

~~Secret~~

UNCLASSIFIED

MILITARY IMPLICATIONS OF
A COMMUNIST CHINESE
NUCLEAR CAPABILITY (U)

JOHN B. CARY
MAJOR GENERAL
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
RETIRED

AUG 6 1996

DOWNGRADED TO UNCLASSIFIED
PER AUTHORITY OF THE DIRECTOR,
DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH
PROJECTS AGENCY, S&IO

International Studies Division

Study Memorandum 14

Institute for Defense Analyses
WASHINGTON, D.C.
AUGUST 31, 1962
1 PAGE




copy. 75

PACIFICA 206
IDA-HQ-62-709

UNCLASSIFIED

~~Secret~~

DO NOT
REMOVE



18MS

.02811812Y

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

Study Memorandum No. 14

MILITARY IMPLICATIONS OF A
COMMUNIST CHINESE NUCLEAR CAPABILITY (U)

John B. Cary

Major General
United States Air Force, Retired

Prepared for IDA in support of a study to be
submitted to the Department of Defense under
Contract No. SD-50, Task Order T-23, effective
1 July 1961

AUG 6 1996

DOWNGRADED TO UNCLASSIFIED
PER AUTHORITY OF THE DIRECTOR,
DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH
PROJECTS AGENCY, S&IO

The views expressed in this paper are not
necessarily those of IDA or of the Department
of Defense

International Studies Division
Institute for Defense Analyses
1666 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington 9, D. C.

August 31, 1962

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

FOREWORD

This paper was written for Study PACIFICA, an analysis of the emergence of Communist China as a nuclear power. Study PACIFICA is being prepared by the International Studies Division of IDA for the Department of Defense under Contract No. SD-50, Task Order T-23, effective 1 July 1961. Brigadier General Sidney F. Giffin, USAF (Ret.) is the Study Leader.

The author, Major General John B. Cary, is a retired officer of the United States Air Force and Deputy Director of the International Studies Division. He has served as Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Operations, Pacific Air Forces; Director of Plans, Headquarters, United States Air Force ; and Director of Operations, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers, Europe.

JAMES E. KING, JR.
Director
International Studies Division

SECRET

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY	xi
CHAPTER	
I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
GENERAL SITUATION	2
ASSUMPTIONS	4
METHODOLOGY: VALIDITY AND LIMITATIONS	5
II. PEACETIME IMPLICATIONS	9
JAPAN	10
THAILAND	15
MALAYA	17
BURMA, LAOS AND CAMBODIA	18
INDIA, NEPAL AND PAKISTAN	19
OTHER ASIAN COUNTRIES	21
US ALLIANCES AND ALLIES	22
COUNTERACTIONS	25
III. IMPLICATIONS FOR GENERAL WAR AND FOR MILITARY ACTION BY THE SOVIET UNION	29
GENERAL WAR	29
General War Through CPR Catalytic Action	30

~~SECRET~~



PRESSURES ON THE SOVIETS 32

 Soviet Assistance in Local War 33

 Pressures for General War 34

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR WAR IN THE FAR EAST AND
THE WESTERN PACIFIC 41

 MILITARY POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES 41

 General 41

 Future Capabilities 43

 Vulnerabilities of US Forces in the
 Western Pacific and Far East 44

 Restraints on US Military Intervention 49

 Nuclear or Non-Nuclear Operations 51

 Freedom of US Decision 51

 Force Configuration 54

 MILITARY POSITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA,
 NORTH KOREA, AND NORTH VIETNAM 57

 General 57

 Military Utility of a Nuclear Capability 59

 Vulnerabilities of the People's
 Republic of China 62

 Vulnerabilities of North Vietnam
 and North Korea 64

 Asymmetry of Vulnerabilities 66

 The East Asian Communist Assessment of
 Respective Vulnerabilities 66



V. WAR IN SPECIFIC LOCALITIES 69

 INTRODUCTION 69

 Assumptions 69

 Methodology 71

 Categories of Hostilities 71

 CHINA 73

 KOREA 77

 TAIWAN AND THE OFFSHORE ISLANDS 79

 VIETNAM 84

 THAILAND 88

 INDIA AND PAKISTAN 90

 BURMA, LAOS, AND CAMBODIA 93

 SUBVERSION AND INSURGENCY 93

 OVER-ALL ASSESSMENT 95

VI. DETERRENCE OF COMMUNIST CHINA 97

 COMMUNIST RISKS 98

 DETERRENCE OF LOCAL AGGRESSION 99

 General 99

 Military Capabilities to Oppose
 Local Aggression 99

 US Will to Employ its Military Capability 101

 Nuclear Sharing 102

 REGIONAL DETERRENCE 104

 The Regional Deterrent Force 105

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

VII. VARIATIONS 115

 SINO-SOVIET RELATIONS 115

 ACCELERATED NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND DELIVERY
 VEHICLE DEVELOPMENT 119

 AN EARLY CPR DETERRENT STRATEGY 120

 IMPLICATIONS 122

VIII. LONGER-TERM IMPLICATIONS 125

 CHINA AS A CLASS B NUCLEAR POWER 125

 CHINA AS A CLASS A NUCLEAR POWER 128

IX. CONCLUSIONS 131

X. SUGGESTED ACTIONS 137

 GENERAL 137

 TO FORESTALL INITIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS 138

 TO BOLSTER ALLIED WILL AND CAPABILITIES 138

 Air Defense Improvements 138

 Visible Presence of US Forces 139

 Bilateral Arrangements with Thailand 140

 Improved Military Relationship with Pakistan . . 140

 TO IMPROVE THE US DETERRENT POSTURE 140

 Establishment of an Effective Regional
 Deterrent Force 140

 Encouragement of Chinese Doubts of
 USSR Intentions 141

 Vulnerability Studies on East Asian Communist
 States 142

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

TO INCREASE EFFECTIVENESS OF US FORCES DEPLOYED TO FORWARD AREAS	142
Ground Forces	142
Land-Based Air Forces	142
Logistics	143
TO IMPROVE US FORCE CAPABILITIES FOR QUICK LOCAL RESPONSE	143
Strategic Mobility	143
Thai Defenses	144
Forward Base Environment	144
Bilateral Planning	145
TO INCREASE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF WESTERN ALLIES	145
Australia	145
The United Kingdom	146

APPENDIX

A. ESTIMATED COMMUNIST CHINESE NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES	147
B. US ALLIANCE SYSTEMS IN THE FAR EAST	149
C. PSYCHOLOGICAL OPERATIONS	161
D. A LANCHESTER EQUATION ANALYSIS OF INVASION AND RESPONSE (by Seymour J. Deitchman)	173
E. VULNERABILITIES OF COMMUNIST CHINA TO NUCLEAR ATTACK	187
F. COMPARATIVE GROUND FORCES--LATE 1960s	209
G. THE NATO ANALOGY	211

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

x

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

SUMMARY

The initial nuclear detonations by the Chinese People's Republic [CPR] and the subsequent development of an operational nuclear capability will stimulate pressures generally adverse to US military interests. Reactions in Japan and Thailand will be particularly significant; should these nations swing toward neutralism the US military position in North and Southeast Asia would be severely degraded. The Chinese threat may, however, propel these nations into even closer alignment with the United States. Actual effects will depend on prior actions by the United States in Asia, the nature of the internal US reaction, and estimates by Free Asian nations as to the over-all strategic situation in Asia resulting from a Chinese nuclear capability. All of these factors can be influenced by the United States.

The US alliance system in Asia is considered adequate for military purposes and requires no significant alteration.

A regional nuclear capability for the CPR will not significantly increase Communist capabilities in general war. A Chinese nuclear capability will, however, tend to increase pressures on the Soviet Union to support Chinese aggression and will increase

UNCLASSIFIED

the likelihood of circumstances arising requiring, from the Chinese viewpoint, Soviet military support. However, the amount and type of assistance provided will be strongly influenced by the clear Soviet desire to avoid a nuclear war (and certainly general war) at almost any cost.

A locally effective Chinese nuclear capability will frustrate any attempt at invasion of the Chinese mainland, increase the range of Communist military and paramilitary actions that can be conducted without incurring US military response, and permit a nuclear response to US military actions. Present US freedom to decide on nuclear operations in an Asian war, and to impose other ground rules through the threat of nuclear operations, will be lost. The initial military situation in a local war or crisis is likely to be prejudiced, as the threatened Asian ally, reluctant to provoke China and fearful of possible nuclear devastation, procrastinates in requesting US assistance. The United States, too, will be more cautious in committing military forces against Communist forces backed by a local nuclear capability. The resultant delays in a political decision to commit US military forces will require more forces, more effort, and a greater prestige commitment than would otherwise have been necessary.

Wars in specific localities in Asia are examined. Military advantage will as a rule accrue to the CPR only through the existence

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

of an unused capability, permitting the CPR to employ most effectively its huge ground forces. An unused nuclear capability can give the CPR somewhat greater latitude in the use of force at the lower levels, and may prevent US initiation of nuclear operations in situations in which otherwise the US would consider nuclear operations to be necessary.

The United States can retain a large measure of control over escalation of hostilities in the Far East, and the capability to impose ground rules for limited war, including the determination as to whether hostilities will be nuclear or non-nuclear, through rapid, effective reaction (especially at lower levels of hostilities) and by a suitable deterrent posture. These capabilities should be made adequate to cause the Chinese to estimate that escalation would be ineffective and unprofitable--a result facilitated by China's extreme vulnerability to nuclear attack.

The US deterrent posture for this purpose should consist of Pacific-based nuclear offensive forces likely in any event largely to be required in the Pacific Command [PACOM]. These forces should be assigned to the PACOM, suitably protected, and designed and discreetly advertised as specifically a counter-CPR force. The evident existence and capability of this force should bolster US allies, serve as a strong deterrent to open aggression and particularly to initiation of nuclear operations by China, corrode the Soviet alliance, and minimize the risk of escalation to general war.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

The body of the paper is based on a stated rate of nuclear progress by China and on the assumption that Sino-Soviet relations remain approximately as at present. Changes in the present state of Sino-Soviet relations, or a modest acceleration in China's nuclear program or in the attainment of a token intercontinental nuclear force, would not result in significant disadvantage for the United States. Delays and stretchouts in Chinese nuclear programs, which are more likely, will be to US advantage.

If and when China becomes a first class intercontinental nuclear power (and this is by no means certain) comparable to the United States and to the Soviet Union, China must also have become a first class industrial power. This combination of military and economic power will permit China to extend its influence over additional areas in Asia, and thus will reduce geographically areas where the projection of US military power may be required. But if war in Asia should occur, it will be more intense, more dangerous, and require larger forces than previously. The projection of Chinese influence on a global basis must be anticipated. Regional deterrent actions hitherto valuable will lose their effectiveness, and US strategic plans must promise response against both China and the Soviet Union if intercontinental nuclear war occurs.

The specific conclusions of this paper are on pages 131-36. Specific actions are suggested (pages 137-46) to ameliorate adverse military implication of Chinese nuclear developments.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

INTRODUCTION

The US intelligence community estimates that the People's Republic of China [CPR]¹ will explode an experimental atomic device within the next two or three years; will have a locally effective nuclear capability² about three years after the initial atomic detonation; and may, subsequent to 1970, become a major nuclear power with an extensive stockpile of a variety of nuclear weapons and with long-range ballistic missiles and other sophisticated delivery vehicles. This nuclear progress by the CPR will have major political and military repercussions. The purpose of this paper is to examine the military implications of these achievements for the United States and its allies. The body of the paper is limited to consideration of the period ending (presumably about 1972) with the acquisition by the CPR of operational quantities of

1. The "People's Republic of China" is the official name of the Communist regime that governs mainland China. The term "China," sometimes used in this paper for the sake of brevity, refers to Communist China.

2. A "locally effective nuclear capability" as used in this paper is defined as the ability to deliver one or more nuclear weapons on targets within 1,000 miles of launch sites within Communist China.

~~SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~
UNCLASSIFIED

~~TOP SECRET~~

thermonuclear-armed intercontinental ballistic missiles [ICBMs]. Certain longer-range implications are, however, also discussed.

This paper will examine, in order: the military implications of China's nuclear accomplishments in time of peace, for general war and for Soviet military action, for wars in East Asia and the Western Pacific, and for US deterrence of the CPR; the effects of possible variations in present estimates of CPR nuclear progress and in the state of Sino-Soviet relations; longer-range implications; certain conclusions stemming from these analyses; and, finally, suggested ameliorating actions that the United States might take to offset the military advantages otherwise accruing to the CPR from its nuclear weapons and weapons systems program.

GENERAL SITUATION

The specific quantitative estimate of Chinese nuclear capabilities used for the body of this paper is reproduced as Appendix A.³ In summary, this estimate credits the Chinese with an

3. The accuracy of this estimate is not a critical factor. A moderate acceleration in China's nuclear progress would still provide ample time for almost any countermeasure that the United States may wish to adopt (see Chapter X, below), possibly excepting measures needed to preclude deleterious reactions to China's initial test detonation. Delay of even several years in China's estimated progress (and some delay will probably result from current economic troubles) is unlikely to find the United States in a significantly different political, military, and technological environment. Hence the military implications, and the US countermeasures required, should not be materially different if China's nuclear progress is slower than reflected in this estimate, although requirements in terms of time would of course be eased.

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

initial aircraft-deliverable nuclear capability of about twelve 20-kiloton [KT] weapons by the end of 1964; a warhead inventory passing the fifty mark in 1967; the introduction of medium-range ballistic missiles [MRBMs] in 1966-67 and of thermonuclear weapons in 1969; and an initial operational ICBM capability, possibly in 1972, at which time China's warhead stockpile could be about 550 fission weapons, or 275 thermonuclear weapons, or some combination in between. This estimate is based on a "moderately slow" program (that is, continuing economic difficulties within the CPR).⁴ This nuclear capability will be additive to the CPR's conventional military forces, which will remain approximately equal in size to her present forces but moderately improved in quality.

The external objectives of the CPR will almost certainly include:

- 1) The acquisition of Taiwan and the offshore islands.
- 2) A measure of control over, and possibly territorial expansion in, Southeast Asia.
- 3) Regional leadership or hegemony in Asia.
- 4) The elimination of Western, and particularly US, influence in Asia and the Western Pacific.

4. The estimate here used is taken from Donald B. Keesing, The Communist Chinese Nuclear Threat: Warheads and Delivery Vehicles (U), SECRET-RESTRICTED DATA, ISD Study Memorandum No. 17 (IDA, Washington, D. C.). This PACIFICA paper will be issued shortly.

~~SECRET~~

CLASSIFIED

SECRET

5) A position of leadership within the Communist bloc and the international Communist movement.

6) The expansion of communism, particularly in the under-developed areas.

7) Eventually, world-wide acceptance of China as a superpower at least equal to the United States and to the Soviet Union.⁵

It is also practically certain that the CPR will use its nuclear capability as a lever, or as a backdrop, for intensive propaganda, blackmail, and political warfare to further these aggressively expansionist objectives.

ASSUMPTIONS

For the purposes of this paper, it is assumed that:

1) There will be no effective disarmament or arms control agreement accepted by Communist China as binding upon her.

2) The United States will retain readily available forces in the Western Pacific-Far East area on a scale approximating present Service programs.

3) The United States will retain secure, long-range strategic strike forces, over and above those necessary for employment against the Soviet Union, adequate for strategic operations against China.

5. For a detailed discussion, see Harold C. Hinton, Communist China's External Policy and Behavior, UNCLASSIFIED, ISD Study Memorandum No. 18 (IDA, Washington, D. C.). This PACIFICA paper will be issued shortly.

SECRET

UNCLASSIFIED

4) There will be no war resulting in major dislocation of the economies of the United States, China, or the Soviet Union.

The body of this paper is based on the additional assumption that the state of Sino-Soviet relations remains approximately as at present--that is, these countries remain politically and militarily aligned, and hostile to the West. Stress and strains within this association will, however, result in a degree of friction and mistrust, and in lack of cohesion in foreign policy objectives. The effects of variations in this assumption are discussed in Chapter VII.

In discussing US military capabilities, no attempt has been made to recommend specific employments. Such an endeavor, which would connote specific war planning, is inappropriate for a study such as this, and in any event would necessarily be based on so many assumptions--largely surmise--as to have little if any value. Military requirements are therefore discussed in terms of capabilities which will permit a variety of decisions by the United States. More specifically, discussion of US nuclear forces is based on the clear realization that if employed at all they need not be used to their full capacity nor against any target system postulated herein.

METHODOLOGY: VALIDITY AND LIMITATIONS

The analyses and judgments in this paper are based on extensive consultations with US military and diplomatic officials in

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

the Pacific, the Far East and Europe; on consultations with and data furnished by representatives of the US Armed Services, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of State in Washington; on broad situation gaming to a degree sufficient to permit assessment of basic military environments; and on research in official US diplomatic, military, and intelligence documents as made available to the PACIFICA staff. Advice and assistance were also received from the civilian consultants of Study PACIFICA.

The analysis employed is considered to be of sufficient depth to provide a valid basis for the broad conclusions reached and specific actions suggested. While no specific cost estimates have been undertaken, suggested actions have been limited to those considered to be reasonable projections of past and current funding programs.

The present paper is in accordance with the PACIFICA directive to determine implications for US policy. While the conclusions are believed to be well founded, the method of analysis does not have the precision or detail needed to determine specific force requirements or deficiencies; to serve as a basis for judging or recommending revisions in contingency war plans; to establish the cost of, or determine priorities between, specific alternative military programs; or to provide a basis for assessment of alternative tactics or weapons. Specific recommendations of this nature would require extensive

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

detailed analysis, war gaming, and costing of various alternatives; and would necessarily be based on assumptions largely hypothetical in nature. An extensive research program of this type is beyond the scope of Study PACIFICA.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

CHAPTER II

PEACETIME IMPLICATIONS

Other PACIFICA papers examine the possible repercussions in Asian nations and in Europe of China's explosion of an atomic device, and subsequent development of a nuclear capability.¹ The purpose of this chapter is to set forth the direct military implications of these possible political repercussions. This analysis does not constitute a prediction of future events; it is an examination of the military effects of events which may occur. To some degree the United States can control the course of events, encouraging favorable trends and discouraging adverse ones. Actions toward this end, insofar as they pertain to United States and

1. The implications summarized in this chapter are discussed from other points of view in other papers of the PACIFICA study, namely, for Southeast Asia by Tillman Durdin, for South Asia by Loy W. Henderson, for Australasia by Arthur Burns, for Japan by Donald B. Keesing and Roger Pineau, for Korea by John B. Cary, for Taiwan by Harold C. Hinton, for Continental Europe by General "X," for the United Kingdom by Roderick MacFarquhar, and for the Soviet Union by John R. Thomas. Reactions to a Nuclear-Armed Communist China: South Asia (U), CONFIDENTIAL, has been issued as IDA/ISD Study Memorandum No. 11, dated May 30, 1962; Reactions to a Nuclear-Armed Communist China: Europe and the United Kingdom, UNCLASSIFIED, by General "X" and Roderick MacFarquhar, has been issued as IDA/ISD Study Memorandum No. 12, dated September 15, 1962. Other studies will be issued in due course.

~~SECRET~~
UNCLASSIFIED

allied military activities in the Far East, are discussed in Chapter X.²

The more important peacetime implications of a Chinese nuclear program will in large part depend upon the potential reactions to the initial atomic detonation (as affected one way or the other by Chinese psychological exploitation) and to other Chinese nuclear exploits prior to the time China has, and displays, a locally effective nuclear capability. This chapter therefore is largely devoted to the developments which may be generated during this two- to three-year time period. Certain discernible longer-range trends are also discussed.

JAPAN³

Japan will be subjected to at least some degree of shock by the initial Chinese atomic demonstration, and to carrot-and-stick pressures from China as its nuclear capabilities develop. Japan's reaction to these influences could range from the extremes of disengagement from the US alliance and accommodation with the People's Republic of China [CPR] on the one hand, to an intensified cooperation with the United States (to the extent of permitting the

2. See below, pp. 137-46.

3. See also Donald B. Keessing and Roger Pineau, Reactions to a Nuclear-Armed Communist China: Japan (U), SECRET, ISD Study Memorandum No. 15 (IDA, Washington, D. C.). This PACIFICA paper will be issued shortly.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

[REDACTED]

introduction or storage of nuclear weapons in Japan) and an increased independent defense effort on the other. Either of these extremes could result only from the reinforcing interaction of many critical but largely unpredictable variables, which include Japan's domestic political situation and its external economic relations, the world situation in general, and especially the posture of the United States compared to the postures of Communist China and the Soviet Union.

The initial Chinese test detonation will probably lead to an intense, public, largely emotional reappraisal of Japan's position in the world, its security policy, and its relations with the East and the West. But with forethought and preparation by the Japanese government--hopefully instigated and assisted by the United States --and given no change in the present world general political environment, neither the initial atomic explosion nor subsequent Chinese pressures should cause major change in Japanese policy, because the reactions among the principal opposing factions in Japan will be countervailing. Groups favoring an accommodation with Communist China will gain adherents, but advocates of close ties with the United States and of an increased defense effort will also gain supporters by pointing out the hopeless condition of Japan's military forces under the menace from a nuclear-capable Communist China and Soviet Union. Although a middle-course

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

reaction is thus anticipated, the extreme reactions must also be considered in terms of their military implications.

A "neutral"⁴ or pro-Communist Japan would at best deny to the United States, and at worst provide the Communists with, the only strategic base in the Far East--outside of China and the Soviet Union--presently adequate for the support of major military forces and operations.

Japan's location is the key to operations in the Korea-Manchuria-Maritime Provinces area of Northeast Asia. Japanese bases are irreplaceable for these purposes: possible alternates are either too vulnerable and undeveloped (Korea), too small to serve as an adequate base area (Okinawa and Iwo Jima), or too distant for sustained and general utility (Taiwan, the Philippines, and Guam).

The United States is now dependent upon bases in Japan for:

1) Operational and logistic support of forces in South Korea, and the protection of the sea and air lines of communication to Korea.

4. The term "neutral" in this paper is used in a rather special sense. The word implies both political and ideological avoidance of relationships with the non-Communist West--political neutrality in the sense of shunning military alliances or political obligations (e.g., India); ideological neutrality in the sense of cultural aloofness from the West (e.g., Indonesia).

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

2) Initial general war strikes against targets in Manchuria and Siberia by all Navy and Marine land-based aircraft in the Pacific Command PACOM and a large part of Pacific-based Air Force aircraft.

3) The ready availability for redeployment to a crisis area of all land-based Navy and Marine aircraft, and a portion of Air Force aircraft, based in the Western Pacific.

4) Support of sustained operations in and over the Yellow Sea, Sea of Japan, and Sea of Okhotsk, and the protection of these operations.

If Japan should become neutral--or worse, pro-Communist--the United States position in Okinawa would be adversely affected. At best, there would be strong political pressures for the return of Okinawa to Japan; at worst, the island could become, in effect, hostile territory occupied by US forces.

A neutral Japan would be highly vulnerable to attack by the Soviet Union. US assistance in the defense of Japan would be rendered difficult and probably would be impossible without ultimately carrying operations to the Soviet Union. This strategic weakness of a neutral Japan, while not likely to lead to general war, would make that country most vulnerable to threats and pressures. It could lead to ever-increasing concessions on the part of Japan which in the long run could conceivably give to the

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

Communists, and deny to the United States, the military position and assets of Japan.

In summary, neutrality for Japan would seriously impair and possibly prevent the defense of South Korea; would impede US military operations against northern China, Siberia, and adjacent areas; and would impair the ability of the United States to project its sea and air power into the Yellow Sea and Sea of Japan, and adjoining portions of the Asiatic mainland. A pro-Communist Japan--which might succeed a neutral Japan--would give to the Communists, and deny to the United States, all of the advantages of these highly strategic islands and their adjacent sea and air space.

It is possible and even probable, particularly if the United States has prepared the ground, that Chinese nuclear achievements may propel Japan into even closer alliance with the United States, and cause Japan to build up effective defense forces. Japan's adamant stand against atomic weapons may be eliminated, her defense forces permitted to have nuclear defensive weapons, US forces based in Japan openly permitted offensive nuclear armament, and Japanese facilities made openly available as bases for US nuclear-armed or nuclear-powered vehicles. While the initial Chinese atomic detonation should not be used as in itself sufficient basis to press the Japanese along these lines, any evolutionary trend in this direction, such as would be normal for the

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

highly nationalistic Japanese, should be discreetly encouraged to the end, in particular, of affording the United States nuclear freedom.

