SUBJECT: G-2 policy on release of cryptographic principles

16 September 1950

TO: Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, General Staff, United States Army, The Pentagon, Washington 25, D. C.

Forwarded.

S. P. COLLINS
Colonel, Signal Corps
Deputy Director, AFSA

G2-SMI 350.0511

Office, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, Intelligence, Department of the Army, Washington 25, D. C.

TO: Director, Armed Forces Security Agency, U. S. Naval Communication Station, 3801 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 25, D. C.

ATTN: Mr. William F. Friedman

With reference to the request contained in paragraph 5, basic letter, Major Mills is cognizant of the policy which was set forth in Reference (a) and in fact had been fully aware of the same prior to 10 March 1950, the date of enclosure (B); however, Reference (a) was rescinded by Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, on 7 July 1950.

FOR THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, GA

JOHN W MIDDLETON
Colonel, GSC
Chief, Security & Training Division

Declassified and approved for release by NSA on 08-30-2013, pursuant to E.O. 13526.
SUBJECT  G-2 policy on release of cryptographic principles

THRU  Director, Armed Forces Security Agency
       Washington 25, D C

TO  Director of Intelligence, U S Army
     Washington 25, D C

Reference  (a) Memorandum dated 29 April 1946 for Chief, Army
       Security Agency Subject Release of cryptographic principles

Enclosures  (A) Copy of memorandum dated 26 Oct 1949 from Director
           of Intelligence U S Army to Chief, Army Security
           Agency
 (B) Copy of correspondence between Department of Defense
     and Mr. Henry G. Fischer
 (C) Copy of memorandum dated 21 Aug 1950 from Mr. Henry G
     Fischer to the Department of Defense Subject Bill
     for the relief of William F. Friedman

1  a  The undersigned, a civilian employee of the Armed Forces
    Security Agency, is the inventor of a number of cryptographic
    systems and devices, patent applications on which were placed by appropriate
    authority in a secrecy status, where they have been and will probably
    remain for a considerable number of years

    b  Reference (a) deals with the Department of the Army policy
    in the premises

    c  With a view to obtaining assistance in preparing a case
    which appears to fall within the scope of Department of the Army policy
    referred to in Par. 1b above, I requested and obtained permission to
    employ private counsel as noted in Enclosure (A). I thereupon sought
    and obtained the services of Mr. Henry G. Fischer of the firm of
    Fischer, Panzer and Willis of Washington D C, to assist me

2  a  After I had presented to counsel the facts in the case, so
    far as was permissible under the limitations required by security
    considerations, counsel took up the matter with the Department of Defense.
    Enclosure (B) is a copy of the correspondence that ensued
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b. As a result of that correspondence and conferences between counsel and Major James R. Mills, Chief of the Patents Division, Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, counsel submitted to Major Mills on 21 August 1950 a formal memorandum on the subject of a private bill to be initiated in the Congress on my behalf. Enclosure (C) is a copy of that memorandum.

c. The memorandum referred to in Par. 2b above, requests no affirmative action or support on the part of the Department of Defense for such a private bill, but merely requests permission to present the case to the Congress without objection by the Department.

3. a. As will be noted in Par. 2 of Enclosure (A), the condition on which I was permitted to employ private counsel was that I would not reveal any classified information.

b. For the foregoing reason and because the policy set forth in Reference (a) is classified, I was unable to tell counsel even of existence of the policy. As a consequence, when counsel proposed to me that the matter be presented to the Department on the basis indicated in Par. 2c above, I was able to go no further than to concur in his proposed basis for the presentation. Hence, instead of being in a position to direct counsel to request the active support of the Department in the presentation of the case to the Congress, in consonance with the letter and spirit of Reference (a), I was forced to let counsel remain in the more limited position of merely requesting the Department to refrain from expressing objection to the presentation of the case to the Congress.

4. Several years have passed since the policy in Reference (a) was elaborated and it is possible that presently assigned personnel in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Army are not cognizant of the Department of the Army policy set forth in Reference (a). It would therefore appear to be desirable and in my interest to insure that that policy is known to Major Mills in the early stages of his study of the facts in the case.

5. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Director of Intelligence ascertain whether Major Mills has knowledge of the existence and nature of the policy set forth in Reference (a), and if not, that steps be taken to inform him thereof so that this information will be available to him for consideration in connection with his study of the memorandum which was submitted to him by my counsel.
1. I would feel better if this were kept as few people as possible because of its private nature.
2. Am sending this through you on the basis that I think it should go through proper administrative channels. I am sending a copy for information to Col. Collins, as Army representative, and to Capt. Wanger, as Navy representative.

Attached was a copy of the brief by Farber.