

Wot 3-1

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

2 Jun 64

Subject: EKC Dorian Briefing to Dr McMill Ean 28 May 64

1. A briefing was given to Dr. McMillian in Washington by EKC on 28 May 64. The purpose of this presentation was to provide the Secretary with a status report on the Dorian effort and a summary of the follow-on plans.

2. The following personnel in addition to Dr. McMillan were present: Dr. Flax, Gen Martin, Maj Skantze, Col Berg, LtCol Knolle, Mr. Simmons, Dr. Oder, Dr. Feldman, Mr. Spoelhof and Mr. Collinge.

3. A set of  $8^{*}$ x10" reproductions of the charts used were provided and are in the files.

4. The briefing generally followed the charts; however, considerable discussion developed with the session lasting over 2 hours. The following conclusions were drawn from the comments made by Dr. McMillian during the course of the briefing:

a. The MOL is not intended to be an operational system, but for experiments only. There must be a fundamental technical reason to justify orbital experiments.

b. He wanted to confirm that our present effort did include the requirement for the comparison of man vs unmanned. He was assured that it did and that some of this preliminary information would be included in the EK briefing to be given 5 June to the Hornig board. Also to be included was some of the early technical data on man's abilities as presented to Dr. McMillian on 9 Mar 64. The Hornig board on "black activities" (York, Purcell, Land) is to meet 5 June to review MOL in relation to our activities.

c. He does not want to be actually designing a manned system, but rather determining what man's capabilities are and the performance of a system configured to make maximum use of these capabilities. After having these answers, the comparison can be made with unmanned systems. I feel this is exactly the way the project has been oriented.

d. He felt that our answers were somewhat different than some he had heard from Aerospace. We pointed out that he was probably recalling earlier information presented by Dr. Leonard and Aseltine comparing manned and unmanned strip cameras. In such a comparison, for a given booster capability, the unmanned will always appear superior. Dr. McMillian agreed that the frame camera approach should be pursued and compared with a like performing unmanned system.





e. He felt that attitude control systems could be improved so as to improve attitude rate control by an order of magnitude. Therefore, attitude rate errors should not be a controlling item limiting unmanned performance.

f. He wanted EKC to brief Dr. Fubini on 4 June as to what previous EKC work indicated could be placed on T-IIIC for area coverage.

BYRON F. KNOLLE, JR. LIColonel, USAF

2

 $(1,1)_{i\in \mathbb{N}} = \{0,1,\dots,n\}$