(b)(3):10 US	SC 424	а т с то талан сон т жи и	s s n nik ma m	 а <sup>с</sup>	
Sent:	Monday, April 16,	2001 8:34 AM			
To:	(b)(3):10 USC 424				
Cc:					
Subject:	FW: China Manuso	cript Redux	•		
Importanc	ce: High				
CLASSIE					

CAVEATS: NOFORN TERMS: NONE

(b)(3):10 USC 424

This is to request your assistance or guidance.

(b)(1),1.4 (c)

(U) Bottom line to the review was that DIA opposed publication of roughly 25% of the material. (b)(3):10 USC 424 was the primary reviewer for DIA.) OSD/Policy weighed in with a complete objection to publication of any of it. The DoD security/policy review office (which took the lead for the review for DoD) agreed with OSD/Policy and that became the DoD position.

(U) Since then the author has retained the services of an attorney, who is "exploring" DoD objections and challenging DoD review. I have attached a copy of a desknote that is being forwarded to the CE, which explains in a little more detail the current state of play.

(U) Also below is a note I sent to (b)(3):10 USC 424

(U) The DoD security/policy review office (DFOISR) has sent a memo to DIA requesting our input/comments on a number of issues. One in particular concerns DIA's/DoD's grounds for having the need to review the manuscript. As I note below, PO-PA will prepare the DIA reply to DFOISR, but am in need of DO input in explaining DIA equities in the manuscript. The DIA reply to DFOISR is due 20 April.

(b)(1	),1	.4	(C)	
(D)(T	), 1	.4	$(\mathbf{U})$	

ſ

(U) Am bringing this to your attention since you have some familiarity with this case from your (b)(3):10 USC 424 days as Deputy and also to seek <u>your assistance/nuidance</u>. I realize that there may be a lot of sensitivity regarding discussion of (b)(1),1.4 (c) In addition to not sure if there are other offices within DO I should be contacting. is aware of this case and the inquiries being made by the author's attorney.) (b)(3):10 USC 424 (b)(3):10 USC 424