

Dear Bill

I have taken the liberty of reading the script of your lecture to the Marine Corps Schools and am glad I did. I can <sup>appreciate</sup> ~~understand~~ why it was so enthusiastically received. It is most entertaining as well as informative and I can see a benefit from having Marine Corps personnel so favorable impressed with our types of work. I could

not however, <sup>put aside the need for</sup> ~~make~~ making a security appraisal <sup>of the disclosure</sup> ~~of such information to an unindoctrinated audience.~~

As I have told you before I feel that existing rules do not satisfy such a need and therefore I have the personal dilemma of choosing between instinct and logic. I am dissatisfied with instinct because it is inadequate for action and I have a hard time <sup>being</sup> ~~attempting to be~~ logical. In this case I feel that I must make the choice of attempting to be logical. I assume the lecture is to be presented again largely as now written and to an unindoctrinated but TOP SECRET audience. My question is whether CODEWORD

information is involved.

I interpret the logic behind CODEWORD usage to be that it invokes indoctrination and a stricter than average application of "need to know" to protect COMINT activities against such specific foreign COMSEC actions or new COMSEC concerns as may be stimulated by disclosures of information.

I feel that your lecture includes an abundance of material that would probably stimulate to some degree any complacent or inactive COMSEC organization, particularly if delivered direct, but would have no effect on an alert and active COMSEC organization or one incapable of sophisticated response. Moreover, I feel that the specific nature of the information would probably have disappeared by the time it might possibly be <sup>further</sup> disclosed by any of your audience.

Therefore, I have no personal pang of conscience in judging that none of the substance should logically be considered

CODEWORD

There is a further consideration, however, in the fact that DCID No. 6/3 prescribes that types of information which "Indicate<sup>COMINT</sup> a sophisticated technique" ~~SECRET~~ must bear a codeword. This is a rule which is explicit and which causes me to urge you to damp out ~~some of~~ your references to the more modern practices of NSA. I feel too that a classification of TOP SECRET<sup>for the second and third parts</sup> would be more appropriate than SECRET, thus assuring some additional protection.

Please discuss this matter with me if I have caused you difficulty.

Glad to see you back home.

Mr William F. Friedman  
316 Second Street, S E  
Washington 3, D C