

WITHDRAWAL SHEET (PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES)

FORM OF DOCUMENT	CORRESPONDENTS OR TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
#1 memo	Cooper to Bundy <i>open 12-6-99</i> S 3 p	4/23/64	A
#2 memo	Rostow to Planning Group Members C 3 p <i>open 12-6-99</i>	3/25/64	A
#3 memo	Chase to Bundy <i>open 12-6-99</i> C 1 p	3/30/64	A
#4a memo	Duplicate of #3 <i>open 12-6-99</i>		
#4b memo	Duplicate of #2 <i>open 12-6-99</i>		
#5 memo	Rostow to Bundy <i>open 12-6-99</i> C 1 p	2/17/64	A
#6 memo	Read to Bundy <i>open 12-6-99</i> S 1 p	1/7/64	A
#6e rpt	"National Policy Paper on Ethiopia" S 2 p <i>open 12-6-99</i>	1/6/64	A
#6e memo	NSAM draft C 1 p <i>open NLT 92-271</i>	1/13/64	A
#6f memo	NSAM draft <i>open 12-6-99</i> S 2 p	1/13/64	A
#7 memo	Bundy to Rostow <i>open 12-6-99</i> S 1 p	2/11/64	A
#7a memo	"National Policy Paper Series" S 2 p <i>open 12-6-99</i>	undated	A
#8 memo	Komer to Bundy <i>open 12-6-99</i> S 1 p	1/7/64	A
#11 memo	Rostow to Bundy <i>open 12-6-99</i> C 1 p	12/2/63	A

FILE LOCATION

NSF, NSAM, NSAM 281--National Policy Paper Series

Box 2

RESTRICTION CODES

- (A) Closed by Executive Order 12356 governing access to national security information.
- (B) Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- (C) Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in the donor's deed of gift.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET (PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES)

FORM OF DOCUMENT	CORRESPONDENTS OR TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
#11b rpt	<p>Status of Country Planning Activities C 7 p <i>open 12-6-99</i></p>	11/1/63	A
#12 memo	<p>NSAM 281 C 1 p <i>open MLJ 92-271</i></p>	2/11/64	A

FILE LOCATION

NSF, NSAM, NSAM 281--National Policy Paper Series

Box 2

RESTRICTION CODES

- (A) Closed by Executive Order 12356 governing access to national security information.
- (B) Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- (C) Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in the donor's deed of gift.

~~SECRET~~

23 April 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. McGeorge Bundy

SUBJECT : Planning Tasks

1. As I indicated at the Staff Meeting a few days ago, I strongly support the view that planning should be undertaken now on several "sensitive" international problems that lie ahead. A decision to go forward with such planning should, of course, rest on whether we consider these problems likely to become sufficiently pronounced to confront us with tough decisions during the remainder of 1964 or through 1965; and on whether the problems we identify lend themselves to useful advance planning -- some may not.

2. A decision to go forward should not rest on an assumption that planning or even discussions devoted to sensitive problems will necessarily be leaked, with consequent embarrassment to the Administration. The chances of disclosure will be slight if we limit the group involved to the necessary minimum (say, five or six selected people), and if that group keeps its activity informal (out of the usual art forms) and truly secret (out of existing regular forums).

3. The documents emerging from this effort should be reviewed personally by a very few key officials, with the object of getting agreement in principle rather than of obtaining firm commitments to specific and detailed courses of action. The idea should be to clear away the debris and the basic conceptual underbrush so that, at such time as it became necessary, or propitious, we could re-direct these planning problems -- with, hopefully, the considerable head start our efforts would have given them -- into more orthodox planning and execution channels than circumstances now permit.

4. The chief hazard is, of course, biting off too many such planning projects for available time and energies. A few such careful, albeit informal, planning studies -- those agreed upon as crucially needed -- would clearly be preferable to a vaster undertaking with its inevitable bureaucratic superstructure. I suggest we soon try to agree on a short list of needed planning studies, from among such nominees as those which follow.

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5

NSC Memo, 1/30/95, State Dept. Guidelines

By rg, NARA, Date 12-3-99~~SECRET~~

Excluded from automatic declassification

~~SECRET~~

5. Broadly speaking, I think there are four types of planning questions that might concern us:

a. "Policy planning" regarding problems which are certain to emerge, but for which little planning has yet been done; e.g., East-West trade, France.

b. "Policy planning" regarding new problems which might emerge, and for which little effective planning has yet been done; e.g., open Sino-Soviet hostilities, serious Soviet overtures for limited joint actions against China, the outbreak of large-scale and prolonged racial violence in the US, and the death of this or that crucially important world leader.

c. "Review of existing options" -- A systematic and imaginative examination of certain existing plans sadly in need of improvement -- if sudden, substantial new problems are to be avoided; e.g., China (discussed at length below), treatment of certain client states, Latin America, counterinsurgency.

d. Advance planning for the "worst possible case." Despite reams of existing planning studies, I am not sure that we have done very much to cope with situations arising out of the failure of our "plans"; e.g., suppose we don't get MLF? Suppose there is a complete breakdown in our attempts to isolate Cuba? Suppose we are confronted with a complete collapse of the will-to-fight in South Vietnam? Some "worst case" planning can be done in regular, existing channels; some, however, could perhaps only be done through means we are discussing here because of the public stake we have in existing policy, or because of the embarrassment or harm that would accrue at this time from any sign of self-doubt.

6. At the Staff Meeting on Monday there was some skepticism concerning the value of "planning" a US policy for China. The basis of this skepticism was that planning has already been done and that it is now simply a question of what decision to make. I think this misses the mark on several scores:

a. Existing China "planning" studies are for the most part quite irrelevant, shabby, and gassy.

b. Existing "planning" on China tends to take off on a note of "wouldn't it be nice if ...," rather than from the specific circumstances of where we are and the circumstances we should try to develop for the exercise of our options.

~~SECRET~~

c. Whether we like it or not, during the next year or so several situations might present us with requirements for advance planning; e.g., detonation, the death of Mao, a rash of new diplomatic victories for Peiping (involving not only recognitions, but the UN), a break in Sino-Soviet relations, a major deterioration in Laos, Vietnam, or Burma; a complete breakdown of our trade embargo against China.

7. If only to provoke further discussion of such planning enterprises as suggested above, I nominate China as a prime candidate for new and urgent planning.

Chester L. Cooper

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Policy Planning Council
Washington

NSAM 281 1658

Bundy

Man Staff mdy
2

March 25, 1964

TO: Planning Group Members

SUBJECT: Program of National Policy Papers for FY 1965

At the Planning Group meeting on Tuesday, March 31, 1964, 12:00 noon, I should like to spend a little time discussing the program of National Policy Papers for FY 1965.

The attached paper lists the eleven NPPs which we expect to complete in FY 1964 and twenty possibilities for the FY 1965 program. With the benefit of this year's experience, I believe that we should be able to do sixteen NPPs in the next fiscal year. Since five of the 20 countries listed in the attached paper represent firm commitments, our problem is to select an additional 11 countries.

If we can reach a rough consensus on a program for FY 1965, I propose to consult the regional Assistant Secretaries of State on the portions of the program affecting their areas. I would then report back to you and seek your concurrence in the program as it might be modified by those consultations.


W. W. Rostow

Attachment:

List of National Policy Papers, FY 1964 and FY 1965.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
State Dept. Guidelines
By ry, NARA, Date 12-3-88

Group 3
Downgraded at 12 year intervals;
not automatically declassified

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MAR 30 1964

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

National Policy Papers, FY 1964 and FY 1965

I. National Policy Papers to be Completed in FY 1964: ✓

AFRICA

Ethiopia (approved, January 6, 1964)
Ghana
Nigeria
South Africa

EUROPE

None

*rely not Germany - or France - or Spain? BICS
in '64 or '65*

FAR EAST

Republic of China

LATIN AMERICA

Brazil —
Colombia

? Bungen

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India
Pakistan
Turkey
United Arab Republic

II. Possibilities for National Policy Papers in FY 1965

AFRICA

Algeria
Kenya
Liberia*
Southern Rhodesia
Tanganyika
Tunisia

* In process or definitely scheduled.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

EUROPE

Canada
Portugal

FAR EAST

Indonesia*
Korea
Philippines
Thailand*

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina
Bolivia*
Central American Common Market**
Chile*
Peru
Venezuela

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan
Iran

* In process or definitely scheduled.

** Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua.

NSAM 281

3

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

March 30, 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. BUNDY

SUBJECT: Program of National Policy Papers for FY 1965

I talked to various staff members about the attached paper from Walt Rostow.

1. Far East -- Mike Forrestal is not a great supporter of National Policy Papers (NPP). As between the Philippines and Korea, Mike would choose the Philippines, although Korea is also important.

2. Europe -- Dave Klein, who is also a non-believer, says that neither Canada nor Portugal are appropriate subjects for NPP. Canada is all tied up in domestic politics; Portugal is at the end of a regime, and is complicated by the African dimension. Dave suggests that Italy would be the best subject. Among other things, Italy at least is a relatively self-contained problem.

3. North Africa and Near East -- Bob Komer would put Afghanistan first; we may have to make an investment there, and an NPP is one way to stimulate examination of the problem. While an NPP on Algeria probably will not get us anywhere, it will be more useful than NPP's on Iran or Tunisia.

4. Latin America -- Ralph Dungan would stop work on the Brazil NPP which is scheduled for FY 1964. As for FY 1965, Ralph's priority listing is as follows: (a) Chile, (b) Peru, (c) Argentina, (d) Bolivia, (e) Central American Common Market and (f) Venezuela.

5. Africa -- Sam Belk is out of town today. I will try to reach him before the luncheon meeting tomorrow.

OK
ask Komer to make
the case at lunch tomorrow

GC
Gordon Chase

Bob,
do you want me
to call Sam? Or do you
prefer to do your own
calling on this one.
Gordon C

Chase to call
3/30
see per
RWC

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- 1. Tanganyika
- 2. Kenya
- 3. S. Rhodesia
to Africa NO

MAR 30 1964

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 30, 1964

✓
4

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. BUNDY

SUBJECT: Program of National Policy Papers
for FY 1965

1. I'm afraid I was daydreaming this morning and forgot to hand you the attached for staff meeting. I apologize for the goof.

2. Do you want me to set up a staff meeting for Tuesday morning to discuss this matter (before the planning lunch)? Or do you prefer to talk with the staff after Walt Rostow has consulted with the regional Assistant Secretaries?

GC

Gordon Chase

Why don't you walk it
past Klein, Frazee, and
Kamen, as a penance - today
mwc

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

file

4a
—

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

March 30, 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. BUNDY

SUBJECT: Program of National Policy Papers for FY 1965

I talked to various staff members about the attached paper from Walt Rostow.

1. Far East -- Mike Forrestal is not a great supporter of National Policy Papers (NPP). As between the Philippines and Korea, Mike would choose the Philippines, although Korea is also important.
2. Europe -- Dave Klein, who is also a non-believer, says that neither Canada nor Portugal are appropriate subjects for NPP. Canada is all tied up in domestic politics; Portugal is at the end of a regime, and is complicated by the African dimension. Dave suggests that Italy would be the best subject. Among other things, Italy at least is a relatively self-contained problem.
3. North Africa and Near East -- Bob Komer would put Afghanistan first; we may have to make an investment there, and an NPP is one way to stimulate examination of the problem. While an NPP on Algeria probably will not get us anywhere, it will be more useful than NPP's on Iran or Tunisia.
4. Latin America -- Ralph Dungan would stop work on the Brazil NPP which is scheduled for FY 1964. As for FY 1965, Ralph's priority listing is as follows: (a) Chile, (b) Peru, (c) Argentina, d) Bolivia, (e) Central American Common Market and (f) Venezuela.
5. Africa -- Sam Belk is out of town today. I will try to reach him before the luncheon meeting tomorrow.

CK
ask Komer to make
this case at lunch tomorrow

GC
Gordon Chase

3/31/64
Give RWT Sam
Belk's comment

Bob,
do you want me
to call Sam? Or do you
prefer to do your own
calling on this one.
Gordon

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
NSC Memo, 1/30/95, State Dept. Guidelines
By *af*, NARA, Date *12-3-99*

230 1964

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Policy Planning Council
Washington

March 25, 1964

TO: Planning Group Members

SUBJECT: Program of National Policy Papers for FY 1965

At the Planning Group meeting on Tuesday, March 31, 1964, 12:00 noon, I should like to spend a little time discussing the program of National Policy Papers for FY 1965.

The attached paper lists the eleven NPPs which we expect to complete in FY 1964 and twenty possibilities for the FY 1965 program. With the benefit of this year's experience, I believe that we should be able to do sixteen NPPs in the next fiscal year. Since five of the 20 countries listed in the attached paper represent firm commitments, our problem is to select an additional 11 countries.

If we can reach a rough consensus on a program for FY 1965, I propose to consult the regional Assistant Secretaries of State on the portions of the program affecting their areas. I would then report back to you and seek your concurrence in the program as it might be modified by those consultations.


W. W. Rostow

Attachment:

List of National Policy Papers, FY 1964 and FY 1965.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
State Dept. Guidelines
By ry, NARA, Date 12-3-99

Group 3
Downgraded at 12 year intervals;
not automatically declassified

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MAR 30 1964

CONFIDENTIAL

National Policy Papers, FY 1964 and FY 1965

I. National Policy Papers to be Completed in FY 1964: ✓

AFRICA

Ethiopia (approved, January 6, 1964)
Ghana
Nigeria
South Africa

EUROPE

None

*rely not Germany - or France - or Spain? BICS
in '64 or '65*

FAR EAST

Republic of China

LATIN AMERICA

Brazil
Colombia

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India
Pakistan
Turkey
United Arab Republic

II. Possibilities for National Policy Papers in FY 1965

AFRICA

Algeria
Kenya
Liberia*
Southern Rhodesia
Tanganyika
Tunisia

* In process or definitely scheduled.

CONFIDENTIAL

EUROPE

Canada
Portugal

FAR EAST

Indonesia*
Korea
Philippines
Thailand*

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina
Bolivia*
Central American Common Market**
Chile*
Peru
Venezuela

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan
Iran

* In process or definitely scheduled.

** Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and
Nicaragua.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Counselor and Chairman
Policy Planning Council
Washington

✓ 998
NSAM
5


~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

February 17, 1964

MEMORANDUM TO: Mr. McGeorge Bundy
The White House

As I have already told you orally, I am most grateful for your assistance in getting us the NSAM on National Policy Papers.

Your suggestions for changes in the procedures for these Papers, which were appended to your memorandum of February 11 to me, were excellent. We have picked up your language and inserted it at the points marked on pages 2, 3 and 6 of the enclosed copy of the final version of the procedures paper.

W. W. Rostow


Enclosure:

Procedures and Annotated Standard
Outline for National Policy Papers

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
State Dept. Guidelines
By ry, NARA, Date 12-3-91

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

998

5a

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Department of State

NATIONAL POLICY PAPER

Procedures and Annotated Standard Outline



February 19, 1964

DECLASSIFIED

Authority E. O. 11652 SEC. 5(A) and (D)

By ip, NARS, Date 1-31-80

GROUP 4

Downgraded at 3-year intervals;
declassified after 12 years.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

NOTE

The present paper is issued pursuant to National Security Action Memorandum No. 281, February 11, 1964, which vested in the Secretary of State responsibility for promulgation of National Policy Papers and for the circulation of procedures and a standard outline for such Papers.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS

Table of Contents

A. PROCEDURES

- | | |
|--|---------|
| 1. <u>Purpose of Program</u> | Page 1 |
| 2. <u>Content of National Policy Papers</u> | Page 1 |
| 3. <u>Initiation and Priorities</u> | Page 3 |
| 4. <u>The Nine Steps in the Development of
a National Policy Paper</u> | Page 4 |
| 5. <u>Explanation of Nine Steps (including
Clearance Procedures)</u> | Page 5 |
| 6. <u>Distribution</u> | Page 12 |
| 7. <u>Relationship between National Policy
Papers and Other Country Papers and
Planning Activities</u> | Page 12 |
| 8. <u>Execution</u> | Page 12 |

B. ANNOTATED STANDARD OUTLINE

- | | |
|---|---------|
| PART ONE - U. S. Policy | Page 14 |
| PART TWO - Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy | Page 17 |

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS

A. PROCEDURES

1. Purpose of Program

National policy papers are comprehensive and authoritative statements of U.S. policy toward each country included in the program.

2. Content of National Policy Papers

Each national policy paper presents an analysis of the social, political, economic and military forces at work in the country in question and of those forces which bear on the country in the international sphere; and from that analysis derives a country strategy for the U.S. for the next two to five years. Regional considerations affecting U.S. strategy, particularly those involving commitments of resources and their relative priority should be taken into account. The country strategy should include an analysis of the manner in which the U.S. should relate to the country's participation in the United Nations and its principal agencies. Those specific courses of action which are essential to carrying out the country strategy and which do not merely reiterate current action programs are also set forth, i.e., courses of action to be initiated, to be dropped, or to be continued with more (or less) resources or emphasis. (See the attached annotated standard outline for a more detailed description of a national policy paper.)

