

5 October 1959

DRAFT

25X1A8a

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: City Planning Exchange

REFERENCE: Your Memo for the Record, dated 24 September 1959,  
Same Subject

1. In our opinion, an exchange of US-USSR city planners would produce a net intelligence advantage for the U.S. The extent of the U.S. advantage would depend upon <sup>the</sup> USSR cities visited and the accessibility of the U.S. group to intelligence briefing officers prior to departure.

2. Information on layout, development plans, and location of important establishments is lacking <sup>for</sup> most Soviet cities. [REDACTED] 25X1X4

25X1X4

[REDACTED] City planning specialists, properly briefed, ~~may~~ <sup>should</sup> be able to contribute uniquely to the acquisition of elements of this information, not only through observation but also through elicitation in the course of technical discussions with their Soviet hosts. We would also anticipate some possible return in the form of unique urban mapping which this specialist group may have access to.

3. We feel that the Soviet group, on the other hand, is not likely to obtain new information of intelligence significance. A wide variety of open sources provide information on the U.S. cities

cited in your memo. In addition, data on U.S. urban planning theory and practice <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ available to the Soviets through a variety of professional publications and international planners meetings, the last of which was held some <sup>time</sup> ~~two years~~ ago in Moscow.

4. It is recommended that the proposed exchange be encouraged. Recognizing that the exchange will of necessity include such fairly adequately covered cities as Moscow, Leningrad, Minsk, Kiev, and Khar'kov, it is recommended that one half of the itinerary (three cities) be made up of such cities, and the second half include three of the following cities: Gor'kiy, Kuybyshev, Angarsk, Novosibirsk, and Irkutsk. These cities are less frequently visited, and therefore more important intelligencewise. They are plausible as selections to be put forward by a city planner group. If negotiations come to a standstill over the selection of these cities, Chelyabinsk, Baku, Kazan', Noril'sk, Stalinsk, Tomsk, Komsomol'sk, or Yerevan may be substituted for cities in the second group. If feasible, the itinerary of cities in the U.S.A. might be expanded to include at least one additional closed city to strengthen our bargaining position in the negotiations for the USSR cities.

5. Additionally, it is recommended that after the itinerary is firm/ steps be taken to insure that appropriate members of the U.S. delegation <sup>are</sup> ~~be~~ briefed in detail on key intelligence gaps.

25X1A9a

Chief, Geographic Research Area