

SIOP~~TOP SECRET~~EXEMPT FROM
AUTOMATIC DECLASSIFICATION

E.O. 12958-3.4 (D)

21 January 1963

DATE: OCT 24 2000
REVIEW DATE: 10/24/2010

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Subject: Summary of Discussions by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Deputy Director, STPS, Regarding Retargeting to Cover Withdrawal of JUPITER Missiles from Turkey and Italy (S)

1. At their meeting on Friday, 18 January 1963, the Joint Chiefs of Staff discussed with Admiral Johnson, Deputy Director, STPS, the retargeting necessary to provide attack of the threats that will be uncovered in consequence of the Presidential decision to withdraw JUPITER missiles from Turkey and Italy.

2. In his discussion with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Johnson covered the following significant points:

a. Approximately 61 missiles will have to be retargeted from presently scheduled attacks on other time-sensitive targets. This figure of 61 results from the loss of 45 JUPITER missiles and a possible loss on station of up to 16 POLARIS missiles during transit from Holy Loch to the Mediterranean. (The average loss of POLARIS missiles will only be 8 missiles.) Admiral Johnson affirmed that this missile shortage was a relatively short range problem of decreasing significance after July 1963.

b. From a threat point of view the Soviets will be able to attack additional NATO targets with Soviet missiles presently scheduled to cover the JUPITERS.

c. In response to questioning as to how long SAC retargeting would take, Admiral Johnson stated:

(1) Assuming use of free time without resolution of TOT, retargeting could be accomplished in about 60 days.

(2) Optimizing and completing TOT resolution, retargeting would require approximately ninety days.

(3) Retargeting of POLARIS submarines was dependent on cutting new cards for the computers used in connection with the POLARIS missile. Admiral Demison has indicated that these cards would not be completed prior to 23 March.

~~TOP SECRET~~DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, Sec. 5.5By STJ Date 12/21/98

~~TOP SECRET~~

d. To point out considerations involved in retargeting, Admiral Johnson provided an illustrative example of how 61 missiles could be diverted from currently scheduled attacks. The example presented drew the bulk of the 61 missiles retargeted from presently scheduled attacks on medium bomber bases. The specific breakout provided for taking 45 missiles off medium bomber bases, 1 missile off a heavy bomber base, 5 missiles off primary staging bases, 7 missiles off military control centers, and 3 missiles off missile submarine bases. In this example, Admiral Johnson pointed out that the DE against threats to NATO was increased by approximately ten per cent. Correspondingly, the DE against threats to the US was decreased by twenty per cent.

3. General Taylor emphasized to Admiral Johnson the problem of assuring General Lemnitzer that the NATO position would not be detrimentally affected by the retargeting which would follow the withdrawal of JUPITER missiles. He pointed out that it was particularly desirable to retain the present level of missile attacks against:

a. IR/WRBM targets now scheduled for attack by JUPITER missiles, and

b. Medium bomber bases now scheduled for missile attack.

Admiral Johnson pointed out that, considering the shortage of missiles and relative target worth, an attack of each medium bomber base with at least one missile might not be the optimum employment of missiles even against the threat to NATO. The JCS requested Admiral Johnson present specific proposals for their consideration.

4. In response to the above request by the JCS, Admiral Johnson presented for their consideration a range of alternative criteria for determining the targets from which missiles could be diverted to provide for attack of targets uncovered by the withdrawal of JUPITER missiles and the decrease in POLARIS missiles on station. These alternative lines of guidance were presented by means of three specific proposals for absorbing the over-all reduction of missile damage expectancy within the remainder of the missile target system. These lines of guidance were, respectively, to:

a. Cover targets now attacked by JUPITER and maintain the present DE against medium bomber bases.

~~TOP SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED

Authority NNID 941029~~TOP SECRET~~

b. Cover targets now attacked by JUPITER and keep at least one missile on each medium bomber base.

c. Cover targets now attacked by JUPITER and maintain the present DE against ICBM threats to the US. This was the same proposal earlier outlined by Admiral Johnson diverting 45 missiles from attack of medium bomber bases.

5. After discussion of the three proposals presented by Admiral Johnson, the Joint Chiefs of Staff agreed to leave specific selection of retargeting criteria to the STFS. In general, however, this retargeting should:

a. Provide, by missile programming, a DE on the current JUPITER targets which is no less than that provided prior to JUPITER withdrawal.

b. Provide, at a minimum, a missile weight of effort equivalent to one missile for each medium bomber base and approach, consistent with over-all considerations of target weight and priority, the present DE against medium bomber bases.

c. Absorb, within the remainder of the missile target system, the over-all reduction of missile damage expectancy brought about by the withdrawal of JUPITER missiles.

6. USCINCEUR was advised of the JCS action, paragraph 5 above, by JCS Msg 8304 dated 19 January 1963.


R. B. SPILMAN
Lt Col USA
Assistant Secretary

cc: Chairman ✓
Director
J-3
J-5

~~TOP SECRET~~