Faulty Intelligence System

The incident involving General Grow and his diary indicates a need for something more than the proposed order banning the keeping of diaries by military personnel, including generals. There is need for further improvement in the system of selecting high-ranking officers for intelligence assignments. Apparently General Grow was picked for the key Moscow post of military attache chiefly because of his impressive combat record. The picking was done by the personnel branch of the Army, which naturally judges officers by their records as fighters. If the post had called for a colonel instead of a general, the selection would have been made by the intelligence branch, G-2.

The present theory seems to be that the more important the intelligence post—and there is no disguising the intelligence role of a military attache—the less need for giving G-2 control of the selection. There is something wrong with a.system which deprives G-2 of a major role in the picking of generals who are to occupy vital intelligence posts abroad. One of the troubles is that intelligence has been looked upon as collateral duty, permanent assignment to which would be tantamount to depriving an officer of promotion rights. It is a wonder that military intelligence has done as well as it has during the critical cold war period.