the usability and accessibility of historical collections. HCD also develops release events and partnerships to highlight each collection and make it available to the broadest audience possible.

The mission of HCD is to:

- Promote an accurate, objective understanding of the information and intelligence that has helped shape major US foreign policy decisions.
- Broaden access to lessons-learned, presenting historical material that gives greater understanding to the scope and context of past actions.
- Improve current decision-making and analysis by facilitating reflection on the impacts and effects arising from past foreign policy decisions.
- Showcase CIA's contributions to national security and provide the American public with valuable insight into the workings of its government.
- Demonstrate the CIA's commitment to the Open Government Initiative and its three core values: Transparency, Participation, and Collaboration.



The History Staff in the CIA Center for the Study of Intelligence fosters understanding of the Agency's history and its relationship to today's intelligence challenges by communicating instructive historical insights to the CIA workforce, other US Government agencies, and the public. CIA historians research topics on all aspects of Agency activities and disseminate their knowledge through publications, courses, briefings and web-based products. They also work with other Intelligence Community historians on publication and education projects that highlight interagency approaches to intelligence issues. Lastly, the CIA History Staff conducts an ambitious program of oral history interviews that are invaluable for preserving institutional memories that are not captured in the documentary record.



The VC-54C *Sacred Cow*

When President Franklin D. Roosevelt flew to the Casablanca Conference in 1943 on board a commercial Boeing 314 Clipper Ship, he became the first U.S. president to fly while in office. Concerned about relying upon commercial airlines to transport the president, the USAAF leaders ordered the conversion of a military aircraft to accommodate the special needs of the Commander in Chief.

After encountering difficulties with converting a C-87A transport, the USAAF arranged with Douglas Aircraft to construct a new transport aircraft specifically for presidential use. Nicknamed the *Sacred Cow*, this VC-54C became the first military aircraft to transport a U.S. president when President Roosevelt took it to the USSR for the Yalta Conference in February 1945.

On 26 July 1947, President Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947 while on board the *Sacred Cow*. This act established the Air Force as an independent service, making the *Sacred Cow* the "birthplace" of the USAF.

Extracted and quoted from: The National Museum of the US Air Force

THE FOUNDING OF THE POST-WWII US INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Its Tortuous Creation Initially Revealed in Eight Hundred Newly Declassified Documents Released by CIA's Information Management Services/Historical Collections Division at a special Release Event at Culver Academies, Culver, Indiana, 14 May 2009

Elizabeth Bancroft

AS WORLD WAR II WAS COMING TO A CLOSE, General William Donovan, head of the Office of Strategic Services – the wartime intelligence agency run by the War Department – put forth a plan to continue intelligence activities as an independent agency reporting directly to the President. The need was recognized, but his proposal as presented, met a cautious, chilly reception. Other senior US officials began debating the closing, restructuring, and creation of new agencies or internal intelligence-gathering divisions within existing arms of the government (often their own agencies or military branches), to form a new, centralized, post-war US Intelligence Agency.

These plans faced a major obstacle: a skeptical Harry Truman, as an unenthusiastic new President distrustful of post-war secret intelligence activities becoming a permanent government function. As his first decision, Truman had little hesitation in marshaling support for shuttering OSS at war's end. But in its absence, the State Department, the Navy, and the War Department recognized that a secret information vacuum loomed, triggering calls and discussions for the creation of something to replace a wartime intelligence service...something different from OSS...to take over in 1946.

Showing the need for a new, centralized capability, and arriving at its creation, was not easy. It required skillful diplomacy, awareness of openly or secretly coveted activities or interests by existing military, FBI, State, and other entities, and the desire to shape any new agency so it would work seamlessly with, and support, existing military capabilities

and enterprises. These *previously released* documents alert researchers to some of the plans and suggestions that were colored by political expediency, conflicting goals, personal antipathy to all forms of intelligence, and turf battles among existing Intelligence Community players...all of it overlaid by the widespread recognition that an expanded, permanent, centralized intelligence group was urgently needed to face the post-War world.

This rich mix of declassified historic material weaves a fascinating story of the twists and turns in communications and events that culminated in CIA's creation. They were thus the perfect tools for a public symposium jointly sponsored by CIA's Historical Collections Division and the Culver Academies' Global Studies Institute on 14 May 2009. This release event hosted more than 300 students, faculty, and guests at the Academies' Indiana campus. The symposium, titled *Creating Global Intelligence: The Creation of the US Intelligence Community and Lessons for the 21st Century*, spotlighted the public release of more than 800 declassified documents from the late 1940s to the early 1950s. The documents are a montage of notes, letters, memoranda, radio bulletins, briefings, minutes, routing slips, drafts, reports, speech transcripts, directives and executive orders. They display the considerable political and legal finesse required to assess the plans, suggestions, maneuvers, and actions that ultimately led to the establishment of the Central Intelligence Agency and other national security entities possessing special safeguards to protect civil liberties.

It was the intent of Congress in establishing CIA to establish an independent agency which would be the focal point of all foreign intelligence information, to correlate and evaluate all such information and to disseminate the product to the necessary Government officials. The Congress felt it had conferred the statutory authority necessary for CIA to perform these functions, even though it left broad direction largely to the NSC and the President. We believe there is ample authority latent in the law, and that adequate directives will permit CIA to fulfill the role which, even now, the Congress believes the Agency is playing as an essential element in the national defense and security.

Lawrence R. Houston/2/
Walter L. Pforzheimer

Memorandum From the General Counsel (Houston) and the Legislative Liaison Officer of the Central Intelligence Agency (Pforzheimer) to the Executive of the Central Intelligence Agency (Shannon) Washington, 27 September 1949.

This symposium was particularly important because it provided two beginnings. For scholars, the public, and the students, the event presented the first ‘beginning’—the many steps that led to the founding of CIA, highlighted through declassified documents, one convoluted step after another. The second ‘beginning’ fell to the young symposium participants, for whom this was the first time they had heard official government and academic experts discuss the creation of the modern intelligence establishment, and the first time they had seen or worked with newly declassified national security and intelligence documents. It also provided exposure to some of the existing, and occasionally bewildering, intelligence war year acronyms and entities: FBIS, CIG, ICAPS, IAC, CIA, SSU, OSO, OSS, NIA, DCID, NSCID, IAB.¹ Symposium participants were able to glimpse the give-and-take required by military branches, government agencies, Congress, and the White House, to establish duties, responsibilities, personnel, leadership, reporting, funding, and physical locations for an entirely new agency...today’s independent CIA.

¹ FBIS – Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service; CIG – Central Intelligence Group; ICAPS – Interagency Coordinating and Planning Staff; IAC – Intelligence Advisory Committee; CIA – Central Intelligence Agency; SSU – Strategic Services Unit, War Department; OSO – Office of Special Operations; OSS – Office of Strategic Services; NIA – National Intelligence Authority; DCID – Director of Central Intelligence Directive; NSCID – National Security Council Intelligence Directive; and IAB – Intelligence Advisory Board.

Christine Burke, a Culver Academies Global Scholar, opened the event by saying that reading the declassified documents was “like watching history come to life.” She commended CIA for making the documents available to the Culver students, noting that reading first-hand accounts of historical events is “a lot more intriguing than just reading out of a textbook.” CIA Chief Historian David Robarge kicked off the event by describing how the United States’ intelligence requirements after World War II interacted with political, legal, and institutional forces leading to the overhaul of the US national security apparatus. These activities ushered the passage of the National Security Act of 1947, which created a National Security Council, a Secretary of Defense, a statutory Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Department of the Air Force, and a Central Intelligence Agency.

Other speakers included NSA Chief Historian Dr. David Hatch, who provided a presentation on how inter-service rivalries in the field of communications intelligence created the underpinnings for the creation of the National Security Agency. Dr. David Barrett, Professor of Political Science, Villanova University, described how the relationship between Congress and the Intelligence Community has evolved since 1947; and Eugene Poteat, President of the Association of Former Intelligence Officers, gave a personal perspective of the role of intelligence in informing senior US policymakers.

Dr. John Buggeln, Director of the Global Studies Institute and host for the symposium, closed the event noting that the program contributed to the school’s goal of providing students a forum for learning about significant events that shaped the country, and our relations worldwide.

Each symposium attendee received a CD-ROM containing the released documents—providing detailed insight into the complex issues senior US Government officials grappled with in establishing the Intelligence Community.



L-R: David Robarge, CIA Historian; David Hatch, NSA Historian; Eugene Poteat, President, AFIO; David Barrett, Prof. of Pol. Sci., Villanova Univ.; John Buggeln, Director, Global Studies Institute.

History balances the frustration of “how far we have to go” with the satisfaction of “how far we have come.” It teaches us tolerance for the human shortcomings and imperfections which are not uniquely of our generation, but of all time.

—Lewis F. Powell, Jr. US Supreme Court Justice

THE CORNERSTONE BOX

President Dwight D. Eisenhower at the cornerstone laying ceremony and installation of a copper-covered steel time capsule at the new CIA Headquarters Building, Langley, Virginia, 3 November 1959.



Contents of the Cornerstone box include:

- Memorandum for President Franklin D. Roosevelt from Major General William J. Donovan, Director of the Office of Strategic Services, dated 18 November 1944, regarding the establishment of a permanent centralized intelligence service and Memorandum from President Roosevelt to General Donovan, dated 5 April 1944, directing that General Donovan discuss his plan with the appropriate officials of the Government.
- President Harry S. Truman's Executive Letter of 22 January 1946, establishing the National Intelligence Authority and the Central Intelligence Group.
- Statement of General (then Lieutenant General) Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Director of Central Intelligence, before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, on 29 April 1947, in support of the sections of the proposed National Security Act of 1947 to establish the Central Intelligence Agency.
- A Text and Explanation of Statutes and Executive Orders relating specifically to the Central Intelligence Agency, including Enabling and Appropriations Acts for the construction of the new CIA Building.
- Reproduction of the CIA seal and its official description.
- "William J. Donovan and the National Security." A speech by Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, to the Erie County Bar Association, Buffalo, New York, 4 May 1959.
- An aerial photograph of the area of the CIA Building site.
- Drawings of the CIA Building as it will appear when completed.
- The Program, a recording, and photographs of the Cornerstone Ceremony.
- Microfilm copies of daily and weekly newspapers of 3 November 1959.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE: ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION—HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Editor Michael Warner
CIA History Staff

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

“...what have appeared to be the most striking successes have often, if they are not rightly used, brought the most overwhelming disasters in their train, and conversely the most terrible calamities have, if bravely endured, actually turned out to benefit the sufferers.”

