HISTORY AND MEMORY IN INTELLIGENCE

INTELLIGENCE ANALYSIS AND THE CIA—A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE: REFORMING THE CIA ANALYTICAL SYSTEM UNDER CONDITIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL CRISIS (1973-1981)

Dan ROMAN *

Abstract:
Drawing on declassified internal CIA documents, this article reconstructs the key structural transformations of the Agency's analytical apparatus between 1973 and 1981. The period is framed by two major institutional turning points: the dissolution of the Office of National Estimates (ONE) by Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) William Colby in 1973 and the sweeping reorganization of the Directorate of Intelligence (DI) undertaken by DCI William Casey in 1981. Between these two milestones, the study examines three main analytical developments: the establishment of the National Intelligence Officers (NIOs) system; the reorganization of the DI in 1976-1977 and the creation of specialized analytical units; three emblematic episodes that tested the limits of the reformed system. The analysis shows that the reforms implemented during this period produced a more structured analytical apparatus, more closely aligned with the needs of policymakers, while leaving unresolved the inherent tensions between analytical independence and policy relevance. This article represents the third part of a broader research project on the historical evolution of intelligence analysis within the CIA.

Keywords: *analysis, CIA, Cold War, Casey, Colby, crisis, declassified documents, estimates, intelligence, reform.*

Introduction

The sequence between 1973 and 1981 represents one of the most turbulent yet intellectually productive periods in the history of American intelligence. The geopolitical context of the era was shaped by a fundamental contradiction. On the one hand, Soviet–American rivalry had reached unprecedented levels of complexity, placing increasingly

*Associate lecturer "Vasile Goldis" Western University Arad, Romania. Email: roman.dan@uvvg.ro

sophisticated analytical demands on political decision-makers. On the other hand, U.S. intelligence institutions were experiencing a profound crisis of credibility and legitimacy precisely at the moment when pressures upon them were intensifying.

The world of the early 1970s could no longer be interpreted through the simplified bipolar framework characteristic of the early decades of the Cold War. The policy of détente, negotiated by Henry Kissinger and Richard Nixon with the Soviet Union and China, introduced new parameters into global strategic competition: arms-control agreements (SALT I, 1972), the normalization of relations with Beijing, and the multiplication of diplomatic channels. At the same time, the Third World became an increasingly dynamic and unpredictable arena of competition. The Yom Kippur War of October 1973 and the subsequent Arab oil embargo demonstrated that regional instability in the Middle East could generate systemic shocks for the global economy and Western security. Revolutions, coups d'état, and low-intensity conflicts across Africa, Asia, and Latin America required a nuanced understanding of local political dynamics—an area of expertise that the American analytical apparatus struggled to provide consistently.

Domestically, the CIA and the broader U.S. Intelligence Community entered a period of unprecedented scrutiny. The Watergate scandal (1972-1974) cast a shadow over the entire executive branch and triggered a strong congressional reaction against the secret activities of the state. Investigations conducted by the Church Committee in the Senate and the Pike Committee in the House of Representatives (1975-1976) brought to light a range of CIA covert operations—planned assassinations of foreign leaders, domestic surveillance programs, and drug experiments conducted on American citizens—generating widespread public outrage and intense legislative pressure for reform and oversight of the intelligence services. The disclosure of the *Family Jewels*—internal reports commissioned by Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) James Schlesinger in 1973 that catalogued the Agency's institutional abuses—further deepened the CIA's crisis of legitimacy and fuelled broader debates about the limits of executive power in the field of intelligence.

Within the CIA, this external crisis overlapped with structural tensions that had been accumulating for more than a decade. The Agency's analytical apparatus had largely been built in the 1950s, in a comparatively simpler strategic environment dominated by the direct Soviet threat and by the need for centralized strategic estimates. As the international environment grew more complex—with a greater number of relevant actors, a wider range of threats, and multiple dimensions of global competition—the institutional architecture of the Directorate of Intelligence (DI) became increasingly difficult to adapt to evolving requirements. Analytical offices operated largely in isolation, producing economic, political, or military intelligence without effective mechanisms for integration. At the same time, the pressure of current production—the daily intelligence deliverables required by the White House and the National Security Council (NSC)—consumed analytical resources that might otherwise have supported deeper, long-term research. Intelligence consumers, whose expectations were becoming progressively more sophisticated, increasingly signalled that CIA products were either too general, too fragmented, or too slow to keep pace with events.

Against this background, the period 1973-1981 became a laboratory of institutional reform of unusual intensity and depth in the history of U.S. intelligence services. Three major structural transformations unfolded almost simultaneously, fundamentally reshaping the way the CIA produced, organized, and delivered intelligence analysis.

In 1973, DCI William Colby abolished the Board of National Estimates (BNE) and the Office of National Estimates (ONE)—the traditional pillars of collective strategic estimation—and replaced them with a system of individually specialized officers, the National Intelligence Officers (NIOs), intended to provide a more direct and responsive link between analysts and policymakers.

In 1976-1977, a far-reaching reorganization of the entire DI was initiated through: (1) the separation of current production from in-depth research; (2) the creation of mechanisms for interdisciplinary integration; (3) the establishment of new structures dedicated to strategic military analysis and regional political analysis.

In 1979, DCI Stansfield Turner implemented a major organizational change by renaming the DI as the National Foreign Assessment Centre

(NFAC). This decision reflected Turner's broader vision of repositioning CIA analysis within the wider Intelligence Community. Through this change, Turner sought to emphasize that the CIA's analytical mission extended beyond the institutional boundaries of the Agency itself.

The move inevitably generated internal resistance. Some career officers within the DI viewed the rebranding as a dilution of the Agency's analytical identity and as a subordination of CIA expertise to broader interagency coordination objectives—an agenda that Turner promoted with considerable determination. Ultimately, however, the NFAC experiment proved short-lived. In 1981, with the arrival of William Casey as DCI, the structure was dismantled. The DI regained both its traditional name and its own organizational logic, reconfigured largely along regional lines.

The present study represents the third part of a broader research project on the analytical dimension of the CIA, conceived as a historical perspective on this core professional activity of the Agency. The first part covered the period 1947-1950, examining the beginnings of intelligence analysis within the CIA and the development of its first analytical structure—the Office of Reports and Estimates (ORE) (Roman, 2023, 164-188). The second part addressed the 1950–1973 period, highlighting the consolidation of the CIA's analytical architecture and its principal institutional components (Roman, 2025, 96-125).

