

be no US-UK or US-UK-Fr agreement on mtg or any other MEC matter without prior consultation with Turks. I urge that Turks be advised that there wld be no formal MEC discussions until after their entry into NATO and that four powers will then consult as equals as to next steps to be taken. I hope that Dept will in future keep us better advised with respect to MEC developments. To date I have recd nothing to indicate progress of US-UK or SG discussions and am embarrassed by fact that I have recd no reply to Embtel 671, Jan 26,¹ making it impossible discuss MEC with FonMin as agreed. I hope that GTI will follow MEC developments with same interest as NE. MEC cannot be successfully developed on basis private deals between US and Brit. We can only assure Turk coop if they are in fact, as well as in name treated as equal partner in development of MEC concept and org.

McGHEE

¹ Not printed; it requested the Department of State's latest thinking on the Middle East Command, including any matters discussed with the British which had not been relayed to the Turks, in preparation for talks with the Turkish Foreign Minister the following week on the Command. (780.5/1-2652)

No. 60

780.5/1-2652: Telegram

*The Secretary of State to the Embassy in Turkey*¹

SECRET

WASHINGTON, February 6, 1952—8:56 p. m.

661. Fol is round-up re MEC (re Ankara 671 Jan 26² and 710 Feb 5).³

A. Pres and Churchill reaffirmed agreement sponsoring powers proceed estab MEC without delay.⁴ Brit Gov in Morrison-Acheson exchange Oct agreed to initial location MEC hq on Cyprus though generally accepted that in long run hq shld be located Suez if possible.⁵ Fol this line thought, Dept suggested to Defense Dec 29 that State-Defense working grp estab US position re location, nature and complement MEC hq for which Mar-Apr wld be target date establishment.⁶ Defense has not yet replied.

¹ Repeated for information to London, Paris, and Cairo.

² See footnote 1, *supra*.

³ *Supra*.

⁴ See the minutes of the White House meeting of Jan. 8, Document 56.

⁵ Regarding this exchange, see the editorial note, *Foreign Relations*, 1951, vol. v, p. 208.

⁶ For the Dec. 29 letter, see *ibid.*, p. 265.