

REVISION # 1

BYE-6450-71

Copy 1

16 June 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT: Report on the Land Panel Meeting and
Related Events

The Land Panel met in Cambridge on Friday to review EOI/FROG. To set the stage, Land told the Panel about his conversation with the President in which he argued for pushing ahead with EOI and against an interim system which might delay its schedule. The President reportedly said he would seriously consider any recommendations Land could give him. Land now feels he has an obligation to get back to the President with a report. The Panel heard briefings from Roland Inlow on the requirement studies, from the Air Force on the FROG system, and from OSP on EOI.

Based on the questions that were asked by the Panel during the briefings and on the comments made to me by Panel members after the meeting, I believe that the Panel opinion has developed along the following lines:

1. That FROG is a more risky development to contemplate at this time than is EOI.
2. That EOI has much greater capability than FROG and has sufficient capability to replace the Gambit system when it becomes operational.
3. That there are no technological improvements on the horizon which would significantly change or improve EOI's current configuration even if development were deferred as much as two or three years.
4. That an all-out effort should be placed on EOI and work on FROG should be dropped.

HANDLE VIA BYEMAN
CONTROL SYSTEM ONLY

~~SECRET~~

In executive session Dr. Land told the Panel that although he had an obligation to go back to the President on this he felt obliged to discuss the matter with Dr. David first and try to persuade him to the Panel's point of view. I understand that meeting is now scheduled for 12 July. I presume some Panel members will participate.

On another front, Dr. Naka showed me a memorandum written by Dr. McLucas to Mr. Packard shortly after the EXCOM meeting in which Dr. McLucas pointed out the serious budgetary impact of concurrent EOI/FROG developments. He referred to discussions with a number of people who, he says, were of the opinion that this pressure could best be relieved by delaying the EOI program start by a year or more. He suggested an additional advantage for doing so would be to allow some technology to mature which might significantly improve the EOI over the current configuration being proposed. (This, of course, is Ed David's line.) He specifically excluded you from the list of people holding this view, but included Laird, Froehlke, Foster, David and Adm. Anderson. (Wheaton Byers of the PFIAB staff doubts that Anderson holds this view; he tells me that Adm. Anderson is planning to send a letter to the EXCOM members letting them know about the meeting with the President and the Board's interest in participating in the decision.)

Finally, McLucas suggested that perhaps Mr. Packard should set up a technical review panel reporting to D/NRO which would review the EOI program to determine what its schedule should be. I told Bob Naka that we would be very much against establishing another panel in this area and that I believed you would feel that any Panel review of the matter should be left with the Land Panel.

Donald H. Steininger
Assistant Deputy Director
for
Science and Technology

HANDLE VIA BYEMAN
CONTROL SYSTEM ONLY

2

~~SECRET~~