

<b>MEMO ROUTING SLIP</b>		<small>NEVER USE FOR APPROVALS, DISAPPROVALS, CONCURRENCES, OR SIMILAR ACTIONS</small>	
1 NAME OR TITLE <b>Col. Hetherington</b>	INITIALS		CIRCULATE
ORGANIZATION AND LOCATION <b>Chief, P &amp; P</b>	DATE		COORDINATION
2			FILE
			INFORMATION
3			NECESSARY ACTION
			NOTE AND RETURN
4			SEE ME
			SIGNATURE
REMARKS			
<p>1. As a member of the USCIB SECCOM I can say that I do not believe there is good basis for Col. Horton's opinion expressed in last sentence of his par. 3.</p> <p>2. A study having an important bearing on this subject has been undertaken by SECCOM. It has to do with the philosophy of current BRUSA policy re changing the codeword regularly or when a compromise has been declared. The subject of a codeword for analytic methods can be re-opened when the results of the new SECCOM study have become known.</p> <p>3. I therefore concur in Col. Horton's recommendation and as a member of SECCOM will keep you informed of the progress of SECCOM's study.</p> <p>4. In the meantime I see no reason why we can not or do not follow the GCHQ practice in regard to putting the COMINT codeword on those COMSEC documents which deal with cryptanalytic methods. I have read</p>			
FROM NAME OR TITLE	Declassified and approved for release by NSA on 02-06-2014 pursuant to E.O. 13526		(OVER)
ORGANIZATION AND LOCATION	DATE	2 October 52	
<b>TOP SECRET</b> WILLIAM F. FRIEDMAN CONSULTANT	TELEPHONE	60493	

*just pass*  
~~20/11/52~~  
~~15 March 53~~  
~~15 Aug 52~~

Appendix B the ~~USA~~ agreement quite carefully in regard to the point at issue and am of the opinion that Capt. Goodwin, when in his former AFSA position, made an erroneous or at least a much too rigid interpretation of the rule. I do not think GCHQ is violating the rule and hence if we follow their practice we would not violate it. If you wish to consult DDI or DIR, I would be glad to go with you to present the matter. In this connection, please note that my suggestion to follow GCHQ practice is not only not objected to by SECCOM but in fact meets with the support of the Committee, as evidenced by paras. 4c & d, and recommendation 6b of the SECCOM memo to the Coordinator.