If a flat prediction were necessary, the safest would be that Chinese nuclear accomplishments alone will have no militarily significant bearing on Japanese policies or actions. The possible, even though not necessarily probable, adverse military implications are so serious, however, and the possible implications favorable to the United States are so advantageous, that it is clearly in the US interest to overinsure, as feasible, against adverse reactions and to encourage favorable ones.

THAILAND

Just as Japan is the military key to the Northeast Asia area, so Thailand is the key to Southeast Asia. It has the only reasonably adequate port in mainland Southeast Asia north of Singapore; it has the best developed and most usable, airfield complex in all of Southeast Asia; it has a road and rail net and communications radiating from Bangkok which, although poor by Western standards, are superior to those elsewhere in Southeast Asia. The country is suitably located to support operations in or against Burma, Laos, North and South Vietnam, and Cambodia. Its facilities will probably be essential for the rapid air transport of US forces to Burma and farther west. As a result of past deployments of US

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

forces to Thailand, that country has already been partially developed as a base for US forces--the only such prepared base in Southeast Asia.

As the CPR develops its nuclear capability, a reaction in Thailand adverse to US interests is likely only if the Thais should estimate that the United States can no longer be depended upon with certainty to assist effectively in the defense of Thailand. Such an unfavorable estimate may require not only a perceptible raising of over-all Chinese military capabilities through nuclear developments, but also an apparent deterioration in the ability of the United States to assist its Asian allies.

Such an estimate would result in a strong tendency in Thailand to seek an accommodation with the Communists (probably with the Soviets as a curb on Chinese ambitions), particularly if Vietnam should be wholly lost to the West. The United States, if denied Thai facilities because of such an accommodation, would be unable to counter Communist military or para-military moves anywhere in Southeast Asia except under severe handicaps. Even operations in support of South Vietnam would be handicapped if the only land area available were in South Vietnam, itself. Elsewhere in mainland Southeast Asia a military solution to Communist aggression of any kind would become virtually impossible.

SECRET

MALAYA

Malaya (or the Federation of Malaysia) is unlikely to be directly influenced, in a military sense, by Chinese nuclear accomplishments. If the train of events started by a Chinese nuclear detonation should result in substantial change in the position of Thailand, however, Malaya would be directly affected. If aggression clearly attributable to the Communists should occur against Thailand, Malaya would probably feel its own security threatened and call on the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth, and possibly on the United States, for assistance.⁵ If Thailand should become neutral or oriented toward the Communists as the result of political action or "internal" insurgency, it is unlikely that Malay government policy would be changed. Such events in Thailand, however, would likely presage the revival of Communist insurgency in Malaya. This could result in a pro-Communist government of Malaya; or it might lead to another protracted guerrilla campaign absorbing sizable UK forces, with obvious implications for NATO, and possibly an involvement of the United States.

5. Throughout this paper the term "military assistance," is used to describe assistance provided by active military units, combat or support. The term "military aid" is used to describe assistance--in the form of equipment, supplies, and advice--provided under the Military Assistance Program.

UNCLASSIFIED

As a minimum result of a Chinese capability to attack Malaya with nuclear weapons, bases in Malaya and Singapore will become even less likely to be available for support of British and Commonwealth forces that may be committed to assist nations in Southeast Asia other than Malaya.

BURMA, LAOS AND CAMBODIA

Chinese nuclear developments alone are unlikely to cause significant reaction in these countries. All are subject to direct overland attack which none can counter, and Chinese capabilities to invade these countries will not be appreciably enhanced by a nuclear capability. Laos and Cambodia will continue to be avenues for infiltration of, and possibly bases for attack on, South Vietnam and Thailand. If, however, the new government of Laos avoids actual Communist domination, Cambodia, although potentially unstable, will remain geographically insulated from the Communist bloc and can retain independence of action.

Burma will almost certainly retain its policy of neutrality, probably generally oriented toward the CPR. The latter may, with some likelihood of success, use its developing military capability as a lever to encourage ever closer alignment of Burmese policy with that of China. The CPR would appear to have little more to gain by military threats or actual aggression against Burma.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

INDIA, NEPAL AND PAKISTAN⁶

It is not likely that there will be militarily significant reaction in India or Pakistan to an initial Chinese nuclear detonation. India, already afraid of China, might initiate an atomic weapons program of its own, hoping for British assistance in this effort. Unless major assistance is provided by the United States or Great Britain, however, an Indian nuclear-development program would be unlikely to produce a significant delivery capability for many years. While a nuclear program alone might have appreciable political and psychological effects, it would have little effect on the over-all strategic situation in Asia during the present decade. If relations between India and Pakistan remain exacerbated, an Indian nuclear-weapons-development program would be of concern primarily to Pakistan.

India is too self-centered in outlook to undertake preventive countermeasures against Chinese expansion in Southeast Asia, or even to be acutely concerned about actions which Southeast Asian nations might take to accommodate to a nuclear-capable CPR. An open attack by China against Burma (a move which as we have indicated, does not appear to be in China's interest) or the development of a threatening situation in Nepal, would, however, be

6. See also Henderson, Reactions to a Nuclear-Armed Communist China: South Asia (U).

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

perceived by India as a direct threat requiring counteraction. Nepal has already shown signs of willingness to reach an accommodation with the CPR. The relatively level southern part of Nepal provides military access to India in much the same way that Laos offers entry across Thailand's northeastern frontier. While Nepal is unlikely to be substantially influenced by a Chinese atomic detonation, previous Chinese penetration of Nepal would greatly intensify Indian alarm and reaction to the event.

India may seek closer relations with the USSR in the hope that the Soviets can and will restrain Chinese military adventures. While these actions could lead to an India more closely aligned with Soviet political, economic, and military policies, such a drift toward communism might be forestalled by timely countermeasures on the part of the United States and (hopefully) Great Britain--particularly actions designed to dampen the initial shock effect of the first Chinese detonation.

It is possible that India and Pakistan, both acutely aware of the Chinese threat, might as a result of a Chinese atomic detonation reach agreement between themselves on their major differences and present a common front against a common enemy. The United States and Great Britain should offer discreet encouragement to this end. A more likely consequence, however, would be the intensification of Indian-Pakistani differences over

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

Kashmir. Pakistan may seek a closer relationship with the CPR to obtain backing in the dispute with India (supported by the Soviet Union) over Kashmir, and moral support against encroachment by Afghanistan, but probably not to the extent of alienating the West. Any inclination by Pakistan to adopt this approach would be intensified either by an impression of increased Chinese military power stemming from Chinese nuclear feats or by a closer alignment of India with the Soviet Union. The best prospect for offsetting any such tendency on the part of Pakistan appears to lie in convincing the Pakistani that the United States will retain military superiority over the CPR in spite of the latter's nuclear-weapons program and that the United States is able and willing to assist Pakistan in defense against Communist aggression. But the United States must anticipate demands from Pakistan for increased military aid as the price of continued alignment.⁷

OTHER ASIAN COUNTRIES

No militarily significant impact stemming directly from Chinese atomic achievements is foreseen elsewhere in Asia, provided the US reaction is one of strength and confidence. South Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines are all strongly anti-Communist,

7. For a more detailed discussion of the alternatives facing Pakistan, see ibid., pp. 26-29.

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

this posture being a reflection of popular conviction as well as that of the governments; they should therefore remain largely immune to nuclear blackmail. These countries, however, and also South Vietnam, are vulnerable in varying degree to air attack even by the obsolescent aircraft now in the Chinese air force. Increased demands for US military aid, particularly for the provision of adequate air defenses, can be expected. Pressures will probably be generated for developing indigenous nuclear forces.

Neither Ceylon nor Indonesia is likely to be affected significantly, in a military sense, by Chinese nuclear developments. Both are too remote to be immediately threatened by China and too unschooled to understand clearly the significance of a nuclear capability. Indonesia's present neutrality, based on somewhat closer cooperation with the USSR than with the West, and on a sharp distrust of Communist China, is unlikely to be affected solely by the development of a Chinese nuclear capability.

US ALLIANCES AND ALLIES

Occidental Allies. The French apparently are determined to avoid any further military involvement in Southeast Asia. Having suffered a stinging defeat in Indochina, they also appear to be determined to prevent military operations by any other Western power that might, by comparison, further decrease French military

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

prestige. Great Britain almost surely would assist (within its limited capabilities) a member of the Commonwealth, probably would accede to a request by an ex-colony for military assistance, and probably, although reluctantly, would fulfill military commitments under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty in the event of clear Communist aggression. However, the United States should not expect the British either to participate in or to agree to US actions--other than in defense of Commonwealth members--taken either outside the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization [SEATO] or in meeting ambiguous aggression. Other European allies, more concerned with the defense of Europe and mindful of the cost and results of the Korean War, will exert all possible pressure on the United States to prevent or limit US military involvement in the Far East. Of all the Occidental allies, only Australia and New Zealand (and possibly Canada) can be depended upon to support, even morally, any US military action in Asia.

US military plans, therefore, should be based on the premise that there will be no military participation by an Occidental ally; that any French missions in Laos and Cambodia will not assist and may obstruct US military operations; and that no Commonwealth facilities or forces (except Australasian) will be available to assist the United States unless there is a clear threat to a member of the Commonwealth.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

US Alliance Systems in Asia. The United States now has bilateral defensive alliances with Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines. The United States is formally aligned with Thailand only through the multilateral arrangement of SEATO, and with Pakistan through SEATO and the Central Treaty Organization [CENTO].⁸ While the United States is perhaps hampered from entering into formal security arrangements with the nations of former French Indochina by unilateral commitments assumed at the time of the Geneva agreements of 1954 ending the Indochinese War, present US understandings and arrangements with South Vietnam constitute a de facto political and military alliance.

US alliance systems in the Far East are examined in Appendix B⁹ in the light of, first, their military utility in a political environment that includes a nuclear-capable China and, second, their political usefulness as a means of assuring US allies of the US determination effectively to assist them in withstanding a nuclear-capable China.

In summary, SEATO appears to have little practical military utility. It should, however, be retained to avoid damage to the

8. See below, pp. 156-57.

9. The United States, though not formally a member of CENTO, is represented at the council meetings by observers and is a full member of the military and counter-subversion committees.

~~SECRET~~

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

relationships of the United States with its European allies, and also because the existence of this treaty organization might be useful to the United States in the event of overt Communist Chinese aggression.

Other possible multilateral arrangements in the Far East would appear to offer little, if any, military advantage. If Thailand should require further or more formal assurance of US commitment, a bilateral agreement would be justified. Improvement on an informal basis in military relationships with Pakistan is desirable. These arrangements with Pakistan should include an expansion in the functions of the Military Assistance Advisory Group [MAAG], and, preferably, its placement under the Commander in Chief, Pacific [CINCPAC], thus paving the way for a closer operational relationship between the two countries, while at the same time minimizing the probable adverse effects on US relations with India. A firmer commitment of the United States to the strategic defense of Australia under the ANZUS treaty could result in more effective military support of any operations undertaken by the United States in Asia, and particularly in Southeast Asia.

COUNTERACTIONS

The possible deleterious effects of the Chinese nuclear program, and particularly the initial test detonation, will flow essentially from one or more of the following:

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

1) An estimate by Asian nations that the possession of a nuclear capability will give Communist China strategic superiority over the United States in Asia. Such an estimate would stem in the first instance from ignorance of the essential factors underlying the strategic posture of the United States vis-a-vis the People's Republic of China. The likelihood of such an estimate will be intensified if the initial CPR nuclear accomplishment comes as a surprise.

2) A desire by Asian nations to seek closer association with the Soviet Union in the belief that the latter may serve as a restraint on an aggressive, nuclear-capable Communist China; conversely, in the case of Pakistan, a desire to seek the support of a nuclear-capable CPR in furtherance of Pakistan's disputes with India and Afghanistan.

3) Concern over the adequacy of indigenous defenses against a nuclear-capable CPR.

4) Increased reluctance and decreased ability on the part of Occidental allies to support or assist US military operations in Asia.

Whether or not these deleterious influences prevail will depend in large measure on the character of the regimes then in power in non-Communist Asia, on the nature of other world events preceding China's initial test detonation and coinciding with the

~~SECRET~~

subsequent development of a Chinese nuclear capability, and particularly on US actions and attitudes. An apparent deterioration of the US position in Asia, or a reaction in the United States reflecting a lack of confidence in US and allied military capabilities to defend Free World interests in spite of Chinese threats or actual aggression, will significantly increase pressures to reach an early accommodation with China. All of these major factors are subject in varying degrees to US influence.

Actions that the United States can take to alleviate or prevent possible harmful reactions and to encourage beneficial ones, are largely political in nature. However, certain military actions can materially assist these larger efforts; such actions are discussed in subsequent portions of this paper. Those operations [not necessarily wholly military] that would be undertaken primarily for their psychological effects are discussed in Appendix C,¹⁰ those involving specific military actions of the United States are set forth in Chapter X, "Suggested Actions."¹¹

10. See below, pp. 161-71.

11. See below, pp. 137-46.

SECRET

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

CHAPTER III

IMPLICATIONS FOR GENERAL WAR AND FOR MILITARY ACTION BY THE SOVIET UNION¹

GENERAL WAR

For the purposes of this paper, the term "general war" refers to an armed conflict involving both the United States and the Soviet Union in which the total resources of both powers are employed and the national survival of both is at stake.

Almost irrespective of the number of nuclear weapons one assumes the CPR will be capable of producing, these can constitute only a marginal increment to the nuclear power otherwise available to the Communist bloc. The Soviet Union can already deliver a massive attack against the United States and simultaneously strike all militarily important targets in the Western Pacific and the Far East within range of Communist Chinese forces. The United States is therefore now threatened by a general war capability which will not be significantly increased by the addition of a Chinese regional nuclear capability, and the actions required to insure the availability and effectiveness in general war of

1. This chapter parallels Chapter IV, section on the Soviet Union, of the Study PACIFICA final report, The Emergence of Communist China as a Nuclear Power (U), ~~SECRET-RESTRICTED DATA~~, ISD Study Report Two (IDA, Washington, D. C., 1962).

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

deployed US forces will then still be necessary, and with no appreciable change in form or magnitude.

Possession by the CPR of a nuclear capability may increase the likelihood that local hostilities in the Far East will expand into general war. If general war should stem from these circumstances, US forces in the Pacific theater might be mal-deployed or attrited to an extent that would seriously impede their immediate use for assigned general war tasks. Some diversion of strategic strike forces to the local effort may also have occurred, with a resultant diminution of ability to carry out initial general war tasks. These disadvantages may be offset by a higher state of alert for other US and allied forces as a result of tensions induced by the local hostilities, and by completion of general war offensive strikes against China or the Asian satellites prior to the initiation of operations against the Soviet Union. Further, Communist forces are just as likely to be mal-deployed and attrited, and China's small stockpile of nuclear weapons destroyed or expended. Escalation from local to general hostilities, therefore, is unlikely to offer military advantage to the Communists.

General War Through CPR Catalytic Action

Possession of a nuclear capability will permit Chinese covert use of one or more nuclear weapons, either clandestinely introduced or delivered as mines or at short range by ship or submarine on the

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

United States or the Soviet Union. The Chinese might be tempted to do exactly this if they believe that they would thereby trigger a thermonuclear exchange between the US and the USSR, leaving China relatively undamaged.

A few nuclear explosions--or even one--occurring within the US or the USSR, not immediately identifiable as domestic in origin, could, and today probably would, result in a thermonuclear exchange. This situation exists now because (1) of a state of tension; (2) the United States and the Soviet Union have only each other as a dangerous, nuclear enemy; and (3) the present reciprocal vulnerability of strike forces requires a hair trigger reaction capability, if with "fail safe" attributes.

With the passage of time and as China and other powers develop a nuclear capability, albeit modest, any tendency toward a reflex response to a few nuclear explosions occurring in the US or USSR should moderate. It is apparent that should one of these last two powers choose to attack the other, attack on a scale which China could mount clandestinely would be foolhardy to the extreme. A minor clandestine attack by China, therefore, could hardly be credibly attributed to one of the two major nuclear powers, and thus should not catalyze an immediate thermonuclear exchange.

Nevertheless, the CPR should be given no reason to believe that she might catalyze a thermonuclear exchange with benefit to herself. On the contrary, the United States should assure Communist

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

China that it is on the target list of any such exchange, and thus has a heavy stake in helping to avert any thermonuclear exchange. The regional deterrent force later recommended in this paper² should provide publicly evident assurance that the United States can destroy Communist Chinese political, industrial, and military power at the same time she is engaging in a general war with the USSR. The regional deterrent force can thus play an important role even in the deterrence of covert, as well as overt, action by the CPR for catalytic purposes.

PRESSURES ON THE SOVIETS

There are strong ideological and political pressures on the Soviet Union to support any Communist military or paramilitary operations which may occur in Asia. Bloc leadership, cohesion, and prestige will be involved, as will be the loyalties and future effectiveness of Communist parties worldwide. Further, there are compelling ideological reasons, quite apart from the fact that they are allied powers, for the Soviet Union to succor China in military difficulty.³ These pressures may be increased through the acquisition by China of a nuclear capability. China can be expected to exploit her nuclear achievements for political purposes to the

2. See below, pp. 105-113.

3. The wording of the Sino-Soviet treaty of alliance, however, also permits the Soviets to deny, on legalistic grounds, its applicability under almost any circumstances.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

point that considerable damage would be done to her prestige (not to say that she would lose face) should she be forced to back down after challenging the United States. Success in developing the most modern and complex weaponry can be advertised by China as a triumph of the Communist system, thus implying that a defeat for the CPR would be a defeat for the Communist system.

The Chinese may be able to obtain Soviet support for some types of Chinese or Chinese-sponsored non-nuclear military operations by exploiting Soviet fear that otherwise the Chinese might resort to nuclear operations or to actions risking a US nuclear response. Support of the Chinese would retain for the Soviets more control over the course of local hostilities and give greater assurance that these would remain non-nuclear--and the Soviets have clearly demonstrated that they wish to avoid a nuclear war at almost any cost.

Soviet Assistance in Local War

Unless local hostilities are initiated by China over the objections of the Soviet Union, some degree of Soviet support of China must be anticipated. This support will almost surely include political and psychological support, and the provision of critical military supplies and advice. Direct Soviet military intervention might also be involved, probably by "volunteers."

~~SECRET~~

There are severe limitations, however, on the amount of effective military assistance which Soviet forces can provide.⁴ Certain specialized military functions such as submarine warfare and air transport, and possibly an increment of offensive air power, could be of great utility to the Chinese. But, generally speaking, Soviet military intervention would be limited by the same logistic factors which severely limit Chinese offensive capabilities, and Soviet forces could only substitute for Chinese forces. Thus effective Soviet assistance, from the Chinese viewpoint, during this mid-term phase, is most likely to consist in the main of strategic cover for Chinese local operations.

Pressures for General War

It must be anticipated that China's possession of non-nuclear weapons will increase her independence in policy and decision, and commensurately impair any Soviet restraining influence. An aggressive, nuclear-armed and possibly reckless⁵ China will be

4. If Communist nuclear operations were undertaken now in Asia, they would be undeniably of Soviet origin. A Chinese nuclear capability will permit the Soviets to furnish nuclear weapons, or to conduct "volunteer" nuclear operations, in support of Chinese military moves while denying that the Soviet Union is involved. The Soviets, however, will almost certainly view this situation as a source of danger rather than of profit.

5. The record indicates that the CPR has been reckless only with words and cautious in action. Mao Tse-tung has sometimes been overimpressed by developments of modern technology, however, and acquisition of a few nuclear weapons may lead to his being overconfident. It should not be forgotten that the USSR launched

SECRET

UNCLASSIFIED

more likely to miscalculate both its own power and the strength and the will of the United States and its allies to counter Chinese aggression. Nuclear capability obviously will permit China to transform non-nuclear operations swiftly into nuclear war, and to strike at distant targets. As a result, China is more likely to find herself involved in unexpected military difficulties which can be redressed, from the Chinese viewpoint, only by actual or threatened Soviet attack against the United States.

Thus, pressure on the Soviet Union to provide military support for any military operations the Chinese may undertake will continue and may even increase. At the same time, however, a situation is even more likely to arise in which effective assistance to China would require a direct Soviet threat to the United States. The Soviets may therefore find themselves in a difficult position: they must either offer a credible threat to initiate general war, requiring at least an apparent willingness to follow through if necessary, or they must withhold effective support from their ally. The first course would risk destruction of the Soviet Union, possibly through US pre-emptive attack. The second would

the North Koreans into what (rather to Soviet surprise) shortly became a war with the United States at the time when the USSR was first emerging as a nuclear power. But if Soviet experience is a guide, the CPR may rapidly develop a sense of responsibility in respect to hostilities which may develop into a nuclear exchange.

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

result, at the minimum, in grave embarrassment within the bloc, and it could have far-reaching effects on the cohesion of the bloc and the future of communism.

In the dilemma which the Soviets may face, their decision to intervene, especially a decision involving a willingness to initiate general war, is the less probable. The Soviets have demonstrated that they have no stomach for aggressive moves that might lead to a thermonuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The contemporary balance of United States and Soviet strategic strike forces, the state of Sino-Soviet relationships, and the clarity or ambiguity of circumstances of aggression all will have a bearing on the Soviet decision whether to undertake or to withhold strategic operations directly against the United States in support of its ally.

The likelihood of Soviet military response directly against the United States will be increased or minimized by the following considerations:

- 1) The Soviet Union is unlikely to give support to Chinese Communist aggression undertaken without its prior agreement, and the Soviet Union will be reluctant to agree to overt military moves unless these are instigated and controlled by the Soviet Union. Ambiguous operations that can, if necessary, be called off prior

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

to a direct confrontation of United States and organized Communist forces will doubtless continue to receive Soviet support. But the Soviets can generally be depended upon to withhold support of unambiguous Communist aggression--they are most unlikely to invite repetition of the Soviet-inspired Korean War.

2) The clarity or ambiguity of responsibility for a situation leading to major hostilities will strongly influence the Soviet decision to honor, or to ignore, its formal alliances, particularly the Sino-Soviet Pact. A clear case of US aggression or the escalation by the United States of a local crisis far beyond the requirements of the situation would make it difficult for the Soviet Union to withhold its support. Contrarily, Chinese military initiatives likely to lead to escalation would permit the Soviets, particularly if forewarned by the United States, to deny, within the bloc, that the mutual defense provisions of the alliance were involved; in these circumstances, Soviet support of the Chinese would be unlikely.

3) The speed and adequacy of the initial US response will be of signal importance. If sufficient US offensive power is brought to bear to obtain an immediate local decision at the outset of hostilities, the Soviets would be faced with a fait accompli. Attack upon the United States could not recoup the local situation but would bring certain devastation to the Soviet Union. In these circumstances the Soviet Union would be most unlikely to attack the

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

United States. On the other hand, a slowly developing situation, which resulted in a series of threats and counterthreats, could propel the Soviets into a position in which, regardless of rational factors, they might consider themselves forced to attack the United States.

4) The launching of US-based strategic strike forces would alarm and alert Soviet long-range strike forces. It might result in an immediate Soviet strike against the United States if US intentions were misread, or in a similar strike with slight delay if the Soviets should judge that there had been a significant reduction in the US second strike capability. Immediate Soviet counteraction would be far more likely if their own long-range strike forces remain largely in a targetable, soft configuration.

So long as the United States retains immediately available forces adequate in size and power to mount a massive thermonuclear offensive against the Soviet Union, and provided local or regional hostilities in the Far East are not permitted to escalate slowly and on an uncontrolled basis, generating uncontrollable emotional issues, Soviet attack on the United States as the outgrowth of Communist Chinese action would present the Soviet leadership with risks far beyond the stakes involved in the immediate hostilities.⁶ Soviet

6. The Soviets stress that a limited war (such as one involving the United States and China) must not be allowed to be transformed into a general war involving the USSR since, in case of Soviet destruction, the Communist cause will suffer a fatal blow. The Soviets thereby imply that if China suffers nuclear damage, however

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

intervention, therefore, while possible, need not be considered probable.

In fact, a principal Soviet interest in the developing nuclear striking power of China should be to see that it is not used. The United States should be able to count on assistance from the Soviet Union to restrain China from potentially explosive military actions--at least to the extent that Soviet influence can be made effective. In the circumstance of strain in Sino-Soviet relations, this influence could be effectively exerted negatively--no promise of Soviet aid to China in an extremity brought on by the Chinese. Communist China could also be brought to doubt that the Soviet Union would engage the United States in general war in order to succor China.