In order to simplify clearance procedures and facilitate use by operating officials, the body of a national policy paper should be no longer than is absolutely necessary. Additional detail can be provided in the operational programs of the several agencies, whose consistency with the national policy paper should be assured by the procedures described below, including those set out in paragraphs 7 and 8.

On completion

GROUP 4

Downgraded at 3-year intervals;
declassified after 12 years.

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

2

On completion of the procedures outlined below, the Secretary of State, or in his absence the Acting Secretary of State, will review National Policy Papers following their approval by the appropriate interdepartmental committee under the Chairmanship of an Assistant Secretary of State. The Secretary or Acting Secretary will formally sign each Paper after satisfying himself not only that differences among agencies have been resolved, but that the Paper reflects the President's own purpose and policy. The formal sign-off will be reflected in the frontispiece of each Paper as follows:

"PART ONE of this paper, covering Objectives, Strategy and Courses of Action, is a comprehensive, authoritative and approved statement of United States Policy toward _____.

"PART TWO is the supporting analysis of factors bearing on national policy.

"The _____ Committee has cleared* Part ONE. The Committee has also carefully reviewed Part TWO, which has its approval as a basic supporting analysis.

"All agencies with major responsibilities affecting our relations with _____ participated in drafting the paper and concur in the Strategy and Courses of Action which it sets forth. The Country Team in _____ was consulted in the course of the paper's preparation and its views have been taken into account.

"Execution of the policy set forth in this paper is the responsibility of the various executive agencies under the leadership of the Secretary of State and in the country, under the leadership of the Ambassador. All other agency planning and programming documents, and directives to the field will proceed from and be consistent with, the Strategy and Courses of Action

stated

*The procedure envisaged is described in I, Step #9, below.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

stated in this paper. Intensive working level consultation will be maintained through normal interdepartmental channels under the guidance of the Assistant Secretary of State for _____. The latter will guide the execution of this program and see that necessary adjustments are made consistent with the outlined Strategy and Objectives as new events and situations unfold.

"The Assistant Secretary of State for _____ will designate a coordinating officer in Washington and ensure that both that officer and the Country Team submit appropriate reports to the _____ Committee on the course of execution of national policy.

"A substantial change in the situation may require revision of the Strategy or Major Courses of Action. Any interested agency or the Ambassador may initiate at the appropriate level discussion designed to bring about such substantial revision. The need for such substantial change may then be brought to the attention of the _____ Committee.

/s/ Secretary of State"

3. Initiation and Priorities

The Secretary of State has assigned general responsibility for the program of national policy papers from Steps #1 through #8 to the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council.

Any interested agency may appropriately propose initiation of a national policy paper. Action on such a proposal should be taken by the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council after consultation with the appropriate regional Assistant Secretary of State, other interested Bureaus, and the agencies principally concerned. Priority in the development of national policy papers should depend upon the intensity of our political, economic and security interests in the various countries covered by the program. First attention should, in the usual case, be given to countries in which we expect to make major expenditures or where major security problems exist or may arise. The President himself may initiate a National Policy Paper, either by requesting a general review of policy toward a particular country, or by laying down guidelines against which a review and recommendations should be made.

4. The Nine Steps in the Development of a National Policy Paper

The development of a national policy paper will take place in specifically defined steps once the need for such paper on a particular country has been clearly established and its priority determined as set forth in paragraph #3 above. These steps, which are more fully described hereinafter, will be as follows:

- Step #1: Designation of a Senior Officer to Assume Responsibility for Paper: The Responsible Officer.
- Step #2: Convening of an Interagency Working Group By the Responsible Officer.
- Step #3: Request for Agency Contributions to a First Draft.
- Step #4: Preparation of a First Draft Representing Preliminary Views of Members of Working Group.
- Step #5: Field Visit: By Responsible Officer and Members of Working Group for Discussion of First Draft with Ambassador and Country Team.
- Step #6: Preparation of Second Draft (Revision #1) on Basis of Discussions in Field - Circulation to Agencies for Comment.
- Step #7: Preparation of Third Draft (Revision #2) on Basis of Comments Received from Agencies - Circulation for Formal Clearance.
- Step #8: Resolution of Major Policy Differences Surfaced in Course of Preparing Revisions #1 and #2 through normal channels appropriate to Authority of Departments and Agencies.

Step #9

Step #9: Final Review and Approval of National Policy Paper by Regional Policy Committee or Equivalent Interagency Committee and Submission to Secretary of State for Signature. Distribution to all Agencies Concerned as a Binding, National Policy Document.

5. Explanation of Nine Steps (including Clearance Procedures)

A. Step #1: Designation of a Senior Officer to Assume Responsibility for Paper: The Responsible Officer.

When a decision has been made to initiate a new national policy paper, the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, in consultation with the responsible geographical bureau and other interested agencies, will designate a senior officer to assume responsibility for the paper. Responsible officers designated may be members of the Policy Planning Council, other officers of the Department of State, or officers of other government agencies, possessing special knowledge and experience in the country to be studied, or qualified outside consultants.

Working under the general direction of the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, the responsible officer chairs the interagency working group, coordinates the contributions of the various agencies concerned, and assumes responsibility for drafting the national policy paper itself. He is expected to avoid the perils of "drafting by committee" and to provide effective leadership to the interagency working group in arriving at considered judgments concerning the key issues involved. He will bear a special responsibility to surface and assure precise definition of differences of view, later to be resolved by higher authority.

B. Step #2: Convening of an Interagency Working Group by the Responsible Officer.

Immediately upon his designation, the responsible officer should convene an interagency working group representing all agencies and bureaus with a substantial interest

in U.S.

in U.S. policy and operations in the country to be studied. In the usual case, the working group would include at least the representatives of the Department of State, the Department of Defense, AID, CIA, USIA, Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget. AID would be represented by the appropriate regional bureau and the Program Coordination Staff. From Defense, ISA and the Joint Staff would normally be invited to participate. In the case of CIA, both DD/I and DD/P would usually be represented. Each agency may determine, however, what representation it requires in any specific case. The need for advice of area specialists, as for example those in the Department of Labor, should be taken into account. The Department of State would usually be represented by S/P, the geographical bureau concerned, INR and CU. The responsible officer will be expected to work closely with INR especially in the preparation of the draft of Part TWO of the National Policy Paper. Members of the White House staff may participate in the working group to ensure that the policy evolved is consistent with the President's purposes. Their participation will normally begin at Step 7, hereinafter defined, unless they wish to participate at an earlier step.

C. Step #3: Request for Agency Contributions to a First Draft.

(a) Political Dynamics Study

In the usual case, the first contribution to be requested by the responsible officer will be a study of political dynamics by INR or by an outside scholar under contract arranged by INR.

(b) Other Contributions

The responsible officer can determine in consultation with the interagency working group what other contributions will be required. Existing and still current LASs, Military Assistance Plans, NISs, IDPs, USIA country plans, and CU country studies would, of course, be reviewed and serve as useful sources of information and analysis.

Some

Some contributions will take the form of first drafts of particular sections of the national policy paper. Many contributions, however, will be background papers from which the responsible officer can draw the information and analysis needed in drafting relevant parts of the paper. It must be emphasized that a national policy paper is not a clip-and-paste job composed of drafts done in various parts of the government.

D. Step #4: Preparation of a First Draft Representing Preliminary Views of Members of Working Group.

The first draft of a national policy paper should represent only the preliminary views of the members of the working group. The principal functions of the first draft are to identify the key points at issue and to provide a basis for productive and orderly discussions in the field. To this end, it is important that differences of opinion encountered within the working group be explicitly incorporated and sharply clarified in the first draft.

The responsible officer or other members in the inter-agency working group may find it necessary to request specific contributions from the field in the early phases of work on the national policy paper. Care should be taken, however, not to burden the field with unnecessary or excessively detailed requests for information.

E. Step #5: Field Visit: By Responsible Officer and Members of Working Group for Discussion of First Draft with Ambassador and Country Team.

After a first draft of the national policy paper has been completed it should, in the usual case, be taken to the field by the responsible officer and discussed in detail with the ambassador and the other members of the country team. If possible, the responsible officer should be accompanied by those members of the interagency working group whose agencies are most vitally concerned, particularly members involved in

a significant

a significant difference of opinion in the draft paper. After appropriate consultation with the field post concerned through the geographical bureau, the responsible officer will determine the minimum size of team needed for the field visit, given the nature of the issues involved. The draft, which at this step has no formal clearance, should be thoroughly discussed within the working group in Washington prior to visiting the country and copies of the draft, including objectives and lines of action, should be forwarded to the Embassy concerned well in advance of discussions with the country teams.

By intensive discussion of the first draft with field agencies, the working group can both remedy gaps in information and improve the analysis leading to formulation of an effective country strategy. Also field participation at an early phase of the work should make the finished paper both more practical and more easily understood by the officials who will have to carry out the approved strategy and courses of action.

The Department of Defense is responsible for arranging appropriate participation by the unified and specified commands in the preparation of national policy papers.

F. Step #6: Preparation of Second Draft (Revision #1) on Basis of Discussions in Field - Circulation to Agencies for Comment.

After the first draft of the national policy paper has been revised on the basis of discussions in the field, the revised draft, which will include major differences of opinion which might have developed from these discussions, should be circulated to the responsible Washington agencies represented in the working group, if the draft deals with problems in their fields of responsibility. The responsible officer should maintain close consultation with the Interdepartmental Psychological Political Working Group in the course of development of the paper.

Adequate time

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

-9-

Adequate time should be allowed both at this step and at the later step of formal clearance for thorough review and staffing of the paper within all of the agencies concerned.

- G. Step #7: Preparation of Third Draft (Revision #2) on Basis of Comments Received from Agencies - Circulation for Formal Clearance.

It is at this step that White House staff representation will, in the usual case, be included in the working group.

At this step the responsible officer, in consultation with the working group, will prepare a further revision on the basis of the Washington agencies' comments, looking toward a draft which can be submitted for formal clearance. As appropriate, major problems that are surfaced in preparing a draft for formal clearance should be referred to the field for consideration by the country team. To the extent possible, questions raised in the Washington agencies' comments and reactions elicited from the field should be reconciled in the working group and further revisions made in the course of preparing a draft for formal clearance. The responsible officer must make a special effort to insure that real policy differences are not submerged through adoption of imprecise compromise language.

After the responsible officer is satisfied that the working group has exhausted all efforts to reconcile policy differences which may have been surfaced, and that the remaining differences are precisely and understandably presented, the policy paper at this step will be submitted to all agencies for formal clearance. The country team should be furnished a copy of the paper as it is circulated in Washington for review and resolution of outstanding differences.

Where the clearance process results in no requirement for resolution of major policy differences, the formally cleared policy paper will go immediately to the Regional Policy Committee

or

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

-10-

or to an equivalent ad hoc group convened by the responsible regional Assistant Secretary of State for approval and forwarding to the Secretary of State as described in Step #9 hereinafter.

IN FORWARDING NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS FOR FORMAL CLEARANCE TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDA WILL REQUEST FORMAL CLEARANCE ON PART ONE (U.S. Policy: objectives, strategy and courses of action) WITH EACH AGENCY OF GOVERNMENT TO BE THE JUDGE AS TO THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL WITHIN THE AGENCY AT WHICH CLEARANCE IS OBTAINED. REGARDLESS OF THE LEVEL CHOSEN, FORMAL CLEARANCE WILL BE CONSIDERED AS BINDING ON THE AGENCY CONCERNED. THE REMAINDER OF THE POLICY PAPER (PART TWO (Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy) WILL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE OR AN EQUIVALENT AD HOC GROUP CONVENED BY THE RESPONSIBLE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

Where the clearance process reveals major policy differences, Step #8 will apply:

- H. Step #8: Resolution of Major Policy Differences Surfaced in Course of Preparing Revisions #1 and #2 and in the Formal Clearance through Normal Channels Appropriate to Authority of Departments and Agencies.

Major policy differences between two or more agencies may be surfaced in the clearance process. The responsible officer will inform the appropriate Assistant Secretary of State, of such issues. These will be resolved, after lucid formulation, by normal (usually bilateral appeal channels appropriate to the specific issue raised and the agencies involved. If necessary, referral of the issue (not the whole paper) will be made to the White House. Once major policy differences have been resolved at the appropriate level, those agencies not involved will be informed and the paper, now cleared, will move forward.

Step #9

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- I. Step #9: Review and Approval of National Policy Paper by Regional Policy Committee or Equivalent Interagency Committee and Submission to Secretary of State for Signature - Distribution to all Agencies Concerned as a Binding, National Policy Document.

The National Policy Paper, Section ONE, which will have been formally cleared, will be submitted to the Regional Policy Committee or an equivalent group for review and approval of the paper in its totality before submission to the Secretary of State for review and signature. In the absence of the Secretary of State, the Acting Secretary of State has authority to perform the review and signing function.

The above clearance procedures are designed to insure that the time of Regional Policy Committees or equivalent groups are not taken up with protracted debate and editing. To the extent humanly and bureaucratically possible, a National Policy Paper at the time of its receipt by such committees will require a minimum of additional review. Specifically, the Regional Policy Committee or equivalent interagency group will be called upon to:

- a) Review the paper in its entirety.
- b) Approve Part TWO (Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy) of the paper which is not subject to formal clearance.
- c) Determine that all clearances previously given remain valid.
- d) Perform such "tidying up" as may be necessary as a result of last minute changes suggested by member of the committee.
- e) Satisfy itself that the National Policy Paper is in order and readiness for submission to the Secretary of State for review and signature.

f) As a committee approve the paper in its entirety for submission to the Secretary of State.

g) Transmit the approved paper to the Secretary of State.

6. Distribution

The Assistant Secretary of State for the geographical region concerned will arrange for distribution of the National Policy Paper, signed by the Secretary of State, to all agencies concerned, as a binding national policy document.

7. Relationship between National Policy Papers and Other Country Papers and Planning Activities.

The National Policy Papers will constitute comprehensive, authoritative and unifying statements of U. S. policy and operational strategy towards particular countries. Insofar as statements of policy and strategy are included in other country documents (IDPs, LASs, MAP Five Year Plans, USIA Country Plans, CU Country studies, AID Country Assistance Strategy Statements, etc.) they will be superseded by National Policy Papers, on the latter's approval. The operating programs contained in such other country plans and studies should subsequently flow from and be consistent with the strategies and the pertinent courses of action set forth in the National Policy Papers, and as they may be modified under the procedures set out in paragraph 8, below.

8. Execution

Execution of the policies set forth in national policy papers is the responsibility of the various executive agencies under the leadership of the Secretary of State. All other agency planning and programming documents, and directives to the field, will proceed from and be consistent with the Strategy and Courses of Action presented in the national policy papers. Intensive working level consultation will be maintained through normal interdepartmental channels under the guidance of the Assistant Secretary of State for the geographical region concerned. The latter will guide the execution of this program

and see

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

13

and see that necessary adjustments are made consistent with the outlined Strategy and Objectives as new events and situations unfold.

The Assistant Secretary of State for the region concerned will designate a coordinating officer in Washington and ensure that both that officer and the Country Team submit appropriate reports to the Regional Policy Committee (or equivalent interagency arrangement) on the course of execution of national policy.

A substantial change in the situation may require revision of the Strategy or Major Courses of Action. Any interested agency or the Ambassador may initiate at the appropriate level discussion designed to bring about such substantial revision. The need for such substantial change may then be brought to the attention of the appropriate Assistant Secretary of State as chairman of a regional policy committee or other interagency group.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

14

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS

ANNOTATED STANDARD OUTLINE

NOTE: The following outline is distributed for the use of interagency working groups convened to prepare national policy papers. This outline should be viewed as a guide and not as a strait-jacket. Changes in subheading can and should be made to facilitate adequate treatment of the particular problems of the country being studied. Also, the list of annexes required to supplement Parts One and Two will inevitably vary from country to country and are designed to be suggestive. With rare exceptions, however, the broad framework set forth in the major chapter headings should be used.

PART ONE
U. S. POLICY

I. Introduction

A. Profile of Country

In a few pages, the profile provides the minimum factual basis for understanding the following three subsections of Chapter I. In some instances, an historical approach will be appropriate. In other cases, a brief description of current social, economic and political conditions and trends will be most useful. In still other cases, a combination of historical and functional approaches might be best.

B. U.S. Interests and Objectives

This subsection consists of a summary of U.S. interests followed by an enumeration of U.S. objectives. A brief statement of the strategic importance of the country to the United States should be included. This statement can be elaborated on

in an annex.

Exempted from automatic decontrol
by Joseph A. Yager

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

in an annex. Objectives should be stated in terms of what we want - not in terms of how we get what we want, which is the subject of later chapters on strategy and courses of action.

C. Relations of Country with U.S.

This subsection sketches briefly the current state of relations, including major commitments.

