

SECRET

NOV 1954

MEMORANDUM FOR: C/OPS

VIA : G/PP

SUBJECT : Request for Radio Policy Guidance

1. For some time SE Division and the [] which conducts clandestine radio projects against Albania (OBTEST), Bulgaria (METAPHOR), and Rumania (SHELLAC), have been interested in "unconventional broadcasting operations" as methods of counter-acting jamming and reaching a wider audience. While the three project outlines differ in detail, we have attempted to treat them in a similar fashion from the point of view of radio policy. However, in connection with recent efforts to provide general clandestine radio policy guidance requested by the [] we have discovered discrepancies concerning the authorization to use "unconventional broadcasting techniques" between the three projects and the terms of their approval by DDP/G/OPS. We have also discovered a general uncertainty as to the exact meaning of the phrase "unconventional broadcasting techniques". Your advice is therefore solicited in order that we may provide the field with a clear, consistent directive governing their operations in this sensitive field.

2. Project OBTEST, approved by DDP/G/OPS on 16 July 1954, makes no reference to the possibility of using "unconventional broadcasting techniques"; therefore no limitations or conditions on its approval were imposed by higher authority. Project METAPHOR, however, cites as an objective "to use unconventional broadcasting techniques whenever approved by Headquarters". Approval for METAPHOR by DDP/G/OPS on 12 January 1954 was granted "subject to conditions recommended by PP Radio", which suggested merely that "unconventional broadcasting techniques be submitted for specific PP approval". Project SHELLAC, referring to PPS approval in principle for their

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

use, states

SECRET

SECRET

- 2 -

use, states that "unconventional broadcasting techniques will be utilized when authorization for such use is granted". In this case, approval of the project by DDP/G/OPS, dated 18 December 1953, was made contingent upon "individual clearance of each and every unconventional broadcast and approval in advance by DDP". As a result of this situation, we have no authorization for ORTEST to engage in "unconventional broadcast operations", and two different, in part conflicting, unconventional broadcast clearance policies for METAPHOR and SHELLAG.

3. In addition to the clearance problem, we are unaware of any official definition of the phrase "unconventional broadcasting techniques". We have, in fact, recently discovered that the term has been variously interpreted to mean random frequency broadcasts, the use of the "spotlight" technique, "single-sidebanding", "ghost-voicing", and "cuddling", as well as "intruder" broadcasts. Since certain of the foregoing techniques are now, or may soon become, standard operating procedures for the Office of Communications in transmitting our broadcasts, it would appear that the DD/P limitations mentioned in paragraph 2 were not intended to affect all special clandestine radio techniques which may at any time have been characterized as "unconventional".

4. In a preliminary effort to clarify these related problems, we have informally queried the Office of Communications and STD. The latter has advised us that only "intruder" radio transmissions, defined as deliberate interruption on hostile communications circuits, are governed by the provisions of CIB #000138, and require extensive clearance at the highest national levels. STD is not, they tell us, concerned with other types of "unconventional broadcasts", such as interference on regular broadcast frequencies. The Office of Communications, however, has told us informally that, in addition to limitations on "intruder" broadcasts, national policy prohibits two other types of broadcasts, i.e., those which have the effect of jamming enemy broadcasts and those which employ "deception" tactics. With the exception of these three major limitations, however, the Office of Communications considers our efforts in the "unconventional broadcasting" field to be limited solely by our capabilities.

5. Since the above information appears of considerable significance for our radio operations, your advice would greatly assist us in providing the field with authoritative radio policy, and, at the same time, permit us to modify our project outlines where

necessary to

SECRET

SECRET

- 3 -

necessary to allow the field maximum flexibility consistent with national policy. In particular, guidance on the following points is desired.

- a. What specific practices are covered by the phrase "unconventional broadcasting techniques"?
- b. Which of these "unconventional broadcasting techniques" require clearance outside of SE Division?
- c. What "unconventional broadcasting techniques" may be written into project outlines and authorized thereby (i.e., random frequency broadcasting)?
- d. What procedure should SE follow in presenting for clearance a field proposal for the use of a particular unconventional technique?

SE/PP, /ac/28 October 1954

Distribution:

Chief, SE

Original & 1 - addressee

- 1 - C/PP
- 2 - SE/PP
- 1 - SE/1
- 1 - SE/2
- 1 - SE/5
- 1 - SE/EX
- 1 - RI

SECRET