This article focuses on the period of institutional turbulence and far-reaching reform between 1973 and 1981—a time when external pressures and accumulated internal deficiencies generated the most profound reorganization of the CIA's analytical apparatus up to that point. Its structure follows the chronology of the main institutional changes:

- the National Intelligence Officers (NIOs) system, introduced following the structural changes of 1973;
- the reform of the DI, 1976-1977, and the resulting analytical architecture, including a discussion of two organizational structures;
- vulnerabilities and failures of CIA intelligence analysis during 1973-1981.

Taken together, these transformations portray an intelligence apparatus that, under the pressure of events and criticism, sought to reinvent itself structurally to remain relevant in a rapidly changing world.

The article argues that the institutional reforms undertaken between 1973 and 1981 produced a more flexible analytical apparatus, better aligned with the needs of policymakers, but did not eliminate the structural tensions inherent in intelligence analysis. Despite organizational modernization, vulnerabilities related to interdisciplinary integration, political pressures, and the limits of strategic anticipation continued to shape the analytical performance of the CIA.

NIOs: Replacing the ONE with Individual Specialist Officers

In 1973, a new system of individually specialized officers was established in the DI under the title National Intelligence Officers (NIOs).

The reform of the CIA's analytical apparatus was the culmination of a decade of mounting tensions between the intelligence community and political decision-makers. The Vietnam War, the Watergate scandal, and the political pressures exerted by the Nixon administration generated a profound crisis of confidence in the analysis produced by the CIA, creating the conditions for a substantial reorganization of its analytical structures. The need for reform had already been clearly articulated in the Schlesinger Report of 1971, commissioned by President Richard Nixon and prepared by James Schlesinger in his capacity as Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget at the White House. The report noted that although intelligence expenditures had grown exponentially over the previous decade, the intelligence community had failed to achieve "a corresponding improvement in the scope and overall quantity of intelligence products." Consequently, the report advocated a structural reform of the entire U.S. intelligence community (Warner, 2009, 387-417).

The Watergate scandal disrupted these reform efforts, at the cost of directing intense political and public scrutiny toward the Agency. Richard Helms was dismissed as DCI in 1973 after refusing to involve the CIA in the cover-up of the scandal. His successor, Schlesinger, remained at the helm of the Agency for less than six months, during which he dismissed nearly 2,000 employees. Colby, who succeeded him, inherited an agency under intense media and political pressure and already

undergoing structural transition (CIA Document no. 1). It was within this institutional and political context that the transformation of the CIA's analytical apparatus unfolded during the early 1970s.

A brief overview of how strategic intelligence was produced within the CIA before the introduction of the NIO-based system clarifies the significance of the changes that followed.

The system for producing National Intelligence Estimates (NIEs) was established in 1950 at the initiative of DCI Walter Bedell Smith, in response to the failure to anticipate North Korea's invasion of South Korea. Smith created the BNE, a collegial body of senior analysts responsible for coordinating and drafting the intelligence community's authoritative estimates. For nearly two decades, the BNE functioned as a quasi-academic body, enjoying a considerable degree of autonomy from the immediate pressures of political decision-making.

The bureaucratic model embodied by the BNE/ONE framework gradually revealed increasingly evident structural deficiencies as the Cold War intensified. For example, National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger considered that the BNE approached foreign policy issues with an excessive degree of academic detachment, producing analyses of remarkable intellectual quality but of limited operational utility (Ford, 1993, 39-44; Helgerson, 1995, 106-111).

A memorandum issued by the National Intelligence Council (NIC) in 1988 summarizes, in institutional rather than merely political terms, several of the criticisms that had fuelled the demand for reform: dissatisfaction within the White House regarding the control exercised by the DCI over the intelligence community, complaints about the declining clarity of NIEs, and accusations of "bias" toward the CIA's institutional perspective:

> "President Nixon faulted then CIA Director Helms for not exerting enough control over the Intelligence Community. Kissinger complained that National Intelligence Estimates had lost their edge and that they sometimes reached unsupported conclusions. Directors of other US intelligence agencies alleged that the Estimates were biased toward the CIA viewpoint." (CIA Document no. 2, 1)

The same document explicitly notes that "Colby put the system into place in 1973," while also tracing the origin of the concept to Schlesinger's earlier initiative to appoint senior intelligence officers who would serve as community-wide points of reference for specific geographic and functional areas.

From an explanatory perspective, Colby justified the implementation of the NIO system on operational grounds. In his memoir on his tenure at the CIA, he describes the difficulty he faced, as Director of the Agency, in rapidly obtaining an integrated picture of a given issue:

> "I was troubled over how badly the machinery was organized to serve me. If I wanted to know what was happening in China, for example, I would have to assemble individual experts in China's politics, its economics, its military, its personalities, as well as the clandestine operators who would tell me things they would tell no one else." (Colby, 1978, 352).

In formal terms, the establishment of the NIOs is recorded directly in several memoranda that Colby addressed to the United States Intelligence Board (USIB). One such memorandum, dated 3 October 1973, set out the functional framework of the new structure replacing the ONE/BNE, which had previously been responsible for the production of NIEs.

> "National Intelligence Officers will be appointed by the Director of Central Intelligence for such geographical areas or functional subjects as may be required from time to time. Each NIO will be the Director's personal representative and will report directly to him on his subject, but all direction will be issued through normal command channels to elements of USIB member agencies." (CIA Document no. 3)

This formulation is essential because it highlights three particularly significant features of the NIOs system: (1) a direct relationship with the DCI; (2) high-level staff status; and (3) a role as an extension of the DCI's authority within the Intelligence Community. Beyond the general rationale for their creation, it can therefore be argued that the NIOs were conceived as a mechanism of direct support for the

DCI, designed to facilitate the integration of community-wide analysis and to enhance the policy relevance of estimative intelligence.

Conceptually, the new organizational framework represented a clear departure from the collegial model embodied by the BNE/ONE structure. The establishment of the NIOs system shifted the emphasis from collective institutional deliberation toward the individual responsibility of senior officers operating in a direct relationship with the DCI.

Another memorandum, dated October 26, 1973, indicates the timetable for operationalization: "effective 1 November 1973," the first six NIOs were appointed. The responsibilities of five of them were defined on a geographic basis—one each for the following areas of interest: Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; Western Europe; Southeast Asia; Middle East and Islamic World; and Latin America. The sixth position was defined on functional grounds: James Critchfield, appointed as NIO for Energy Matters, whose name is also the only NIO identity left unreacted in the memorandum (CIA Document no. 4).

