

File copy w/ Comments 1-4  
sent to Mr. Kullback for  
information & return.

13 May 52

4/5/52

Declassified and approved for release by NSA on 06-16-2014  
pursuant to E.O. 13526

~~This goes in bottom  
drawer, left-hand  
Cabinet safe~~

~~SECURITY INFORMATION~~  
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~SUBJECT: Publication of Material Contained in  
Unclassified AFSA Technical DocumentTO: Chief, Training Division FROM: Consultant DATE: 13 May 1952 COMMENT NO. 4  
\*\*\*\*\*

1. To do what you recommend would be to the detriment of AFSA, as pointed out in Comment No. 3, without sufficient compensating gain to either AFSA or the author.

2. In this connection I wish to indicate that one of the recommendations in the report recently submitted to DIRAFSA by the Special Communications Advisory Group (SCAG) was the following:

"In order to attract and to keep key personnel and other top-flight people needed for the performance of AFSA's mission, SCAG feels that a careful revision of personnel policy is needed, particularly with respect to the assignment of technically qualified people and their adequate recognition and compensation."

When certain SCAG members were asked to explain what the recommendation meant in connection with the phrase "adequate recognition" it developed that one of the principal points they had in mind was this very question of the security handicaps which AFSA technicians have when it comes to such things as gaining the recognition of other scientists by virtue of publications dealing with contributions to their field.

3. I recommend reconsideration of your recommendation. I do not think that realistic security considerations dictate our having to go so far as to prohibit the author of a completely unclassified article from showing his official attachment to this Agency.

1 Inclosure  
a/c

WILLIAM F. FRIEDMAN  
Consultant

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

**SUBJECT: Rights and Duties of Civilian Employees  
to Present Complaints or to Report Instances of  
Wrongdoing**

**TO: Chief of Staff**

**FROM: Consultant**

**DATE: 13 May 1952 COMMENT NO. 2**

-----

1. After discussing this with Col. Crane, and gaining an understanding of the types of complaints involved, I disagree with the AFSA Inspector's point of view.

2. An employee who wishes to complain about conduct or conditions affecting him personally, for example, what he regards as being unfair treatment accorded him by his immediate supervisor, should go through command channels; but an employee who notes dishonesty, fraud, unfair practices affecting government operations should not only have the right to by-pass command channels and go directly to the Inspector but would do well to by-pass them.

**WILLIAM F. FRIEDMAN**  
Consultant