D. Key Issues

A brief, unvarnished statement of the key issues and problems faced by the U.S. in the country under study serves both to set the stage for the analysis of political, economic, social and security factors in PART TWO and to indicate the obstacles that must be surmounted by the U.S. strategy to be formulated in Chapter II below. Preparing a preliminary statement of the key issues might well be the first step taken by the working group.

E. Assumptions

Only the minimum necessary assumptions should be made. Generally speaking, assumptions should deal with developments outside the country under consideration - not, of course, including U.S. courses of action.

II. U.S. Strategy for the Next Two to Five Years

Sections B, C, D, and E of this chapter should be concise, straightforward statements of what we propose to do in the various fields of action. The stage for these statements is set by Section A, which takes up briefly what we want to see happen, how much leverage we have on the course of events, a general description of our strategy and the principal contingencies that might require a change in that strategy. The various aspects of the total strategy should be mutually consistent. Key interrelationships (as, for example, between political and economic assistance strategies) should be explicitly noted.

A. General

A. General

1. Desired course of country's political, social, military, and economic evolution.
2. Dimensions of U.S. influence.
3. General description of U.S. strategy.
4. Principal contingencies.

B. U.S. Political Strategy

C. U.S. Economic Strategy

1. Economic assistance strategy.
2. Trade and investment policies.

D. Future U.S. Role in Internal Defense

E. Future U.S. Role in External Defense

III. Courses of Action

In the light of the objectives and strategy developed above, this chapter presents specific courses of action required to give meaning to the strategy described in the preceding chapter, i.e., courses of action to be initiated, to be dropped or to be continued with more (or less) resources or emphasis. These courses of action are neither so detailed as to compromise the executive responsibilities of the operating agencies, nor so vague as to be without operational meaning. The action agency, or agencies, should be noted after each course of action.

A. Political

B. Economic

C. Security (including military)

D. Information, Culture and Education

E. Other

PART TWO

PART TWO
FACTORS BEARING ON
U. S. POLICY

I. Political Forces

This chapter will usually be based principally on a political dynamics study prepared by the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR).

A. The Government and Its Basic Policies

A brief description of the formal structure of the government and of its basic policies. Analysis of most of those policies should be reserved for Chapters II, III and IV below.

B. Instruments for Exercising Power

Brief descriptions of the principal institutions through which the rulers actually govern the country. Subheadings might include:

1. The ruling party.
2. The bureaucracy.
3. Mass organizations.
4. Public Information media.
5. Police and security organizations.
6. The military.

C. Politically Significant Groups

Identification of politically significant groups based upon a concise analysis of the structure of the society. Groups discussed might include labor, business, the professions, farmers, landlords, students, racial minorities.

Some

Some duplication of groups treated in I is probably unavoidable (e.g., military, police, bureaucracy). In the case of at least the major groups, their present and prospective political importance, interests and attitude should be noted, with special reference to those groups, or to elements within them, which may be most susceptible to or resistant to influence.

D. The Political Process

How major decisions are actually made and carried out (in contrast to the formal structure described in I). Significant differences in the political process in different fields of policy should be noted.

E. International Relations

A survey of major features of the country's foreign policy and the state of its relations with other countries. Fuller treatment of international economic relations and external security questions should be left to Chapters II and IV, respectively.

F. Special Problems (examples listed)

1. Regional differences.
2. Racial and communal differences.
3. Leadership succession.

II. Economic and Social Forces

If an AID Long-Range Assistance Strategy Statement (LAS) is prepared in conjunction with work on a national policy paper, this chapter plus sections A.1 and C.1 of Chapter II in PART ONE would contain the essence of the LAS. The more detailed analysis and documentation called for in an LAS, along with certain more detailed programmatic material, may be included in an annex. The instructions issued by AID for preparation of the LAS provide particularly useful guidance for sections B, C and D of this chapter.

A. Major

A. Major Economic and Social Trends and Problems

Major subheadings might include:

1. Demographic trends.
2. Trends in level, composition and distribution of the gross national product.
3. Trends and problems in major economic sectors (agriculture, manufacturing, mining, services, transportation, and communications, etc.).
4. Labor and employment trends and problems.
5. Agrarian problems (land tenure, modernization, farm credit, etc.).
6. Problems of urbanization.
7. State of the national market.
8. Education and public services.
9. Fiscal, monetary and exchange policy.
10. Depressed classes, ethnic groups and geographical regions.
11. International economic relations.

B. Appraisal of Country's Efforts Toward Self-Help and Social Progress

Drawing on the descriptive material presented in the preceding section, indicate the areas in which efforts toward self-help and social progress have been either notably deficient or notably successful. Insofar as available information justifies, estimate the probable extent and success of such efforts in the future.

C. Appraisal

C. Appraisal of Country's Development Program and Policies

Due account should be taken in this section of both major economic programs and policies and of those non-economic programs and policies which significantly affect the course of economic development.

D. Analysis of Foreign Resource Needs

In addition to arriving at an estimate of total foreign resource needs, this section should indicate what portion of those needs might be satisfied from non-U.S. sources.

III. Internal Defense

This chapter presents the essential analytic and policy elements bearing on internal defense policy.

General guidance for drafting this chapter is provided in the instructions on the preparation of Internal Defense Plans which are issued by the State Department in collaboration with other interested government agencies.

A. The Present Character of the Threat

A description of the already visible threat of overthrow of the existing political order through subversion, insurrection, or a combination of the two.

B. Vulnerabilities

Vulnerabilities treated in this section should relate to the specific threat described above - not the less immediate and more diffuse weaknesses in the social and political fabric that should be dealt with in other chapters.

C. Appraisal of Country's Assets, Policies and Programs

This appraisal should be related to the specific threat described above; it should not be a general commentary on the merits and demerits of the society and its government.

D. Present

D. Present Role of U.S. In Internal Defense

Again, only those U.S. activities should be described which bear on the specific subversive threat.

IV. External Defense

The subheadings set forth below are largely self-explanatory. Sections D and E will, of course, not be relevant in some country policy papers. In some cases, E might be dropped as a separate section. The nuclear factor could then be treated in A as an aspect of the threat.

A. The Threat

Note any difference between the country's view of the threat and that of the U.S.

B. Missions and Tasks of Country's Armed Forces

Note any significant differences between the views of the U.S. and those of local officials on the missions and tasks of the country's armed forces.

C. Country's Military Capabilities

Military capabilities should be appraised in terms of the country's ability to create and maintain armed forces which can perform the missions and tasks described in the previous section.

D. Regional Security Arrangements

E. The Nuclear Factor

When relevant, both the nuclear threat and the country's attitude toward acquiring nuclear weapons should be discussed.

F. Present Role of U.S. in External Defense

When relevant, treat both:

1. Plans and commitments to deploy U.S. forces.
2. Military assistance

Annexes

Annexes

The annexes required to supplement Parts One and Two will, of course, vary from case to case. Those listed below are designed to be suggestive:

- A. U.S. Commitments
- B. Strategic Importance to the U.S.
- C. Detailed Presentation of U.S. Assistance Strategy
- D. Supplemental Material on Internal Defense
- E. Special U.S. Programs
- F. Special Contingency Plans

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

91

Dene
6



S/S 296

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
WASHINGTON

January 7, 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. McGEORGE BUNDY
THE WHITE HOUSE

Subject: National Policy Papers

The Secretary of State today cleared the attached version of the procedures for developing National Policy Papers. (Tab A) He also reviewed and signed off on the Ethiopia paper, on the attached form. (Tab B)

He indicated that, in view of the interest expressed by the Department of Defense and AID, and in view of the bureaucratic history of the internal defense plans, he would prefer that the promulgation of the procedures for the National Policy Papers take place through a National Security Action Memorandum.

Mr. Rostow told him that you appeared agreeable to this method for proceeding.

I attach a draft of a possible NSAM. (Tab C)

Ben H. Read

Benjamin H. Read
Executive Secretary

Attachments:

- Tab A - Procedures.
- Tab B - Sign off on Ethiopia paper.
- Tab C - Draft NSAM.

cc: Robert Komer, NSC Staff

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
State Dept. Guidelines
By 4, NARA, Date 12-3-99

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

GROUP 3
Downgraded at 12 year
intervals; not
automatically declassified

FEB 4 1964

6a

A

6b

① I believe procedure will be generally sub 7.



6c

SAMPLE

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

-i-

NATIONAL POLICY PAPER

ON

ETHIOPIA

PART ONE of this paper, covering Objectives, Strategy and Courses of Action, is a comprehensive, authoritative and approved statement of United States Policy toward Ethiopia.

PART TWO is the supporting analysis of factors bearing on national policy.

The African Policy Committee has cleared Part ONE and carefully reviewed Part TWO, which has its approval as a basic supporting analysis.

The courses of action contained in Part TWO are commended to the relevant operating agencies in their execution of the strategy contained in Part ONE.

All agencies with major responsibilities affecting our relations with Ethiopia participated in drafting the paper and concur in the Strategy and Courses of Action which it sets forth. The Country Team in Addis Ababa was consulted in the course of the paper's preparation and its views have been taken into account.

Execution of the policy set forth in this paper is the responsibility of the various executive agencies under the leadership of the Secretary of State and, in the country under the leadership of the Ambassador. Agency programs and directives to the field will proceed from, and be consistent with, the Strategy and Courses of Action stated in this paper. Intensive working

level

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
State Dept. Guidelines
By rf, NARA, Date 12-3-95

SECRET/NOFORN

-ii-

level consultation will be maintained through normal interdepartmental channels under the guidance of the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. The latter will guide the execution of this program and see that necessary adjustments are made consistent with the outlined Strategy and Objectives as new events and situations unfold.

The Chairman of the African Policy Committee will provide that appropriate reports are filed with the Committee on the course of execution of national policy both from the Country Team and a designated coordinating officer in Washington.

A substantial change in the situation may require revision of the Strategy or Major Courses of Action. Any interested agency may initiate at the appropriate level discussion designed to bring about such substantial revision. The need for such substantial change may then be brought to the attention of the African Policy Committee.



Secretary of State

Approved: January 6, 1964

SECRET/NOFORN

6d

C

DRAFT

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

(1/13/64)

*redo both
on green
for signature*

NATIONAL SECURITY ACTION MEMORANDUM NO. _____

6e

TO: Secretary of State
Secretary of the Treasury
Secretary of Defense
Secretary of Agriculture
Secretary of Commerce
Secretary of Labor
Director, Bureau of the Budget
Director of Central Intelligence
Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission
Director, United States Information Agency
Administrator, Agency for International Development
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4
NIJ 92-271
By *JP*, NARA, Date 3/25/92

SUBJECT: NATIONAL POLICY PAPER SERIES

In keeping with his responsibilities for the coordination of foreign policy, I have today vested in the Secretary of State the responsibility for the promulgation of certain National Policy Papers.

Procedures and standard outlines for this series will be circulated promptly by the Secretary of State.

Lyndon B. Johnson

Attachment:

National Policy Papers
(Procedures and Annotated
Standard Outline), dated
January 6, 1964.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DRAFT

~~SECRET~~

(1/13/64)

NATIONAL SECURITY ACTION MEMORANDUM NO. _____

6/8

TO: Secretary of State

I have today vested in you the responsibility for the promulgation of National Policy Papers toward specific countries for which you or I may consider such papers useful. The inclusion or omission of a country will be based on the value and relevance, in each case, of this particular process of policy review. Where this procedure is not applied, other policy planning processes will continue as at present.

I have also approved in general the proposed outline of procedures for the preparation of these papers dated January 6, 1964. But before you circulate this outline I should be glad to have it revised so that it contains the following paragraph, and so that all parts of it are consistent with that addition:

"The President himself may initiate a Policy Paper, either by requesting a general review, or by laying down guidelines against which a review and recommendation should be made. Members of his staff may participate in the process of any review as may be desirable to ensure consistency with his purposes. The Secretary of State, in giving final approval to any paper, will satisfy himself not only that differences among agencies have been resolved, but that the paper as a whole reflects the President's own purpose and policy."

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
Nsc/
By NY, NARA, Date 12-3-99
State Dept. Guidelines

~~SECRET~~

-2-

(1/13/64)

I of course have complete confidence in your judgment on what does and does not require to be referred directly to me, but I think it important that neither of us should be thought to be leaving our own responsibilities in the hands of interdepartmental policy committees, strong and well led though we mean them to be.

Let me emphasize, however, my own satisfaction at the development of this carefully considered method for strengthening our policy in selected countries, and my hope that it will prove helpful in making our over-all efforts more effective.

NSAM 281
J
7

~~SECRET~~

February 11, 1964

MEMORANDUM TO: Mr. Walt W. Rostow

²⁹¹
The attached NSAM is going out today. I enclose, for such use as you may wish to make of it, the draft memorandum which I am not submitting to the President with respect to the President's own participation in procedures. I myself believe that both the President and Secretary of State would be in a slightly stronger position if the paragraph suggested in this draft memorandum were included in your outline of procedures. But it may be that the same thing could be said in much shorter language, and it may also be that neither the President nor the Secretary requires this explicit protection. I am happy to leave it to you to decide whether there is enough importance in these suggestions to justify your drafting appropriate language and checking it with the Secretary.

Let me add that the fact that the NSAM goes out over my signature in no sense derogates from the President's own direct understanding of and interest in this new series. He understands clearly what it is for and he is glad that you are doing it.

McG. B.

2 Enclosures

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
NSC Memo, 1/30/95, State Dept. Guidelines
By ry, NARA, Date 12-3-88

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

7a

DRAFT

~~SECRET~~

NATIONAL SECURITY ACTION MEMORANDUM

TO: The Secretary of State

SUBJECT: National Policy Paper Series

I have today vested in you the responsibility for the promulgation of National Policy Papers toward specific countries for which you or I may consider such papers useful. The inclusion or omission of a country will be based on the value and relevance, in each case, of this particular process of policy review. Where this procedure is not applied, other policy planning processes will continue as at present.

I have also approved in general the proposed outline of procedures for the preparation of these papers dated January 6, 1964. But before you circulate this outline I should be glad to have it revised so that it contains the following paragraph, and so that all parts of it are consistent with that addition:

"The President himself may initiate a Policy Paper, either by requesting a general review, or by laying down guidelines against which a review and recommendation should be made. Members of this staff may participate in the process of any review as may be desirable to ensure consistency with his purposes. The Secretary of State, in giving final approval to any paper, will satisfy himself not only that differences among agencies have been resolved, but that the paper as a whole reflects the President's own purpose and policy."

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
NSC Memo, 1/30/95, State Dept. Guidelines
By 14, NARA, Date 12-3-99

~~SECRET~~

- 2 -

I of course have complete confidence in your judgment on what does and does not require to be referred directly to me, but I think it important that neither of us should be thought to be leaving our own responsibilities in the hands of interdepartmental policy committees, strong and well led though we mean them to be.

Let me emphasize, however, my own satisfaction at the development of this carefully considered method for strengthening our policy in selected countries, and my hope that it will prove helpful in making our over-all efforts more effective.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

✓ Policy 8
✓ Planning

McGB:

January 7, 1964

I gather you've no problem with Walt Rostow's request for a NSAM sanctifying National Policy Papers (he's got Rusk signed on to it now). Walt is anxious to get LBJ signature by this weekend. He and others have to testify, I believe Monday, before Fascell Subcommittee, and Walt naturally thinks that touting this new series will reinforce the impression that LBJ is taking hold without any disarray. However, I wonder whether we ought to publicize so soon an exercise which may peter out.

WWR's draft NSAM seems deficient to me in that (1) it doesn't say what National Policy Papers are; (2) I see no need for LBJ to sign off on proposed procedures or outlines, which we may just want to change later. So here is a redraft:

"As part of his responsibility for the coordination of foreign policy, I have vested in the Secretary of State responsibility for promulgating a series of National Policy Papers outlining US policy toward various foreign countries of security interest to the US.

"The Secretary of State, in consultation with other interested departments and agencies, will put into effect the necessary procedures for this purpose. Of course, if major interdepartmental differences of substance arise, I will expect them to be referred to me for decision."

Final Query: Might this new procedure, especially if publicized, lead people to conclusion President is delegating to SecState his foreign policy responsibilities, and doesn't intend to take a very active role himself? If any chance of this, LBJ will rightly demur. We could modify last para to make clear President's continuing determination to run the show; dilemma here, however, is how to say this without at same time inviting WH, if not Presidential, review of every piece of paper in this embryo paper mill.

RWT
RWK

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
NSC Memo, 1/30/95, State Dept. Guidelines
By sj, NARA, Date 12-3-99

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
POLICY PLANNING COUNCIL

33

*See
Policy
Co.*

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

December 26, 1963

9

MEMORANDUM TO: ALL OFFICERS OF THE COUNCIL

SUBJECT : NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS (Procedures and Outline)

The attached procedures and outline take into account the comments and recommendations received at the time the previous version was submitted for formal concurrence.