The Guide to the National Intelligence Community's Production Organizations and Their Products of October 1975 provides the clearest procedural description of the NIO's role in the production of intelligence. The document reaffirms that, through the memorandum of October 3, 1973, the DCI established the NIO functions in order to assume the responsibilities previously exercised by the BNE (CIA Document no. 5).

At the same time, the guide emphasizes that the specific responsibilities of the NIOs include:

- identifying the needs of national intelligence consumers;
- evaluating intelligence products and the effectiveness of relevant programs;
- identifying uncertainties that require guidance for intelligence collection;
- maintaining contact with the National Security Council (NSC) and other principal consumers;
- objectively presenting alternative viewpoints.

The document also explicitly notes that the bulk of analytical production remained within the DI, whose responsibilities are described in detail. At the same time, it contains no reference to any significant

transfer of analytical capacity to the NIOs themselves. This suggests that the system functioned primarily as a level of coordination and guidance rather than as an independent centre of analytical production.

Based on the documents examined, several observations can be made regarding the design of the system in its initial phase (1973-mid-1970s):

- the NIOs were conceived as a direct extension of the DCI, rather than as an autonomous bureaucratic structure;
- their role was primarily integrative and managerial-analytical, rather than one of primary analytical production;
- specialization followed a mixed pattern (regional and functional), reflecting the strategic agenda of the period;
- the link with the political decision-making level was explicitly institutionalized through the requirement to maintain close contacts with the NSC and other principal intelligence consumers.

In 1979, DCI Turner further institutionalized the arrangement by creating the National Intelligence Council (NIC), which brought together the senior officers responsible for coordinating NIEs and integrating analytic judgments across the Intelligence Community.

Both this new entity and the NIOs were incorporated, in the same year, into the National Foreign Assessment Centre (NFAC) (CIA Document no. 6)—an administrative arrangement that was abandoned at the end of 1981.

The creation of the NIC provided a clearer institutional framework for the exercise of the NIOs' responsibilities. The officers thus acquired their own organizational space, formally separate from the DI, thereby reducing the risk that community-level analysis would be subordinated to the institutional perspective of the parent agency. Internal documents indicate that, although the core functions of the NIOs system remained relatively stable, the way the system was used varied depending on the managerial style and priorities of the DCI.

An NIC memorandum from February 1988 provides a valuable perspective on these developments. It explicitly notes that Colby's successors—Bush, Turner, and Casey—retained the system, but did so while "imposing their own style and emphasis." In its initial phase, the

system continued to operate largely within the parameters established by Colby, preserving what the document describes as "from the beginning, a close and special relationship between the Director and the NIOs."

Under Colby, the responsibilities of the NIOs remained centred on the four functions already identified: substantive support for the DCI, community coordination, management of the estimative process, and the enhancement of the relevance of intelligence products for policymakers.

The Bush period appears as a relatively brief transitional phase. The NIC memorandum observes that Bush "was not in office long enough to have much impact on the system", although he did issue a statement of objectives for the NIOs and initiated "a start toward formalizing the Director's control over their activities" (CIA Document no. 2).

A more visible phase of adjustment emerged under DCI Turner. He considered that the NIO system required "more structural coherence and discipline", which he sought to achieve through the creation of the NIC. An analytically significant doctrinal element introduced by Turner was his insistence on explicitly highlighting differences of opinion within intelligence estimates (CIA Document no. 2).

The most dynamic phase reflected in the documents examined appears to be the tenure of DCI William J. Casey. The NIC memorandum portrays a Director "eager to make a strong impact on the workings of the Intelligence Community", who frequently relied on the NIOs as agents of change. Under Casey, the document points to several notable developments:

- increased direct involvement (Casey frequently requested immediate expertise from the NIOs and used them as a "reference library for quick response items", a formulation suggesting a highly operational use of their expertise);
- greater emphasis on short analytical products (the DCI encouraged the preparation of "short think-pieces" and showed openness toward dissenting views and unconventional approaches);
- expansion of estimative production (the memorandum states explicitly that during this period "the number of Estimates produced more than doubled, with NIOs deeply and personally involved at every stage of the process");

- a broader interface with the policy level (Casey placed several NIOs in direct contact with Cabinet members, and some of them were used as intelligence advisers both in Washington and during foreign travel).

The document also notes that many NIOs spent up to a third of their time in interdepartmental meetings or external consultations. Overall, under Casey, the NIO system was used in a more activist manner, oriented toward direct support of the decision-making process (CIA Document no. 2).

Based on the documents examined, the evolution of the NIO system between 1973 and the early 1980s can be characterized by functional continuity combined with variations in managerial style. The core functions established at the system's inception remained largely intact, but their emphasis differed across successive leaderships:

- under Colby, the focus was on implementation and the direct relationship with the DCI;
- under Bush, on limited formalization;
- under Turner, on structural coherence and analytical discipline;
- under Casey, on intensive use and a strong orientation toward the needs of policymakers (CIA Document no. 2).

Declassified CIA documents portray the NIOs system primarily in functional and utilitarian terms, as an instrument through which the DCI could obtain substantive support, integrate positions from across the U.S. intelligence community, and orient analytical production toward the needs of policymakers. At the same time, even within this "institutional" perspective, both structural advantages and potential vulnerabilities of a model based on individual roles with direct access to senior leadership can be discerned.

One major advantage was the flexibility of the system. In Colby's conception, it addressed the difficulty of organizing the "machinery" required to rapidly integrate dispersed expertise. At the same time, the implementation documents also assign the NIOs a coordinating role within the intelligence community, suggesting that they were designed as a mechanism for integrating multiple organizational structures.

Along the same lines, the October 1975 guide records that the NIOs were created to perform the functions previously exercised by the BNE and to ensure the briefing and coordination of national-level intelligence production. It explicitly mentions their obligation to maintain contact with the NSC and other principal consumers, as well as to present "fully objective presentations of alternative views" (CIA Document no. 5).

The documents also indicate an explicit orientation toward policy relevance. The NIC memorandum of 1988 cites Colby as stating that the NIOs were expected to make intelligence products "more relevant to the needs of the policymakers", including through the expansion of contacts and the identification of priority topics (CIA Document no. 2).

In a review of the book *Truth to Power: A History of the U.S. National Intelligence Council* (eds. Robert Hutchings and Gregory F. Treverton, Oxford, 2019), published in the CIA's professional journal *Studies in Intelligence* (December 2019), Roger Z. George emphasizes that the NIOs—more than the NIEs themselves—"produced impact and relevance for the NIC." The same author notes that, to be effective, NIOs had to be "recognized specialists but also well versed in intelligence practices and personally connected to those sitting in the White House, State Department, and Pentagon" (George, 2019).

