MEMORANDUM FOR GENERAL BERG

SUBJECT: Reports and Briefings

This responds to your memorandum of April 4, same subject.

The case in point -- Dr. Land's query regarding how GAMBIT is doing -- is not unexpected by either of us, I am sure. Dr. Land asked about GAMBIT on August 29, at a rather stormy PSAC meeting, which you attended. At that time, Dr. Flax sent you a note saying, "I want to take the offensive on this -- prepare paper giving balanced assessment of G-3 program to be sent to PSAC panel." On February 14, in anticipation of a PSAC meeting, you forwarded a thirteen-page GAMBIT report to Dr. Flax (I have withdrawn the report, briefly, from Dr. Flax's vault and it is attached to this memo).

It would be a mistake to generalize from this incident that the NRO fails to keep the Land panel well informed. I would also advise against a periodic "all-up" FIAB-type report to the panel, mainly because too many people would get the report, read it, and abuse our hospitality.

I would suggest that if we are pressed in this matter we recommend that the panel be given a product analysis once -- or at the most twice -- per year, by a where-we-stand expert like John Hughes. The use of a third party would give us maximum credibility with the panel and would be a labor of love for John Hughes.

PAUL E. WORTHMAN
Colonel, USAF

April 10, 1968
MEMORANDUM FOR COLONEL WORTHMAN

SUBJECT: Reports & Briefings

1. Dr. Flax was bothered by Dr. Land's question to him at the last PSAC session "How is GAMBIT doing? and what kind of optical quality are you experiencing?" It is very apparent that this group is not being kept up-to-date with either a written report or an oral Dog & Pony.

2. Dr. Flax simply assumed this to be the case and was surprised that it was not. His questions: How many cases like this are there? and shouldn't we sort this out like we do for FIAB for instance?

3. May I have your comments please, Paul?

Russell A. Berg
Brigadier General, USAF
Director