The Secretary's sign-off statement at page #2 is the same as that used in the Ethiopian National Policy Paper which was approved by the African Policy Committee.


John W. Ford
Executive Secretary

Enclosure: Revised Procedures and Annotated Standard
Outline for National Policy Papers dated 12/26/63

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

(Unclassified on removal of classified enclosure)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

9a

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
POLICY PLANNING COUNCIL

December 26, 1963

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS
(PROCEDURES AND ANNOTATED STANDARD OUTLINE)

DECLASSIFIED
Authority E. O. 11652 SEC. 5(A) and (D)
By if, NARS, Date 1-31-80

GROUP 4
Downgraded at 3-year intervals;
declassified after 12 years

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS

Table of Contents

A. PROCEDURES

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1. <u>Purpose of Program</u> | Page 1 |
| 2. <u>Content of National Policy Papers</u> | Page 1 |
| 3. <u>Initiation and Priorities</u> | Page 3 |
| 4. <u>The Nine Stages in the Development of a National Policy Paper</u> | Page 4 |
| 5. <u>Explanation of Nine Stages (Including Clearance Procedures)</u> | Page 5 |
| 6. <u>Distribution</u> | Page 12 |
| 7. <u>Relation Between National Policy Papers and Other Country Planning Activity</u> | Page 12 |
| 8. <u>Execution</u> | Page 12 |

B. ANNOTATED STANDARD OUTLINE

- | | |
|---|---------|
| PART ONE - U. S. Policy | Page 14 |
| PART TWO - Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy | Page 17 |

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS

A. PROCEDURES

1. Purpose of Program

National policy papers are comprehensive and authoritative statements of U.S. policy toward each country included in the program.

2. Content of National Policy Papers

Each national policy paper presents an analysis of the social, political, economic and military forces at work in the country in question and of those forces which bear on the country in the international sphere; and from that analysis derives a country strategy for the U.S. for the next two to five years. Regional considerations affecting U.S. strategy, particularly those involving commitments of resources and their relative priority should be taken into account. The country strategy should include an analysis of the manner in which the U.S. should relate to the country's participation in the United Nations and its principal agencies. Those specific courses of action which are essential to carrying out the country strategy and which differ from current action programs are also set forth. (See the attached annotated standard outline for a more detailed description of a national policy paper.)

In order to simplify clearance procedures and facilitate use by operating officials, the body of a national policy paper should be no longer than is absolutely necessary. Additional detail can be provided in the operational programs of the several agencies, whose consistency with the national policy paper should be assured by the procedures described below, including those set out in paragraphs 7 and 8.

On completion

GROUP 4

Downgraded at 3-year intervals;
declassified after 12 years.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

2

On completion of the procedures outlined below, the Secretary of State, or in his absence the Acting Secretary of State, will review and formally sign National Policy Papers following their approval by the appropriate inter-departmental committee under the Chairmanship of an Assistant Secretary of State. The formal sign-off will be reflected in the frontispiece of each National Policy Paper as follows:

"PART ONE of this paper, covering Objectives, Strategy and Courses of Action, is a comprehensive, authoritative and approved statement of United States Policy toward _____.

"PART TWO is the supporting analysis of factors bearing on national policy.

"The _____ Committee has cleared* Part ONE and carefully reviewed Part TWO, which has its approval as a basic supporting analysis.

"The courses of action contained in Part TWO are commended to the relevant operating agencies in their execution of the strategy contained in Part ONE.

"All agencies with major responsibilities affecting our relations with _____ participated in drafting the paper and concur in the Strategy and Courses of Action which it sets forth. The Country Team in _____ was consulted in the course of the paper's preparation and its views have been taken into account.

"Execution of the policy set forth in this paper is the responsibility of the various executive agencies under the guidance of the Secretary of State and in the country, under the leadership of the Ambassador. All other agency planning and programming documents, and directives to the field will proceed from and be consistent with, the Strategy and Courses of Action

stated

*The procedure envisaged is described in I, Stage #9, below.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

stated in this paper. Intensive working level consultation will be maintained through normal inter-departmental channels under the guidance of the Assistant Secretary of State for _____ . The latter will guide the execution of this program and see that necessary adjustments are made consistent with the outlined Strategy and Objectives as new events and situations unfold.

"The Chairman of the _____ Committee will provide that appropriate reports are filed with the Committee on the course of execution of national policy both from the Country Team and a designated coordinating officer in Washington.

"A substantial change in the situation may require revision of the Strategy or Major Courses of Action. Any interested agency or the Ambassador may initiate at the appropriate level discussion designed to bring about such substantial revision. The need for such substantial change may then be brought to the attention of the _____ Committee.

/s/ Secretary of State"

3. Initiation and Priorities

The Secretary of State has assigned general responsibility for the program of national policy papers from Stages #1 through #8 to the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council.

Any interested agency may appropriately propose initiation of a national policy paper. Action on such a proposal should be taken by the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council after consultation with the appropriate regional Assistant Secretary of State, other interested Bureaus, and the agencies principally concerned. Priority in the development of national policy papers should depend upon the intensity of our political, economic and security interests in the various countries covered by the program. First attention should, in the usual case, be given to countries in which we expect to make major expenditures or where major security problems exist or may arise.

4. The stages

4. The Stages in the Development of a National Policy Paper

The development of a national policy paper will take place in specifically defined stages once the need for such paper on a particular country has been clearly established and its priority determined as set forth in paragraph #3 above. These stages, which are more fully described hereinafter, will be as follows:

- Stage #1: Designation of a Senior Officer to Assume Responsibility for Paper: The Responsible Officer
- Stage #2: Convening of an Interagency Working Group by the Responsible Officer.
- Stage #3: Request for Agency Contributions to a First Draft.
- Stage #4: Preparation of a First Draft Representing Preliminary Views of Members of Working Group.
- Stage #5: Field Visit: By Responsible Officer and Members of Working Group for Discussion of First Draft with Ambassador and Country Team.
- Stage #6: Preparation of Second Draft (Revision #1) on Basis of Discussions in Field - Circulation to Agencies and to the Field for Comment.
- Stage #7: Preparation of Third Draft (Revision #2) on Basis of Comments Received from Agencies and the Field - Circulation for Formal Clearance.
- Stage #8: Resolution of Major Policy Differences Surfaced in Course of Preparing Revisions #1 and #2 through normal channels appropriate to Authority of Departments and Agencies.

Stage #9

Stage #9: Final Review and Approval of National Policy Paper by Regional Policy Committee or Equivalent Interagency Committee and Submission to Secretary of State for Signature. Distribution to all Agencies Concerned as a Binding, National Policy Document.

5. Explanation of Stages

A. Stage #1: Designation of a Senior Officer to Assume Responsibility for Paper: The Responsible Officer.

When a decision has been made to initiate a new national policy paper, the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, in consultation with the responsible geographical bureau and other interested agencies, will designate a senior officer to assume responsibility for the paper. Responsible officers designated may be members of the Policy Planning Council, other officers of the Department of State, or officers of other government agencies, possessing special knowledge and experience in the country to be studied, or qualified outside consultants.

Working under the general direction of the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, the responsible officer chairs the interagency working group, coordinates the contributions of the various agencies concerned, and assumes responsibility for drafting the national policy paper itself. He is expected to avoid the perils of "drafting by committee" and to provide effective leadership to the interagency working group in arriving at considered judgments concerning the key issues involved. He will bear a special responsibility to surface and assure precise definition of differences of view, later to be resolved by higher authority.

B. Stage #2: Convening of an Interagency Working Group by the Responsible Officer.

Immediately upon his designation, the responsible officer should convene an interagency working group representing all agencies and bureaus with a substantial interest

in US

in US policy and operations in the country to be studied. In the usual case, the working group would include at least the representatives of the Department of State, the Department of Defense, AID, CIA, USIA, Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget. AID would be represented by the appropriate regional bureau and the Program Coordination Staff. From Defense, ISA, the Joint Staff and service representatives would normally be invited to participate. In the case of CIA, both DD/I and DD/P would usually be represented. Each agency may determine, however, what representation it requires in any specific case. The need for advice of area specialists, as for example those in the Department of Labor, should be taken into account. (It is to be noted that at Stage 7, hereinafter defined, the White House staff will participate with the working group, unless members of the White House staff desire to participate at an earlier stage.) The Department of State would usually be represented by S/P, the geographical bureau concerned, INR and CU. The responsible officer will be expected to work closely with INR especially in the preparation of the draft of Part TWO of the National Policy Paper.

C. Stage #3: Request for Agency Contributions to a First Draft.

(a) Political Dynamics Study

In the usual case, the first contribution to be requested by the responsible officer will be a study of political dynamics by INR or by an outside scholar under contract arranged by INR.

(b) Other Contributions

The responsible officer can determine in consultation with the interagency working group what other contributions will be required. Existing and still current LASs, Military Assistance Plans, NISs, IDPs, USIA country plans, and CU country studies would, of course, be reviewed and serve as useful sources of information and analysis.

Some contributions

Some contributions will take the form of first drafts of particular sections of the national policy paper. Many contributions, however, will be background papers from which the responsible officer can draw the information and analysis needed in drafting relevant parts of the paper. It must be emphasized that a national policy paper is not a clip-and-paste job composed of drafts done in various parts of the government.

D. Stage #4: Preparation of a First Draft Representing Preliminary Views of Members of Working Group.

The first draft of a national policy paper should represent only the preliminary views of the members of the working group. It should be cleared informally with the agencies represented on the working group. The principal functions of the first draft are to identify the key points at issue and to provide a basis for productive and orderly discussions in the field. To this end, it is important that differences of opinion encountered within the working group be explicitly incorporated and sharply clarified in the body of the first draft, in the appropriate places.

The responsible officer or other members in the inter-agency working group may find it necessary to request specific contributions from the field in the early phases of work on the national policy paper. Care should be taken, however, not to burden the field with unnecessary or excessively detailed requests for information.

E. Stage #5: Field Visit: By Responsible Officer and Members of Working Group for Discussion of First Draft with Ambassador and Country Team.

After a first draft of the national policy paper has been completed it should, in the usual case, be taken to the field by the responsible officer and discussed in detail with

the ambassador

the ambassador and the other members of the country team. If possible, the responsible officer should be accompanied by those members of the interagency working group whose agencies are most vitally concerned, particularly members involved in a significant difference of opinion in the draft paper. After appropriate consultation with the field post concerned through the geographical bureau, the responsible officer will determine the minimum size of team needed for the field visit, given the nature of the issues involved. The draft, which at this stage has no formal clearance, should be thoroughly discussed within the working group in Washington prior to visiting the country and copies of the draft, including objectives and lines of action, should be forwarded to the Embassy concerned well in advance of discussions with the country team.

By intensive discussion of the first draft with field agencies, the working group can both remedy gaps in information and improve the analysis leading to formulation of an effective country strategy. Also field participation at an early stage of the work should make the finished paper both more practical and more easily understood by the officials who will have to carry out the approved strategy and courses of action.

The Department of Defense is responsible for arranging appropriate participation by the unified and specified commands in the preparation of national policy papers.

F. Stage #6: Preparation of Second Draft (Revision #1) on Basis of Discussions in Field - Circulation to Agencies for Comment.

After the first draft of the national policy paper has been revised on the basis of discussions in the field, the revised draft, which will include major differences of opinion which might have developed from these discussions, should be circulated to the responsible Washington agencies represented in the working group, if the draft deals with problems in their fields of responsibility. The responsible officer

should

should maintain close consultation with the Interdepartmental Psychological Political Working Group in the course of development of the paper.

Adequate time should be allowed both at this stage and at the later stage of formal clearance for thorough review and staffing of the paper within all of the agencies concerned.

G. Stage #7: Preparation of Third Draft (Revision #2) on Basis of Comments Received from Agencies - Circulation for Formal Clearance.

It is at this stage that White House staff representation will, in the usual case, be included in the working group.

At this stage the responsible officer, in consultation with the working group, will prepare a further revision on the basis of the Washington agencies' comments, looking toward a draft which can be submitted for formal clearance. As appropriate, major problems that are surfaced in preparing a draft for formal clearance should be referred to the field for consideration by the country team. To the extent possible, questions raised in the Washington agencies' comments and reactions elicited from the field should be reconciled in the working group and further revisions made in the course of preparing a draft for formal clearance. The responsible officer must make a special effort to insure that real policy differences are not submerged through adoption of imprecise compromise language.

After the responsible officer is satisfied that the working group has exhausted all efforts to reconcile policy differences which may have been surfaced, and that the remaining differences are precisely and understandably presented, the policy paper at this stage will be submitted to all agencies for formal clearance. Experience has shown that only through the formal clearance process is it possible accurately and clearly to pinpoint major policy differences. The country team should be furnished a copy of the paper as it is circulated in Washington for review and resolution of outstanding differences.

Where the

Where the clearance process results in no requirement for resolution of major policy differences, the formally cleared policy paper will go immediately to the Regional Policy Committee or to an equivalent ad hoc group convened by the responsible regional Assistant Secretary of State for approval and forwarding to the Secretary of State as described in Stage #9 hereinafter.

It is to be noted that the Regional Policy Committee or equivalent interagency committee under an Assistant Secretary of State, will not receive the National Policy Paper for approval until after formal clearance has been obtained from the agencies of government concerned. Such interagency committees are not "reapproving" the paper. The action taken by these interagency committees on National Policy Papers is described in Stage #9.

IN FORWARDING NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS FOR FORMAL CLEARANCE TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDA WILL REQUEST FORMAL CLEARANCE ON PART ONE (U.S. Policy: objectives, strategy and courses of action) WITH EACH AGENCY OF GOVERNMENT TO BE THE JUDGE AS TO THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL WITHIN THE AGENCY AT WHICH CLEARANCE IS OBTAINED. REGARDLESS OF THE LEVEL CHOSEN, FORMAL CLEARANCE WILL BE CONSIDERED AS BINDING ON THE AGENCY CONCERNED. THE REMAINDER OF THE POLICY PAPER (PART TWO (Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy) WILL BE REVIEWED BY THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE OR AN EQUIVALENT AD HOC GROUP CONVENED BY THE RESPONSIBLE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE. PART TWO IS NOT SUBJECT TO FORMAL CLEARANCE.

Where the clearance process reveals major policy differences, Stage #8 will apply:

- H. Stage #8: Resolution of Major Policy Differences Surfaced in Course of Preparing Revisions #1 and #2 and in the Formal Clearance through Normal Channels Appropriate to Authority of Departments and Agencies.

Major policy differences between two or more agencies may be surfaced in the clearance process. The responsible

officer

officer will inform the appropriate Assistant Secretary of State, of such issues. These will be resolved, after lucid formulation, by normal (usually bilateral) appeal channels appropriate to the specific issue raised and the agencies involved. If necessary, referral of the issue (not the whole paper) will be made to the White House. Once major policy differences have been resolved at the appropriate level, those agencies not involved will be informed and the paper, now cleared, will move forward.

- I. Stage #9: Review and Approval of National Policy Paper by Regional Policy Committee or Equivalent Interagency Committee and Submission to Secretary of State for Signature - Distribution to all Agencies Concerned as a Binding, National Policy Document.

The National Policy Paper, Section ONE, which will have been formally cleared, will be submitted to the Regional Policy Committee or an equivalent group for review and approval of the paper in its totality before submission to the Secretary of State for review and signature. In the absence of the Secretary of State, the Acting Secretary of State has authority to perform the review and signing function.

The above clearance procedures are designed to insure that the time of Regional Policy Committees or equivalent groups are not taken up with protracted debate and editing. To the extent humanly and bureaucratically possible, a National Policy Paper at the time of its receipt by such committees will require a minimum of additional review. Specifically, the Regional Policy Committee or equivalent inter-agency group will be called upon to:

- a) Review the paper in its entirety.
- b) Approve Part TWO (Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy) of the paper which is not subject to formal clearance.
- c) Determine that all clearances previously given remain valid.

d) Perform

d) Perform such "tidying up" as may be necessary as a result of last minute changes suggested by members of the committee.

e) Satisfy itself that the National Policy Paper is in order and readiness for submission to the Secretary of State for review and signature.

f) As a committee approve the paper in its entirety for submission to the Secretary of State.

g) Transmit the approved paper to the Secretary of State.

6. Distribution

State |

The Assistant Secretary of State will arrange for distribution of the National Policy Paper, signed by the Secretary of State, to all agencies concerned, as a binding national policy document.

7. Relationship between National Policy Papers and Other Country Papers and Planning Activities.

The National Policy Papers will constitute comprehensive, authoritative and unifying statements of U.S. policy and operational strategy towards particular countries. Insofar as statements of policy and strategy are included in other country documents (IDPs, LASSs, MAP Five Year Plans, USIA Country Plans, CU Country Studied, AID Country Assistance Strategy Statements, etc.) they will be superseded by National Policy Papers, on the latter's approval. The operating programs contained in such other country plans and studies should subsequently flow from and be consistent with the strategies and the pertinent courses of action set forth in the National Policy Papers, and as they may be modified under the procedures set out in paragraph 8, below.

