Chapter 6  INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Even during the earliest days of planning, when it was envisioned that U.S. monitoring would concentrate on shortwave broadcasts beamed to the Western Hemisphere, it became apparent that posts established within the continental United States could not satisfactorily do the job. That led to selection of Puerto Rico as one of the first monitoring posts. Soon after monitoring was under way at Portland and Puerto Rico it became evident that the former could not adequately cover the Far East and the latter was not a satisfactory site for monitoring Africa, the Middle East, and South Europe. No doubt Lloyd Free, who was familiar with BBC monitoring, also was aware that an effective monitoring system would have to move beyond broadcasts beamed to this hemisphere, that any foreign broadcast monitoring system worthy of the name would have to operate outside the United States. This called for international negotiations.

British-American Arrangements

It is not clear exactly when Lloyd Free started negotiations for establishment of a staff in England, but it must have been very soon after he assumed office on 16 June 1941. Of course approval by FCC was the first step, then acquiescence by the State Department,
which instructed Ambassador John Winant in London to investigate the attitude of the British Government and the BBC monitoring station. Free may also have made his own contacts in London, but he definitely approached British officials in the United States. On 26 August 1941 he wrote Gerald Cook, BBC representative in New York City; contents of the letter made it apparent that he already had discussed the matter with Cook. Mr. Free declared that official approval was complete on this side, and that he awaited only acceptance from London to start action.\* Formal State Department approval actually came much later, but Free must have been assured verbally that the plan was acceptable.\**

The Pearl Harbor attack came so quickly after Free and Rhodes arrived in London that very little had

\* Free recalled in the letter that the "proposed arrangement" was that the U.S. representative would have access to data of the BBC Monitoring Service, so that he could send out daily reports by telephone and the BBC printed material by airmail. In exchange, FBMS was to provide the British with its own data, specifically, with broadcasts from the Far East and those beamed to Latin America. FBIS Records, National Archives. Such a detailed analysis of the planned agreement indicates that Free had held considerable discussion with the British, though no printed records of this discussion have been found.

** See pages 32, 33 and 34.
been done toward completing detailed arrangements with the BBC. At a meeting held on 10 December 1941, the BBC promised to provide FBIS with office accommodations at Evesham; to tie in its flash service from the monitoring post to the FBIS London office; and to allow FBIS personnel at Evesham the use of a BBC line to London in case of an emergency. No exclusive FBIS line from Evesham to London was yet available. It was agreed that there would be no charge to FBIS "except where the BBC was actually out of pocket." BBC officials described as "extremely useful" the services promised then by Free. They expressed a preference for Japanese and Chinese broadcasts of news and intelligence value, but were content to leave selection of material and other details to FBIS. Any material cabled to the BBC from the United States would be at FBIS expense.

It was obvious that FBIS was getting much more from the arrangement than were the British. On the other hand, the BBC was going to absolutely no extra expense. Cable costs both ways would be an FBIS obligation, and though the Americans were left free to decide what they would send the British in return, the volume of material they received would depend entirely upon the effort and expense to which they
were willing to go. The BBC at the time was listening to about a million words a day. All of this was made available to FBIS, provided it could supply staff and communications facilities to make use of it.

The BBC did not change its monitoring coverage, its methods or procedure, to meet the needs of FBIS, but it did display from the start a liberal and cooperative attitude. Rhodes had no authority to hire non-American employees, and was badly in need of an experienced secretary. The BBC offered the services of a capable BBC secretary, Mrs. E. L. Trinder, on a reimbursable basis. She continued to draw BBC pay, with FBIS billed for the amount on a quarterly basis. On 3 March 1942 the BBC informed Rhodes that a teletype line from Evesham to London was now available, along with suitable office space at Evesham, at no cost to FBIS. The BBC took the precaution of adding that if the needs of FBIS were considerably expanded the offer of free services might have to be reconsidered, but in that case it would do its best to meet any request on a reimbursable basis. A wire from Tom Grandin, who was anxious to get a BBC representative in Washington to select copy to file to London, assured the BBC on 6 September 1942 that similar free facilities would
be provided such a representative.*

