

# RESTRICTED

STAFF REPORT

1081

1 February 1952

## CONTENTS

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| INTRODUCTION--Brigadier General J. L. Holman, USA,<br>Deputy Commandant for Education, ICAF ..... | 1           |
| SPEAKER--Colonel B. S. Waterman, USA, Member of the<br>Faculty, ICAF .....                        | 1           |
| GENERAL DISCUSSION .....  | 15          |

Publication No. L52-89

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington, D. C.

# RESTRICTED

---

# RESTRICTED

1083

## STAFF REPORT

1 February 1952

GENERAL HOLMAN: Back in 1939 and 1940 when my class went through the Industrial College, we had a little exercise which was the use of a staff memorandum and the preparation of a staff memorandum. We went through the exercises and they turned out all right. Actually, we spent two or three days working up a real report, using the form which was then current. At that time it struck me as being a pretty good thing to know, but I didn't realize that it would assume later a great deal of importance in my life.

Subsequently, however, we got over in the Southwest Pacific starting a new headquarters. There were no regulations there. Everything had to be organized from scratch. We found that we had to have some uniform basis around the headquarters that would give proper information in an abbreviated form that permitted the attachment of a lot of inclosures. But it was more important that we pick up the problem, follow through with factual data--facts bearing on the subject, make a brief analysis, and come up with conclusions and recommendations.

So another officer and I got together and we actually developed from memory the important parts of this exercise in which we had been trained 10 years before. It paid off tremendously in helping a new staff and a new headquarters. Since 1940 when we were going through this staff memorandum preparation, things have become much more complicated and you gentlemen will be going out on all kinds of assignments.

We felt that one period here in the Industrial College, just to acquaint you with the intricacies of this particular procedure, might be very helpful to you so we have asked Colonel Waterman to give you the methodology on which a staff memorandum is prepared, the concept that goes into it, and some of the variations that are employed in the various agencies such as the Joint Staff and Munitions Board, and other details.

I think it is well worth our while to spend one period on it. There won't be anything laborious about it. You will just be given the briefest orientation of it, but I think it will save you many hours on a lot of digging if you happen to land in one of the organizations where they are very particular about the type of paper work they have.

COLONEL WATERMAN: It is nice to get such generous applause before I begin, because I think there is considerable doubt that there will be any when I finish. I counted on Elmer Barnes to work you into a state of pliability in the first period. I hope he has not beaten you to a pulp with his intimations of the blood, sweat, and tears to come.

1  
RESTRICTED

# RESTRICTED

1084

I would like to start this by reading a letter:

"To M. de Champagny, Duc de Cadore                      Paris, 17 Jan 1810  
Minister of Foreign Affairs

"I send back your report about Rome. It strikes me as being weak, and contains some doubtful assertions. When you say that the entry of the troops into the March of Ancona was not an act of hostility, you put yourself in the wrong, and bring forward questions which would startle Europe.

"The style is not sufficiently businesslike; what I want is hard reasoning, not picturesqueness. I will ask you, therefore, to remodel this report, and return it to me. Generally speaking, the report has no divisions or plan, and leaves no impression on the mind after it has been read.

Napoleon."

I read this primarily to show you that our problem of staff reports is really a pretty high-level problem. Not only that--it has been around for more than 140 years.

I undertake this discussion of the preparation of staff reports with the full realization that most of us have a constitutional aversion for the kind of detail the subject implies. Perhaps the most prevalent attitude that I have discovered in the school and elsewhere is the one indicated by the officer who says: "When I write a paper I put a whole string of commas in one of the upper corners with a note to the reader: 'Put them wherever you find them most useful.'"

I am not going to discuss the subject of commas. This talk will cover three very broad areas:

First of all, Chart 1, the general principles for preparation of staff reports.

Second, Chart 2, the preparation of Joint Chiefs of Staff papers.

Third, Chart 3, the preparation of Munitions Board papers.

I am not talking about the preparation of Industrial College student reports, except as you recognize that what I say may apply with equal force to the college reports.

I realize that some of you may have had some prior experience with either JCS or Munitions Board papers, and perhaps some have had a lot of experience with the preparation of staff studies in general. Those of

# RESTRICTED

you who have, I hope will bear with me if I direct this to those who have not.

