



UPI Telephoto  
**ABM HEARING** — David Packard, deputy secretary of defense, testifies before the Senate disarmament subcommittee.

## Packard Says Pentagon Got One Outside ABM Opinion

3/27/69

By JOSEPH R. L. STERNE  
[Washington Bureau of The Sun]

Washington, March 26—David Packard, deputy defense secretary, came up with only one name today when pressed at a Senate hearing to list outside experts consulted during the Pentagon review of the anti-ballistic missile question.

The scientist he mentioned, Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, later told newsmen he has "very serious engineering criticisms" of the Safeguard ABM system chosen by the Nixon administration.

"Casual Conversation"  
A professor of physics and director of the linear accelerator center at Stanford University, Dr. Panofsky said he had only a "casual conversation" with Mr. Packard and had not discussed

the specifics of the Safeguard program.

Dr. Panofsky, by ironic coincidence, happened to be on his way to Capitol Hill to visit an aide to Senator John Sherman Cooper (R., Ky.), an ABM opponent, when his name was mentioned by Mr. Packard.

Quickly apprised of this after he entered the Senate caucus room, the short, amiable scientist smiled and said: "I'm very angry."

Late this afternoon Dr. Panofsky was asked to appear Friday before the Senate disarmament subcommittee to spell out his views on the ABM. He has been instrumental in developing the

(Continued, Page A 2, Col. 1)

(Continued from)  
klystron tube, a key component in high-powered radar of the type that would be used in the Safeguard system.

The attitude of the Pentagon toward outside, independent consultants arose at today's hearing after Senator J. William Fulbright (D., Ark.) wondered aloud how the Defense Department so suddenly changed the configuration of the ABM system.

Last year, the senator noted the emphasis of missile defense was to be on protection for the cities. But after a public outcry, he continued, Mr. Packard came up with the modified Safeguard plan emphasizing the defense of the Minuteman ICBM retaliatory force.

After extracting an acknowledgment from Mr. Packard that many of the same military and civilian officials at the Pentagon played a part in devising both ABM plans, Mr. Fulbright asked if outside analysts were

consulted.

Mr. Packard paused, said there were some, hesitated again, mentioned Dr. Panofsky's name and then added: "I'm not sure it's necessary to go outside the Pentagon" for the required advice.

#### Engineering Problem

Speaking from his experience in the electronics industry, where he amassed a \$300 million fortune, Mr. Packard said he regarded the ABM primarily as an engineering problem.

Critical experts who have appeared before the Senate subcommittee have not brought out any facts causing him to doubt the "basic scientific principles of the ABM decision," Mr. Packard remarked.

He assured the Senate panel that no construction would begin on the proposed first two Safeguard ABM bases in Montana and North Dakota until Congress acts on the necessary authorization and appropriations bills later this year.

This would give the administration several months in which to test the attitude of the Soviet Union toward strategic arms limitations.

#### Urged New Review

Senator Fulbright and Clifford Case (R., N.J.), welcoming Mr. Packard's assurance there would be no start in construction, urged the Pentagon to review the ABM issue once again—this time with outside consultants. Mr. Fulbright called last month's review "very superficial."

In appearing before the subcommittee, Mr. Packard finally got the chance to give a chart lecture on details of the ABM system which critical senators denied him during a hearing on live television last week.

He prefaced his explanation by stressing his desire for an alternative to a "doomsday machine approach" in which the United States automatically would launch a nuclear strike after picking up warnings of an enemy attack.

To avoid the "doomsday machine, he went on, the United States had developed its underwater Polaris fleet, had kept its strategic bombers on alert and had hardened its Minuteman missile sites so it could be assured of a retaliatory force if hit by an enemy first strike.

#### Further "Hedge"

The proposed ABM system,

Mr. Packard stated, was a further "hedge against possible unacceptable erosion of deterrent" by advances in Soviet nuclear power.

Senator Albert Gore (D., Tenn.), the subcommittee chairman, responded to Mr. Packard's chart lecture with one of his own in which he sought to

(on Page A 1)

show that ABM deployment would escalate a nuclear arms race.

"This is madness," the senator cried, as he pointed to a tall chart showing huge increases in both Soviet and American "overkill" capacity by the mid-1970's.

"Pretty soon something is going to happen to blow the whole world up."

Mr. Gore discounted the need for ABM protection by insisting the United States now holds a "vastly superior" lead in all major nuclear weapons systems.

## ABM COULD START BALTIMORE'S END

'Incineration' In Event Of An  
Enemy Attack Is Envisaged

(Continued from Page A 1)

[ABM interceptor] was sent up to meet it.

"He undertook to say the interception would be approximately over Baltimore.

"So I said, 'well, suppose the incoming missile . . . had a kind of mechanism that would detonate if a Sprint approached at a certain proximity?"

"I said, 'what would happen to Baltimore?' and he said, 'If it were a clear day the city would be incinerated.'"

When asked his views on this nuclear scenario, David Packard, deputy secretary of defense, replied:

"The name of this game is not what happens in those kinds of incidents but to consider this [ABM] deterrent so we don't get into war."

Mr. Packard, mentioning both components in the administration's Safeguard ABM system, said there would be no danger to Baltimore either from the explosion of a Sprint short-range intercept or a Spartan long-range intercept.

But then, speaking about the enemy warhead he added:

"If the enemy gets through, whether it detonates at a high altitude or on the ground we're in trouble."

### Trudeau Aims Stand

Ottawa, March 26 (AP) — Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau told the House of Commons today that the United States never sought or received Canadian agreement to go ahead with the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system.

Reporting on his two-day trip to Washington, the prime minister also said he had not protested the U.S. decision but had expressed concern about its potential effect on the East-West arms race.