FBIS in Washington launched its daily cable to the BBC as soon as the harassed staff could get to it. Called the D Wire, it included material monitored in Portland, Puerto Rico, and Kingsville, prepared and filed by the Daily Report staff. On 26 February 1943 responsibility for the file was transferred to the A Wire staff. Instead of preparing a daily file as in the past, A Wire editors began filing immediately to London any item that seemed to fit specifications. FBIS editors remained largely in the dark as to specific needs of the BBC, and British plans to send a representative to work in Washington never materialized. Rhodes assured Grandin on 28 August 1942 that the copy was widely appreciated in London and was improving the image of FBIS. Anderson pointed out on 4 April 1943 that the value of the copy could not be gauged by the 15 percent which the BBC published, as FBIS was distributing the copy among

* FBIS also served another British agency, the Ministry of Information (MOI) in the Foreign Office, but here arrangements were different, as MOI had nothing to offer in return. Service to MOI started on 24 April 1943 with utilization of B Wire facilities to New York and Press Wireless from New York to London. MOI paid communications costs of 3 cents per word. This file carried more than 10,000 words a month in 1943, but on 30 May 1944 the British asked that it be restricted to 250 words a day. Job 49-24, CIA Records Center.
local British as well as American offices and had considerable evidence it was appreciated. British officials informed Leigh on 3 June 1943 that the immediate filing of D Wire items to replace the daily cable was "a definite improvement," and it was hoped the practice would be continued.

FBIS staff members were slightly embarrassed at the puny service FBIS gave the BBC in exchange for access to its daily million-word monitoring file, but there is no indication that the British were dissatisfied. There was an occasional opportunity to provide additional service. With expansion of Pacific monitoring the D Wire grew, and on 3 January 1944 the British Political Warfare Mission in San Francisco, broadcasting to the Far East, asked the San Francisco monitoring station to copy for it daily an entire BBC program. FBIS readily agreed, though the monitoring had to be done on the East Coast and sent by wire to San Francisco.

Another British request reluctantly had to be sidetracked. In March 1945 the British Political Warfare Mission contacted Charles Hyneman on the possibility of stationing an editor and from four to eight Japanese monitors at the FBIS Guam station. FBIS was badly in
need of competent Japanese monitors and was quite willing to meet any British request in repayment for BBC services, but in this case, because of closeness of the Guam operation to the Navy, the suggestion had to be rejected. *

On the other hand, FBIS found it impossible to induce the BBC to increase its coverage. In the fall of 1942, with Puerto Rico failure to obtain desired broadcasts from Spain and Portugal, FBIS, hard pressed to meet the demands of subscribers, asked the BBC to add certain broadcasts from those countries. Also the BBC was urged to increase coverage of German Hellschreiber. Anderson wrote Grandin on 17 November 1942 that the British were adamant. Their personnel were overworked, with no possibility of getting additional monitors.

* Russell Shepherd, in Hawaii, talked to intelligence officers in Honolulu and wrote Hyneman on 10 March 1945 that the military was strongly opposed to admitting British to the field of operations. If the FBIS were to allow British personnel on Guam it would jeopardize its good relations with the Navy. At any rate, approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be obtained first. Hyneman discussed the matter with Capt. Gilbert Meyers of the Joint Chiefs and learned that Shepherd's estimate was correct -- that the military did not want British observers in the Theater. Shepherd letter of 10 March and Hyneman memorandum of 14 June 1945 -- Organization and Management, History of FBIS, FBIS Headquarters Executive Files.
There was no fear during the war that the BBC would alter its terms of agreement with FBIS, but after transfer of FBIS to the War Department, Alfred M. Brace, new chief of the London Bureau, thought he detected clear danger signals. He warned Headquarters that thought should be given to a new FBIS-BBC agreement. Access to BBC output had become such an important asset to FBIS that its loss would cripple the service or force a complete reorganization. Brace pointed out that the BBC was hard pressed financially, and though it was not spending funds directly for the benefit of FBIS, it might logically decide that FBIS should contribute financially in proportion to the benefits it received. Brace also feared a sharp curtailment in the BBC operation.

