

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

RE: Application for Patent of  
WILLIAM F. FRIEDMAN

Serial Number  
478,193

Filed  
6 March 1943

For  
SYSTEM FOR ENCIPHERING  
FACSIMILE

Division 16

Room 6624

AMENDMENT

*28 July 49*

\* \* \* \* \*

The Honorable Commissioner of Patents  
Washington 25, D. C.

Sir:

This is in response to the Final Rejection of 28 January 1949  
in the above-identified application for patent. Please amend  
the case as follows:

IN THE SPECIFICATION

Page 2, line 27 - After "biased" cancel the comma.

28 - After "direction" insert a comma.

Page 3, line 18 - After "direction" cancel the comma.

19 - After "direction" insert a comma.

IN THE CLAIMS

Claim 9 - Cancel.

REMARKS

The changes in the specification merely effectuate minor corrections  
intended to have been made by the amendment of 9 December 1948.

The cancellation of Claim 9 leaves only Claim 14 rejected on its merits, and reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

If, as the Examiner suggests, the code tape of Cartier or Vernan be considered graphic information (and this appears to be without dictionary sanction), where then is the camouflage message, and how are the two elements (messages) scanned? Actually, both references employ one keyboard transmitter and one tape transmitter.

Furthermore, in both patents, the impulses of two series occur simultaneously or synchronously, and this, as was pointed out by the Applicant in an earlier amendment, is necessary in a Baudot system. Thus, Cartier states (page 2, lines 68-73) that the travel of the keying strip is effected automatically upon each rotation of brush  $B_1$ , and Vernan assumes (page 8, lines 20-39) that the letter B is in the tape transmitter when the letter A is being transmitted from the keyboard.

In Applicant's invention, there is, of course, no necessary time relationship between the impulses of the "message" series and the impulses of the "camouflage" series. It would be a rare occurrence, in fact, for any message impulse to be initiated at the same instant as a camouflage impulse, and such were rare for the duration of one such impulse to be an even multiple of the duration of the other.

It appears possible that the Examiner read "nonsynchronous" as "nonidentical", as on this basis the references would seem to apply, whereas, if "nonsynchronous" be properly construed to relate to time alone, the references seem not pertinent.

In order to avoid a possible holding of abandonment, an appeal to the Board of Appeals is being filed concurrently with this amendment. Should favorable action be received on Claim 14, the appeal will, of course, be withdrawn.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM F. FRIEDMAN, Applicant

By \_\_\_\_\_

His Attorney