

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Sent to Subj
to page 58

HEADQUARTERS
AIR FORCE BALLISTIC MISSILE DIVISION (AFBMD)
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
Air Force Unit Post Office, Los Angeles 45, California



REPLY TO:
ATTN OF: **WHEW/Dr Rockefeller/R37A**

SUBJECT: **Request for Information**

24 JAN 1961

TO: **WHEW (Col. Ayres)**

1. Reference your telephoned request of 22 January for

[REDACTED]

2. [REDACTED]

3. This information was prepared from material in the AFMD archives. It can be furnished. It has not been classified with any AFMD aircraft.

SIGNED

Alfred Rockefeller, Jr.
Historian
Air Force Ballistic Missile Division
Air Research & Development Command

A. Wick
Development of the ICBM/US IIR
Development & Management Structure (G)
W-1 Staff

as Lt Colonel Shiner - WED

When incl. items are withdrawn the classification of this correspondence will be downgraded to *Secret* in accordance with AFR 203.1.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DRAFT

24 JAN 1961

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF
HEADQUARTERS, AIR FORCE

The report of the Air Force Strategic Planning
Committee (ASPC) and the technical evaluation of the ASPC program
conducted under the ASPC program (both in 1958) led to the
development of the current ASPC program. ASPC reports
provide a historical perspective of the program and valuation
of its administrative responsibilities. The ASPC group, chaired
by Colonel John von Neumann, and whose report was basic to the
ASPC program, conducted a complete design review based on a new
and comprehensive program system study, and exploration of alternate
approaches to military systems based on fundamental science. This
study viewed the ASPC as such a difficult development as to require
establishment of a development management group which should
assume executive responsibility for the design project, and
a technical coordination of the ASPC project considerably
enhancing the ASPC program as a militarily useful vehicle
designed to be a self-contained ASPC program.

Further, the report
The ASPC program is a result of the caliber and strength
of the program, the quality of the ASPC group by a granting
of authority by the ASPC level government executives
in military, industry, and government organizations.

It is suggested to note that in other papers subsequent to
this report (ASPC - 1958) by Colonel George, Special Assistant
to the ASPC, and the Secretary of the Air Force, H. E. Talbot, to

DOWNGRADED AT 12-MONTH INTERVALS
DECLASSIFIED LATER 12 YEARS
EOP FOR 1300.101

PREPARED BY HQ AFBMD HISTORIAN

DRAFT

The following information is being furnished to you for your information and guidance. It is based on the information available to the Department of the Air Force as of the date of this report. It is not intended to constitute a commitment on the part of the Department of the Air Force. It is subject to change without notice. It is being furnished to you for your information and guidance. It is not intended to constitute a commitment on the part of the Department of the Air Force. It is subject to change without notice.

[Redacted]

DRAFT

The management of the project was not considered necessary by the Committee, or by Dr. Donald A. Gossett, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, who attended the Committee meeting as an observer.

The Committee expressed strong doubt as to General's management and technical competence to handle system responsibility for the project. Dr. Gossett stated that a decision was necessary on who had system responsibility. As stated in the Committee minutes:

It was noted that the so-called system contractor had to be held responsible in case of a failure. In such case the West-Whitbridge Corporation was part of the system, responsibility and could be held. It was stated that the West-Whitbridge Corporation must have system responsibility in such case there should not be any confusion as to the line. It should be as required to have the necessary strong line technical direction over the other contractors, and the other contractors should be so informed.

The Committee considered matters of the Committee expressed doubt as to whether the current contract was strong enough for system responsibility. The group would be strengthening of the organization with a clear and single direction of authority and responsibility for system engineering.

As a result of these comments, on 20 July 1954 General, Major, and Colonel, Assistant General, were directed to review a study to the basic role of R&D in the program, with particular reference to who will be responsible for the level of engineering technical quality required by a prime weapon system program.

DRAFT

... of the ... of the ... (...)
... the ... of the ... was ... to Mr. ...
... the ... of the ... with the ... III
... of the ... study. ... the ... of
... and ... , ... to ...
... (...) ... Mr. ... indicated he
... the ... which he ... approved it
... the ... , ...
... for
... .