8. Execution

Execution of the policies set forth in national policy papers is the responsibility of the various executive agencies under the guidance of the Secretary of State. All other agency planning and programming documents, and directives to the field, will proceed from and be consistent with the Strategy and Courses of Action presented in the national policy papers. Intensive working level consultation will be maintained through normal interdepartmental channels under the guidance of the Assistant Secretary of State for the geographical region concerned. The latter will guide the execution of this program and see that necessary adjustments are made consistent with the outlined Strategy and

Objectives

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

13

Objectives as new events and situations unfold.

The Assistant Secretary of State for the region concerned will provide that appropriate reports, both from the Country Team and a designated coordinating officer in Washington, are filed with the Regional Policy Committee (or equivalent interagency arrangement) on the course of execution of national policy.

A substantial change in the situation may require revision of the Strategy or Major Courses of Action. Any interested agency or the Ambassador may initiate at the appropriate level discussion designed to bring about such substantial revision. The need for such substantial change may then be brought to the attention of the appropriate Assistant Secretary of State as chairman of a regional policy committee or other interagency group.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

C. U.S. Interests and Objectives

This subsection consists of a summary of U.S. interests followed by an enumeration of U.S. objectives. More detailed exposition of U.S. interests should, if required, be taken care of in annexes. Objectives should be stated in terms of what we want--not in terms of how we get what we want, which is the subject of later chapters on strategy and courses of action.

D. Relations of Country with U.S.

This subsection sketches briefly the current state of relations, including major commitments.

E. Key Issues

A brief, unvarnished statement of the key issues and problems faced by the U.S. in the country under study serves both to set the stage for the analysis of political, economic, social and security factors in PART TWO and to indicate the obstacles that must be surmounted by the U.S. strategy to be formulated in Chapter III below. Preparing a preliminary statement of the key issues might well be the first step taken by the working group.

F. Assumptions

Only the minimum necessary assumptions should be made. Generally speaking, assumptions should deal with developments outside the country under consideration--not, of course, including U.S. courses of action.

II. U.S. Strategy for the Next Two to Five Years

Sections B, C, D and E of this chapter should be concise, straightforward statements of what we propose to do in the various fields of action. The stage for these statements is set by Section A, which takes up briefly what we want to see happen, how much leverage we have on the course of events, a general description of our strategy and the principal contingencies that might require a change in that strategy. The various aspects of the total strategy should be mutually consistent. Key interrelationships (as, for example, between political and economic assistance strategies)

should be

should be explicitly noted.

A. General

1. Desired course of country's political, social, military, and economic evolution.
2. Dimensions of U.S. influence.
3. General description of U.S. strategy.
4. Principal contingencies.

B. U.S. Political Strategy

C. U.S. Economic Strategy

1. Economic assistance strategy.
2. Trade and investment policies.

D. Future U.S. Role in Internal Defense

E. Future U.S. Role in External Defense

III. Courses of Action

In the light of the objectives and strategy developed above, this chapter presents specific new courses of action required to give meaning to the strategy described in the preceding chapter. These courses of action are neither so detailed as to compromise the executive responsibilities of the operating agencies, nor so vague as to be without operational meaning. The action agency, or agencies, should be noted after each course of action.

A. Political

B. Economic

C. Security (including military)

D. Information, Culture and Education

E. Other

PART TWO
FACTORS BEARING ON
U. S. POLICY

I. Political Forces

This chapter will usually be based principally on a political dynamics study prepared by the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR).

A. The Government and Its Basic Policies

A brief description of the formal structure of the government and of its basic policies. Analysis of most of those policies should be reserved for Chapters II, III and IV below.

B. Instruments for Exercising Power

Brief descriptions of the principal institutions through which the rulers actually govern the country. Subheadings might include:

1. The ruling party.
2. The bureaucracy.
3. Mass organizations.
4. Public information media.
5. Police and security organizations.
6. The military.

C. Politically Significant Groups

Identification of politically significant groups based upon a concise analysis of the structure of the society. Groups discussed might include labor, business, the professions, farmers, landlords, students, racial minorities.

Some

Some duplication of groups treated in I is probably unavoidable (e.g., military, police, bureaucracy). In the case of at least the major groups, their present and prospective political importance, interests and attitude should be noted, with special reference to those groups, or to elements within them, which may be most susceptible to or resistant to influence.

D. The Political Process

How major decisions are actually made and carried out (in contrast to the formal structure described in I). Significant differences in the political process in different fields of policy should be noted.

E. International Relations

A survey of major features of the country's foreign policy and the state of its relations with other countries. Fuller treatment of international economic relations and external security questions should be left to Chapters II and IV, respectively.

F. Special Problems (examples listed)

1. Regional differences.
2. Racial and communal differences.
3. Leadership succession.

II. Economic and Social Forces

If an AID Long-Range Assistance Strategy Statement (LAS) is prepared in conjunction with work on a national policy paper, this chapter plus sections A.1 and C.1. of Chapter II in PART ONE would contain the essence of the LAS. The more detailed analysis and documentation called for in an LAS, along with certain more detailed programmatic material, may be included in an annex. The instructions issued by AID for preparation of the LAS provide particularly useful guidance for sections B, C and D of this chapter.

A. Major

A. Major Economic and Social Trends and Problems

Major subheadings might include:

1. Demographic trends.
2. Trends in level, composition and distribution of the gross national product.
3. Trends and problems in major economic sectors (Agriculture, manufacturing, mining, services, transportation and communications, etc.).
4. Labor and employment trends and problems.
5. Agrarian problems (land tenure, modernization, farm credit, etc.).
6. Problems of urbanization.
7. State of the national market.
8. Education and public services.
9. Fiscal, monetary and exchange policy.
10. Depressed classes, ethnic groups and geographical regions.
11. International economic relations.

B. Appraisal of Country's Efforts Toward Self-help and Social Progress

Drawing on the descriptive material presented in the preceding section, indicate the areas in which efforts toward self-help and social progress have been either notably deficient or notably successful. Insofar as available information justifies, estimate the probable extent and success of such efforts in the future.

C. Appraisal of Country's Development Program and Policies

Due account should be taken in this section of both

major

major economic programs and policies and of those non-economic programs and policies which significantly affect the course of economic development.

D. Analysis of Foreign Resource Needs

In addition to arriving at an estimate of total foreign resource needs, this section should indicate what portion of those needs might be satisfied from non-U.S. sources.

III. Internal Defense

This chapter presents the essential analytic and policy elements bearing on national defense policy.

General guidance for drafting this chapter is provided in the instructions on the preparation of IDPs which are issued by the State Department in collaboration with other interested government agencies.

A. The Present Character of the Threat

A description of the already visible threat of overthrow of the existing political order through subversion, insurrection, or a combination of the two.

B. Vulnerabilities

Vulnerabilities treated in this section should relate to the specific threat described above--not the less immediate and more diffuse weaknesses in the social and political fabric that should be dealt with in other chapters.

C. Appraisal of Country's Assets, Policies and Programs

This appraisal should be related to the specific threat described above; it should not be a general commentary on the merits and demerits of the society and its government.

D. Present Role of U.S. In Internal Defense

Again, only those U.S. activities should be described which bear on the specific subversive threat.

IV. External

IV. External Defense

The subheadings set forth below are largely self-explanatory. Sections D and E will of course not be relevant in some country policy papers. In some cases, E might be dropped as a separate section. The nuclear factor could then be treated in A as an aspect of the threat.

A. The Threat

Note any difference between the country's view of the threat and that of the U.S.

B. Missions and Tasks of Country's Armed Forces

Note any significant differences between the views of the U.S. and those of local officials on the missions and tasks of the country's armed forces.

C. Country's Military Capabilities

Military capabilities should be appraised in terms of the country's ability to create and maintain armed forces which can perform the missions and tasks described in the previous section.

D. Regional Security Arrangements

E. The Nuclear Factor

When relevant, both the nuclear threat and the country's attitude toward acquiring nuclear weapons should be discussed.

F. Present Role of U.S. in External Defense

When relevant, treat both:

1. Plans and commitments to deploy U.S. forces.
2. Military assistance

Annexes

The annexes required to supplement Parts One and Two will, of course, vary from case to case. Those listed below are designed to be suggestive:

A. U.S. Commitments

B. Detailed

Annexes (Continued)

- B. Detailed Presentation of U.S. Assistance Strategy
- C. Supplemental Material on Internal Defense
- D. Special U.S. Programs
- E. Special Contingency Plans

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

✓
Policy Planning

10
—

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
POLICY PLANNING COUNCIL

December 26, 1963

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS
(PROCEDURES AND ANNOTATED STANDARD OUTLINE)

DECLASSIFIED

Authority E. O. 11652 SEC. 5(A) and (D)

By ij, NARS, Date 1-31-80

GROUP 4

Downgraded at 3-year intervals;
declassified after 12 years

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS

Table of Contents

A. PROCEDURES

1. <u>Purpose of Program</u>	Page 1
2. <u>Content of National Policy Papers</u>	Page 1
3. <u>Initiation and Priorities</u>	Page 3
4. <u>The Nine Stages in the Development of a National Policy Paper</u>	Page 4
5. <u>Explanation of Nine Stages (Including Clearance Procedures)</u>	Page 5
6. <u>Distribution</u>	Page 12
7. <u>Relation Between National Policy Papers and Other Country Planning Activity</u>	Page 12
8. <u>Execution</u>	Page 12

B. ANNOTATED STANDARD OUTLINE

PART ONE - U. S. Policy	Page 14
PART TWO - Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy	Page 17

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS

A. PROCEDURES

1. Purpose of Program

National policy papers are comprehensive and authoritative statements of U.S. policy toward each country included in the program.

2. Content of National Policy Papers

Each national policy paper presents an analysis of the social, political, economic and military forces at work in the country in question and of those forces which bear on the country in the international sphere; and from that analysis derives a country strategy for the U.S. for the next two to five years. Regional considerations affecting U.S. strategy, particularly those involving commitments of resources and their relative priority should be taken into account. The country strategy should include an analysis of the manner in which the U.S. should relate to the country's participation in the United Nations and its principal agencies. Those specific courses of action which are essential to carrying out the country strategy and which differ from current action programs are also set forth. (See the attached annotated standard outline for a more detailed description of a national policy paper.)

In order to simplify clearance procedures and facilitate use by operating officials, the body of a national policy paper should be no longer than is absolutely necessary. Additional detail can be provided in the operational programs of the several agencies, whose consistency with the national policy paper should be assured by the procedures described below, including those set out in paragraphs 7 and 8.

On completion

GROUP 4

Downgraded at 3-year intervals;
declassified after 12 years.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

2

On completion of the procedures outlined below, the Secretary of State, or in his absence the Acting Secretary of State, will review and formally sign National Policy Papers following their approval by the appropriate inter-departmental committee under the Chairmanship of an Assistant Secretary of State. The formal sign-off will be reflected in the frontispiece of each National Policy Paper as follows:

"PART ONE of this paper, covering Objectives, Strategy and Courses of Action, is a comprehensive, authoritative and approved statement of United States Policy toward _____.

"PART TWO is the supporting analysis of factors bearing on national policy.

"The _____ Committee has cleared* Part ONE and carefully reviewed Part TWO, which has its approval as a basic supporting analysis.

"The courses of action contained in Part TWO are commended to the relevant operating agencies in their execution of the strategy contained in Part ONE.

"All agencies with major responsibilities affecting our relations with _____ participated in drafting the paper and concur in the Strategy and Courses of Action which it sets forth. The Country Team in _____ was consulted in the course of the paper's preparation and its views have been taken into account.

"Execution of the policy set forth in this paper is the responsibility of the various executive agencies under the guidance of the Secretary of State and in the country, under the leadership of the Ambassador. All other agency planning and programming documents, and directives to the field will proceed from and be consistent with, the Strategy and Courses of Action

stated

*The procedure envisaged is described in I, Stage #9, below.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

3

stated in this paper. Intensive working level consultation will be maintained through normal inter-departmental channels under the guidance of the Assistant Secretary of State for _____. The latter will guide the execution of this program and see that necessary adjustments are made consistent with the outlined Strategy and Objectives as new events and situations unfold.

"The Chairman of the _____ Committee will provide that appropriate reports are filed with the Committee on the course of execution of national policy both from the Country Team and a designated coordinating officer in Washington.

"A substantial change in the situation may require revision of the Strategy or Major Courses of Action. Any interested agency or the Ambassador may initiate at the appropriate level discussion designed to bring about such substantial revision. The need for such substantial change may then be brought to the attention of the _____ Committee.

/s/ Secretary of State"

3. Initiation and Priorities

The Secretary of State has assigned general responsibility for the program of national policy papers from Stages #1 through #8 to the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council.

Any interested agency may appropriately propose initiation of a national policy paper. Action on such a proposal should be taken by the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council after consultation with the appropriate regional Assistant Secretary of State, other interested Bureaus, and the agencies principally concerned. Priority in the development of national policy papers should depend upon the intensity of our political, economic and security interests in the various countries covered by the program. First attention should, in the usual case, be given to countries in which we expect to make major expenditures or where major security problems exist or may arise.

4. The stages

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

4. The Stages in the Development of a National Policy Paper

The development of a national policy paper will take place in specifically defined stages once the need for such paper on a particular country has been clearly established and its priority determined as set forth in paragraph #3 above. These stages, which are more fully described hereinafter, will be as follows:

- Stage #1: Designation of a Senior Officer to Assume Responsibility for Paper: The Responsible Officer
- Stage #2: Convening of an Interagency Working Group by the Responsible Officer.
- Stage #3: Request for Agency Contributions to a First Draft.
- Stage #4: Preparation of a First Draft Representing Preliminary Views of Members of Working Group.
- Stage #5: Field Visit: By Responsible Officer and Members of Working Group for Discussion of First Draft with Ambassador and Country Team.
- Stage #6: Preparation of Second Draft (Revision #1) on Basis of Discussions in Field - Circulation to Agencies and to the Field for Comment.
- Stage #7: Preparation of Third Draft (Revision #2) on Basis of Comments Received from Agencies and the Field - Circulation for Formal Clearance.
- Stage #8: Resolution of Major Policy Differences Surfaced in Course of Preparing Revisions #1 and #2 through normal channels appropriate to Authority of Departments and Agencies.

Stage #9

Stage #9: Final Review and Approval of National Policy Paper by Regional Policy Committee or Equivalent Interagency Committee and Submission to Secretary of State for Signature. Distribution to all Agencies Concerned as a Binding, National Policy Document.

5. Explanation of Stages

A. Stage #1: Designation of a Senior Officer to Assume Responsibility for Paper: The Responsible Officer.

When a decision has been made to initiate a new national policy paper, the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, in consultation with the responsible geographical bureau and other interested agencies, will designate a senior officer to assume responsibility for the paper. Responsible officers designated may be members of the Policy Planning Council, other officers of the Department of State, or officers of other government agencies, possessing special knowledge and experience in the country to be studied, or qualified outside consultants.

Working under the general direction of the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, the responsible officer chairs the interagency working group, coordinates the contributions of the various agencies concerned, and assumes responsibility for drafting the national policy paper itself. He is expected to avoid the perils of "drafting by committee" and to provide effective leadership to the interagency working group in arriving at considered judgments concerning the key issues involved. He will bear a special responsibility to surface and assure precise definition of differences of view, later to be resolved by higher authority.

B. Stage #2: Convening of an Interagency Working Group by the Responsible Officer.

Immediately upon his designation, the responsible officer should convene an interagency working group representing all agencies and bureaus with a substantial interest

in US

in US policy and operations in the country to be studied. In the usual case, the working group would include at least the representatives of the Department of State, the Department of Defense, AID, CIA, USIA, Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget. AID would be represented by the appropriate regional bureau and the Program Coordination Staff. From Defense, ISA, the Joint Staff and service representatives would normally be invited to participate. In the case of CIA, both DD/I and DD/P would usually be represented. Each agency may determine, however, what representation it requires in any specific case. The need for advice of area specialists, as for example those in the Department of Labor, should be taken into account. (It is to be noted that at Stage 7, hereinafter defined, the White House staff will participate with the working group, unless members of the White House staff desire to participate at an earlier stage.) The Department of State would usually be represented by S/P, the geographical bureau concerned, INR and CU. The responsible officer will be expected to work closely with INR especially in the preparation of the draft of Part TWO of the National Policy Paper.

C. Stage #3: Request for Agency Contributions to a First Draft.

(a) Political Dynamics Study

In the usual case, the first contribution to be requested by the responsible officer will be a study of political dynamics by INR or by an outside scholar under contract arranged by INR.

(b) Other Contributions

The responsible officer can determine in consultation with the interagency working group what other contributions will be required. Existing and still current LASSs, Military Assistance Plans, NISSs, IDPs, USIA country plans, and CU country studies would, of course, be reviewed and serve as useful sources of information and analysis.