—Polybius, *The Rise of the Roman Empire*, Book III, 7

THE EXPLOSIONS AT PEARL HARBOR still echoed in Washington when President Harry Truman and Congressional leaders passed the National Security Act of 1947. A joint Congressional investigation just a year earlier had concluded that the Pearl Harbor disaster illustrated America’s need for a unified command structure and a better intelligence system.¹ Indeed, the President and many of his aides rightly believed that the surprise attack could have been blunted if the various commanders and departments had coordinated their actions and shared their intelligence. With that thought in mind, the creators of the National Security Act attempted to implement the principles of unity of command and unity of intelligence, fashioning a National Security Council, a Secretary of Defense, a statutory Joint Chiefs of Staff and a Central Intelligence Agency.

In almost the next breath, however, the National Security Act made important concessions to the traditional American distrust of large military establishments and centralized power. The Act (among other qualifications) ensured that the Joint Chiefs would not become a Prussian-style “General Staff,” created an independent air force, and insisted

that the new Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) would have no law enforcement powers. The Act also decreed that the intelligence divisions in the armed services and the civilian departments (what came to be called the “Intelligence Community”) would remain independent of the CIA.

Since 1947, Directors of Central Intelligence (DCIs) have served within the bounds of this ambiguous mandate. They have had the responsibility of coordinating national intelligence collection and production without a full measure of the authority they needed to do so. Many Presidents and Congresses—not to mention DCIs—have expressed their frustration with this ambiguity and have assumed that the solution to the dilemmas it created lay in concentrating more power in the office of the Director of Central Intelligence. This centralizing impulse has prompted various reforms to increase the Director’s ability to lead the Intelligence Community. For years these attempts were made by the National Security Council (NSC) through a series of NSC Intelligence Directives. In the wake of “the time of troubles” for the Intelligence Community in the mid-1970s—marked by investigations into questions about excesses and accountability—three Presidents issued successive executive orders aimed at one goal: rationalizing American intelligence and increasing the DCI’s power. Since the end of the Cold War, Congress itself has taken up the task, repeatedly amending the intelligence sections of the National Security Act.

The various regulations and amendments, however, have not fundamentally altered the “federalist” intelligence structure

created in 1947. Strong centrifugal forces remain, particularly in the Department of Defense and its Congressional allies. Indeed, the case for centralization seems to be countered by historical illustrations of the perils of excessive concentration. In actual practice, the successful end to the Cold War and the lack of any national intelligence disasters since then seem to militate in favor of keeping the existing structure until some crisis proves it to be in dire need of repair.

REFORM AFTER WORLD WAR II

The Agency began its statutory existence in September 1947—its creation ratifying, in a sense, a series of decisions taken soon after the end of the Second World War.² That conflict ended in the summer of 1945 with Washington decisionmakers in broad agreement that the United States needed to reform the intelligence establishment that had grown so rapidly and haphazardly during the national emergency. Nevertheless, when President Truman dissolved the wartime Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in September 1945, he had no clear plan for constructing the peacetime intelligence structure that he and his advisers believed they needed in an atomic age. President Truman wanted the reforms to be part and parcel of the “unification” of the armed services, but the overhaul of the military that the President wanted would take time to push through Congress.³ In the interim, he created a Central Intelligence Group (CIG) to screen his incoming cables and supervise activities left over from the former OSS.

In early 1946, the White House authorized CIG to evaluate intelligence from all parts of the government, and to absorb the remnants of OSS’s espionage and counterintelligence operations.⁴ Initially these disparate components of the new CIG shared little in common except an interest in foreign secrets and a sense that both strategic warning and clandestine activities abroad required “central” coordination. Indeed, these two missions came together in CIG almost by accident. Under

the first two Directors of Central Intelligence, however, CIG and the Truman administration came to realize how strategic warning and clandestine activities complemented one another.

Meanwhile, the military “unification” issue overshadowed intelligence reform in Congressional and White House deliberations. In mid-1946 President Truman called again on Congress to unify the armed services. That April, the Senate’s Military Affairs committee had approved a unification bill that provided for a central intelligence agency, but the draft legislation had snagged in the hostile Naval Affairs committee.⁵ Perhaps with that bill in mind, Secretary of War Robert Patterson and Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal in May agreed among themselves that a defense reorganization bill should also provide for a central intelligence agency. President Truman the following month sent Congress the result of the Secretaries’ accord (with modifications of his own), repeating his call for lawmakers to send him a unification bill to sign.⁶

The administration’s judgment that a central intelligence agency was needed soon firmed into a consensus that the new Central Intelligence Group ought to form the basis of this new intelligence agency. Indeed, CIG continued to accrue missions and capabilities. Oversight of the CIG was performed by a committee called the National Intelligence Authority (NIA), comprising the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, joined by the President’s chief military adviser, Admiral William Leahy. National Intelligence Authority Directive 5, issued on 8 July 1946, provided the DCI with the basic implementation plan for the broad scope of powers envisioned in President Truman’s charter for CIG. Indeed, it was NIAD-5 that created the real difference between OSS—an operations office with a sophisticated analytical capability—and CIG, a truly (albeit fledgling) national intelligence service authorized to perform strategic analysis and to conduct, coordinate, and control clandestine activities abroad.

NIAD-5 represented perhaps the most expansive charter ever granted to a Director of Central Intelligence. It allowed



1942

13 June: President Franklin D. Roosevelt signs a military order establishing the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) and naming William J. Donovan as its Director. Donovan remained a civilian until 24 March 1943, when he was appointed brigadier general. He advanced to the rank of major general on 10 November 1944.

CIG to “centralize” research and analysis in “fields of national security intelligence that are not being presently performed or are not being adequately performed.”⁷⁷ NIAD-5 also directed the DCI to coordinate all US foreign intelligence activities “to ensure that the over-all policies and objectives established by this Authority are properly implemented and executed.” The National Intelligence Authority through this directive ordered the DCI to conduct “all organized Federal espionage and counter-espionage operations outside the United States and its possessions for the collection of foreign intelligence information required for the national security.”

In NIAD-5, the National Intelligence Authority determined that many foreign intelligence missions could be “more efficiently accomplished centrally” and gave CIG the authority to accomplish them. This in effect elevated CIG to the status of being the primary foreign intelligence arm of the US government. This mandate did not, however, give CIG the controlling role in intelligence analysis that DCI Hoyt Vandenberg had sought. The NIA’s authorization was carefully phrased to allay fears that the DCI would take control of departmental intelligence offices; the Cabinet departments were not about to subordinate their own limited analytical capabilities to an upstart organization. In addition, NIAD-5 did not force a consolidation of clandestine activities under CIG control. Indeed, the Army defended the independence of its Intelligence Division’s own collection operations by arguing that NIAD-5 gave CIG control only over “organized” foreign intelligence operations.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Congress initially paid scant attention to the new Central Intelligence Group. Indeed, CIG had been established with no appropriations and authority of its own precisely to keep it beneath Congressional scrutiny. As CIG gained new authority in 1946 and the White House gained confidence in its potential, however, a consensus emerged in Congress that postwar military reforms would not be complete without a simultaneous modernization of American intelligence capabilities.

The budding consensus even survived the death of the Truman administration’s cherished unification bill in 1946. Ironically, prospects for unification only brightened when the opposition Republicans subsequently swept into control of the Congress in that year’s elections, taking over the committee chairmanships and displacing powerful Democrats who had made themselves (in Harry Truman’s words) “the principal stumbling blocks to unification.”⁷⁸ With the Presi-



Director of Central Intelligence Allen Dulles at Cornerstone Box ceremony for new CIA building, Langley, Virginia, 3 November 1959.

dent’s goal of military modernization suddenly in sight, the White House firmly told DCI Vandenberg that enabling legislation for CIG would remain a small part of the defense reform bill then being re-drafted by the President’s aides, and that the intelligence section would be kept as brief as possible in order to ensure that none of its details hampered the prospects for unification.⁹

This tactic almost backfired. When President Truman sent his new bill forward in February 1947, the brevity of its intelligence provisions had the effect of attracting—not deflecting—Congressional scrutiny. Members of Congress eventually debated almost every word of the intelligence section, and made various adjustments. Ultimately, however, Congress passed what was essentially the White House’s draft with important sections transferred (and clarified in the process) from Truman’s 22 January 1946 directive establishing CIG—thus ratifying the major provisions of that directive. Thus the Central Intelligence Agency would be an independent agency under the supervision of the National Security Council; it would conduct both analysis and clandestine activities, but would have no policymaking role and no law enforcement powers; its Director would be confirmed by the Senate and could be either a civilian or a military officer.

What did Congress believe the new CIA would do? Testimony and debates over the draft bill unmistakably show that the lawmakers above all wanted CIA to provide the proposed

National Security Council—the new organization that would coordinate and guide American foreign and defense policies—with the best possible information on developments abroad. Members of Congress described the information they expected CIA to provide as “full, accurate, and skillfully analyzed”; “coordinated, adequate” and “sound.” Senior military commanders testifying on the bill’s behalf used similar adjectives, saying the CIA’s information should be “authenticated and evaluated”; “correct” and based on “complete coverage.” When CIA provided such information, it was believed, the NSC would be able to assess accurately the relative strengths and weaknesses of America’s overseas posture and adjust policies accordingly.¹⁰

Congress guaranteed CIA’s independence and its access to departmental files in order to give it the best chance to produce authoritative information for the nation’s policymakers. CIA was to stand outside the policymaking departments of the government, the better to “correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security.”¹¹ Although other departments and agencies would continue to handle intelligence of national importance, the Agency was the only entity specifically charged by the Act with the duty of producing it. To assist in the performance of this duty, the DCI had the right to “inspect” all foreign intelligence held by other agen-

cies, as well as the right to disseminate it as appropriate. If the DCI happened to be a military officer, then he was to be outside the chain of command of his home service; this would help him resist any temptation to shade his reports to please his superiors.¹² Finally, the Agency was to provide for the US Government such “services of common concern” that the NSC would determine could more efficiently be conducted “centrally.” In practice, this meant espionage and other clandestine activities, as well as the collection of valuable information from open sources and American citizens.

