SUBJECT NUMBER

FINAL

AFCIAC: 4/4 Item 1 of the Agenda for the Second Meeting of AFCIAC, held 19 July 1949.

Subject: Consider Draft JCS Directive to Director, AFSA, as amended at the First Meeting of AFCIAC.

ADMIRAL STONE opened the discussion of this item by stating that there was still some question about subparagraph 3.b., indicating that the Army had offered a substitute version. He asked General Irwin to comment on the Army proposal.

GENERAL IRWIN suggested that Lt. Colonel Peterson state the Army's position with regard to this subparagraph.

LT. COLONEL PETERSON remarked that the changes in subparagraph 3.b. suggested by the Army are almost self-explanatory in that they indicate a philosophy of operations regarding the use of personnel. He said the primary purpose of the changes was to avoid compartmentation and make the best use of personnel available. He pointed out that in many cases there was no way of breaking down problem assignments along Service lines, especially in the fields of IBM and research. He referred to the Coleridge problem which he said would be identical regardless of whether it was Army, Navy, or Air Traffic. He observed that the responsibility for processing such a problem should be assigned to the personnel best qualified to handle it. He said that the Army's subparagraph 3.b. reflects what is being done at ASA and, he thought, to a large extent at the Navy's Communication Supplementary Activity. He added that he would be glad to answer specific questions regarding the Army's proposals.

GENERAL CABELL said he thought that the phrase "insofar as practicable" in the original subparagraph 3.b. would make for desirable flexibility of operations.

LT. COLONEL PETERSON said he thought that was a negative explanation to the problem.

GENERAL CABELL disagreed, stating that the inclusion of that phrase would leave maximum flexibility of operations in the hands of the Director.

LT. COLONEL PETERSON said he thought subparagraph 3.b.(i) failed to grasp completely the COMINT processing problem. He said he could think of no aspect of the problem that could be so divided. He said that the Army version gives a complete application and complete philosophy to the COMINT processing problem, pointing out that the Director would use the best qualified people in the best spots.

Declassified and approved for release by NSA on 06-12-2012 pursuant to E.O. 13526

GENERAL CABELL asked Lt. Colonel Peterson if his proposal recognized that there is a unique operation in COMINT processing.

LT. COLONEL PETERSON replied in the negative, stating that the attack must be made on a problem basis and not on a Service basis.

GENERAL CABELL suggested that the Council ought to concern itself with the clarification of the two main issues; first, the place of the military and the civilian employees of AFSA; and second, whether any compartmentation along Service lines would be desirable.

ADMIRAL STONE suggested that the members discuss the first issue. He asked Captain Wenger for his comments.

CAPTAIN WENGER read a paper which he had prepared entitled: "Consolidation of CSA and ASA", (A copy of this paper is attached as Enclosure (A) with these minutes.)

ADMIRAL STONE asked for comments on the paper.

LT. COLONEL PETERSON observed that there appeared to be no conflict between Army's proposal and the ideas expressed in Captain Wenger's paper except perhaps for definitions of "management control" and "technical control". He said that these two terms were not used in the Army. He said that the civilian personnel situation of the Navy COMINT organization was exactly what the Army proposal purports to set up. He pointed ou that many of the Divisions in CSAW are in actuality headed by civilians; such as NY-2, NY-4, NI-4, NS-2, NO, N-31, N-32, N-33, N-52, N-53 and ND.

GENERAL CABELL pointed out that the original subparagraph 3.b. does not mention civilian personnel.

CAPTAIN WENGER referred to the employment of civil service personnel in the CSAW organization and explained that civilians normally are not assigned as heads of sections of major military operational importance. He said he thought the question of civilian personnel and military personnel would have to be settled as soon as possible, pointing out that this is not a new problem that has arisen solely out of this consolidation. He read a paper which he had written in 1946. (This paper is attached as part of Enclosure (A)). CAPTAIN WENGER went on to explain that in the CSA research group the determination of priorities for example, is considered to be "management control". He explained that the civilian heads of the radio engineering and RAM sections have technical control over those sections, but when it comes to establishing priorities for the projects handled in these sections, this phase of the work is controlled by the military.

LT. COLONEL PETERSON remarked that subparagraph 3.b. as originally written would not permit the use of civilian personnel, pointing out that the phrase "AFSA personnel of the Service concerned" could mean only military personnel.

CAPTAIN WENGER read a paper which he had prepared, setting forth the reasons for retaining subparagraph 3.b. as originally drafted. (See Enclosure (B)).

