UNCLASSIFIED

FROM: A/I - Behavioral TO: Subject: Booby Traps/Tamper Proofs



NAT OHAL SECURITY Anternation of Subject to Sanat Sanctions

Summary Conclusions:

Based upon most recent assessments, Behavioral contingent now discounts liklihood of booby-trap detonators installed on device. This assessment supercedes earlier Behavioral report.

Data used:

Intelligence injects since 0900 this date. Latest OPSIT report.

Rationale

Intelligence indicates that "GOOTCH" is principal advesary on site. Given his extensive background in terrorist activities, it is not likely that he would risk suicidal effort implied by dangers of automatic detonation of his device while he is still in jeopardy. New intelligence of possible move of device 1400 hours (now apparently confirmed) this date implies that the device assembly was not completed until this date and that the claim of such completion in the radioed message of 12/5 was designed as disinformation in order to buy time. Even now, it is possible that the final activation of the device is being delayed until after it is "in place" at its ultimate destination.,

(b) (1)

Most importantly, however, is the fact that the advesaries have invested considerable effort in installing anti-personnel attack defenses around the area. It is not likely that such efforts would have been made under the circumstance that the advesaries were relying on device connected booby traps as their intended deterent, particularly in view of the fact that they have not made attempts to make this clear to the potential attackers. As of this time it is not clear why the advesary has not as yet made contact with us regarding their intentions and clarification of their resolve regarding sacrifice of their personnel by detonation of their device either upon mission failure or possibility of such failure. So far, it is clear that the advesaries appear to believe that they are capable of defending their position from attack.

These conclusions are not meant to imply that there may not be a dead-man detonater; i.e., a trigger which activates the device upon the death of the holder of the device. Decision on this issue must await further intelligence. The above interpretations key only on the original implication that the device would "go off" upon entry to the "building" site. Behavioral now assesses this claim to have been disinformational.

