Information removed for national security and/or personal sensitivities

20/1/35

Defence Signals Branch, C/- Defence Registry, Victoria Barracks. MELBOURNE.

Ref. No. : 2601/005

23rd June 1958.

GCO, SINGAPORE.

(Copy to

Special Operations in the Federation

MZ has asked me to answer your 000/13-1 (Supp)-335 of 5th June 1958 since the MCP problem is in my court but before doing so, may I make a general observation.

- The D.S.B. part in the MCP problem is a somewhat anomalous one until MCP transmissions are found, we can do nothing but look for them. Up to 1954, we chased many hares which together with our own search, forced us to the subjective conclusion that the MCP were not using wireless. From 1954 onwards, we started to receive from your office intercepted courier material, and from this we concluded objectively (para 19 of attachment to my 2601/005 of 30th April 1957) that "The MCP technical radio standards are not at present high enough to overcome the difficulties of maintaining guerilla jungle W/T communications....". We rounded off our assessment by saying "D.S.B's present methods, amended as necessary by studying as full a flow of collateral intelligence, particularly of intercepted courier material, as the Federation feel able to supply, remain as adequate protection against the future efforts of the MCP to develop W/T communications....".
- 3. In our 160558/9/57 para 1 we reiterated our requirement for collateral and in GCO/12-1-514 of 3/10/1957, GCO intimated that had agreed to continue the supply of the material through SLO.
- 4. However, to the best of my knowledge we have received no courier material other than in your letter under reference since the publication of our paper. It could be that nothing of W/T interest has come to hand.
- We are not grumbling but we think it should be clearly understood in that our ability to help is proportional to the feed of collateral given us. Once having tasted the courier material, we have no appetite for the sort of stuff served up in your 170110/7/571
- and firstly the document. We (SF 1001/Malaya/10/Link para 4(a)) Over to agree entirely with that the author of the document does not know his or her subject. The specification for the receiver is more or less gibberish. We do not agree with para 3(a) of the above reference that "it is apparent" that spares are required for "an existing" trans-Were this so, it would be reasonable to expect the

- 2 -

Ref. No. : 2601/005

actual values of the replacement points to be specified.

However, the lack of precise values, if a transmitter does exist would reinforce the view that the writer is untutored in the radio art.

7. The description of the receiver tallies more with one required for broadcast reception on loudspeaker rather than communications reception.

suggest there is some need for caution, even though the prize is great. For years the MCP have been trying to establish communication. To set them up with equipment (supposing they could (a) get it going and (b) maintain it, both extremely doubtful) would be to allow them to realise an important aim and to increase the tempo of their operations. It should be appreciated that the only possible advantage for us would be our ability to intercept the traffic. Any thought of D.Fing the site should be treated with the greatest reserve. Even the interception might be difficult and could be virtually impossible if they were to receive up to date tuition on how to fox sigint organisations. Even if the traffic remained interceptable, there is no guarantee that it would remain readable.

9. Presumably, if they established an elusive clandestine link, their courier traffic might disappear. All in all, from the D.S.B. point of view, the exercise is likely to demand more cover from us and we are not very sanguine about results.

10. Your para. 5 - shall do.

MS.