Having approved the placement of these authorities and activities under one head, Congress in 1947 expected that CIA would provide the best possible intelligence and would coordinate clandestine operations abroad. Congress also implicitly assumed that the executive branch would manage CIA and the Intelligence Community with these purposes in mind.¹³ After fixing this course in the statute books, Congress stepped back and left the White House and CIA to meet these expectations. This was how Congress resolved the apparent contradiction of creating “central intelligence” that was not centrally controlled. The institution of central intelligence would henceforth steer between the two poles of centralization and departmental autonomy.

NOT ONLY NATIONAL BUT CENTRAL

Congress passed the National Security Act on 26 July 1947 and President Truman immediately signed it into law. The act gave America something new in the annals of intelligence history; no other nation had structured its foreign intelligence establishment in quite the same way. CIA would be an independent, central agency, but not a controlling one; it would both rival and complement the efforts of the departmental intelligence organizations.¹⁴ This prescription of coordination without control guaranteed friction and duplication of intelligence efforts as the CIA and the departmental agencies pursued common targets, but it also fostered a potentially healthy competition of views and abilities.

The National Security Council guided the Intelligence Community by means of a series of directives dubbed NSCIDs (the acronym stands for National Security Council Intelligence Directive). The original NSCIDs were issued in the months after the passage of the National Security Act. Foremost was NSCID 1, titled “Duties and Responsibilities,” which replaced NIAD-5 and established the basic responsibilities of the DCI and the interagency workings of the Intelligence Community.¹⁵



The National Security Act was amended on 10 August 1949, to put the service secretaries under the aegis of the defense secretary. At the same time, the National Military Establishment was renamed the Department of Defense.

NSCID 1 did not re-write NIAD-5, but instead started afresh in the light of the debate over the National Security Act and the experience recently gained by the new CIA. Where the earlier document had authorized the DCI to coordinate “all Federal foreign intelligence activities” and sketched the initial outlines of his powers, NSCID 1 had to work within the lines already drawn by Congress and precedent. The Director who emerged from NSCID 1 was more circumscribed in his role and authority than previously. He was now to “make such surveys and inspections” as he needed in giving the NSC his “recommendations for the coordination of intelligence activities.” Nonetheless, the DCI was—in keeping with Congress’ implicit intent in the National Security Act—a substantial presence in the intelligence establishment. NSCID 1 gave the DCI an advisory committee comprising the heads of the departmental intelligence offices, and told him to “produce” intelligence (but to avoid duplicating departmental functions in doing so). The type of intelligence expected of him and his Agency was “national intelligence,” a new term for the information that the National Security Act called “intelligence relating to the national security.”¹⁶ The DCI was also to perform for the benefit of the existing agencies such “services of common concern” as the NSC deemed could best be provided centrally. The NSC left the particulars of these responsibilities to be specified in accompanying NSCIDs (which eventually numbered 2 through 15 by the end of the Truman administration in 1953).¹⁷

Under this regime, DCIs were faced with contradictory mandates: they *could* coordinate intelligence, but they *must not* control it. Since the prohibitions in the statute and the NSCIDs were so much clearer than the permissions, every DCI naturally tended to steer on the side of looser rather than tighter oversight of common Intelligence Community issues. Because of this tendency to emphasize coordination instead of control, CIA never quite became the integrator of US intelligence that its presidential and congressional parents had envisioned. The DCI never became the manager of the Intelligence Community, his Agency never won the power to “inspect” the departments’ operational plans or to extract



CIA office workers, circa 1950.

community-wide consensus on disputed analytical issues, and CIA never had authority over all clandestine operations of the US Government.

REVISIONS AND OVERSIGHT

This federalized intelligence structure did not satisfy the White House. Indeed, presidents from Dwight Eisenhower through Richard Nixon sought to adjust the NSCIDs to improve the functioning of the Intelligence Community, primarily by pushing successive DCIs to exert more control over common community issues and programs. President Eisenhower paid particular attention to this issue, approving in 1958 the first major revisions of NSCID 1. The September 1958 version of the revised directive added a preamble stressing the need for efficiency across the entire national intelligence effort, and began its first section by declaring “The Director of Central Intelligence shall coordinate the foreign intelligence activities of the United States....”

The September 1958 version of NSCID 1 also added a section on “community responsibilities” that listed the duties of

1945

1 October: President Harry S. Truman’s Executive Order 9621 abolishes the OSS and transfers its functions to the State and War Departments.



the DCI to foster an efficient Intelligence Community and to ensure the quality of the intelligence information available to the US Government. It also emphasized to the existing departments and agencies their responsibilities to assist the DCI in these tasks. To this end, the new NSCID 1 created the United States Intelligence Board (USIB), a panel chaired by the DCI—with the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence (the DDCI) representing CIA—to coordinate a range of cooperative activities through a network of interagency committees. USIB soon built a sophisticated set of procedures, prompting former CIA Executive Director Lyman Kirkpatrick in 1973 to declare that “the USIB structure provides the community with probably the broadest and most comprehensive coordinating mechanism in the history of any nation’s intelligence activities.”¹⁸

In 1971 President Nixon turned to the topic of intelligence reform and issued a directive that precipitated the first major revision of NSCID 1 in over a decade. In the spirit of President Eisenhower’s earlier initiatives, Nixon authorized a full-dress study of Intelligence Community cooperation, with an emphasis on cutting its costs and increasing its effectiveness. A committee headed by James Schlesinger of the Office of Management and Budget recommended major reforms, among them a greater role for the DCI in managing the Intelligence Community. President Nixon directed the adoption of many of these recommendations in a 5 November 1971 letter to the cabinet secretaries and senior policymakers who oversaw the community’s far-flung components.¹⁹ The NSC issued a revised NSCID 1 in February 1972 to disseminate the new guidance to the community.

The new version retained much of the earlier text, while adding that the DCI had “four major responsibilities.” He was to plan and review all intelligence activities and spending, submitting annually to the White House the community’s overall “program/budget”; to produce national intelligence for the President and policymakers; to chair all communi-

ty-wide advisory panels, and to establish intelligence requirements and priorities. In addition, the 1972 NSCID 1 established several objectives to guide the DCI in discharging these responsibilities. He was to seek the attainment of greater efficiency, better and more timely intelligence; and, perhaps most of all, “authoritative and responsible leadership for the community.” The provision for DCI authority (albeit limited) over the Intelligence Community budget was new and significant; henceforth all subsequent directives governing the community would place at least one of the DCI’s hands on the collective purse strings.

The years that followed the issuance of the 1972 version of NSCID 1 witnessed dramatic changes in the policy dynamic surrounding the Intelligence Community. For several reasons—many of them related to the Vietnam War and the Watergate scandal, but including Agency misdeeds under earlier administrations as well—Congress began to impose itself directly on CIA and other parts of the Intelligence Community in the mid-1970s. The White House responded to the new mood in Congress by acting to protect what it defended as the exclusive prerogatives of the executive branch. Republican and Democratic Presidents had long been content to delegate the chore of overseeing the community to the National Security Council, but President Gerald Ford, concerned that Congress would re-write the statutes undergirding the Intelligence Community, intervened with an executive order that supplanted the earlier NSCIDs.

Executive Order 11905 (18 February 1976) retained much of the language of the 1972 NSCID 1, but added much else as well. Most prominently, it established a lengthy list of restrictions on intelligence activities, which ran the gamut from a prohibition on the perusal of federal tax returns to a ban on “political assassination.” E.O. 11905 also revisited the traditional ground covered by the now-obsolete NSCID 1 series, assigning “duties and responsibilities” to the DCI and the various members of the Intelligence Community.



1946

22 January: President Truman signs an executive order establishing the Central Intelligence Group to operate under the direction of the National Intelligence Authority. Truman names the first Director of Central Intelligence (DCI), Rear Admiral Sidney W. Souers, USNR, who was sworn in on the following day.

President Ford's executive order did not diverge noticeably, however, from the earlier listings of the DCI's duties. These were now to be: acting as "executive head of the CIA and Intelligence Community staff;" preparing the community's budget, requirements and priorities; serving as "primary adviser on foreign intelligence," and implementing "special activities" (i.e., covert action). Indeed, E.O. 11905 encouraged the DCI to devote more energy to "the supervision and direction of the Intelligence Community." In this spirit, it revived an Eisenhower administration idea and urged the DCI to delegate "the day-to-day operation" of CIA to his Deputy Director for Central Intelligence.

President Jimmy Carter superseded E.O. 11905 with his own Executive Order 12036 barely two years later. The new order retained basically the same (albeit reordered) list of duties for the DCI in his dual role as manager of the Intelligence Community and head of CIA. It also revamped the old United States Intelligence Board, expanding the list of topics on which it was to advise the DCI and renaming it the National Foreign Intelligence Board (NFIB). Where E.O. 12036 differed from preceding directives was in tasking the DCI to oversee the Intelligence Community budget. President Ford's executive order had created a three-member committee, chaired by the DCI, to prepare the budget and, when necessary, to reprogram funding.²⁰ Under the new provisions of E.O. 12036, however, the DCI now had "full and exclusive responsibility for approval of the National Foreign Intelligence Program budget." These combined powers were somewhat less sweeping than under E.O. 11905, but more concentrated in now being vested in the DCI alone. He would issue guidance to the community for program and budget development, evaluate the submissions of the various agencies, justify them before Congress, monitor implementation, and he could (after due consultation) reprogram funds.

President Ronald Reagan in his turn replaced the Carter directive with Executive Order 12333 (4 December 1981), which remains in effect today. The new order deleted provisions for the NFIB and other boards, allowing the DCI to arrange interagency advisory panels as he needed (DCI William Casey quickly reinstated the NFIB on his own authority). This was, however, almost the only enhancement of the DCI's power in an executive order that otherwise stepped back slightly from the centralization decreed by President Carter. Specifically, E.O. 12333 diluted DCI authority over the National Foreign Intelligence Program budget that E.O. 12036 had briefly strengthened. Where Carter had explicitly made the DCI the manager of the NFIP budgeting process,

Reagan instead outlined a leading role for the DCI in developing the budget, reviewing requests for the reprogramming of funds and monitoring implementation. The change was not dramatic, but it was significant.