Nevertheless, while there is little likelihood that Soviet strategic strike forces could be triggered against the United States by unilateral Communist Chinese action, ambiguous Chinese

great, this would not administer a catastrophic blow to the Communist cause and would be tolerable if the alternative was Soviet destruction. It follows from the Soviet position that if the Soviet Union were confronted with the choice between involvement, with the certainty of a fatal blow to the world Communist cause, or abstention in a United States-China conflict (which might inflict partial, but not fatal, damage to world Communism) the Soviet choice would be clear. The implication of the Soviet position was obviously designed for Chinese consumption.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

provocations could result in a series of escalations that might cause the USSR to view the situation in a different light. Chinese possession of nuclear weapons, because of the resulting possibility of escalation, must therefore impose restraints upon United States actions in Asia, and it would appear that the United States should employ nuclear weapons in Asia only under conditions in which it is plain to the Soviets that the action is intended to be limited and to fall well short of an invitation to general war.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

CHAPTER IV

· IMPLICATIONS FOR WAR IN THE FAR EAST AND THE WESTERN PACIFIC¹

This section examines the military position of the United States, a nuclear-armed Communist China, and North Korea and North Vietnam in relation to war in the Far East and the Western Pacific. The following chapter will examine wars in specific locations in the light of this analysis.

MILITARY POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES

General

US forces in the Western Pacific and Far East constitute essentially a light screening force deployed for immediate response in time of crisis, whether major or minor. Except for quite minor operations these forces are dependent on reinforcement from the United States. They now have these general tasks:

1. This chapter parallels Chapter IV, sections on The United States Versus A Nuclear-Armed China and on Implications for the United States, of the Study PACIFICA final report, The Emergence of Communist China as a Nuclear Power (U), SECRET-RESTRICTED DATA, ISD Study Report Two (IDA, Washington, D. C., 1962).

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

1) Offensive air forces² maintain a general war stance, primarily but not exclusively aimed against the Soviet Union. The commitment of these forces is an integral part of the Single Integrated Operational Plan [SIOP] for general war.

2) Ground forces in Korea and air and naval forces in Japan, Okinawa, and adjacent waters are continuously in position for immediate response in the event of renewal of hostilities in Korea.

3) Naval forces, a large segment of the Pacific-based air forces, and the Marine and the Army contingents on Okinawa maintain a posture of readiness for immediate deployment to any area of local crisis.³

4) Air defenses, primarily immobile, are deployed for the defense of US forces and installations.

These US forces in general are concentrated (or are dependent for support) on a relatively few, large-scale bases, all within range of light bombers and medium-range missiles based in

2. The term "air forces" and similar generic terminology is used, unless otherwise qualified, to include all land- and ship-based air units of the United States Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps. The term "ground forces" similarly includes both United States Army and Marine Corps forces.

3. The terms "local war" and "local crisis" are used in this paper to refer to hostilities or incidents limited to a specific locality such as Korea, Taiwan, or Vietnam. Broader actions over all or large areas of Asia are termed "regional war."

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

China. In addition to these forward forces, the United States maintains on Hawaii and Guam military forces which serve as an immediate reserve.

In any contingency short of general war, these forces are dependent in varying degrees on allied combat and support capabilities. Present arrangements provide for retention by the United States of command of all US forces, regardless of the area of commitment.

Future Capabilities

By 1970, when the Chinese will probably have a highly significant local nuclear capability, United States forces in the Western Pacific and Far East may, if US authorities so decide, have increased capabilities that will be of major tactical significance in a bilateral nuclear environment.

1) SAMOS and other satellite systems will afford a major improvement in US reconnaissance and targeting capability.

2) The Polaris and, to some degree, the Army Pershing missile system will add a significant increment to US offensive nuclear capabilities. By the late 1960s the United States can also have a medium-range ballistic missile, either land-based and hardened or ship-based.

3) US nuclear capabilities in a local war situation should be significantly increased through the availability of the Davy

SECRET

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

Crockett. The nuclear-armed Bullpup will also provide a major capability in local nuclear war.

4) The US defensive posture will be materially enhanced through programmed increases in the Nike-Hercules and Hawk units; through the semi-automation of the air defense ground environment in Korea, Japan, Okinawa, and possibly other areas; and possibly through the provision of Mauler and Red Eye to the ground forces. The Field Army Ballistic Missile Defense System probably can be available by 1970.

5) US ability to respond in a crisis situation will be materially improved through advances in strategic airlift capabilities, through the provision of "roll-on, roll-off" cargo ships, by floating depots, and by the provision of STOL and possible VTOL aircraft.

Vulnerabilities of US Forces in the Western Pacific⁴ and Far East

General. US forces in the Western Pacific and Far East are continuously faced with the threat of a surprise, massive,

4. A rough calculation indicates that the CPR would require about 15 accurately delivered weapons (i.e., some 45-60 launched weapons) for a minimum, local, air counterforce role; about 60 accurately delivered weapons (i.e., 180-240 launched weapons) would destroy all major, fixed, soft US military targets in the Western Pacific. Attacks on these scales would not, however, be effective against concealed, hardened, and mobile targets.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

nuclear attack by the Soviet Union. Many actions have been taken, and presumably will continue to be taken, to permit the effective employment of these forces in spite of such an attack. These actions include concealment (e.g., Polaris), hardening (e.g., Mace), improvement of communications (e.g., scatter system), dispersal (e.g., relocation of stocks from Ascom City), and particularly the development of a rapid reaction capability on the part of land- and sea-based aircraft and missiles. While these measures will also reduce US vulnerability in a nuclear war with Communist China, they are inadequate in some respects for this purpose.

Land-Based Air Forces. The problem of survivability of land-based air forces subject to nuclear attack in a regional war with China differs considerably from that in a war with the USSR. The means available within economic limits to reduce vulnerabilities include active air defenses, moderate hardening of critical facilities, and a degree of dispersal. The only means now available, however, which promises the survivability and effective use of a substantial portion of the forces exposed to nuclear attack, is a rapid reaction capability. While such a capability may be of great utility in general war, war with China will almost certainly require an appreciable time for decision to launch nuclear attacks against the Chinese mainland;

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

a rapid reaction capability is thus unlikely to be of material assistance in the survivability of exposed forces. Until a decision is taken to launch major offensive strikes against all of China, it must be assumed that a war with the People's Republic of China [CPR] will be prolonged and therefore require the sustained employment of major US forces based in the Far East. Hence the retention of operational and supporting facilities in the area, in spite of a constant threat of Chinese nuclear attack, is important.

All of these factors indicate that minimizing vulnerabilities of US land-based air forces in the Far East to nuclear attack will be a continuing requirement, becoming more important and more difficult when China obtains a locally effective nuclear capability.

Naval Forces. US naval forces at sea will for a great many years be much less vulnerable to CPR than to Soviet attack. Missiles are relatively ineffective against moving, not easily targetable, surface ships, and practically useless against submarines. Unless the Chinese obtain modern, long-range bombers and reconnaissance aircraft,⁵ with sophisticated electronic

5. This role conceivably may eventually be filled by reconnaissance satellites.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

search equipment and air-to-surface missiles, or a modern navy, they will be restricted to small-scale attack on surface forces by obsolete light bombers. This is not to say that there will be no impact on US naval operations stemming from a Chinese nuclear capability. Naval forces operating within range of Chinese delivery vehicles, particularly in close-in, relatively restricted waters such as the Yellow Sea and Taiwan Strait, will incur substantial risk which must be either countered or accepted--the latter probably at some cost in freedom of action. Sustained close-in operations, such as were common during the Korean War, will become high-risk actions unlikely to be undertaken except under compelling circumstances.

Naval ships in port and naval bases will be neither more nor less vulnerable to attack by the CPR than by the Soviets. Like ground forces, however (see below), these will be more inviting targets to the CPR than to the USSR, and hence possibly somewhat more likely to be targeted in the initial strike of a surprise attack.

Ground Forces. Ground forces concentrated (in normal times) on Okinawa and in a small sector along the Demilitarized Zone (DmZ) of North and South Korea, and their logistic support installations, will be no more vulnerable to attack by the CPR than by the Soviet Union. They will, however, be much more

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

likely to be specifically targeted by the CPR for attack, since these forces offer no immediate threat to the Soviet Union. They do, however, pose a continuous threat of attack against China proper as well as against the Asian satellites, and in local hostilities (actual or potential) they become a primary threat to CPR military operations and hence would constitute a most inviting target.

The vulnerability of these forces and facilities cannot easily be reduced. So long as China possesses a significant air-delivery capability (probably at least through 1970), improvement in the US and allied air defense posture is desirable. The eventual deployment of the Field Army Ballistic Missile Defense System or another forward area anti-ballistic-missile system may reduce vulnerabilities to missile attack. The present extreme vulnerability of the logistic system, however, can be reduced only moderately through additional dispersion; an economical remedy for this Achilles' heel is not now in sight.

Command and Control Facilities. Many of the same considerations that affect the survivability of land-based air forces apply to command and control facilities. In the absence of nearly automatic, pre-planned offensive strikes, survival of these mechanisms is of critical importance. Yet these

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

facilities must be prepared to operate continuously during hostilities of a non-nuclear nature, when their attractiveness as targets for a Chinese pre-emptive strike would continuously increase.

Other Vulnerabilities. Local war in any area of the Far East will require the forward deployment to the area of US forces. The movement of forces of any magnitude, and their subsequent support, will create concentrations of forces, equipment, and supplies. These concentrations will create attractive nuclear targets.

Until or unless China's nuclear capability is destroyed, large-scale airborne and amphibious operations against major organized Chinese forces would entail a very high degree of risk.

Restraints on US Military Intervention

A Chinese nuclear capability is likely to prejudice the initial US military position in a local war or crisis situation. Most of our allies in the Far East will be to some extent intimidated by the threat of Chinese nuclear operations, and any natural reluctance they may have to become the scene of nuclear conflict will be heightened by the Chinese capability. There will be a strong tendency, therefore, on the part of threatened

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

Asian states⁶ to hesitate before requesting US military assistance. This can result only in delay in US military intervention and thus a deteriorated situation. In addition, except in clear-cut cases involving vital US interests, it will be more difficult for the United States to agree to commit forces to local operations. In addition, faced with the threat of nuclear attack on its forces, the United States must in major conflicts decide either to initiate nuclear warfare itself and accept the consequent risks and political onus, or face increased risks and difficulties in its military operations. These increased risks may result in some delay in the commitment of US forces even in clear-cut cases. Finally, a nuclear capability in Chinese hands will acutely discourage military participation by allies not directly menaced, and particularly the European powers. This general reluctance will curtail the likelihood of broad or solid political support for US military moves, and thus may induce additional US political reticence to commit US forces.

Any delay in the decision to commit military forces will normally lead to a requirement for more forces (as compared to the force requirements for early intervention) and to greater

6. Particularly Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Burma, and India. Thailand, Pakistan, and South Vietnam may also be included if the prior course of events should lead them to believe that US military capabilities vis-a-vis Communist China had been appreciably reduced.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

costs in time and resources, thus considerably raising the stakes involved on both sides.⁷ The increased effort involved, combined with the deteriorated situation facing United States and allied forces, will significantly heighten the risks of escalation, both in scale and in area.

Nuclear or Non-Nuclear Operations

The most obvious implication of a Chinese nuclear capability for the United States is that the United States cannot alone decide whether a local war in Asia will involve nuclear operations. If the United States intervenes in major local hostilities, it must decide in advance either to initiate the use of nuclear weapons when and if necessary (and, if needed at all, the need will be greatest in the early stages) or refrain from first use of nuclear weapons while taking simultaneous action to minimize the advantage to the Chinese of their first use.

Freedom of US Decision

With its present monopoly on nuclear capability in Asia, the United States has almost complete freedom of decision on

7. The advantages accruing from a rapid response to an act of aggression, in terms of reductions in the size of forces required and in casualties, can be vividly demonstrated. See Appendix D, below, pp. 173-85. Put simply, delay means automatic escalation.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

the ground rules governing a local war not directly involving the Soviet Union. By its own choice the United States can decide to fight with or without nuclear weapons. It can establish ground rules on the area and the scale of hostilities and on the permissible size and character of aggressor forces. Serious Communist breaches of these ground rules would risk invoking escalation completely controlled (at least locally) by the United States, which can at any time or place exercise its option for unilateral nuclear operations. A locally effective nuclear capability at the disposition of the CPR will put an end to this US monopoly in Asia. Even though China's nuclear capability will not be comparable to that of the United States, the Chinese too will be able to initiate nuclear operations, or to expand the area of local hostilities by means of nuclear strikes in other areas. The Chinese can, if they choose, make a pre-emptive nuclear first strike against the forces of the United States and its allies.

The ability of a nuclear-armed CPR to escalate hostilities, either by the initiation of local nuclear operations or by more distant nuclear attack, can be countered by making such escalation unprofitable or ineffective. It may also be made unattractive by the promise of appropriate US counteraction the Chinese cannot match, or ineffective by obtaining a decision in the local

~~SECRET~~

hostilities sufficiently early so that Chinese escalation cannot recoup the local loss. The first avenue requires an adequate and flexible US deterrent posture; the second avenue requires speed and adequacy of initial US response to aggression, particularly at the lower levels.

Deterrence. An overriding prerequisite to the commitment of US military forces to non-nuclear war in Asia will be the conscious provision of a military sanction adequate to prevent Chinese first use--a military capability that will insure that the Chinese correctly estimate that their first use of nuclear weapons will surely lead to retaliatory destruction far beyond the possible benefits to be achieved from success in the local operations. The problem of thus deterring a nuclear-capable CPR--a central question in assessing the impact of a nuclear-capable CPR on US military capabilities and requirements--is discussed at length in Chapter VI.

Speed of Response. If the initial reaction by the United States and its allies to Communist aggression is sufficiently rapid and of adequate weight to obtain early control of a crisis situation, Chinese escalation would be unlikely to affect the outcome of the local hostilities--particularly since an early local decision will keep the scale and intensity of the hostilities, and the degree of great power prestige

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

SECRET

involvement therein, at the lowest possible levels. Thus speed of response will become even more important when China becomes a nuclear power. Yet, as indicated above, commitment of military forces to local hostilities by the United States will then tend to be delayed: first, by inhibitions aroused in some threatened states against requesting United States military assistance; and, secondly, by increased caution on the part of the United States in deciding to participate in local hostilities after the United States can no longer alone establish ground rules for their conduct. In an environment that will tend to increase delays in arriving at a political decision for military intervention, it appears important that the military capability for quick response be improved as rapidly as possible. This requirement includes not only the immediate availability of forces and of adequate means of transport, but also prior preparations in potential areas of hostilities to facilitate the reception and support of United States forces that may be needed.

Force Configuration

While it is generally held that US forces can fight either a nuclear or non-nuclear war, there are sufficient differences in requirements between the two situations to demand a decision in advance of the commitment of forces on the question whether

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

US forces will forgo the first use of nuclear weapons and therefore accept the risk that the Chinese may not refrain from first use of nuclear weapons. From a ground force viewpoint, the dispersion requirement of combat forces in a nuclear environment is incompatible with the concentration of both men and conventional firepower required to fight a non-nuclear battle; the degree of tactical mobility needed in two-sided nuclear operations completely transcends the essential needs (and present capabilities) of forces committed to non-nuclear operations. From a land-based air viewpoint, non-nuclear war minimizes the requirements for dispersion and defense, but increases drastically the numbers of offensive sorties needed to obtain a given degree of damage. Thus, in a non-nuclear situation, there can be a much higher concentration of forces on any individual airfield, and a greater proportion of effort can go into offensive resources, but the forces committed must be very significantly increased. From both a ground force and land-based air point of view, major modification is required in logistic support arrangements to permit operations in a nuclear environment.

While the operations of combatant forces of the Navy at sea are less affected in character by foreknowledge that operations will be nuclear or non-nuclear, the total naval force requirements will depend in part on this determination. Navy

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

capabilities for supplying forces ashore will also need to be designed in light of the decision on use or non-use of nuclear weapons, and the resultant design of the logistic systems ashore. This may require significant changes in the composition of the transport fleet, and possibly in arrangements for its protection. Similarly, in a nuclear environment the Air Force can expect materially increased demands for large-scale air transport operations as a substitute for in-place logistic facilities within a local area of hostilities.

Thus forces committed on the assumption that operations will be non-nuclear are unlikely to be configured to fight a nuclear war effectively; conversely, forces configured for nuclear operations are unlikely to be effective in non-nuclear operations. It is necessary therefore that a decision be made by the United States in advance of the commitment of forces either: (a) to fight effectively on a non-nuclear basis and to accept the risks (minimized through a suitable deterrent posture) that the Chinese may not respect the ground rules established by the United States, or (b) to initiate nuclear operations.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MILITARY POSITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA, NORTH KOREA, AND
NORTH VIETNAM

General

The People's Republic of China will have these basic military capabilities to which a nuclear capability will be additive:

1) Very large and presumably well-equipped ground forces. These, however, can be used outside of China proper only in contiguous areas, and they then face major logistic difficulties. The logistical problem will require either that ground operations (except in Korea) be on a relatively minor scale, or that the Chinese pre-establish forward bases to support larger operations. The establishment of these bases would, of course, provide long lead time strategic warning.

2) Large-scale, but relatively backward, air defenses fixed in China itself.

3) Offensive air forces that will be capable of delivering nuclear weapons as indicated in Appendix A.⁸ In addition, the CPR will probably have additional offensive air forces of limited conventional capability.

4) A probable airlift capability for approximately one division and a probable amphibious lift capability of up to

8. See below, p. 147.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

three divisions. Lacking, however, the necessary naval and air combatant forces to make a major, opposed amphibious or airborne landing, these capabilities can be used only in exceptional circumstances where US and allied air and naval strength have been neutralized, against very close-in objectives where the Chinese can gain local air and naval superiority, or, conceivably, in special circumstances permitting the Chinese to achieve complete surprise. Until the CPR develops long-range amphibious or airborne capabilities, she cannot invade such remote areas as Japan, Okinawa, or the Philippines.

5) A significant force of long-range submarines. These, however, have in the past apparently been used exclusively for coastal defense purposes. No significant improvement in Chinese naval capabilities is anticipated.⁹

6) The ability to foment and support extensive insurgent and guerrilla operations where the ground is favorable for these. Again, major efforts in this field will be limited to peripheral areas permitting overland or short-range, unopposed air or sea supply of the insurgents.

9. The economically competitive nature of programs to create a valid nuclear capability on the one hand, and on the other of programs to provide strategic mobility, a valid airborne or amphibious capability, or a major naval capability, will probably prevent simultaneous progress down more than one road. This road will almost surely be that leading toward a nuclear capability.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

Military Utility of a Nuclear Capability

The primary utility to the CPR of a nuclear capability will lie in the political and psychological fields, in which the military significance of nuclear capabilities seem certain to be exploited.

A locally effective nuclear capability will have potential military significance for the CPR in these respects:

1) Defense of the Chinese Mainland. While to most Westerners an invasion of the Chinese mainland would appear to be beyond the capabilities of any conceivable forces that might be marshalled for the purpose, the Communist Chinese have indicated a high sensitivity in this regard. Chinese Nationalist forces on Taiwan, and US and Republic of Korea [ROK] forces in Korea, have evoked continuous diversions of Chinese military resources and attention. A nuclear capability would provide an almost certain means of defeating any attempt to invade the Chinese mainland.

2) Counterforce Operations Against Pacific-Based US Nuclear Offensive Forces. In time the Chinese can acquire a significant first strike counterforce capability, and presumably thereafter a significant retaliatory capability. A Chinese first strike capability would, at the least, require increased caution on the part of the United States in committing military forces to local action where they might face Chinese forces, in expanding

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

an area of local conflict, and particularly in initiating nuclear operations during such a local action.¹⁰ A retaliatory capability (when achieved) would provide, in Chinese eyes, an appreciable deterrent to direct US attack upon China, and in any event would permit nuclear response to US nuclear operations. China may also believe that through a nuclear strike on US forces in some circumstances she could require the Soviet Union to engage in operations against the United States. She may further believe that the existence of this capability might cause the United States to refrain from attack on China in the event of a US-USSR war.

It is difficult, though not impossible, to visualize a situation in which a Chinese first strike against US forces in the Western Pacific and Far East would be advantageous to the Chinese--at least until they have achieved near-equality with the United States in long-range strategic striking power. The Chinese may believe, however, that circumstances might arise which would lead the United States to accept the destruction of these forces rather than invite near-certain (as the Chinese

10. The Chinese may or may not realize that the existence of this capability would also invite US first strike, counter-force operations against the Chinese mainland as a prelude to the commitment of US forces to any local operations, and particularly to nuclear operations the United States may decide are necessary.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

would hopefully expect) counter-retaliation in the form of a first strike by the USSR. Circumstances might also arise which would lead the Chinese to believe that a Chinese preemptive strike could blunt an intended US attack on the mainland.

3) Increased Freedom for Chinese and Communist Military Operations. The existence of a Chinese nuclear capability will increase any reluctance that threatened Asian nations may have to request US military assistance, and will tend to inhibit a US decision to intervene militarily except in cases clearly involving essential US interests. These factors will, at least to some degree, curtail US military intervention in lesser situations, and thus commensurately increase the range of Communist military and paramilitary operations that can be conducted without invoking US military response.

4) Selective Military Use. Certain local war situations might arise in Asia that would permit Communist forces to gain a decisive local advantage by the employment of a few weapons at particular times and places. These are discussed in more detail in Chapter V.¹¹

11. See below, pp. 69-96.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

Vulnerabilities of the People's Republic of China¹²

China's basic social and economic structure is less vulnerable to nuclear attack than that of the more industrialized nations, and particularly the United States. People and industry per se as targets would require a very extensive nuclear offensive, the results of which cannot be predicted with certainty. China as a modern governmental and war-making entity, however, is highly vulnerable to nuclear attack.

Chinese nuclear delivery forces during the present decade are expected to be very limited in numbers, unhardened, and highly vulnerable. Other Chinese forces will be largely concentrated on eastern Chinese bases all of which are within range of US Pacific-based strike forces and in quantity well within the destruction capability of those forces.

A critical factor in the feasibility of a counterforce effort against Chinese nuclear strike forces will be the ability of the United States to locate and to target these forces accurately. Until the CPR approaches superpower status, its nuclear forces will be numerically insufficient to retain an appreciable second strike capability after a major attack if they are exposed. Either the United States or the Soviet Union could mount a pre-emptive attack of sufficient weight to destroy

12. See also Appendix E, below, pp. 187-208.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

China's total nuclear capability almost regardless of the degree of hardening, dispersal, or active defense which the Chinese can attempt. Survivability of Chinese forces must thus rest primarily upon denying both the United States and the Soviet Union the capability to target these forces, presumably through concealment and mobility of missiles, and through concealment of a nuclear capability in aircraft. For the purpose of this paper, however, it is assumed that US intelligence capabilities are adequate to target at least the bulk of Chinese nuclear delivery forces accurately. This appears to be a wholly reasonable assumption in view of the size of the CPR force in comparison with US forces, in view of the known difficulties of providing concealment for major operational forces, and in view of demonstrated US intelligence capabilities in the past. If the assumption should not be warranted, in the sense that the Chinese were able to hide their entire force successfully (or even most of it), the consequence would be to give them a second strike capacity, which, although limited to near-by targets, would nevertheless add substantially to US problems. In particular such a capacity would impair, though it would not entirely discount, the credibility of the regional deterrent force proposed in Chapter VI of this paper.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

Chinese governmental and military controls, communications, and transportation and distribution centers are largely concentrated in or around large metropolitan areas, as are primary military forces. These metropolitan areas also include the preponderance of the governmental, military, scientific, and technical elites, as well as a high proportion of the total heavy industry. A successful nuclear attack on these metropolitan areas would render the CPR incapable of waging modern war; and such an attack, in view of the co-location of vulnerabilities, would need to be on only a comparatively modest scale.¹³

The projection of Chinese military power beyond the borders of China would cause concentration of troops and materiel and a saturation of inadequate lines of communication, creating additional (and probably critical) vulnerabilities to nuclear attack.

Vulnerabilities of North Vietnam and North Korea

North Vietnam and North Korea have essentially the same socio-economic structure as the CPR, with generally similar, but greater, basic vulnerabilities.

13. Calculations comparable to those made for attack on US forces (see above, p. 44 n.) indicate that in 1970 about 25 accurately delivered weapons would be required for a minimum first strike counterforce operation directed against Chinese nuclear delivery vehicles. Some 65 additional accurately delivered weapons should be adequate to destroy the CPR as a modern governmental and war-making entity. See Appendix E, below, pp. 187-208.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

North Vietnam has a basically agrarian economy, with all appreciable industry, governmental and military controls, and transportation and distribution centered in the Hanoi-Haiphong area. Even agriculture is largely concentrated in this flat, highly vulnerable delta area. Nuclear attack (unless with weapons specifically designed and targeted to cause personnel casualties and ground contamination) could not destroy the basically agrarian way of life in North Vietnam, but a very few weapons in the one metropolitan area could completely destroy the existing government, economic life, and military direction of the country. Further, North Vietnam is at present completely open to such an attack.

