

*ddi file
file OSR*

DDI-264-74

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy to the DCI for the Intelligence Community

SUBJECT : Your Proposal on the Military Costing Review Board

1. In your memorandum to Admiral de Poix and me, you urge us to add a "devil's advocate" to the DIA/CIA Military Costing Review Board. Having given this due consideration, I believe that the participation of a "devil's advocate" on a board of this sort would be inappropriate, and I decline your offer to nominate an "atheist" in the same spirit in which you made it.

2. Because this Board was established as a working group to coordinate the activities of the two organizations, I believe participation by an outsider would be counterproductive. Your implication that the participants are "believers" in the usefulness and need for costing military programs is correct, but your implication that there will be pressure on them for uncritical defense of particular methods and results is not.

3. Rather than participate in the work of the Board, the "devil's advocate" should have his say at a higher level--that is, at the time that the Board's results are reviewed. In this context he should be given the opportunity to review and comment on the reports which the Board will present to Admiral de Poix and me. Copies of such reports will be furnished you for that purpose.

4. By the way, my adviser on things ecclesiastical tells me that a "devil's advocate" is never an "atheist" but is to be viewed as a "promoter of the faith."

[Redacted Signature Box]

25X1

EDWARD W. PROCTOR
Deputy Director for Intelligence

Distribution:

- Orig & 1 - Addressee
- 2 - D/OSR

[Redacted Box]

25X1

Approved For Release 2006/03/10 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000700110030-3

BASIC

Approved For Release 2006/03/10 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000700110030-3

DCI/IG 74-004

THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20505

DDI-193-74

Office of the Director

21 JAN 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director, Defense Intelligence Agency
Deputy Director for Intelligence, CIA

SUBJECT: Military Costing Review Board

1. I am in receipt of a Memorandum of Understanding between DIA and CIA on setting up a Military Costing Review Board. This memorandum is to urge you to add a "devil's advocate" to that Board.

2. As constituted the Board is composed of representatives of the costing activity. I cast no aspersions on their intentions, but must point out that all will be inclined by reason of position and bureaucratic pressures to defend rather than critique methods and results. The board needs at least one "atheist" in addition to the true believers. I have a nominee if this suggestion meets with your approval.

25X1

25X1

[Redacted signature area]

[Redacted] Daniel O. Graham
Major General, USA
Deputy to the DCI for the
Intelligence Community

25X1

25 January 1974

Ed,

I think you can get by with the argument in your draft, and I attach a copy with some verbal amendments you may wish to consider. But, assuming for the moment a devil's advocate role myself, I must note that there is something in Granam's position.

Graham does indeed slip when he uses "atheist" in connection with the role of a "devil's advocate." As I indicated to you yesterday, and as you had already recognized, the "devil's advocate" is never an atheist. In fact, advocatus diaboli is really only a popular name for one who is properly called promotor fidei, "promoter of the faith."

But the promotor fidei does keep an eye on the investigations.

Thus, either side here could use the analogy of beatification and canonization processes to support its position. (Attached is an excerpt from a handbook on Canon Law.) The question is whether the Board or the first reviewing officials would be comparable to the first tribunal in a beatification/canonization process. Graham, if he pursued the matter, presumably would argue that the cause of military costing has already been launched, and that the Board is investigating the matter--that is to say, the postulator (plaintiff) is functioning, and it's time to appoint a promotor fidei. Your draft rather takes the position that the Board is what will originate any cause--the postulator will present the petition and an advocatus diaboli will have his say when Knoche and Smith sit as the first tribunal.

Omnis similitudo claudicat.



25X1

CHAPTER FOUR

PROCESSES OF BEATIFICATION AND CANONIZATION

320. Among the various special procedures of canon law are to be included the process of beatification of a servant of God and that of canonization of one already declared a blessed.

These causes are ordinary (*per viam non cultus*) in the case of those servants of God who have not been the object of any veneration or cult, and extraordinary (*per viam cultus; casus excepti*) when there is question of confirming an immemorial or ancient veneration.

The Holy See (Sacred Congregation of Rites) is alone competent in all such causes, local Ordinaries possessing only certain well-defined and delegated powers.

321. An ordinary cause is introduced normally before the Ordinary of the place where the servant of God died. The cause is petitioned by members of the faithful who are represented by a postulator who acts as plaintiff and who must be a priest resident in Rome. Once the diocesan tribunal has been set up, composed of three judges, the promotor fidei³³⁵ (c. 1587), and a notary, and permission has been obtained to open proceedings, the cause begins with the *processus informativus*. To assist this process a collection is made of all the writings of the servant of God (by means of an edict or proclamation) which are then subjected to an examination. At the same time evidence is taken to prove the sanctity of the servant of God and the perfection and heroic nature of the virtues he practiced. These proofs must be full and conclusive and are to be taken from the testimony of witnesses,³³⁶ documents,³³⁷ and experts.³³⁸ On the

³³⁵ The *promotor fidei* employed by the Sacred Congregation of Rites is known as *promotor fidei generalis*. The chief duties of the *promotor* consist in raising objections when he deems it opportune and, in general, in keeping a close watch on all investigations concerning the process (c. 2012).

