

COPY NO. 24

1464 NATO  
SECRET

NORTH ATLANTIC MILITARY COMMITTEE  
COMITE MILITAIRE DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD

Standing Group

Groupe Permanent

SGM-341-53

9 March 1953

MEMORANDUM FOR THE STEERING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: Report on Visits of the Intelligence Committee to  
National Staffs in Ankara, Athens and Rome; SHAPE  
and London

1. At Enclosure, for your information, is a report by the  
Intelligence Committee on their recent visit to Europe.
2. It is recommended that the Steering Committee take note  
of this report.
3. The SGIC has given careful consideration to the question  
of submitting either a combined report or separate reports to the  
countries visited. They are of the opinion that, as much of the  
work was of an informal nature, no official record should be  
transmitted.

*E. A. Keegan*

E. A. KEEGAN  
Asst. Secretary

350.09  
Dec 9

SECRET

REGRADED \_\_\_\_\_

Per Authority \_\_\_\_\_ DOCUMENT RECLASSIFICATION MEMO. #1

By *JCR* \_\_\_\_\_ Date *Dec-69*

ENCLOSURE

NATO  
SECRET

STANDING GROUP INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE

Report on

VISIT TO THE NATIONAL STAFFS OF ANKARA, ATHENS AND ROME,  
TO SUPREME HEADQUARTERS ALLIED POWERS EUROPE AND TO LONDON

Reference: SGM-63-53

I. VISIT TO SHAPE

1. During their visit to SHAPE, which commenced on 2 February, the Committee first met General Schow, Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence. On 2-4 February, a conference was held with the following representatives from the Major NATO Commands:

SACLANT

Captain W.A.F. Hawkins, RN

CHANNEL COMMAND

Capt. de Fregate Echinard, FN  
Captain Suther, RN  
Cdr. Maitland-Makgill-Crichton, RN  
Commander Edwards, RN  
Wing Cdr. McWhannel, RAF

SHAPE

Brig. General Schow, USA  
Brig. General Pasquale, Italian Army  
Colonel Helliot, FA  
Colonel Fergusson, BA  
Captain Rice, USN  
Lt. Col. Roberts, BA  
Major Vallet, FAF

2. At these meetings, all possible improvements in the peace-time machinery of NATO intelligence were fully discussed. The Standing Group Intelligence Committee outlined their proposals as already agreed by the Steering Committee through S.G. 128/1. A number of changes, which were important to and satisfy Major Commands, have been provisionally accepted by the Standing Group Intelligence Committee. These have been circulated (SGM-272-53) to the Standing Group National Staffs and the final paper will be submitted to the Standing Group by 20 March.

NATO  
SECRET

3. During the visit, many other points were raised by SHAPE, the most important of which are indicated below:

a. SHAPE pointed out that there was a requirement for a new general paper to lay down the basic policy for a NATO wartime intelligence organization which would be similar to S.G. 128/1 and to which could be attached as annexes detailed plans for POW Intelligence, Documents Exploitation and Technical Intelligence. The Standing Group Intelligence Committee thought that the preparation of such a general paper would be premature at this stage but were anxious to proceed with individual papers on POW's and Documents, as had already been done with Technical Intelligence.

b. SHAPE is very much concerned with the question of the allocation and training of intelligence personnel to meet wartime requirements. In this field, they raised the question of the provision of personnel to man intelligence staffs in wartime and asked the Standing Group Intelligence Committee if it would not be wise to warn nations as soon as possible that demands for qualified staff officers and specialist personnel would be large and would, in all cases, be in addition to the purely national requirements.

c. SHAPE again raised the question\* of the zone of operations of the Major (and subordinate) NATO Commands in the operational intelligence field, with special reference to the depth over which the Commands would operate, so as to give National Staffs an opportunity of sending them detailed Intelligence material covering their local spheres of interest.

\*SGM-1407-52, Paragraph 5

NATO  
SECRET

## II. VISIT TO NATIONAL STAFFS

### 1. TURKEY

On 9 February, the SGIC called on the Deputy G-2, Colonel Gökce, of the Turkish General Staff at the General Staff Headquarters. After a short period of discussion relating to the purpose of the visit by the Committee, a plan of work was adopted. At the first conference meeting, various branch chiefs of the Intelligence Division were present. Lt. Col. Mesnard opened the general meeting with full explanation covering the reasons for the visit to Turkey of the SGIC, and the need for closer personal liaison with the various National Staffs. The question of the Turkish logistical study was covered in connection with the explanation of the logistical conference to be held in London.

