

~~SECRET~~

000016325

~~SECRET~~

April 26, 1971



SECY-1412

Redacted Copy Version

This document consists of 9 pages

Copy No. 19 of 37 Series A  
DP-32FK89DF1087

COMMENTS ON PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF LASER CLASSIFICATION PANEL

Note by the Secretary

The General Manager has requested that the attached memorandum of April 23, 1971 from the Director of Classification, with enclosures, be circulated for the information of the Commission.

W. B. McCool

Secretary of the Commission

DISTRIBUTION

- Secretary
- Chairman Seaborg
- Commissioner Ramey
- Commissioner Johnson
- Commissioner Larson
- Commissioner
- General Manager
- Deputy Gen. Mgr.
- Asst. Gen. Mgr.

COPY NO. DISTRIBUTION

- 1,23-34 Exec. Asst. to GM
- 2,35-37 Asst. GM for Admin.
- 3 Asst. GM for MA
- 4 Asst. GM for R&D
- 5 General Counsel
- 6 Classification
- 7-8 Controller
- 9 Inspection
- 10 Research

COPY NO.

- 11-12
- 13
- 14-15
- 16
- 17
- 18-19
- 20
- 21
- 22

RESTRICTED DATA

This document contains restricted data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Its transmittal or the disclosure of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited.

GROUP 1  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

~~SECRET~~

Department of Energy Declassification Review

Authority: *L. S. ...*

Name: *L. S. ...*

2<sup>nd</sup> Review Date: *...*

Authority: *...*

Name: *...*

contains *...*

WITH ATTACHMENT 9 pp.

*Staff papers*  
*...*

P9451

Apr 28 1971



UNITED STATES  
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

APR 20 1971

Chairman Seaborg  
Commissioner Ramey  
Commissioner Johnson  
Commissioner Larson  
Commissioner

L

THRU: General Manager

LASER CLASSIFICATION PANEL

At the request of the Panel, copies of the preliminary response which the Laser Classification Panel made to the Commission in the letter from Dr. Seitz dated February 5, 1971, were sent to interested AEC Division Directors, to three major AEC weapons laboratories, and to Dr. Foster and Dr. Walske of the DOD. Copies of the only replies received to date are enclosed for the information of the Commission. Other responses will be furnished when they are received.

As the Commission will recall, the Panel will meet again on May the 21st, and they are looking forward to meeting with the Commission again on that date so that they may be advised of the Commission's reaction to their preliminary response and to the replies that have been received from the sources mentioned above.

C. L. Marshall, Director  
Division of Classification

Enclosures:

1. Cy. of 3/30/71 memo to CLMarshall  
fm. PMcDaniel (SRD-1)
2. Cy. of 3/16/71 ltr. to Dr. Seaborg  
fm. Squires & Vesper, GAC
3. Cy. of 3/23/71 ltr. to CLMarshall  
fm. JAHornbeck (SRD-1)
4. Cy. of 3/24/71 ltr. to CLMarshall  
fm. BHenderson
5. Cy. of 4/12/71 ltr. to CLMarshall  
fm. DMacDougall, LASL (SRD-1)

When separated from this document  
as SECRET  
(insert proper classification)



[REDACTED]

UNITED STATES  
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

[REDACTED]

= P 16405  
dated  
3/30/76

March 30 1976

Mr. W. J. ... Director  
Office of Classification

**COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF THE LASER CLASSIFICATION PANEL**

1. The Panel reviewed the preliminary response of the Laser Classification Panel and fully concur with its draft recommendations. Our reasons for supporting the proposed declassification are as follows:

1. The proposed declassification should assist university and industrial researchers to freely enter and contribute to the field. The proceedings on the subject should result in free dissemination of information and cannot help but speed the determination of the feasibility of this process for controlled fusion.

PoE  
b(3)

*Deleted*

While we are not experts in nuclear weapons, it appears from our understanding of the weapons design problem and our conversations with weapons physicists that the proposed declassification will not release so much information that potential subversives or "Nth" countries will be able to build their own nuclear weapons any more easily than is now possible.

PoE  
b(3)

*Deleted*

4. The proposed declassification will make the policing of the recent laser classification guide considerably easier. Already many university researchers are working and publishing in this area and the magnitude of the policing job is enormous. As the field continues to gain momentum, and it is fully expected to do so, this task will become even more difficult. Further, the proposed declassification would greatly simplify the problem of monitoring the recent KMS no-fund contract and the proposed privately supported activities of Gulf Energy and Environmental Systems.

~~RESTRICTED DATA~~  
~~SECRET~~

~~[REDACTED]~~  
P9011

~~SECRET~~

C. L. Marshall

DOB  
b(3)

*Deleted*

The intense interest in this field spurred by the statements of KMS seem likely to attract still other physicists. The time until these people "rediscover" the key elements of the problem appears short. By taking the initiative in this matter, the Commission's stature in the scientific and lay communities would appear to be considerably enhanced at a minimum risk.

If we can be of any further service to you or the Panel, please do not hesitate to let us know.



