

29 September, 1981

Mr. Clarence L. Johnson, Senior Advisor
Lockheed Corporation
P.O.Box 551
Burbank, California 91520

Dear Kelly:

First of all, let me say what a pleasure it was to see you again and to get a chance to meet Nancy. I think your speech went over quite well, especially given the fact that you could not depart from the text which had been approved. My recollections of past occasions when you spoke before other audiences (like suppliers' meetings) were that you much prefer to extemporize! The windy lectures on organization and test equipment could have been left out as far as I was concerned. Incidentally, there have been no questions raised about what you said, from any quarter, official or otherwise.

Your discussion with Senator Goldwater about [redacted] STAT
Twelve Questions had a fairly immediate payoff. Instead of calling Les, Barry wrote him a letter the same day you saw him. Given our wonderful inter-office mail, the letter just arrived in Langley this morning. I had prepared Les for a possible phone call when I saw him yesterday morning, but the letter was a surprise. The gist of what he said was that after his discussion with you relative to the questions, he felt that what we should do was to tell [redacted] "that the questions he STAT
asked are classified and some of them will remain classified for many, many years." He then added that he felt "we are not in a position to go any further with the whole subject." As I now understand it, things are in a holding pattern for what I had been asked to do, at least until Les has a chance to discuss Barry's letter with Inman to see what the latter thinks comes next.

I personally think that it might be well for me to continue my informal evaluation of what might or might not be declassified or acknowledged, since apparently no one has ever addressed this subject before. At least a departure point would be in the record if somehow, at a later time, it was decided that limited disclosure might be helpful.. But since I "ain't the regular crew chief" I shall have to await the pleasure of others. Meanwhile, USAF's informal position is that they would object to any disclosures "about the innards" of the Deuce. That is a pro-motherhood and apple pie stand, of course, and one that may need better definition. After all, for instance, what is to protect about the Collins 618-T SSB or the Baird sextant? Meanwhile, I shall be discussing the rough draft you sent me with the General Counsel to see what implications lie in the Federal Privacy Act of 1974 about releasing names of key people who are still living. I will try to keep you in the loop on this. For the moment then, all the best.

Sincerely [redacted] STAT

Page Denied