All reports, whether prepared for military commanders, civilian government executives, or business executives, have several things in common. They must state the problem clearly. They must set forth the important facts. They must evaluate these facts and reach some conclusions from them about the problem. And they must propose some action. They must be brief and clear. Any executive who is important enough to have people writing staff reports for him is much too busy to read long and involved ones.

Chart 1. The Problem.  
The Facts.  
Discussion.  
Conclusions.  
Recommendations.

The Problem.--Both the writer and the reader must have the problem clearly defined at the outset. It is essential, then, that a report begin with a precise definition of the problem. You will see two different approaches to this in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Munitions Board papers, but the requirement is met in both of them.

Once the problem is defined, the next step is to marshal the facts which bear on that problem, in order that some conclusions may be reached.

The Facts.--It is a human tendency to have some preconceived notions about the solutions to most of the problems with which we deal. This could lead us to select only those facts which support our own preconceptions and to reject those which deny them. The only remedy I know for this is to lean over backward in trying to state facts which refute your initial point of view.

Next, make sure that only those facts that are really important are set down. It is entirely possible to dredge up enough insignificant facts about any problem to fill a whole ream of paper, but that does not advance you toward a good conclusion. Nobody can tell you how to discriminate between a significant fact and an insignificant one, but I think it is safe to say that your boss will tell you if you have allowed an insignificant one to prevail in reaching your conclusion.

Now, what is a fact? Facts are often confused with opinions. The points you set down as facts must be capable of validation. If your problem happens to be one of determining whether to grant some foreign country's request for military equipment, for example, you can state it as a fact that the law says certain things about such aid. If you say

# RESTRICTED

1000  
the country will be on our side in the event of a war, you are not stating a fact but only your opinion. If you say the country has signed a treaty in which it agrees to be on our side, that is a fact.

After all these significant facts have been set down, the next process is discussion or evaluation or analysis of these facts against each other.

Discussion.--It is here that the intangible thing called reasoning power comes into play. Sound conclusions can be reached only if the relative importance of the facts is recognized. The fact that a country has signed a treaty in which it agrees to be on our side is probably a cogent one for reaching the conclusion that we should give it the arms it asks for. If there happens to be a law forbidding it, that is a fact which clearly outweighs any agreement to be on our side.

Not all decisions about the relative importance of facts are as easy as that to make. In calling the close ones, you ought to be on your guard against allowing your prior personal opinions to influence your judgment of relative importance.

Another pitfall to watch out for in evaluating the relative importance of facts is the one known in Latin as post hoc, ergo propter hoc, which means "after the fact, therefore because of it." This is the error in which, because one fact follows another chronologically, you conclude that the first fact was the cause of the second. As you have probably noticed by now, economists are particularly fond of that sort of reasoning.

For instance, let us say that this country granted a large amount of ECA help to a foreign nation. Now, let us assume that very shortly afterward, that nation fell flat on its economic face. This may be an indisputable fact, too, but it doesn't necessarily follow that the collapse was due to our aid. That is a little far fetched, I know, but that is how conclusions are often reached. I must point out here that discussion or analysis often has some gaps between the facts, which you must fill in with some opinions or assumptions. Otherwise you can't reach any conclusions about the problem. There are certain assumptions which might very well bridge the two facts I cited and warrant a conclusion that the first did in fact cause the second.

Well, let us assume that we have made a brilliant, clear-cut analysis of the facts, or even just a sensible one. We must now draw some conclusions. Step four is conclusions.

Conclusions.--Conclusions are opinions. They are the opinions we form about the problem from the facts which we have dredged up. They don't state what we are going to do about the problem; I think you have

# RESTRICTED

1087

heard that before. Let me repeat it--conclusions do not state what we are going to do about the problem. Conclusions must be supported by the facts and discussion.

We may conclude from the fact that the country we were talking about has agreed to be an ally in case of war that it would be a good thing to give it arms. We must conclude we can't do it now if the law forbids. We might have had facts about the country's lack of technical know-how or its proximity to the border of the major enemy, which would compel a conclusion that, despite its professed intention to be an ally, it can't make proper use of the arms or will be overrun too quickly to use them effectively.

