

State Dept. review completed.

6 May 1975

NOTE FOR:

*John,*  
Re the attached, I am sorry I didn't get a chance to meet with you, but you might take the following position:

a. Ever since the Katzenbach report, we have been operating on a policy of not contracting directly with universities and colleges to do contract work for us.  
*in the social science research field*

b. We do contract with individual professors as you know, but on the condition that the head of their school is aware of the relationship.

c. This policy was reinforced a couple of years ago when Columbia made us back off from a contract arrangement with it to do economic research on Communist countries.

Your position should be that in view of our practice, we obviously would have to get a new policy signal from the Director. Even so, we are certain that if we participated in the joint endeavor, one of the conditions would have to be that CIA involvement be publicly known. This might kill the whole program.

Given all this, if the FAR is still interested in our participation, we will pursue the matter.

Paul V. Walsh

MORI/CDF

C  
U  
R  
R  
E  
N  
T  
  
I  
N  
F  
O  
R  
M  
A  
T  
I  
O  
N

25X1

25X1

28 April 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Associate Deputy Director for Intelligence

SUBJECT : Special Meeting of the USC/FAR

1. The attached memorandum from Bill Hyland is self-explanatory. It talks in the third paragraph of a task which requires the establishment "for FY-1976 a jointly funded program of at least \$2 million." The memo brings up certain questions relating to the Agency's position on this for which I ask your guidance.

a. Does CIA want to be identified and involved in funding the activities of university research centers in the United States? Such funding would in my judgment have to be overt and this could cause us public relations problems.

b. The Preliminary Prospectus attached to Hyland's memo is unclear as to how this program is to be managed. Page 4 refers to an "executive agency" but does not further define it, nor is the Prospectus clear as to what authority the agencies providing funds will have in regard to making awards. And finally, it does not specify any criteria for the studies to be undertaken.

2. You will note that I am summoned in my capacity as Agency USC/FAR representative to a meeting on 7 May. I would appreciate a chance to talk with you about this before that meeting.



CIA Representative  
USC/FAR

25X1



DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Washington, D.C. 20520

USC/FAR Doc. No. 39  
April 16, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: (See Attached List of Addressees)

SUBJECT : Special Meeting of the USC/FAR

The Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs has instructed me as Chairman of the USC/FAR to strengthen government funding of academic foreign affairs research along the lines set forth in the attached "Preliminary Prospectus."

I have accordingly scheduled a special meeting of the USC/FAR for 2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 7, 1975, in Room 6320 of the Main State Building. This meeting will consider a response to Mr. Kissinger's directive that the government establish significantly stronger intellectual links with university research centers on matters of central concern to U.S. foreign relations, and to build this new emphasis into our forward planning for fiscal years 1976 and 1977.

Our initial task is to establish for FY-1976 a jointly funded program of at least \$2 million. State plans to devote \$600,000, nearly 3/4 of its entire FY-76 external research budget, to this program. It will be helpful if USC/FAR Member and Observer representatives will come to this meeting prepared to indicate:

- how their respective FY-1976 and FY-1977 research goals can be restructured to support the new program;
- the magnitudes of the FY-1976 and FY-1977 funds they can earmark for this interagency effort;
- refinements they believe it essential to make in the attached "Preliminary Prospectus."

William G. Hyland  
Chairman, USC Subcommittee on  
Foreign Affairs Research

Attachment:  
Preliminary Prospectus.

USC/FAR MEMBERS:

STATE	Mr. William G. Hyland, Chairman Director, Bureau of Intelligence & Research
DEFENSE (Co-Rep.)	Mr. Robert Ellsworth, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs
DEFENSE (Co-Rep.)	Lt. Col. Henry L. Taylor, Military Assistant for Human Resources, Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering
AID	Dr. Miloslav Rechcigl, Assistant Director, Office of Research and Insti- tutional Grants
ACDA	Dr. Amrom H. Katz, Assistant Director, Plans & Analysis Bureau
USIA	Mr. James Mocerri, Chief, Research Services, Office of Research and Assessment
NSC STAFF	Mr. Jerry Dargis, Staff Officer

USC/FAR OBSERVERS:

TREASURY	Mr. Thomas D. Willett, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Research and Planning
COMMERCE	Mr. Jonathan C. Menes, Director, Applied Research Division, Office of Economic Research
HEW	Mr. David E. Hohman, Deputy Director, Office of International Affairs Management
OMB (Co-Rep.)	Mr. James F. Barie, Chief, State/USIA Branch, International Affairs Division
OMB (Co-Rep.)	Mr. Robert E. Howard, Branch Chief/Air Force, National Security Division
CIA	<span style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 150px; height: 1em; vertical-align: middle;"></span> Deputy Director, Office of Political Research
NSF (Co-Rep.)	Dr. Russell C. Drew, Director, Science & Technology Policy Office
NSF (Co-Rep.)	Dr. Howard Hines, Director, Division of Social Sciences

25X1

DRAFT - 4/15/75

Preliminary Prospectus for  
A PROGRAM OF GOVERNMENT-FUNDED  
RESEARCH ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

NOTE: In the interest of brevity, this paper is more assertive than analytical. It is nonetheless meant to invite attention to matters that need to be resolved quickly, not to suggest that alternative resolutions are beyond consideration.

