

(OTA)

## ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

**SUBJECT:** (Optional)

Requests from the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) for Briefing and Publications on Ballistic Missile Defense

**FROM:** [Redacted] DLL/LD  
7B02 Hqs.

**EXTENSION NO.** OLL 84-3073/1

STAT  
STAT

**DATE**  
6 December 1984

**TO:** (Officer designation, room number, and building)

**DATE**  
RECEIVED - FORWARDED

**OFFICER'S INITIALS**

**COMMENTS** (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

STAT

1.	[Redacted]	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS
		RECEIVED	FORWARDED	
2.	[Redacted]			
3.	DD/OLL	7 DEC 1984		SSS
4.	D/OLL	10 DEC 1984		SSS
5.	DD/OLL	10 DEC 1984		SSS
6.	[Redacted]			
7.	[Redacted]			
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

chuck:  
I have asked May to draft a response to Shapiro from you that denies access to documents but offers to continue briefings.

(OK)

[Redacted]  
10 DEC 1984

STAT

STAT

*OTA*  
**RECORD COPY**

OLL 84-3073/1  
6 December 1984

**MEMORANDUM FOR:** Director, Office of Legislative Liaison

**VIA:** Chief, Liaison Division, OLL

**FROM:** [redacted]  
Liaison Division

25X1

**SUBJECT:** Requests from the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) for Briefing and Publications on Ballistic Missile Defense

1. As you can see from Sharfman's letter of 28 November, he does not accept our refusal to give OTA access [redacted]. After extensive research of Agency files and the questioning of Agency personnel, I have to assume that Sharfman and several other OTA staffers were allowed to read [redacted] in 1980 in connection with OTA's study on MX Missile Basing. OLL records show nothing beyond the paperwork leading to the granting of codeword clearances in 1980 to Sharfman, Kaplan, Johns, and Gibbons specifically for their MX study. Of the dozen or so DI staffers I have queried, no one can recall the particulars of OTA's 1980 access. [redacted]

25X1

25X1

25X1

2. With regard to OTA's request for a briefing on Soviet attitudes toward ballistic missile defense, DI/SOVA is prepared to provide a briefing in accord with OTA's two page outline of questions. This is scheduled for 1330 on 10 December at Headquarters. I so informed Mr. Rochlin of OTA on 5 December. I also told him I had no new response to Sharfman's reiterated request [redacted]

25X1

3. Sharfman is almost certain to continue pressing for the documents. [redacted] says Sharfman's legal citation does not require us to concede. However, Sharfman is likely to pursue his request at higher levels. (In 1980, he had the

25X1

[redacted] 25X1

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Chairman of OTA (Morris Udall) petition DCI Turner for codeword clearances.) You also ought to be aware that [redacted]

25X1  
25X1

4. At this point we have several options:

a. write Sharfman a letter over your signature reaffirming denial of the publications based on tightened security;

b. provide all or some of the publications OTA wants;

c. not respond directly to the letter and wait to see if Sharfman keeps pushing after the 10 December briefing.

25X1  
25X1

Distribution:

Orig - Addressee

1 - DD/OLL (w/att)

1 - OLL Record (w/att)

1 - OLL Chrono (wo/att)

2 - Liaison Div (wo/att)

OLL/LD [redacted] (6 Dec 84)

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

**Page Denied**

Next 6 Page(s) In Document Denied

BARRY GOLDWATER, AR  
DANIEL BATTUCK, MONTMAY, I  
JACK GARN, UTAH  
JOHN H. CHAFFEL, RI  
RICHARD S. LUGAR, IN  
DAVID COLM WALLOP, WYO  
DAVID BURENBERGER, MINN  
WILLIAM V. ROYH, JR., DEL  
WILLIAM S. COHEN, MARI

WALTER D. MIDDLETON, KY.  
JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., DEL  
DANIEL K. BIDUVE, HAWAII  
PATRICK J. LEAHY, VT.  
LLOYD BENTSEN, TEX  
SAM NUNN, GA

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON  
84-3073

# United States Senate

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., TENN., EX OFFICIO  
ROBERT C. BYRD, W. VA., EX OFFICIO

ROBERT R. SIMMONS, STAFF DIRECTOR  
GARY J. SCHMITT, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

June 4, 1984

[Redacted]

STAT

Deputy Director,  
Office of Legislative Liaison  
Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington, D.C. 20505

Dear [Redacted]

STAT

Thank you for your letter of May 31, regarding the Evans and Novak column in the May 16 Washington Post. Giving informal advice on the matter referred to in your letter does not appear to be within the scope of my responsibilities with the Select Committee on Intelligence. As part of the ongoing effort I am sure you are making to ascertain all of the relevant facts and circumstances pertaining to this matter, you may be interested in the attached article from the June 2 Washington Post. You also might want to consider consultation with the Committee on Armed Services, and with the Committee on Rules and Administration, which has oversight responsibility for the Office of Technology Assessment.

Sincerely,

  
Gary M. Chase,  
Chief Counsel

**Page Denied**

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied



## Space Secrets? Nonsense!

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak allege that the congressional Office of Technology Assessment has attacked President Reagan's space-based defense proposal and published a paper that contains "security information" ["Don't Give Secrets to a Rogue Elephant," op-ed, May 16]. As members of the congressional board that oversees the operation of OTA, we feel that these allegations must be answered.

As a support agency of Congress, OTA is prohibited from proposing specific policies for Congress to follow or to avoid. Its sole purpose is to assess available technologies and present options to Congress. It does not "spew out reports without regard for security rules in order to pursue their own policy interests," as Evans and Novak contend. On the contrary, OTA rarely initiates assessments other than those requested by congressional committees or the chairmen and ranking minority members of such committees; and the assessment now under way of the Strategic Defense Initiative set forth by the president was undertaken based on such requests.

