MEMORANDUM BY THE DIRECTOR, JOINT STAFF,
for the
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

on

ATOMIC ANNEX TO THE JOINT STRATEGIC CAPABILITIES PLAN (JSCP)(U)

References:

a. J.C.S. 1823/109
b. J.C.S. 1844/237
c. J.C.S. 1844/226
d. J.C.S. 262/54

1. On 9 October 1957, the Joint Chiefs of Staff directed that an Ad Hoc Committee undertake a study of all factors pertinent to atomic weapon planning, with the view towards preparing appropriate guidance for commanders of commands established by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the preparation of the atomic annexes in support of JSCP for the period 1 July 1953 - 30 June 1959. It was further directed that the revised guidance incorporate appropriate instructions specifically related to:

* SM-723-57 (Rev.); see Decision On J.C.S. 1844/237
** See Enclosure to J.C.S. 1844/237

DISTRIBUTION

Gen. Twining (C/JCS)  Gen. LeMay (VCSAF)
Gen. Taylor (CSA)   Gen. Gerhart (DC/S-P&P)
Adm. Burke (CNO)   Gen. Cary (Dir. Plans, Air)
Gen. White (CSAF)   Gen. Martin (DD Plans, Air)
Gen. Pate (CNC)     Gen. Roberts (DC/S-P, MC)
Gen. Eddleman (DC/S, OOPS)   Adm. Austin (D/JS)
Gen. Woolnough (Dir., PD)    Gen. Wentworth (S/JCS)
Adm. Libby (DCNO-P&P)    Secys, JSSC
Adm. Wellings (ACNO-P&P)    Secys, JSPC
Adm. Buchanan (Op60)    Gen. Colmer (AFOAT)
2. Attached for your consideration is the proposed guidance* prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee. The proposed guidance contains several divergencies.**

3. It is recommended that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after resolution of the divergent views, approve the new guidance* and direct the Joint Strategic Plans Committee to include it in the Atomic Annex to the JSCP for 1 July 1959 - 30 June 1959.

4. No recommendation is made as to the distribution of this paper to commanders of unified or specified commands.

---

* Enclosure hereto
** For statement of basic issues underlying divergent views, see the Annex hereto
ENCLOSURE

ANNEX "C" (ATOMIC) TO JOINT STRATEGIC CAPABILITIES PLAN FOR THE PERIOD 1 JULY 1958 - 30 JUNE 1959

1. Purpose. The purpose of this Annex is to:
   a. Provide guidance for the conduct of atomic warfare and for the preparation and coordination of atomic annexes to plans for accomplishment of tasks assigned in the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan (JSCP), 1 July 1958 - 30 June 1959.*
   b. Allocate atomic weapons to commanders for the period 1 July 1958 to 30 June 1959.

2. General.

   a. Conflict Short of General War.

* See Enclosure "B" to J.C.S. 1244/232

JCS 1244/242
b. General War.

3. Objectives. Plans for atomic operations will be in consonance with and in furtherance of the military objectives, the strategic concepts, the brief of plan of action, and the assigned tasks contained in the basic plan.*

a. Operations Short of General War.

* See Enclosure "B" to J.C.S. 1344/238
b. Initial Phase of General War: Primary Undertakings. Plans will be formulated to carry out the following primary initial phase undertakings in order of importance, but not necessarily in order of accomplishment:

(1)

(2)

(3)

c. Initial Phase of General War: Alternative Undertakings.

(1)
4. Subsequent Phase of General War

5. Targets.

a.

* For basic issues underlying divergent views, see Annex hereto

Enclosure
7. Targets for the Subsequent Phase. Those targets which should be programmed for attack in the subsequent phase of war include the following:


a. General.

(1) Planning CEP's shall be appropriate to the respective delivery systems.
For basic issues underlying divergent views, see Annex hereto
D. Initial Phase of General War.

- For basic issues underlying divergent views, see Annex hereto
c. Subsequent Phase of General War.