Finally Shepherd sent a list of proposed FBIS services to the BBC for Brace to present "as soon as the British make a specific proposal concerning a basis for continued cooperation." Brace revealed the list to Maj. Gen. C. L. Bissell on 30 May 1946. FBIS publications would continue to go to British, Canadian, and Australian offices in Washington, as well as to the BBC; FBIS Pacific posts would move forward, perhaps to Manila and Tokyo; Latin American coverage would be expanded;
the BBC would be welcome to send editors to Washington and to any FBIS post; the D Wire would continue via Signals and would be expanded to 5,000 words a day; and FBIS would take over the Cairo monitoring post operated by MOI on 1 June 1946, with the BBC welcome to the full output of the station.Apparently these plans appealed to the BBC, which soon made clear that cooperative arrangements would continue without revision.

United Nations Monitoring Network

The idea of a united monitoring operation for all allied nations was discussed in London early in 1942. Rhodes reported to Grandin on 26 May 1942 that he attended a meeting with representatives of the BBC, MOI, COI, and the Chinese Propaganda Ministry. Immediate steps were proposed to pool the monitoring output of London, the United States, Australia, New Delhi, and if possible Chungking and Kuihyshev. MOI, like OWI later, had been commissioned to conduct monitoring outside its own country and already had working arrangements in New Delhi with the Indian Government. Rhodes continued to keep the home office informed. On 1 August 1942 Chairman Fly complained to the Secretary of State that progress in the London discussions was hampered because of "a lack of understanding" among the conferees as to what U.S. office was responsible for monitoring.
He asked that State inform British officials that FBIS held this responsibility. Rhodes later informed Grandin that MOI had instructed all British agencies to clear questions concerning U.S. monitoring with FBIS. Rhodes reported to Grandin in October that MOI was going to Ankara with the idea of setting up a monitoring operation, and also was considering one in Accra. On 7 October he wrote urging that FBIS send a man to Stockholm to investigate monitoring possibilities there.

Talks also took place in Washington. Robert Burns, chief of the BBC Monitoring Service, visited Washington, and Leigh wrote him on 10 January 1943 that his visit had advanced the cause of cooperative monitoring. Leigh also informed him that the State Department on 6 January 1943 had formally approved a "U.N. Monitoring Committee." Leigh went to London in June 1943. In requesting State Department approval for the trip, Fly noted that Leigh would meet with British and Australian officials "to discuss joint and cooperative activity in the monitoring field." On 12 July 1943 Leigh held a meeting with various MOI representatives. A report of the meeting shows monitoring coverage by U.S., British, Australian and Chinese agencies was discussed, as well as current
practices for exchanging products and plans for future development of broadcast monitoring.*

Following Leigh's trip to London, regular reports of meetings of the U. N. Monitoring Committee were filed. Leigh was Chairman. A liaison office was maintained in London under the direction of MOI employee Penelope Robinson, Committee Secretary. The FBIS London Bureau Chief attended meeting as the representative of Leigh. Writing to Julian Behrstock on 28 December 1943, Leigh instructed him to push discussion of PWR monitoring activities at the next meeting and suggest that Robert Burns be Committee Chairman for the coming year. Reporting to Leigh on 9 June 1944, Behrstock informed him that the last meeting of the U.N. Monitoring Committee concentrated on monitoring in the Mediterranean, with Maj. Frazer, head of the MOI post at Cairo, present. In a formal request for a file of monitored material from New Delhi on 7 September 1943, Leigh described sending such a file as "part of the general cooperative arrangement

* This must have been the organization meeting of the U.N. Monitoring Committee, though the report of the meeting does not show this. Leigh told the Cox Committee that the U.N. Monitoring Committee was organized in July 1943. See Page 3458, Report of Special Committee Investigating the FCC, GFO 1944.
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whereby we look forward to sharing our monitored material with the United Nations." In a memorandum dated 7 January 1944, Leigh noted "the problem of integrating Far East coverage from Portland-San Francisco-Hawaii-Broome-Melbourne-Darjeeling-Delhi, all being tapped and released in a U.N. network."