Management of the Intelligence Community by executive order during this period did not forestall increased Congressional oversight. In the 1970s both houses of Congress had created permanent intelligence oversight committees and passed legislation to tighten control of covert action. With the renewed polarization of foreign policy debates in the 1980s, both Republican and Democratic officials and lawmakers sought to "protect" intelligence from allegedly unprincipled forces that might somehow co-opt and abuse it to the detri-



On 26 July 1947, President Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947 while on board the *Sacred Cow*, a Douglas C-54 Skymaster (VC-54C) originally configured for President Roosevelt. The Act established the Department of the Air Force as an independent service, making the *Sacred Cow* the "birthplace" of what is now the USAF.

ment of the community and the nation's security. Responding to these concerns, Congress further toughened the new regulatory, oversight, and accountability regime to check the powers and potential for abuses at CIA and other agencies. Congress ensured permanence for these changes by codifying them as amendments to law, particularly to the National Security Act of 1947.

By the late 1980s, Congress's increased oversight role (and its new appetite for finished intelligence) prompted then-DD-CI Robert Gates to comment publicly that CIA "now finds itself in a remarkable position, involuntarily poised nearly

equidistant between the executive and legislative branches.”²¹ Not until the 1990s, however, did these changes significantly affect the “duties and responsibilities” of the DCI and the Intelligence Community.



After the bill's House passage, floor leader Representative James W. Wadsworth of New York remarked, “It [the CIA] will be a gathering point for information coming from all over the world through all channels concerning the potential strength of other nations and their political intentions.” Wadsworth continued, “There is no secret every nation in the world is doing the same thing.”

INTO A NEW ERA

For the duration of the Cold War, the White House kept nudging successive Directors of Central Intelligence to do more to lead the Intelligence Community. DCIs more or less tried to comply. The statutory and institutional obstacles to centralization, however, proved daunting. Each DCI held budgetary and administrative sway only over the Central Intelligence Agency; the much larger budgets and staffs of the intelligence agencies in the Department of Defense (and their smaller cousins in other departments) remained firmly under cabinet-level officials who saw no reason to cede power to a DCI. Faced with this reality, DCIs had tended to let their community coordination duties suffer and to concentrate on the management of the CIA. Congress had intended a different course, however, and

in the 1990s the legislative branch began its own campaign to encourage greater coordination in the Intelligence Community.

The end of the Cold War saw a subtle shift in Congressional attitudes toward intelligence. With the political need for a “peace dividend” acutely felt, Congress and the White House oversaw a gradual decline in real defense spending that affected the Intelligence Community as well. Declining defense budgets soon meant relatively declining intelligence budgets, which in turn put a premium on cost-cutting, consolidation and efficiency. Similar concerns had surfaced during the debate over the creation of CIA (when demobilization, not the incipient Cold War, was still the primary consideration in defense budgeting).²² To many members of Congress in 1992—as in 1947—the answer seemed to lie in increased authority for the DCI, who in turn could motivate a leaner, more agile Intelligence Community.

Congress in the 1990s partially supplanted E.O. 12333 with a series of amendments to the National Security Act. Those amendments were occasionally proscriptive (like the prohibitions added in the 1980s), but often they mandated various acts by the DCI. The intelligence-related passages of the National Security Act—which had hardly been amended at all before 1980—grew from 22 pages of text in the 1990 edition of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's Compilation of Intelligence Laws to 48 pages in the 2000 version.²³

Foremost among these amendments was the Intelligence Organization Act of 1992.²⁴ Inspired by the reforms of the Joint Chiefs of Staff accomplished in the 1986 Goldwater-Nichols Act, the legislation—for the first time in a statute—specified the roles (as opposed to the duties) of the Director of Central Intelligence.²⁵ The DCI was to serve as head of the Intelligence Community, as principal intelligence adviser to the president, and as head of the CIA. As principal intelligence adviser he was to provide the nation's senior policymakers, commanders, and lawmakers with “national” intelligence that was “timely, objective, independent of political considerations, and based on all sources.” As head of the Agency he was to collect and evaluate intelligence (particularly from human sources), and to perform services of common concern and “such other functions and duties” as had been suggested since 1947. As head of the Intelligence Community he was to develop the Community's budget, to advise the Secretary of Defense in the appointments of chiefs for the military's joint intelligence agencies, to set collection requirements and priorities, to eliminate unneeded duplication, and to coordinate the community's relationships with foreign intelligence services.

The Intelligence Organization Act also codified the DCI's budgetary powers as described in E.O. 12333, considerably strengthening their provisions. The Act decreed that the budgets of the various components of the Intelligence Community could not be incorporated into the annual National Foreign Intelligence Program until approved by the DCI, and required all agencies to obtain DCI approval before reprogramming any NFIP funds. In addition, the Act gave the Director something new: a carefully limited authority to shift funds and personnel from one NFIP project to another (provided he obtained approvals from the White House, Congress, and the affected agency's head).

Events at mid-decade lent new urgency to the unfinished task of modernizing the Intelligence Community. At CIA, the arrest of Aldrich Ames and the spy scandal that ensued led to bipartisan calls for reform of the Agency. The subsequent Republican takeover of Congress in the 1994 elections seemed to provide an opportunity for sweeping changes in the community as a whole. Finally, the re-ordering of national priorities after the end of the Cold War had meant substantial budget cuts for the US military, resulting in reduced budgets and lower personnel ceilings for the Intelligence Community.²⁶ While military and intelligence resources had been reduced in early 1990s, however, Washington committed American forces to several, major overseas deployments in Africa, the Balkans, the Middle East, and the Caribbean.

The White House responded to the new situation by re-ordering intelligence priorities. The burgeoning military deployments demanded ever more tactical intelligence support, and President William Clinton issued a 1995 presidential order (PDD-35) instructing the Intelligence Community to provide it. Explaining his directive at CIA headquarters a few months later, he emphasized that the Community's first priority was to support "the intelligence needs of our military during an operation." Commanders in the field needed "prompt, thorough intelligence to fully inform their decisions and maximize the security of our troops."²⁷ Since the military spent most of the 1990s deployed in one peacekeep-

ing operation after another (often with more than one taking place at a time), the result of the commitment in PDD-35 was a diversion of shrinking national, strategic intelligence resources to growing, tactical missions.

Congress took a little longer to respond. In 1995 Congressional and outside critics coalesced in no fewer than six separate panels to study the US intelligence effort and recommend reforms.²⁸ Almost all of the reports published by these groups endorsed a greater degree of centralization and enhanced authority for the Director of Central Intelligence.²⁹ The wide variance in the size and scope of the study groups—which ranged in stature from academic colloquia to the presidentially-appointed "Brown-Aspin" commission—seemed to highlight their basic agreement on this issue. The Brown-Aspin commission report perhaps expressed the feeling best. After considering arguments for decentralization, the report cited President Truman's disgust with the bureaucratic rivalry that "contributed to the disaster at Pearl Harbor" and concluded that "returning to a more decentralized system would be a step in the wrong direction." The report declined to suggest alterations in "the fundamental relationship between the DCI and the Secretary of Defense," but nonetheless urged a strengthening of "the DCI's ability to provide centralized management of the Intelligence Community."³⁰

Congress heeded the conclusions and the recommendations of these several reports when it drafted the Intelligence Renewal and Reform Act of 1996. That Act, among its other provisions, required the Secretary of Defense to win the concurrence of the DCI in appointing directors for the National Security Agency, the new National Imagery and Mapping Agency, and the National Reconnaissance Office. Under the Act, the DCI would also write (for the NSC) annual performance appraisals of these three agencies.³¹ The Act also gave the DCI several new aides (nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate) to assist in managing the Intelligence Community: a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence for Community Management, as well as Assistant Directors of Central Intelligence for Collection, Analysis and Production, and Administration. It also en-

1947

18 September: The National Security Act of 1947 establishes the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to replace the National Intelligence Authority and the Central Intelligence Group.



hanced the DCI's role as an adviser to the Pentagon's tactical and inter-service intelligence programs, strengthened his limited ability to "reprogram" money and personnel between national intelligence programs and created a subcommittee of the NSC to establish annual priorities for the Intelligence Community.

Congress did not, however, resist the shift of national means to tactical ends. The shift of intelligence resources toward support for military operations worried officials and observers of the Intelligence Community. Indeed, DCI Robert Gates complained as early as 1992 that cuts in the defense budget were forcing the military to trim tactical intelligence programs and pass their work on to the "national" intelligence services.³² PDD-35 seemed to make the situation even more acute. More than one appraisal in the year after its issuance warned that "support to the warfighter" could demand a disproportionate share of intelligence efforts; a Congressional study even blamed PDD-35, in part, for this development.³³ Nevertheless, these worries remained on the margins of the debate for several more years.

CONTRADICTIONARY IMPULSES

The net effect of the changes made both by the White House and by Congress under both Republican and Democratic majorities was to urge the DCI to exercise more control over the Intelligence Community while limiting his freedom to allocate "national" intelligence resources among competing priorities. Members of Congress collectively seemed impatient with executive branch implementation of reforms to streamline and motivate the community during a long decade of shrinking real defense budgets. At the same time, however, no Congress seriously considered forcing the various civilian and military agencies into a unitary system with a Director of Central Intelligence (or whatever the title) transformed into a true intelligence czar. The executive branch neither assisted nor resisted this congressional impulse to enhance the DCI's authority and the centralization of the Intelligence Community. In effect, however, the White House's aforementioned actions with regard to intelligence were anything but neutral.

The contradictory impulses affecting the Intelligence Community showed in the way the executive and legislative branches together crafted a 1996 law, the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) Act, which created the Department of Defense agency of that name out of components from CIA and Defense. While this marked a diminution of the DCI's direct control over imagery analysis, the NIMA Act took pains to preserve DCI authority to prioritize assignments for "national imagery collection assets" and to resolve conflicts among competing priorities.³⁴ The net effect was ambiguous; the DCI and the CIA lost actual, day-to-day control over an important component of the Intelligence Community, but gained a statutory voice in the nation's employment of that component.

In 1998 DCI George Tenet issued a reconstituted series of Director of Central Intelligence Directives (DCIDs), led by a new DCID-1/1, titled "The Authorities and Responsibilities of the Director of Central Intelligence as Head of the US Intelligence Community." DCIDs had traditionally not been issued as policy statements; they had essentially been implementing documents for the policies established in the NSCIDs (and later in the executive orders). DCID 1/1 stayed well within this tradition, but provided an important reference for the entire community by arranging and citing in one document the key passages of Executive Order 12333 and the amended National Security Act.

