***************************************					
			REF	ID:A	6565
BY AIR PAR A AIR LI ABROG					94)
-		•	•		
,	Mr. W. H	riedman			
	<u>310 Secor</u>	nd St. SE	****	1	
:	Washing	ton 3, D.C.		Paga 5 4 4 9 5 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	
	U.S./			*****	
	*******	, 	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
		-			
M(**************	<	- Second fold here	, 20 c o o 1 c o o t a o o a o o o		
• Sender's	s name and address :	oseph A. Me	yer	54-5 ; 4 6 ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ;	
	Glenrise,	Harp Hill,	Chelt	enham	
	**	, England	*****		
,					
	SURE; IF IT D	HOULD NOT CO SES IT WILL BE BY ORDINARY M	surc		
-	-				
	۰ ۹				
				; ~	<u>`</u> [

Approved for Release by NSA on 08-22-2013 pursuant to E.O. 13526

Dear Mr. Friedman,

I finally have something concrete to report. I have just finished typing up a first draft of the article you described last summer. It is about 3500 words long at present, before editing, rewriting, and putting in footnotes. I'm not sure this is the length you wanted, but the material seemed to form up that way, so I heven't tried to do any serious cutting yet.

My most difficult problem in doing the article has been, not keeping away from classified material, but remembering correctly the unclassified material I have read. I have used material which I think I remember seeing in "The Black Chamber", the "Pearl Harbor Report", "The Eyes of the Navy", and a few other sources, but it has been five years since I read some of these books, and they are not **EMIX** easily obtained over here, in Cheltenham.

I want particularly to check many of my references in the article, not only to provide public domain footnotes for items which might otherwise be regarded (by suspicious people) as compromises, but also to make sure I have reported historical events correctly (or at least as other people have reported them).

Effore I really do any serious verification of details, however, which will take a fair amount of rereading of these various books, I thought it would be test to let you see the article in a relatively unpolished state, because we really have not discussed it at all since August, and I'm not at all sure that the article I8ve written resembles the one you have been thinking of.

The ideas, the writing, and the authentication of the details all have to be considered. The best way that I can think of to do this is to let you have the thing to read and criticize. If it's not at all what you want, we can drop it. If you think I should go ahead, you can indicate ideas and changes you want included, and I would rather put formal footnoting, etc. off until we have an article that reads effectively.

I shall play with the article for a few more days over here, to try to smooth out the writing, and then route it to you through official channel, probably Dr. Leibler at NSA, Although I believe that all the information I have used is really public domain, I will, as a matter of proceedure, 1°bel the envelope Confidential, so if I have slipped up, it will have received proper handling. You can change to classification to suit.

Whether this paper materializes or not, I must say that I have had an enjoyable/ ( if somewhat challenging ) time writing it. and I hope you do not find it all balderdash.

Joe mayn