Members of Congress may ask OTA to provide preliminary information on subjects of interest before a full assessment is completed. Such is the case with Dr. Ashton Carter's background paper on space-based defense systems. It was not the goal of either OTA or Carter to "bring down the Star Wars program," as reported by Evans and Novak. As a matter of fact, the inside of the front cover of Carter's background paper bears in large letters the statement, "This is an OTA background paper that has neither been reviewed nor approved by the Technology Assessment Board."

OTA provided this background paper to members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at their re-

quest, for use at a hearing on space-based defenses. Since the release of this document, it has been misinterpreted as a definitive statement of OTA by both those who oppose the Star Wars concept and by those who support it.

It is true that Carter's paper was commissioned by OTA in an attempt to learn more about space-based defenses. In March, the OTA board approved an assessment requested by the House Armed Services Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for a study of New Ballistic Missile Defense Technologies. The preface of Carter's paper specifically states that it "will serve as one point of departure" for the full assessment. This paper was never intended to be an objective analysis of all options for a space-based defense. This is the purpose of the full assessment, which will consider many differing options and points of view, including those of the Reagan administration.

With regard to security allegations, OTA staff complied with the security procedures established by the Defense Department prior to the release of Carter's paper. It is important to note that the Evans and Novak column did not specifically state that security had been breached by OTA or that proper procedures had not been followed, only that some offices in the Pentagon had not seen the paper before its release. This is an internal matter within the Pentagon, not a violation by OTA. The implication that OTA disregards security procedures is without basis in fact.

The statement that Congress does not feel bound by Pentagon secrecy reflects the fact that over the years some members of Congress, not OTA, have released classified material. We do not condone the release of classified material for political purposes and will continue to ensure that OTA follows established procedures regarding such material.

The idea that OTA is "playing to an emotional anti-Star Wars mood" or that it could give anyone "carte blanche to prowl the most secret nuclear labs" is absolute nonsense. It is a great disservice to Congress to imply that it should not be allowed to conduct its own impartial analysis of highly complex and controversial issues.

—John D. Dingell and Cooper Evans

John D. Dingell is a Democratic representative from Michigan. Cooper Evans is a Republican representative from Iowa.

**Page Denied**



and Evans and Robert Novak

# 't Give Secrets to a Rogue Elephant

James A. Abrahamson, newly appointed director of President Reagan's "Star Wars" defense program, could scarcely be seen in the Washington Post a news account that recounted a congressional version of a rogue elephant charging at will on Capitol Hill.

How did this ever get into print? Abrahamson referred to Maj. Gen. E. R. Holberg III, his former superior at the congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) attacking the Reagan space defense program and containing what the Defense Department considered as security information.

Abrahamson's memorandum back to Abrahamson a few days later, signed Peter J. Sharfman, manager of the international security division, and Holberg as saying that "Congress does not have the authority to demand that information be available to the Soviet Union now or in the future for anti-missile space defense purposes. It is the role of the House of Representatives to request information of security breaches.

Abrahamson's memorandum also concerns semi-autonomous agencies such as the OTA, that have sprouted in the massive congressional bureaucracy. He says they resemble the fabled rogue elephant, that roams without regard for security rules and pursues their own policy interests.

The goal here is to bring down the Star Wars program. The OTA "Background Paper" by MIT research associate Ashton B. Carter (a former OTA employee) derided Star Wars as "so remote that it should not serve as the basis of public expectation or national policy." The 97-page document also contained what Pentagon officials insist is the most detailed description ever published of the so-called "Excalibur" system for creating an anti-missile defense by harnessing the energy of a nuclear explosion.

The Excalibur system was first described in a report published by the House of Representatives in 1979. Holberg's May 1 memorandum to Abrahamson (in answer to "how the hell" such information got into print) contained this explanation of why OTA did not ask for security clearance from the Pentagon's top brass: "When I asked Mr. Sharfman why he had not gone to the Office of the Secretary of Defense for security clearance, he said: 'We ask anyone we please.'"

In a legal sense, Sharfman was correct. Security rules are mainly presidential executive orders and have no legal standing in the legislative branch. But in the broader sense, security leaks on Capitol Hill can undermine the national interest.

OTA, much praised in the past for some of its research papers, is supposed to be governed by a congressional board. But Sen. Ted Stevens, Senate Republican whip and vice chairman of the OTA Board,

said the first he knew of the Carter document was when he read about it in the newspapers. Democratic Rep. Morris Udall, now chairman of the rotating board, told us Carter's paper never had been approved because it was not an official "assessment."

Actually, the study by the MIT professor was cooked up by Sharfman and his OTA colleagues to find out more about the Pentagon program. "We didn't know enough about the subject to discuss it wisely," Sharfman told us. "We couldn't even ask the right questions." Backed by congressional authority and playing to an emotional anti-Star Wars mood, the OTA staff gave Carter carte blanche to prowl the most secret nuclear labs.

Not aired for public consumption was this devastating riposte to Carter in a Pentagon memo from Dr. W. B. Shuler, a top weapons engineer at California's Livermore lab: "The author has adopted a pejorative approach... littered with innuendo... inconsistent with current thinking in the defense technical community."

Reagan's attempt to create a workable space-based defense against an enemy's nuclear ballistic missiles is not going to fall on a single OTA background paper. But if Congress allows a semi-autonomous agency to probe at will from whatever ideological bias happens to be ascendant, a worthwhile experiment is threatened with abortion.

© IBM, News Group Chicago, Inc.

WASH POST- 16 MAY 84

**Page Denied**