

~~TOP SECRET~~

HANDLE VIA
TALENT-KEYHOLE
 CONTROL SYSTEM

~~15~~ NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C.



October 10, 1968

101

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: State Department Resource Survey Satellite Initiative

On October 2, 1968 we were furnished a copy of a draft "Outline for a Resource Survey Satellite Initiative at the United Nations" prepared by Mr. J. P. Lorenz, IO/UNP, State Department, on August 30, 1968 (Tab A). Aside from our concern over the proposed approach, State's rationale and State's assessment of related considerations, we were particularly troubled by two paragraphs contained in the August 30 draft. Both were considered, by us, to be in violation of the TALENT-KEYHOLE security system. The one exposed the "fact" of "our military reconnaissance satellites" and related as an additional political issue the use of observation satellites for the purpose of arms control verification -- a subject currently under consideration by the NSAM 156 Committee. The other revealed that "cameras of less than 100' resolution would, in the opinion of DOD, record little of military significance. This order of reconnaissance is in any case of no concern to the United States and Soviet Union, both of which are living with observation by cameras of far higher resolution."

On October 4 we had a copy of Tab A retyped to remove the identification of the source. We were then prepared to take some appropriate action to have the draft revised by State and the objectionable paragraphs removed. A copy of the retyped draft is at Tab B.

Before we were able to take this action, we received from Colonel Keator, JCS (SAAC), on October 8 a revised State Department draft of this same paper (Tab C) dated October 3, 1968 with a covering memo to members of a Study Group on International Organizations and Outer Space, which (1) indicated that the Group at its last meeting agreed that

HANDLE VIA
TALENT-KEYHOLE
 CONTROL SYSTEM

~~TOP SECRET~~
 EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING
 DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.10 DOES NOT APPLY

CONTROL NO _____
 COPY _____ OF _____ COPIES
 PAGE 1 OF _____ PAGES

~~TOP SECRET~~HANDLE VIA
TALENT-KEYHOLE
CONTROL SYSTEM

resource survey satellites constituted one of the principal problem areas in outer space and foreign policy (2) offered the revised draft as an attempt to define these problems and develop possible solutions, and (3) proposed a meeting of the Study Group on October 10 to discuss the paper.

We reviewed the revised draft and found that one of the objectionable paragraphs -- that having to do with the order of resolution -- had been removed. We found further that several other statements with which we were initially concerned had been adjusted to read more acceptably (see Tab D). Unfortunately, the revised draft did not remove the reference to "our military reconnaissance satellites" nor the references to arms control verification possibilities. We decided then on October 8 to officially approach State (since the revised draft was furnished us by an official OSD participant) and request that the one remaining objectionable paragraph be removed on the basis of security policy. In the PM of October 8 Mr. Ladner called Mr. W. C. Marvel, BCO/TCO, State, to suggest that he review the material and arrange to have the offensive paragraph removed from the draft. Mr. Marvel expressed his reluctance to take any such action and indicated to Mr. Ladner that he did not consider it either feasible or appropriate. We immediately called Mr. Marvel back for an appointment at 0900 on Wednesday, October 9, indicating that we wanted to discuss this matter further in person. We then retyped the October 3 draft, carefully removing the offensive paragraph, and assuring that the continuity of the paper was not destroyed (Tab E). We reproduced 40 copies of this paper in preparation for our meeting with Mr. Marvel on Wednesday. I (accompanied by Mr. Ladner and Lt Col Haskins) met with Mr. Marvel and related to him our serious concern over the presence of that particular paragraph in the State draft and strongly urged Mr. Marvel to have it removed on the grounds that it violated TALENT-KEYHOLE security. Mr. Marvel was terribly upset at the thought of having to take any such action on this paper and began to rationalize his reluctance to have to do so. He proceeded to inform us of the principal motive of the NSAM 156 Committee in its earliest and all subsequent deliberations, i.e., "to strive toward acceptance of satellite observation while precluding possible embarrassment to the U. S." I countered his statements by filling in the key issues discussed and acted upon by the NSAM 156 Committee and attempted to place the case he was apparently trying to build in its proper perspective. After some discussion and exchange of views

HANDLE VIA

TALENT-KEYHOLE
CONTROL SYSTEM~~TOP SECRET~~EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING
DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.10 DOES NOT APPLYCONTROL NO. _____
COPY _____ OF _____ COPIES
PAGE 2 OF _____ PAGES