Finally, NIOs often found themselves in the position of "estimating orally" for members of the NSC, demonstrating that their relationship with policymakers was direct and highly personalized.

Despite its advantages, the NIOs architecture also incorporated several notable structural vulnerabilities. Among these, the most evident was the high degree of personalization and dependence on individual officeholders, reflected even in the formal description of the NIO role as "the Director's personal representative." As a result, the effectiveness of the system depended heavily on the qualities of the individual officer, his or her credibility, and the strength of the personal relationship with the Director. While this arrangement provided flexibility—potentially a significant advantage—it also introduced a degree of institutional instability.

Reform of the DI and the Reconfiguration of the CIA's Analytical Apparatus

The reform carried out by Colby in 1973—the establishment of the NIOs system in place of the BNE/ONE structure – primarily targeted the interface between the CIA and political decision-makers, namely the level of coordination and strategic guidance of intelligence production. The DI as a whole, including its analytical offices and divisions, remained largely unaffected by this structural intervention.

A deeper reconfiguration took place during 1976-1977, driven by two converging factors: the external pressures generated by congressional investigations and the change in leadership at the top of the CIA.

The internal structural problems of the DI became increasingly visible by the mid-1970s. The DI entered a period of accumulated pressures that made the need for a thorough reorganization increasingly apparent. These pressures came from several directions simultaneously: congressional investigations, expanding demands from intelligence consumers, declining resources, and an increasingly intense internal debate regarding the quality and policy relevance of analytical products (*Final Report of the Select Committee…*, 1976).

The CIA document from February 1977, which provides an overview of the DI during that period, highlights the origins of these pressures. The impulse for a closer examination of how the CIA produced intelligence came from outside the Agency:

> "The momentum for undertaking a more intensive examination of the way in which CIA was organized to produce intelligence was given additional impetus by the numerous Executive and Congressional examinations of the production process. In particular, the findings of both the House and Senate Select Committees on Intelligence and a number of consumer surveys undertaken by the IC Staff all seemed to focus on two basic areas—the need for CIA to produce more integrated or interdisciplinary analysis and the need to create a working environment in which the analytic career could flourish." (CIA Document no. 7, 13).

The reform of the CIA's analytical activities began with a process of internal evaluation, materialized in an interim report submitted to the Executive Advisory Group (EAG) on August 25, 1976. The document identified four areas in which improvements were considered imperative.

The first concerned multidisciplinary (interdisciplinary) analysis. The organizational structure of the DI was predominantly vertical and organized by discipline: economists in one office, political scientists in another, and military specialists and geographers in separate offices of their own. The result was an artificial fragmentation of analytical responsibilities and a deficit of collaboration.

The second problematic area concerned the selection of analytical issues and the allocation of resources. The DI tended to respond primarily to the immediate demands of policymakers, often at the expense of anticipatory research. The document notes that the institution lacked adequate mechanisms and incentives to encourage analysts to come together at the outset of the analytical process to share their knowledge and perspectives. The difficulty of balancing responses to current requests with investment in deeper, long-term research is described as one of the most challenging structural problems to address.

The third area concerned the slow pace at which the DI adopted new analytical methodologies that had become available in the academic world, such as systems analysis, probabilistic analysis, mathematical and statistical procedures, and decision analysis. Moreover, these new techniques were often treated as institutional window dressing rather than as genuine working tools.

The fourth—and perhaps most important—issue involved strengthening the "analytical ethos" within the DI. The document identifies a vicious circle: career advancement was not directly linked to genuine analytical excellence, which generated a bureaucratic pressure toward the proliferation of managerial positions. At the same time, the internal review process tended to strip analytical products of their timeliness and practical utility; a study could circulate for up to six months through various levels of approval before being released (CIA Document no. 7, 16-17).

In parallel with the internal evaluation, the CIA contracted an external consulting firm to conduct an independent study on the

organization of the DI and the changes required—both structural and procedural. The study was carried out over two months, after which the consultants presented their findings and recommendations, concluding the process with a written report in November 1976.

Based on the two assessments—internal and external—the Deputy Director for Intelligence (DDI) established a working group tasked with preparing a series of documents outlining possible organizational measures. Drawing on these materials, the DCI authorized the implementation of the proposed reorganization on November 15, 1976.

The reform produced an organizational structure substantially different from the previous one. The document describes each component and its role within the new analytical ecosystem, as follows:

Office of the Deputy Director for Intelligence (ODDI). It remained the command center of the DI, incorporating staff responsible for administration, planning, and coordination.

Under the umbrella of the ODDI operated the Centre for Policy Support (CPS), described as the principal mechanism for monitoring the DI's production activities and maintaining relations with the policy-making community. The CPS was assigned three major responsibilities: 1) enhancing the relevance of CIA analytical production to the needs of policymakers; 2) executing and managing intelligence analysis across the entire directorate on key U.S. policy issues; 3) monitoring and maintaining effective managerial control over the production activities of the DI's component units.

CIA Operations Center (OPSC). It functioned as a 24-hour watch and alert unit for the entire Agency, providing a focal point for the reception of new information and for its dissemination to other components of the Intelligence Community.

Current Reporting Group (CRG). This was the new structure assigned exclusive responsibility for monitoring and providing immediate analysis of ongoing international developments, as well as for producing the DI's daily publications. CRG analysts operated in a manner similar to journalists, identifying relevant news coverage areas and drafting articles for current intelligence publications. The CRG prepared the President's Daily Brief, the National Intelligence Daily, and a weekly publication. At the same time, it provided analytical commentary based

on its own expertise as well as on consultations with analysts in the research offices.

Publications and Presentations Group (PPG). It was responsible for providing professional publishing services to the production offices, improving the quality of published products, and developing new presentation formats. The PPG concentrated advanced word-processing equipment and functioned as a centre where new presentation techniques could be developed for the entire DI.

Office of Central Reference (OCR). It was responsible for maintaining the Agency's central reference services and for producing biographical intelligence reports for the entire Intelligence Community.

Seven research offices which provided in-depth analysis and periodic reporting within their respective areas of specialization: Office of Economic Research (OER), Office of Geographic and Cartographic Research (OGCR), the Office of Strategic Research (OSR), Office of Imagery Analysis (OIA), Office of Scientific Intelligence (OSI), Office of Weapons Intelligence (OWI), and Office of Regional and Political Analysis (ORPA).