The preface to DCID 1/1 stated that it was only intended to be "illustrative." Indeed, readers were directed to the citations "for controlling language." This spare format perhaps conveyed a message more powerful than its authors realized. The DCI's new-found ability to cite so many passages of the United States Code to buttress his authority meant that his powers had grown substantially since its meager beginnings in January 1946. The fact that a DCI felt the need to cite all those passages for the edification of Intelligence Community colleagues, however, suggests that his authority still had far to go.

The blurring of the divide between "national" and "tactical" intelligence seemed at decade's end to provide unclear portents for the future of the DCI's authority. By 2000, the earlier warnings were widely seen to have been accurate. A high-level

1949

20 June: The Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 provides special legal and administrative authorities and responsibilities for the Agency and the DCI.



CIA South Building in what was called the E Street Complex, circa 1960. Located in the city's Foggy Bottom neighborhood at 2430 E St. NW, it was the original CIA Headquarters, a site it took over from its wartime predecessor, the Office of Strategic Services.

study commission recently has complained that declining intelligence resources, combined with increased demands for “warning and crisis management,” have resulted in:

*...an Intelligence Community that is more demand-driven.... That demand is also more driven by military consumers and, therefore, what the Intelligence Community is doing is narrower and more short-term than it was two decades ago.*³⁵

Another commission, reporting its findings on the National Reconnaissance Office, found in PDD-35 a lightning rod for its criticism:

There appears to be no effective mechanism to alert policy-makers to the negative impact on strategic requirements that may result from strict adherence to the current Presidential Decision Directive (PDD-35) assigning top priority to military force protection. That Directive has not been reviewed recently to de-

*termine whether it has been properly applied and should remain in effect.*³⁶

THE ELUSIVE VISION OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

*Today, intelligence remains the only area of highly complex government activity where overall management across departmental and agency lines is seriously attempted.*³⁷

Ten years past the end of the Cold War and five since the spate of reform proposals in 1996, this observation by the Brown-Aspin commission seems to remain valid. The Director of Central Intelligence is nominally stronger now; new laws and amendments have augmented his power to lead the Intelligence Community. Nevertheless, the community remains a confederated system, in which the DCI has leadership responsibilities greater than his responsibilities. The system seems roughly balanced between the need for central

1950

1 December: The Directorate of Administration is established.

direction and the imperative to preserve departmental intelligence autonomy. If that balance perhaps appears to be less than optimal, there nevertheless is no obvious imperative to correct it in any fundamental way. Indeed, the 2001 report of the blue-ribbon “Commission on National Security/21st Century” (the Hart-Rudman commission) recommended “no major structural changes” in the management of the Intelligence Community and noted that “current efforts to strengthen community management while maintaining the ongoing relationship between the DCI and the Secretary of Defense are bearing fruit.”³⁸

The members of Congress who passed the National Security Act of 1947 had wanted the new Central Intelligence Agency to provide policymakers the best possible information and to coordinate clandestine operations. They assumed that the President’s intelligence officer—the Director of Central Intelligence—would accomplish these objectives, and left the executive branch to its own initiative for the next four decades. This was how Congress resolved the dilemma of having a “national” intelligence system that was not centrally controlled. Succeeding presidents oversaw the Intelligence Community through a series of National Security Council Intelligence Directives and executive orders, which recognized the gap between coordination and control and encouraged DCIs to do more to bridge it and to manage America’s intelligence efforts. After the Cold War ended, however, Democratic and Republican Congresses grew impatient with the executive branch and urged that intelligence be done centrally. None-

theless, no Congress grasped the nettle of sweeping reform, either to decentralize the system or to give the DCI command authority over military intelligence and the departmental intelligence offices. At the same time, the executive branch’s insistence on using declining resources first and foremost to support military operations effectively blunted the Congressional emphasis on centralization by limiting the wherewithal that DCIs and agency heads could devote to national and strategic objectives.

This ambiguity is likely to endure for the same reasons it arose in the first place: no one can agree on what should replace it. Reform faces the same obstacles that Harry Truman and his aides encountered in 1945. Everyone has a notion of how reform should be implemented, but everyone also has a specific list of changes they will not tolerate. The mix of preferences and objections produces a veto to almost every proposal, until the one that survives is the one policymakers and legislators dislike the least. Ambiguity is also likely to keep alive the durable idea—born from the Pearl Harbor disaster—that the axiomatic principles of unity of command and unity of intelligence can best be served through an increased centralization of US intelligence efforts.

America’s national security framework forces such ambiguities on policymakers and commanders for good reasons as well as bad. The great economic and military strength of America and the comparative material wealth of its Intelligence Community has provided a certain latitude for experimentation—and even duplication of effort—in the service of higher, political goals. In such a context, a decentralized Intelligence Community may be the only kind of system that can maintain public and military support for an independent, civilian foreign intelligence arm in America’s non-parliamentary form of government, where it is possible for the two major political parties to split control over the executive and legislative branches of government. Decentralization assures the Pentagon of military control over its tactical and joint intelligence programs. It also assures members of Congress of both parties that the President’s chief intelligence adviser cannot acquire a dangerous concentration of domestic political power or monopolize the foreign policy advice flowing into the White House. Thus we are likely to live with the decentralized intelligence system—and the impulse toward centralization—until a crisis re-aligns the political and bureaucratic players or compels them to cooperate in new ways.

“Reform [of the intelligence community] faces the same obstacles that Harry Truman and his aides encountered in 1945. Everyone has a notion of how reform should be implemented, but everyone also has a specific list of changes they will not tolerate. The mix...produces a veto to almost every proposal...”

¹ Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, "Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack," 79th Congress, 2nd Session, 1946, pp. 252-253. (U)

² Shorthand reference to "the Agency" is commonly used, and is used herein, as synonymous with CIA. "Community" has long been used, and is herein, to denote the totality of US executive branch organizations that produce and provide foreign intelligence to US policymakers and military commanders.

³ "Text of the President's Message to Congress Asking Unification of the Army and Navy," *New York Times*, 20 December 1945, p. 14.

⁴ President Truman's 22 January 1946 directive establishing CIG is reprinted in US Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1945-1950, Emergence of the Intelligence Establishment* (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1996) [hereafter cited as FRUS], pp. 178-179. The first DCI, Sidney Souers, recalled in 1954 that he had been part of the collective effort (leading to CIG's establishment) to create "a central intelligence agency" that would ensure that national security policymakers "all would get the same intelligence—in contrast to the system that had prevailed, where the OSS would give one bit of intelligence to the President and not any to the secretaries of the military departments and the State Department, who had some responsibility to advise the President." Quoted in Ralph E. Weber, ed., *Spymasters: Ten CIA Officers in Their Own Words* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1999), p. 3.

⁵ David F. Rudgers, *Creating the Secret State: The Origins of the Central Intelligence Agency, 1943-1947* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2000), p. 107.

⁶ Anthony Leviero, "Truman Offers Congress 12-Point Program to Unify Armed Services of Nation," *New York Times*, 16 June 1946. For the Patterson-Forrestal accord in May 1946, see Walter Millis, ed., *The Forrestal Diaries* (New York: Viking, 1951), p. 163.

⁷ National Intelligence Authority Directive number 5, 8 July 1946, reprinted in FRUS, pp. 391-392.

⁸ Harry S Truman, *Memoirs*, Volume II, *Years of Trial and Hope* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1956), pp. 46-47.

⁹ Admiral Forrest Sherman, a member of the White House team that drafted the bill, later told the House Committee on Expenditures that he and his colleagues feared that a detailed CIA section would prompt Congress to seek similar levels of detail in the armed services' sections of the bill, forcing a re-opening of the drafting process and possibly encumbering the draft with controversial specifics. See Lyle Miller's declassified draft, "Legislative History of the Central Intelligence Agency—National Security Act of 1947," Central Intelligence Agency (Office of Legislative Council), 25 July 1967, p. 72.

¹⁰ Quoted in Miller, "Legislative History," pp. 40, 45, 47, 48, 50.

¹¹ Sec. 102(d)3. The phrase came from President Truman's 22 January 1946 directive establishing CIG; see FRUS, p. 178. The original pages of the intelligence section of the National Security Act of 1947 are reproduced in Michael Warner, ed., *The CIA under Harry Truman* (Washington: Central Intelligence Agency, 1994), pp. 131-135.

¹² The Act was amended in 1953 to provide for a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence (DDCI) with the stipulation (since removed) that

the positions of DCI and DDCI must not "be occupied simultaneously by commissioned officers of the armed services, whether in an active or retired status."

¹³ Ludwell Montague believed the term "Intelligence Community" made its earliest documented appearance in the minutes of a 1952 meeting of the Intelligence Advisory Committee. For the sake of consistency the term Intelligence Community is used throughout this essay, even though the size and composition of the community has changed and now includes several large entities that did not exist when the National Security Act was passed in 1947. For example, of today's 13 intelligence organizations in the community, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office and the National Imagery and Mapping Agency are among the eight intelligence organizations that come under the Department of Defense. The only independent agency (that is, not part of a policy department) is CIA. For the 1952 usage of the term, see Ludwell Lee Montague, *General Walter Bedell Smith as Director of Central Intelligence: October 1950—February 1953* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), p. 74.

¹⁴ At the time the Act went into effect, the intelligence agencies of the US government comprised the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Intelligence Research (State), the Intelligence Division (Army), the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Directorate of Intelligence (Air Force), and associated military signals intelligence offices, principally the Army Security Agency and the Navy's OP-20-G.

¹⁵ All versions of NSCID 1 have been declassified and are available at the National Archives and Records Administration, Record Group 263 (CIA), NN3-263-91-004, box 4, HS/HC-500.

¹⁶ NSCID 3 (13 January 1948) defined national intelligence as "integrated departmental intelligence that covers the broad aspects of national policy and national security, is of concern to more than one Department or Agency, and transcends the exclusive competence of a single Department or Agency or the Military Establishment." Its opposite was "departmental" intelligence, which NSCID 3 defined as intelligence needed by a department or agency "to execute its mission and discharge its lawful responsibilities;" see FRUS, p. 1109. Executive Order 11905 in 1976 retained "national intelligence" but changed its opposite to a phrase used in President Nixon's 1971 letter, "tactical intelligence" (which the executive order did not further define, apart from saying that the DCI shall not have responsibility for it). E.O. 11905 also added the overarching term "foreign intelligence," defining it as information "on the capabilities, intentions, and activities of foreign powers, organizations or their agents."

