

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Security Information

3-5247

9 December 1952

**MEMORANDUM FOR:** Colonel Sheffield Edwards  
**SUBJECT:** Your Memorandum of 5 December  
Registry 3-5116

1. While the subject memorandum, dealing as it does with the eleven primary objectives of our security investigation, may possibly avoid in rare instances the necessity for investigation, it does not meet what I consider to be the primary problem associated with all security refusals.

2. Our present practice, when an applicant is not cleared, is to inform the applicant that the job for which he was being recruited has been eliminated. This is in most cases a palpable falsehood. In cases where a consultant is involved or where the applicant has been provisionally cleared or in a pool or otherwise is acquainted with the Agency, the story does not even have the cover of truth.

3. What is needed, in my opinion, is not a statement to applicants of what a security clearance covers, but a plausible statement of investigation objectives and criteria, failure to meet which cannot be construed by the applicant as a reflection upon his loyalty, trustworthiness or morals. In simple language, we must find an additional and credible statement to make to security turn downs which will close the matter. Our present method of handling such cases is not adroit.

4. I seriously feel that the reading to an applicant of the criteria set forth in the subject memorandum will make even more difficult the problem of relations with an applicant who is not cleared. As long as Security is unwilling to discuss with an applicant the basis for a security refusal, it is incumbent upon the organization from the point of view of public relations to find a plausible story which will satisfy the applicant. For two of our security refusals are on a clear black and white basis. The proposed approach is subject to the objection that once you list specifics you invite an elimination game by unsuccessful applicants - putting yourself right back into the position you want to avoid, namely, that of being pressed to specify exact grounds.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Security Information

5. A statement along the lines of [redacted] memorandum seems to me to accomplish much more and to involve infinitely less risk of harm than that set forth in the subject memorandum.

25X1

STUART NEEDLE  
Inspector General

IG/SN:jck (8 December 1952)

Distribution:

Original & 1 - Addressee

1 - Chrono

1 - Subject File ✓

9 December 1952

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Hedden

SUBJECT: Security's proposed memorandum  
of Advice to Applicants

For such interest or use as it may be to you as a parallel to your memorandum to Colonel Edwards on the subject, I submit the following comments on the proposed Security memorandum:

<u>Paragraph of I&amp;S Memo.</u>	<u>C o m m e n t</u>
1.	Very weak, a "We're against Sin." paragraph. What applicant could be expected to assume the contrary?
2.	The approach is wrong. That is, once you list specifics you incite an elimination game by unsuccessful applicants - putting yourself right back into the position you want to avoid, namely, that of being pressed to specify exact grounds.
3.	This is redundant: there would be no point to making investigations were the results of those investigations <u>not</u> "carefully weighed."
4.	No Comment.
5.	Undesirable for the reason given in number 2 above.



AIG/WG:jck

25X1