4 JAN 1966

BYE-21002/65

Brigadier General Russell A. Berg Deputy Director, MOL Program Space Systems Division (SAF-SIA) AF Unit Post Office Los Angeles, California

Dear Russ:

Over the past year a tremendous amount of progress has been made in the MOL Program. The program has been approved, its objectives reoriented, and then reoriented again, Contract Definition Phase is well underway and, particularly during the last few months, many significant program decisions have been made. There is, however, at least one major and fundamental problem remaining with us, which I believe require concerted effort from all of us to solve. This problem is the broadening of the MOL Program to increase its capabilities to perform useful military functions and experiments in space.

In addition to my own concern, I think it is pertinent to review certain of the statements and positions taken by Mr. McHamara and by the President at the time the MOL Program was approved. Extracted immediately below are quotes from Mr. McHamara's memo to the President dated 24 August 1965. He stated:

"Based upon a thorough review of the conclusions I recommend the following:

- 2. That the MOL program proceed toward the following objectives:
 - a. Semi-operational use beginning in late 1968 to secure photographs of resolutions of significant targets. This is approximately better than the best satellite photography we are now obtaining, and approximately better than the best expected U-2 photographs or the G3 satellite system, now under development, from which we expect photographs in about 15 months.

(0)

DORIAN/GAMBIT

Page 1 of pages Copy 5 of 5 copies SAFSL BYE 21002-65

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING; DOD DIR 5200.10 DOES NOT APPLY

SA TO

KANDLE VIA TALENT-HANDLE VIA BYEMAN SYSTEM ONLY
KEYHOLE CHANNELS HANDLE VIA BYEMAN SYSTEM ONLY
ONLY



- b. Development of high-resolution optical technology and systems for either manned or unmanmed use. This technology will provide the resolution and be simed at ultimately even better resolution
- c. Provision of a facility for the development, test and use of other potential military applications such as SIGINT collection, radar observation and ocean surveillance, as the utility and feasibility of such applications become established.
- d. Provision of an experimental program for determination of man's utility in assembling large structures, and in adjusting, maintaining and processing the output from complex military equipment in space."

At another point, Secretary McHamara states: "I have the concurrence of Secretary Rusk, Mr. Webb, Admiral Raborn, and Dr. Hornig on the above recommendations." Later in the paper Mr. McHamara states:

"The plan for MOL as proposed by the Department of Defense has been prepared specifically to meet defense needs. Provision has been made, however, for including experiments and technology of special relevance to certain military needs other than recommissance. As the program proceeds, they may increase in importance. Preliminary study has been made as well to determine what general scientific needs could be included. On the basis of further DoD-BASA cooperative studies, NASA will determine which of its scientific or general technological experiments should be carried out using the MOL capability on the basis of non-interference with defense priority objectives."

Also extracted from the news release provided by the Department of Defense on August 25, 1965 are the following:

"The primary objectives of the MOL Program are to:

- (a) learn more about what man is able to do in space and how that ability can be used for military purposes.
- (b) develop technology and equipment which will help advance manned and unmanned space flight.

MANGLE VIA TALENTKEYEGLE CHANNELS
G H L Y

IOP SECRET

Page 2 of hpages Copy [of 5 copies SAFSL BYE 21002-66

TO STATE

(c) experiment with this technology and equipment."

Later on in this release the following paragraph is extracted:
"On the basis of Department of Defense-NASA studies, the National
Aeronautics and Space Administration will decide which of its scientific
or technological experiments are carried out in the MOL. These will not
interfere with DoD experiments."

It would seem that the statements above clearly indicate that we should proceed with a MOL Program considerably broader than is currently being pursued. Even without the direction which we have received, it seems very risky to make an a priori determination that there is nothing of military significance in space other than reconnaissance. Therefore, we need to improve our organization and our capabilities to fulfill these broader objectives. I think it is particularly pertinent to initiate action along these lines immediately because of the obviously difficult questions which will be forthcoming in some of our Congressional sessions this spring. We have held preliminary discussions on this subject. I have had some of my people examine better ways to conduct our affairs in the sense of broadening our program. I would like to send Dr. Yarymovych and one or two others from the MOL Program Office and Colonel Lowe from MIF to meet with whomever you designate next week to do at least the following:

a. To review our previous list of primary and secondary experiments to determine which of these experiments should be reactivated and carried on in the white program. For instance, in a review of the primary experiments it seems that the extra-vehicular work done under experiment P-5 should be re-energized. I think it is very much in consonence with the objective listed in paragraph 2d of Mr. McHamara's memo for the President. I also believe that some of the remaining "P" experiments which have been incorporated into the primary mission activities should continue to be considered as separate experiments for the sole purpose of having some white objectives which can be discussed under proper security classifications of AFR 205-23 on those occasions where we are pressured into discussing our experimental activities. It is my personal view that the P-designation should be eliminated but the same experimental work carried on under some new designator. The reason is quite simple. If we continue to talk about P-5, people will want to know what happened to the rest of the experiments. It seems that some change in name is appropriate.

b. The second major task that I think needs to be addressed is to build a broader and more enduring management and organizational approach to the generation, sponsorship, and development of manned space flight experiments. I should explain that my definition of experiments is just that. I do not view our work in optical recommaissance, in

HANDLE VIA TALENT- DORTA/GAMBLE KEVNOLE GHANNELS

ONLY

HANDLE VIA BYEMAN SYSTEM ONLY

TOP SECRET

Page 3 of 4 pages Copy 5 of 5 copies SAFSL BYE 21002-66

TOP STORT

SIGINT, or in ocean surveillance as experimental; I think it is developmental, mission-oriented, and generally in response to accepted military requirements. Although we have not done too well in defining SIGINT and ocean surveillance hardware, at least there are people and some money being applied to those tasks. My concern is providing some means of advancing the state of the art, or identifying those other space activities which are necessary to the national defense and the consequent development of space material or the state of the art essential to carry those activities to a useful conclusion. It is my view that these kinds of activities must involve the whole of the Air Force Systems Command or at least those parts of it that can make a substantive contribution. In a general sense, I think that AFSC must generate and sponsor such manned space flight experiments. Once a decision is taken to flight test, then they become the responsibility of the MOL Program to integrate and to flight test.

c. The final major activity that needs to be addressed is how we shape ourselves to support NASA, should they desire to participate in the MML Program. It is significant that this be done for the low earth orbit regime where the MML vehicle presumably is the most cost effective way to provide for manned space flight experimentation.

As you know, General Schriever is quite concerned about this entire subject, and has directed that I proceed expeditiously to evolve a course of action to provide alternate missions for the MOL. I would appreciate your comments and cooperation for the forthcoming trip for Mike Yarymovych.

Sincerely,

SIGNED

HARRY L. EVANS Brigadier General, USAF Vice Director, NOL Program

Gen Evans/4Jan66/rad

Cys to:
SAFSL File
SCG Read
SAFSL Chron
SAFSL Read

DOBIAN /GAMBIT

Page 4 of 4 pages Copy 5 of 5 copies SAFEL BYR 21002-66

KALBLE VIA TALENT-KEYHOLE CHANNELS O MANDLE VIA BYEMAN SYSTEM ONLY

