

IN REPLY REFER TO

WAR DEPARTMENT  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER  
WASHINGTON

Dec. 31, 1937.

Subject: Cryptographs, Ser. No. 107,244,  
Filed Oct. 23, 1936 (Improvement in  
Converter M-134-T2 )

To: Mr. William F. Friedman,  
Chief, Intelligence Section,  
War Plans and Training Division,  
Office of the Chief Signal Officer

1. This will report ~~to~~ further Patent Office Action in this case. Copy of the Examiner's communication of Dec. 21, 1937, is sent for your files.

2. It appears from the Examiner's position that the art previously cited is not regarded as anticipatory and when the claims have been amended to overcome the objections and criticisms noted in the official letter, the application will be found in condition for allowance.



Charles A. Rowe,  
Patents Section, Signal Corps

Address only  
 "The Commissioner of Patents,  
 Washington, D. C."  
 and not any official by name

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE  
 WASHINGTON

All communications respecting this  
 application should give the serial number,  
 date of filing, and name of  
 the applicant

TODD/N

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in  
 charge of this application.

... 11-8623

  
 Commissioner of Patents,

Applicant: W.F. FRIEDMAN,

ROBERT V. LAUGHLIN &  
 CHARLES A. ROWE,  
 c/o Chief of the Air Corps,  
 Munitions Bldg.,  
 Washington, D.C.

Ser. No. 107,244,  
 Filed Oct. 23, 1936,  
 For CRYPTOGRAPHS.

Responsive to amendment filed Aug. 24, 1937.

Pending claims are 1-13.

Claims 1-5, claim 6 dependent on 5, 9-11, last one or two lines, "to effect permutative step-wise displacements", etc., or similar expressions, set forth a desired result, but does not set forth any structure by which such structure may be had. These claims are therefore rejected, since means for effecting this result are not well recognized apparatus in the arts. In the locomotive art means for effecting traction are now so well known that such might perhaps be recited in terms of function without being liable to the criticism of functionality. The functionally described means in the instant case is of the essence of the invention so it is believed, and should therefore be adequately described. Reference to the locomotive art is by way of illustration.

It is not apparent wherein the cams on the chain are not the equivalent of cams on a rotatable element. It is not clear that the apparatus of claims 7, 8, 12, 13 produces the "permutative displacements which appears to be the essence of the invention.

If the grounds of rejection and objection set forth were avoided, the claims would appear allowable, as now advised.

EXAMINER.