

17 March 1961

Pages 2020 - 2024, incl.

MEMORANDUM BY THE CHIEF OF STAFF, US AIR FORCE
for the
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
on

STRATEGIC TARGET PLANNING (U)

Reference: JCS 2056/208-3205 (17 Aug 59) rec 9

CSAFM 85-61

16 March 1961

- 1. I have reviewed the extract* from the memorandum for the President from the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, dated 25 November 1960, in which Dr. Kistiakowsky reported to the President on the methodology employed in the preparation of the MSTL and SIOP. 1
- 2. In view of Dr. Kistiakowsky's position at the time of authorship, his comments could have significant impact on strategic planning. It would appear that they merit special attention in that they were brought to the attention of the Secretary of Defense at the request of the President. 2
- 3. I have recommended that Dr. Kistiakowsky's memorandum be forwarded to the Director of Strategic Target Planning for detailed study insofar as it relates to SIOP. Such action would respond to the expressed** wishes of the Secretary of Defense, and would assist the Joint Chiefs of Staff in their own study of the memorandum. 3
- 4. Insofar as it relates to Study 2009, I believe that the Joint Chiefs of Staff should comment directly to the Secretary of Defense. In this connection there are statements in 4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

Handwritten notes: 17/05/61, 17/05/61, 17/05/61

* Annex to JCS 2056/208
** Enclosure to JCS 2056/208

DISTRIBUTION

- Gen. Lemnitzer (C/JCS)
- Gen. Decker (CSA)
- Adm. Burke (CNO)
- Gen. White (CSAF)
- Gen. Shoup (CMC)
- Gen. Hamlett (DC/S, OPS)
- Adm. Sharp (DCNO-P&F)
- Gen. Gerhart (DC/S, P&P)
- Gen. Wieseman (DC/S-P, MC)
- Gen. Wheeler (D/JS)
- Adm. Wellings (DD/JS)
- Gen. Breitweiser (J-2)
- Gen. Dean (J-3)
- Adm. Ferrall (J-5)
- Gen. Campbell (NSC Rep)
- Adm. Blouin (S/JCS)
- Col. Ingelido (DS/JCS)
- Secys, J-2
- Secys, J-3
- Secys, J-5

Handwritten: 26 Nov 82

Stamp: ~~TOP SECRET~~

Stamp: DASH (S) DISOIS FOR SECY J CONTROL

Stamp: Copy No 921

Stamp: Case No 921

Stamp: T.S. No 921

Stamp: Document No. 6

17 March 1961

Pages 2020 - 2024, incl.

MEMORANDUM BY THE CHIEF OF STAFF, US AIR FORCE
for the
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
on

STRATEGIC TARGET PLANNING (U)

Reference: JCS 2056/208-3205 (17 Aug 59) rec 9

CSAFM 85-61

16 March 1961

1. I have reviewed the extract* from the memorandum for the President from the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, dated 25 November 1960, in which Dr. Kistiakowsky reported to the President on the methodology employed in the preparation of the MSTL and SIOP. 1
2. In view of Dr. Kistiakowsky's position at the time of authorship, his comments could have significant impact on strategic planning. It would appear that they merit special attention in that they were brought to the attention of the Secretary of Defense at the request of the President. 2
3. I have recommended that Dr. Kistiakowsky's memorandum be forwarded to the Director of Strategic Target Planning for detailed study insofar as it relates to SIOP. Such action would respond to the expressed** wishes of the Secretary of Defense, and would assist the Joint Chiefs of Staff in their own study of the memorandum. 3
4. Insofar as it relates to Study 2009, I believe that the Joint Chiefs of Staff should comment directly to the Secretary of Defense. In this connection there are statements in 4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

Handwritten notes: 17/05/61, 17/05/61, 17/05/61

* Annex to JCS 2056/208
** Enclosure to JCS 2056/208

DISTRIBUTION

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Gen. Lemnitzer (C/JCS) | Adm. Wellings (DD/JS) |
| Gen. Decker (CSA) | Gen. Breitweiser (J-2) |
| Adm. Burke (CNO) | Gen. Dean (J-3) |
| Gen. White (CSAF) | Adm. Ferrall (J-5) |
| Gen. Shoup (CMC) | Gen. Campbell (NSC Rep) |
| Gen. Hamlett (DC/S, OPS) | Adm. Blouin (S/JCS) |
| Adm. Sharp (DCNO-P&F) | Col. Ingelido (DS/JCS) |
| Gen. Gerhart (DC/S, P&P) | Secys, J-2 |
| Gen. Wieseman (DC/S-P, MC) | Secys, J-3 |
| Gen. Wheeler (D/JS) | Secys, J-5 |

