

14 00014461D

29 March 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Meeting with Perkin-Elmer on 22 March 1965
re Their Assessment of the FULCRUM Itek Design

ATTENDEES:

PERKIN-ELMER

Chester Nimitz
Robert Sorensen
Kenneth MacLeish
Rod Scott
Milton Rosenau
Dick Babish
Robert Landsman
Charles Hall

AGENCY

Albert D. Wheelon
Jack Maxey
John Crowley
Les Dirks
John McMahon

1. As a preview for historical purposes, it should be noted that from the outset of the FULCRUM program, the Itek Corporation was responsible for providing the primary reference camera design. As an alternate to that system the Perkin-Elmer Corporation was engaged to suggest their own proposed system and to build a brassboard to demonstrate the feasibility of their design approach. The Perkin-Elmer Corporation had been advised that their system could in no

SUBJECT: Meeting with Perkin-Elmer on 22 March 1965
re Their Assessment of the FULCRUM Itek Design

way be considered competitive to the Itek design because we did not have sufficient funds nor time to permit a truly competitive situation. The Perkin-Elmer effort, of course, as a secondary system did not enjoy the funding or attention which was manifested to the Itek system. The P-E representatives wittingly accepted the back-burner approach which their design would have and were truly cognizant of the fact that their system would merely be an insurance policy for the Itek design.

2. As life would have it, the feasibility demonstration of the Itek design occurred on 23 February, when the entire FULCRUM program was presented to the Land Panel in Boston. The Land Panel were witness to the Itek presentation of FULCRUM on 23 February and later that evening and the following morning heard of a competitive design from another group at Itek, as well as a proposed E-K system. On the afternoon of 24 February, without prior knowledge of FULCRUM project personnel, the Itek Corporation sent emissaries to Dr. Land to advise him that Itek had made a corporate decision to withdraw its support from the FULCRUM program. Suffice it to say, at this stage of the *game,*

SUBJECT: Meeting with Perkin-Elmer on 22 March 1965
re Their Assessment of the FULCRUM Itek Design

the FULCRUM project suddenly found itself without its prime camera contractor.

3. A rapid assessment of the market suggested that the most encouraging alternate left to the FULCRUM program was to engage P-E in a determination of whether or not the FULCRUM system could be built by P-E. During the month of March the hardware brassboard, miscellaneous equipment, operating manuals, technical memoranda and various reports on engineering data was physically transferred in several loads from the Itek Corporation to P-E, where P-E undertook the assessment of the Itek system in behalf of the Government.

4. On 22 March 1965 the individuals mentioned above assembled at Perkin-Elmer to hear P-E's preliminary corporate decision vis-a-vis the Itek FULCRUM camera design. In the presentation offered by Milt Rosenau, he stated that:

(1) the FULCRUM system can be built as is and will take some photographs. He went on to state that this was not to say how good the photographs would be or whether or not one could get them into the recovery vehicle.

SUBJECT: Meeting with Perkin-Elmer on 22 March 1965
re Their Assessment of the FULCRUM Itek Design

(2) the P-E project group were willing to build FULCRUM as it now is;

(3) P-E Corporation do not recommend building FULCRUM as it now is;

(4) starting from where we now are, P-E believes a better system is achievable within an acceptable time-span.

5. At this point, Mr. Nimitz interjected that "Those clowns (i.e., the Project Group) are egotistical. As a corporation, we have now learned the hard way that there are certain things in building and producing cameras which are foolish to ignore and Perkin-Elmer values the opportunity to take a critical viewpoint of the system." Milt Rosenau went on then to review a chart which depicted P-E's technical evaluation summary and the noteworthy aspects of a system which requires five passes of film through it without repeating the information contained in the charts (attached). Mr. Rosenau went into great detail in

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied

Page Denied