North Korea's vulnerabilities are intermediate between those of North Vietnam and the CPR. Government and military controls are centered in Pyongyang; there is some evidence, however, that extensive hardening and passive defense measures have been undertaken to protect these elements. Industry (in the Western sense) is centered mainly in the Pyongyang and Hamhung areas. There are 16 airfields now supporting 485 aircraft. There is an extensive but qualitatively poor air defense system in North Korea.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

Asymmetry of Vulnerabilities

US forces in the Far East, and also those of US allies, are now so disposed as to be vulnerable to nuclear attack. There are and will long continue to be, however, glaring asymmetries between the basic vulnerabilities to initial nuclear attack of the United States and the CPR--the great imbalance in numbers and types of nuclear weapons and in delivery vehicles; the capability and invulnerability of US strategic strike forces; the ability of the United States to use the sea for its own purposes; and particularly, the fact that the United States, as a base for war, will for many years be automatically a sanctuary in a war with China as opposed to the accessibility of all of China to US nuclear attacking forces. This great disparity in vulnerability in a bilateral nuclear exchange is too patent to need elaboration.

The East Asian Communist Assessment of Respective Vulnerabilities

An appreciation of both the capabilities and limitations of nuclear weapons has developed in each of the present nuclear powers in generally the same sequence. While the CPR may find a way to compress the sequence, it is unlikely that Chinese thinking has yet progressed much beyond the capability of the weapons and delivery means which the Chinese expect to have in the near future. These weapons are "city busters," even though

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

pygmies as compared to the weapons available to the United States and the Soviet Union. Delivery vehicles will be suitable primarily for use against large, soft targets the destruction of which does not require precise delivery. Weapon scarcity will require that only the most remunerative targets be attacked. The strategic thinking associated with this type of weapon by other nuclear powers has generally been limited to the concept of people and industry as suitable nuclear targets, and it is in these categories that the Chinese are less vulnerable than the more industrialized nations. This might lead the Chinese to underestimate their vulnerability to nuclear attack, particularly if they should estimate that the destruction of opposing forces in the immediate area would cause the United States to accept local defeat rather than accept the risk of Soviet intervention.

It is much more likely, however, that the Chinese leadership, essentially pragmatic and realistic, would more accurately assess the probable results of a bilateral nuclear war involving the United States and Communist China. It is in the US interest to assist the Chinese in all feasible ways to make an accurate assessment, and at the earliest possible time.

Even if North Korea and North Vietnam should correctly assess their own high vulnerability in a nuclear war, it is

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

entirely possible that they may overestimate the protection afforded them through extended deterrence stemming from the Communist Chinese nuclear capability. Just as the CPR exhibited belief that the first Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile and space vehicle [Sputnik] in 1957 counteracted (at least to some extent) US nuclear superiority, so these two minor states are apt to believe that a token Red Chinese nuclear capability will serve to protect them in their own military adventures. This possibility can be countered by bringing home to them not only their own vulnerability in a war, but also that of the CPR.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

CHAPTER V

WAR IN SPECIFIC LOCALITIES¹

INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter discussed over-all considerations applying to a war in the Far East involving a nuclear-capable Communist China. This chapter applies these over-all considerations, plus specific factors pertaining to each area in the Far East and South Asia in which local hostilities are likely, to analyze the basic military environment and evaluate the utility of nuclear armament to the People's Republic of China [CPR].

Assumptions

The discussion of specific limited war situations in this chapter is based on the following assumptions:

1) The nuclear capability of the CPR is generally as stated in Appendix A to this paper.²

1. This chapter parallels Chapter IV, section on Utility of A Chinese Nuclear Capability In Hostilities In Asia, of the Study PACIFICA final report, The Emergence of Communist China as a Nuclear Power (U) SECRET-RESTRICTED DATA, ISD Study Report Two (IDA, Washington, D. C., 1962).

2. See below, p. 147.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

2) The over-all strength of indigenous ground forces, and the extent of Chinese capabilities for invasion, is as projected in Appendix F.³

3) The Communist Party of China retains control over the people and government of mainland China.

4) The Soviet Union does not openly intervene, at least initially, in local hostilities in the Far East.

5) Laos and Cambodia are neutrals. Burma, while neutral, is oriented toward the CPR.

6) Singapore, Malaya, and North Borneo have federated into the Federation of Malaysia. Commonwealth forces have been largely withdrawn.

7) The United States is not allied with, but may respond to requests for military assistance from India or the Malaysian Federation (if they are attacked). These countries are therefore treated in this section as "allies."

8) The alliances among the Soviet Union, the CPR, North Korea, and North Vietnam continue, with no substantial increase in the amount of territory under Communist control. Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, South Vietnam, Thailand, and Pakistan, with no substantial changes in their internal political situations, remain aligned with the United States. The United States retains control of Okinawa.

3. See below, p. 209.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLAS

Methodology

The assessments contained in this section are based upon general considerations, notably the asymmetry in nuclear capabilities that will exist between the United States and the CPR during the period before China has an effective intercontinental capability. The endeavor has been to examine the basic military environment in order to permit a broad assessment of the utility of a nuclear capability to one side or the other, but particularly to the CPR, in specified contingencies. Detailed war games have not been undertaken and are not considered necessary to substantiate the conclusions reached in this chapter.

Categories of Hostilities

Military conflicts in the Far East and South Asia can be conveniently grouped into five general categories. These are identified below (subsequent discussion of the various contingencies will be in the same order):

First category: a war between the United States and China proper.

Second category: open hostilities in areas on the periphery of China involving opposing major organized forces. These areas include Korea, Taiwan and the offshore islands held by the Nationalist Chinese, Vietnam, and Thailand.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

Third category: wars in the Indian subcontinent (India, Pakistan, and Nepal).

Fourth category: open Chinese aggression against nations unable to provide significant indigenous opposition. These include Burma, Laos, and Cambodia.

Fifth category: Communist subversion and insurgency in areas vulnerable to this type of conflict. Such activity is particularly likely in regions near the Chinese frontiers, but all of non-Communist Asia may eventually be affected. This category also includes (for the purpose of this analysis) relatively minor actions by the Communists, whether with regular or irregular forces, against isolated areas near China's periphery.⁴

There are some nations that the CPR will have no capability to invade. They include Japan, the Philippines, and (so long as China stays within her present borders) Malaya. These nations may be subject to attack as part of a larger war but should be immune from direct, localized, overt Chinese aggression. The utility of a nuclear capability to the CPR in forwarding its ambitions with regard to these three areas is therefore limited to blackmail and pressures. Thus no discussion of limited war involving these nations is included in this chapter.

4. A series of such actions might of course significantly change the military geography as well as the internal political situation of the attacked nation.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

UNCLASSIFIED

CHINA

A war between the United States and China should be regarded as a regional war.⁵ Such a conflict will extend to all of China, and will involve major US forces and (at least indirectly) most major US allies in the Far East. The war can occur either directly as a result of Chinese attack on US forces or major US allies, through other Chinese provocation, or (more likely) as the outgrowth of hostilities initially limited to a specific area on China's periphery.

The basic strengths and vulnerabilities of China and of the United States in the Far East have been discussed earlier. In summary, China will have a great numerical preponderance over the United States and its allies in ground forces and locally in air forces, greater dispersion of forces, but a comparatively small and initially primitive nuclear capability. China's war-making capability will continue to be highly vulnerable to nuclear attack. The United States and its allies will have supremacy on the seas, qualitative air superiority, and vastly superior nuclear capabilities including, for at least a decade, the entire United States as an inherent sanctuary. US local vulnerability stems primarily from the high concentration of forces and logistic support, and this weakness can be reduced by timely remedial actions.

5. See above, p. 42 n. 3.

SECRET

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

In a regional war between the CPR and the United States, the Communist Chinese will be unable to invade any area critical to US operations. China can conduct limited ground operations in contiguous land areas, but only insofar as these actions are not impeded by US operations. She can attack those forces of the United States and its allies--as well as the capitals and other major urban areas of principal US allies--that are within range of Chinese delivery vehicles. To be meaningful, these offensive operations, in view of anticipated Chinese capabilities, would necessarily be nuclear.

Unless there is some major political deterioration within Communist China, operations by the United States and its allies would also necessarily be limited, at least initially, to relatively long-range, nuclear offensive strikes against Chinese territory. Non-nuclear offensive operations within the capabilities of the forces estimated to be available to the United States and its allies could not in themselves force a decision. Invasion of the mainland appears to be far beyond the capabilities of any conceivable forces that the United States and its allies could commit except in the aftermath of a major nuclear offensive. Offensive nuclear operations against the mainland will thus be necessary to effect the enemy's defeat.

It is a practical certainty therefore that if a regional war with China occurs, it will involve bilateral nuclear operations, but limited (so long as the USSR abstains) to targets in the Far East, including mainland China, and the Western Pacific.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCL

The United States will have a variety of targeting options for its nuclear operations. On the assumption that US reconnaissance capabilities will permit accurate targeting of Chinese nuclear delivery forces, China's nuclear capability could be quickly and cheaply destroyed by a pure counterforce operation. The destruction of other Communist forces would be feasible, but targeting difficulties and the greater enemy dispersion would require an increased weight of offensive effort maintained over a longer period than for the counterforce action. Operations against urban centers, exploiting this extreme vulnerability of China, could be undertaken at the discretion of the United States.

Given these basic military factors, the following conclusions are apparent. If the United States strikes first (and this may well happen if hostilities occur as the result of open Communist Chinese aggression on its periphery), the United States, with no serious impairment of its general war capability, can, if it so decides:

- 1) Eliminate by its first strike the ability of the CPR to launch a second strike of serious consequences.

- 2) Progressively, if not simultaneously, eliminate all CPR offensive capabilities, all CPR organized military capabilities except in scattered localities, and finally the ability of the CPR to maintain or control effective military forces.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Even if given the advantage of the first strike, the United States cannot, except at an enormous cost in time and resources:

- 1) Invade and occupy mainland China.
- 2) Create by military means alone conditions which will lead to the installation of a government of mainland China friendly to the United States.⁶

If nuclear hostilities were initiated by the Communist Chinese, by means of a surprise attack aimed in the first instance against US forces and bases in the Far East, and assuming adequate prior preparations on the part of the United States in the way of force configuration, control, and survivability, US Pacific-based second strike and subsequent capabilities should be sufficient to permit the United States to accomplish the same results as those just stated with the same limitations on capabilities. In this case, however, the accomplishment of the destruction of Communist Chinese military capabilities might take longer and would, of course, involve much greater damage to US forces and to US allies. It

6. The disarming or devastation of China through a nuclear offensive is not likely to create immediate conditions which will permit the Nationalist Chinese to "return to the mainland." The destruction and chaos which would result from such an offensive, however, might permit the gradual takeover by the Nationalists of more and more of mainland China. They would not, however, be welcomed back as heroes. They would need to occupy successive small areas, each within their military capabilities, consolidating each successive bite before proceeding.

A contingency at least as likely would be the occupation of parts or all of China by the Soviet Union.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

might involve use of US strategic strike forces, with a possible resultant minor degrading of the capability of the United States for general war.

Such an exchange with China could eliminate once and for all a major potential world adversary, and would have shattering results within the Communist bloc. It would involve some (but probably not catastrophic) destruction in allied lands of US forces and their facilities. Taken alone, however, it would not be likely to provide a final answer to the question posed by China, and it should be assumed that subsequent action by massive military forces on the Chinese mainland will be required. Whether these required military actions would be in the nature of relief and rehabilitation, the occupation of hostile territory, or a confrontation with Soviet forces can be only a matter of conjecture.

KOREA

Korea as an arena of conventional combat requires and can accommodate very large forces on each side, up to 60 or more divisions. Yet, as clearly demonstrated in the Korean War, the terrain and logistic limitations severely curtail mobile offensive or defensive operations. Non-nuclear operations restricted to the Korean Peninsula are thus likely to result in another static situation of stalemate.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

The deployment of large forces to Korea and their employment requires on both sides major dependence on operational and support facilities outside of Korea--on the Communist side, in Manchuria and probably the Shantung Peninsula; on the US-Republic of Korea /ROK/ side, in Japan and Okinawa. These extensive supporting facilities provide lucrative nuclear targets, as do force concentrations and logistic facilities in Korea proper. Non-nuclear operations against these targets, on a scale within the capabilities of either side, are most unlikely to provide a decisive advantage.

In a bilateral nuclear-armed environment, it is unlikely that a stalemated, non-nuclear ground situation can be redressed through large-scale amphibious or airborne operations, in view of the very high risks involved. If in such a situation a military solution is to be achieved by either side, therefore, there must be either the massive destruction of opposing forces and their means of support (i.e., employment of nuclear weapons in a manner that directly affects the course of battle in the front lines) or an expansion of the war so that the decisive battle is fought in circumstances more favorable to the side which chooses to expand the area of hostilities. The first course would require the initiation of nuclear operations which probably will need to extend to parts of China for US-ROK operations, or to Japan for Communist operations.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

Other than extended nuclear operations, no military means are visible on either side that would permit the opening of a "second front" with decisive effect on operations in Korea.

If hostilities are resumed in Korea, there will thus be strong military reasons on both sides to initiate nuclear operations. The existence of such pressures should not be construed as a prediction that operations must necessarily develop into a nuclear exchange; a stalemate may again be politically acceptable to both sides. It will, however, be to the military advantage of the United States, by permitting flexibility of decision, to take whatever preparations--both military and political--may be necessary to enable the United States to initiate nuclear operations should it choose to do so. Similarly, the United States and the Republic of Korea should take all practical action to minimize vulnerabilities if nuclear operations should be initiated by the Communists. These vulnerabilities are particularly acute in the event of war in Korea.

TAIWAN AND THE OFFSHORE ISLANDS

Taiwan. The situation of Taiwan and the Penghu Islands is unique in that an invasion would require a major, but short-range, amphibious or airborne effort; since the critical phase of an invasion would be of very short duration, the defense is wholly dependent on forces in position from the outset.

Using assorted junks and fishing craft in addition to normal amphibious shipping, the Communist Chinese could mount an amphibious

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

operation of six or possibly more divisions. Such an operation would create a series of critical targets extremely vulnerable to nuclear attack. An amphibious attack could be defeated by a very few nuclear weapons used against the transport force while concentrated in loading areas, while the transport fleet is at sea, while the ships are concentrated off the coast of Taiwan preparatory to a landing, or against the initial bridgeheads before the attacking force has consolidated its positions ashore. While such an attack could thus be easily and cheaply defeated by nuclear means, it would also be highly vulnerable to attack by conventional weapons on a scale within the capabilities of US and Nationalist Chinese forces normally in the area.

An airborne operation against Taiwan, or a combination airborne and amphibious operation, would be even more difficult for the CPF than an amphibious attack. Because of the requirement for a sea-borne follow-up to any airborne operation, many of the same vulnerabilities would exist as for an amphibious attack. Additional vulnerabilities would be created in the launch and drop areas, and the transport aircraft themselves would be highly vulnerable to the air defenses on Taiwan.

It thus appears that a major airborne operation would be most unlikely to be successful under any foreseeable circumstances except as a minor adjunct to an amphibious attack. An amphibious operation

SECRET

would be more feasible, but would be a formidable task. For one to be successful:

1) The Communists must achieve complete surprise at least until the transport fleet is well at sea. This is not impossible in view of the extended periods of bad weather over the Taiwan Strait and the short sailing time (12 to 24 hours) involved. The Communists would also need to be secure, however, from early detection by electronic maritime reconnaissance over the Strait.

2) US naval and air protection for Taiwan, including specifically the US capability for early nuclear response, would need to be either eliminated or at least greatly reduced.⁷ It is conceivable that this might occur through political action. It is more likely, however, that a major diversion of regional US combatant strength to some other threatened area might lead the Communist Chinese to estimate that residual US strength in the area could be substantially neutralized through nuclear attack.

3) The vulnerability of transport concentrated off the coast, and of the initially landed forces, would need to be overcome by preparatory fire directed against both ground and air forces on Taiwan. Adequate preparation for an opposed landing does not

7. If a credible threat of an invulnerable, nuclear offensive capability in the hands of Nationalist Chinese forces were created, it is most unlikely that the Communists would conclude that an invasion of Taiwan could succeed.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

appear to be possible by conventional means estimated to be at the disposal of Communist China; a nuclear capability would permit accomplishment of this essential task.

Thus nuclear weapons, under favorable circumstances, may provide the CPR with a military capability that would lead it to believe it could invade Taiwan successfully--a capability which the CPR probably lacks under present circumstances.

On the US-Nationalist Chinese side, an attempted invasion of Taiwan could be countered under normal conditions by either conventional or nuclear weapons. As has been indicated, however, one of the essential conditions that would permit a Communist attack to be successful is a reduction or diversion of US capabilities to oppose an attempt at invasion. In such a circumstance, the defense of Taiwan would require the residual US forces to use nuclear weapons against one or more of the critical vulnerabilities of the attacking force, or else to accept the probability of Communist Chinese success. It follows that, if the United States is determined to defend Taiwan, both the United States and the Government of the Republic of China should be prepared militarily and politically to use nuclear weapons, if needed, and these states should also minimize, as feasible, vulnerabilities to nuclear attack by the Communists. In this connection, it should be noted that the political disadvantages flowing from US first use of nuclear weapons

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

in Asia would be markedly reduced if these were aimed at Communist forces obviously involved in aggressive action, particularly if such first use were against the aggressor force while at sea.

If an invasion of Taiwan should be attempted, it is thus likely to result in a bilateral nuclear engagement. Such an invasion attempt could lead to a regional war with the CPR.⁸

Offshore Islands. The offshore islands (notably Quemoy and Matsu) now held by the Nationalist Chinese can be effectively denied to either side by a very few nuclear weapons--by fallout, if not by blast. Such a Communist nuclear attack would, in isolation, be an implausible means toward "liberation" of these islands. Nuclear operations are more likely to result from an attack on Taiwan as well. From a military viewpoint, and considered apart from the defense of Taiwan, the defense of the offshore islands will thus not be materially affected through CPR acquisition of a nuclear capability.

The defense of the offshore islands by conventional means, in view of their proximity to the Chinese mainland, is a difficult task. Their defense through nuclear attack on Communist concentrations on the mainland, prior to and during the early stages of an invasion attempt, would be a simple matter. There

8. For the nature of such a war, see above, pp. 73-77.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

will clearly be severe political restraints on US use of nuclear weapons in the defense of the offshore islands. The Communists are well aware of these restraints and probably consider any conventional action limited to the offshore islands to be immune from nuclear attack by the United States. A credible threat of Nationalist Chinese nuclear operations would, however, provide a major deterrent to Communist aggression against these outposts.

VIETNAM

Open aggression against South Vietnam does not appear to be a profitable course of action for the Communists unless very favorable circumstances exist, which, however, they may be able to create. The total organized ground forces which the Communists can logistically support in an attack against South Vietnam⁹ are about equal in size to South Vietnamese regular forces. The terrain and lines of communication prevent major front-line concentrations of either defending or attacking forces, and the initial local Chinese air superiority is not likely to have a major bearing on the course of front line hostilities. Both sides present inviting and highly

9. Estimates used in this paper of Communist ability to support regular forces in an invasion of Vietnam include forces advancing via Laos. Communist control of Laos should not, therefore, substantially improve Communist capability to support an invasion. Communist capabilities to support insurgency would, of course, be significantly improved (see below, pp. 93-95).

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

vulnerable nuclear targets: in the north, the Hanoi-Haiphong complex; and in the south, Saigon with its port, airfield, communications, and governmental and military control concentrations. Other profitable nuclear targets, except (possibly transitory) force and supply concentrations, would be few in Vietnam proper; attractive nuclear targets would exist, in the form of concentration of forces, supplies, logistic facilities and lines of communication, in adjacent areas within China and, on the United States-South Vietnam side, in the Philippines and probably Thailand.

A direct attack upon South Vietnam alone¹⁰ would be an inviting course of action for the Communists if three conditions exist:

1) Organized South Vietnamese forces are in large part diverted to the struggle against insurgency, affected by widespread disaffection and disloyalty, or otherwise barred from effective employment.

2) The Communists are convinced that insurgency alone will be insufficient, and that open aggression will also be necessary.

3) The Communists believe that the United States cannot or will not be willing to participate effectively in the defense of South Vietnam.

10. If the Chinese should overtly attack Thailand, such an attack would almost certainly progress so as eventually to include South Vietnam. A key element, therefore, in the security of South Vietnam is the security of Thailand. This is discussed beginning on page 88 below.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

If these preconditions do, in fact, all exist, nuclear operations by the CPR would be unnecessary.

If the Communists calculate wrongly that the United States lacks the will or capability to assist effectively in the defense of South Vietnam, and, consequently, the United States does react to Communist attack but only with conventional forces limited initially to operations in Vietnam itself, the situation which would emerge would at best be a difficult one for the defending forces. If the first precondition does not then exist (that is, if the present state of insurgency has been brought under control), the South Vietnamese, reinforced by major US forces, should be able to attain a significant numerical superiority over the organized forces that the Communists can support over their tenuous lines of communication. This numerical superiority might permit the United States and South Vietnamese forces eventually to defeat the Communists, but in view of the physical environment such a victory, if possible at all, would take a very long time and would be a very expensive operation. If, on the other hand, major Communist aggression is coupled with widespread insurgency, defeat of the Communists by conventional means would be improbable, but a complete (non-nuclear) Communist victory, requiring the conquest and occupation of the more developed portions of the country as well as the mountain and jungle areas, would be equally improbable. Thus, open Communist aggression in a non-nuclear environment is likely, as in Korea, to lead to stalemate.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

Under these circumstances the deployment of US forces and materiel would almost certainly create highly lucrative nuclear targets. Hence it is conceivable that a Chinese nuclear capability might be used to establish a locally decisive advantage, and bilateral nuclear operations, whether initiated by the Communists or the United States, might eventuate. It would be more advantageous to the Communists, however, to de-emphasize (and possibly abandon) operations by organized forces in favor of additional emphasis on insurgency and guerrilla operations, than to invite reprisal, not necessarily localized, by superior US nuclear power. A nuclear capability is therefore unlikely to be used by, or offer any real military advantage to, the Communists in the conquest of South Vietnam, except as it may serve as a restraining influence on the United States.

An evident will and capability of the United States to carry the war, with nuclear weapons if the United States should so desire, into the heart of North Vietnam and if necessary China, should almost certainly preclude open aggression against South Vietnam. This capability should make it evident to the Chinese that their use of nuclear weapons would entail extreme risk; yet, barring catastrophic political developments, they are not likely to be able to invade and conquer South Vietnam without using them. If this US will and capability appeared to China to have been lost

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

in a military sense, precluded by US political decision, or susceptible to neutralization by a Chinese first strike on US forces, then an invasion of South Vietnam might be attempted. The existence of a visible US regional deterrent (discussed in detail in Chapter VI)¹¹ and the political basis for its employment at the discretion of the United States, is thus of primary importance.

THAILAND

Under present conditions, the United States and the CPR face almost equal difficulties in supporting and maintaining organized regular forces for conventional military operations in Thailand. While the Chinese can sustain sufficient forces to defeat an unassisted Thailand, their logistic problems would limit the attack in the main to lightly armed forces whose overland progress would be slow. On the United States-Thai side, the deployment of US ground and air forces to Thailand (except for comparatively small forces in readiness in the Western Pacific) would also be relatively slow, and constricted through the single port of Bangkok and, generally, the airfield complex of Bangkok-Takhli-Khorat. The United States could expect to receive at least several days of strategic warning, however, as Chinese forces

11. See below, pp. 104-113.

~~SECRET~~

[REDACTED]

traverse Burma and Laos, and during this time could preposition carrier forces, and air and ground forces within Thailand. US deployments into Thailand, dependent upon the single port and few airfields, would create attractive nuclear targets. However, logistic limitations would make extremely difficult, if not prevent, Chinese exploitation of any nuclear operations, and would create a situation of extreme danger to China if the United States retaliates. Chinese initiation of nuclear warfare is thus not probable, and should be readily deterrable.

