

24 May 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Director-Comptroller  
SUBJECT: Archives, History, and Records

1. This paper, in conjunction with my 18 May comments on Annual Chronicles, completes the Directorate response to your memorandum of 9 May 1972.
2. The revised draft accommodates several important points expressed in my 25 April 1972 memorandum. Specifically, I refer to the transcendent priority accorded Records Management and the transfer of the Records Management Board and its Chairman under your command authority. As you might suppose, however, I still harbor certain reservations about the program. The implied association, even interdependence, among the program components -- archives, history, and records -- would be better balanced and more easily managed, if treated separately with their inter-relationships pointed up by appropriate cross-referencing.
3. I notice the boards and officers that constitute the current records management apparatus are apparently to be retained. These have proved to be cumbersome and ineffective in the past, and I urge again that they be reviewed carefully before a decision is made to keep them.
4. While it is self-evident that archival material derives from records, the CS is far from sanguine that it can be identified on an annual basis without benefit of perspective afforded by the passage of time. Should the present guideline prevail, however, the CS probably would have to keep duplicate "archival records" so as not to interfere with normal exploitation, retirement, and disposition of records. This can be done, but it does not appear to be the most efficient method. It is reassuring to note that the

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
| <del>GROUP 1</del>                 |
| <del>Excluded from automatic</del> |
| <del>downgrading and</del>         |
| <del>declassification</del>        |

archives part of the program does not seem to be fully formulated and is, presumably, open to future input from CS participants who are familiar with CS documentation and security requirements. In general, I suggest that you appoint an inter-Directorate working group, composed of officers with appropriate expertise, to come up with recommended criteria as to what constitutes archival material.

5. The CS historical program should be essentially autonomous under the general guidance and coordination of the CIA historian, or -- if a centrally directed program is to continue -- the CS should participate in overall management. Either the CIA historian or his deputy should come from the CS, and a CS representative should participate in reviewing the preparation of overall and other Directorate histories that bear on DDP activity. Already, there is a diffusion of CS information (identifying operations, methods, assets, agents and staff personnel) in other Directorates (primarily DDS) and overall Agency histories. As of now, the CS does not review drafts or these histories, does not receive published copies, and has no voice in and is not informed as to their use and readership.

6. Beyond the purely historical objectives of preserving a record of CS activities over the years, the CS has its own internal interests in preparation of historical papers. To be sure, the CS contribution to overall Agency history is, and will continue to be, substantial. Beyond that, however, the CS should be free to prepare papers for its own purposes, on subjects of its own selection, and in its own manner.

7. Preparation of "catch-up" chronicles of CS units will in itself be a substantial task. To illustrate the magnitude of this pending effort, please find attached a list of uncompleted papers scheduled in the current historical program. The names of writers are listed with those in preparation or partially completed. If field stations are to be covered in subsequent up-dates, and I realize that this is no longer an Agency-level requirement, there would be an additional dozen or so stations which do not appear on this schedule.

SECRET

8. Perhaps too much discussion has been directed toward specific points and, in closing, I wish to recall an observation made in my 25 April paper. The current system requires improvement, perhaps extensive overhaul, but at no point have we, in light of experience, paused to judge exhaustively those program aspects that are worth retaining and those that should be modified. The program is so important to the execution of our business that I feel we should be as certain of our direction as is feasible -- and one way to obtain this assurance is to suspend the current correspondence aimed at arriving at a final draft and ask those Agency officers most experienced in these several fields, singly or in panel, to study these questions and, forward their recommendations concerning the program structure, procedures, and guidance for use by the Deputy Directors and yourself. With their solicited views in hand, we should be able to issue directives that will best accommodate needs and resources.

/s/

Thomas H. Karamessines  
Deputy Director for Plans

Attachments:  
As Stated

SECRET