¹⁷ It bears noting that the NSCIDs endorsed the NIA's 1946 assignment of the two main missions (strategic warning and the coordination of clandestine activities abroad) to the DCI and his Central Intelligence Group. In particular, NSCID 5 (12 December 1947) reaffirmed NIAD-5 in directing that the DCI "shall conduct all organized Federal espionage operations outside the United States...except for certain agreed activities by other Departments and Agencies." See FRUS, p. 1106.

¹⁸ Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Jr., *The US Intelligence Community: Foreign Policy and Domestic Activities* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1973), p. 39.

¹⁹ Richard Nixon to the Secretary of State et al., “Organization and Management of the US Foreign Intelligence Community,” 5 November 1971.

²⁰ The panel had been created by E.O. 11905, which titled it the “Committee on Foreign Intelligence”; it comprised the DCI (chairman), the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, and the Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

²¹ Robert M. Gates, “The CIA and American Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs* 66 (Winter 1987/88), p. 225.

²² Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones, “Why Was the CIA Established in 1947?,” *Intelligence and National Security* 12 (January 1997), p. 30.

²³ Unless otherwise noted, all amendments to the National Security Act cited herein are published in the several editions (1993, 1998, or 2000) of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence’s *Compilation of Intelligence Laws*.

²⁴ The Intelligence Organization Act was passed as part of the Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 1993. Much of its text came from S. 2198, introduced by Sen. David L. Boren (D-OK) and titled the “Intelligence Reorganization Act of 1992.” S. 2198 proposed a “Director of National Intelligence” to head the Intelligence Community; subordinate to this new officer would be the newly-styled “Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.” Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, “S. 2198 and S. 421 to Reorganize the United States Intelligence Community,” 102d Congress, 2d Session, 1992, p. 2. The companion bill in the House of Representatives was HR. 4165, which offered a milder version of the DNI proposal. See also Frank J. Smist, Jr., *Congress Oversees the United States Intelligence Community, 1947-1994* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1994 [2d ed.]), pp. 286-287.

²⁵ The Goldwater-Nichols Act is widely credited with adding coherence to the Joint Chiefs of Staff structure—another creation of the National Security Act of 1947—which had long been viewed as fragmented and less effective than it should have been in advising the commander-in-chief. Among other reforms, Goldwater-Nichols strengthened the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, naming him (as opposed to the Joint Chiefs as a body) the principal military adviser to the President, clarifying his place in the national chain of command, giving him a Vice Chairman and improving the Joint Staff. See Ronald H. Cole et al., *The Chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff* (Washington: Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff [Joint History Office], 1995), pp. 25-38.

²⁶ Commission on National Security/21st Century, *Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 2001), p. 82.

²⁷ President William J. Clinton, address to the US Intelligence Community, delivered at the Central Intelligence Agency’s headquarters, 14 July 1995.

²⁸ The six panels’ reports were: Commission on the Roles and Missions of the United States Intelligence Community [the Brown-Aspin commission], *Preparing for the 21st Century: An Appraisal of US Intelligence* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1996); House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, “IC21: Intelligence Community in the 21st Century,” 104th Cong., 2d Sess., 1996; Richard N. Haass, Project Director for the Independent Task Force, *Making Intelligence Smarter: The Future of US Intelligence* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1996); Working Group on Intelligence Reform

[Abram Shulsky and Gary Schmitt, authors], *The Future of US Intelligence* (Washington: Consortium for the Study of Intelligence, 1996); the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on the Future of US Intelligence [Stephen Bosworth, chairman], *In From the Cold* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund Press, 1996), and Georgetown University’s Institute for the Study of Diplomacy [John Hollister Hedley, author], *Checklist for the Future of Intelligence* (Washington: Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, 1995).

²⁹ The lone dissenter was the Consortium for the Study of Intelligence’s report, overseen by Georgetown political scientist Roy Godson and Harvard historian Ernest May. Its authors concluded:

... the failure of centralization efforts can be seen as reflecting the reasonable needs of the various components of the national security bureaucracy. In any case, the centralized model was probably better suited to the Cold War, with its emphasis on “national” level intelligence about the Soviet strategic nuclear threat, than to the present period when departmental, regional, and tactical intelligence requirements have exploded and gained new urgency. [See pp. xiv-xv.]

The Twentieth Century Fund’s report did not discuss the DCI’s responsibilities or the centralization issue, although a “Background Paper” by Allan E. Goodman (bound with the report) implicitly endorsed greater powers for the DCI; see p. 78.

³⁰ Commission on Roles and Missions, *Preparing for the 21st Century*, pp. xix, 51-52.

³¹ See Sections 808 and 815 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997; *Compilation of Intelligence Laws* (1998).

³² Testimony of Robert Gates on 1 April 1992 at the Joint Hearing, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, “S. 2198 and S. 421 to Reorganize the United States Intelligence Community,” 102nd Cong., 2nd Sess., 1992, p. 108.

³³ For expressions of official and outside concern, see House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, “IC21: Intelligence Community in the 21st Century,” 104th Cong., 2d Sess., 1996, p. 245. See also the joint comment by Morton I. Abramowitz and Richard Kerr in Richard N. Haass, Project Director for the Independent Task Force, *Making Intelligence Smarter: The Future of US Intelligence* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1996), p. 38.

³⁴ See Section 1112 of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency Act, which was passed as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997; *Compilation of Intelligence Laws* (2000).

³⁵ Commission on National Security, *Road Map for National Security*, p. 82.

³⁶ National Commission for the Review of the National Reconnaissance Office, Final Report (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 2000), p. 51.

³⁷ Commission on Roles and Missions, *Preparing for the 21st Century*, p. 47.

³⁸ Commission on National Security, *Road Map for National Security*, p. 83.

MILESTONES IN THE CREATION OF THE US INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

1941

11 July - William Donovan is named Coordinator of Information (COI), making him responsible for coordination of intelligence from the Army, Navy, FBI, Department of State, and other intelligence-gathering entities; jurisdictional battles quickly followed.

October - Donovan establishes the COI's New York headquarters in Room 3603 of Rockefeller Center (a former British MI6 office), and asks Allen Dulles to head it.

1942

13 June - President Franklin D. Roosevelt signs a military order establishing the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) and naming William J. Donovan as its Director. Donovan remained a civilian until 24 March 1943, when he was appointed brigadier general. He advanced to the rank of major general on 10 November 1944.

1944

18 November - William Donovan submits "Memorandum for the President" to President Truman, suggesting continuation of a comprehensive post-war intelligence entity "...which will procure intelligence both by overt and covert methods and will at the same time provide intelligence guidance, determine national intelligence objectives, and correlate the intelligence material collected by all government agencies."¹

1945

3 July - US Army Signal Security Agency establishes Cryptographic Security Board.

15 September - US Army Signal Security Agency renamed Army Security Agency (ASA).

1 October - President Harry S. Truman's Executive Order 9621 abolishes the OSS and transfers its functions to the State and War Departments.

1946

22 January - President Truman signs an executive order establishing the Central Intelligence Group (CIG) to operate under the direction of the National Intelligence Authority (NIA). Truman names the first Director of Central Intelligence, Rear Admiral Sidney W. Souers, USNR, who is sworn in on the following day.

1 August - The Atomic Energy Act (McMahon Act) is signed into law, making the FBI responsible for investigating the backgrounds of persons able to access restricted nuclear data.

1947

26 July - President Truman signs the National Security Act of 1947 aboard the VC-54C presidential aircraft Sacred Cow, the first aircraft used for the role of Air Force One.

18 September - The National Security Act of 1947 is implemented upon the confirmation of James Forrestal as first Secretary of Defense. It merges the Department of War and Department of Navy into the National Military Establishment (NME) and establishes a Department of the Air Force separate from existing Army Air Forces. It also creates the National Security Council (NSC) and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) - the first peacetime intelligence agency - to replace the National Intelligence Authority (NIA) and the Central Intelligence Group (CIG).

1948

20 October - The Air Force Security Group is renamed Air Force Security Service.

1949

The Central Intelligence Agency Act (also called "Public Law 110") is passed permitting confidential fiscal and administrative procedures.

20 May - The Armed Forces Security Agency (AFSA) is established.

10 August - The National Security Act Amendments of 1949 subordinate the three service secretaries to the new Secretary of Defense.

20 August - Further National Security Act Amendments of 1949 rename the National Military Establishment (NME) the Department of Defense, and amend the duties of the National Security Council (NSC) and further, place the NSC in the Executive Office of the President.

1950

19 July - By directive of President Harry S. Truman, the National Security Council staff is reorganized to have a more representative mix of agencies, Congress, and groups.

1952

2 January - Creation of the Directorate of Intelligence (DI) at CIA.

1 August - Creation of the Directorate of Plans (DP) at CIA.

4 November - The National Security Agency (NSA) is established



1953

2 September - The Operations Coordinating Board (OCB) is established by EO 10483 as an independent agency. It reports to the NSC on the development, by appropriate Executive branch agencies, of operational plans for national security policies.

1955

4 August - President Dwight D. Eisenhower signs a bill authorizing \$46 million for construction of a CIA Headquarters Building.

1957

1 July - The Operations Coordinating Board (OCB) is incorporated into the National Security Council (NSC) by EO 10700.

1959

3 November - Laying of the cornerstone of the CIA Headquarters Building, Langley, Virginia.

1960

25 August - The National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) is established based on a recommendation by President Dwight D. Eisenhower during a special National Security Council meeting. NRO is to coordinate the USAF and CIA's reconnaissance activities.

1961

1 January - President Dwight D. Eisenhower authorizes creation of the National Photographic Interpretation Center (NPIC) - a part of CIA's Directorate of Science and Technology (DS&T) - combining Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Army, Navy, and Air Force assets to solve imagery analysis problems.

1 February - The Operations Coordinating Board (OCB) is abolished by EO 10920.

1 October - The Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) is born. It was designated in 1986 as a Defense Department combat support agency, but is made separate by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, under President John F. Kennedy, through Directive 5105.21.



