

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~FROTH~~

REF ID: A67072

Friedman

~~U. S. EYES ONLY~~

INCOMING MESSAGE

~~TOP SECRET FROTH~~

09 JULY 54

FM: DIRNSA

TO: SUSLO

DECODE: PJM

090005Z

PRIORITY

WL 433. FOR PULLING FROM CANINE PASS TO ACKERMAN.

1. I HAVE RECEIVED A COPY OF S/6640 AND AM FORWARDING MY VIEWS ON PARAGRAPH 17 FOR YOUR INFORMATION AND GUIDANCE.

2. I CANNOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED PROCEDURE FOR THE DETERMINATION OF TECHNICAL INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED [REDACTED] AS SET FORTH IN THIS PARAGRAPH. I FEEL THAT JOINT NSA-GCHQ DETERMINATION OF ALL TECHNICAL DATA TO BE PROVIDED TO EACH NATION IS AN UNNECESSARILY INVOLVED PROCEDURE, AND COULD RESULT IN UNDESIRABLE DELAY IN THE PROVISION OF SUCH DATA TO THESE NATIONS.

3. MY POSITION ON PARA 17 IS AS FOLLOWS:

A. NSA AND GCHQ SHOULD ESTABLISH CLEARLY PRESCRIBED LIMITS AS TO THE TYPES OF TECHNICAL INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO EACH NATION.

Later?

Now

B. NSA OR GCHQ SHOULD PROVIDE THE TECHNICAL INFORMATION TO THE NATIONS FOR WHICH THE U.S. OR THE U.K. RESPECTIVELY, HAS THE NEGOTIATING AUTHORITY.

PL 86-36/50 USC 3605
EO 3.3(h) (2)

C. NSA AND GCHQ, OPERATING WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED LIMITS OF EXCHANGE, SHOULD DETERMINE INDEPENDENTLY THE ITEMS OF TECHNICAL INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED. INFORMATION PRODUCED BY BOTH CENTERS SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE BY THE SUPPLYING CENTER.

D. ANY QUESTIONS AS TO THE DESIRABILITY OF PROVIDING INFORMATION NOT CLEARLY WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED LIMITS OF EXCHANGE WILL BE RESOLVED BETWEEN NSA AND GCHQ THROUGH NORMAL CHANNELS.

4. THE ABOVE PROCEDURE, WHICH IS WITHIN THE SPIRIT OF THE UKUSA AGREEMENT WOULD PROVIDE ADEQUATE CONTROL OF THE EXCHANGE AND WOULD PRESERVE THE NECESSARY FREEDOM OF ACTION FOR BOTH CENTERS.

5. ALTHOUGH AVAILABLE EVIDENCE INDICATES SOME DEGREE OF COMINT COLLABORATION

[REDACTED] I DO NOT FEEL THAT THE PROVISION OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SHOULD BE COMPLICATED BY THIS FACT. I CANNOT, FOR EXAMPLE, AGREE TO THE GCHQ PROCEDURE ON THE BASIS THAT ANALOGOUS INFORMATION SHOULD BE SUPPLIED [REDACTED] BECAUSE OF A PRESUMED EXCHANGE OF DATA BETWEEN THESE NATIONS. I BELIEVE THAT IN THE LIGHT OF PRESENT EVIDENCE, WE MUST DEAL WITH EACH NATION INDEPENDENTLY. THE ABOVE VIEWS IN NO WAY CONFLICT WITH THE U.S. POSITION (WHICH I REAFFIRM) AS OUTLINED IN THE U.S. POSITION PAPERS. THIS CONCLUDES MY COMMENTS ON PARA 17.

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~FROTH~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~FROTH~~

REF ID: A67072

PAGE 2 OF WL-433

~~U. S. EYES ONLY~~

~~TOP SECRET FROTH~~

6. MY ONLY COMMENT ON REMAINDER OF PAPER PERTAINS TO SECTION 3 PARA 10 THRU 12, I CANNOT AGREE TO FLAT PROHIBITION OF TECH ASSISTANCE WHICH WOULD INCREASE COMINT CAPABILITY. FOR EXAMPLE RE PARA 12 I FEEL WE SHOULD DEFINITELY PROVIDE KEY FAMILIES AND PATTERNS OF KEY EXTRACTION EVEN THOUGH THEY HAVE GIVEN US NO EVIDENCE OF KNOWLEDGE THEREOF.

7. RECOMMEND YOU DISCUSS PAPER WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON PARA 17 WITH OTHER U.S. DELEGATES PRIOR TO CONFERENCE.

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~FROTH~~