In the summer of 1943 Vincent O. Anderson was sent from London to Stockholm to direct a monitoring enterprise there. The American Legation had set up a small monitoring unit, which later was enlarged by OWI for its own operations. With an FBIS man placed in charge, the station became known as a unit of the U.N. Monitoring Network. Early in 1944, when FBIS considered closing down the operation, it was continued at MOI and BBC insistence. When a new director was sent to take over New Delhi monitoring by MOI in June 1943 -- a BBC man named Stanley Harrison -- he stated that in moving the operation from Delhi to Darjeeling one of his main goals was to avoid duplication of Portland and San Francisco coverage and supply the British and Americans with new material.

With the exception of some cooperation from the Australians, the U.N. Monitoring Committee remained essentially a British-American organization. In July 1943 Leigh discussed with CIAA the possibility of
bringing Brazil into the network, and also suggested a monitoring post at Montevideo, but nothing came of it. The Dutch East Indies Government joined with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation in establishing a monitoring service which at one time employed 29 monitors. Both FBIS and the British received transcripts from Melbourne, but it was decided that the dearth of exclusive material available there made it impractical to attach FBIS editors to the operation. Leigh reported to Owen Lattimore on 7 February 1944 that he was "chagrined" to learn that the Dutch East Indies post at Broome, Australia, had been sending copy to the BBC but not to FBIS or OWI. OWI planned a Chinese monitoring post in cooperation with the Chinese Government, but was never very successful.

One weakness of the U.N. Monitoring Committee was failure to bring French and Russian monitoring into the network. The goal of a monitoring system that would exchange materials with them was propounded regularly at Committee meetings, and various efforts were made to enlist the services of the Free French and of the Russians, but with little success. The U.S. Embassy in Moscow, in reply to a request sent by Fly through the State Department, stated on 7 July 1944 that "in spite of repeated requests" the Soviet
Government had failed to supply any information concerning its monitoring operations or its desire to cooperate with other allied nations. Julian Behrstock wrote, upon leaving the London Bureau to return to the States in April 1945, that "one matter of unfinished business" in London was fulfillment of the plan to bring France and the USSR into the U.N. Monitoring Network. Charles Hyneman, giving his estimate of the U.N. Monitoring Committee on 31 July 1945, said that the Committee "formalizes to some extent relations between MOI-BBC and FBIS-OWI, which would be carried on about as effectively if there were no Committee."

**Working Arrangements with Canada**

Canadians evinced an early interest in FBMS. Fly was informed by the Secretary of State on 7 May 1941 that the Canadian Broadcasting Company (CBC) had asked if it would be "legitimate" for it to get the product of FBMS when ready for distribution. On 5 June 1941 Fly informed the manager of CBC that State had approved Canadian receipt of FBMS reports and analyses. FBIS also was informed by the Canadian Embassy in the fall of 1942 that the Canadian Navy was depending upon FBIS for information concerning Canadian POW broadcasts from Berlin, and the Embassy would be glad to send a messenger daily to get the information. In December 1942 the
Canadian Wartime Information Board applied for the A Wire file, and received it as soon as State Department approval was available -- 19 February 1943. In March 1943 the Canadian Government informed the BBC that Canada had decided to make direct use of FBIS and BBC materials rather than set up its own monitoring system. Edward Hullinger reported to Leigh on 2 September 1943 that he had been interviewed by a Canadian intelligence officer, who expressed great enthusiasm for FBIS services and said he hoped they would not be discontinued.

As a matter of fact, Canada did establish a monitoring post nine miles from Ottawa and another at Grey's Point in British Columbia. Miss Sally Solomon set up the Ottawa station in 1941 with the cooperation of the CBC. She visited FBIS 21-22 December 1943 and left a description of her monitoring post. Her primary clients were the Canadian Wartime Information Board and military intelligence, and the entire staff of the post consisted of three persons. After FBIS materials became available, this Canadian post concentrated on broadcasts beamed to French Canada. At Point Grey the monitoring was done by the Wartime Information Board, and its chief concern was prisoner messages. It cooperated with FBIS Portland.
through exchange of prisoner information. As a rule
information obtained at Point Grey duplicated Portland
monitoring, but the exchange was of value for veri-
ification purposes.