Some contributions

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

7

Some contributions will take the form of first drafts of particular sections of the national policy paper. Many contributions, however, will be background papers from which the responsible officer can draw the information and analysis needed in drafting relevant parts of the paper. It must be emphasized that a national policy paper is not a clip-and-paste job composed of drafts done in various parts of the government.

D. Stage #4: Preparation of a First Draft Representing Preliminary Views of Members of Working Group.

The first draft of a national policy paper should represent only the preliminary views of the members of the working group. It should be cleared informally with the agencies represented on the working group. The principal functions of the first draft are to identify the key points at issue and to provide a basis for productive and orderly discussions in the field. To this end, it is important that differences of opinion encountered within the working group be explicitly incorporated and sharply clarified in the body of the first draft, in the appropriate places.

The responsible officer or other members in the inter-agency working group may find it necessary to request specific contributions from the field in the early phases of work on the national policy paper. Care should be taken, however, not to burden the field with unnecessary or excessively detailed requests for information.

E. Stage #5: Field Visit: By Responsible Officer and Members of Working Group for Discussion of First Draft with Ambassador and Country Team.

After a first draft of the national policy paper has been completed it should, in the usual case, be taken to the field by the responsible officer and discussed in detail with

the ambassador

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

8

the ambassador and the other members of the country team. If possible, the responsible officer should be accompanied by those members of the interagency working group whose agencies are most vitally concerned, particularly members involved in a significant difference of opinion in the draft paper. After appropriate consultation with the field post concerned through the geographical bureau, the responsible officer will determine the minimum size of team needed for the field visit, given the nature of the issues involved. The draft, which at this stage has no formal clearance, should be thoroughly discussed within the working group in Washington prior to visiting the country and copies of the draft, including objectives and lines of action, should be forwarded to the Embassy concerned well in advance of discussions with the country team.

By intensive discussion of the first draft with field agencies, the working group can both remedy gaps in information and improve the analysis leading to formulation of an effective country strategy. Also field participation at an early stage of the work should make the finished paper both more practical and more easily understood by the officials who will have to carry out the approved strategy and courses of action.

The Department of Defense is responsible for arranging appropriate participation by the unified and specified commands in the preparation of national policy papers.

F. Stage #6: Preparation of Second Draft (Revision #1) on Basis of Discussions in Field - Circulation to Agencies for Comment.

After the first draft of the national policy paper has been revised on the basis of discussions in the field, the revised draft, which will include major differences of opinion which might have developed from these discussions, should be circulated to the responsible Washington agencies represented in the working group, if the draft deals with problems in their fields of responsibility. The responsible officer

should

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

should maintain close consultation with the Interdepartmental Psychological Political Working Group in the course of development of the paper.

Adequate time should be allowed both at this stage and at the later stage of formal clearance for thorough review and staffing of the paper within all of the agencies concerned.

- G. Stage #7: Preparation of Third Draft (Revision #2) on Basis of Comments Received from Agencies - Circulation for Formal Clearance.

It is at this stage that White House staff representation will, in the usual case, be included in the working group.

At this stage the responsible officer, in consultation with the working group, will prepare a further revision on the basis of the Washington agencies' comments, looking toward a draft which can be submitted for formal clearance. As appropriate, major problems that are surfaced in preparing a draft for formal clearance should be referred to the field for consideration by the country team. To the extent possible, questions raised in the Washington agencies' comments and reactions elicited from the field should be reconciled in the working group and further revisions made in the course of preparing a draft for formal clearance. The responsible officer must make a special effort to insure that real policy differences are not submerged through adoption of imprecise compromise language.

After the responsible officer is satisfied that the working group has exhausted all efforts to reconcile policy differences which may have been surfaced, and that the remaining differences are precisely and understandably presented, the policy paper at this stage will be submitted to all agencies for formal clearance. Experience has shown that only through the formal clearance process is it possible accurately and clearly to pinpoint major policy differences. The country team should be furnished a copy of the paper as it is circulated in Washington for review and resolution of outstanding differences.

Where the

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

10

Where the clearance process results in no requirement for resolution of major policy differences, the formally cleared policy paper will go immediately to the Regional Policy Committee or to an equivalent ad hoc group convened by the responsible regional Assistant Secretary of State for approval and forwarding to the Secretary of State as described in Stage #9 hereinafter.

It is to be noted that the Regional Policy Committee or equivalent interagency committee under an Assistant Secretary of State, will not receive the National Policy Paper for approval until after formal clearance has been obtained from the agencies of government concerned. Such interagency committees are not "reapproving" the paper. The action taken by these interagency committees on National Policy Papers is described in Stage #9.

IN FORWARDING NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS FOR FORMAL CLEARANCE TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDA WILL REQUEST FORMAL CLEARANCE ON PART ONE (U.S. Policy: objectives, strategy and courses of action) WITH EACH AGENCY OF GOVERNMENT TO BE THE JUDGE AS TO THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL WITHIN THE AGENCY AT WHICH CLEARANCE IS OBTAINED. REGARDLESS OF THE LEVEL CHOSEN, FORMAL CLEARANCE WILL BE CONSIDERED AS BINDING ON THE AGENCY CONCERNED. THE REMAINDER OF THE POLICY PAPER (PART TWO (Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy) WILL BE REVIEWED BY THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE OR AN EQUIVALENT AD HOC GROUP CONVENED BY THE RESPONSIBLE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE. PART TWO IS NOT SUBJECT TO FORMAL CLEARANCE.

Where the clearance process reveals major policy differences, Stage #8 will apply:

- H. Stage #8: Resolution of Major Policy Differences Surfaced in Course of Preparing Revisions #1 and #2 and in the Formal Clearance through Normal Channels Appropriate to Authority of Departments and Agencies.

Major policy differences between two or more agencies may be surfaced in the clearance process. The responsible

officer

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

officer will inform the appropriate Assistant Secretary of State, of such issues. These will be resolved, after lucid formulation, by normal (usually bilateral) appeal channels appropriate to the specific issue raised and the agencies involved. If necessary, referral of the issue (not the whole paper) will be made to the White House. Once major policy differences have been resolved at the appropriate level, those agencies not involved will be informed and the paper, now cleared, will move forward.

- I. Stage #9: Review and Approval of National Policy Paper by Regional Policy Committee or Equivalent Interagency Committee and Submission to Secretary of State for Signature - Distribution to all Agencies Concerned as a Binding, National Policy Document.

The National Policy Paper, Section ONE, which will have been formally cleared, will be submitted to the Regional Policy Committee or an equivalent group for review and approval of the paper in its totality before submission to the Secretary of State for review and signature. In the absence of the Secretary of State, the Acting Secretary of State has authority to perform the review and signing function.

The above clearance procedures are designed to insure that the time of Regional Policy Committees or equivalent groups are not taken up with protracted debate and editing. To the extent humanly and bureaucratically possible, a National Policy Paper at the time of its receipt by such committees will require a minimum of additional review. Specifically, the Regional Policy Committee or equivalent inter-agency group will be called upon to:

- a) Review the paper in its entirety.
- b) Approve Part TWO (Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy) of the paper which is not subject to formal clearance.
- c) Determine that all clearances previously given remain valid.
- d) Perform

d) Perform such "tidying up" as may be necessary as a result of last minute changes suggested by members of the committee.

e) Satisfy itself that the National Policy Paper is in order and readiness for submission to the Secretary of State for review and signature.

f) As a committee approve the paper in its entirety for submission to the Secretary of State.

g) Transmit the approved paper to the Secretary of State.

6. Distribution

The responsible officer will arrange for distribution of the National Policy Paper, signed by the Secretary of State, to all agencies concerned, as a binding national policy document.

7. Relationship between National Policy Papers and Other Country Papers and Planning Activities.

The National Policy Papers will constitute comprehensive, authoritative and unifying statements of U.S. policy and operational strategy towards particular countries. Insofar as statements of policy and strategy are included in other country documents (IDPs, LASSs, MAP Five Year Plans, USIA Country Plans, CU Country Studied, AID Country Assistance Strategy Statements, etc.) they will be superseded by National Policy Papers, on the latter's approval. The operating programs contained in such other country plans and studies should subsequently flow from and be consistent with the strategies and the pertinent courses of action set forth in the National Policy Papers, and as they may be modified under the procedures set out in paragraph 8, below.

8. Execution

Execution of the policies set forth in national policy papers is the responsibility of the various executive agencies under the guidance of the Secretary of State. All other agency planning and programming documents, and directives to the field, will proceed from and be consistent with the Strategy and Courses of Action presented in the national policy papers. Intensive working level consultation will be maintained through normal interdepartmental channels under the guidance of the Assistant Secretary of State for the geographical region concerned. The latter will guide the execution of this program and see that necessary adjustments are made consistent with the outlined Strategy and

Objectives

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

13

Objectives as new events and situations unfold.

The Assistant Secretary of State for the region concerned will provide that appropriate reports, both from the Country Team and a designated coordinating officer in Washington, are filed with the Regional Policy Committee (or equivalent interagency arrangement) on the course of execution of national policy.

A substantial change in the situation may require revision of the Strategy or Major Courses of Action. Any interested agency or the Ambassador may initiate at the appropriate level discussion designed to bring about such substantial revision. The need for such substantial change may then be brought to the attention of the appropriate Assistant Secretary of State as chairman of a regional policy committee or other interagency group.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

- 14 -

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS
ANNOTATED STANDARD OUTLINE

NOTE: The following outline is distributed for the use of interagency working groups convened to prepare national policy papers. This outline should be viewed as a guide and not as a strait-jacket. Changes in subheadings can and should be made to facilitate adequate treatment of the particular problems of the country being studied. Also, the list of annexes required to supplement Parts One and Two will inevitably vary from country to country and are designed to be suggestive. With rare exceptions, however, the broad framework set forth in the major chapter headings should be used.

PART ONE
U. S. POLICY

I. Introduction

A. Profile of Country

In a few pages, the profile provides the minimum factual basis for understanding the following three sub-sections of Chapter I. In some instances, an historical approach will be appropriate. In other cases, a brief description of current social, economic and political conditions and trends will be most useful. In still other cases, a combination of historical and functional approaches might be best.

B. Strategic Importance of Country

Include a brief statement on the strategic importance of the country to the U.S. Include economic, military and psychological aspects.

C. U.S. Interests

Exempted from automatic decontrol
by _____

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

C. U.S. Interests and Objectives

This subsection consists of a summary of U.S. interests followed by an enumeration of U.S. objectives. More detailed exposition of U.S. interests should, if required, be taken care of in annexes. Objectives should be stated in terms of what we want--not in terms of how we get what we want, which is the subject of later chapters on strategy and courses of action.

D. Relations of Country with U.S.

This subsection sketches briefly the current state of relations, including major commitments.

E. Key Issues

A brief, unvarnished statement of the key issues and problems faced by the U.S. in the country under study serves both to set the stage for the analysis of political, economic, social and security factors in PART TWO and to indicate the obstacles that must be surmounted by the U.S. strategy to be formulated in Chapter II below. Preparing a preliminary statement of the key issues might well be the first step taken by the working group.

F. Assumptions

Only the minimum necessary assumptions should be made. Generally speaking, assumptions should deal with developments outside the country under consideration--not, of course, including U.S. courses of action.

II. U.S. Strategy for the Next Two to Five Years

Sections B, C, D and E of this chapter should be concise, straightforward statements of what we propose to do in the various fields of action. The stage for these statements is set by Section A, which takes up briefly what we want to see happen, how much leverage we have on the course of events, a general description of our strategy and the principal contingencies that might require a change in that strategy. The various aspects of the total strategy should be mutually consistent. Key interrelationships (as, for example, between political and economic assistance strategies)

should be

should be explicitly noted.

A. General

1. Desired course of country's political, social, military, and economic evolution.
2. Dimensions of U.S. influence.
3. General description of U.S. strategy.
4. Principal contingencies.

B. U.S. Political Strategy

C. U.S. Economic Strategy

1. Economic assistance strategy.
2. Trade and investment policies.

D. Future U.S. Role in Internal Defense

E. Future U.S. Role in External Defense

III. Courses of Action

In the light of the objectives and strategy developed above, this chapter presents specific new courses of action required to give meaning to the strategy described in the preceding chapter. These courses of action are neither so detailed as to compromise the executive responsibilities of the operating agencies, nor so vague as to be without operational meaning. The action agency, or agencies, should be noted after each course of action.

A. Political

B. Economic

C. Security (including military)

D. Information, Culture and Education

E. Other

PART TWO
FACTORS BEARING ON
U. S. POLICY

I. Political Forces

This chapter will usually be based principally on a political dynamics study prepared by the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR).

A. The Government and Its Basic Policies

A brief description of the structure of the government and of its basic policies. Analysis of most of those policies should be reserved for Chapters II, III and IV below.

B. Instruments for Exercising Power

Brief descriptions of the principal institutions through which the rulers actually govern the country. Subheadings might include:

1. The ruling party.
2. The bureaucracy.
3. Mass organizations.
4. Public information media.
5. Police and security organizations.
6. The military.

C. Politically Significant Groups

Identification of politically significant groups based upon a concise analysis of the structure of the society. Groups discussed might include labor, business, the professions, farmers, landlords, students, racial minorities.

Some

Some duplication of groups treated in I is probably unavoidable (e.g., military, police, bureaucracy). In the case of at least the major groups, their present and prospective political importance, interests and attitude should be noted, with special reference to those groups, or to elements within them, which may be most susceptible to or resistant to influence.

D. The Political Process

How major decisions are actually made and carried out (in contrast to the formal structure described in I). Significant differences in the political process in different fields of policy should be noted.

E. International Relations

A survey of major features of the country's foreign policy and the state of its relations with other countries. Fuller treatment of international economic relations and external security questions should be left to Chapters II and IV, respectively.

F. Special Problems (examples listed)

1. Regional differences.
2. Racial and communal differences.
3. Leadership succession.

II. Economic and Social Forces

If an AID Long-Range Assistance Strategy Statement (LAS) is prepared in conjunction with work on a national policy paper, this chapter plus sections A.1 and C.1. of Chapter II in PART ONE would contain the essence of the LAS. The more detailed analysis and documentation called for in an LAS, along with certain more detailed programmatic material, may be included in an annex. The instructions issued by AID for preparation of the LAS provide particularly useful guidance for sections B, C and D of this chapter.

A. Major

A. Major Economic and Social Trends and Problems

Major subheadings might include:

1. Demographic trends.
2. Trends in level, composition and distribution of the gross national product.
3. Trends and problems in major economic sectors (Agriculture, manufacturing, mining, services, transportation and communications, etc.).
4. Labor and employment trends and problems.
5. Agrarian problems (land tenure, modernization, farm credit, etc.).
6. Problems of urbanization.
7. State of the national market.
8. Education and public services.
9. Fiscal, monetary and exchange policy.
10. Depressed classes, ethnic groups and geographical regions.
11. International economic relations.

B. Appraisal of Country's Efforts Toward Self-help and Social Progress

Drawing on the descriptive material presented in the preceding section, indicate the areas in which efforts toward self-help and social progress have been either notably deficient or notably successful. Insofar as available information justifies, estimate the probable extent and success of such efforts in the future.

C. Appraisal of Country's Development Program and Policies

Due account should be taken in this section of both

major

major economic programs and policies and of those non-economic programs and policies which significantly affect the course of economic development.

D. Analysis of Foreign Resource Needs

In addition to arriving at an estimate of total foreign resource needs, this section should indicate what portion of those needs might be satisfied from non-U.S. sources.

III. Internal Defense

This chapter presents the essential analytic and policy elements bearing on national defense policy.

General guidance for drafting this chapter is provided in the instructions on the preparation of IDPs which are issued by the State Department in collaboration with other interested government agencies.

A. The Present Character of the Threat

A description of the already visible threat of overthrow of the existing political order through subversion, insurrection, or a combination of the two.

B. Vulnerabilities

Vulnerabilities treated in this section should relate to the specific threat described above--not the less immediate and more diffuse weaknesses in the social and political fabric that should be dealt with in other chapters.

C. Appraisal of Country's Assets, Policies and Programs

This appraisal should be related to the specific threat described above; it should not be a general commentary on the merits and demerits of the society and its government.

D. Present Role of U.S. In Internal Defense

Again, only those U.S. activities should be described which bear on the specific subversive threat.

IV. External

IV. External Defense

The subheadings set forth below are largely self-explanatory. Sections D and E will of course not be relevant in some country policy papers. In some cases, E might be dropped as a separate section. The nuclear factor could then be treated in A as an aspect of the threat.

A. The Threat

Note any difference between the country's view of the threat and that of the U.S.

B. Missions and Tasks of Country's Armed Forces

Note any significant differences between the views of the U.S. and those of local officials on the missions and tasks of the country's armed forces.

C. Country's Military Capabilities

Military capabilities should be appraised in terms of the country's ability to create and maintain armed forces which can perform the missions and tasks described in the previous section.