The OER was the largest research office within the DI and had developed a growing reputation for the quality of its analyses on international monetary issues, global trade, and petroleum-related matters. The ORPA represented one of the central innovations of the reform. It was organized primarily along geographic lines, and its missions covered three temporal horizons: current intelligence, medium-term analysis, and long-term research on selected topics relevant to the formulation of U.S. policy.

The institutional architecture resulting from the 1976-1977 reform reflected a more functional organizational logic in the production of CIA analysis. What were the major changes? At a preliminary level, at least three significant achievements can be identified: the separation of current production (CRG) from in-depth research (the specialized research offices); the creation of mechanisms for interdisciplinary integration (CPS and ORPA); and the strengthening of editorial support (PPG). One of the principal outcomes was the reduction of the fragmentation that had characterized the previous period.

OSR: The Institutionalization of Military Analysis within the CIA

Within the CIA's analytical architecture of the late Cold War period, the OSR represented the Agency's principal instrument for producing independent military assessments. The creation of this structure marked the maturation of the CIA's capacity to generate its own strategic military intelligence, distinct from the estimates produced by the Pentagon. Its evolution reflects both the interinstitutional competition within the U.S. intelligence community and the transformation of policymakers' requirements in an era dominated by nuclear rivalry.

Military intelligence analysis constituted one of the most contested and complex domains within the architecture of U.S. intelligence services throughout the Cold War. Unlike political or economic analysis, the assessment of Soviet military capabilities required not only highly specialized technical and analytical expertise but also constant navigation through the institutional tensions between the CIA and the military structures of the Department of Defence (DoD). In this context, the creation of the Office of Strategic Research (OSR) in 1967 represented a turning point in the history of the CIA, marking the Agency's explicit assumption of an independent and competitive role in the field of military intelligence estimates.

The principal source used in preparing this section is the official historical study authored by Robert Vickers under the auspices of the CIA History Staff, *The History of CIA's Office of Strategic Research, 1967-1981*, published August 2019 by the Centre for the Study of Intelligence. This work represents a primary source of exceptional value, incorporating declassified documents, memoirs of former OSR directors, and internal Agency studies that had not previously been made publicly available.

The origins of the OSR must be understood within the broader context of the evolution of the CIA's role in the field of military intelligence. The National Security Act of 1947 clearly delineated the intelligence responsibilities of U.S. agencies: The Department of State was responsible for political and social intelligence, the military services for military intelligence, and the CIA for economic, scientific, and technical intelligence (Vickers, 2019, X).

This division of responsibilities generated early tensions. Max Millikan, the MIT economist appointed by DCI Smith to lead the ORR established in 1951, argued from the outset that a nation's economic strength was inseparable from its capacity to wage war. Accordingly, he organized the ORR so that it could conduct comprehensive analyses of all aspects of the Soviet economy, including the defence sector. Vickers summarizes Millikan's conception in the following terms:

> "He believed that this micro-analytic approach would help analysts to estimate the total economic resources available to the Soviet Bloc, the allocation of these resources to the military sector, and the strengths and limitations of the economy. This, in turn, would assist in determining enemy capabilities and weaknesses and help policymakers exploit Soviet Bloc economic vulnerabilities." (Vickers, 2019, XI)

The ORR expanded rapidly in its early years: the four economic divisions alone grew from approximately 150 personnel to nearly 500 by 1953. A key element in this development was the creation within the office of a new component responsible for estimating the cost of the Soviet military sector.

The period 1953-1961 brought two major issues that further strengthened the CIA's analytical role in the military domain: the "bomber gap" and the "missile gap." Both involved intense disputes between the CIA and the military services regarding the actual size of Soviet forces. Although the CIA initially accepted higher estimates of Soviet air and missile capabilities, subsequent analysis—especially after the launch of reconnaissance satellites in the early 1960s—dramatically reduced these projections.

The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, the expanded mandate granted to the CIA by DCI John McCone, and the debates surrounding anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems and Soviet ground forces marked a new stage in this evolution. Under the leadership of McCone and later Richard Helms, the CIA concluded that it needed to play a role in military intelligence comparable to the one it already held in political and economic intelligence. This shift in perspective created the institutional framework for the establishment of the Office of Strategic Research (OSR).

In July 1967, DCI Helms decided to create this new structure, bringing together nearly all DI analysts responsible for military intelligence. Its mission was clear: to provide the DCI with an independent assessment of strategic military threats to U.S. national security interests.

The OSR began with approximately 180 personnel, most of them drawn from the ORR and the Office of Current Intelligence (OCI). The initial organization of the office reflected both the complexity of its mission and the ambition to cover the entire spectrum of military analysis. According to the 1968 annual report, the organizational structure included four main divisions designed to address Soviet strategic forces, theatre forces, military-economic analysis, and technical intelligence:

- Programs Analysis Division (military-economic analysis);
- Strategic Forces Division;
- Theater Forces Division;
- Regional Analysis Division.

The first division assessed the costs and trends of military programs; the second focused on missile and space systems; the third analysed conventional forces; and the fourth produced current intelligence. This structure shows that the OSR combined in-depth research with operational support, a characteristic shared with other analytical offices within the DI. OSR later evolved through the creation of specialized centres, such as the Military-Economic Analysis Centre (MEAC) and the Strategic Evaluation Centre (SEC), designed to support analyses of Soviet military expenditures and the effectiveness of Soviet forces (Vickers, 2019, 38-40).

The core activity of the OSR consisted in producing and contributing to NIEs concerning the strategic military capabilities of the Soviet Union. OSR participated in a series of crucial estimates addressing intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), nuclear submarines, anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems, and the conventional forces of the Warsaw Pact. These estimates were often a source of tension between the CIA and the DoD as the military services tended to produce higher assessments of Soviet capabilities, while OSR analyses frequently proved more cautious (Vickers, 2019, 208; Steury, 1996).

A declassified CIA document referring to an internal professional seminar on biases in intelligence analysis, organized by the Centre for the Study of Intelligence in January–February 1977, illustrates—somewhat anecdotally—the differing views within U.S. intelligence agencies. According to one participant's remarks, the Soviet threat was perceived along the following lines:

- from a right-leaning perspective—the U.S. Air Force: "The Russians are not only coming, they are already here";
- somewhat less pronounced, the Defence Intelligence Agency (DIA) and the other military intelligence services: "The Russians are coming; they are halfway here";
- the CIA, positioned closer to the centre: "The Russians are coming, but we do not know when";
- the DoD, situated on the left of the spectrum: "The Russians are not only not coming, they probably do not even care" (CIA Document no. 8).

Over its fifteen years of existence, the OSR has also experienced a number of difficult periods and situations. These were generated either by the complexity of its responsibilities, by the demands of political decision-makers, or by its interactions with other structures within the intelligence community.