Conclusions, then, are the results of our evaluation of the facts. It is not uncommon to see reports in which the conclusions fail to square with the facts presented. I recall seeing a student report--the class doesn't matter--which stated as a fact that substitutes were being found for one of the major uses of an important strategic commodity. After that statement he turned right around and concluded that there appear to be no real substitutes for this commodity and its important uses.

To complete the staff report, recommendations must be made as to the action to be taken on the problem. The conclusions that you have drawn furnish you with the basis for making the recommendations.

Recommendations.--It is at this point that the well-known doctrine of completed staff work comes into play. Your recommendations must be in such a form that the boss need only give his approval and they can be put into effect. There should be no if's or and's or but's and no alternative recommendations. You've got to choose what your own reasoning tells you is the one best course of action and recommend it.

The most common form of recommendation in high staffs is one recommending that an attached letter which you have prepared, and which directs someone to do the thing you have recommended, be signed and dispatched. For example, your action in the case of the country requesting arms might be a directive by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to one of the services to issue the equipment, or, in case the law prevents it, a letter to the Secretary of Defense recommending that he seek a change in legislation which will permit giving it. Another action which you would probably attach would be a letter to the mission of the country concerned.

Let us turn now to the somewhat more elusive topic of style. I would like to say right here that I am fully aware that this is a pretty delicate subject. It is also one on which I have very strong feelings. Some people seem to resent any implication that their writing style is not all it should be. There are others who feel this

# RESTRICTED

1058

is kindergarten stuff with which they should not be bothered. But I don't think it is unfair to say that the quality of writing in the services is substandard, based on what ought to be expected of educated men, and I don't believe we have any right to expect our subordinates to supplement our inadequacies and put our ideas into understandable written form for us.

It may be too late for us to acquire the style of a Churchill, but, common belief to the contrary notwithstanding, it is possible to improve our style considerably by a little conscious attention. All that is required, really, is that we be able to say what we want to say clearly, concisely, completely, and as briefly as possible.

There are certain characteristic ideas about writing which seem to be prevalent among service officers. I know a lot of people who just throw up their hands and say, "I can't write and I hate to do it." Some are very effective writers and if it seems I am implying that is not the case, don't misunderstand me. I have seen some very fine written work in the service. I am sure you all have, too. There are some who believe good writing style consists in using a lot of long words or fancy words. That is called the "purple passage" type of writing. There are some who think the way to get brevity is to cut out the connectives, leaving you with the impression that they have run their words through a meat grinder.

Perhaps the best contribution I can make on this subject of style is to show you a few concrete examples of some of the various pitfalls.

One of the most common ones is never to use one word where five or six will do. Another is attempting to use a big word and getting the wrong one. Here's a very excellent example of both:

"Frequent guerrilla raids mitigated against successful operation in the running of the railroad."

The writer who spawned this one tried to use a fancy word--militated--and he got the wrong one. All he meant to say in using "militated against successful operations" was "hindered." You can see how much more forceful the style becomes when you say simply: "Frequent guerrilla raids hindered the running of the railroad."

Here's another sample of the "purple passage" taken from a student report of a previous year. This, by the way, is my favorite.

"Overpopulation, poverty, illiteracy, sectionalism, together with a renascent nationalism and distrust of colonial imperialism characterizes India and Pakistan, much as these very same elements epitomize the great Asian syndrome."

I think this is what he meant to say:

# RESTRICTED

1089

"India and Pakistan, like other Asiatic countries, suffer from overpopulation, poverty, and illiteracy. Nationalism is increasing, but there are many political factions."

Now let us take a look at the samples of the telegraphic or meat-grinder style, also from student reports. I hope you don't think I am picking on you. These are not from students of this class. I am sure you recognize that.

## "5. USSR and Satellites

a.

b. Principally on barter basis for items critically needed by India and Pakistan. Receipts by Russia apparently stockpiled. However, only small part of South Asia exports involved."

"While the standards of living are low they are higher than in South Asia, which is not of much help."

