Dr. Howard T. Engstrom  
Vice President  
Engineering Research Associates  
507 15th Street, South  
Arlington, Virginia  

Dear Dr. Engstrom:

Admiral Wenger and I have examined the enclosed draft letter to SCAG members and agree that it would be useful to send such a letter.

The only suggestion we have is that in the penultimate paragraph the following be inserted after the second sentence:

"In the light of the definition given for solution, which implies success on a fully current basis, are we justified in stating unequivocally that there is a clear-cut promise of success or do we mean rather that there is sufficient promise to warrant considerable augmentation and extension of the present effort?"

If you agree to this insertion, it would be desirable to insert "on this point" in the position shown on your draft.

We shall be glad to produce the necessary number of copies and to mail them if you will send over a mimeograph or ditto master with your signature.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

\[Signature\]
To: Members of Special Communications Advisory Group (SCAG)

From: H. T. Engstrom

The SCAG report dated 12 March 1952 has been studied with interest. The director of AFSA is most interested in establishing the revised organization proposed therein on a sound basis as soon as possible. This includes establishing a separate research organization (Office of Research within AFSA) and a position of Senior Civilian Technical Director.

There were two major points in the report of 12 March which were not completely clear. A statement in the report implied that the proposed Senior Civilian Technical Director have under his cognizance research, development, and operations. Upon being questioned about this matter, I stated that it was my opinion that the members of SCAG intended the Technical Director to be responsible for research and development only. This was concurred in by Mr. Speakman. Members of the SCAG committee had expressed themselves on various occasions that the large scale operations of AFSA should remain under military control. In order that there be no doubt about this point, I would appreciate an expression from you concerning it.

The other matter which AFSA questioned was the statement concerning the solution of the main problem. Most AFSA personnel feel that the statement in the report was overly optimistic. I think therefore that an individual expression from each SCAG member would be valuable.

In establishing the proposed Office of Research, it would also be useful to AFSA to have an indication from SCAG members of the technical nature of research programs which AFSA should sponsor or undertake. If you have any thoughts along these lines, I would appreciate hearing from you.