



MILITARY LIAISON COMMITTEE  
TO THE UNIQUE DOCUMENT  
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Series A-1  
100-105000

RCC3.980611.011

P. O. BOX 1814  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

IN REPLY REFER TO:

12 September 1950

This document consist of 2 Pages.

Cy: 1 C: 1 Doc. Series: A-HD

FOR: ~~SECRETARY~~ GENERAL JAMES McCORMACK, JR., SECRETARY, 94400T1083  
JOINT AEC-DD RW PANEL

SUBJECT: Comments on Report of RW Study Group

OSD ATSD(AE) DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW BOARD COMPRISED OF REPRESENTATIVES OF OSD, THE AIR FORCE, ARMY AND NAVY HAS NO OBJECTION TO THIS DOCUMENT BEING DECLASSIFIED.

DOE ARCHIVES

- Reference is made to your memorandum of 1 September 1950, transmitting for my comments, the report of the RW Study Group of the Joint AEC-DD Panel on Radiological Warfare.
- The report of the Study Group is a notable contribution toward the solution of this difficult and controversial subject. It places radiological warfare in its proper perspective as a method of warfare which cannot compete successfully in the general sense with other methods of demonstrated worth, but which possesses unique characteristics which may justify its development and adoption for a specific purpose.
- I concur in the conclusions contained in Section I of the report and recommend that they be accepted by the Panel as the basis of a final report and recommendations to the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense.
- I do not concur in the recommendation contained in paragraph 1 of Section II for the reason that it proposes to dispose summarily of a major political, economic, and military matter which may be of real significance in the event of war with the USSR. Specifically, I do not agree that the superiority of the atomic bomb for denial of the use of enemy installations necessarily, and with absolute finality, eliminates further consideration of RW as applied to the USSR. In my opinion the unique properties of RW, wherever they may be applicable, should be the basis of a Joint Chiefs of Staff decision on its development, rather than an arbitrary conclusion that this method of warfare may be applicable to enemy occupied or satellite countries only. accordingly, I recommend that the Panel substitute the following recommendations for those contained in paragraph 1 and 2 of Section II of the report:

"1. That the JCS be advised that: 95-M-0111

- RW has relatively little value for tactical employment; and the destruction or denial of the use of enemy installations can be accomplished more effectively by atomic bombs than by RW.

SECRET (NS) I  
W. B. Maguire, A/Asst. Dir.  
I. L. Cuccinelli, Dir.  
10/19/76

OSD ATSD(AE) DECLASSIFICATION  
REVIEW BOARD  
DECLASSIFIED BY 3/20/81  
DECLASSIFIED ON: 1/10/81  
LAW EO 12356

NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION  
Unauthorized Disclosure Subject to Criminal Sanctions.

~~RESTRICTED DATA - ATOMIC ENERGY ACT 1946~~  
~~SPECIAL RESTRICTION~~

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW	
1ST REVIEW DATE: <u>11/1/84</u>	DETERMINATION: <u>CLASSIFIED</u>
AUTHORITY: <u>10AOC 10AOC 10AOC</u>	1. CLASSIFICATION MAINTAINED
NAME: <u>11-3A</u>	2. CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO:
2ND REVIEW DATE: <u>3/1/95</u>	3. CONTAINS NO DDE CLASSIFIED INFO
AUTHORITY: <u>ADP</u>	4. COORDINATE WITH: <u>DDP</u>
NAME: <u>W. B. Maguire</u>	5. CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED
	6. CLASSIFIED INFO BRACKETED

3191

12

2092



Memorandum For: Brig Gen James McCormack, Jr.  
Subject: Comments on Report of RW Study Group

12 September 1950

- b. RW has the unique property of denying the use of important enemy installations without destruction thereof and without the necessity of extensive casualties to the inhabitants. **DO NOT ARCHIVE**
- c. In the opinion of the Joint Panel, Radiological Warfare would appear to be particularly applicable to important installations in enemy occupied or satellite countries, e.g. for the denial of major centers of communication and manufacturing installations in satellite countries or Western Europe .

"2. That the JCS be requested to decide whether this unique characteristic of Radiological Warfare justifies the development of a special weapons system for that purpose."

5. I concur in the remaining recommendations contained in Section II of the report on the condition that the captions for alternatives A, B, and C, be reworded as follows:

Alternative A

"Should the decision on recommendation in paragraph 2 be in the affirmative."

Alternative B

"Should the JCS be unable to give an unqualifiedly affirmative or negative decision on the recommendation in paragraph 2."

Alternative C

"Should the JCS decide that the unique characteristics of Radiological Warfare do not justify its development."

  
HERBERT B. LOFER  
Brigadier General, GSC



~~RESTRICTED DATA - ATOMIC ENERGY ACT, 1946~~  
~~SPECIFIC RESTRICTED DATA CLEARANCE REQUIRED~~