1963

5 August - The Directorate of Science and Technology at CIA is created.

1964

1 December - President Lyndon B. Johnson receives the first President's Daily Brief (PDB), supplied by CIA.

¹ From *OSS Training in the National Parks and Service Abroad in World War II* by John Whiteclay Chambers II, 2008, U.S. National Park Service, Washington, D.C., in Chapter 10, is the following: On Donovan's 18 November 1944 plan for a permanent central intelligence agency, see Richard Dunlop, *Donovan: America's Master Spy* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1982), 458-459; Smith, *OSS: The Secret History*, 363, both of whom claim Roosevelt had requested it. But the much more detailed account in Thomas F. Troy, *Donovan and the CIA: A History of the Establishment of the Central Intelligence Agency* (Frederick, Md.: University Publications of America, 1981), 218-222, indicates that the impetus came from Donovan rather than the President. Donovan's first recorded statement of his goal of a permanent OSS is in a question and answer period following a talk to an audience of Army officers in Washington in May 1943; he later put such a recommendation in a memorandum to General Eisenhower on 17 September 1943.

SELECTED INTELLIGENCE DOCUMENTS

TOP SECRET SECRET CONFIDENTIAL RESTRICTED UNCLASSIFIED
 (Sender will circle classification Top and Bottom)

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE GROUP
 INTER-OFFICE ROUTING SLIP
 (Revised 10 Sept 1946)

APPROVED FOR RELEASE BY THE
 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
 DATE: 2001

FROM	TO	INITIALS	DATE
DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE	✓	<i>[Signature]</i>	
EXECUTIVE TO THE DIRECTOR			
SECRETARY TO THE DIRECTOR			
EXECUTIVE OFFICE: ASST. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR			
ADVISORY COUNCIL			
EXECUTIVE FOR PERSONNEL & ADMINISTRATION			
CENTRAL RECORDS			
SECRETARY, NIA			
CHIEF, INTERDEPARTMENTAL STAFF			
ASST. DIRECTOR, SPECIAL OPERATIONS			
ASST. DIRECTOR, RESEARCH & EVALUATION			
ASST. DIRECTOR, COLLECTION & DISSEMINATION			
CHIEF, SECURITY BRANCH			
<i>Legislative Liaison Division</i>			
APPROVAL			

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
 DCI 2/1
 25 October 1948

DIRECTOR OF C
 IMPLEMENTATION

Under the authority of Directive No. 2, and for the details for the guidance of their field representatives objectives established there

1. Coordinating
 - a. The senior where the United the spirit of the for the coordina his area.
 - b. To impl shall:
 - (1) Ex information
 - (2) E effort and informatic
 - (3)

PRINCIPLES - THE SOUNDNESS OF WHICH IT IS BELIEVED
HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED BY OUR OWN EXPERIENCE AND A
FIRST-HAND STUDY OF THE SYSTEMS OF OTHER NATIONS -
WHICH SHOULD GOVERN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CENTRALIZED
UNITED STATES FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM.

1. That each department of Government should have its own intelligence bureau for the collection and processing of such information material as it finds necessary in the actual performance of daily functions and duties. Such a bureau should be under the sole control of the department head and should not be encroached upon or impaired by the functions granted any other Government intelligence agency.

2. That, in addition to the intelligence unit for each department, there should be established (for the purpose of obtaining information upon which long range policy could be based) a national centralized foreign intelligence agency which should have the authority:

- (a) To serve all departments of the Government;
- (b) To procure and obtain political, economical, psychological, technological, sociological, military and other information which may bear upon the national interest and which has been collected by the different governmental departments or agencies;
- (c) To collect, when necessary, supplemental information either at its own instance or at the request of any governmental department by open or secret means from other and various sources;

(d) To integrate, analyze, process and disseminate, to authorized governmental agencies and officials, intelligence in the form of strategic interpretive studies.

3. That no executive department should be permitted to engage in secret intelligence, because secret intelligence covers all fields, but in a proper case call upon the central intelligence agency which should be in charge of secret intelligence.

4. That such an agency should be prohibited from carrying on clandestine activities within the United States, and should be forbidden any police functions either at home or abroad.

5. That since the nature of its work requires it to have status, it should be independent of any department of the Government (since it is charged to serve all and must be free of the natural bias of an operating department). It should be under a director, appointed by the President, and be administered under Presidential direction.

6. That, subject to the approval of the President, the policy of such an intelligence service should be determined by the director with the advice and assistance of a board on which the Secretaries of State, War, Navy and Treasury should be represented.

7. That this agency, as the sole agency for secret intelligence, should be authorized, in the foreign field only, to carry on services such as espionage, counter-espionage, and those special operations (including morale and psychological) designed to anticipate and counter any attempted penetration and subversion of our national

security by enemy action.

8. That such a service should have an independent budget granted directly by Congress. It should be authorized to have its own system of codes and should be furnished facilities by departments proper and necessary for the performance of its duties.

9. That such a service should include in its staff specialists (within Government departments, civilian and military, and in private life) professionally trained in the analysis of information and possessing a high degree of linguistic regional or functional competence to analyze, coordinate and evaluate incoming information, to make special intelligence reports, and to provide guidance for the collecting branches of the agency.

10. That in time of war or unlimited national emergency all departments of such agency in areas of actual and projected military operations shall be coordinated with military plans, and shall be subject to the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or if there be a consolidation of the armed services, under the supreme commander.

/s/ WILLIAM J. DOHOVAN

ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER OF JANUARY 7, 1941

FURTHER DEFINING THE STATUS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE
FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

APPROVED FOR RELEASE BY
THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
AGENCY DATE: 2001

WHEREAS Executive Order No. 8248, dated September 8, 1939, provides, in part, as follows:

"There shall be within the Executive Office of the President the following principal divisions, namely: (1) The White House Office, (2) the Bureau of the Budget, (3) the National Resources Planning Board, (4) the Liaison Office for Personnel Management, (5) the Office of Government Reports, and (6) in the event of a national emergency, or threat of a national emergency, such office for emergency management as the President shall determine";

AND WHEREAS the Office for Emergency Management was formally established by Administrative Order of May 25, 1940, and it is deemed advisable to modify the said order and further define the duties and functions of the said office;

NOW, THEREFORE, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the Statutes, and in pursuance of Part I of the aforesaid Executive Order of September 8, 1939, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. The Office for Emergency Management shall have the following duties and functions:

(a) To advise and assist the President in the discharge of extraordinary responsibilities imposed upon him by any emergency arising out of war, the threat of war, imminence of war, flood, drought, or other condition threatening the public peace or safety.

(b) To serve as a division of the Executive Office of the President, with such subdivisions as may be required, through which the President, during any emergency, may coordinate and supervise and, in appropriate cases, direct the activities of agencies, public or private, in relation thereto.

(c) To serve as a channel of communication between such agencies and the President concerning emergency activities, to keep the President currently advised of their progress, to assemble and analyze information concerning additional measures that should be taken, and to assist in the preparation of recommendations for any necessary legislation.

(d) To provide and maintain liaison during any such emergency with other divisions of the Executive Office of the President and with other agencies, public or private, for the purpose of bringing about maximum utilizations and coordination of their services and facilities.

(e) To advise and assist the President upon or before termination of any such emergency with respect to any measures that may be useful to facilitate a restoration of normal administrative relations and to ameliorate the consequences of the emergency.

(f) To perform such other duties and functions with respect to any such emergency as the President may from time to time direct.

2. The work and activities of the following-named agencies, and such other agencies as the President may from time to time designate, shall be coordinated in and through the Office for Emergency Management under the direction and supervision of the President.

(a) The Council of National Defense, the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense and all subordinate bodies and agents of the Council and Commission.

(b) Defense Communications Board.

(c) Office of Production Management (to be created immediately hereafter¹).

3. Provision may be made in the Office for Emergency Management for liaison facilities and for the maintenance of routine office services required in the conduct of the work and activities of the agencies coordinated through or established in the Office for Emergency Management.

4. Any provisions of the Administrative Order of May 25, 1940 establishing the Office for Emergency Management inconsistent with this order are hereby superseded by this order.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

The White House

January 7, 1941

¹See E.O. 8629

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED AND APPROVED FOR
RELEASE
BY THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
DATE: 2001

FBI
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

File PRR

3 April 1946

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service

A Policy and Review meeting was held on 3 April 1946 to discuss the report of the ad hoc committee to survey foreign intelligence broadcast service. A general discussion of the report was conducted and the following points brought out by the survey were emphasized:

1. The product of the FBIS is primarily of interest to the State Department, but is also of definite interest to both War and Navy.
2. The War Department took over the FBIS activity on an interim basis only.
3. There is still some FCC equipment on loan to the War Department.
4. A large percentage of FBIS product is obtained from the British (MOI-BBC) on an informal basis.
5. There is definitely a need for central direction of this activity.

As a result of the discussion, it was determined that the Information Branch should obtain answers to the following questions before a definite recommendation could be made as to the future control of the FBIS:

1. If the FBIS activity was transferred to another department, or to the C.I.G., what facilities, personnel, and equipment would be transferred and what other facilities, equipment, etc. would be required to run it?
2. Can the State, War, Navy Departments run it and, if not, why not?
3. What would be required for the C.I.G. to take it over?
4. What budgetary arrangement and administrative arrangements are necessary to have another department, or the C.I.G., take it over?

cc: Information Branch

WAP
W. A. P.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

*Agreed
Concerned in by
Col. Fortier for Director
of Central Intelligence
J.F.*

COMGENCHINA SHANGHAI CHINA
INFORMATION
COMSEVENTH FLEET
CNO CINGPAC

SSU Teams should remain operative after 1 May in those areas of China where collection of intelligence is necessary for accomplishment of missions of COM7thFLEET and COMGEN AF CHINA. Present responsibilities of COMGENCHINA with respect to SSU will be assumed by COMGENUSAF China on 1 May 46 in accordance with WARY 82100.

This is in accordance with Gen Wedemeyer's desires to which Gen Marshall agrees. In accordance with overall instructions issued SSU here some reduction of the present SSU Personnel in China should nevertheless be effected.

Personnel will confine their activities to intelligence collection and will operate only in areas controlled by Chinese or US Forces. No repeat no movements will be made in areas controlled by Soviet Forces.

OPD Chief of Staff
SSU Gen Wedemeyer
G-2 CG, AAF
Navy ~~CG~~ (Col Fortier)
G/G

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

WAR DEPARTMENT
The Adjutant General's Office
Washington, 25, D. C.

COPY

AGAO-S 380.01 (28 Feb 47) B-M
DECLASSIFIED AND APPROVED FOR
RELEASE
BY THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY LA-872 Pentagon
DATE: 2001

10 March 1947

SUBJECT: Safeguarding Information in Communications which refer to
Central Intelligence Group Activities

TO : The Commanding Generals,
Army Air Forces
Army Ground Forces
Commander-in-Chief,
Far East Command
The Commanding Generals,
Theaters of Operations
Caribbean Defense Command
Alaskan Department
Military District of Washington
Independent Commands under the War Department
Armies (Z/I)
Ports of Embarkation
Chiefs of Technical and Administrative Services

1. Any communication to be electrically transmitted, which bears upon foreign activities of the Central Intelligence Group, will be classified in accordance with Paragraph 4 of AR 380-5.