An illustration of the first type of challenge was the persistent lack of reliable data on Soviet military expenditures. The USSR treated such information as state secrets, and the official figures published by Moscow were considered by the CIA to be either insufficient or misleading. In response, the OSR developed its own estimation methods—including cost models expressed in rubbles—which enabled it to produce independent assessments of the Soviet military budget. A significant revision published in 1976 indicated that Soviet military expenditures during the 1970-1975 period had been underestimated, generating a major controversy both within the intelligence community and in academic and political circles (Firth, Noren, 1998).

In addition to its strategic estimates, the OSR played an essential role in providing intelligence support for the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) and the Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR) negotiations. The office established dedicated structures—such as the Soviet Strategic Forces Division and the Theatre Forces Division—to

support U.S. negotiators with precise analytical data on Soviet arsenals. This function of direct support for foreign policy gave the OSR immediate practical relevance in the eyes of policymakers.

With respect to relations with policymakers, an important role was played by Henry Kissinger, the President's National Security Advisor. He introduced mechanisms such as the National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM) and the Defence Policy Review Committee (DPRC), which required much more detailed military analyses. As a demanding consumer of intelligence, Kissinger did not seek conclusions that merely supported policy decisions. Rather, he wanted CIA documents to include the reasoning behind their judgments as well as alternative analytical perspectives (Vickers, 2019, 59).

Finally, the relationship between the OSR and the DoD was characterized by constant competition. Divergences in the assessment of the Soviet threat were recurrent, and former office managers emphasized the need for the CIA to provide independent estimates to better serve the President and other decision-makers.

These institutional dynamics were compounded by political controversies surrounding the OSR's analytical performance. Particularly in the late 1970s, the office was criticized in certain political circles and in Congress for allegedly underestimating the Soviet threat. These controversies also reflected the inevitable politicization of strategic military intelligence in the context of nuclear competition.

In October 1981, DCI Casey abolished the OSR as part of a broad reorganization of the DI. The restructuring replaced the DI's functional organization (by political, economic, and military themes) with a regional structure, grouping analysts into offices dedicated to specific geographic areas: SOVA (Soviet Union), OEA (East Asia), NESA (Near East and South Asia), EURA (Europe), and ALA (Africa and Latin America). The majority of OSR personnel were transferred to SOVA.

ORPA: Consolidating the Political Analysis Dimension within the DI

Within the DI architecture of the 1976-1981 period, the ORPA can be seen as the political and regional counterpart to the OSR. While the latter addressed the hard dimension of threats to U.S. national security—nuclear capabilities, weapons systems, and military doctrines—ORPA

covered the soft and political dimension: the internal dynamics of key states, political instability, opposition movements, interstate relations, and regional trends with implications for U.S. foreign policy. What internal drivers led to the creation of this new functional structure within the DI? Why was such a structure dedicated to the production of political intelligence considered necessary? Once again, a brief examination—supported by declassified Agency documents—helps clarify the issue.

At the beginning of the 1970s, the DI faced a profound structural crisis in political analysis. Resources were fragmented across distinct organizational entities—Office of National Estimates (ONE), Office of Current Intelligence (OCI), Office of Basic and Geographic Intelligence (OBGI), Strategic Research Staff (SRS), and Propaganda Analysis Staff (PAS)—with overlapping responsibilities and significant gaps in in-depth political research.

The diagnosis of this situation is articulated in an internal memorandum dated May 16, 1973, drafted by Richard Lehman, Director of Current Intelligence, and addressed to the Deputy Director for Intelligence. The document notes the following:

> "The Agency is not well organized to perform these functions. Its resources are scattered among a number of components which, through chance or evolution, overlap. Some jobs are done well, some are overdone through duplication, and some are neglected. We suffer notably in research, which is given second place in OCI, misdirected in SRS, and ignored in ONE." (CIA Document no. 9)

The same document lists four major CIA functions in the field of political intelligence production—current reporting, estimative writing, research, and basic intelligence—observing that these categories were not entirely distinct and that their separation was largely arbitrary. Lehman also notes that among the six organizations with analytical responsibilities in the political domain, the only one "fully devoted to political research" was the SRS. However, its research concept was described as "badly distorted by its isolation from the intelligence mainstream," with an excessive emphasis on historical reconstruction and too little concern for relevance to political decision-makers (CIA Document no. 9).

The response to this situation came a month later, as reflected in another internal document. The memorandum of June 21, 1973, signed by DDI Edward W. Proctor and addressed to the Executive Secretary of the CIA Management Committee, acknowledges the existence of significant problems in the Agency's production of high-quality political intelligence. The proposed solution was the creation of an integrated structure—the Office of Political Research (OPR)—designed to conduct in-depth political analysis and research (CIA Document no. 10).

OPR became operational in the autumn of 1973, amid major institutional turbulence that complicated the process of consolidation. The Yom Kippur War of October 1973 and the subsequent oil crisis immediately mobilized the analytical resources of the DI, delaying the planned personnel transfers and placing additional pressure on the OCI precisely at the moment when it was expected to relinquish part of its capabilities.

The period 1973-1976 represented for the OPR a phase of gradual consolidation and continuous negotiation of its institutional space in relation to the OCI. The structural tension between the two offices—anticipated and conceptualized in the founding documents—manifested itself in practice: officers capable of conducting in-depth research were often drawn into the immediate demands of OCI's current intelligence work, while the division of responsibilities remained ambiguous.

Nevertheless, OPR survived this period of uncertainty and produced sufficient evidence of its value for the concept of a structure dedicated to in-depth political research to be reinforced in the reorganization that followed.

The structural reorganization of 1976, which reshaped the analytical landscape within the DI, also led to the reconfiguration of political intelligence (Overton, 1992). OPR was transformed into a new structure: The Office of Regional and Political Analysis (ORPA), which represented the institutional crystallization of the project launched in 1973.

Compared with OPR, the new office was larger and more structurally articulated, with distinct regional divisions, including a USSR Division, as well as divisions for the Middle East, Asia, Latin America, and others. It also enjoyed a clearer organizational position in relation to

current intelligence production, which had now been explicitly separated through the Centre for Policy Support (CPS).

The founding philosophy, however, remained the same: ORPA was intended to produce analyses that went beyond reacting to the event of the day, identifying structural dynamics and constructing coherent interpretations of how political systems and international political forces function.