³³⁶ Besides those who wish to attack the cause, the relatives whether by blood or affinity, of the servant of God, and his servants or household, including even heretics and infidels, may be admitted to give evidence (cc. 2027, § 1; 2023; 2024; 2028). The confessor, even if absolved from the obligation of secrecy, the *advocatus*, and the judge or judges in the cause are excluded from testifying (c. 2027, § 2, 1°-3°). If the servant of God whose sanctity or martyrdom is under discussion was a member of a religious

* the *promotor fidei* is popularly known as the *advocatus diaboli*, "devil's advocate."

completion of the investigation the postulator may be granted a further term during which, if he thinks fit, he may present further facts and proofs useful for his purpose. If no further proofs are forthcoming, the tribunal, having consulted the *promotor fidei*, issues a decree of *conclusio in causa*.

The process is then published and a copy of all the acts (the complex of which is known as the *transumptus*) together with the report of the tribunal and that of the *promotor fidei* are to be sent to the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Having examined and approved the writings³³⁵ of the servant of God in the first place, and after a discussion of the *processus informativus* the said Congregation may then give either a negative or affirmative reply to the *dubium: an signanda sit commissio introductionis causae in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur*. If the reply is favorable and receives the approbation of the Sovereign Pontiff, the Sacred Congregation then issues a decree for the introduction of the cause. At this stage of the proceedings the *processus apostolicus* begins and henceforth the local Ordinary concerned enjoys delegated powers only. The cardinal *ponens* or *relator* then returns all the acts and documents to the local Ordinary. The latter, through the medium of a delegated tribunal consisting of five judges under the presidency of the said Ordinary himself or of another judge appointed by the Sacred Congregation for this purpose, then examines and weighs anew the evidence already collected and at the same time endeavors to gather new evidence especially as regards the virtues and miracles, as well as the fact of martyrdom and its cause if the case deals with one who died for the faith, attributed to the servant of God. At this stage the remains of the latter are to be examined and formally recognized. This part of the process should not, as a rule, last beyond a period

institute at least one half of the witnesses called must be nonmembers of the said institute.

³³⁷ Besides examining the documents which are produced in court spontaneously, the tribunal may also direct the postulator to produce any other documents which may be useful in arriving at the truth (c. 2032). The documents so produced must be furnished with the required attestation as to their authenticity (c. 2034).

³³⁸ The experts must be at least two in number, unacquainted with each other. They normally give their evidence or opinion separately although, upon consultation with the *promotor fidei*, the judge may allow them to do so together and at the same time. These experts are to be appointed without the knowledge of the postulator and are themselves obliged to keep their appointment secret.

³³⁹ This is an essential condition for proceeding *ad ulteriora*.

of two years, unless the term is extended by the Sacred Congregation.

Upon completion of this stage of the proceedings (carried out in the form of a discussion or debate between the parties, i.e., the postulator and the *promotor fidei*), the process then returns to the Sacred Congregation which judges as to the validity of the process and appraises its results, and, if necessary, completes it by means of further evidence.

At this point, judgment is passed on the heroic nature of the virtues of the servant of God at three meetings of the Sacred Congregation. The first, known as the *ante-preparatoria*, attended by the cardinal *ponens* and the officials and consultors of the said Congregation, examines the various points at issue or the *positiones*.³⁴⁰ The second meeting or the *preparatoria* is attended by all the cardinals attached to the said Congregation together with the officials and consultors of the same and examines the opinions which were given at the first meeting in order to be able to give the *ponens* permission to present a report to the pope of all the discussions so far held. The third or general meeting is held in the Apostolic Palace and is attended by the Sovereign Pontiff himself as presiding official and by all the cardinals, officials, and consultors attached to the Congregation. At this meeting, the Sovereign Pontiff alone, aided by the consultative vote of all those present, gives his decision on the *dubium: an constet de heroicitate virtutum Servi Dei vel de martyrio ejusque causa* (cfr. c. 2104).

In virtue of this decree the servant of God may be called Venerable.

Proceedings for a judgment on the miracles³⁴¹ then begin and are conducted more or less according to the form described above for the establishing of the heroic nature of the virtues of the Venerable. In the investigation much weight is given to the evidence of medical experts. These are to be two in number.³⁴²

The proceedings concerning the miracles terminate with the decree

³⁴⁰ The *positiones super virtutibus* are examined at the first meeting (*ante-preparatoria*) of the Sacred Congregation and are usually printed. They contain among other things, a summary of the original process including a complete copy of all documents and depositions made by witnesses; the defense made by the *advocatus*; the *animadversiones* of the *promotor fidei generalis*, together with the opinions of those appointed to examine the writings of the servant of God (c. 2106).

³⁴¹ For the number of miracles required, cfr. c. 2117.

³⁴² Cfr. cc. 2118; 2119; 2122, §§ 2-4.

called *De tuto* because the pope concludes the general meeting proposing the *dubium: an tuto procedi possit ad beatificationem Servi Dei* (cfr. c. 2124).

A solemn decree of beatification is reserved to the pope.