FBIS Attaches in Foreign Posts

A letter from Rhodes to Graves on 27 June 1942
remarked that, "now that the U.N. monitoring scheme
has been raised and may go through," FBIS should
consider use of London as a training ground for men
to be assigned to the outposts. This was in keeping
with Headquarters thinking, though it was not con-
sidered necessary to send all overseas representatives
first to London. Plans already were underway before
the end of 1942 to tap the London staff to obtain
editors for Algiers and Stockholm, but it was thought
editors also would be needed for Lisbon, Istanbul,
New Delhi, and Australia; obviously the London training
ground could not supply all of them. Plans for a
monitoring station in Lisbon were rather far advanced
in 1942, with Douglas Orangers, an editor and moni-
toring manager in Washington, selected for the post.
Rhodes wrote the U.S. press attache in Lisbon on
6 December 1942 that the project had made "real progress,"
and Orangers should be there by the end of the month.
Owen Lattimore of OWI wired Leigh from San Francisco on
9 January 1943 that he agreed with Leigh's plan to station FBIS men in New Delhi and Chungking, and that he had arranged a conference to discuss the matter with Spencer Williams, who tentatively had been selected for the New Delhi assignment.

Actually, Algiers and Stockholm were the only posts to which FBIS men were immediately sent. Negotiations proved more difficult than had been expected, and new budgetary problems arose for FBIS. The Lisbon project was delayed pending development of the Algiers station and eventually dropped. OWI sent William Carter, a former FBIS editor and bureau manager, to New Delhi in April 1942, and his report to Grandin dated 26 April convinced FBIS officials that it would be worthwhile to send a man to that post. FCC was asked at once to approve this position. The FBIS representative was to work with MOI and OWI, but his sole duty would be to provide FBIS with needed broadcast information. A formal request was sent to MOI on 7 September 1943 for acceptance of one FBIS man at New Delhi, with a possible second one to be sent later. Meantime, a file from OWI in New Delhi was received by FBIS, with Graves reporting on 10 July 1943 that the Far East Division was enthusiastic concerning prospects. Leigh was informed on 11 December 1943 that
the Government of India had approved stationing of an FBIS representative as "a further step toward the complete coordination of our respective monitoring efforts in the Far East." Grandin, who was traveling in the Middle East in the fall of 1943 under the auspices of OWI in an effort to iron out some of the monitoring problems, included New Delhi in his itinerary and made final arrangements for an FBIS man there. However, Williams was by that time involved in plans for an Hawaii post, and did not leave for New Delhi until June 1944. He was formally transferred to the OWI payroll, but under the agreement with OWI was recognized as an FBIS representative, with OWI entitled to claim reimbursement for his salary.

Tentative plans to attach FBIS men to OWI staffs in Istanbul, Chungking, and other centers were all abandoned, and the only other post to get a representative not directly under control of PWB was Cairo. By late 1943 MOI had a monitoring station there with more than 70 employees. MOI was notified through the London Bureau on 23 December 1943 that Edward Berkman was going directly from Washington to Cairo and would arrive soon. On 14 February 1944 Chairman Fly formally notified Elmer Davis that Berkman was being transferred
to the OWI payroll and would proceed at once to Cairo, but with the sole responsibility of serving FBIS.*

Despite this stipulation, OWI sought to transfer Berkman to Bari, and it was not until 13 May 1944 that his position in Cairo was clarified to the satisfaction of everybody.** He was designated as a radio attache of the U.S. Legation in Cairo, on the payroll of OWI, but working with the MOI monitoring post. Hyneman wrote Berkman on 26 February 1945 informing him that his situation, and Williams’ in New Delhi, had been gone over thoroughly, and it had been decided to ask OWI to bill FBIS for their salaries, something that OWI had neglected to do.