ADMIRAL STONE observed that as Director, AFSA, he would be concerned with maintaining efficiency of operations and proper morale among all the personnel concerned.

GENERAL CABELL suggested that the conflict in this subparagraph 3.b. could be resolved by omitting the words "by, and" before "under the immediate direction" etc. He pointed out that the Army substitution for subparagraph 3.b. was clearly a personnel policy and should not be a part of this draft.

LT. COLONEL PETERSON agreed and stated that it was his desire to have the whole matter discussed thoroughly.

GENERAL IRWIN and COLONEL CLARKE agreed to the deletion of "by, and".

GENERAL IRWIN observed that with General Cabell's change the subparagraph was now comparatively innocent since it states that the work will be done "under the immediate direction of" rather than "by" AFSA personnel of the service concerned.

COLONEL CLARKE suggested that subparagraph 3.b. could be omitted in its entirety.

CAPTAIN WENGER pointed out that this subparagraph was based upon the responsibilities and functions of AFSA as detailed in subparagraph 3.b.(1)(a) of the AFSA Directive, JCS 2010. He explained that where it was a question of producing unique information essential to a Service for the prosecution of war it would be only logical to ask that such work be under the immediate supervision of personnel of the Service concerned.

ADMIRAL STONE suggested that the members consider the problem of providing unique information and asked for examples of problems which could be considered of particular Service interest.

CAPTAIN WENGER replied that anti-submarine warfare would be one such problem, pointing out that the Navy has been assigned primary responsibility for that program. He continued that it would be logical for air-traffic-analysis problems, as another example, to be under the direction of an Air Force officer. He explained that in the USA organization Naval traffic analysis is always under the direction of Naval personnel, pointing out that rotation of duty between the processing center and the field stations makes for well-trained T/A personnel.

LT. COLONEL PETERSON remarked that the Army would expect that the Director would use the best qualified personnel for the various jobs. He asked whether it was contemplated to place officers in every job or in the jobs they were best qualified to perform.

ADMIRAL STONE replied that he would expect the work-load to be shared among the three Services.

GENERAL [illegible]IN said that he would agree with General Cabell regarding the amendment to this subparagraph and proceeded to read subparagraph 3.b. as amended.

LT. COLONEL PETERSON inquired if this change meant military personnel would be used all the way from top to bottom in any given problem.

GENERAL [illegible]IN replied that such would not be the case, explaining that in the case of anti-submarine warfare, for example, one Naval officer would direct the problem but that work on the problem would be done by military and civilian personnel alike.

All members agreed to subparagraph 3.b. as amended by General Cabell's proposal.

SUBPARAGRAPH 3.c.

ADMIRAL INGLIS explained that at the time of the previous AFSAC meeting he had a reservation with respect to the last clause of the first sentence of this subparagraph. He stated that he was now willing to delete the clause entirely so that the subparagraph would now read "The organization of AFSA will provide for a full-time deputy director from each Service". ADMIRAL INGLIS went on to explain that he would go along with this change provided the members understood that, as far as the Navy is concerned, it was felt that the full-time deputy director appointed by the Navy should represent the Navy's interest. He explained that such an arrangement would be necessary until such time as the CONSIDO problem is settled, pointing out that as it stands now there is a gap between the intelligence organization of the Navy and AFSA. He said he would agree to the change as long as it was understood that he did not agree to complete elimination of service representation.

GENERAL [illegible]ELL said that he had no comment on this change.

GENERAL [illegible] said that he would concede the necessity for some such representation as Admiral Inglis had described. He said that the deputy director appointed from the Army would be primarily a deputy, and secondarily a contact with ID.

ADMIRAL INGLIS remarked that he had no objection to the Navy deputy's being given a functional task so long as he could consider him a link with ONI.

All members agreed to subparagraph 3.c. as amended at this meeting.

PARAGRAPH 1

ADMIRAL STONE suggested deleting the words "commencing 15 July 1949" from this paragraph, since that date had already passed, and since he had already reported to the JCS as Director, AFSA.

All members agreed to omit any reference to a definite date in this paragraph.

ADMIRAL STONE asked whether there were any further comments on the draft JCS Directive to Director, AFSA.

There were no further comments.

DECISION: AFCIAC agreed to accept the draft JCS Directive to Director, AFSA, as amended at the first and second meetings of the Council. It was agreed, further, that the amended draft Directive should be forwarded to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for consideration. The Secretary was directed to forward this paper to the JCS.