

~~TOP SECRET~~

#165122

DOCUMENT NO. 22  
NO CHANGE IN CLASS.   
 DECLASSIFIED  
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S C  
NEXT REVIEW DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
AUTH: HR 10-2

23 October 1958

DRAFT  
DATE: 21 APR 1980 REVIEWER: 018645

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT : Recommended Topic for Next Comparative Evaluation

1. The memorandum on Comparative Evaluations approved by the President on 17 July 1958 recommended in order of suggested priority the following topics:

- a. Air defense radar (now completed),
- b. Submarine weapons systems and antisubmarine warfare capabilities.
- c. Nuclear weapons production capabilities (taking into account the extent to which USSR nuclear production facilities have been dispersed, and placing particular emphasis upon capability to produce small nuclear weapons).
- d. Strategic bomber attack capabilities.
- e. BW and CW Capabilities.

2. Selection of topic e. on BW and CW was deferred pending your analysis of data available on Soviet capabilities in these fields, to permit assessing whether a comparison would be worthwhile. The Acting DCI's memorandum of 5 September 1958 to the Comparative Evaluations Group, enclosing such a study, recommended

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

#165122

against this evaluation (see Tab). I suggest that you ask the group to approve this recommendation and delete topic e. from the list.

3. With respect to the next subject for evaluation, topic c. on comparative nuclear weapons production capabilities would appear to have particular merit at this time. Since a nuclear test moratorium may well eventuate from the forthcoming Geneva discussions, it would be most useful to have a comparative evaluation of where we and the Soviets stand weapons-wise at the outset of such a moratorium period. However, Dr. Scoville points out that it will take some time to analyze the data available from the current Soviet test series, which would be essential before an up-to-date comparison could be made. Therefore, this topic probably should be reserved for the third comparative evaluation to be made roughly three months from now.

4. In view of the current interest in the submarine-launched missile threat and in our capabilities to meet it, we recommend that topic b. be accepted for the second evaluation. However, this subject is even broader than the previous one on air defense radar, since it involves a whole series of offensive and defensive weapons systems and sub-systems. Under the circumstances, it

- 2 -

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

#165122

might be preferable to confine it to submarine-launched missile systems and defensive capabilities against them.

5. Under the procedure approved by the President, you are authorized to designate in consultation with the USIB, "the expert or experts" most capable of handling the intelligence side of the study. In your memo of 24 July to the IAC (IAC-D-126) you stated your intention to designate the "best-qualified individuals in the intelligence community, regardless of agency affiliation." In view of the subject, I suggest that you nominate Admiral Frost, or another flag officer of his choice. (General Twining's nominee will probably again be Admiral Sides).

6. You may wish to suggest adding to the list of suitable topics another look at the Soviet and U.S. ICBM programs, in the light of the new intelligence available (as well as further developments in our own programs). The original 8 May Killian-Kistiakowsky report to the NSC on this subject is now almost six months old, and should be reviewed at some time within the next six months or so.

R. W. KOMER

~~TOP SECRET~~