The structure based on regional divisions enabled the office to combine the ongoing monitoring of political developments in its areas of responsibility with broader research projects extending over months or even years. The USSR Division, for example, periodically published classified analyses—such as the series *The USSR: Regional and Political Analysis*—which combined current intelligence with deeper structural analysis of Soviet domestic politics, the dynamics of Moscow's relations with Western communist parties, or bureaucratic disputes concerning foreign economic policy (CIA Document no. 11).

An emblematic example of the type of analysis for which ORPA had been designed is the ORPA memorandum of October 19, 1978, on the implications of the election of a Polish pope for the Soviet Union. Written shortly after the election of Karol Wojtyła as John Paul II, the document anticipated the medium-term strategic consequences of this event for the stability of the Eastern Bloc and for the dynamics of Polish domestic politics:

> "The selection of a Polish Pope, which reflects the uniquely vital Polish church, will make even more difficult Moscow's traditional attempts to bind culturally Western Poland more closely to the East, to integrate the Poles more closely into the Soviet-dominated bilateral and multilateral system of alliances, and to foster greater social and political discipline in Poland by consolidating the power of the Polish communist party." (CIA Document no. 12)

The events of 1979-1980 subjected ORPA to intense operational pressures that tested the limits of its organizational model. The Iranian Revolution, the seizure of American hostages in Tehran, and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan created three major crises requiring in-depth

strategic interpretation. ORPA produced significant analyses on all these issues, but the pressure of urgency reproduced—on a larger scale—the structural tension already identified in the founding documents: when events accelerated, analytical resources intended for long-term research were inevitably diverted toward current production.

The reorganization that brought an end to ORPA occurred in 1981, with the appointment of Casey as DCI under the Reagan administration. Casey promoted a markedly different vision from Turner regarding the organization of analytical intelligence: less centralization, greater institutional agility, and a stronger orientation toward operational support for foreign policy. The 1981 reorganization of the DI replaced the NFAC model with a system of autonomous, interdisciplinary regional offices.

This second major reform in less than a decade confirmed that the structural tensions identified in the 1973 documents could not be definitively resolved through a single reorganization. The 1981 model of interdisciplinary regional offices addressed many of the same concerns, particularly the need to integrate multidisciplinary analysis and eliminate overlapping responsibilities. The reorganization reduced analytical fragmentation and clarified regional accountability. Nevertheless, the structural tension between operational urgency and in-depth research appears to have remained an enduring feature of intelligence analysis within the CIA even under the new organizational framework.

Structural Vulnerabilities of Intelligence Analysis

The institutional reforms of the 1973-1977 period produced an analytical apparatus more closely connected to the needs of policymakers. Nevertheless, three major episodes from the same period demonstrated that no organizational architecture can fully eliminate the inherent vulnerabilities of intelligence analysis.

The first episode preceded the completion of the DI reorganization. In 1976, an internal review of the Office of Strategic Research concluded that CIA estimates of Soviet military expenditures during the previous decade had been substantially underestimated. This did not occur because the Soviet Union had spent more than previously believed.

Rather, the problem lay elsewhere: the cost models used by analysts contained systematic methodological errors in calculation.

The revision generated a major controversy both within the intelligence community and in political and academic circles. Its conclusions were quickly instrumentalized by factions opposing the policy of détente, providing a strong argument for the claim that the CIA had chronically underestimated the Soviet threat (Firth, Noren, 1998).

This vulnerability provided the ground on which the second episode, better known and more controversial, developed. Also, in 1976, at the initiative of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) and with the approval of DCI George H. W. Bush, the Ford administration authorized an unprecedented experiment: a competitive parallel evaluation of the National Intelligence Estimate concerning Soviet strategic forces and objectives (Freedman, 1997, 122-142).

The CIA's internal analytical team, designated Team A, was confronted with an external panel of experts, Team B, led by the Harvard historian Richard Pipes and including figures such as Paul Wolfowitz and Paul Nitze, selected explicitly, as the documents note, from analysts known for holding a more pessimistic view of the Soviet threat. Team B's mandate was to determine whether the available data could support the conclusion that Soviet strategic objectives were more ambitious and more threatening than those assessed in existing NIEs. Team B's conclusion—that the CIA suffered from "mirror-imaging", projecting the logic of mutual deterrence onto Soviet military thinking—proved rhetorically more compelling than Team A's presentation and forced a revision of the NIE toward what Bush, in his covering letter, described as "a harder appreciation of Soviet strategic capabilities and objectives" (Freedman, 1997).

The political consequences of the exercise far exceeded its analytical validity: The Team B reports became the intellectual foundation for the concept of the "window of vulnerability" and for the large-scale rearmament pursued under the Reagan administration. Later, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the opening of Soviet archives, many of Team B's specific assessments proved largely inaccurate.

The Team B case demonstrated how permeable the estimative process could become to politically motivated interventions, even within a formally structured analytical framework:

> "Members of Team B were deliberately selected from among experienced political and military analysts of Soviet affairs known to take a more somber view of the Soviet strategic threat than that accepted as the intelligence community's consensus." (FRUS 1969-1976, vol. XXXV, doc. 171)

The third episode occurred two years later and struck directly at the core of ORPA's mission: understanding the political dynamics of states of importance for U.S. security. The Iranian Revolution of 1978-1979 and the collapse of the Shah's regime represented the most frequently cited analytical failure of the period.

The assessment commissioned immediately after the Shah's fall, and prepared in spring 1979 by Robert Jervis and John Devlin as consultants to NFAC, identified the mechanisms behind this failure. The two concluded that CIA analysts had provided little information about the opposition, that senior officials did not systematically read the available reporting, and that until August 1978, the CIA had described its reporting from Iran as "first rate"—at precisely the moment when the Israeli embassy in Tehran was assessing that a violent regime change was "highly likely."

As in many other intelligence failures, the problem lay not in collection but in interpretation—a crucial distinction in the literature on intelligence failure. The intelligence community viewed Iran almost exclusively through the lens of regime stability, ignoring the religious dimension of the opposition, which was treated largely as an anachronism. The Shah had survived previous predictions of his downfall and was expected to do so again—and this assumption was never subjected to systematic analytical testing. The two consultants concluded that the judgments of CIA analysts relied primarily on their intrinsic plausibility, while alternative possibilities were not seriously considered (CIA Document no. 13).

Taken together, the three episodes outline the systemic limits of the period. The reforms implemented between 1973 and 1977 addressed

some of the structural problems of the Directorate of Intelligence (DI). The deeper ones, linked to the very nature of intelligence as an activity that is both intellectual and political, inevitably remained unresolved. This suggests that while organizational reform can improve analytical performance, it cannot eliminate the inherent uncertainty of strategic intelligence.