For the canonization of a *Beatus* the Sacred Congregation must verify the existence of two further miracles. A new papal decree *De tuto* upon the process of canonization is also required. At the conclusion of the proceedings, the pope, in Consistory, fixes the date of the actual ceremony.

322. Extraordinary causes (*per viam cultus*) are employed with regard to those servants of God to whom veneration and cult was paid previous to the Constitution *Coelestis Hierusalem* of July 5, 1634.

The object of the proceedings is to confirm or not the ancient cult.

The process must be introduced before the Ordinary of the place where the cult exists or where there are documents which prove its existence. The process goes through more or less the same stages which make up a formal cause, with the difference that the formula of the *dubium* is concerned with the existence or not of the fact of cult or veneration and, thus, of the *casus exceptus*.³⁴³

If the outcome is favorable the process is concluded by a decree of beatification or canonization.

³⁴³ For the formula, cfr. c. 2127.

OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	ADD1		
2	DD1	21 Jan	
3			
4			
5			
6			

File DSR

ACTION	DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY
APPROVAL	DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION
COMMENT	FILE	RETURN
CONCURRENCE	INFORMATION	SIGNATURE

25X1

Remarks:

To: 2
 Ed
 As you recall, [] (with my and your approval) proposed in September the establishment of a CIA-DIA panel to oversee construction of a joint data base on military costing. The panel is now operational, per the attached. This is a step forward. Suggest you pass word along to DDCI and DCI for their info. I am sending a copy to DDCI and IC Staff.

25X1

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.	DATE
	1-21-74

Approved For Release 2006/05/10 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000700110030-3
 UNCLASSIFIED CONFIDENTIAL SECRET

25X1

25X1

Approved For Release 2006/03/10 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000700110030-3

Approved For Release 2006/03/10 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000700110030-3

7 January 1974

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

SUBJECT: Establishment of the CIA-DIA Military
Costing Review Board

GENERAL

1. Events of the past twelve months have made it clear that intelligence estimates on Warsaw Pact military spending have become increasingly important to US policy decisions and that they are likely to become even more important in the future. This has made it even more essential than in the past that we develop the best possible spending estimates and coordinate the military costing activities under way in the different agencies. The CIA-DIA Military Costing Review Board is established as of this date with the objective of improving our military cost estimates, effecting a more efficient exploitation of our collection and analytical resources in this area and ensuring the proper use of military cost and expenditure estimates.

MEMBERSHIP

2. The Board consists of five members. The Chairman and two members are designated by the Director of Strategic Research, CIA; two members are designated by the Deputy Director for Intelligence, DIA. CIA is responsible for providing the Secretariat. The Board is authorized to appoint working groups as it sees fit.

RESPONSIBILITIES

3. The Board is charged with the following responsibilities:

a. Establishing and maintaining a Joint Data Bank of military price data and costing methodologies.

b. Reviewing all entries into the Joint Data Bank.

c. Coordinating all research activities, including external contracts, on military pricing methodologies to ensure that all resources are being exploited, that research standards are rigorous and procedures consistent, and that both agencies have opportunity for joint participation where desirable.

d. Coordinating collection activities related to military costing matters.

4. CIA will continue to operate its Strategic Cost Analysis Model (SCAM) as a service of common concern and will provide the output to DIA on a regular basis. The Board will review the use of SCAM data to ensure consistency in concepts and methods and identify and correct, to the extent possible, any misapplication of cost and expenditure analysis.

5. The Board will consult regularly with CIA's Military Economic Advisory Panel to obtain the benefit of its review and advice.

6. The Board will prepare an annual report for the Deputy Directors for Intelligence, CIA and DIA, on accomplishments and problems in the area of military costing.

MEETINGS

6. The Board will meet on a regular monthly basis. Ad hoc meetings may be called at the request of any Board member.

25X1

25X1

[Redacted]

E. H. KNOCHE
Director, Strategic Research
Central Intelligence Agency

[Redacted]

Deputy Director for Intelligence
Defense Intelligence Agency

15 JAN 1974

25X1

MEMORANDUM FOR: Messrs. Proctor/Walsh

25X1

FYI only. I have sent an info copy to
Knoche.



22 Jan 74
(DATE)

FORM NO. 101 REPLACES FORM 10-101
1 AUG 54 WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

25X1

Office of Strategic Research

66

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Intelligence

cut
A/DOJ

SUBJECT: General Graham's Suggestion to Add an "Atheist"--read "Exorcist"--to the CIA/DIA Military Costing Review Board

Danny's proposal is to add someone not involved in costing activity to the MCRB. I believe this would be a mistake. My reasons--and proposed alternatives--are set forth in the attached draft reply, prepared for your signature. I suggest that you convey these views by telephone to H.P. Smith, and recommend that he approach Admiral de Poix in a similar vein. General Smith has been advised by his costing staff--independently of our views--along the lines of the attached memo.

[Redacted]

25X1

E. H. KNOCHE

.. You may want to revise the draft reply to invite the "atheist" [Redacted] to sit in on the periodic meetings in which the panel will be reporting to you and [Redacted].

25X1

25X1