D. Regional Security Arrangements

E. The Nuclear Factor

When relevant, both the nuclear threat and the country's attitude toward acquiring nuclear weapons should be discussed.

F. Present Role of U.S. in External Defense

When relevant, treat both:

1. Plans and commitments to deploy U.S. forces.
2. Military assistance

Annexes

The annexes required to supplement Parts One and Two will, of course, vary from case to case. Those listed below are designed to be suggestive:

A. U.S. Commitments

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

B. Detailed

Annexes (Continued)

- B. Detailed Presentation of U.S. Assistance Strategy
- C. Supplemental Material on Internal Defense
- D. Special U.S. Programs
- E. Special Contingency Plans

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
POLICY PLANNING COUNCIL

December 2, 1963

MEMORANDUM TO: Mr. McGeorge Bundy - White House

SUBJECT: NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS (Procedures and Annotated Standard Outline)

Under date of November 19, 1963, the Secretary of State approved the recommendation of the Planning Group that he review and formally sign National Policy Papers following their approval by the appropriate interdepartmental committee under the Chairmanship of an Assistant Secretary of State.

In accordance with the recommendation of the Planning Group, the name National Policy Papers has been adopted in lieu of the previous designations: National Strategy Papers or Strategic Country Studies.

An ad hoc inter-agency working group has been meeting for several weeks in drawing up a procedures paper and a standard outline designed to guide the preparation, review and clearance of National Policy Papers. The attached procedures memorandum and annotated standard outline which resulted from the work of this group are now circulated for formal concurrence. Your reply by December 12, 1963, will be greatly appreciated.

Please address your replies to John W. Ford, Executive Secretary of the Council, Room 7261, Department of State, who is available for any questions or explanations (extension 3445 and 5635).

W. W. Rostow

Attachments:

1. Procedures Memorandum
2. Annotated Standard Outline
3. Status Report

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
State Dept. Guidelines
By 4, NARA, Date 12-3-99

11a

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
POLICY PLANNING COUNCIL

NOVEMBER 30, 1963

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS
(PROCEDURES AND ANNOTATED STANDARD OUTLINE)

GROUP 4
Downgraded at 3-year intervals;
Declassified after 12 years.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED
Authority E. O. 11652 SEC. 5(A) and (D)
By ip, NARS, Date 1-31-80

NATIONAL STRATEGY PAPERS

Table of Contents

A. PROCEDURES

1. <u>Purpose and Status of Program</u>	Page 1
2. <u>Content of National Policy Papers</u>	Page 1
3. <u>Initiation and Priorities</u>	Page 3
4. <u>The Nine Stages in the Development of a National Policy Paper</u>	Page 3
5. <u>Explanation of Nine Stages (Including Clearance Procedures)</u>	Page 4
6. <u>Distribution</u>	Page 10
7. <u>Relation Between National Policy Papers and Other Country Planning Activity</u>	Page 10
8. <u>Review and Up-dating</u>	Page 11
9. <u>Execution</u>	Page 12

B. ANNOTATED STANDARD OUTLINE

PART ONE - U.S. Policy	Page 13
PART TWO - Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy	Page 16

C. ATTACHMENT: Status Report on 18 Countries

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

November 30, 1963

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS

A. PROCEDURES

1. Purpose and Status of Program

National policy papers (formerly known as strategic studies) are comprehensive and authoritative statements of U.S. policy toward each country included in the program. The Secretary of State has assigned general responsibility for the program to the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council.

At present, the program is limited to the underdeveloped areas of the free world. National policy papers have been initiated or scheduled on 18 countries. (See attached status report.)

2. Content of National Policy Papers

Each national policy paper presents an analysis of the social, political, economic and military forces at work in the country in question and from that analysis derives a country strategy for the U.S. for the next two to five years. Initial specific courses of action for carrying out the country strategy are also set forth where they differ from current action programs. (See the attached annotated standard outline for a more detailed description of a national policy paper.)

In order to simplify clearance procedures and facilitate use by operating officials, the body of a national policy paper should be no longer than is absolutely necessary. Additional detail can be provided in annexes.

The Secretary

GROUP 4
Downgraded at 3-year intervals;
declassified after 12 years

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED

Authority E. O. 11652 SEC. 5(A) and (D)

By iq, NARS, Date 1-31-80

The Secretary of State, or in his absence the Acting Secretary of State, will review and formally sign National Policy Papers following their approval in toto by the appropriate interdepartmental committee under the Chairmanship of an Assistant Secretary of State. The formal sign-off will be reflected in the frontispiece of each National Policy Paper with the following statement:

"PART ONE (U.S. Policy: objectives, strategy and courses of action) of this paper is a comprehensive and authoritative statement of national policy toward _____. All agencies with major responsibilities affecting our relations with _____ participated in drafting the paper and concur in the strategy and courses of action which it sets forth. The Country Team in _____ was consulted in the course of the paper's preparation and its views have been taken into account.

"Execution of the policy set forth in this paper is the responsibility of the various operating agencies under the leadership of the Secretary of State, and in the field, under the leadership of the Ambassador. Agency programs and directives to the field will proceed from and be consistent with the strategy and courses of action stated in the paper. Intensive working level consultation will be maintained through normal interdepartmental channels to ensure that this program is executed and that minor adjustments are made, consistent with the outlined strategy, as events and new situations unfold.

"A substantial change in the situation may require revision of the strategy or in major courses of action. The need for such substantial changes should be brought to the attention of the _____ Policy Committee.* Any interested agency may initiate

discussion

*Where no Policy Committee, such as the African Policy Committee or the Latin American Policy Committee, exists, need for substantial changes should be brought to the attention of the Assistant Secretary of State for the region concerned.

discussion designed to bring about such substantial revision.

/s/ Secretary of State"

3. Initiation and Priorities

Any interested agency may appropriately propose initiation of a national policy paper. Action on such a proposal would be taken by the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council after consultation with the appropriate regional Assistant Secretary of State and the agencies principally concerned. Priority in the development of national policy papers would depend upon the intensity of our political, economic and security interests in the various countries covered by the program. First attention would usually be given to countries in which we expect to make major expenditures or where major security problems exist or may arise.

4. The Stages in the Development of a National Policy Paper

The development of a national policy paper will take place in specifically defined stages once the need for such paper on a particular country has been clearly established and its priority determined as set forth in paragraph #3 above. These stages, which are more fully described hereinafter, will be as follows:

Stage #1: Designation of a Senior Officer to Assume Responsibility for Paper: The Responsible Officer.

Stage #2: Convening of an Interagency Working Group by the Responsible Officer.

Stage #3: Request for Agency Contributions to a First Draft.

Stage #4: Preparation of a First Draft Representing Preliminary Views of Members of Working Group.

Stage #5

- Stage #5: Field Visit: By Responsible Officer and Members of Working Group for Discussion of First Draft with Ambassador and Country Team.
- Stage #6: Preparation of Second Draft (Revision #1) on Basis of Discussions in Field - Circulation to Agencies for Comment.
- Stage #7: Preparation of Third Draft (Revision #2) on Basis of Comments Received from Agencies - Circulation for Formal Clearance.
- Stage #8: Resolution of Major Policy Differences Surfaced in Course of Preparing Revisions #1 and #2 through normal channels appropriate to Authority of Departments and Agencies.
- Stage #9: Approval of National Policy Paper in toto by Regional Policy Committee or Equivalent Group and Submission to Secretary of State for Signature. Distribution to all Agencies Concerned as a Binding, National Policy Document.

5. Explanation of Stages

- A. Stage #1: Designation of a Senior Officer to Assume Responsibility for Paper: The Responsible Officer.

When a decision has been made to initiate a new national policy paper, the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, in consultation with the responsible geographical bureau and other interested agencies, will designate a senior officer to assume responsibility for the paper. Responsible officers designated thus far in the program have included members of the Policy Planning Council, other officers of the State Department or of other government agencies possessing special knowledge and experience in the country to be studied, and qualified outside consultants.

Working

Working under the general direction of the Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, the responsible officer chairs the interagency working group, coordinates the contributions of the various agencies concerned, and assumes a major portion of the task of drafting the national policy paper itself. He is expected to avoid the perils of "drafting by committee" and to provide effective leadership to the interagency working group in arriving at considered judgments concerning the key issues involved.

B. Stage #2: Convening of an Interagency Working Group by the Responsible Officer.

Immediately upon his designation, the responsible officer should convene an interagency working group representing all agencies with a substantial interest in US policy and operations in the country to be studied. In the usual case, the working group would include at least the representatives of the Department of State, the Department of Defense, AID, CIA, USIA, and the Bureau of the Budget. AID would be represented by the appropriate regional bureau and the Program Coordination Staff. From Defense, both ISA and the Joint Staff would be invited to participate. In the case of CIA, both DD/I and DD/P would usually be represented. The Department of State would usually be represented by S/P, the geographical bureau concerned, INR, and CU.

C. Stage #3: Request for Agency Contributions to a First Draft.

(a) Political Dynamics Study

In the usual case, the first contribution to be requested by the responsible officer will be a study of political dynamics by INR or by an outside scholar under contract arranged by INR.

(b) Other Contributions

The responsible officer can determine in consultation with the interagency working group what other contributions will

be required.

be required. Existing and still current LASs, IDPs, USIA country plans, and CU country studies would, of course, serve as useful sources of information and analysis.

Some contributions will take the form of first drafts of particular sections of the national policy paper. Many contributions, however, will be background papers from which the responsible officer can draw the information and analysis needed in drafting relevant parts of the paper. It must be emphasized that a national policy paper is not a clip-and-paste job composed of drafts done in various parts of the government.

D. Stage #4: Preparation of a First Draft Representing Preliminary Views of Members of Working Group.

The first draft of a national policy paper should represent only the preliminary views of the members of the working group. It should not be cleared formally with the agencies represented on the working group. The principal functions of the first draft are to identify the key points at issue and to provide a basis for productive and orderly discussions in the field. To this end, it is important that differences of opinion encountered within the working group be explicitly noted in the first draft.

The responsible officer or other members in the interagency working group may find it necessary to request specific contributions from the field in the early phases of work on the national policy paper. Care should be taken, however, not to burden the field with unnecessary or excessively detailed requests for information.

E. Stage #5: Field Visit: By Responsible Officer and Members of Working Group for Discussion of First Draft with Ambassador and Country Team.

After a first draft of the national policy paper has been completed it should, in the usual case, be taken to the field by the responsible officer and discussed in detail with the ambassador

and the

and the other members of the country team. If possible, the responsible officer should be accompanied by those members of the interagency working group whose agencies are most vitally concerned with the particular paper.

By working with field agencies on a revision of the first draft, the working group can both remedy gaps in information and improve the analysis leading to formulation of an effective country strategy. Also, field participation at an early stage of the work should make the finished paper both more practical and more easily understood by the officials who will have to carry out the approved strategy and courses of action.

The Department of Defense is responsible for arranging appropriate participation by the unified and specified commands in the preparation of national policy papers.

- F. Stage #6: Preparation of Second Draft (Revision #1) on Basis of Discussions in Field - Circulation to Agencies for Comment.

After the first draft of the national policy paper has been revised on the basis of discussions in the field, the revised draft should be circulated to the responsible Washington agencies for comment. Agencies commenting should include agencies not represented in the working group, if the draft deals with problems in their fields of responsibility. Comments should also be solicited from the Interdepartmental Psychological Political Working Group.

Adequate time should be allowed both at this stage and at the later stage of formal clearance for thorough review and staffing of the paper within all of the agencies concerned. Handling of annexes would depend upon their content and need not be the same as that of the body of the paper.

- G. Stage #7: Preparation of Third Draft (Revision #2) on Basis of Comments Received from Agencies - Circulation for Formal Clearance.

At this stage the Working Group will prepare a further revision on the basis of the Washington agencies' comments,

looking

looking toward a draft which can be submitted for formal clearance. As appropriate, major problems are surfaced in preparing a draft for formal clearance they should be referred to the field for consideration by the country team. To the extent possible, questions raised in the Washington agencies' comments and reactions elicited from the field should be reconciled in the working group and further revisions made in the course of preparing a draft for formal clearance. A special effort must be made, however, not to submerge real policy differences through adoption of imprecise compromise language.

After the Working Group is satisfied that it has exhausted all efforts to reconcile policy differences which may have been surfaced, the policy paper at this stage will be submitted to all agencies for formal clearance. Experience has shown that only through the formal clearance process is it possible accurately and clearly to pinpoint major policy differences. The country team should be furnished a copy of the paper as it is circulated in Washington for clearance.

Where the clearance process results in no requirement for resolution of major policy differences, the formally cleared policy paper will go immediately to the Regional Policy Committee or to an equivalent ad hoc group convened by the responsible regional Assistant Secretary of State for approval and on-forwarding to the Secretary of State as described in Stage #9 hereinafter.

IN FORWARDING NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS FOR FORMAL CLEARANCE, TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDA WILL REQUEST FORMAL CLEARANCE ON PART ONE (U.S. Policy: objectives, strategy and courses of action) WITH EACH AGENCY OF GOVERNMENT TO BE THE JUDGE AS TO THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL WITHIN THE AGENCY AT WHICH CLEARANCE IS OBTAINED. REGARDLESS OF THE LEVEL CHOSEN, FORMAL CLEARANCE WILL BE CONSIDERED AS BINDING ON THE AGENCY CONCERNED. THE REMAINDER OF THE POLICY PAPER (PART TWO (Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy) WILL BE REVIEWED AND CLEARED BY THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE OR AN EQUIVALENT AD HOC GROUP CONVENED BY THE RESPONSIBLE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

Where the

Where the clearance process reveals major policy differences, Stage #8 will apply:

- H. Stage #8: Resolution of Major Policy Differences Surfaced in Course of Preparing Revisions #1 and #2 and in the Formal Clearance through Normal Channels Appropriate to Authority of Departments and Agencies.

Major policy differences between two or more agencies may be surfaced in the clearance process. The Responsible Officer will inform the appropriate Assistant Secretary of State, of such issues. These will be resolved, after lucid formulation, by normal (usually bilateral) appeal channels appropriate to the specific issue raised and the agencies involved. If necessary, referral of the issue will be made to the White House. Once major policy differences have been resolved at the appropriate level, those agencies not involved will be informed and the paper, now cleared, will move forward.

- I. Stage #9: Formal Approval in toto of National Policy Paper by Regional Policy Committee or Equivalent ad hoc Group Convened by Responsible Regional Assistant Secretary of State - Submission to Secretary of State for Signature - Distribution to all Agencies Concerned as a Binding, National Policy Document.

The formally cleared National Policy Paper will be submitted to the Regional Policy Committee or an equivalent group for approval of the paper in toto before submission to the Secretary of State for review and signature. In the absence of the Secretary of State the Acting Secretary of State has authority to perform the review and signing function.

Specifically, the Regional Policy Committee or an equivalent group will be called upon to:

- a) Review PART ONE (U.S. Policy: objectives, strategy and courses of action), which will have been

formally

formally cleared with all agencies of Government concerned.

- b) Review and clear PART TWO (Factors Bearing on U.S. Policy).
- c) Approve the National Policy Paper in toto.
(or advise the Responsible Officer of reasons why the Committee is not able to give its approval)
- d) Transmit the approved National Policy Paper to the Secretary for review and signature.

6. Distribution:

The Responsible Officer will arrange for distribution of the National Policy Paper signed by the Secretary of State, to all agencies concerned, as a binding, national policy document.

7. Relation Between National Policy Papers and Other Country Planning Activity

(a) Long-range Assistance Strategy Statements

With rare exceptions, LASs will in the future be prepared only in conjunction with national policy papers. The national policy paper can then provide the broader framework required for formulation of an assistance strategy and the more general analytical and descriptive portions of the LAS can be incorporated in the body of the national policy paper. The full LAS, containing more detailed analysis and documentation along with detailed programmatic material, can become an annex to the national policy paper.

If a LAS already exists, it should be drawn upon in preparing a national policy paper on the same country. If the national policy paper develops a strategy and courses of action at variance with the existing LAS, the LAS should be appropriately revised. If possible, the revision should integrate the LAS into the national policy paper in the manner described above.

A somewhat

A somewhat similar problem arises if an LAS is undertaken after a national policy paper has been completed. In that case, the national policy would provide the general framework for development of an assistance strategy. Revisions in the national policy paper might, however, be required on the basis of the completed LAS. Again, the objective should be to integrate the two documents in the manner described above.

(b) Internal Defense Plans

Observations made above concerning the LAS are also generally applicable to the question of relations between national policy papers and internal defense plans. The objective is to make the IDP a chapter in the national policy paper.

The Special Group (CI) would continue to review IDPs which have been incorporated into national policy papers.

(c) Other Country Plans and Studies

Other country plans and studies (MAP Five Year Plans, USIA Country Plans, CU Country Studies, AID Country Assistance Strategy Statements, etc.) pose no serious problems. These documents should be consistent with the country strategies and the pertinent courses of action set forth in the national policy papers. They should also proceed from and not duplicate the analytical sections of the national policy papers.

