

CIA HAS NO OBJECTION TO
DECLASSIFICATION AND/OR
RELEASE OF THIS DOCUMENT
DATE: JAN 2002
BY: NONE

~~SECRET~~



THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

NIC #1082-83
8 February 1983

National Intelligence Council

MEMORANDUM FOR: Thomas Niles, Deputy Assistant Secretary
for European Affairs
Department of State

FROM: [REDACTED]
National Intelligence Officer for Economics

SUBJECT: NATO Study on East-West Economic Relations

1. I do not believe that the work plan tentatively approved by the NATO Economic Committee gives the Study a reasonable chance for a successful outcome. The three meetings which have been scheduled--21-24 February, 14-15 March, and 24-25 March--appear to provide sufficient time for expert testimony on all the major parts of the paper. The work plan does not, however, provide for an adequate review of the Staff's overall product.

2. I feel committed to the DCI to help produce a NATO estimate of the implications of East-West economic relations for the Alliance. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Consequently, there is a high risk that discussions of the Draft Study in the Economic Committee and at higher policy levels will be more acrimonious and divisive than would be the case if a serious estimative review had already been done.

(b)(1)
(b)(3)

3. My preferred approach to a review of the NATO Staff's draft paper is that used in the production of our own National Intelligence Estimates, in which each interested agency is represented by a senior representative, who is prepared not only to discuss the draft, but also to suggest and negotiate changes in wording. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

~~SECRET~~

[REDACTED]

over the outcome. It does not matter whether the review is performed by the so-called "Heads of Economic Intelligence" or by "Senior Intelligence Experts." Also, the review could be handled either informally or as part of a reinforced meeting of ECONAD. In any event, the Chairman of the NATO Economic Staff would chair the meeting and the final product would be his responsibility.

4. The review I am proposing would not be a substitute for an Economic Committee review. The latter, however, should be considered to be the first step in the policy review process; the ECONADs could be reinforced by policy level officials from the capitals. The purpose of the intelligence review would be to facilitate the policy discussion.

5. With regard to the specific work plan, I assume that changes in the agreed-upon dates are probably impossible. If so, there should be a Senior Intelligence meeting to review the full draft of the Economic Staff in April, as soon as possible after the Easter holidays. I believe our NATO Reps should insist on such a meeting, and be prepared to take the matter to higher levels if necessary.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

indirect and uncertain. Please let me know your reaction ASAP.

[REDACTED]

(b)(1)
(b)(3)

cc:

[REDACTED]