26 Nov 82

TOP SECRET CONTROL

Copy No. 92

Case No. 92

T.S. No. 92

Document No. 6

~~TOP SECRET~~

the report with regard to Study 2009 which are not substantiated ' 1
in that Study. I consider that these should be brought to the 2
attention of the Secretary of Defense. 3

5. In the Enclosure hereto is a draft memorandum for the 4
Secretary of Defense which advises him of our action in response 5
to his request,* and points out discrepancies in the report 6
with regard to Study 2009. 7

6. It is recommended that: 8

a. The memorandum in the Enclosure be forwarded to the 9
Secretary of Defense. 10

b. This paper NOT be forwarded to the commanders of 11
unified or specified commands. 12

c. This paper NOT be forwarded to US officers in NATO 13
activities. 14

d. This paper NOT be forwarded to the Chairman, US 15
Delegation, United Nations Military Staff Committee. 16

* Enclosure to JCS 2056/208

~~TOP SECRET~~
JCS 2056/230

2021

ENCLOSURE

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Subject: Strategic Target Planning (U)

1. On 20 January 1961, the Secretary of Defense forwarded 1
to the Joint Chiefs of Staff a memorandum from the then Special 2
Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, Dr. 3
Kistiakowsky. This memorandum comprised a report to the Presi- 4
dent on the methodology employed in the preparation of the 5
National Strategic Target List (NSTL) and Single Integrated 6
Operational Plan (SIOP). It was the suggestion of Mr. Gates 7
that the report be studied, both by the Director of Strategic 8
Target Planning and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. 9

2. In compliance with the desires of the former Secretary 10
of Defense, and in order to facilitate their own assessment 11
of the Kistiakowsky report as it relates to SIOP, the Joint 12
Chiefs of Staff are forwarding the report to the Director of 13
Strategic Target Planning for comment. You will be advised 14
if further action is indicated. 15

3. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that the references 16
to Study 2009 in the report are misleading. In order to 17
preclude misunderstanding regarding comparison between SIOP-62 18
and Study 2009, the following comments are pertinent: 19

a. The report states: "A comparison of the present SIOP 20
for the alert force with the plans worked out in the '2009 21
Study' is informative. The latter used [redacted] 22
[redacted] 23
[redacted] 24
in the USSR. The SIOP for the 25
alert force alone uses some [redacted] 26
[redacted] 27
in the Sino-Soviet Bloc." 28

b. Actually, Study 2009 reflects considerably more than [redacted] in the alert force. Study 2009 considers weapon and force requirements for each of a number of situations and assumptions, such as using aircraft only, missiles only, combinations of the two, 75% assurance of weapon delivery, 90% assurance, and various conditions of warning or alert. For example, in the case of an alert force consisting of aircraft only [redacted] [redacted], and assuming 75% assurance of delivery, the number of weapons in the alert force as reflected in the Study 2009 is [redacted]. This very closely approximates the [redacted] in the initial SIOP-62 alert force. This has been confirmed by a recent comparison of Study 2009 and SIOP alert forces, conducted by the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff.

c. As quoted above, the report states that Study 2009 used these alert weapons against [redacted]. Actually, the figure [redacted]

[redacted]

d. The "Estimate of Damage" reflected in Study 2009 shows that [redacted] of the USSR, rather than [redacted] respectively, as shown above in the quote from the Kistiakowsky report. Of more importance, even the lower figures in the Study 2009 were based on the admittedly unrealistic assumption that 100% of the weapons programmed for each DGZ would arrive at the bomb release line. In view of this the figures were qualified in Study 2009 as follows: "The expected damage would be somewhat less depending on the programmed assurance of delivering a weapon to each bomb release line."

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

~~TOP SECRET~~

4. Since the Essential National Task defined by the 1
National Strategic Targeting and Attack Policy includes the 2
requirement to attain damage levels as specified in Study 2009, 3
that Study is a criterion for formulation of the NSTL/SIOP. 4
The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that the comments of 5
Dr. Kistiakowsky are misleading, as illustrated above, in 6
that they imply that SIOP-62 is not in conformance with Study 7
2009. It is the view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that SIOP-62 8
does conform to this criterion and that Dr. Kistiakowsky's 9
report is erroneous in this respect. 10

~~TOP SECRET~~

JCS 2056/230

2024

Enclosure

921118 95

~~TOP SECRET~~