2. This directive includes intelligence activities of the Central Intelligence Group, and the names, movement, location, pay, procurement, promotion, relief from duty, operations, and other activities of personnel assigned or attached to the Central Intelligence Group, as well as the shipment of supplies and equipment for such units or personnel, but does not include personnel and activities of the Foreign Broadcast Information Branch.

3. When transmitted by electrical means a message containing such information will be enciphered in the most secure system available.

BY ORDER OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR:

/s/ Edward F. Witsell

EDWARD F. WITSELL
Major General
The Adjutant General

COPIES FURNISHED:
Divisions of the War Department Special Staff
Divisions of the War Department General Staff
Director of Central Intelligence (2)
Distribution I

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~RESTRICTED~~

5 March 1946

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE GROUP

C.I.G. DIRECTIVE NO. 2

SURVEY OF THE FUNCTION OF MONITORING PRESS
AND PROPAGANDA BROADCASTS OF FOREIGN POWERS

Memorandum by the Director of Central Intelligence,
with the Unanimous Concurrence
of the Intelligence Advisory Board

1. a. During the war the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) conducted a Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service (FBIS) which monitored press and propaganda broadcasts of foreign powers. The FCC was in process of liquidating this agency when its functions were taken over by the War Department on an interim basis on 30 December 1945.

b. The product of the FBIS was valuable to the State Department, to the intelligence agencies of the War and Navy Departments, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and undoubtedly to other departments and agencies.

c. Since the interim arrangements will cease at the end of the fiscal year 1946, it is essential that the ultimate disposition of former FBIS functions be determined at an early date.

2. By unanimous approval of the Director of Central Intelligence and the Intelligence Advisory Board an ad hoc committee is hereby established to consist of five members, one representing the Director of Central Intelligence and one representing each member of the Intelligence Advisory Board. This committee will promptly make a detailed study of facilities, resources and operations for monitoring foreign press and propaganda broadcasts, and will determine whether this service is of continuing value to existing Federal agencies.

APPROVED FOR RELEASE DATE: 26-Aug-2008

clude recommendations as to:

HR 70-14
(U)

~~RESTRICTED~~

CXC DIR 2

- 1 -

et/100

~~RESTRICTED~~

a. Which resources, facilities, and operating functions should be continued in the national interest.

b. What disposition should be made of preserved resources and facilities and what assignments should be made of responsibility for conducting the preserved operating functions.

c. What budgetary arrangements should be made.

3. The committee will submit a report of findings, conclusions and recommendations to the Director of Central Intelligence, who will then prepare suitable recommendations to be submitted to the National Intelligence Authority after obtaining the concurrence or comment of the Intelligence Advisory Board. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation will be invited to sit as a member of the Intelligence Advisory Board for consideration of these recommendations.

DISTRIBUTION:

National Intelligence Authority
Intelligence Advisory Board
Ad Hoc Committee members

~~RESTRICTED~~

CIG DIR 2

- 2 -

~~TOP SECRET~~

*File under
W-104*

TOP SECRET

C
O
F
Y
THE WHITE HOUSE

DECLASSIFIED AND APPROVED FOR RELEASE
BY THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
DATE: 2001

WASHINGTON

July 18, 1946

My dear Admiral Leahy:

The President has directed me to assemble for him certain facts and information regarding the Soviet Union. He has directed me to obtain from the Central Intelligence Group estimates of the present and future foreign and military policies of the Soviet Union. I am therefore writing to request that the National Intelligence Authority instruct the Director of Central Intelligence to prepare such estimates for submission to the President at the earliest practicable date.

It is also desired that the Central Intelligence Group prepare a statement of conclusions drawn from the monitoring of Soviet broadcasts, with special attention devoted to the descriptions of Soviet and American foreign policies.

Inasmuch as the President hopes that this information will be in his hands before the convening of the Peace Conference in Paris on 29 July 1946, it is desired that the reports I have requested be delivered to me prior to that date.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Clark M. Clifford

CLARK M. CLIFFORD
Special Counsel to the President

Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy, USN
The National Intelligence Authority
Washington, D.C.

19 July 1946

To: Director of Central Intelligence:

Please comply as a matter of priority.

/s/ William L. Leahy
Chief of Staff

Document No. 43
Review of this document by CIA has
determined that
 CIA has no objection to declass
 It contains information of CIA
interest that should remain
classified at TS (S) S
Authority: NIP 70-2
 It contains nothing of CIA interest
Rev 244581

~~TOP SECRET~~

EO 12958 J.4(h)(1)-25Yrs

~~SECRET~~

COPY NO. 43

30 October 1947

~~SECRET~~
DCI 1/2

PROPOSED DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE DIRECTIVE 1/2

ATOMIC ENERGY INTELLIGENCE

Under the authority of paragraph 3 of National Security Council Intelligence Directive 1, the Central Intelligence Agency shall:

1. Coordinate the collection of all intelligence information relating to foreign atomic energy developments and potentialities affecting the national security.
2. Accomplish the correlation, evaluation, and appropriate dissemination within the Government of the resulting intelligence.
3. Supervise and control the flow of intelligence material between the Atomic Energy Commission and the departments and other agencies of the Government.

R. M. HILLENKOTTER
Rear Admiral, USN
Director of Central Intelligence

~~SECRET~~
DCI 1/2

APPROVED FOR RELEASE DATE:
26-Aug-2008

HR 70-14
(U)

~~SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED AND APPROVED FOR RELEASE
BY THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
DATE: 2001

27 August 1946.

MEMORANDUM FOR: FLEET ADMIRAL WILLIAM D. LEAHY, USN
Chief of Staff to the Commander-in-Chief.

The following report from Copenhagen (dated 23 August 1946), [REDACTED] is forwarded for your information.

"Molotov and Zhukov have disagreed on USSR policy. Molotov insists that pressure be exerted to the point of war in securing military bases. Zhukov has been trying to restrain Molotov from extreme measures which may precipitate war as he (Zhukov) insists the Army is not prepared to fight now."

HOYT S. VANDENBERG
Lieutenant General, USA
Director of Central Intelligence.

EO 12958 3.4(h)(1)-25Yrs
(U)

42
DOCUMENT NO. _____
NO CHANGE IN CLASS.
 DECLASSIFIED
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS C 2011
NEXT REVIEW DATE: _____
AUTH: HR 70-2
DATE: 4/03/01

~~TOP SECRET~~

24 January 1947

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

By agreement between Mr. Charles Murphy, Administrative Assistant to the President, and the undersigned, the following paragraph is being added to the draft of the "National Defense Act of 1947", submitted to Mr. Murphy on 23 January 1947:

() When the Director first appointed under section 102 (a) has taken office, the National Intelligence Authority and the Central Intelligence Group (established by directive of the President dated January 22, 1946) shall cease to exist, and the personnel, property, and records of such Group shall be transferred to the Agency. Any unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available or authorized to be made available for such Group shall be available and shall be authorized to be made available in like manner for expenditure by the Agency.

**APPROVED FOR RELEASE BY THE
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY DATE:
2001**

WALTER L. PFORZHEIMER
Chief, Legislative Liaison Division

~~SECRET~~

Mr. MacLuthy

~~SECRET~~
DCI 4/2
28 September 1950

COPY NO. 48

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE DIRECTIVE NO. 4/2
PRIORITY LIST OF CRITICAL NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE OBJECTIVES

In accordance with DCI 4/1, paragraph 3, the following list of critical national intelligence objectives, with respect to the USSR, is established; so the highest priority shall be given to the collection of information and to the production of intelligence concerning Soviet capabilities and intentions for:

1. taking direct military action against the Continental United States;
2. taking direct military action, employing USSR Armed Forces, against vital U. S. possessions, areas peripheral to the Soviet Union, and Western Europe;
3. interfering with U. S. strategic air attack;
4. interfering with U. S. movement of men and material by water transport;
5. production and stockpiling, including location of installations and facilities, of atomic and related weapons, other critical weapons and equipment, and critical transportation equipment;
6. creating situations anywhere in the world dangerous to U. S. national security, short of commitment of Soviet Armed Forces, including foreign directed sabotage and espionage objectives;
7. interfering with U. S. political, psychological, and economic courses of action for the achievement of critical U. S. aims and objectives.

R. H. Hillenkoetier
R. H. HILLENKOETIER
Rear Admiral, USN
Director of Central
Intelligence

~~SECRET~~
DCI 4/2
28 September 1950

HR 70-14
(U)

APPROVED FOR
RELEASE DATE:
26-Aug-2008

~~SECRET~~



The Historical Review Program, part of the CIA Information Management Services, identifies, collects, and produces historically relevant collections of declassified documents.

These collections, centered on a theme or event, are joined with supporting analysis, essays, video, audio, and photographs, and showcased in a booklet plus DVD, and made available to historians, scholars, and the public.

All of our Historical Collections are available on the CIA Library Publication page located at <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/historical-collection-publications/> or contact us at HistoricalCollections@UCIA.gov.

Disclaimer

All statements of fact, opinion, or analysis expressed in this booklet are those of the authors. They do not necessarily reflect the official positions or views of the Central Intelligence Agency or any other US Government entity, past or present. Nothing in the contents should be construed as asserting or implying US Government endorsement of an article's factual statements and interpretations.

15 May 1946

DECLASSIFIED AND
APPROVED FOR RELEASE
BY THE CENTRAL
INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

~~TOP SECRET~~

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO.

ESTABLISHING A CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
SERVICE IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT AND DEFINING ITS
FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES

By virtue of the authority vested in me
by the Constitution and the statutes of the
United States, including the First War Powers
Act, as President of the United States
and as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy,
I hereby order and centralize the
functions of the Government relating
to intelligence is hereby ordered as fol-



Established in the Executive
Office of the President a central intelligence
service as the _____,
there shall be a Director appointed
and the Director shall discharge

and perform his functions and duties under the
direction and supervision of the President.
The Director may exercise his powers, authorities
and duties through such officials or agencies
and in such manner as he may determine.

2. There is established in the _____