With the ... of the ... the ...
... the ... of the ... III
... of the ...
... in a letter to ...
... The ...
... the ... of the
... in the U.S. is
... over to an
... The Panel,
...
... at
... that an
... this

DRAFT

[The body of the document contains approximately 25 lines of text that is extremely faint and illegible due to heavy noise and low contrast. The text appears to be a formal document or report.]

[Redacted signature area]

DRAFT

Review of these studies and studies leading to the establishment and control of the 1970 development - independent operations indicated:

1. High level scientific advisory groups considered that because of the technical nature of the program, its magnitude and the risks involved, that it required special scientific engineering talents, and a special management structure, utilizing top talent.

2. To maintain maximum program value requirements.

3. Research should be given to the form of the management structure to be adopted, and to the advantages and disadvantages.

4. The structure should maintain a greater degree of separation of management activity in the program than when the prime contractor approach was utilized a better definition and control of responsibilities for the program.

Management responsibility for the 1970 was transferred from the prime contractor to the Government with a decision made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, December 1967, 10 October 1977. Since the transfer occurred to the Government, the system should be designed to be self-sufficient and thus assigned to the Government for program integration and management. To avoid duplication of the 1970 system design studies which were then started, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Deputy Chairman, JCS, AIC, recommended that the structure of the transfer be carefully planned. In a report, an agreement between Major General D. A. Schriever,

DRAFT

The first phase of the program was the development of a preliminary design for the aircraft. This was done by the contractor in cooperation with the Army and Navy. The preliminary design was completed in 1945 and was based on the requirements of the Army and Navy. The preliminary design was based on the requirements of the Army and Navy and was completed in 1945.

The second phase of the program was the development of a detailed design for the aircraft. This was done by the contractor in cooperation with the Army and Navy. The detailed design was completed in 1946 and was based on the requirements of the Army and Navy. The detailed design was based on the requirements of the Army and Navy and was completed in 1946.

The third phase of the program was the development of a prototype aircraft. This was done by the contractor in cooperation with the Army and Navy. The prototype aircraft was completed in 1947 and was based on the requirements of the Army and Navy. The prototype aircraft was based on the requirements of the Army and Navy and was completed in 1947.

The fourth phase of the program was the development of a production aircraft. This was done by the contractor in cooperation with the Army and Navy. The production aircraft was completed in 1948 and was based on the requirements of the Army and Navy. The production aircraft was based on the requirements of the Army and Navy and was completed in 1948.

The fifth phase of the program was the development of a final report. This was done by the contractor in cooperation with the Army and Navy. The final report was completed in 1949 and was based on the requirements of the Army and Navy. The final report was based on the requirements of the Army and Navy and was completed in 1949.

DRAFT

The Department of Justice, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development are invited to comment on this draft.

The draft is being prepared in accordance with the provisions of the President's memorandum of June 17, 1967, regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The draft is being prepared in accordance with the provisions of the President's memorandum of June 17, 1967, regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The draft is being prepared in accordance with the provisions of the President's memorandum of June 17, 1967, regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The draft is being prepared in accordance with the provisions of the President's memorandum of June 17, 1967, regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The draft is being prepared in accordance with the provisions of the President's memorandum of June 17, 1967, regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The draft is being prepared in accordance with the provisions of the President's memorandum of June 17, 1967, regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The draft is being prepared in accordance with the provisions of the President's memorandum of June 17, 1967, regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The draft is being prepared in accordance with the provisions of the President's memorandum of June 17, 1967, regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The draft is being prepared in accordance with the provisions of the President's memorandum of June 17, 1967, regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

[REDACTED]

DRAFT

The following information is for the system.
The system is designed to be used for the purpose of the system.
The system is designed to be used for the purpose of the system.
The system is designed to be used for the purpose of the system.
The system is designed to be used for the purpose of the system.

For more information, please contact the system administrator.
The system is designed to be used for the purpose of the system.
The system is designed to be used for the purpose of the system.

Page 1 of 1