~~TOP SECRET~~HANDLE VIA
TALENT-KEYHOLE
CONTROL SYSTEM

with Mr. Marvel I felt we were really not winning our case so I resorted to emphasizing that "accept it or not, there did exist two security control systems established specifically to protect the sensitive information being divulged in the State paper, and that we could not hope to rationalize our actions to dispose of the, 'perhaps distasteful', thought that the paper did violate TALENT-KEYHOLE security." I offered Mr. Marvel our substitute version and suggested that he proceed to replace all copies of the present State draft with the substitute version. I reassured him that we had not harmed the text of the paper in any way, as a matter of fact, we had probably strengthened the paper by removing the satellite reconnaissance consideration which should not have been addressed by this Group and which could not possibly enhance the State initiative. Mr. Marvel reluctantly then accepted the 40 substitute copies of the paper. He added that he had investigated the possibility of indoctrinating TALENT-KEYHOLE a Mr. Ward P. Allen who had and would serve as the chairman of the Study Group. We agreed that Mr. Allen, from a witting standpoint, could perhaps insure that the sensitive aspects of this subject were not discussed by the Study Group but insisted that it was necessary that the substitution of the paper be made in order to disquiet additional discussion of the sensitive points. Mr. Marvel indicated only that he would "see what he could do about it."

On October 10 I met with Mr. Dwayne S. Anderson, an OSD/ISA employee on detached duty with ACDA, a member of the Study Group, to seek his help in assuring that the substitute draft was provided the Study Group and that discussion of sensitive information was eliminated. I also provided Mr. Anderson a copy of Col Worthman's comments on the State initiative (Tab F).

Important to note were several comments by Mr. Anderson:

1. Mr. Anderson indicated that he personally had espoused our feelings on satellites vs. aircraft as an earth-sensing platform for the past two years and still considered it to be the most feasible way to go.
2. He was in complete agreement with our comments and hence our suggestion that the initiative be deferred until such time as several NASA efforts had been completed and some further study by State had been made on the potential backlash inherent in any such initiative.

HANDLE VIA
TALENT-KEYHOLE
CONTROL SYSTEM~~TOP SECRET~~EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING
DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.10 DOES NOT APPLYCONTROL NO. _____
COPY _____ OF _____ COPIES
PAGE 3 OF _____ PAGES

~~TOP SECRET~~HANDLE VIA
TALENT-KEYHOLE
CONTROL SYSTEM

3. He personally feels that the probability that such an initiative will make it before the UNGA this fall is almost nil.

4. He pointed out that ACDA's position on such an initiative has been and continues to be a rather "mild" one, i. e. ACDA is generally interested in any initiative that would tend to legitimize the use of observation satellites in arms control but feels that there is not much hope in an initiative such as that proposed by State (IO).

5. He indicated that State (IO), on the other hand, is presenting this initiative for the very purpose of attempting to attain international acceptance of satellite observation in terms of its "potential political capital."

Mr. Anderson promised a report back on the proceedings of the Study Group meeting.

Mr. Anderson visited us on Thursday PM, October 10, to debrief the proceedings of the meeting. He indicated that he felt all went well. Key points of interest:

1. Our substitute draft was passed out to replace the earlier (October 3) State paper -- without comment or question.
2. Mr. Anderson presented a strong case for investigating first the potential of aircraft vs. satellites for such surveys.
3. To our surprise, Mr. Anderson had xeroxed and passed to each participant a copy of the comments prepared by Colonel Worthman -- not as a DOD position but rather as comments for review and consideration by the members.
4. The NASA spokesman, Mr. Morris, violently protested the proposed State initiative (obviously out of concern that an international approach would lead only to further erosion of the NASA space mission).
5. State has overruled the "objections" and is insisting on an initiative of some kind in the UNGA next week.

HANDLE VIA

TALENT-KEYHOLE
CONTROL SYSTEM~~TOP SECRET~~EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING
DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.10 DOES NOT APPLYCONTROL NO. _____
COPY _____ OF _____ COPIES
PAGE 4 OF _____ PAGES

~~TOP SECRET~~

HANDLE VIA
TALENT-KEYHOLE
CONTROL SYSTEM

6. IO of State is obviously going it alone -- since strong support from even other elements of State was not forthcoming.

William R. Yost
WILLIAM R. YOST
Lt Colonel, USAF

Copy sent to SS-3 on October 14/mjn

HANDLE VIA
TALENT-KEYHOLE
CONTROL SYSTEM

~~TOP SECRET~~

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING
DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.10 DOES NOT APPLY

CONTROL NO _____
COPY _____ OF _____ COPIES
PAGE 5 OF _____ PAGES