~~SECRET~~
~~SECURITY INFORMATION~~

THIS DOCUMENT CONSISTS OF 1 PAGE(S)
NO. 4 OF 5 COPIES, SERIES A

635
Castle

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW
1ST REVIEWER DATE: 6-16-94 | DETERMINATION [CIRCLE NUMBER(S)]
AUTHORITY: DADC X | 1. CLASSIFICATION RETAINED
NAME: W. M. Matheson | 2. CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO:
2ND REVIEWER DATE: 6-17-94 | 3. CONTAINS NO DOE CLASSIFIED INFO
AUTHORITY: ADC | 4. COORDINATE WITH:
NAME: | 5. CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED
| 6. CLASSIFIED INFO BRACKETED

DIR- 716

June 4, 1952

CRM FILE BC
DD 64842

Carroll L. Tyler, Manager
Santa Fe Operations
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dear Mr. Tyler:

Reference is made to my letter to you, DIR-710, May 8, 1952 and to Mr. Kraker's letter to General Fields, T-6, May 15, 1952 on Operation Castle. The difficulties inherent in trying to plan the details of a test operation so far in advance have been pointed out many times. One such difficulty has already appeared with respect to Castle.

I stated in my letter referenced above that present plans envisage a total of 3 ± 1 tower or ground shots, no drop tests. Mr. Kraker's letter, then, states that no drop aircraft and related support will be required for Castle. Since the date of my letter, we have begun consideration of a possible test shot which might be drop-tested much more economically than if fired on the ground. In addition, the thought of firing as many as four ground or tower shots, some probably of very high yield, at Eniwetok in a single operation has caused J-Division some qualms and a preliminary investigation of the cost of reactivation of Bikini for one or more Castle shots has been begun.

In view of the possibility that the ability of the Task Force to carry out a drop test on Operation Castle might effect an appreciable saving by making it unnecessary to use Bikini, or at least be cheaper than a tower shot on Eniwetok if one of the tests can be done with a drop, we recommend now that the Task Force maintain such a capability. It seems most unlikely that the maintenance of this capability can be very costly because the Air Force must indeed be maintaining the capability of dropping atomic bombs continuously.

We regret having to suggest a change in plans so soon, but now believe it would be a mistake to proceed from this date on the positive assumption that no air drops will be required.

Very truly yours,

Original Signed by N. E. Bradbury

N. E. Bradbury
Director

3390

CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED
PER DOC REVIEW JAN 1973

NEB:ejd
1A - C. L. Tyler
2A - C. L. Tyler
3A - A. C. Graves
4A, 5A - Files

Receipt # 92640

(1)

~~RESTRICTED DATA~~
This document contains restricted data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. Its transmittal or the disclosure of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited.

~~SECRET~~
~~SECURITY INFORMATION~~