

Following that there was establishment of the Combat Development Group and the Department of Army desired to determine the effectiveness of the group and how it could be improved and the Committee known as the Hayworth Committee, after Mr. Leland J. Hayworth, Chairman, was appointed to perform critical analysis of the functions and relationships of the combat development group. That report to the Secretary of the Army in October 1954 called the Hayworth report, contained an overall evaluation of the system and recommended changes which should be adopted to improve the overall operation.

Now this was the combat development system and it relies on information and data for its effectiveness. The information is obtained from a great variety of sources in a great many different ways and deals largely with very complex subjects and it is disseminated to widely divergent sources, civilian and military and in the process of this work the problems of data transmission processing, storage, and retrieval arise, so this study was initiated by the Continental Army Command, Commanding General Combat Developments, to determine several questions: The nature and extent of use of the body of knowledge at headquarters, terminals inside and outside Conarc, which is Continental Army Command, to determine the needs and possible areas of improvement which exist in the combat development system so as to obtain compatible and effective communications and data handling throughout the system.

This was the most important of all, and following that there were a number of additional purposes of this study such as balancing the current combat development system and its ideals or the ideal system versus what is practical from an economic standpoint, and to develop a set of recommendations for steps to be taken to improve the system, particularly in the areas of transmittal, processing, storage, and rapid data retrieval.

Mr. HARDY. How many people did it take to do all that?

Mr. VANCE. This study was a five-man effort for 6 months time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Well, now what special competence does the Armour Research Institute have on it? What you have said pretty much looks as though it would be the soldiers' job to define the doctrine of a competent group or group in combat.

Now the part of it that deals with the information, the papers, whatever you want to call it, is somewhat associated with the library sciences where you would find out what is written on the subject and how it is distributed. This is understandable.

Mr. VANCE. Where it is, what it contains, how consistent it is with your new doctrine and so on.

Mr. COURTNEY. But when you are defining doctrine—

Mr. VANCE. Procedures is another term that is often used.

Mr. COURTNEY. Well, doctrine has a pretty well-understood meaning, in these precincts at least, but when you are defining doctrine, isn't this the business of the men in uniform?

Mr. VANCE. Let me explain the difference between the combat development system and this study. This study was directed toward the efficient performance of this function. How efficiently it is being performed.

Mr. HARDY. Couldn't the Army make a determination in that area without hiring somebody else to do it?