I am sorry I can't offer any better solutions to those two statements. I haven't figured out yet what they mean. I would like to assure you that there was nothing in the context of this report that made the observations any clearer. You might call this the technique of the suspended idea.

There are many other common errors which are easily enough avoided, such as the confusion of similar words with different meanings and the misinterpretation of meanings. Let us take a look at a few of them.

|                                  |             |
|----------------------------------|-------------|
| Adapt                            | adopt       |
| affect                           | effect      |
| alternate                        | alternative |
| continual                        | continuous  |
| assure                           | insure      |
| unique, more unique, less unique |             |
| consensus of opinion             |             |

I think you will recognize in that list some words with which you have had difficulties in the past. Let's take a look at this. Nothing can be more or less unique. When you say a thing is unique you mean it is the only one of its kind in existence. This is a favorite, the "consensus of opinion." The word "consensus" means "weight of opinion." Therefore, I would presume that means "weight of opinion of opinion." Perhaps that's emphasis.

If you are not sure of the proper uses of these pairs of words, or of other pairs of words that I am sure you can think of, the only thing to do

# RESTRICTED

1050

is to check on them in the dictionary every time you use them, until you are sure you have them.

There is no better way I know of to create an impression of illiteracy than to misuse words. Here's another very fine example that occurs to me: Sometime during the war the word "criterion" was accepted wholeheartedly into Federalese. It was most often used in the plural, so "criteria" became a part of the very necessary equipment of every carpet-bagger. You know how many times you have heard from this platform and elsewhere "a criteria" or "the criteria is." I think it is reasonable to expect that anyone will know whether the word he uses is singular or plural, which it is obvious many didn't in this case.

So much for that sort of thing. There are two other very common practices which spoil the effectiveness of writing. They are nonparallel construction and more than one idea in a sentence. Here's a sample of nonparallel construction:

"The emplacement will be 20 feet wide and have a length of 65 feet."

Some people have the impression that it sounds a little bit more elegant than this:

"The emplacement will be 30 feet wide and 65 feet long."

This is the sort of thing which spoils writing more than the more radical types of errors I showed you before.

Here's a really breath-taking example of the multiple-idea sentence:

"Under the approved plan for reorganization of army areas, railroad maintenance has been transferred to the post engineers of the posts concerned, and consequently they should be consulted with regard to repair of existing equipment and facilities, although authority for the purchase of new equipment rests with the Chief of Transportation."

All one sentence. Now, see how much easier it is to absorb all the ideas contained in that sentence when you break it into three sentences:

"Under the approved plan for reorganization of army areas post engineers become responsible for railroad maintenance. They should be consulted about repair of existing equipment and facilities. The Chief of Transportation retains responsibility for purchase of new equipment."

Now, here is a very common type of error which results in more misunderstanding, actually, than the errors I have indicated. That is the muddled use of negatives. Here are three samples which say nearly, but not quite, the same thing.

# RESTRICTED

1091

"The prisoner did not claim that German artillery was superior to American."

"The prisoner claimed that German artillery was not superior to American."

"The prisoner claimed that German artillery was inferior to American."

Seeing them together, I am sure you can detect the differences in meaning, but many writers are very careless about the manner in which they express negative ideas. It could make quite a difference to Intelligence whether the prisoner didn't claim that German artillery was superior to American or whether he actually said it was inferior.

Well, what is the road to better style? I think it is this: Write the things you want to say in the same direct way that you say them in conversation, leaving out the cuss words. When you use a big word or a foreign word, make sure you get the correct meaning. Get familiar with some of the texts on effective writing. Here are a couple which I think you will find very helpful: "The Army Writer," by a man named Kahn, and "Guide for Air Force Writing." There are others, too. I am sure there's something for Navy writing, too, but I couldn't find it. These may be found in the library.

Now I would like to show you how the things I have said about staff reports in general work into the two forms of staff reports which may be of use and interest to you in the very near future, possibly in your next assignments. These are the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Munitions Board papers. I don't want to burden you with a lot of detailed information about them, but I would like to call your attention to certain significant points. There will be a handout in your boxes after this session which will give you some of the salient details which might be useful to you later on.