Objective: To develop and sustain a Government-funded program of foreign affairs research in U.S. universities and research institutions. The research effort supported by the program should:

- aim to develop analyses and policy concepts concerning aspects of world affairs of central importance to the successful conduct of U.S. foreign relations in the mid-term future;
- be institutionally linked to the intellectual processes of government that enter into the formulation of U.S. foreign policy.

Supplementary in Nature: The purpose of the program is to assist existing university research centers wishing to do so to focus part of their research effort in ways that will contribute to a productive dialogue between those centers and the government on mid-term questions of foreign policy. A number of cautions are therefore in order. The program should not:

- be viewed as a source of funding for new centers;
- have the effect of displacing or discouraging either existing or additional sources of support for the centers;

-2-

- become so central to the work of any center that the continuing existence of the center comes to depend upon the continuation of awards under the program.

Topical Priorities: In principle, such a program could have topical foci as numerous as the regional and functional foreign policy concerns of the U.S. Government. In practice, however, informed judgment will have to be brought to bear in order to identify topics of central importance. The following list of five topics reflects State Department priorities, though most topics will be of interest to other agencies as well. Additional consultations, as well as some of the considerations discussed in subsequent sections of this prospectus, may well require modification of the list before it is accepted as a definitive series of foci for the initial program.

- The Political Dynamics and International Relations of the People's Republic of China.
- The Political Dynamics and International Relations of the USSR.
- Critical Problems of International Interdependence: Food, Resources, Population, Development, Trade, Finance, Currencies, Coordination of Policies.
- The Dynamics of Inter-American Relations.

Academic Initiative: While it is the purpose of the program to return beneficial inputs to policy thinking in

4  
WE have imp

-3-

the government, the initiative for proposing and conducting specific research activities is to be in academia. Thus, within each priority topic:

- pertinent university centers are to be asked to propose specific research projects which fit their capabilities and which they believe will illuminate matters that ought to be of important concern to the U.S. Government in the mid-term;
- each proposal is to suggest arrangements under which the researchers can maintain a productive dialogue with interested government officers on the pertinence of the research effort and its findings;
- proposing centers are to be encouraged to develop arrangements with non-resident scholars in their area for involving the latter in the research effort proposed;
- proposing centers wishing to do so are to be encouraged to coordinate their proposals with one another in order to provide more thorough coverage of the topic;
- awards are to be made to those centers whose proposals are judged most likely to contribute to improved policy thinking in the government;
- procedures for selecting proposals to be supported by the funding agencies are to include provision for soliciting the advice of non-competing private experts;
- awards are to be made primarily to university centers in the U.S., however, collaborative research arrangements between the centers and foreign scholars or institutions are to be encouraged in appropriate cases;
- all research conducted under an award is to be carried out on an unclassified basis with open publication of results.

-4-

Funding--Sources and Management: At least in its initial stages, the program will require funding from several government agencies if it is to achieve significant results at the earliest possible time.

-- NSDM-98 provides the authority and the mechanism-- the Under Secretaries Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs Research (USC/FAR)--for the planning and implementation of the program;

-- to the extent permitted by existing legislation, management of a single, multi-topic, multi-agency program by an "executive agency" is preferable to coordination of separate agency programs; in either case, arrangements are to be made for all funding agencies to advise on the program and participate in its benefits.

Size of Awards: Many factors will enter into determining the size, and therefore the number, of awards to be made in any year. Given the likelihood that the total FY-1976 funding will be modest--about \$2 million--and that proposing centers will need some idea of what is feasible, a reasonable guideline for the first year would be that proposals provide for 2-3 professional man-years of effort per year.

The Start-Up Problem: Once the program is established, awards can be made to support research efforts that get underway at a time that fits the rhythm of the academic year. However, the first year of the program presents a special difficulty in this regard.



-5-

Awards cannot be made until funds are available for obligation. Given the vagaries of federal budget making, only limited funds will be available in July 1975; total funding for the program is not likely to become available until the end of 1975, well after the academic year opens. If the start of research funded under the program is not to be unduly delayed, proposing centers will face the challenge of contingent planning to begin new activities in the course of the academic year. Funding agencies can ease but not eliminate the challenge by making funds available in the most timely fashion possible.