

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL

RESTRICTED

TO DATE *8 Feb 45* FROM

- Commanding Officer
- Assistant Commandant
- Dir of Comm Research
- Control O - *Major Frier*
- Fiscal O
- Administrative O
- Post Adjutant
- Intelligence C
- Provost Marshal
- 2nd Sig Serv Bn
- Chief, Pers & Tng Div
- Chief, Pers Br
- Chief, Tng Br
- O/C Officer Pers Sec
- Chief, Oper Serv Div
- Chief, Communications Br
- Chief, Laboratory Br
- Chief, Machine Br
- Chief, Supply Br
- O/C, SSA Mail Unit
- Chief, Security Div
- Chief, Protective Sec Br
- Chief, Cryptographic Br
- Chief, Development Br
- Chief, Intelligence Div
- Chief, Language Br
- Chief, Mil Cryptanalytic Br
- Chief, Gen Cryptanalytic Br
- Chief, T/A and Control Br
- Chief, I & L Br

- As discussed
- As requested
- Comments and return
- Information and file
- Information and forwarding
- Information and return
- Recommendation
- See note on reverse
- Signature if approved
- Your action

1. It is interesting to observe that the Classification Analysts for G-2 have advised us that they are reportedly at [unclear] at [unclear] Hall and [unclear] (10 v 10)

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

higher than in C-2.

2. J + K was the Branch most concerned on the question of Info. Clerts. Our new standards will help considerably.
3. Thanks for letting me see it.

JWD
8 Feb 53

COMMENTS BY THE CONTROL OFFICE

REGARDING

NONCONCURRENCE OF PERSONNEL BRANCH

1. The following comments are made in connection with the "Non-concurrence of Personnel Branch," regarding the recommendations of the Control Office.

a. 2 b (1) - The recommendation of upgrading CAF-2 and CAF-3 job classifications as recommended by the Control Office, called not for the abandonment of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended by the Brookhart Act of 1930, but for a more liberal interpretation of this Act as a means to correcting a personnel situation at Signal Security Agency intolerable both from a personnel and security standpoint. The objective sought by the Act itself was not merely to equalize civilian grades of government employees, but obviously was fundamentally designed to save the taxpayers' money. Therefore, the fundamental objective of the Act should be considered before the rigid interpretation of its detailed rules, which cannot be strictly applied to Signal Security Agency. It is believed that if approach is made from this viewpoint, and this upgrading at Signal Security Agency is accomplished within the framework of the Acts referred to, a solution would be found.

b. 2 b (2) - These statements are only partially true and are purely technical, and are further not applicable to this situation as the increases referred to are approximately \$16.00 per month, and would not be considered as "substantial" in a private industry. Obviously, if a salesman should become a sales manager in a private industry, there would be a decided increase in compensation, but this situation is not relevant to the matter reviewed herein.

c. 2 b (3) - No recommendation is made to "discard" standards. The recommendation is to interpret these standards liberally.

d. 2 b (4) - This is believed to be purely controversial.

e. 2 b (5) - Any investigation would result in discovering proof that the step taken was to safeguard security, conserve money for the taxpayers, and promote operating efficiency, and the wisdom of the action should be evident even if the step required a very liberal interpretation of existing statutes.

f. 2 b (6) - This statement is believed to be completely contrary to the evidence as shown by the percentage of employees resigning within grade categories, statements of branch personnel officers, and by employees themselves, and the extensive survey made by Captain Rhea F. Smith in 1943 as to causes of dissatisfaction of personnel. (To Commanding Officer, Signal Security Agency, July 1943.)

- g. 2 b (6) (a) - Contrary to the evidence as above.
- h. 2 b (6) (b) - Believed to be irrelevant to the matter under review.
- i. 2 b (6) (c) - Partially concurred in. The objective sought is to reduce separations. It is understood that separations cannot be eliminated entirely.

2. It is obvious that placement plays an important role in separation, as well as many other factors such as transportation, living conditions, relations within branches, etc., and there is no intention to minimize the importance of these other factors. But on the other hand, within the two categories referred to - CAF-2 and CAF-3 - the problem is believed to be - and the evidence supports this conclusion - predominantly a financial one, and this must be solved first before there can be any hope of achieving any major results through the solution of the subordinate factors.

3. Were it possible to accomplish the financial solution recommended, it would be immediately essential to exercise a sound and complete control over promotions, institute a complete and ordered relationship between the branch personnel officers, the Personnel Branch and the unit supervisors, and take active steps to cure as far as possible other weaknesses in the personnel situation. But again, unless we can solve the financial problem we can have little hope of achieving any major result from a solution of these other factors.

4. It is impossible to develop better morale or to retain the employees at Signal Security Agency if they cannot live on the salary they receive. And while there may be from time to time CAF-2's who through help from their families or even through a rigid economy "get by" on their income, to the average CAF-2 - and we can only deal in averages - this is completely impossible.