Berkman and Williams remained at their posts and

* The letter informed Davis that although Berkman would be attached to OWI, his duties would be "to review, edit, and prepare a file of monitored material to be transmitted to Washington for the use of FBIS, OWI, and other war agencies." OWI would pay his salary and he would be under OWI administration, but his salary was reimbursable. FBIS Records, National Archives.

** On 4 May 1944 a cable from James Jones in Cairo asked Washington to approve transfer of Berkman to Bari to assist Lieberman, who was in charge there. Berkman wrote questioning the move and complaining that OWI seemed to feel he was under its complete supervision. The 13 May wire was signed by Leigh and an OWI official and made clear that Berkman was working for FBIS alone, and would transfer to Bari only if Berkman himself decided this was best. FBIS Records, National Archives.
continued to supply FBIS with information, even into the post-war period. Anderson, who also was named radio attache at the U.S. Legation in Stockholm in October 1943, continued to file material through London until the Stockholm post was closed on 2 January 1945.\footnote{The Stockholm project also offered another example of FBIS cooperation with other U.S. offices. The Legation gave administrative support; OWI supplied working personnel. Anderson wrote Shepherd on 21 January 1944 that cooperative arrangements were working well, with OWI bearing most of the cost. FBIS paid communications costs, which ran as high as $219 a month. As Radio Attache at the Legation, Anderson was entitled under State regulations to a living allowance of $1,700 a year, but ICC regulations prevented a single man from drawing more than $1,000. Job 49-24, CIA Records Center.}

On the other hand, transfer of FBIS personnel to FWB jurisdiction proved to be a rather poor investment from an FBIS standpoint. FWB, a joint U.S.-British organization, utilized the efforts of several civilian groups, including MOJ, OWI and OSS. Its monitoring operations were strictly field activities designed to serve the military command. FBIS assumed that field units would make much valuable information available to Washington. This assumption proved unfounded. The posts were short of personnel and equipment. In monitoring for field usage they duplicated to a great extent the work of regular FBIS monitoring posts. They produced
litter of value in Washington, communications for getting it there were not readily available, and the overworked staff members had little inducement to prepare special files for FBIS Headquarters.

Four of the original FBIS staff members transferred to Algiers remained in the area and each one eventually became head of a field monitoring post. James Jones remained an employee of FBIS, while Rhodes, Ellington, and Lieberman transferred to OWI. When Rhodes left for a front post, Jones was in charge at Algiers and made some rather unsuccessful attempts to get information to Washington. When Grandin visited the area in the fall of 1943 he tried to coordinate monitoring in the area so it would provide a maximum of service to Washington offices, but PWB monitoring did not easily lend itself to such coordination. Writing to Leigh on 28 November 1943, Grandin said one of the main problems was duplication. If the forward posts could get a file of 10,000 words a day from Washington and London it could avoid much of this duplication. This also did not prove practicable. Jones wrote to Leigh on 11 May 1944 that PWB monitoring faced a crisis. With a shortage of personnel and equipment he must tackle the problem of providing
for at least five forward posts, which made it impossible to give any attention to the needs of FBIS in Washington. Jones also asked that another FBIS editor be sent to Algiers, but was informed by Leigh on 14 June 1944 that the organization could send but one man to such a post. As long as Jones was still with FBIS they would have to depend on him.

In Western Europe, following the Normandy invasion, PWB followed a different system. It did not depend upon field teams, but instead asked FBIS to provide it with a basic file from London. The request, from Hamblett and C.D. Jackson, was forwarded to Leigh in Washington. He reported on 18 February 1944 that two men would be added to the London staff to provide the file. Keiste Janulis, one of the earlier editors sent to London, was assigned to head the project. On 24 July 1944 he was transferred to OWI in line with the agreement that OWI would be in charge of outpost operations involving FBIS personnel. This work continued until the end of the war in Europe. During the Paris Peace Conference a similar file was prepared in London five days a week, this time under direct supervision of the FBIS London Bureau Chief and by FBIS personnel.