The situation will be greatly changed if Laos should become a Communist state. The Communists could build up major military resources in Laos and could infiltrate forces there. This concentration would permit a much heavier weight of attack by well-equipped forces, with some possibility of achieving tactical surprise. Unless there is prior major improvement in Thai forces, or actions are taken to permit the predeployment of US forces to Thailand (and these actions would probably preclude Chinese attack), a non-nuclear defense on the ground would appear to be unpromising. Communist initiation of nuclear warfare would therefore be unnecessary.

Thus a Chinese nuclear capability is not likely materially to affect local hostilities in Thailand. The existence of a credible threat on the part of the United States to carry the war

to the source of any aggression will be of critical importance in deterring open aggression, or at a minimum in holding it to a low level of intensity, as well as deterring Chinese initiation of nuclear operations. It will, of course, be important to avoid, or at least to keep to the minimum feasible, any concentration of forces or resources that would invite Communist nuclear attack.

INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Despite the persistence of armed conflict between the Chinese and Indians in border areas claimed by both, neither India nor Pakistan would appear to be profitable or likely targets of Chinese military conquest. In the first place, unless there is a major Chinese effort to develop Tibet or Sinkiang to support military operations--an effort which owing to the remoteness of these areas might be expected to require several years--or a very great improvement in Chinese air transport capabilities, China will not be able to support major forces in operations against India or Pakistan. Further, it can be reasonably assumed that the Chinese would be deterred by the expectation that the United Kingdom would actively assist the attacked nation, and might be prepared to respond with nuclear weapons if the Chinese should use them first.¹²

12. For a discussion of British policy on nuclear weapons in Asia, see Reactions to a Nuclear-Armed Communist China: Europe and the United Kingdom, UNCLASSIFIED, ISD Study Memorandum No. 12 (IDA, Washington, D. C., 1962), "The United Kingdom," by Roderick MacFarquhar, pp. 8-13.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

The situation might be materially changed if Nepal should become in effect or in actuality a Chinese satellite.¹³ If Nepal is available to the Chinese as a base, the CPR should be able to overrun parts of India in a very short time (although the occupation of all of India would be a most difficult and time-consuming task, if possible at all). Any build-up in Nepal would, of course, provide long-term strategic warning which would doubtless be heeded by India--and reasonable preparation by India, aided by the West, should more than offset Chinese advantage accruing from an unimpeded build-up in Nepal.

In either case, Chinese nuclear operations could:

- 1) Assist in breaching the initial Indian (or Pakistani) defensive position. If, however, China can transport and support forces adequate for a major invasion, an initial nuclear assist would be unnecessary. If she cannot, initial success could not be exploited.
- 2) Largely destroy (primarily through a counter-city offensive) the ability of the attacked nation to defend itself with organized forces. Destruction of this nature would however destroy the only reward of conquest, and hence almost surely would

13. See on this point Loy W. Henderson, Reactions to a Nuclear-Armed Communist China: South Asia (U), ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~, ISD Study Memorandum No. 11 (IDA, Washington, D. C., 1962), pp. 13-17, 25-26.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

not be undertaken. Even if nuclear weapons were so used, China would still require very large forces for an extended period to consolidate its gains, and the stringent logistic limitations governing Chinese operations would probably prohibit this.

Thus, it appears that a nuclear capability, under any likely circumstance, would not provide a decisive military advantage to China in an invasion of India or Pakistan.

Yet another situation would exist if India and Pakistan were at war with each other, and the CPR intervened on behalf of one party (presumably Pakistan). Neither India nor Pakistan appears capable of defeating the other under present circumstances. Presumably, open warfare between these two states would be preceded by extensive mobilization on both sides. Whether the increment of force which the Chinese could then provide--either in terms of additional conventional forces or in terms of an initial nuclear assist--would be a decisive advantage to its ally is problematical in a situation with so many unpredictables. However, CPR intervention in such a situation, and particularly CPR use of nuclear weapons, should be deterrable. China cannot afford to dissipate its limited nuclear stocks on a third country, nor even become heavily committed in the West, while facing a major threat by US forces from the East, including the threat of nuclear reprisal for Chinese initiation of nuclear operations.

~~SECRET~~

BURMA, LAOS, AND CAMBODIA

The Communists now have the ability to conquer these countries at will. The primary problem facing the Communists in connection with any military ambitions they may have with regard to these nations is to keep the level of hostilities low enough to preclude a US decision to intervene militarily, and particularly to preclude a US decision to counter Communist aggression by direct attack on China or North Vietnam. The existence of a CPR nuclear capability will affect this situation only if it causes the United States to exercise greater restraint in committing military forces, and thus permits the Communists to use force more openly and at a somewhat higher level of intensity.

SUBVERSION AND INSURGENCY

China has the capability of instigating and supporting extensive and widespread insurgency and guerrilla activity (including isolated actions by organized or irregular forces) in all nearby areas and to a lesser degree, elsewhere in Asia, including Indonesia. With the passage of time the political environment in Korea, Pakistan, and possibly the Philippines may deteriorate to an extent that would permit low-grade Communist aggression. This Communist capability will not be directly enhanced by a Chinese nuclear capability, although (as discussed

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

in Chapter II)¹⁴ political exploitation of China's nuclear accomplishments may assist the CPR in preparing the climate for low-grade aggression.

The following effects on US and allied military operations to counter insurgency or guerrilla operations are possible, but unlikely:

1) In all threatened areas there is a scarcity of ports, airfields, and communications and support facilities. The concentration of US resources (whether forces committed to the scene, or merely materiel and other support for indigenous forces) can create vulnerabilities inviting Communist Chinese nuclear attack. Such an attack would of course end the "insurgency" phase and introduce open warfare.

2) Unless the will and character of the threatened government is strong, it is conceivable that Communist Chinese nuclear blackmail, if coupled with suitable blandishments, might lead to a capitulation (or "accommodation") by the supported government, at the expense of any US forces already committed to the scene.

The only likely danger attributable to a Chinese nuclear capability, however, is an increase in the level of provocation that would cause the US to intervene with military forces. This political restraint can have serious military implications. The United States is unlikely to be swayed in making an early decision to

14. See above, pp. 9-27.

~~SECRET~~

assist such staunch allies as Korea and the Philippines, but a decision for US military intervention in less crucial areas may well be delayed by extensive efforts to find a nonmilitary solution. Further, countries such as Thailand and Malaya, may procrastinate in seeking the assistance of Western powers when there is a chance that such aid might result in nuclear operations on their territories. The military situation may thus have deteriorated significantly before US forces are committed or other significant assistance is provided to the threatened nation.

OVER-ALL ASSESSMENT

While the use of nuclear weapons might be locally advantageous to the Chinese under special circumstances, major gain from a locally effective nuclear capability will accrue to the CPR only through the existence of an unused capability. Its existence will discourage any attempt to invade the Chinese mainland. It will make extremely hazardous, and probably preclude, large-scale US airborne or amphibious operations. It may impede and delay US-allied operations in response to Communist-initiated hostilities.

Communist China's strength will remain in her ground forces and it will be clearly advantageous to her to create situations in which that asset can be exploited. China's real interest therefore must be to avoid a direct US-CPR confrontation if

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

possible, but if a confrontation should nevertheless occur, then to forestall US employment of its nuclear superiority. At lower ranges of the spectrum of warfare China may succeed in preventing any US military intervention whatever. At upper ranges of the spectrum China's nuclear capability, carrying with it increased risk of an escalation uncontrolled by the United States, is likely to induce greater caution on the part of the United States, and thus enable China to succeed in preventing US initiation of nuclear operations in circumstances which the United States might otherwise consider to require such weapons.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

CHAPTER VI

DETERRENCE OF COMMUNIST CHINA

The acquisition of a nuclear capability by the People's Republic of China [CPR] will create a period of increased military risk for the United States and its allies in the Far East. Some risks will be new; primarily, however, there will be an intensification of risks already existing. An aggressive, expansionist, nuclear-capable CPR will be less subject to external restraints, more likely to miscalculate its military capabilities and the will and capabilities of the United States, and will have somewhat more independence of decision in matters which may lead to military action.

The most certain restraint on Communist Chinese military action, and the surest way to cause a correct calculation of the price required for military aggression, will be the maintenance of a military posture by the Free World, and particularly by the United States, adequate to insure a proper CPR assessment of risks--risks which are at least as great as those facing the United States and its allies.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

COMMUNIST RISKS

Increased risks for the United States and its allies stemming from a Chinese nuclear capability have been considered in preceding chapters of this study. Just as real, though less apparent, will be the increase in risks for the Chinese--although these may not be initially evident to the Chinese.

The United States will remain far superior to the CPR in nuclear weapons and delivery capabilities and will retain other major military advantages over China. These advantages need not necessarily go unused. If the United States should face significantly increased military difficulties in local hostilities, an incentive would be created for the United States to carry out operations directly against sources of the aggression, and the latter are highly vulnerable to nuclear attack. If a situation should arise requiring intervention by major US forces in Asia, a preemptive attack on CPR delivery forces would be the most certain way to eliminate the risk of Chinese first use. The risk of general war is a two-edged sword and is as uninviting to the Soviets as to the United States. China will be continuously faced, therefore, with the strong likelihood that full Soviet support will not be forthcoming when it is most needed.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

DETERRENCE OF LOCAL AGGRESSION

General

Deterrence of local aggression depends on a military capability which will cause the Chinese to estimate either that the local aggression is not likely to be successful, or that other dire consequences more than offsetting possible local victory may ensue. In either case, the threat of use of the military capability must be credible.

Military Capabilities to Oppose Local Aggression

Operations within a local area to counter local aggression by a nuclear-capable CPR depend first upon the ability of the United States to reinforce a threatened ally at a rate faster than the Communists can build up their forces. Unless the United States should decide to initiate nuclear operations, success in local operations will also be heavily dependent on deterrence of Chinese first use and on minimizing advantages that would accrue locally to the Chinese through their first use of nuclear weapons.

Total US force availability does not appear to be a problem in this regard now or prospectively, unless one assumes that two or more local wars requiring major US intervention are under way simultaneously. If consideration is limited to Asia, such an assumption would appear to have little validity inasmuch as the limited CPR ability to project power beyond its own borders would

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

make a two-front war even more uninviting to China than to the United States.

Specific capabilities to permit effective local US military operations, and present and prospective deficiencies in this regard, involve at least these major factors:

1) Rapidity of US military intervention will become even more essential than now, not only to defend allied territory successfully, but also to control escalation. Additional highly mobile, immediately available forces and transport in the Pacific Command may not be essential, but would at least be highly desirable. More importantly, the rate of reinforcement in likely areas of local war is now severely curtailed through inadequacies in ports and airfields. These deficiencies should be ameliorated as a matter of high priority.

2) Indigenous forces must be able, with the assistance of those US forces which can be immediately brought into action, to retard a hostile advance long enough to permit the deployment of additional US forces adequate to repel the invasion. A major deficiency in this regard may arise in the case of Thailand which, if Laos should become a Communist base, would be highly vulnerable to major attack.

3) The United States and its allies must be clearly able to continue to fight in a bilateral nuclear environment, either locally or on a broader basis, even if the CPR is given the advantage of first use of nuclear weapons. This requires the maximum

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

practical reduction in vulnerability of committed forces and particularly in the vulnerability of supporting logistic facilities; in a broader sense, it requires the capability to carry the war to the heart of China if that should be required.

4) Where strong inducements can be foreseen on both sides to use nuclear weapons (particularly in Korea and Taiwan), US military forces must be prepared to exploit their nuclear capability. This requires first the military capability and a suitable political basis to permit the United States to initiate nuclear operations if it should choose to do so. It requires also that the forces of the United States and its allies be prepared to operate effectively if the Chinese use nuclear weapons, whether on Chinese initiative or in response to US use. The present situation with regard to tactical mobility, dispersion of bases, air defenses, and logistic vulnerability in the two critical areas is inadequate in this respect. These inadequacies, which are clear to a sophisticated opponent, are now probably sufficient to warrant a conclusion by the Communists that the United States cannot fight a bilateral nuclear war, and hence will not employ nuclear weapons locally to oppose aggression by a nuclear-armed power.

US Will to Employ its Military Capability

The United States clearly has the capability to contest any Chinese aggression, and--considering military power solely--the

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

capability to defeat, one way if not another, any open Chinese attack. Communist estimates, however, of US determination to use this capability if required, will be based largely upon US actions prior to the achievement of a locally effective Communist Chinese nuclear capability. If the United States has earlier failed to support an Asian ally effectively, the CPR leadership may well estimate that the United States will not, except for issues of the gravest concern to the United States, involve itself in military operations against forces supported by a nuclear-capable CPR. The United States already has appeared reluctant to commit forces for the defense of Laos and (until recently) South Vietnam, in spite of its regional nuclear monopoly; its willingness to intervene when it has lost that monopoly locally may appear to Asians to be highly doubtful. The open reluctance of European nations to agree to any Western military action in Asia will be assessed by the CPR as a further brake on US military support of its Asian allies. Thus the credibility of US will to oppose local aggression may well be reduced by the acquisition of a nuclear capability by the CPR.

Nuclear Sharing

A nuclear capability, actual or potential, in the hands of selected Asian allies, might serve as a deterrent to local aggression by a nuclear-armed China.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

A rudimentary potential nuclear capability now exists for certain allies, and will be increased in the future, in the form of dual-capable air defense and ground force weapons. A potential offensive nuclear capability also theoretically now exists in the Nationalist Chinese Air Force, through the provision of a low altitude bombing [LAB] capability in its F-86s; this offensive potential does not in fact exist, however, because of the incompatibility of the airplane with weapons available in the Pacific Command, absence of special weapons wiring and black boxes in the airplane, and the lack of maintenance and test equipment for the LAB installation. The Chinese Nationalists have, however, been practicing LAB maneuvers. Observation of this training, plus the knowledge that the United States has nuclear weapons and nuclear specialists on Taiwan, must lead the Communist Chinese to estimate that, if the Chinese Nationalists do not now have an offensive nuclear capability, the United States intends at some point in time to provide one. These past actions to provide a rudimentary potential nuclear capability to Asian allies have caused no significant Communist reaction.

It appears from previous analysis that any military requirement for a nuclear capability in allied forces in Asia would not exceed:

- 1) A small but relatively invulnerable offensive capability for Nationalist China and possibly South Korea, as a hedge against

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

the contingency of diversion of US strength from the immediate area, resulting in a Communist conclusion that a quick conquest might then be possible; and to offer a credible threat of a nuclear defense in areas where it would be politically difficult and probably impossible for the United States to use nuclear weapons-- specifically, the offshore islands.

2) An air defense capability against a Chinese air-delivered threat, particularly in Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines.

If the Chinese air delivery capability should significantly exceed that listed in Appendix A,¹ or if for some now unforeseen reason US deployments to the Western Pacific should be greatly reduced, there could be strong military reason for providing a valid potential nuclear capability to some Asian allies. If the future military situation develops as now foreseen, however, there appears to be no overriding military requirement to do this. A decision to provide or withhold a nuclear capability for Asian allies should accordingly be made essentially on political grounds.

REGIONAL DETERRENCE

Control of the scope and intensity of local operations can best be achieved by a military capability which insures that an

1. See below, p. 147.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

expansion² or escalation of hostilities beyond limits openly or tacitly set by the United States will incur punishment far transcending the possible rewards of success in the local operations. This requires deterrence that is regional in its scope.

Regional deterrence--that is, the placing of all of Communist China in the position of a hostage--can deter major overt military aggression by the CPR, and can reduce the risk of CPR escalation of local hostilities. As pointed out above, it is crucial in any situation in which the United States denies itself first use of nuclear weapons.

The Regional Deterrent Force

Concept. Inasmuch as the destruction of Chinese capabilities to wage war requires no more than perhaps one hundred or so delivered weapons, it is evident that this task could be carried out either by US strategic forces or by US forces assigned to the Pacific Command [PACOM].

Highly effective and relatively invulnerable US strategic forces are and will be needed in any event to restrain the Soviet Union. Operations against China would not significantly reduce their total capabilities against the Soviet Union.

2. Including expansion through CPR intervention in a local war not initially involving the Communist bloc.

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

PACOM forces now assigned and prospectively available are of adequate size to carry out the offensive strikes required in a regional war with China. These forces also are and will be required to signify publicly the US commitment to the defense of its Asian allies, to bolster their resistance, and to permit immediate response in local hostilities. Further, these forces will need to be made progressively less vulnerable to Soviet attack and this improvement will in turn make them somewhat less vulnerable to Chinese pre-emptive attack.

Thus the regional deterrent force of the United States, as regards military capability, could be either strategic or theater forces. It is to the advantage of the United States, however, primarily in the political sense, to design and discreetly advertise its forces in the PACOM as a specific counterforce for the CPR.³ This judgment is offered in light of the following considerations:

1) One key to minimizing the risk of general war is a clear understanding by both the Soviet Union and the CPR that they are considered by the United States to be wholly separate entities. If the United States should indicate that it considers the two

3. It might be considered that the situations in NATO and the Far East are analogous, and that arguments for and against a NATO regional deterrent apply also to a wholly American regional deterrent in the Pacific-Far East area. This is not regarded as a valid extrapolation. See Appendix G, below, pp. 211-17.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

powers to be militarily inseparable, so that an attack on China would have to be considered by the Soviet Union a prelude to attack on itself, then attack on China would almost certainly invoke immediate Soviet response against the United States. The United States must, therefore, as an essential step in minimizing the risk of general war, insure a clear realization on the Communist side that the United States considers the Communist military threat to be separable. The design and publicizing of a counter-CPR force, separate and apart from strategic forces specifically designed and long publicized as an instrument for destruction of the Soviet Union, would assist in making this distinction obvious. The existence of such a force, clearly adequate to devastate China but offering little if any increased threat to the Soviet Union (but also not significantly diminishing the deterrent threat to the Soviet Union), should make clear to the Soviets that a US-CPR war need not and should not involve the USSR. Such a capability, if properly and, to the extent practicable, inflexibly deployed against Communist China, could not be mistaken by the USSR as directed against, or seriously threatening, itself. There could be no question concerning a dilution of the US nuclear threat against the USSR. In a situation requiring US nuclear attack against the CPR, the USSR might be able to conclude prudently that its own destruction in an exchange with the United States was not indicated, and thus might well avoid the ultimate escalation.

~~SECRET~~

2) The chance of CPR miscalculation would be minimized if the Chinese clearly understand that the nuclear offensive forces immediately facing them are designed and intended as a counter-China force. The Communist Chinese are likely to estimate that diversion of long-range strike forces against China would substantially impair US capability against the Soviet Union; they might well consider, therefore, that this force must be reserved for use against the USSR. They should be given no opportunity to act on an underestimation of the power and capabilities of US long-range striking forces to which they have not been exposed, which they cannot see, and which they may understand only imperfectly.

3) If nuclear operations against targets in mainland China should be required, the use of PACOM forces would avoid the significant disadvantages inherent in the use of the United States as a base for nuclear offensive operations. If the United States were to respond to aggression by means of a nuclear attack on China, and if this attack were launched primarily from the United States, Communist counteraction would require Soviet attack on the United States, since only thus could further US operations be impeded. A decision to carry the war into China would thus be made politically more difficult for the United States. This difficulty, which would be clearly recognized by the Communists, would materially weaken the deterrent effect.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

4) In the absence of an adequate Pacific-based US deterrent, nuclear escalation by the CPR of local hostilities would require the United States to decide whether to accept local defeat, or alternatively to invoke its long-range strategic strike capability with the possibility of triggering a Soviet first strike against the United States, perhaps partly on the basis of a calculation that the US long-range nuclear strike capability has been diluted, and (especially if these Soviet forces remain vulnerable) partly in the belief that subsequent attack on the USSR is intended. It is far from certain that the United States would decide, in such circumstances, to escalate hostilities to this degree as an alternative to local defeat. The circumstances would be sharply changed by the provision of PACOM forces visibly adapted to the specific task of retaliation against Communist China.

5) The existence of a visible, Pacific-based, US capability to destroy China's ability to wage war would appear to be an important element in bolstering US allies who may well doubt the reliability of depending for their ultimate defense on a US decision to invoke its long-range nuclear strike force.

6) Finally, a Pacific-based US deterrent force aimed specifically at the CPR would develop important political and psychological advantages, in that it could hardly fail to corrode and divide the Sino-Soviet military alliance.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

The regional deterrent effort by the United States need not be completely successful to be worthwhile. Chinese initiatives will, in any event, be subject to restraint to the extent that the Chinese suspect that the Soviets may not support them. Moreover, a US regional deterrent force will encourage and tempt the Soviets to defect; even though they may not entirely disassociate themselves from the Chinese, the support they provide for any specific action may well be reduced.

No major reconfiguration of PACOM forces as now programmed will be required to tailor them to satisfy the requirement of a specific counter to a nuclear-armed CPR. Reasonable modernization will be necessary to keep ahead of the Communists in weaponry. Sea-based forces will be an important component because of their invulnerability to Chinese attack. Vulnerability of land-based forces and of command and control systems should be progressively reduced so as to provide with certainty a capability for controlled but delayed response. These preparations must be of a nature to permit participation of these forces in extensive non-nuclear, local hostilities without creating vulnerabilities to a surprise pre-emptive Chinese nuclear attack. Of crucial importance, however, is the conscious although discreet construction of an adequate political and psychological basis to permit these forces to be effective in a deterrent and divisive role.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

A good case can be made politically for the design of PACOM nuclear offensive strike forces inflexibly poised to devastate China but offering no threat to the USSR. To some degree the facts of geography will achieve this result. PACOM forces are, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, limited in any event to operations in Eastern Siberia, far removed from the more critical Soviet military, industrial, and population centers. Terrain and political restrictions will necessarily require that land-based offensive weapons be based largely on Okinawa and southward. Practically, however, the ultimate in divisive effect of these forces cannot be attained within reasonable economic limits, nor is it desirable that these forces be unable to respond rapidly to local crises requiring redeployment. Further, the deterrent posture should rely heavily on sea-based forces, which are practically immune to Chinese surprise attack and which minimize Asian sensitivities to the presence of nuclear armament, but whose mobility suggests the ability to attack Soviet as well as Chinese targets.

It should nonetheless be entirely possible to make it obvious both to the Communists and to our allies that the primary attention of these forces is devoted to the People's Republic of China. In addition to any public statements or similar verbal indications that may be made, many military indications to this effect can be created. Command post /CPX/ and other exercises involving the

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

exclusive use of PACOM forces against China, the elimination or minimization of PACOM play in at least some world-wide (general war) CPXs, the publicized presence in more southerly Pacific waters and ports of Polaris submarines and ship-based medium-range ballistic missiles, and similar devices can make this point clear. To be effective, indicators of this type must, of course, be backed by the reality of assignment of mainland China targets as a high priority to PACOM strike forces.

Characteristics. The regional deterrent force should meet the following criteria:

1) It must remain adequate to destroy the essential war-making capability of the CPR without detriment to the general war posture of the United States.

2) It must not materially increase the threat to the USSR. US forces in the Pacific, while basically adequate for a regional war with China, provide only a marginal increase in the total US capability against the USSR. If the regional deterrent force is clearly designed for and considered to be a counter to CPR aggression, it can be used for that purpose with far less risk of bringing on general war than if it were considered, by both the United States and the Communists, as an inseparable, important segment of the US threat to the USSR.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

3) The force must have relative invulnerability, be responsive to control at the highest level after the onset of hostilities, and avoid a "hair trigger" posture. This requires the discreetly publicized presence of concealed weapons, the hardening and dispersal of land-based strike forces, the survivability (through hardening and redundancy) of command and control facilities, and--so long as the Chinese retain a significant bomber threat--the maintenance of effective air defenses for these forces. Any lesser posture will invite attack whenever the Chinese believe they can destroy the local capability of the United States to retaliate effectively.

4) The regional deterrent force should be reinforced in times of local crisis in the Far East. Local hostilities in the Far East will create a strong temptation, whenever the United States and its allies enjoy military success, for the Chinese to expand the scale or area of hostilities. Further, a local crisis will almost surely cause movements and redeployments of forces now in the Far East, focusing on the area of local hostilities. Thus, unless conscious preventive action is taken, the regional deterrent posture is likely to be degraded at the very time when it needs to be strongest.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

CHAPTER VII

VARIATIONS

The preceding analysis has been based on the assumption that the development of a Chinese nuclear capability will proceed, within the present Sino-Soviet political framework, along the general lines, and in the approximate scale and time frame, stated in Appendix A.¹ Certain alternative political and technological courses of action are possible, however, which may affect the military situation in the Far East.

SINO-SOVIET RELATIONS

Implicit in the body of this paper is the assumption that relations between the People's Republic of China [CPR] and the Soviet Union remain about as they are at present; that is, strains exist while the coalition persists. This is regarded not only as the most likely situation in fact, but also as the contingency most complex in its military aspects.

