

Martin Co., in the amount of \$54,000. The description of the contract was

Study to determine the feasibility of defending small hardened targets, such as ICBM launch sites, against an enemy missile threat.

Both contractors apparently came out with the results identically the same, which were as follows:

Technically it is feasible to defend small hardened targets; economically, it may or may not be feasible, depending on the size of the target.

(The contracts data not read is as follows:)

AIR FORCE EFFORTS CONTRACTS

CONTRACT NO. AF 30(602)-2109

Contractor: United Aircraft Corp., Missile and Space Systems Division.
Value: \$170,812 (cost shared).¹

Description: Study to determine feasibility of defending small hardened targets such as ICBM launch sites against an enemy missile threat.

Results: Technically it is feasible to defend small hardened targets; economically, it may or may not be feasible depending on size of target.

CONTRACT NO. AF 30(602)-2206

Contractor: The Martin Co.

Value: \$54,000.

Description: Study to determine feasibility of defending small hardened targets such as ICBM launch sites against an enemy missile threat.

Results: Technically it is feasible to defend small hardened targets; economically, it may or may not be feasible depending on size of target.

Consider above two together.

Mr. SANDWEG. Could we speak to those, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary IMRIE. Yes, Mr. Jack Segal, on my right, from the Headquarters of the Electronic Systems Division of our Systems Command is here, as well—from the technical part of the problem, Mr. Charles Meyer is again back on the procurement side.

Now I have one word of caution on this one. I believe that Mr. Segal can cover this with unclassified material—to give you a general idea of the thing. If it must be pursued, I would like to recommend we go into executive session, because of the classified parts of it.

Mr. HÉBERT. We won't touch on that, Mr. Sandweg.

Mr. SANDWEG. All right. Let's refer to the results of both contracts, in which it gives what seems to be a very obvious answer. "Technically it is feasible. Economically it may or may not be." It seems rather obvious an answer. It seems like a lot of money to have been spent to get that kind of an answer.

Mr. SEGAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman and Committee members, industry was approached on this particular problem after a new concept for ballistic missile defense was generated with inhouse capability at the Rome Air Development Center. Industry was approached to study the concept as we had presented it to them, to provide approaches to the achievement of this particular system capability in a time period which we requested them to study, and to trade off the various system elements that were involved in this particular concept against the various costs involved. Namely, for varying degrees of technical

¹ One-half this cost was paid by the contractor.