Chart 2, following page, gives the prescribed procedure for Joint Chiefs of Staff papers. This is the most complete, precise method that I think you are likely to find anywhere. It has grown so out of necessity. The Joint Chiefs are among the busiest individuals in the United States; they demand a maximum of precision, conciseness, and concreteness in the form of presentation of matters they must consider. Nobody denies that content is more important than form, but the Joint Chiefs insist on top quality in both. I think it would scarcely be possible for them to deal with all the matters they must consider unless they got both.

The sequence of this form is similar to the general approach which I outlined earlier.

# RESTRICTED

# RESTRICTED

1092

## Chart 2

Model Cover Page for a JCS Paper  
(Submitted by a committee)

### CLASSIFICATION

COPY NO. \_\_\_\_\_

JCS 0003/1

01 February 1951

Pages 1-10 incl.

### Report by the Joint Strategic Survey Committee

To The  
Joint Chiefs of Staff  
On

The title of the paper when too long for one line, is  
divided approximately in half and written on two lines

References: a. JCS 0001/3  
b. JCS 0002/21

### The Problem

1. (Indicate briefly the essentials of the directive given the committee, paragraphs as required)

### Facts Bearing on the Problem

2. (Enumerate succinctly and in logical order the significant facts, stated in the simplest form)

### Discussion

3. (Date supporting the facts and necessary discussion. When this material is long or complicated it is attached as an inclosure and referred to parenthetically when clarity will be improved, discussion may be incorporated with facts bearing on the problem)

### Conclusions

4. (List any conclusions inferred from the facts)

### Recommendations

5. (State briefly and clearly the action recommended)

### Classification

JCS 0003/

# RESTRICTED

# RESTRICTED

1033

This report is limited to two pages, the page numbering in the upper corner where it says "pages 1 to 10 inclusive" indicates that you number right through the attachments. The actual body of the report, however, is limited to two pages. The two-page limit doesn't mean that a full and complete staff action must be reduced to two pages. It does mean that the report must be synopsisized and that full discussion and voluminous recommendations must be put into attachments. The Joint Chiefs are very precise, by the way, in their designation of attachments. The primary one is called an inclosure; the attachment to an inclosure is called an appendix; the attachment to an appendix is an annex; the attachment to an annex is a tab; the attachment to a tab is an exhibit. I think if you go beyond there they ought not to let you write staff papers.

Notice that the heading of the paper states first the name of the committee preparing the report. The original form had the heading "Joint Chiefs of Staff" and then the committee name. Some report apparently came to the attention of someone in Congress, who demanded a copy. The Joint Chiefs then had a great deal of difficulty in establishing that the paper had no standing as a JCS opinion or action until they acted on the recommendations. Thus, the title "Joint Chiefs of Staff" was dropped out so as to make it appear evident that the statements in a report are those of the originating committee and not of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, such as a report by the Joint Strategic Survey Committee to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Notice the method of making references. The Joint Staff does not go in for elaborate footnoting. This is because it does not matter in these reports whether credit is given for borrowed ideas as it does in a scholarly paper like an Industrial College report.

The problem is stated as an infinitive phrase: "To draft for the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff a reply to the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense dated 1 February 1952, with reference to the employment of personnel with two left feet." Every statement of the problem must contain the expression "for approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff"-- a further attempt, I believe, to emphasize that the paper has no standing until approved by the Joint Chiefs.

Where a paper has political as well as military implications, it would be expected that the State Department would be consulted in preparation. In such a case the statement of the problem will include an indication that "Mr. John Doe of the State Department has been consulted in the preparation of this report." Mr. Doe, of course, must be someone of sufficient consequence to give an official State Department view.

This form shows a separate section for discussion. It is permissible, however, to develop facts and discussion simultaneously in one section if it will help clarity and cut down repetition. In such a case the section is labeled "Facts Bearing on the Problem and Discussion."

# RESTRICTED

# RESTRICTED

1094

The Joint Chiefs of Staff never approve any part of a paper except the recommendations. Everything else represents solely the thought processes of the preparing committee, showing how the recommendations were reached, in order that the Joint Chiefs may have a better basis for deciding whether the recommendations are sound.