8. Review and Up-dating

Periodic review and up-dating of completed national policy papers will be the responsibility of the appropriate regional Assistant Secretaries of State, working in collaboration with the other agencies concerned. The Chairman of the Policy Planning Council will consult with the regional Assistant Secretaries of State on the establishment of review schedules. In most cases, annual review will probably be appropriate, although more frequent review may in some cases be forced by events.

9. Execution

CONFIDENTIAL

12

9. Execution

Execution of the policies set forth in national policy papers is the responsibility of the various operating agencies under the leadership of the Secretary of State. Agency programs and directives to the field should proceed from and be consistent with the strategies and courses of action presented in the national policy papers.

CONFIDENTIAL

November 30, 1963

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

-13-

NATIONAL POLICY PAPERS

ANNOTATED STANDARD OUTLINE

NOTE: The following outline is distributed for the use of interagency working groups convened to prepare national policy papers. This outline should be viewed as a guide and not as a strait-jacket. Changes in subheadings can and should be made to facilitate adequate treatment of the particular problems of the country being studied. Also, the list of annexes will inevitably vary from country to country. With rare exceptions, however, the broad framework set forth in the major chapter headings should be used.

PART ONE

U.S. POLICY

I. Introduction

A. Profile of Country

In a few pages, the profile provides the minimum factual basis for understanding the following three sub-sections of Chapter I. In some instances, an historical approach will be appropriate. In other cases, a brief description of current social, economic and political conditions and trends will be most useful. In still other cases, a combination of historical and functional approaches might be best.

B. U.S. Interests and Objectives

This subsection consists of a summary of U.S. interests followed by an enumeration of U.S. objectives. More detailed exposition of U.S. interests should, if required, be taken care of in annexes. Objectives should be stated in terms of

what

Exempted from automatic decontrol
by _____

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

what we want--not in terms of how we get what we want, which is the subject of later chapters on strategy and courses of action.

C. Relations of Country with U.S.

This subsection sketches briefly the current state of relations, calling attention to any major problems. U.S. commitments can be dealt with more fully in an annex.

D. Key Issues

A brief, unvarnished statement of the key issues faced by the U.S. in the country under study serves both to set the stage for the analysis of political, economic, social and security factors in PART TWO and to indicate the obstacles that must be surmounted by the U.S. strategy to be formulated in Chapter II below. Preparing a preliminary statement of the key issues might well be the first step taken by the working group.

E. Assumptions

Only the minimum necessary assumptions should be made. Generally speaking, assumptions should deal with developments outside the country under consideration--not, of course, including U.S. courses of action.

II. U.S. Strategy for the Next Two to Five Years

Sections B, C, D and E of this chapter should be concise, straightforward statements of what we propose to do in the various fields of action. The stage for these statements is set by section A, which takes up briefly what we want to see happen, how much leverage we have on the course of events, a general description of our strategy and the principal contingencies that might require a change in that strategy. The various aspects of the total strategy should be mutually consistent. Key interrelationships (as, for example, between political and economic assistance strategies) should be explicitly noted.

A. General

A. General

1. Desired course of country's political, social and economic evolution.
2. Dimensions of U.S. influence.
3. General description of U.S. strategy.
4. Principal contingencies.

B. U.S. Political Strategy

C. U.S. Economic Strategy

1. Economic assistance strategy.
2. Trade and investment policies.

D. Future U.S. Role in Internal Defense

E. Future U.S. Role in External Defense

III. Courses of Action

This chapter presents the specific courses of action to be followed in carrying out the strategy described in the preceding chapter. The action agency, or agencies, should be noted after each course of action.

A. Political

B. Economic

C. Security

D. Information, Culture and Education

E. Other

PART TWO

PART TWO
FACTORS BEARING ON
U. S. POLICY

I. Political Forces

This chapter will usually be based principally on a political dynamics study prepared by the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR).

A. The Government and Its Basic Policies

A brief description of the formal structure of the government and of its basic policies. Analysis of most of those policies should be reserved for Chapters II, III and IV below.

B. Instruments for Exercising Power

Brief descriptions of the principal institutions through which the rulers govern the country. Subheadings might include:

1. The ruling party.
2. The bureaucracy.
3. Mass organizations.
4. Public information media.
5. Police and security organizations.
6. The military.

C. Politically Significant Groups

Identification of politically significant groups based upon a concise analysis of the structure of the society. Groups discussed might include labor, business, the professions, farmers, landlords, students, racial minorities.

Some

Some duplication of groups treated in I is probably unavoidable (e.g., military, police, bureaucracy). In the case of at least the major groups, their present and prospective political importance, interests and attitude should be noted.

D. The Political Process

How major decisions are actually made and carried out (in contrast to the formal structure described in I). Significant differences in the political process in different fields of policy should be noted.

E. International Relations

A survey of major features of the country's foreign policy and the state of its relations with other countries. Fuller treatment of international economic relations and external security questions should be left to Chapters II and IV, respectively.

F. Special Problems (examples listed)

1. Regional differences.
2. Racial and communal differences.
3. Leadership succession.

II. Economic and Social Forces

If an AID Long-Range Assistance Strategy Statement (LAS) is prepared in conjunction with work on a national policy paper, this chapter plus sections A.1. and C.1. of Chapter II in PART ONE would contain the essence of the LAS. The more detailed analysis and documentation called for in an LAS, along with certain more detailed programmatic material, would be included in an annex. The instructions issued by AID for preparation of the LAS provide particularly useful guidance for sections B, C and D of this chapter.

A. Major

A. Major Economic and Social Trends and Problems

Major subheadings might include:

1. Demographic trends.
2. Trends in level, composition and distribution of the gross national product.
3. Trends and problems in major economic sectors (Agriculture, manufacturing, mining, services, transportation and communications, etc.).
4. Labor and employment trends and problems.
5. Agrarian problems (land tenure, modernization, farm credit, etc.).
6. Problems of urbanization.
7. State of the national market.
8. Education and public services.
9. Public finance and credit policy.
10. Depressed classes, ethnic groups and geographical regions.
11. International economic relations.

B. Appraisal of Country's Efforts Toward Self-help and Social Progress

Drawing on the descriptive material presented in the preceding section, indicate the areas in which efforts toward self-help and social progress have been either notably deficient or notably successful. Insofar as available information justifies, estimate the probable extent and success of such efforts in the future.

C. Appraisal

C. Appraisal of Country's Development Program and Policies

Due account should be taken in this section of both major economic programs and policies and of those non-economic programs and policies which significantly affect the course of economic development.

D. Analysis of Foreign Resource Needs

In addition to arriving at an estimate of total foreign resource needs, this section should indicate what portion of those needs might be satisfied from non-U.S. sources.

III. Internal Defense

This chapter presents the essential elements of the Internal Defense Plan (IDP).

If necessary, supplemental material on internal defense can be included in an annex. General guidance for drafting this chapter is provided in the instructions on the preparation of IDPs which are issued by the State Department in Collaboration with other interested government agencies.

A. The Present Character of the Threat

A description of the already visible threat of overthrow of the existing political order through subversion, insurrection, or a combination of the two.

B. Vulnerabilities

Vulnerabilities treated in this section should relate to the specific threat described above--not the less immediate and more diffuse weaknesses in the social and political fabric that should be dealt with in other chapters.

C. Appraisal

C. Appraisal of Country's Assets, Policies and Programs

This appraisal should be related to the specific threat described above; it should not be a general commentary on the merits and demerits of the society and its government.

D. Present Role of U.S. in Internal Defense

Again, only those U.S. activities should be described which bear on the specific threat.

IV. External Defense

The subheadings set forth below are largely self-explanatory. Sections D and E will of course not be relevant in some country studies. In some cases, E might be dropped as a separate section. The nuclear factor could then be treated in A as an aspect of the threat.

A. The Threat

Note any difference between the country's view of the threat and that of the U.S.

B. Missions and Tasks of Country's Armed Forces

Note any significant differences between the views of the U.S. and those of local officials on the missions and tasks of the country's armed forces.

C. Country's Military Capabilities

Military capabilities should be appraised in terms of the country's ability to create and maintain armed forces which can perform the missions and tasks described in the previous section.

D. Regional Security Arrangements

E. The Nuclear

E. The Nuclear Factor

When relevant, both the nuclear threat and the country's attitude toward acquiring nuclear weapons should be discussed.

F. Present Role of U.S. in External Defense

When relevant, treat both:

1. Plans and commitments to deploy U.S. forces.
2. Military assistance.

Annexes

The annexes will, of course, vary from case to case. Those listed below are ones that may often be required.

- A. U.S. Commitments
- B. Appraisal of Country's Strategic Importance
- C. Detailed Presentation of U.S. Assistance Strategy
- D. Supplemental Material on Internal Defense
- E. Special U.S. Programs

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
POLICY PLANNING COUNCIL

November 1, 1963

Status of Country Planning Activities

NOTE: The present report summarizes the status of three country planning activities: national strategy papers (formerly known as strategic studies), AID long-range assistance strategy statements (LASs), and Internal defense plans (IDPs). Target dates shown for national strategy papers are estimated times of final interagency clearance of completed papers. The status of INR's political dynamics studies is also noted.

AFRICA

Ethiopia

National Strategy Paper: Draft to be submitted to Africa Policy Committee for final review and clearance as soon as working group has made revisions required by agency and field comments. Target date: November 1963. Responsible officer: Mr. William R. Duggan.

LAS: Not Scheduled

IDP: Not Scheduled.

Ghana

National Strategy Paper: Intermediate draft being revised. Final draft should be completed and circulated for agency comments about November 10. Target date: December 1963. Responsible officer: Mr. William R. Duggan

LAS: Not Scheduled.

IDP: Not Scheduled.

Political Dynamics Study: Final draft due in November.

Liberia

- DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 3.5
State Dept. Guidelines

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

By NY, NARA, Date 12-3-99

Liberia

National Strategy Paper: Work to begin early next year. Target date: Not set. Responsible officer: Mr. William R. Duggan.

IAS: Work will probably begin early next year in coordination with work on the National Strategy Paper.

IDP: Not Scheduled.

Political Dynamics Study: Work on first draft begun.

Nigeria

National Strategy Paper: Intermediate draft being revised. Final draft may be completed and circulated for agency comments about November 25. Target date: January 1964. Responsible officer: Mr. William R. Duggan.

IAS: Under consideration, possibly for late spring of 1964.

IDP: Voluntary plan submitted by country team.

South Africa

National Strategy Paper: Intermediate draft completed and circulated for agency comments on October 29. Target date: February 1964. Responsible officer: Mr. William R. Duggan.

IAS: Not Scheduled.

IDP: Voluntary plan submitted by country team.

Political Dynamics Study: Final draft due in early November.

FAR EAST

Indonesia

National Strategy Paper: An interagency working group will

will probably be formed this month. Target date: Winter 1964.
Responsible officer: Mr. Robert H. Johnson.

LAS: Not Scheduled.

IDP: Field submission postponed.

Political Dynamics Study: Work suspended under pressure of current demands.

Republic of China

National Strategy Paper: Interagency working group will complete first draft about November 8. Interagency team will go to Taipei about November 15 to work over draft with field agencies. Target date: February 1964. Responsible officer: Mr. Joseph A. Yager.

LAS: Being done in conjunction with National Strategy Paper. Field team will also work on LAS.

IDP: Voluntary plan submitted by country team.

Political Dynamics Study: First draft to be reviewed by analyst with field agencies in mid-November.

Thailand

National Strategy Paper: An interagency working group may be formed this month or next. Target date: Not set. Responsible officer: To be named.

LAS: Work already done on LAS will be incorporated into National Strategy Paper. AID/W has proposed that field submit interim joint military-economic assistance strategy statement in December.

IDP: Completed.

Political Dynamics Study: Draft completed by consultant after field trip is being reviewed in Department.

LATIN AMERICA

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina

National Strategy Paper: An interagency working group will probably be formed in December to review and update the experimental strategic study prepared in 1962. Target date: Not set. Responsible officer: To be named.

LAS: Not Scheduled.

IDP: Not Scheduled.

Bolivia

National Strategy Paper: An interagency working group will be formed in November to review and update the experimental study prepared in 1962. Target date: March 1964. Responsible officer: Mr. Jerome F. Fried.

LAS: Not Scheduled.

IDP: Completed.

Brazil

National Strategy Paper: The responsible officer recently returned from Brazil with a draft prepared in collaboration with the Country Team. This draft will be ready for circulation to Washington agencies for comment this month. Target date: December 1963. Responsible officer: Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker.

LAS: Not Scheduled.

IDP: Being prepared as part of the National Strategy Paper.

Political Dynamics Study: To be completed in early November.

Chile

Chile

National Strategy Paper: The experimental strategic study done in 1962 is to be revised and updated. A new draft will be submitted to an interagency working group. Target date: February 1964. Responsible officer: Mr. Jerome F. Fried.

LAS: Revision of the draft LAS will be completed this month. The LAS will subsequently be integrated with the National Strategy Paper.

IDP: Not Scheduled.

Columbia

National Strategy Paper: The responsible officer has revised the draft paper on the basis of his consultation with field agencies last month. Field comments on the revised draft are being awaited, after which the draft will be circulated for agency comments. Target date: November 1963. Responsible officer: Mr. Jerome F. Fried.

LAS: Draft LAS received in Washington October 21. Review of LAS will be conducted in conjunction with that of National Strategy Paper to assure consistency of two papers.

IDP: Completed. To be incorporated in National Strategy Paper.

Venezuela

National Strategy Paper: An interagency working group will probably be formed early in 1964 to review and update the experimental strategic study done in 1962. Target date: Not set. Responsible officer: To be named.

LAS: Not Scheduled.

IDP: Completed.

NEAR EAST AND

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India

National Strategy Paper: The responsible officer is expected to return from India November 6, bringing with him Country Team comments on both the draft political dynamics study and a partial draft of the national strategy paper. Target date: January 1964. Responsible officer: Mr. Howard Wriggins.

LAS: AID/W has proposed to field that draft LAS be submitted December 31 to permit coordination with the National Strategy Paper.

IDP: Not Scheduled.

Political Dynamics Study: Draft being reviewed in field.

Pakistan

National Strategy Paper: The responsible officer has returned to Washington with the Country Team reactions to the draft political analysis section of the paper. He is now drafting a complete version of the paper. Target date: January 1964. Responsible officer: Mr. James Spain.

LAS: Being developed in conjunction with the National Strategy Paper. Draft received from field in October is being reviewed by AID/W.

IDP: Being done by Country Team as part of National Strategy Paper. Draft expected in Washington November 15.

Political Dynamics Study: Second draft being prepared after review of first draft in Department and field.

Turkey

National Strategy Paper: An interagency team will go to Turkey early this month to consult the Country Team. Target date: January 1964. Responsible officer: Ambassador Philip W. Bonsal.

LAS:

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

7

LAS: Draft received from field in late September is being reviewed in AID/W. Before formal approval, LAS and National Strategy Paper will be conformed.

IDP: Not Scheduled.

Political Dynamics Study: Consultant's field report now being amplified; draft due in early December.

United Arab Republic

National Strategy Paper: An interagency working group has been formed and contributions are being received from other agencies. Target date: January 1964. Responsible officer: Mr. William R. Polk.

LAS: Not Scheduled.

IDP: Not Scheduled.

Political Dynamics Study: Draft under way after field trip; due in December.

NOTE

The above report does not include IDPs which have been completed, or are being prepared, on countries not yet included in the National Strategy Series Program. IDPs have been completed and approved on Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, and Cambodia. IDPs are being prepared on Peru, Iraq, Cameroon, Somalia, South Vietnam, Burma, Saudi Arabia and Jordan. In addition, Country Teams in Ceylon, Libya and Sierra Leone have voluntarily submitted IDPs even though no plans on those three countries had been requested.

No LAS is under way in a country not covered by the National Strategy Series Program.

S/P: JAYager

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

February 11, 1964

NATIONAL SECURITY ACTION MEMORANDUM NO. 281

- TO:
- The Secretary of State
 - The Secretary of the Treasury
 - The Secretary of Defense
 - The Secretary of Agriculture
 - The Secretary of Commerce
 - The Secretary of Labor
 - The Director, Bureau of the Budget
 - The Director of Central Intelligence
 - The Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
 - The Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission
 - The Director, United States Information Agency
 - The Administrator, Agency for International Development
 - The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

DECLASSIFIED
 E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4
 NJ 92-271
 By JP, NARA, Date 3/25/92

SUBJECT: National Policy Paper Series

In keeping with his responsibilities for the coordination of foreign policy, the President has today vested in the Secretary of State the responsibility for the promulgation of certain National Policy Papers.

Procedures and standard outlines for this series will be circulated promptly by the Secretary of State.

McGeorge Bundy
 McGeorge Bundy

cc:

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- Mr. Bundy
- Mr. Komer
- Mr. C. Johnson
- NSC Files

Dispatched 2/12/64