Paul W. McDaniel, Director  
Division of Research

~~SECRET~~

GENERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
TO THE  
U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

Livermore, California  
March 16, 1971

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman  
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Glenn:

At the recent meeting of the General Advisory Committee at Los Alamos, Commissioner Larson brought the GAC up to date on the Brueckner - KMSI situation, and mentioned the recent Seitz Panel report to the Commission regarding classification policy on lasers related to CTR work. This Seitz report was subsequently made available to the GAC.

The Committee (acting as a group to review the CTR program) has today given the Seitz recommendations a preliminary review. Although the Committee has not had extensive discussions with weapons representatives, it does feel the recommendations are sound. If adopted, these revised classifications should assist greatly in resolving future problems similar to KMSI. As you will recall, you asked some time ago that the GAC consider the handling of such problems.

We note the Seitz Panel has suggested "a second meeting (in approximately two months) with the Commission and others, as appropriate..." The GAC will be very pleased to assist in such a meeting if desired by the Commission.

Sincerely,

*Jorn*

Lombard Squires  
Chairman  
CTR Review Committee

*Howard*

Howard G. Vesper  
Chairman, GAC

- 5 -

COPY

P8886

P88

MEM - E-3-12-UP

SANDIA LABORATORIES

SANDIA CORPORATION

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87115

J. A. HORNBECK  
PRESIDENT

MAR 23 1971

RS 1/1753

Mr. C. L. Marshall, Director  
Division of Classification  
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20545

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Subject: Modification of Laser Classification

We agree with the preliminary views expressed by the Laser Panel members in their February 5 letter. We specifically endorse the view that classification requirements on laser characteristics should be abandoned.

DoE  
b(3)

*Deleted*

Since  $10^7$  J is equivalent to only 5 lbs. HE, while "laboratory" type experiments at Sandia involve up to 200 lbs. HE, it is not obvious that the proposed guideline is sensible. It should be remarked, however, that this concern is a minor one.

Yours sincerely,

*J. A. Hornbeck*

SJB:aja

RS 1/1753, Series A, 1 page, SRD, 4 copies,

Distribution:

- 1 - C. L. Marshall, USAEC, ML163
- 2 - R. W. Henderson, 2000
- 3 - S. J. Buchsbaum, 5000
- 4 - J. A. Hornbeck, 1

~~RESTRICTED DATA~~  
~~This document is the property of Sandia Corporation and is loaned to you for your information only. It is not to be distributed outside your organization.~~

~~RESTRICTED DATA~~

~~RESTRICTED DATA~~  
~~This document is the property of Sandia Corporation and is loaned to you for your information only. It is not to be distributed outside your organization.~~

*Per [unclear]*  
P8945

= D16406

SANDIA LABORATORIES  
SANDIA CORPORATION  
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87115



March 24, 1971

Mr. C. L. Marshall  
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Division of Classification  
Washington, D. C. 20545

Dear Charlie:

Your letter of February 12 to me as a Senior Reviewer relative to the preliminary responses of the Laser Classification Panel mentioned that the same text was being sent to the Directors of the three weapons laboratories, among others. I delayed replying knowing that Sol Buchsbaum who has this area of activity at Sandia was working up a reply for John Hornbeck to sign out.

You should have by now Hornbeck's reply which is dated March 23. I therefore consider Sandia's inputs to the matter complete with this note.

Best regards,

Bob

200 P. 1000  
2/24/71

PS912

Green  
2/24/71

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ALAMOS SCIENTIFIC LABORATORY  
(CONTRACT W-7405-ENG-36)  
P. O. Box 1663  
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

= 16729

IN RE:  
REFER.

April 12, 1971

Director  
Division of Classification  
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20545

Dear Mr. Marshall:

This is a somewhat belated response to your letter of February 12, 1971, to Harold Agnew in which you asked for our comments on the recommendations from the "Seitz Panel" on the subject of the classification of certain matters related to the use of laser energy. I doubt that any two people would have precisely the same opinion on matters like these, but the contents of this letter result principally from discussions between R. N. Thorn and me.

DOE  
b(3)

Deleted

DOE  
b(3)

present, we believe that it should be possible to devise a system in which a pulse of laser energy amounting to  $10^5$  joules would ignite a DT pellet and put out more energy than was put in.

DOE  
b(3)

Deleted

AEC policy, I believe, to encourage (require?) the publication of the results of all technical work if this is not prevented by security restrictions, and thus all of this work would be described in due course in the open literature.

I have attempted to describe the technical consequences of the proposed change in the classification rules but to express no opinion on the broader question of whether the national interest will or will not be served by such an action.

~~RESTRICTED DATA~~

~~This document contains Restricted Data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Its transmission or disclosure in any manner is prohibited by law. Excluded from automatic declassification.~~

ADW-81

April 12, 1971

DOE

b(3)

Deleted

Sincerely yours,



D. P. MacDougall  
Assistant Director for Weapons

Distribution:

- 1A - C. L. Marshall
- 2A - R. N. Thorn
- 3A - E. H. Eyster
- 4A - C. Mark
- 5A - ISD-5
- 6A - ISD-5

~~SECRET~~