MEMORANDUM FOR DR. McLUCAS

SUBJECT: Our Relationships with Mr. Froehlke

Mr. Froehlke has forwarded a memorandum in which he discusses his relationship with you and the NRP (Tab A). Mr. Froehlke states that although he believes that you and he understand the responsibilities and interfaces, the respective staffs may not have as clear an understanding.

Mr. Froehlke then outlines the tasks given to him by Mr. Laird and Mr. Packard as he sees them with regard to the NRP. He asks for your reaction to his thoughts on his view of the organizational relationship.

We have attached at the right our proposed response to Mr. Froehlke's memorandum.

JOHN R. MECEDA
Captain, USAF
MEMORANDUM FOR Honorable John L. McLucas
Under Secretary of the Air Force

November 13, 1969

From time to time, John, I see little bits of evidence that perhaps others still have some question about our relationship. I have the feeling that you and I understand what we are trying to accomplish and aren't overly concerned about the formal structure. However, for the sake of our respective staffs I think it might be well for you and me to get in writing our understanding of our relationship.

In this memo I'll outline my understanding of our respective responsibilities and how we interface. I know you will give me your frank reaction. This should clear the air.

********************************

As I see it, Mel and Dave are looking to me as the line manager for intelligence resources. Any other time I become involved in intelligence activities I do so as staff to them. In both capacities -- but particularly as the line manager -- I must necessarily look over your shoulder and become intimately involved in your operation.

In putting together a resource review process I must look at all major DoD intelligence systems and resources. I must come up with tradeoffs and adjustments. It seems to me there is no way I can do this short of having a full examination of your program and making recommendations effecting it. Most of this examination will have to be done at the staff level.

I totally accept the proposition that you are the operating head of a national program (just as Noel Gayler is). I shouldn't -- and won't -- get involved in your operations except:

***************
1. When it is necessary to do so to intelligently manage ALL DoD intelligence resources, and

2. When given a specific assignment, on an ad hoc basis, from either Mel or Dave.

I also recognize that you respond to requirements which originate in part outside the DoD. That is one of the reasons I asked to be the DoD representative on Dick Helms' NIRB. As a member of the NIRB, I am involved in the examination of the total U.S. intelligence resources measured against total U.S. requirements.

********************

Is this your understanding of our organizational relationship, John? If it is, I suggest that we continue to operate pretty much as we have. I feel that you and I have a rapport which is both comfortable and effective.

Once we agree, we'll want to coordinate with our respective staffs. It is vital that they work closely together. Therefore, it is probably more important that they have a clear understanding.

Let me know your reaction to these thoughts.

Robert F. Froehlke

cc: Melvin R. Laird
    David Packard
    Vice Admiral Harold G. Bowen, Jr., USN
    DASD (I), Room 3C200
MEMORANDUM FOR MR. FROEHLKE, ASD (A)

Bob, I must admit I don't know the specifics which prompted your memo concerning our organizational relationships, but I will be glad to give you my candid reaction to your thoughts.

First, I am certainly willing to cooperate with you. I personally believe that the tasks Mel and Dave have outlined for you are most important. A searching, critical review of the intelligence resources of the DOD is certainly long overdue and I heartily endorse your approach. I am confident we will come up with a better intelligence product as a result.

I am, of course, concerned that you have the impression that my staff is not approaching its dealings with your staff as you and I approach our relationship. Please be assured that in the future my staff will be responsive to our relationship and I hope that the same spirit of cooperation we share will permeate our respective staffs.

I must note, though, Bob, that you have chosen to mention some particulars with regard to our relationship over which I really have no control. As you know, the DOD/CIA Agreement which establishes the National Reconnaissance Program gives me some fairly specific rules for managing the NRP. With regard to resource levels, for example, I must look only to my Executive Committee for guidance. The members of the ExCom, of course, do, from time to time, ask their own organizations to review and provide guidance to them on specific areas or problems.

The same is also true with fiscal guidance. My marching orders clearly direct me to the ExCom for program and budget guidance and approval.
You mention that I am "the operating head of a national program (just as Noel Gaylier is)." There is a difference, however, in our charters and organization. NSA is solely a DOD activity, while the NRO is a joint organization, chartered and operated under a DOD/CIA Agreement. As you know, my management structure, which is single and direct line, is also quite different from Noel's.

I really don't have much choice on some of the matters you mentioned under my present charter. I will, of course, conduct the Program in whatever manner the ExCom sees fit. Maybe the 1965 DOD/CIA Agreement is not responsive to Mel's or Dave's wishes, or to your new responsibilities, and should be changed. If this is the case, I think we should discuss the matter with them and see if they envision a different type of operation than we have at present. Mel may very well desire a change; I truthfully don't know. I must note, however, that the subject of your responsibilities with regard to the NRP was discussed at the August 7, 1969 ExCom meeting at which time Dave stated that the NRP was not to be affected and that the ExCom and the NRO should continue to function as they have in the past.

In summary, Bob, I want to assure you of my cooperation and that of my staff in your activities. I do feel, however, that the larger question concerning formal "line" and "staff" relationships should be addressed to Mel and Dave in light of the charter under which I must execute the NRP and the guidance I have received from the ExCom.

John L. McLucas