The Turkish Staff covered the organization and methods of operation of the Intelligence Division of the Staff. There are 120 officers and non-commissioned officers with no civilians assigned to the Intelligence Division. All are army personnel with the exception of one naval and one air force officer.

The Intelligence Committee called the attention of the Deputy G-2 to the difficulty experienced in obtaining timely answers to intelligence papers sent to Turkey which require comments. Due to the small number of experience translators available, the intelligence staff has been experiencing difficulty in obtaining rapid translation of documents. From 15 to 50 days has been required for transmission and translation of various intelligence documents. It was agreed that hereafter, all intelligence cables sent to the Turkish Staff for action would be marked "URGENT" in order to cut down the time to process them through the message center and place them in the hands of the action officer more rapidly. The question of supplying intelligence directly to subordinate NATO Commands was discussed. The Turkish view is that they do not look with favor on dealing with a command except the Major Command. The exception to the rule would be in case of urgent or operational matters.

NATO  
SECRET

Conferences were also held with General Yamut, the Chief of Staff, and General Okan, the Deputy Chief of Staff. General Okan felt that periodic staff meetings of this nature were highly beneficial and would aid in the settlement of divergences in estimates and lead to a better understanding of intelligence problems.

General Okan pointed out the wide divergence in intelligence estimates produced by different NATO National Staffs and laid stress upon the dangers of underestimation of enemy forces. He cited as an example, the strength of the Soviet forces in the Caucasus. He also raised the question of delays in transmission of papers and messages within the framework of NATO. He felt that more careful deadlines should be placed on the reports, depending upon the urgency, so that papers of secondary importance would not take precedence over more important papers simply because of a deadline placed on the date of answer. He also felt that important papers going through SHAPE instead of coming direct added to the delay.

General Yamut proposed two questions for study as follows:

a. What are the objectives of the relatively large Russian fleet in the Black Sea?

b. What are the objectives of the Russian armed forces concentrated directly north of the Black Sea?

The G-2 of the General Staff, General Akcakoca, was absent from Ankara on an inspection trip during the first several days of the visit of the SGIC; however, he returned in time to hold a conference on the morning of departure. During the conference, he pointed out the possibility of a large-scale invasion of India, and Pakistan by the Soviets after the Soviet right flank in Turkey had been secured. He felt that the Turkish Staff were best informed on Bulgaria, with Rumania and Caucasus in line.

During all the conferences, the SGIC noted the fact that questions to the SGIC asked by junior officers were invariably answered by the senior Turkish officer. As these were not translated, it was impossible to comprehend the problems of the junior officers.

2. GREECE

NATO  
SECRET

The Intelligence Committee met in conference with the Greek Director of Intelligence and his staff officers in Athens on 13 February. After introductory remarks by Colonel Mesnard covering the mission, organization and functions of the SGIC, the conduct of the meeting was turned over to the Greek G-2, General Mpaizenos.

During the conferences which followed, the Greek Staff presented in detail, explanations of the functions, organization and operation of the Intelligence Division of the Greek National Defense General Staff. The staff is composed of members from all three services and total 31.

An estimate on Yugoslavia had been prepared and was presented in brief. A copy of this report has been sent to the Greek Military Representative in Washington; it is possible that it could be made available to the SGIC.

A lengthy discussion took place on the subject of evaluation of intelligence. It was pointed out that different nations might be receiving intelligence from the same source within a country and thereby confirmatory credit might erroneously be given to a piece of information. In order to check on sources of material, the Greek Staff suggested that periodic conferences be held between various intelligence staffs. The SGIC felt that the Greek Staff should place the question before the Standing Group by formal memorandum.

The Greek Staff also felt that it should deal only with Major Commands on intelligence matters. However, in special cases where reports are sent to subordinate commands, in order to avoid confusion, a copy of the report should be sent to the Major Command. This procedure was agreed to by the SGIC.

The Staff pointed out that a special agency to deal with technical intelligence is being set up which will extend down to corps level.

The Greek Staff feels that they are best informed on Bulgaria and Albania and fairly well informed on Rumania. They have



NATO  
SECRET

very little good information on Hungary. Due to their recent close tie-in with Yugoslavia, they feel they have good information on the military and political situation. Subsequent to the Greek-Yugoslavia-Turkish agreement, the Greeks feel that they will not be able to furnish further intelligence about Yugoslavia.

They emphasized how much a shortage of good translators was aggravating the delays in the transmission and handling of NATO papers.

A short meeting was held with General Dovas, the Deputy Chief of the General Staff, and General Papanatissiadis, Assistant Chief of Staff.