So long as the USSR-CPR alliance remains in effect, however strained Sino-Soviet relations may be, the Communist Chinese will have considerable independence of decision, and may also be able

1. See below, p. 147.

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

~~SECRET~~

to "blackmail" the Soviets by threatening to use nuclear weapons in an aggression unless given Soviet support and conventional military aid. The Chinese may therefore be able to induce the Soviets to agree to adventures that the latter would, if firmly in charge, be inclined to veto. The Chinese should thus be in a position to extract military and economic assistance from the Communist bloc hardly available to them in the event of a rupture in relations with the Soviet Union.

A violent rupture of Sino-Soviet relations like that between Stalin and Tito, which must be regarded as a possibility, would leave the CPR isolated from major sources of military aid and economic support, thus probably moderating the rate of her progress toward industrialization and improvement of conventional military forces, and depriving her of any expectation of support for Chinese aggression. While such withdrawal should have little effect on China's progress toward nuclear-weapons capabilities, progress in delivery vehicles would probably be materially delayed. China also would need to divert major military effort and resources to secure herself from Soviet attack. Military measures taken by the United States to cope with a CPR emerging as a nuclear power, under circumstances of strain in her relations with the Soviet Union, appear certain to be fully adequate to deal with the CPR in the situation of a real break in Sino-Soviet relations.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

There remains the possibility that Moscow might establish rigid control over bloc policy and action, including the policy and action of the CPR. In that case, the United States and its allies would continue to face the familiar Soviet threat, enhanced by a considerable addition of territory and a modest addition of resources, but diminished by a reduction in complexity. The combined USSR-CPR military resources would not be significantly increased, although flexibility and coordination in their use might be appreciably enhanced. Thus, in this event, which must be regarded as quite unlikely during the time frame of this paper,² some of the military actions suggested might profitably be amended. The necessity would remain, for example, to deal with local wars and guerrilla wars in the Far East, but restraint of major aggression would be imposed by threat of attack on the Soviet Union. A regional deterrent force would lose its significance as a divisive influence on Sino-Soviet relations, but would remain useful as a threat to war-making capabilities within the Communist Chinese sector of the bloc.

It is not inconceivable that China and the Soviet Union might draw closer together (with a relationship roughly similar to that of the United States and the United Kingdom), but to a degree short of total Soviet control. This circumstance could only exist if China significantly moderates its actions and policies, and accepts

2. From the present to c. 1972. See above, p. 1.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

over-all Soviet leadership within and outside the bloc. In these circumstances, it must be assumed that the Soviet Union would be fully committed to support any military action undertaken by the Chinese and that there would thus be somewhat greater likelihood of Soviet use, or threatened use, of its nuclear capabilities when necessary to succor China. A US regional deterrent force might therefore in these circumstances be somewhat less effective. It should still be a worthwhile effort, however, both for whatever direct deterrent value it might have and also as a divisive factor between China and the Soviet Union. Whatever effectiveness the US regional deterrent posture might lose would be more than offset by the increased ability, and desire, of the Soviet Union to restrain Chinese opportunism.

It is conceivable, further, that such an adjustment in Sino-Soviet relations might result in significant Soviet assistance to the Chinese in their nuclear development program. Real acceleration in this program, however, can be achieved only if the Soviet Union provides finished articles (warheads or delivery vehicles) to the Chinese. This is not believed to be a real possibility; the Soviet Union is most unlikely to create a nuclear threat on its periphery that might eventually be used against itself. The Soviets are thus most unlikely to furnish such systems in response to a possibly transitory Chinese accommodation; they must insist on certain and complete Soviet control. A relaxation of Sino-Soviet

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

CLASS

strain is therefore not likely significantly to accelerate Chinese nuclear progress.

ACCELERATED NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND DELIVERY VEHICLE DEVELOPMENT

Possible variations in Chinese Communist nuclear weapons development and delivery vehicle programs are discussed in another PACIFICA paper, ³ in which it is assumed that little or no further direct Soviet aid will be forthcoming for either the delivery-vehicle or nuclear-weapons programs. Current intelligence estimates are compatible with this assumption.

In the event that Soviet assistance were substantial, advanced Chinese capabilities would be achieved at an earlier date. Unless the Soviets provide fissionable materials outright in large quantities, however, the Chinese stockpile will be a serious limiting factor at least until 1968-69. Because there appears to be little likelihood that the Soviets will give the Chinese a serious capability to attack the heart of the USSR, the improved Chinese capabilities would probably be regional, consisting of medium jet bombers, medium-range ballistic missiles (MRBMs), and thermonuclear warheads. The acquisition of these vehicles earlier than the Chinese could achieve them by their own efforts, would probably have the net effect of moving the regional threat up in time by as much as two to three years.

3. Donald B. Keesing, The Communist Chinese Nuclear Threat: Warheads and Delivery Vehicles (U), SECRET-RESTRICTED DATA, ISD Study Memorandum No. 17 (IDA, Washington, D.C.).

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

The first date for a deliverable Chinese thermonuclear weapon is subject to a wide range of uncertainty. Given good intelligence or some luck with design ideas, the Chinese, after testing their first nuclear device in 1963 or 1964, might attain a thermonuclear missile warhead as early as 1967. Some observers, however, consider that this may not come about until three years later. The date of thermonuclear acquisition is significant because the Chinese are expected to increase their fission yields only slowly, within the 20- to 50-kiloton range for deliverable weapons, until the advent of a thermonuclear weapon.

It is possible that the initial Chinese test operation will involve a series of detonations, either within the time span now estimated for the initial detonation or somewhat later. Such a series might or might not be evidence of a full-blown local nuclear capability from the outset; it would almost certainly be advertised as such by the Chinese. This sudden emergence of the People's Republic of China as a nuclear power with an operational capability (whether real or notional) would intensify the shock effect of the initial detonation and would thus enhance the CPR opportunity to obtain political and psychological advantage from its initial test.

AN EARLY CPR DETERRENT STRATEGY

Another course open to the Communist Chinese would be to concentrate their resources and efforts upon the early acquisition of

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

a nuclear threat against the continental United States, and to rely on this force for indirect defense against nearby US forces. Starting with the early Chinese nuclear devices, there could be very limited Chinese capabilities for delivery against the United States, especially the Pacific Coast, by submarine, surface ship, and clandestine means, and against Alaska and Hawaii by the above means plus a one-way sneak attack using medium bombers (Bulls). Any such capabilities will be inadequate to threaten major destruction in the United States, and the chance that the CPR might use them in the face of the threat of much greater retaliation would appear remote.

A more serious threat to the continental United States could be made (assuming a rapid recovery from the present economic crisis) by combining a relatively massive program of fissionable materials production (once the processes are established) with an early breakthrough in the thermonuclear field, and relying on the large-scale production of a relatively cheap cruise missile designed to reach the United States. An early cruise missile would probably have such poor accuracy as to require reliance entirely on high yields and fallout, but it would be a low-cost item with few design problems. The earliest date on which the cruise missile and thermonuclear warhead combination could be assembled in quantity would probably be 1967 or 1968, and then only at considerable cost in deferred ballistic missile opportunities. The obvious

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

inadequacies of such a weapon, and its lack of growth potential, must make this an unattractive course for the Chinese unless the alternative development, that of the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), would result in an extended delay.

As another alternative, the Chinese might concentrate on an intercontinental ballistic missile program at the expense of shorter-term capabilities. In this case, the first Chinese ICBMs could be tested as early as 1969. An initial operating capability would then be likely by 1970 or 1971, and a sizable ICBM force could be deployed by 1973 or 1974.

IMPLICATIONS

No significant disadvantage to the United States is perceived in any of the likely variations discussed above. Any major change in Sino-Soviet relations will either delay and reduce Chinese capabilities at one extreme (in the event of a complete rift), or, at the other, simplify the political and strategic problem by substituting one potential enemy for two (by creating in effect a single power--in the event of near-complete rapprochement) with no appreciably greater total capability than the sum of the two components taken separately. While the Chinese may be able to accelerate their nuclear program in advance of that envisaged in Appendix A⁴ by one, two, or possibly three years, there will still be time for the

4. See below, p. 147.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

United States to complete any significant countermeasures that may be required. Concentration upon acquiring an early, crude intercontinental capability would not permit the Chinese independently to cause great destruction in the United States, and would appreciably delay the Chinese in obtaining more meaningful military weapons.

More likely variations imply delays and increased difficulties in Chinese progress toward achieving a nuclear capability.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

CHAPTER VIII

LONGER-TERM IMPLICATIONS¹

CHINA AS A CLASS B NUCLEAR POWER

The possession of one hundred--or even of several hundred--thermonuclear-armed intercontinental vehicles will not necessarily make China a Class A nuclear power. To have Class A power, as a matter of political reality, China must be believed to have achieved the ability, in a retaliatory strike, to deliver an effective blow against all nuclear powers likely to combine in a hostile coalition. This means that the CPR will require a very substantial long-range capability that credibly can survive the first strike of all or most of the other nuclear powers.

A significant first strike or other partially effective intercontinental capability, say one hundred missiles, would make China what might be called a Class B nuclear power. Under most circumstances such a Chinese capability would increase restraints on either of the two greater powers against undertaking actions

1. This chapter parallels Chapter V, section on Military Aspects, of the Study PACIFICA final report, The Emergence of Communist China As A Nuclear Power (U), SECRET-RESTRICTED DATA, ISD Study Report Two (IDA, Washington, D.C., 1962).

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

so menacing as to threaten the integrity of China or the survival of the Chinese Communist regime. Restraints on American actions, however, should not be great in practice, because the United States appears unlikely to pursue any objective in relation to China that might charge the Chinese threat with reality. A Class B capability would also improve China's ability to operate under its own nuclear cover, affording it greater freedom of military action, but placing increased strain on the Soviet Union and hence on the Sino-Soviet alliance.

An even greater strain on the Soviet alliance will result from the fact that long-range capabilities against the Soviet Union would be available as an automatic by-product of emplacing such forces against the United States. The Soviet Union could be expected to view the creation of Chinese nuclear offensive forces capable of bringing the entire USSR under threat with extreme unease.

Possession of a Class B capability would place the CPR in an inherently dangerous position. Unless the CPR succeeds in concealing delivery vehicles to an extent that would prevent targeting by either the United States or the Soviet Union, its forces are almost certain to be highly vulnerable and, because they constitute essentially a first strike capability, will invite preemptive attack by a stronger power.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

If for no other reason than this, China may well feel obliged during this period to avoid giving serious provocation to either the United States or the Soviet Union.

Because of the danger of a pre-emption, and because any major use of forces against Communist China must of necessity aim first at destroying its nuclear capabilities, the Chinese can be expected to work in great secrecy, creating stringent requirements for US reconnaissance capabilities. But despite efforts at concealment during the transitional period from regional to Class A nuclear power, China can never be certain of substantial invulnerability to a hostile first strike.

Vulnerability could result in a "hair trigger" Chinese posture materially increasing the likelihood of an ill-conceived launching of the Chinese intercontinental force. Besides inflicting severe damage upon US civilian assets and population, a Chinese first strike might also degrade US strategic capabilities to such a degree as to dangerously weaken the United States relative to Soviet strategic forces.

If the Chinese overestimate the cover their threat affords to local operations endangering the vital interests of the United States, a situation of great danger would ensue. This danger would of course be bilateral, but it would be particularly acute for China, and every effort should be made to assure that China accurately assesses her risks.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

During the period when China possesses only small and vulnerable intercontinental striking forces, the basic arrangements already discussed in relation to US regional military problems will remain valid--particularly actions designed to divide the nuclear strength of the Soviet Union and China. The requirement for selective and deliberate direction of US nuclear forces will continue. As China increases its strategic strength, however, operations against China may have to become increasingly dependent on American long-range striking forces.

CHINA AS A CLASS A NUCLEAR POWER

China will not be able to attain Class A nuclear status until she has acquired a fully developed modern economic and industrial base. This will not occur for at least a decade, and probably several decades. But in the meantime, the technology and military capabilities of the United States and the Soviet Union will not remain static. In addition to improved nuclear capabilities, it is entirely possible that scientific and technological developments by these two powers may have rendered intercontinental nuclear attack outmoded as the primary strategic factor by developments in defense against nuclear attack, by military uses of space, or in consequence of concepts and weapons now quite unforeseeable. In the economic and industrial fields, even rapid growth may be insufficient to permit China to approach parity with the

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

most advanced countries. Finally, intervening events, including wars or arms control measures, could foreclose the possibility of Chinese acquisition of Class A nuclear status.

It is far from certain, therefore, that China will in fact ever approach parity in weaponry with the United States or the Soviet Union. Certainly, if China does so, the process will take a very long time and parity will be attained in an era now unpredictable in its political, military, and technological aspects. But for the purpose of further discussion, it is assumed that China does at some indefinite time in the future attain Class A nuclear capabilities, not outmoded by scientific and technological developments elsewhere.

Once China places the United States under a major second strike nuclear threat, the US deterrent requirement will change. First, inasmuch as a nuclear exchange with China will involve attack on the United States, there will be no special deterrent value in limiting the threat of US nuclear attack against China to forces based in the Far East, or elsewhere outside the United States. Second, the United States could not afford to plan to engage in a thermonuclear exchange with only one of two hostile superpowers, leaving the other relatively undamaged and in a position to achieve world domination. An attack on the United States by either must therefore be expected to cause US response against both, regardless of what use might be made of American

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

strike forces in the actual event. Prior indication of this intention should minimize any inducement for either China or the Soviet Union to play the game of "Let's you two fight."

US forces in the vicinity of China will retain value, other than for general war purposes, to the extent that a requirement exists to fight actions of a localized or limited nature well below the point of an intercontinental exchange.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSIONS

The more general military implications of the emergence of Communist China as a nuclear power can be summed up as follows:

1) A Communist Chinese nuclear capability will increase risks --for the United States and its allies, that China will escalate hostilities to the point of initiating nuclear operations; for China, that it may misread relative strengths and thus overplay its hand, and that the vulnerability of its nuclear forces may invite US counterforce operations; for the Soviet Union, that it will be subject to increased Chinese pressures and might in some measure be implicated through Chinese initiatives in Sino-American hostilities. These risks will increase as Chinese nuclear capabilities grow.

2) A military advantage for the People's Republic of China [CPR] will result primarily from restraints on US military intervention at the lower levels, and increased US reluctance to exploit its nuclear capability at the higher levels of hostilities. The Chinese may obtain an advantage from the actual use of nuclear weapons only in special, less likely, circumstances. Nevertheless,

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

the existence of this capability will require precautionary measures by the United States and its allies.

* * *

More specific implications are:

3) The CPR nuclear weapons program, and particularly the initial detonation, will create political and psychological influences that could materially weaken the military position of the United States and its allies in Asia. While serious adverse reactions are not necessarily inevitable, they are of such potential significance as to require planned and timely US preventive action to reassure the allies of the United States and strengthen their resolution and to discourage the Communists.

4) Any CPR nuclear capability will diminish whatever freedom to decide whether military operations will be nuclear or non-nuclear the United States now enjoys, as well as its present unilateral ability to enforce ground rules for any local hostilities by posing a major nuclear threat. The Chinese capability will:

- a) Permit the CPR to escalate hostilities, in area and intensity, if it should choose to do so.
- b) Decrease foreign political and military support for US military actions in Asia.
- c) Tend to delay and restrain US military intervention, particularly in situations not of vital, immediate importance to the US.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

d) Give the Chinese commensurably more latitude for aggressive action without incurring direct US opposition.

e) Increase the likelihood of bilateral nuclear operations in any local war situation that involves major organized CPR and US forces.

f) Permit the Chinese to make a pre-emptive strike against the forces of the United States and its allies in the Far East, or, under favorable circumstances, to gain a decisive local advantage in hostilities initially non-nuclear in character.

5) A highly significant military advantage that will accrue to the CPR from its nuclear capability will be the additional reluctance of the United States to initiate nuclear operations, which will give China commensurably greater freedom to exploit her superior ground force capability.

6) Chinese capabilities to conduct first strike nuclear operations will create a strong likelihood that hostilities in certain areas (particularly Korea and Taiwan) will be nuclear. This circumstance will require: first, the creation of a basic military environment in these areas that will permit prompt and effective US and allied operations in a nuclear war; second, the reduction of political and psychological disadvantages that may result from a US decision to initiate nuclear operations; and finally, the maximum practical reduction of present vulnerabilities of US and allied forces in these areas to nuclear attack.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

7) These advantages for the Chinese from their new ability to escalate local hostilities in Asia can be minimized by measures to deter such escalation at the higher levels, and by a US reaction capability sufficiently rapid and of adequate weight to make Chinese escalation of lesser hostilities unattractive and ineffective.

8) A deterrent force designed specifically as a counter to the CPR can generally deter overt aggression by the CPR; permit the United States to impose ground rules, within limits, if aggression occurs; and minimize the risk of escalation uncontrolled by the United States--including escalation to the general war level--while serving as a corrosive influence on the Sino-Soviet alliance and as a fortifier for Asian allies of the United States.

This US deterrent force should consist of the nuclear offensive forces assigned to the Pacific Command, modernized as necessary, and provided with a high degree of survivability that is not dependent upon fast reaction. It should be reinforced in times of crisis, in large part uncommitted to local operations, clearly sufficient to destroy China's ability to wage war, and obviously offering specific threat to the CPR rather than the USSR.

9) More specifically, this US deterrent force, if supported by a firm political base, will enable the United States to retain a large measure of freedom to decide whether local hostilities in Asia will be nuclear or non-nuclear in character.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

10) Although a Chinese nuclear capability may exert increased pressures on the Soviet Union to support Chinese military initiatives, a US-CPR nuclear exchange, whether in a peripheral area or against the Chinese mainland, need not of necessity result in a Soviet attack on the United States. In addition to the Soviet reluctance that will be induced by the existence and readiness of uncommitted US strategic strike forces, Soviet reprisal against the US can be further discouraged by US actions, including particularly the rapidity and effectiveness of the initial US regional action and the separation of the forces used against the CPR from those directly threatening the Soviet Union.

11) The CPR nuclear program may not follow the course now estimated, either because of Soviet assistance or because the CPR selects an alternative course of action. The more likely variations will result in delay in China's nuclear program, but some others are conceivable that might either actually increase the initial political and psychological advantages to be gained by the CPR (by reducing moderately the time available for US counteraction) or that might entail some earlier direct risk to the United States. The counteractions suggested here, if taken in time, should, however, be adequate to cope with these variations. In sum, the countermeasures suggested as being required in the near term will retain validity until and unless the CPR attains superpower status.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

SECRET

12) As China achieves a small but vulnerable intercontinental capability, dangers for both China and the United States will increase. This capability may require US counterforce operations as a prelude to any major military operation in Asia. Force vulnerability is likely to result in a hair trigger Chinese posture that could lead to an ill-conceived launching of the Chinese intercontinental force. These extraordinary risks are likely to induce substantially more cautious action by both China and the United States in any situation that might evolve into a military confrontation.

13) China may eventually possess intercontinental nuclear capabilities approaching equality with the United States and the Soviet Union, but this is far from a certainty. If such is achieved, strategic plans of the United States must promise response against both China and the Soviet Union if intercontinental war should occur. The regional deterrent posture will then lose its special effectiveness, though the forces committed to it will continue to serve usefully by providing a portion of the general deterrent to military action by the CPR.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

CHAPTER X

SUGGESTED ACTIONS

GENERAL

This chapter lists US military actions designed to deny advantages that might otherwise be gained by the People's Republic of China [CPR] as the result of its nuclear-weapons program, and to improve the military situation of the United States and its allies vis-a-vis a nuclear-capable CPR.

Examination of the military situation created by a nuclear-capable CPR reveals no single realistic countermeasure, and no satisfactory package of a few countermeasures, that would offset the CPR advantages completely, though one countermeasure (the regional deterrent) could have dramatic effect. The listing which follows is therefore lengthy. Taken together these actions should have highly significant cumulative effects. Avenues considered to be politically unacceptable or economically infeasible have been excluded. Most of the actions suggested involve little if any additional cost. The total cost involved for all the actions listed is nevertheless high, although these include many actions which would probably be necessary in any case, and total costs, of course, are dependent on the scope and phasing of the actions that

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

are adopted. But increased costs are inevitable in the increased-risk environment that will result from the emergence of the CPR as a nuclear power.

The actions suggested below are grouped for convenience into categories according to their primary purpose. This device is not intended to indicate that the purpose or effect of a specific action can be wholly catalogued under a single heading. All of the actions listed will have some general effect.

TO FORESTALL INITIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS

These measures are covered in Appendix C.¹ Those of a specifically military nature include such measures as the provision of schooling in the realities of nuclear warfare for Asian elites, and combined military planning with Asian allies.

TO BOLSTER ALLIED WILL AND CAPABILITIES

Air Defense Improvements

For at least the next several years any Chinese nuclear offensive delivery capability must to a significant extent include aircraft. Present programs envisage substantial improvements in air defense capabilities in Japan, Korea, Okinawa, and Taiwan, and these are the areas most likely to be subject to CPR nuclear attack.

1. See below, pp. 161-71.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

In addition to some improvements in the air defenses for the Philippines, rudimentary air defenses, presently US-manned and on a non-permanent basis, have been provided in Thailand and South Vietnam. All major allies should have some assurance of self-protection at least from a primitive Chinese offensive nuclear strike. If the estimate in Appendix A approximates actual Chinese progress,² present programs should suffice provided those for Thailand and South Vietnam are put on a permanent basis and manned by indigenous personnel. The United States should be prepared, however, to accelerate and enlarge current programs if subsequent events should indicate the development of a larger-scale or more sophisticated Chinese aircraft delivery capability.

Visible Presence of US Forces

Until recently, when the US reacted to Communist threats in South Vietnam and Thailand, exercises of mobile US forces (particularly those deployed from within the United States) were infrequent, of small scale, and limited in locale. Provision should be made for frequent demonstration of the mobile character of US forces, in areas not immediately threatened as well as in areas that are.

2. See below, p. 147.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

Bilateral Arrangements with Thailand

Further action may be desirable. Details are given in Appendix B.³

Improved Military Relationship with Pakistan

This also appears to be desirable. Details are given in Appendix B.⁴

TO IMPROVE THE US DETERRENT POSTURE

Establishment of an Effective Regional Deterrent Force

No single US countermeasure to CPR acquisition of nuclear weapons will be as significant as the constitution of an effective regional deterrent force, plainly capable of devastating the CPR, but posing relatively little threat to the Soviet Union. Some actions to the end of improving the survivability and responsiveness to control of what are, in effect, already elements of a US regional deterrent force are now under way or are planned. Insofar as land-based elements are concerned, however, these measures are devoted largely to insuring short-term survivability in the event of a Soviet first strike. Long-term survivability and responsiveness to control are necessary in the face of a nuclear-capable CPR.

3. See below, pp. 156-57.

4. Ibid.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

This requires additional effort in the way of hardening and concealment of forces and of command and control facilities, dispersion of logistic facilities, and possibly improvement of the air defenses for US forces and facilities.

A missile capability afloat, including both Polaris submarines and ship-based medium-range ballistic missiles /MRBMs/, is a highly desirable element of the regional deterrent force because of the comparative invulnerability of these elements to CPR attack and because political complications will be minimized by their use.

Deployment of the Field Army Ballistic Missile Defense System, or some counterpart, should be accelerated. Hardened land-based MRBMs would also make a significant contribution to the regional deterrent posture; early deployment rather than magnitude of numbers is the critical element.

Encouragement of Chinese Doubts of USSR Intentions

This can be an important psychological and political by-product of US military posture and policy. Details are given in Appendix C.⁵

5. See below, pp. 161-71, and particularly 166-67, 171.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

Vulnerability Studies on East Asian Communist States

Such studies should be initiated by the Department of Defense. Details are given in Appendix C.⁶

TO INCREASE EFFECTIVENESS OF US FORCES DEPLOYED TO FORWARD AREAS

Ground Forces

The ability of ground forces to fight in a nuclear environment requires a high degree of tactical mobility in all committed forces. Present US forces in or available to the Far East do not have this mobility and some improvement is called for.

Land-Based Air Forces

As feasible, additional base facilities suitable for use by US combat units should be made available to permit additional deployments and dispersion, particularly in Korea and Southeast Asia. These facilities can be provided least expensively either by a program to expand indigenous civil aviation capabilities or through funding in part by the Military Aid Program [MAF] to support indigenous air force operations. In either case, the facilities provided should of course be compatible with the requirements for support of US forces.