9. Information for JCS Review. After review of commanders' atomic annexes, the Joint Chiefs of Staff will adjust allocations for achievement of the best possible over-all U.S. atomic plan. To provide information on which to base this adjustment, atomic annexes shall indicate the following for each target or target complex:

a. The optimum ERL program (regardless of allocations).

b. The optimum total program, including the weapons required to compensate for operational factors (regardless of allocations).

c. The actual ERL program based on allocated weapons.
Example:

* For basic issues underlying divergent views, see Annex hereto.
10. Constraints
EUROPEAN AREA
Albania                  Hungary
Bulgaria                 Poland
Czechoslovakia           Rumania
German Democratic Republic

PACIFIC AREA
North Korea              North Vietnam

In order to accomplish the above, the following constraints are specified:

a. |
11. Coordination
   a. 

b. Duplications.
Coordination agreements will be regarded as commitments by the commanders concerned until revised by mutual agreement.

Conflicts which may arise and which cannot be resolved through coordination will be referred to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

12. Content. Atomic annexes will contain the following information:

a. General statement and textual discussion of:

   (1) The commander's mission, tasks assigned in the basic plan, and geographic area of responsibility.

   (2) The relationship of the commander's mission and assigned tasks to the prescribed undertakings, and the concept for completing the undertakings.
(7) The various planned conditions of readiness and corresponding capabilities to carry out the primary and alternative initial phase undertakings for general war.
(See subparagraph 4 c (3)).

(8) Constraint policy.

b. Two separate target-weapon-DGZ lists arranged in target complex order and indicating attack priorities. One list will indicate the targets selected for attack to carry out the primary initial phase undertakings, and one will indicate the targets selected for attack during the subsequent phase.

c. Indication of targets and weapon programs to carry out the alternative initial phase undertakings.

d. Designation of DGZ's for which weapons or delivery means or both will be furnished by other commanders.

e. Designation of those DGZ's on which one or more weapons will be delivered in support of another commander (such weapons will be charged against the allocation of the supported commanders).

f. Designation of:

(1) All targets which, as a result of coordination, are agreed as commitments by one commander to another.

(2) All targets for which delivery of scheduled weapons is contingent, in whole or in part, on reconnaissance.

f. Full description of targets to include:

(1) Major complex TDI reference number.

(2) Sub-complex TDI reference number.

(3) Attack priority.

(4) B.E. number

(5) Geographic coordinates in latitude and longitude (degrees, minutes and seconds).

(6) Accounting line number for JCC reporting.

h. Weapon reserve policy.
1. In accordance with paragraph 9 an indication for each target of:
   (1) The optimum BRL program.
   (2) The optimum total program.
   (3) The actual BRL program.
   (4) The actual total program.

A tabular summary of the planned commitment of allocated weapons to the target categories described in paragraphs 5 and 7. This summary should indicate planned commitments by weapon type, yield, and delivery means and the likely commitment of weapons held in reserve.

13. Implementation. Commanders will submit coordinated annexes by (date) to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for review. Each commander will be prepared to orally brief his annex for the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to explain those portions which the Joint Chiefs of Staff may question. At the conclusion of the review of all annexes, the Joint Chiefs of Staff will make such adjustments in allocations as they consider necessary in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 9 above. For planning purposes, the Joint Chiefs of Staff presently intend that the provisions of this annex will, with the exception of changes to accommodate variations in the stockpile, remain effective through FY 1960, unless revision is required because of changes in the basic plan.
APPENDIX

WSEG STAFF STUDY NO. 46*

STUDY OF IMPLICATIONS OF RADIOLOGICAL FALLOUT
(Control of Radiological Fallout in Fringe Areas)

*Not reproduced herewith; on file in Joint Secretariat
ANNEX

STATEMENT OF THE BASIC ISSUES UNDERLYING THE DIVERGENT VIEWS

1.

2. Whether or not the commanders should be directed to submit an assessment of anticipated damage.