### 3. ITALY

On Monday, 16 February, the SGIC met with key members of the Italian Intelligence Staff for the first of a series of conferences. The presiding Italian officer was General Musco, who is Chief of Intelligence of the General Staff. After a few introductory remarks by Colonel Mesnard, the conduct of the meeting was turned over to the Italians.

A thorough briefing was given the SGIC by General Musco on the organization and operation of the Intelligence Division of the Italian Staff. The Italian Intelligence Staff is composed of officers and men from the three services, with no civilians. There is a total of 400 of all grades. General Musco seems to be the force behind the intelligence organization with every department being under his personal direction. Scientific and technical intelligence was discussed in its relationship to S.G. 181/2. General Musco stated that detailed comments on this paper had been sent to Washington to General Gandini. It was pointed out that the Italian Staff feels that it can handle the operations within Italy without outside help particularly in the field of operations of the technical intelligence teams.

After examination of S.G. 181/3, it was felt by the Italian Staff that a distinction must be made between those countries where

NATO  
SECRET

technical intelligence exists, and those in which there is none.

They further felt that the paragraph dealing with the property rights of nations on captured enemy material (paragraph 4 d and 4 e) should be clarified. The Italians were asked to "make their point" in the form of a simple amendment to S.G. 181/3.

In the discussions concerning S.G. 128, General Musco stated that in accordance with S.G. 128, general and political information was sent to the Standing Group and area information to the Major Commands. The system was felt to be sound inasmuch as it puts the National Staffs in contact with the Commands. He further stated that he saw no necessity to establish direct relations between subordinate commands and National Staffs in intelligence matters because of duplication of work. He said that the Italian Staff had received some requests from subordinate commands for information, but had always requested that application be made through SHAPE.

The Italian Staff has prepared an estimate on Yugoslavia which will be forwarded to the SGIC. The Italian Staff was considerably less confident than the Greeks on the lines of action that Yugoslavia would take in case of Soviet attack on NATO and in their ability to withstand an attack on Yugoslavia.

A short meeting was held before departure of the SGIC with General Marras, the Chief of General Staff, who expressed his satisfaction with the success of the meeting between the Italian Staff and the Representatives of the Standing Group.

4. The Intelligence Committee was left with the following personal impressions on their visit to Turkey, Greece and Italy.

a. Colonel Gokce, the Deputy to General Akcakoca, in the Turkish Staff appeared to be unfamiliar with the organization and the work of his intelligence staff, and only after much prompting by his junior officers was he able to explain the work of his staff to the Committee.



~~TOP SECRET~~

b. In its organization and in the personalities of its officers, the Greek staff gave an impression of keenness and efficiency coupled with a desire to conform to all the requirements of a NATO organization.

c. General Musco, head of the Italian Intelligence Staff conveyed the impression that not only was he familiar with all aspects of his intelligence organization, but on all questions he appeared to hold the reins in his own hands, thus wishing to give the impression that he was a virtual dictator within his intelligence empire.

III. VISIT TO LONDON

1. London was visited by the SGIC from 23-25 February following the visits to SHAPE, Ankara, Athens and Rome. The visit to London coincided with the opening session of the Ad Hoc Logistical Intelligence Committee, and the Intelligence Committee devoted their first day in London to finalizing the arrangements for the Ad Hoc Committee meeting. Discussions in Ankara, Athens and Rome had already ensured that the representatives of those National Staffs would arrive in London fully briefed to take part in the work of the Logistical Committee.

2. The Ad Hoc Logistical Intelligence Committee met in plenary session on the morning of 24 February. General Brownjohn, Staff Officer to the United Kingdom Minister of Defense, welcomed the delegates and stressed the NATO aspect of the meeting and the importance of coming to an agreed solution. The Chairman of the SGIC spoke after the General, dealing in more detail with the requirements of the Standing Group and the Military Representatives Committee. Following his address, Colonel Pottle, United Kingdom Staff, took the chair as Chairman of the Logistical Intelligence Committee.

3. Before the four main problems, i.e. Scandinavia, Turkey, Central Europe and Southern Europe, could be tackled, it had already been decided that agreement on Assumptions and Technical Data should have first priority. To this end, a United Kingdom paper had previously been circulated to the Staffs concerned for preliminary study.

4. On completion of the work of the Logistical Intelligence Committee a report will be formally submitted to the Standing Group and subsequently to the Military Representatives Committee. Those portions of the report which are applicable to S.G. 161/3 will be incorporated in the revision of that document in May 1953.