

~~SECRET~~ ~~AMBLE~~

From: Director, Defence Signals Branch,  
C/o Defence Registry,  
Victoria Barracks,  
MELBOURNE.

Date: 17th June, 1954

Ref. No.: 2601/005

To : Director, [redacted] (attention Head of [redacted] Department)  
Info. G.C.O. SINGAPORE

---

Subject: Suspect M.C.P. Transmissions

1. We have noted your comments on paras. 16 to 18 of O.C. AMF Detachment's report "Summary of information on possible MCP use of Wireless" (SS/2319 of 6th May refers). Here are our own comments on the relevant paragraphs:-

2. Para. 16 & 17. We find these vague and isolated instances tantalising, and would warn against assumptions that a transmitter is closeby because of the strength of the signal. Service communications in Australia have caused a stir in the Federation before now, because of this sort of assumption. Incidentally from callsign evidence, the transmission referred to in para. 17 may possibly have been [redacted]

3. Para. 18b. An official explanation, from DSB at any rate, is not possible since DSB did not see any of the documents, apart from the GCO signals, until January 1954. We agree [redacted] comments and would add that our own analysis of the story revealed the following additional unsatisfactory features:-

(a) The original intercepts of the 4th Hussars contained code groups which were unrecognisable and there were not enough to begin to break.

(b) Nothing of McEachen's intercept on 30th January appeared to have been transcribed. There is no good evidence therefore that McEachen's party was even on to the same transmission, although McEachen reported confidently that it was the wanted transmission.

(c) McEachen did not report any code groups. He did not report intercept of normal commercial code, let alone Commercial code. He simply asserted that Dutch language was used in the first and later conversations. He concluded "from the evidence the link was a radiotelephone link situated at a considerable distance from RAUB (possibly [redacted])".

(d) As has been said before (my 230017/February refers) the papers do not reveal how Dover was able to amplify this statement several days later; "the experts claim the messages to be transmitted from [redacted] and the numbers to be a normal commercial code". The "expert" authors of this statement remain a mystery. However we note that at the time, "authorities

~~SECRET~~ ~~AMBLE~~



~~SECRET~~ AMBL:

Declassified by ASD - 17/11/2021  
Information removed for national security  
and/or personal sensitivities

- 2 -

in [redacted] well satisfied they and FARELF most appreciative  
McEachen's efforts".

4. SS/2319 para. 7. In a conference between DSB, GCO and  
SIFE held on 24th March 1954. it was  
agreed "that the issue is dead in so far as [redacted] is  
concerned. The charges have never been publicly stated, (i.e.,  
charges of dilatory handling) and they should therefore go by  
default in order to secure Federation goodwill which we now  
have". On this understanding Betterill was not asked to  
discuss the case when he visited [redacted] in April.

for Director, Defence Signals Branch.

~~SECRET~~

~~77044~~