6. See below, pp. 165-66.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

Logistics

The most apparent and dangerous vulnerability of US forces that may be committed to potentially nuclear operations in forward areas lies in present logistic facilities and practices. A detailed survey should be made to determine specific actions that can be taken to eliminate or to reduce these vulnerabilities.

TO IMPROVE US FORCE CAPABILITIES FOR QUICK LOCAL RESPONSE

Strategic Mobility

Rapid US local response will be essential in order to control escalation by a nuclear-capable China and to minimize pressures for active Soviet support of Chinese military operations. This capability requires a high degree of strategic mobility both for forces stationed in the Far East and for forces in the United States that may be called upon to reinforce the Pacific Command /PACOM/. Significant improvements in the immediate availability of highly mobile forces within PACOM, and in strategic mobility through improvements in strategic airlift, "roll-on-roll-off" transports, and floating stockpiles, are included in present programs. A further increase in locally available air transport in PACOM may be desirable. Further significant increases in the mobility of US forces will require primarily improvement in the forward-base environment of likely areas of hostility.⁷

7. See below, pp. 144-45.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

Thai Defenses

If future events should lead to the development of a Communist forward base in Laos, Thai force requirements should be carefully re-examined in the light of actual developments to insure that the Thais can retard hostile operations sufficiently to permit the introduction of US forces. Preparations to improve the Thai base structure to permit the accelerated deployment of US forces will be particularly important through provision of dispersion and redundancy. Any such improvements should also reduce vulnerability to a minimum-scale nuclear attack.

Forward Base Environment

The generally primitive logistical environment in Korea and Southeast Asia militates strongly against prompt, effective, military operations whether by allied or US forces, and entails excessive concentration of deployed military resources. In view of the heavy current interest and emphasis on this question of environment, specific recommendations are not offered other than to note that any improvement in ports, roads, railroads, airfields, and communications--or local availability of petroleum products and transport and heavy engineering equipment--would directly assist any US military deployments, operations, or support that may be required. Economic and military aid programs should be carefully

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

coordinated to insure that any effort subsidized by the United States contributes to the over-all US-allied military capability.

Bilateral Planning

Present bilateral planning with US allies in the Far East is generally limited to broad concepts and the basic elements affecting combined control or coordination of operations. Such generalized planning requires our allies to draw their own conclusions on the actual capabilities of US forces to assist them in defense of their territory. More specific planning, which would carry at least a connotation of US force commitment, would permit these nations to assess US capabilities more correctly, and thus provide a much better basis for timely and realistic requests for US assistance when and if a threat arises. This planning should specifically include the allocation of tasks, arrangements for the reception and forward movement of US forces, the provision of locally available supplies and services, and similar matters on which the rate of build-up of US forces depends.

TO INCREASE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF WESTERN ALLIES

Australia

Australia can reasonably be expected to support US military operations in Asia, and in particular in Southeast Asia both morally and, within its capabilities, in action. Australian

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

capabilities for effective military support are severely limited by distance, lack of suitable forces, and inadequate transport-- and these difficulties will be intensified if Malaya, Singapore and North Borneo federate. Active encouragement and assistance should be given Australia to maintain a significant mobile ground and air force capability together with the means for the rapid forward movement of these units when required. Improvement in air and sea transport capabilities, and logistic support capabilities, should have first priority.

The United Kingdom

The creation of the Malaysian Federation will probably lead to the substitution of a "British presence," in the form of a small naval force, for present Commonwealth forces now based on Singapore and Malaya. While little assistance can be expected from UK forces for US military operations, the retention of some British capability in the area can reduce the probability of attack on, or US involvement in, Malaya, India, and Pakistan. The United Kingdom should be discreetly encouraged to retain existing base facilities in Singapore, Malaya, and the Indian Ocean in usable condition (even though largely in standby status). This retention will at least conserve some British capability to commit forces to the area.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX A

ESTIMATED COMMUNIST CHINESE NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES

END OF YEAR	WARHEADS		DELIVERY VEHICLES			REMARKS
	Units ¹	Max. Yield ²	A/C ³	MRBM	ICBM	
						Initial test detonation in 1963 or early 1964
1964	12	20 KT	345			
1965	25		310			Initial Operational Capability <u>/IOC/</u> with Beagle
1966	40		280	5		
1967	65	30 KT	250	10		IOC with MRBM
1968	115		225	30		
1969	180	½ MT	205	60		First thermonuclear weapon
1970	285		185 ⁴	105		
1971	400		165 ⁴	150		
1972	550	1 MT	150 ⁴	200	3(?)	IOC with ICBM (?)

1. One unit represents fissionable material sufficient to produce a fission weapon of approximately nominal yield (20KT). Two units would be necessary to produce a thermonuclear weapon, regardless of yield. Thus, beginning in 1969, the Chinese could have either the stated number of fission weapons, or half as many fusion weapons, or a combination in between.

2. Assumed to be a basic weapon of about 2500 pounds, which would be compatible both with the Beagle and with MRBMs. If Badgers are available, greater weights and hence greater yields could be used.

3. Assumed to be Beagle. Badgers might be available if furnished by the USSR, or possibly by the late 1960s through Chinese production. Alternatively, a new fighter bomber, nuclear-capable, might be available by the end of the decade.

4. Manned aircraft may no longer be essential at this time in view of ratio of missiles to warheads if China has solved the targeting problem. If not, Beagles probably will have been replaced by newer types.

This estimate is based upon Donald B. Keesing, The Communist Chinese Nuclear Threat--Warheads and Delivery Vehicles (U), ~~SECRET-RESTRICTED DATA~~, ISD Study Memorandum No. 17 (IDA, Washington, D. C.). This PACIFICA paper will be issued shortly. The numbers of warheads follow the "Moderately Slow" production program described in that paper, on the assumption that a plutonium-producing reactor came into operation in 1961.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX B

US ALLIANCE SYSTEMS IN THE FAR EAST

Proposals have been made to deal with US security problems in the Asian-Pacific area by the revamping of present US alliances or by unilateral US guarantees. A variety of alternatives has been suggested, among them: a Northeast Asia Treaty Organization, which, at a minimum, would include the United States, Japan, and South Korea; a Pacific Treaty Organization including South Vietnam, the Republic of China, South Korea, the United States, and possibly the Philippines; the dissolution of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization [SEATO] and its replacement by an organization from which the United Kingdom and France (especially) would be excluded; and a new "Eisenhower Doctrine" covering some uncommitted nations of Asia (presumably India, Burma, Malaya, and Ceylon).

It is believed that none of these proposals is attractive. The prime question that has to be answered in each case is: does a new, formal arrangement improve on existing agreements?

A second question--is the proposed arrangement practicable?--rules out such suggestions as might call for an Asian-Pacific structure similar to NATO, because the conditions are sharply

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

different.¹ The North Atlantic Treaty Organization faces a single source of danger in one principal geographic area (when a secondary defense area was introduced with the accession of Greece and Turkey, considerable strain was placed on the alliance). In Asia, the United States, along with assorted allies, faces several sources of danger in several geographic areas. With Japan, the United States faces threats from the Soviet Union and, ultimately, from the People's Republic of China [CPR]. With South Korea, the United States faces threats from North Korea, the CPR, and the USSR. The threat to South Vietnam comes from within and from North Vietnam, and perhaps ultimately from the CPR, but the South Koreans may consider that it does not seriously affect them. The Filipinos may likewise consider that threats against South Korea or Japan do not necessarily constitute a danger to the Philippines. In fact, among Asians allied with the United States, the only common factor in their resistance to external Communist threats is the existence of this alliance. The Asian allies, unlike--under certain circumstances--the European allies, appear to be incapable of agreeing on the direction of forces held in common. The major forces, and certainly the swing forces--naval, air, and mobile ground elements --must be US forces under US control.

1. For further discussion of this point, see Appendix G, below, pp. 211-17.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

The United States now has bilateral agreements with Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines. It has the ANZUS Treaty with Australia and New Zealand. It is allied with Thailand and Pakistan in SEATO. With South Vietnam, which is also covered by a SEATO protocol, special arrangements for satisfactory cooperation exist through the Military Assistance Advisory Group MAAG agreement.

In the North Pacific, any effort to achieve a trilateral alliance of Japan and South Korea with the United States would almost certainly result in a worsening of military cooperation in the area. The two Asian countries dislike and distrust each other. As matters now stand, the air defense of both is joined under a single US command, an arrangement that could not be improved upon and that would probably only deteriorate as the result of a formal alliance agreement. A secret protocol to the bilateral agreement with Japan assures that the United States can use Japan without prior consultation as an operational base for emergency UN operations that might again have to be conducted to defend South Korea. As for South Korea itself, the United States has greater de facto military control under UN auspices than could be confirmed politically by any agreement stemming from a new alliance system, and to formalize the situation further even by a status-of-forces agreement could only reduce the latitude of US military action.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

SECRET

With respect to Japan, important restrictions exist at present, but these are not likely to be relaxed under the terms of a widened and formalized alliance system. The requirement is that the United States consult with the Government of Japan on movements of missiles or nuclear weapons into Japan, and before conducting combat operations directly from Japan. Transit and logistic rights are not thereby affected, and consultation requirements in an emergency should prove to be hardly more than a formality. The restriction making it formally impossible to store nuclear weapons in Japan is a very real hindrance to the immediate capability of US forces (primarily tactical air forces) stationed in Japan. In an emergency requiring such action, a way could probably be found for moving nuclear weapons expeditiously in spite of this restriction, if time permits. In view of the present Japanese attitude toward nuclear warfare and nuclear weapons, it would be unwise to raise the question with the Japanese Government now, and hence for the time being at least the situation should be accepted as it is.²

No reason is seen to abandon the system of bilateral agreements between the United States and South Korea and the United States and Japan in favor of a Northeast Asia Treaty Organization.

2. But the situation should be mended if and when circumstances become favorable, as of course they may when Communist China acquires nuclear weapons. US aircraft based in Japan might then be afforded the opportunity to make a more certain contribution in the event of general war.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

On the contrary, military considerations argue against an enlarged security treaty.

Without US insistence and participation, there is no present possibility that Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines could unite in a defensive alliance. Taiwan, the Philippines, and South Korea can in no real sense reinforce each other, and for them such an alliance would be wholly political--and probably both impracticable and unmanageable. Except in the event either of a general war or a regional war between China and the United States, both Taiwan and the Philippines are likely to be involved in quite different situations of limited warfare than are South Korea and Japan, taken singly or together. From the military point of view a widened alliance of the United States with these four countries is unnatural and unnecessary. Bilateral agreements are better and more flexible in every case.

A bilateral agreement with Taiwan is necessary so long as the United States is committed to that island's defense. The agreement is militarily useful for intelligence purposes as well as for providing a military base. The Republic of China has several times in the past offered to make forces available (supported, of course, from US resources) for anti-Communist operations elsewhere in Asia. Inclusion of Taiwan in a multilateral arrangement might facilitate the use of Nationalist Chinese forces outside of Taiwan, but cannot be considered as a requirement for this purpose.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

So long as the Nationalist Chinese are willing to provide the troops, the United States to support them, and the host nation to receive them, formal multilateral treaty arrangements would appear to be unnecessary. If this combined willingness does not exist, multilateral alliance arrangements could hardly be effective.

The bilateral agreement with the Philippines is desirable as providing a military base, despite restrictions placed upon the United States by the exigencies of Philippine nationalism. While a stronger guarantee that Philippine bases would be available for operational use by US forces, especially for use in the defense of Taiwan, would be desirable, it is unlikely that stronger guarantees than now exist could be obtained through any alternative arrangement.

Turning to Southeast Asia, we witness there a SEATO organization that may, as regards originative action, be viewed as little better than moribund. Chinese Communist (and Indian) propaganda has contributed to making this treaty organization, in the eyes of many neutrals, a symbol of vestigial colonialism in Asia. Nevertheless, in the event of overt Communist Chinese aggression in Southeast Asia, the provisions of the SEATO treaty may become effective, membership in the organization may then compel the United Kingdom and even France to acquiesce in counteraction, and broader political support, both in Asia and in Europe, for military action may be forthcoming. Further, membership in SEATO probably

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASS

played a role in the past, and may again in the future, in influencing individual states (Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines in particular) to offer token military forces for military action to oppose low-level Communist aggression. Finally, the inherent uncertainties on when and if SEATO might agree to concerted military action can serve to discourage Chinese military opportunism.

No multilateral alternative to SEATO, more advantageous to the United States, appears to be practical. No Asian nation not now aligned with the United States would be likely to join in such military alliance regardless of its name or membership, unless the United States were excluded--an arrangement certainly not facilitating US support of a threatened area. Exclusion of Britain and France from membership would eliminate all possibility of practical assistance by those nations and reduce the likelihood of obtaining their political support, and the attempt to exclude them might damage US relationships with European allies of great importance to the United States. Communist claims that any new alliance is a colonial device to exploit Asian nations would not diminish; this propaganda would merely focus even more than before on the United States.

Although SEATO as an organization has proven ineffective in the face of past ambiguous Communist aggression, a weakness that has undoubtedly tended to degrade the alliance in Asian eyes, the possibility remains that overt Communist aggression could evoke a concerted response.

~~SECRET~~

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~

~~SECRET~~

In sum, weak and imperfect though it may be, SEATO is a useful device unlikely for the time being to be bettered by any practicable alternative multilateral arrangement. An effective substitute for SEATO might be an alliance against Communist China in which both India and Pakistan would participate. Such an alliance would not be likely, however, unless a way could be found for composing Indian-Pakistani differences and unless India should be prepared to alter its attitude with regard to alignments.

The US relationship with SEATO nations is weakened by the special situations of Thailand and Pakistan. These nations have no formal security arrangements with the United States except through regional security organizations: SEATO in the case of Thailand; SEATO and, more indirectly, CENTO in the case of Pakistan. Neither Thailand nor Pakistan has real confidence in guarantees offered by the United States solely through regional security arrangements.

In the case of Pakistan, the problem is complicated by the suspicion with which India would view any obvious new link between the United States and Pakistan. It might be possible, without entering into a bilateral security agreement with Pakistan, to improve this situation in Pakistani eyes by placing the Military Assistance Advisory Group there under Commander in Chief, Pacific CINCPAC rather than under the United States Commander in Chief, Europe CINCEUR, and enlarging the scope of the MAAG's activities

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

to include a measure of bilateral planning. This change would place US military responsibilities for Pakistan under the commander with operational responsibilities in the area. The continuing exchange of operational and intelligence views, combined with US advice and assistance in Pakistani operational planning (even though necessarily on a highly selective basis), would constitute a significant commitment of US assistance and support beyond that stemming from the less-certain coalition arrangements, and without providing undue alarm to the Government of India. Pakistan would presumably remain a member of the Central Treaty Organization, retention of which is required partly because it associates Iran with the West, and partly to provide coalition means of dealing with Soviet-Afghan threats to Pakistan. Threats to Pakistan from India may be more real than any of these factors, but can hardly evoke US military reassurance at any time when the United States is also attempting to buttress India.

As respects Thailand, it would appear that the real change in relationships that has been required may have been accomplished as the result of recent executive assurance of US commitment to the defense of Thailand. The Thais should consider that they have thus received assurance that inaction by SEATO will not prevent action by the United States in event Thai security is threatened. If the Thais require further, or more formal, assurance from the United States, it should be provided.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia could be considered for formal bilateral security arrangements with the United States only by violation of the Geneva agreements of 1954, which the United States unilaterally agreed not to disturb. Cambodia and Laos, as confirmed neutrals, are at least for the time being excluded from consideration as security partners. With South Vietnam, the United States possesses military agreements and arrangements capable of being expanded de facto to satisfy the requirements of any likely situation, and any attempt to formalize the situation further would probably only make it worse from the military point of view.

As respects the possibility of covering a reluctant India, Burma, Malaya, and Ceylon with a new "Eisenhower Doctrine," the lack of a specific US military commitment appears preferable until such time as circumstances arise to make a commitment desirable, and desired by the beneficiaries of the guarantees. In any event the United States should not gratuitously offer to enter into such commitments. It is important that these Asian countries do not receive them in the spirit of conferring a favor on the United States.

More real and useful benefits ought to be obtainable from the ANZUS Treaty than are obtained at present. An understanding might be reached by which the United States undertakes the "strategic" defense of Australia and New Zealand against threats of nuclear attack or invasion, thus relieving those countries of insupportable burdens they apparently are striving to assume. This should

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

involve no additional cost to the United States, inasmuch as forces otherwise available can assume this largely political commitment without reinforcement. In return, Australia (assisted by New Zealand) could reconstitute its existing military establishment so as to provide a substantial mobile combat force, along with the necessary transport to make it readily employable in Southeast Asia in response not only to SEATO decisions, but also to those reached within ANZUS.

It is concluded that, except as respects Pakistan, Australasia, and possibly Thailand, existing security arrangements are adequate and, from the military point of view, unlikely to be improved. Consideration should be given to placing the MAAG, Pakistan, under CINCPAC rather than US CINCEUR. The possibility of a more fruitful military collaboration with Australia and New Zealand should be explored. Finally, a more formal bilateral arrangement may be desirable with Thailand, if the Thai government wants it.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX C

PSYCHOLOGICAL OPERATIONS

A "psychological operation" may be defined as any planned action or series of actions a major objective of which is the creation of a desired state of mind, or mental reaction, in the target audience. All suggested actions listed elsewhere in this paper therefore fall broadly within the field of psychological operations, particularly those actions dealing with alliances, improvements in US and allied military forces, the maintenance of deterrent forces, and educational measures.

More narrowly, psychological operations can be limited to the communication of ideas by measures adapted solely to creating a desired psychological reaction. These measures may be employed continuously, or may be designed specifically to take advantage of a single action or situation and completed within a definite time span. In the first category lie such activities as propaganda (white, gray, and black) and education. This appendix concerns itself primarily with those psychological operations designed for a specific situation; it is also limited to measures that affect the military situation and that require some degree of implementation by US military forces.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

Among the many criteria necessary for effective psychological operations, two are considered to be of overriding importance:

- 1) The thought conveyed must be essentially truthful and grounded in reality.
- 2) The United States must speak with a common voice in order to communicate the desired thought and induce the desired reaction.

OBJECTIVES

General objectives of psychological operations that the United States may undertake to counter a nuclear-capable China include:

A. Minimization of any tendency toward neutralism or accommodation on the part of non-Communist Asian nations, and maximization of tendencies toward closer relations with the United States. This objective applies particularly to Japan, Thailand, and India.

B. Assurance that both the Communists and US allies understand that the United States has, and will continue to have, both the will and the capability to:

- 1) Oppose local Communist aggression of whatever nature.
- 2) Take decisive military action in the event of open provocation, including a breach by the Communists of any ground rules established by the United States in a situation of local crisis.
- 3) Exploit US nuclear and other military superiority, as required.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

C. Minimization of the likelihood of open Soviet support of Chinese Communist military adventures, and the inspiration of doubt in the minds of the Chinese leadership on Soviet intentions in this regard.

These general objectives suggest the following specific objectives for psychological operations:

1) Elimination of the "shock effect" in large segments of the Free World (including the United States) that is likely to result if the initial Chinese test detonation comes as a general surprise.

2) Minimization of the likelihood of an estimate by our Asian allies, and by the Communists, that the emergence of the People's Republic of China [CPR] as a nuclear power will materially affect in the foreseeable future the over-all strategic situation, and particularly the military balance in the Far East, between the Free World and the Communist bloc.

3) Assurance that both US allies and the Communists correctly estimate the will and capability of the United States to counter effectively and promptly, and to defeat Communist aggression regardless of a locally effective Chinese nuclear capability.

4) Assurance of a proper appreciation by the Asian Communist bloc states of their vulnerability in a nuclear war involving the United States.

5) An increase in the doubts (which must exist in any case) of the Communist Chinese leadership that the USSR will in fact

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

employ, or even credibly threaten to employ, Soviet long-range striking forces in support of Chinese military operations.

6) An increase in any existing element of mutual suspicion between the Communist Chinese and the Soviets as regards the other's intentions in areas of competition.

7) Minimization of any tendency on the part of non-Communist Asian states to seek either closer relations with the USSR as a restraining influence on an aggressive, nuclear-capable CPR, or (as in the case of Pakistan) with the CPR itself in an effort to achieve local objectives.

SUGGESTED ACTIONS

The following psychological operations, primarily military in character, are suggested:

1) Nuclear Education for Asian Elites.¹ The primary objective--through education of Asian elites in the nuclear facts of life--is to convey an understanding of the overwhelming US military and economic might compared to that of Communist China, and to convey belief in the ability and determination of the United States to protect its allies against any threats from Communist China.

1. A detailed proposal for such schooling is presented in the PACIFICA Report on the Nuclear Orientation of Asians, dated March 27, 1962.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

2) Combined Military Planning. For at least several years Chinese nuclear capabilities will be small and relatively primitive, and the asymmetries in nuclear capabilities and vulnerabilities will greatly favor the United States and its allies. US allies can be made fully aware of these facts by the early initiation of combined planning for the defense of allied territories, conducted on the assumption that China will, for the next few years, have only a small locally effective nuclear capability. The United States is already engaged in coordinated planning with all Asian allies either bilaterally or--with Thailand and Pakistan--through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization [SEATO]. Direct bilateral combined planning can emphasize the limitations of Chinese capabilities, and, at the same time, inure the military and political leaders of our allies to the Chinese nuclear threat. An Asian version of the command post exercises [CPXs] as originally conceived for Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers, Europe [SHAPE], to be conducted by Commander in Chief, Pacific [CINCPAC], should also be a useful device for these purposes.

3) Vulnerability Studies of Far Eastern Communist States. Communist China, North Korea, and North Vietnam are all highly vulnerable to nuclear offensive operations. This vulnerability may be underestimated by the Communists with the result that they may be tempted to initiate aggressive operations. If this vulnerability is not recognized by our allies, it may weaken their

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

SECRET

adherence to the West or cause them to delay a request for US military assistance unnecessarily. A detailed study of the vulnerability of the Far Eastern Communist bloc would clearly indicate, in terms such as personnel casualties and percentage of industry destroyed, the extreme vulnerability of those states and, properly publicized, should give cause for caution to the Communists and comfort to our friends. Such a study, preferably accomplished through detailed, computerized wargaming, should be supplemented by unequivocal and pointed but low key statements or other indicators designed to insure that the CPR correctly estimates that it would be the target for major nuclear offensive strikes in the event of substantial provocation or of a general war.

4) Encouragement of Chinese Doubts of Soviet Intentions. In spite of possible increased pressures on the USSR (engendered by a CPR nuclear capability) to cover Chinese military actions strategically, there will always be some element of uncertainty on the part of the CPR leadership as regards Soviet willingness to accept the grave risks of a serious US-USSR engagement solely to assist China. These doubts can be nourished in the first instance by the publication of austere objective analyses of the disproportionate nature of USSR risk as compared to USSR possible advantage. Such articles could set the stage for more sophisticated divisive action, particularly action employing covert means. The establishment of a separate, obviously effective, regional deterrent to CPR nuclear

SECRET

aggression should prove highly exploitable for corrosive and divisive purposes.

5) Common US Voice on Use of Nuclear Weapons. If there is reasonable probability that the United States may decide to use nuclear weapons in the event of hostilities in specific areas, it is essential that the point be brought home to the Communists that US response will be prompt, of adequate weight, and, if necessary, nuclear. This can be done only if all US official representation in, or visiting, these areas speaks with unanimity on US determination to use nuclear weapons if they should be required. Such a common voice would not of course commit the United States to employment of nuclear weapons in the event of hostilities; it would, however, assist in ensuring that the Communists are unambiguously aware of US will and capability to resist aggression by whatever means may be necessary.

6) Selective Release of Intelligence on Chinese Nuclear Capabilities. While there apparently is general recognition, as reflected by the many rumors which have appeared in the world press, that the CPR will eventually achieve a nuclear capability, it is also apparent that preponderant opinion considers this capability as a vague event which may happen only at some distant time in the indefinite future. If the initial shock effect both in Asia and in the United States is to be minimized, action should be taken progressively to alert the Free World to the reality of

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~

the Chinese nuclear program and to the imminence of the initial test detonation. As evidence becomes available on the developing Chinese nuclear program, this intelligence should be released for public consumption. This would then provide a factual backdrop for other actual and psychological operations that may be adopted. It is particularly important that the Free World be alerted to an imminent CPR test detonation when available intelligence is sufficient to make a reasonably certain prediction of the event.

COVERT PSYCHOLOGICAL OPERATIONS

Most psychological warfare operations must necessarily be of an overt nature. The psychological impact of overt actions can, however, be reinforced, exaggerated, or toned down through covert means.