When the recommendations are approved, the Joint Secretariat sends out a decision sheet which says: "Paragraph 'X' (the recommendations) of JCS O/1 has been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff". They identify a JCS decision sheet by a broad red band on it.

Now, a word about the numbering system. The first JCS paper ever prepared was number JCS 1. The next one, on a different subject, was JCS 2. When one came along that dealt with the same subject as the original one, it was numbered JCS 1/1. The number after the slant indicates one of a series on a like subject.

Now let's turn to the Munitions Board papers. (Chart 3, Munitions Board Reports, following page.)

The Munitions Board prescribes two forms of staff reports--the agenda item, or brief for presentation to the Board, and the staff report, so called.

The agenda item is the real staff report, in the sense in which we are using this term today. It is the form in which a problem is analyzed and recommendations are presented to the Board for its approval. The thing the Munitions Board calls its staff report is nothing but a memorandum for information and is not supposed to be used for obtaining action. In fact it is not a staff report at all.

That (indicating) is the form for the Munitions Board agenda item. You see that the steps are not in the order which I have suggested for attack on a problem or in the order of the JCS form. The Board apparently prefers to know first, what the problem is and second, what the solution is, rather than have you build up to a climax through facts bearing on the problem, discussion, and conclusions, as in the JCS paper.

You will also observe there are no separate sections for facts bearing on the problem, for discussion, and for conclusions, but it is expected that all three will be lumped under "discussion."

Notice that the statement of the problem must be so phrased as to indicate the nature of the action to be taken by the Board. The phrasing would be something like: "To consider a proposed policy relating to such and such."

The prohibition against justification in the recommendations prevents the inclusion of any facts, discussion, or conclusions under

# RESTRICTED

1085

## Chart 3

### Brief for Presentation to the Munitions Board

Item No. \_\_\_\_\_ Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

#### The Problem

(The problem statement must indicate the nature of the action to be taken by the Board, as well as the subject and scope of the problem.)

#### Recommendation

It is recommended that the Munitions Board:

1. (Do not include justification.)
2. (If the recommendations are voluminous include them in a tab.)
3. (Where the recommendations involve action on a tab the general purpose should be indicated here.)

#### Discussion

1. (State why the problem is presented for the Board's consideration.)
2. (Cite considerations which the Board will need to understand the problem.)

(Indicate coordination with the military departments and other government agencies.)

# RESTRICTED

# RESTRICTED

1056

"recommendations." The discussion must include a statement as to why the problem is being considered at this time, and any considerations needed by the Board to understand the problem. I interpret "considerations" to mean the process of analysis, from facts bearing on the problem, through discussion to conclusions.

This form actually requires all the steps I have outlined as necessary for a staff report, but I doubt if it is as likely to result in a good, clear-cut, concise job as the Joint Chiefs of Staff form.

On this form the agenda item is limited to one page in length, any extra long discussion or recommendation being placed in attachments.

The Munitions Board tries to take policy actions, rather than to engage in ad hoc operations. Therefore, if a problem arises, let us say, with respect to maintenance of a particular industrial reserve plant, the Board prefers to consider a policy for maintenance of the whole industrial plant reserve as its problem, rather than to do something about some individual plant.

The typical recommendation, then, would be that the Board approve the manual attached as Tab A--incidentally, the first inclosure in this report is the tab--prescribing standards for maintenance of the industrial plant reserve, rather than that they approve the dispatch of a letter to so and so directing him to do such and such about an individual plant.

I am told that this policy statement approach is an objective rather than a practical fact. In practice, the Board does take a great many actions of an ad hoc nature.

I have not bothered to prepare a chart showing the Munitions Board staff report, because it consists only of the heading, "Staff Report", the date, the subject, and a statement, "By the Vice-Chairman for such and such an activity", followed by a large blank space for the statement. There's a final paragraph prescribed, which says: "Note and furnish adverse comment, if any, at the next Board meeting."

I have included a copy of that staff report form in the handout which you will find in the boxes.

Now, I have said the Munitions Board instructions say specifically that the staff report will not be used for obtaining actions. The Secretary of the Board, however, told me that in actuality the staff report is now being used as an advance action on an agenda item, to lay the ground.

