

No. 84

PPS files, lot 64 D 563, "Near and Middle East"

*Memorandum of Conversation, by the Politico-Military Adviser of
the Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs
(Daspit)*

SECRET

[WASHINGTON,] August 28, 1952.

Subject: MEDO

On August 26 representatives of the Department of State, the Department of Defense and the Joint Staff met at 3:45 to discuss certain points raised in the JCS memorandum ¹ on the UK proposals for the establishment of MEDO (Secto 24, London June 27, 1952) ² as a preliminary to the preparation of U.S. comments on the UK proposals for circulation to the several sponsoring powers. Present at the meeting were:

Maj. Gen. A. P. Fox, USA, JSSC
Maj. Gen. E. J. Rogers, Jr., USAF, JSSC
R. Adm. W. F. Boone, USN, JSSC
R. Adm. H. P. Smith, USN, OSD-OFMA
Capt. E. Grant, USN, OSD-OFMA
Cdr. R. K. Kaufman, USN, JSSC
Mr. J. D. Jernegan, State Department
Mr. J. H. Ferguson, State Department
Mr. A. B. Daspit, State Department
Mr. P. T. Hart, State Department
Mr. W. Stabler, State Department

Mr. Daspit opened the conversation by stating that the Department of State had studied the memorandum of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which suggested that four elements should be included in any US position on the MEDO. The proposals made in paragraphs 3a and 3c ³ of the memorandum were obviously desirable but the

¹ The Joint Chiefs of Staff memorandum of July 29 is not printed. (780.5/7-2952) It was enclosed in a letter dated Aug. 11 from the Deputy Secretary of Defense which informed the Department of State that Frank Nash, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, was prepared to discuss the matter with any representatives the Department might designate. (780.5/8-1152)

² Document 79.

³ Paragraph 3a of the July 29 memorandum stated that the Joint Chiefs of Staff believed it should be made clear that the planning function of the Middle East Defense Organization should not include plans "for the operations in war of forces which may be introduced into the area but which are not specifically allocated for the defense thereof."

Paragraph 3c suggested that paragraph 8 of Secto 24 was ambiguous on the source of military guidance for the planning group, as to whether it would come from the Military Representatives Committee or their respective governments. The Joint Chiefs of Staff believed the planning group should receive military guidance from the Military Representatives Committee.