For Ken Stewart

I have marked up this Memo. It is full of logical errors. Typically Systems Analysis assumes all uncertainty based on what they now know. They assume launchers of SBDs are not unreliable - why is this true for all time? They assume leaders will last
undulate concealed and deception (VFR very good fortune) and there is already evidence that such is being tested. They assume that if we see a new reality system tested in Pacific, we will know which side (and how many house it). Try that on FOBS. They assume we don't care if Fawcett misses who heads from 300-3000 feet; try
MEMORANDUM

To: Chairman

From: Deputy CAF PEO

Date: 18 October 2015

Subject: Request for Status Update on the Production Line

Dear Chairman,

I am writing to request a status update on the production line for the Guardian System. As you are aware, the Guardian System is a critical component of our national defense strategy.

After reviewing the latest reports, I have concerns about the manufacturing process of the Guardian System. Specifically, I am concerned about the delays in the production process, which have significantly impacted the delivery schedule.

I have also noted that the quality control measures have been insufficient, leading to a higher rate of defects in the final product. This is unacceptable and must be addressed immediately.

I urge you to take immediate action to address these issues and ensure that the production line is back on track. A detailed action plan is attached for your review.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chairman
MEMORANDUM

This ABM capability
for several years shallo
all of our strategic
missile forces decline,
(and lingering visibility
still-reducing)

These are not
points having to
do with NMD program
per se. But should
be achieved by
RDA E DIA

[Signature]
MEMORANDUM FOR DR. FLAX

SUBJECT: MOL DCP and the DDR&E/DIA Study of the Need for High Resolution

At Tab A is a copy of Mr. Selin's memorandum commenting on the subject papers. Mr. Selin passed this memo to Mr. Nitze on January 17. Mr. Nitze returned it to Mr. Selin with the note "Have discussed this with Mr. Packard who would prefer to review it himself. PHN".

Under a transmittal memorandum of January 24, 1969 Mr. Selin has asked you, Dr. Foster, General Carroll, and General Stewart to comment directly by February 3. He then plans to prepare the memorandum requested by Mr. Nitze/Mr. Packard. For comparison purposes we have underlined and bracketed in red in the formal memorandum those portions which differ from the original draft passed to the Study Group principals for comment on January 15. A copy of this original draft is at Tab B for your further reference.

In the case of the original draft OASD(SA) memorandum, the Study Group principals met and decided that one should handle the comments for all -- Mr. Palley handled the comments.

We are recommending similar handling of the comments on the formal memorandum. In this regard, Mr. Palley has contacted Study Group principals and has prepared a memorandum for Dr. Foster's signature to Mr. Packard. This memorandum resulted from Mr. Palley's coordinated discussion with the Study Group principals based on a consideration of several alternatives for handling the issue.

Attached at Tab C are:
1. a copy of the memorandum for Dr. Foster's signature;

2. an outline of the alternatives considered;

3. a chronology of background notes on the Selin actions.

You will note in the last paragraph of the memo for Dr. Foster's signature an offer of a briefing to Mr. Packard on the overall MOL program, which includes your name as a principal. Your support of the Foster recommendation on the MOL DCP is noted in the third paragraph of the memorandum. Mr. Palley's memorandum was delivered to Dr. Foster this morning.

We will await your advice as to any further action indicated.

William R. Yost
Lt Colonel, USAF