Now, let's summarize. I have tried to say that in order to prepare an effective staff report you must:

11

# RESTRICTED

# RESTRICTED

1057

1. Recognize the problem you are dealing with and state it clearly enough so that your readers will recognize it, too.
2. Assemble the significant facts relating to the problem.
3. Analyze those facts to determine what is important and what is not so important.
4. Draw some conclusions from your analysis.
5. Make recommendations to implement those conclusions.
6. Write your report in simple, clear style, saying exactly what you want to say and avoiding flamboyant verbosity.

I would like to close with a description of that simple, clear style that I am talking about. There is in existence a document which is a request for leave, written by an officer under the command of General Nathan Bedford Forrest, old "Git thar fustest with the mostest." The officer had been turned down twice before in his request for leave. In this request he sets down, in the most eloquent and flowery style of the period, all the reasons he feels he should have the leave. Scribbled across the bottom of the letter, in General Forrest's handwriting, is one of the finest known examples of what I think is direct, uncluttered, clear, and concise language. It says: "I tole you twict, goddamit, no."

I would like to say that there will be no questions about this lecture in the evaluation exercise. I will now try to deal with some of your questions.

COLONEL WATERMAN: Let's call this a discussion rather than questions, because I am sure there are people here who can throw a lot more light on the subject than I can.

COMMENT: There appears to be some kind of separate heading on the JCS paper, "Assumptions." I recollect that this was set forth in some way. Whether it was under the heading of "Subject" or not, I don't know.

COLONEL WATERMAN: I can't recall whether there ever was or not. Perhaps there's somebody who can answer that.

COMMENT: When it first came out, after "Facts" it was "Assumptions."

QUESTION: Colonel, you mention only one recommendation there. I am not sure about the JCS, but in papers similar to those I have seen recommendations come in every way, by preference. In other words, there's the case where the recommendation is not approved by the Joint Chiefs, and the "Committee recommends that the following action be taken." Do you mean there's only one recommendation, particularly where order of preference is given?

# RESTRICTED

1038

COLONEL WATERMAN: I believe there ought to be only the recommendation which you think is the best recommendation. I think in the instructions there's something that says this. Of course, there may be a split opinion, in which case there would be two recommendations, but each one is the one best recommendation of the people who are its proponents. Incidentally, speaking of split recommendations, there haven't been very many in the Joint Staff. Occasionally one occurs. The Director of the Joint Staff last year set forth how the Joint Staff organization took great pride in pointing out that the three services were getting along extremely well, and there was very seldom a split recommendation.

However, there can be no split--they will permit no split--on the problem or on the facts. That is to say they consider the problem ought to be recognized and agreed to by everybody, and the facts likewise. A fact is a fact. There should not be any difference of opinion on it.

COLONEL BARNES: I would like to add to your list of related words most misused, the combination of infer and imply. I think that's the pair that probably is more misused than any other pair I know of. I "infer" from what you "imply" is the right use of the two words.

COLONEL WATERMAN: Does anybody else want to take another shot at me? This is your last chance until 11 March 1952.

GENERAL HOLMAN: Bernie, do you want to make a few remarks about this handout that will be in the boxes, what it will include? Do you want to amplify that?

COLONEL WATERMAN: I will be glad to do so. We have prepared a sample of the Joint Chiefs of Staff form, one of the Munitions Board agenda item, and one of the Munitions Board staff report, plus a list of "don'ts." On the staff forms we have indicated under each heading some of the detail about the preparation of the form, and attached to the form is additional detail which I have extracted from this Joint Secretariat memorandum 96 which seemed to me to be the most important parts of the instructions; likewise from the Munitions Board directive on the preparation of its agenda item and staff report. In a sense it is a boiling down of the most important points which are contained in these two sets of instructions. Do you think that covers it, General?

GENERAL HOLMAN: Yes. There may be some questions.

COLONEL WATERMAN: I think if there are any questions it might be better to wait until you see the forms. If there are any questions, you can come to see me.

I would like to close by pointing out, then, gentlemen, that even the JCS has its lapses. Its instructions say that abbreviations will be used only to save time and space. Can anybody suggest any other uses?

(16 July 1952--250) s/fhl

16

# RESTRICTED

D 6683