Conclusions

The period 1973-1981 represented one of the most dynamic stages in the evolution of the CIA's analytical function. Under the simultaneous pressure of an internal crisis of legitimacy, transformations in the strategic environment, and increasingly articulated demands from policymakers, the Agency was compelled to fundamentally rethink its analytical architecture. The declassified documents examined in this study show that the process was neither linear nor free of ambiguity. Rather, it appears as a sequence of institutional adjustments intended to respond to converging pressures.

The introduction of the NIOs system sought primarily to shorten the distance between intelligence producers and political consumers. From this perspective, Colby's reform brought a clear increase in flexibility and responsiveness. At the same time, however, the shift toward individual roles operating in direct relationship with the Director transferred part of the system's institutional robustness to the personal performance of the officeholders. The system thus became more agile, but also more dependent on the quality of the individuals who operated it.

The reorganization of the DI in 1976-1977 went further. If the earlier changes had primarily modified the interface with policymakers, this new phase addressed the internal logic of analytical production itself. The separation of current intelligence from in-depth research, the emergence of mechanisms for interdisciplinary integration, and the consolidation of specialized structures such as OSR and ORPA all point to a serious attempt at organizational modernization.

In practice, however, the tension between the pressure of immediate deliverables and the need for forward-looking analysis did not disappear. At best, it was managed more effectively. The three episodes discussed—the revision of estimates concerning Soviet military

expenditures, the Team B experiment, and the strategic surprise represented by the Iranian Revolution—are particularly revealing in this regard. They suggest that the limits of intelligence analysis cannot be explained solely by institutional architecture. Even within a reformed organizational framework, vulnerabilities persist, linked to imperfect methodological models, explicit or implicit political pressures, and the inherent difficulty of interpreting opaque and fluid political systems.

Viewed as a whole, the experience of the 1973-1981 period confirms a recurrent pattern in the history of the U.S. intelligence community. Major reforms generally emerge in moments of crisis and produce real improvements at the procedural and organizational levels. Yet they cannot fully eliminate the structural tension between analytical independence and relevance to the decision-making process. In the case of the CIA, this tension was not resolved by the reforms of the 1970s; it was merely reconfigured in a form better adapted to the context of the late Cold War.

From this perspective, the transformations analyzed here can be interpreted less as a definitive solution to the problems of the analytical function and more as a phase of institutional maturation. The analytical apparatus undoubtedly became more articulated and more closely connected to the needs of its consumers. But the profession's underlying dilemmas—uncertainty, the risk of politicization, and the difficulty of anticipating major political change—remained, to a large extent, the same.

References:

a. Declassified documents (Retrieved from www.cia.gov/readingroom, accessed October–December 2025)

1. CIA Document no. 1 ("Interview with William Colby", May 14, 1978, CBS Network, no. CIA-RDP99-00418R000100110003-7).

2. CIA Document no. 2 (David D. Gries, "How Your NIOs Can Help You", February 16, 1988, no. CIA-RDP90G01353R001400020001-8).

3. CIA Document no. 3 (William Colby, "National Intelligence Officers", Memorandum for USIB Principals, October 3, 1973, no. CIA-RDP80M00165A002900050030-6).

4. CIA Document no. 4 (William Colby, "National Intelligence Officers", Memorandum for USIB, October 23, 1973, no. CIA-RDP801048A000400100007-2)

5. CIA Document no. 5 ("A Guide to the National Intelligence Community's Production Organizations and Their Products", October 1975, no. CIA-RDP83M00171R0008000050002-3).

6. CIA Document no. 6 ("National Foreign Assessment Center. Organizational Structures and Functions", December 1977, no. CIA-RDP85-00988R000100070025-8).

7. CIA Document no. 7 ("The Directorate of Intelligence. A Brief Description", February 1977, no. CIA-RDP80-00473A000600100010-8).

8. CIA Document no. 8 ("Report of a seminar on bias in intelligence analysis", Center for the Study of Intelligence, April 1, 1977, no. CIA-RDP80-00630A000300030001-4).

9. CIA Document no. 9 (Richard Lehman, Director of Current Intelligence, "Organization of Political Intelligence", Memorandum to DDI, May 16, 1973, no. CIA-RDP80B01495R000700080007-3).

10. CIA Document no. 10 (Edward W. Proctor, "Proposal for an Office of Political Research", June 21, 1973, no. CIA-RDP80B01495R000700080005-5).

11. CIA Document no. 11 ("The USSR: Regional and Political Analysis", RP ASU 77-011, USSR Division, ORPA, May 19, 1977, no. CIA-RDP79T00912A000100010016-1).

12. CIA Document no. 12 ("The Impact of a Polish Pope on the USSR", October 19, 1978, NFAC/ORPA Memorandum, no. 0000498567)

13. CIA Document no. 13. ("Analysis of NFAC's Performance on Iran's Domestic Crisis," June 15, 1979, no. CIA-RDP86B00269R001100110003-4).

b. Studies and books

14. Bennett, M. Todd, Wieland, Alexander R. (Eds.). (2014). *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1976,* Volume XXXVIII, Part 2, Organization and Management of Foreign Policy; Public Diplomacy, 1973-1976.

15. Firth, Noel E., Noren, James H. (1998). *Soviet Defense Spending: A History of CIA Estimates, 1950-1990,* Texas A&M Press.

16. Ford, Harold P. (1993, declassified August 10, 2011). *William E. Colby as Director of Central Intelligence*, CIA History Staff.

17. Freedman, Lawrence. (1997). "The CIA and the Soviet Threat: The Politicization of Estimates, 1966-1977", in *Intelligence and National Security,* Volume 12, Issue 1.

18. Helgerson, John. (1995). "A Difficult Relationship. Intelligence Support for Richard M. Nixon", in *Studies in Intelligence,* CIA, Volume 39, no. 4.

19. Overton, David W. (1992). "The DI 10 Years After Reorganization", in *Studies in Intelligence,* CIA, Volume 36, no. 5.

20. Steury, Donald P. (ed.). (1996). *Intentions and Capabilities: Estimates on Soviet Strategic Forces, 1950-1983*, CIA/CSI.

21. Vickers, Robert. (2019). *The History of CIA's Office of Strategic Research, 1967–1981*, Washington DC, Centre for the Study of Intelligence, CIA.

22. Warner, Michael. (2009). "Reading the Riot Act: The Schlesinger Report, 1971", in *Intelligence and National Security,* Volume 24, Issue 3.

23. *Final Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities.* (1976). United States Senate, Book I-VI.