The term "covert operation" as used in this appendix is limited to actions intended to cause the intelligence activities of the target governments to arrive at conclusions desired by the US. These operations consist of providing intelligence, of a real or notional nature, in a manner which will provide "hard evidence" specifically designed to cause the target government to arrive at conclusions predetermined by the United States. This type of operation is analogous to strategic deception; it involves the same methods, entails the same organization, and requires the same tight, centralized control as a strategic deception effort.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

Covert psychological operations to be successful must meet the following primary criteria:

- 1) They must be based on real actions or circumstances, and must be specifically designed to capitalize on those realities.
- 2) They must provide a number of intelligence indicators that are mutually reinforcing and confirming.
- 3) The organization and assets must be available prior to the initiation of the operation.
- 4) The intelligence provided must be consistent regardless of the governmental departments or agencies involved. Close, centralized control, on an interdepartmental basis, is thus essential.

The design of a covert psychological operation depends on the assets available, on the occurrence of specific real activities, and on timing. It is thus not feasible to devise any specific covert psychological operation apart from its context. Attached for purely illustrative purposes is a statement of two types of psychological operations which might be undertaken: one, almost wholly military, devised to meet the requirements of a specific, potentially military, situation; the second, primarily non-military, which might be implemented over a longer time, depending on the occurrence of fortuitous events.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX C

TWO ILLUSTRATIVE COVERT OPERATIONS

1. PURPOSE: To reinforce estimates by the Communists and by US allies of the intentions and capability of the United States to use military force in a specific situation.

Possible Indicators:

Alerts and exercises of forces that might be committed

Stand-down of air transport

A marked increase (some of which may be deceptive) in communications traffic between pertinent headquarters, units, and activities in the crisis area

Carefully timed visits to the area of Very Important Persons, particularly of military VIPs, both openly and pseudo-clandestinely

Negotiations for supplies and services with the threatened government

Aircraft movements to and from nuclear storage sites in the Pacific, and movements of aircraft already tagged by the Communists as associated with movement of atomic weapons to the crisis area

The sudden imposition of new communications security and other security measures, both within the crisis area and by forces elsewhere which may be involved

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

Communications manipulation to exaggerate all of the above measures, with particular regard to the numbers of military units and headquarters that may be involved

2. PURPOSE: To encourage mutual distrust between the Soviet Union and the CPR, and in particular to encourage CPR doubts of Soviet intentions with regard to the use of, or to the posing of a credible threat to use, Soviet long-range strategic forces.

Possible Indicators:

Minor adjustments in US aid programs to give the impression of pertinent United States-Soviet accord and coordination (such as obtained fortuitously in India)

High-level diplomatic consultation with USSR representatives, appropriately timed, succeeded by leaks (diplomatic or military) of notional intelligence on the nature of the subject discussed and the amount of agreement reached

Covert reinforcement, to both the USSR and the CPR, of the US intention to employ PACOM forces, in the event of war with the CPR, solely against the CPR, reserving strategic forces to counter Soviet involvement

Exploitation of any real or notional act that would indicate Soviet dissimulation with regard to the CPR, particularly exploitation of any US-USSR agreement (notionally embroidered)

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX D

A LANCHESTER EQUATION ANALYSIS OF INVASION AND RESPONSE

Seymour J. Deitchman

Research and Engineering Support Division
Institute for Defense Analyses

The Lanchester equations are applied to invasion and response in a circumscribed area. The parameters of timeliness in response and total effort required to win are explored.

INTRODUCTION

The Lanchester equations, describing certain types of military engagement, were published in 1916.⁽¹⁾ Lanchester treated two types of modern combat:

Let x_1 and x_2 be the strengths of odd and even sides, respectively, and x_{10} and x_{20} their initial strengths; a and A the average effectiveness of even men in killing odd men; b and B the average effectiveness of odd men in killing even men; and assume that men put out of action are "dead" and all men in action are firing.* Then,

* a and b are defined as rate of fire times the kill probability of an aimed weapon, rp , while A and B are defined as the kill probability of random shots from an individual weapon, or rate of fire times the ratio of effective area of the weapon to area occupied by the enemy, $r \frac{Ae}{A}$.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

- a) When each side is visible to the other side, and every man on each side is able to fire on any opposing individual, the loss rate on one side is proportional to the number of opponents firing, and $\dot{x}_1 = -ax_2$; $\dot{x}_2 = -bx_1$. This leads to the "square law" for "equality of fighting strength" (i.e., the condition under which neither side wins), $a x_{20}^2 = b x_{10}^2$.
- b) When each side is invisible to the other, and each fires into the area the other occupies,* the loss rate on one side is proportional to the number of men on the other and to the number of men occupying the area under fire, so that $\dot{x}_1 = -A x_2 x_1$; $\dot{x}_2 = -B x_1 x_2$. This leads to the "linear law" for "equality of fighting strength," $A x_{20} = B x_{10}$.

Since the inception of the Lanchester equations, there has been a proliferation of equations of this type, applied to analysis of many situations of warfare (e.g., (2) and (3)). It has, however, been difficult to show that the equations are valid. It is virtually impossible to choose values of the constants or casualty rates a priori to forecast how a battle will turn out; nor do the equations account for all the vagaries of

*Actually, each fires into the area he believes the other to occupy, which may be different from that which he does occupy. In this case, the two are assumed to be the same.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

a real battle. The few attempts (e.g., (4)) at testing the validity of the equations for situations consistent with the assumptions have had to rely on historical data, peculiar to each situation, for evaluation of the casualty rates; and so even in cases where validity has been examined, this has been done on an a posteriori basis, without generality. Despite these limitations of the Lanchester equations, they do, in their original form, represent a simple and elegant description of certain types of military exchange. Even though they cannot ordinarily be used to predict quantitatively the course of a military engagement, they have proved useful in elucidating some general principles regarding the situations to which they can be addressed.

With this in mind, the Lanchester equations have been used to explore some parameters of invasion and response in a circumscribed area.

ANALYSIS

The equations for open combat with constant input of resources by both sides (neglecting operational attrition) are⁽²⁾.

$$\dot{x}_1 = P - a x_2 \tag{1}$$

$$\dot{x}_2 = Q - b x_1$$

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

where P and Q are constant rates of input of men or units by odd or even respectively. The solution to these equations, when $a = b = k^*$, is

$$x_1 = \frac{Q}{k} + E e^{kt_c} + F e^{-kt_c}$$

$$x_2 = \frac{P}{k} - E e^{kt_c} + F e^{-kt_c}$$

where:

(2)

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left(x_{10} + \frac{P}{k} \right) - \left(x_{20} + \frac{Q}{k} \right) \right\}$$

$$F = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left(x_{10} - \frac{P}{k} \right) + \left(x_{20} - \frac{Q}{k} \right) \right\}$$

and t_c is time from the start of combat. The value of E determines which way the battle goes; if E is negative, even wins, and if E is positive, odd wins.

Consider now the situation in which odd invades a single, bounded area with a force of x_{10} , and maintains a constant build-up of forces (P) during his invasion with negligible opposition until time, t_a , when even enters from outside with a force of x_{20}

*It is assumed throughout this section that both sides remain equal in capability regardless of any differences in detail of tactics or weapons. The situation in which only one side uses nuclear weapons is thus excluded.

~~SECRET~~

and starts the battle to oppose the invasion. Then at time

$$0 < t < t_a,$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} x_1 &= x_{10} + Pt \\ x_2 &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3a)$$

at $t = t_a$,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} x_1 &= x_{10} + P t_a \\ x_2 &= x_{20} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3b)$$

and this is the point where $t_c = 0$, so that for any $t_c = t - t_a$, ($t_c > 0$), eq's (2), with

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left[x_{10} + P \left(t_a + \frac{1}{k} \right) \right] - \left[x_{20} + \frac{Q}{k} \right] \right\}$$

$$F = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left[x_{10} + P \left(t_a - \frac{1}{k} \right) \right] + \left[x_{20} - \frac{Q}{k} \right] \right\}$$

give the values of x_1 and x_2 . The buildup required by even just to break even is given by

$$Q_B = k \left[\left(x_{10} - x_{20} \right) + P \left(t_a + \frac{1}{k} \right) \right] \quad (4)$$

The total effort required by even to win, assuming $Q > Q_B$, can be measured by even's total input to the battle,

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

$$\epsilon_T = x_{20} + Q t_{cw} \quad (5)$$

where t_{cw} is t_c when odd is destroyed or gives up.*

Values of Q_B are shown in Fig. 1 for $x_{10} = 1$, $P = 1$, $k = 1$, and various values of x_{20} , as a function of t_a . The values chosen for the variables are consistent with measurement of relative force in terms of divisions or corps, and time in terms of days or weeks. Fig. 2 shows the course of the battle for a few cases, computed using eq's 2. Fig. 3 shows values of ϵ_T for even, for the conditions given. These have been determined by selecting initial values of x_{20} arbitrarily, and arbitrarily choosing values of $Q > Q_B$ appropriate to given values of t_a , with the aid of Fig. 1. Corresponding values of t_{cw} , for use in eq. 5, were obtained from curves like those in Fig. 2.

The penalty for delay is very great; when even's input rate, Q , is slightly greater than that needed to win, the total input, ϵ_T , required increases by a factor of approximately five

*The battle could be defined as ending when even has a preponderance of force, or odd is reduced to some fraction of his greatest force, or odd goes to zero. In this qualitative analysis, the last has been selected; the nature of the results is not affected by this assumption. Further, if odd stops his buildup at some time t_a' and even does not enter until $t_a > t_a'$, the effect of delay beyond t_a' disappears. In the real situation, even though the odd buildup stops, odd would continue to consolidate his position, thereby making the battle more difficult for even as his delay increases. The equations as given do not describe this situation, and the analysis applies only to the case where $t_a < t_a'$.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

as delay increases over the range 0-5. An input rate double that required to break even reduces the penalty, particularly for larger values of t_a . The effect of input rate is much greater than that of initial force. These results are consistent with what is known about the advantage of applying overwhelming force in a military situation. But it should be noted that the break-even input rate itself increases rapidly with t_a . Thus as delay in responding increases, available resources will be strained ever more severely, and these resources will approach the point where they first become inadequate for application of overwhelming force and then for winning at all. Looked at another way, if response is sufficiently rapid, not only is the total input (and therefore cost in casualties) required to win smaller than if there is substantial delay, but the resources required and available are more likely to be consistent with each other.

There is evidently a tradeoff between allocation of resources to large forces if response capability is slow, and allocation of resources to the provision of a rapid response capability for a relatively small force (which may nevertheless be substantial in absolute terms). Airlift, sealift, and maintenance of foreign bases are all expensive, but so, too, are the equipment and support of the large forces that would obviously be required to win if the logistic system is not

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

adequate for a rapid response by even to an invasion of an allied country. While the need for such tradeoff analysis is intuitively obvious, this very crude application of the Lanchester equations to the problem poses the issue very clearly as a critical one, and indicates a direction for quantitative definition of "fast" and "slow" reaction. It may become possible to say precisely what is meant by "too little and too late."

Another question, posed implicitly and related to the previous one (although it cannot be treated by this approach), is that of the effect of response time on enemy actions. There is probably some t_a which, if sufficiently small, is very likely to discourage odd and lead him to abort his invasion plans. For some larger t_a , particularly if even's initial force is small and his potential buildup capability is not obvious, odd will be encouraged to continue. This consideration, too, favors a capability for early and massive response, and must be taken into account (however intangible it is) in the effort balance sheet.

* * * *

CONCLUSIONS

The Lanchester equations have been applied to analysis of invasion in a single, bounded area followed by a response from outside the area. The analysis shows that there is a great premium on reacting quickly with adequate strength to win the opening battle, and that far less total resources are needed to

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

win if the available resources can be brought to bear quickly. It is not so much the size of the initial countering force which matters, as the rate of buildup of forces which can be thrown into the conflict. Planning to win clearly requires study of the tradeoff between provision of expensive means of high mobility for a relatively small part of the potential defending force, and provision of the very much larger force that will be needed to win in the event of long delay in responding to attack.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

SECRET

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

182

SECRET

SECRET

BREAK-EVEN BUILDUP FOR EVEN




Figure 1

EFFORT IN FIGHTING UNITS REQUIRED BY EVEN TO WIN




Figure 3

COURSE OF THE BATTLE - $Q = Q_B + .25; x_{20} = .25$







Figure 2

SECRET

SECRET

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

REFERENCES

1. Lanchester, F. W. Aircraft in Warfare; the Dawn of the Fourth Arm. London: Constable and Company, Ltd., 1916.
2. Morse, Philip M., and Kimball, George E. Methods of Operations Research. New York: The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1951.
3. Weiss, Herbert K. "Lanchester-Type Models of Warfare," Proceedings of the First International Conference on Operational Research (Oxford 1957), Baltimore: Operations Research Society of America, 1957, pp. 82-99.
4. Engel, J. H. "A Verification of Lanchester's Law," Journal of the Operations Research Society of America, Vol. 2, No. 2 (May 1954), pp. 163-71.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

186

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX E

VULNERABILITIES OF COMMUNIST CHINA TO NUCLEAR ATTACK

This appendix is based primarily upon present CPR vulnerabilities, projected to 1972. While a very large-scale CPR effort, continued over a long period of time and pursued in spite of the severe economic penalties involved, could moderately reduce China's present vulnerabilities, it does not appear possible for the People's Republic of China to change radically its basic socio-economic and military environment within one decade. Action to reduce specific vulnerabilities (such as passive protection for selected military forces and military and governmental control elements, minimal civil defenses, and improved air defenses) is feasible within limits. The following discussion anticipates that actions taken to this end will not be allowed to compete substantially with general Chinese economic programs.

PEOPLE

Mainland China's social and economic structure is relatively less vulnerable to nuclear attack than that of more highly industrialized countries. There are about 500 cities in China with 25,000 or more population. The prevailing type of building

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

SECRET

construction makes these cities very vulnerable to atomic blast and heat, and in the more densely populated areas radiation casualties would be high. But it would require an extensive nuclear campaign directed specifically against people to cause casualties proportionate to those that would result from nuclear strikes at the United States or the Soviet Union, even though these strikes were directed primarily against objectives other than people.

Even though relatively less vulnerable, it is obvious that densely populated China would suffer many millions of casualties as the result of a nuclear offensive almost without regard to the primary objective of the offensive operations.

There are some fourteen cities in China of over one million population, and by 1972 there should be sixteen or possibly more. Attack on these cities would require few weapons and would cause heavy casualties. Further, and most importantly, the governmental, party, military, industrial, and intellectual elites are heavily concentrated in these cities, as are skilled technicians and engineers. It is these people whom the CPR can least afford to lose.

INDUSTRY

Modern industry is relatively new in China, for the most part established since 1950. The Chinese industrial base has

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

two distinctive characteristics:

1) Modern industry is concentrated to a high degree in approximately thirty metropolitan areas, some of which have been wholly developed by the Communist regime.

2) Unlike most industrialized nations, China has very few complexes that contribute enough of a specific sector of the economy to be identifiable as a profitable target in a campaign devoted to the destruction of selected elements of the industrial base.

As a result of these two factors, the industrial capability of China is extremely vulnerable to nuclear attack, and such a campaign would not require great selectivity in targeting. It is also true, however, that the large number and diversification of the industrial plants within most metropolitan areas would make confident prediction of the specific effects of such a campaign on the Chinese economy difficult--although it is clear that it would largely destroy modern industry within China.

MILITARY

Counterforce

Predictions on the future positioning and configuration of Chinese nuclear delivery forces must necessarily be largely surmise. Measures to improve the survivability of aircraft, however, except possibly some small measure of ground alert

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

capability, appear to be most unlikely. There is no evidence of the introduction of sophisticated air defenses except for some obsolescent surface-to-air missile defenses provided by the Soviet Union for metropolitan areas. Work on the one such system that has been started (at Peiping) apparently has not been completed, and there is no evidence of any further effort along this line. It is possible, though unlikely so long as the present state of Sino-Soviet relations persists, that additional Soviet assistance may be given to improve these defenses. The state of the Chinese economy and other military demands upon it would appear to preclude independent development by the CPR of a significant modernized air defense capability. It is practically certain that China will not develop defenses, or even warning means, against ballistic missile attack during this decade. With regard to China's own ballistic missiles, those of up to medium range (1,100 nautical miles) probably will be mobile, and basically patterned after USSR designs. Early intercontinental ballistic missiles will most likely be in a generally soft configuration, probably dispersed, and possibly given some shielding through siting in appropriate terrain north and west of the densely populated areas of China.¹

1. A less likely case, but one to which some attention should be given, is that the Chinese, learning from US and USSR experience, will delay the establishment of their ICBM system until the weapons can at least be given some concealment.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Assuming:

1) A nuclear delivery capability for 1968-70 as stated in Appendix A;²

2) Airplanes disposed with approximately one regiment (30 airplanes) per base;

3) Missiles in a mobile, soft configuration, disposed in clusters of ten; and

4) A US intelligence capability to target these delivery forces accurately;³

a minimum counterforce operation against the CPR would require approximately 25 accurately delivered weapons.

Other Forces

China's enormous ground forces (115 line divisions) are dispersed throughout the country (but mainly in the east) and as an initial object of nuclear attack would appear to be unprofitable. Attack on transportation, distribution facilities, support elements (particularly petroleum products), communications, and control should, however, render these forces practically unusable except

2. See above, p. 147.

3. This is a critical but highly uncertain assumption. See above, pp. 62-64.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

internally within China, and then only as in-place forces.

Ground forces committed outside the borders of China are highly vulnerable to nuclear attack. In areas where major forces would be required (Korea and Taiwan), the forces themselves will be massed and vulnerable. The conduct of ground operations, large or small, by organized forces, would require Chinese dependence on supply and support facilities in nearby China and on inadequate communications to and within the forward area. While there is a trade-off between size of force and quality of logistic support, organized forces depending upon substantial quantities of modern equipment such as ordnance, armored vehicles, and motorized transportation, will be heavily dependent on the survivability of these concentrated logistical facilities.

The minor Chinese naval capability could be denied by the destruction of China's three principal bases.

Chinese air defenses depend upon fighter aircraft, centralized control, and inadequate communications, and can be neutralized by attack on any of these highly vulnerable elements.

TRANSPORTATION AND DISTRIBUTION

Support of both air and ground operations is dependent upon a primitive transportation system, the inadequacies of which are clearly evident even in peacetime, particularly in the distribution of petroleum and agricultural products during the past few years.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

These transportation means (both surface and air) radiate weblike from major metropolitan areas. In spite of recent major Communist Chinese efforts to improve the transportation situation (particularly railroads), present estimates indicate that a transportation system of adequate capacity, eliminating the bottlenecks and vulnerabilities now presented by the focusing of these facilities on major population centers, cannot be achieved within a decade. The transportation system is and will continue to be further handicapped by inadequate resources critical in modern war, including particularly POL. Lacking appreciable reserves, and dependent upon many distribution points (the larger of which are concentrated in the major cities), the CPR's supply of combatant forces (and the civilian economy as well) can be readily disrupted by a relatively small-scale nuclear attack on key points.

CONTROL ECHELONS

Medium and higher echelons of CPR control, whether of the government, the Communist party, or the military, are almost without exception located in the larger metropolitan areas. These control echelons are essential elements for the continuing conduct of a war and its support, are vital to effective recuperation after nuclear attack and, indeed, are probably indispensable to the survival of the Communist regime itself. These control elements--in terms of facilities, people, and communications--are

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

highly vulnerable to carefully planned nuclear attack on a relatively small number of metropolitan areas.

CO-LOCATION OF VULNERABILITIES

The most striking aspect of the CPR vulnerability to nuclear attack is the co-location in metropolitan areas of the individual vulnerabilities. Even an attack of relatively small weight on, say, Peiping, would destroy essential military and governmental control capability; would destroy important military targets in the form of air and ground forces and facilities; would seriously disrupt communications and transportation with effects far beyond the area of Peiping; would destroy a significant portion of the national industry; and would cause a very large number of casualties of a nature most detrimental to the Communist Chinese war-making and recuperative ability.

AN ILLUSTRATIVE ATTACK

A hypothetical attack on China has been sketched for illustrative purposes. It is delineated in an addendum to this appendix. This illustrative attack would involve 90 weapons on target.⁴ The most distant target is less than 800 nautical miles from the coast. A rough calculation indicates that such an attack would

4. The numbers of launched or programmed weapons required would vary widely (possibly up to 300 weapons programmed), depending on the assumptions used as to types and configuration of delivery vehicles, reliability, attrition, and so forth.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

not only destroy China's nuclear delivery capability (under the estimates used for this study), but also would kill about 40 to 50 million people by direct blast and thermal effects alone, and would destroy a very large proportion of that country's modern industry. It should also destroy China's capability to control governmental and military actions, thereby jeopardizing the hold of the Communist regime on the people of China, as well as cause extensive damage to her inadequate transportation and communications systems.

SUMMARY

Although the CPR, as a social and economic entity, is somewhat less vulnerable than the United States to nuclear attack, her specific vulnerabilities are nevertheless of a nature that would permit a nuclear offensive to be highly effective in terms of rendering the CPR incapable of continuing to fight. Due to the co-location of vulnerabilities, the nuclear offensive would, comparatively speaking, need to be on only a modest scale.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX E

This addendum is a summary of a hypothetical attack on all of China.

Part 1 is a listing of metropolitan areas of over one million population each (by 1972), showing the number of designated ground zeros (DGZs) and the objectives within each area. Part 2 is a similar listing of industrially important cities of fewer than one million population. Part 3 sets forth the minimum requirements for delivered weapons for a counterforce effort under the assumptions set forth in the body of this appendix.

Designated ground zeros have been selected that primarily affect military targets, but distributed (together with weapon selection) so as to maximize damage to industry, logistic, and similar targets.

In view of the uncertainties in such projections far into the future, no attempt has been made to devise more than an illustrative attack.

In summary:

- 1) The attack would require 65 delivered weapons on metropolitan areas.
- 2) An additional 25 delivered weapons would be needed for

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

a minimum counterforce effort.

3) About 40 to 50 million casualties would result from the blast and thermal effects. There would also be a large number of casualties from residual nuclear radiation, including fallout.

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

198

~~SECRET~~



ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX E

PART 1

MAINLAND CHINA--CITIES OVER ONE MILLION POPULATION (BY 1972)

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>1962 Pop. Est. (Millions)</u>	<u>Designated Ground Zeros (DGZs)</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
1	Shanghai	7.1	5	Primary war resource center of China-shipbuilding, petroleum refining and storage, steel, chemicals, and all military and industrial products
2	Peiping (Peking)	4.2	4	National control and communication center with important new industries such as electronics, machine tools, chemicals, drugs, military depots, and scientific research
3	Tien-chin (Tientsin)	3.1	2	Major, nationally important, industrial complex specializing in vehicles, steel, chemicals, rubber, and medicines
4	Chung-ching (Chungking)	2.4	1	Outstanding industrial city in Southwest China producing steel, nonferrous metals, chemicals, and military equipment
5	Shen-yang (Mukden)	2.2	4	National strategic source of aircraft, heavy machinery, nonferrous metals, railroad stock, ordnance, and chemicals. Also a provincial capital
6	Kuang-chou (Canton)	2.0	4	Primary industrial base of South China with petroleum storage, air force storage, steel and chemicals, and regional civil, naval, and air force control centers

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

200

~~SECRET~~

APPENDUM TO APPENDIX E

PART 1 (Cont'd.)

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>1962 Pop. Est. (Millions)</u>	<u>DGZs</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
7	Wuhan	1.9	2	Provincial capital, air force control and repair center, military equipment production and storage. Second largest steel mill in China
8	Ha-erh-pin (Harbin)	1.5	2	Provincial capital, key railroad center, military storage, aircraft production, air force storage, and heavy electrical equipment
9	Nan-ching (Nanking)	1.2	2	Provincial capital, military control center, arsenals and military depots, electrical equipment, and chemicals
10	Hsi-an (Sian)	1.2	2	Provincial capital, atomic and scientific research, electrical equipment, and nearby aircraft plant
11	Taiyuan	1.1	1	Provincial capital; new major industrial center specializing in steel, chemicals, aluminum, explosives, heavy machinery, and military weapons
12	Lanchow (Lanchow)	1.1	2	Provincial capital, West China transportation center. Key plants include isotope separation, aluminum, petroleum, and chemicals
13	Chengtu	1.0	2	Provincial capital, aircraft plant, electronics equipment and regional industrial center

201

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

202

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

SECRET

ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX E

PART 1 (Cont'd.)

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>1962 Pop. Est. (Millions)</u>	<u>DGZs</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
14	Changchun	1.0	2	Provincial capital, air force storage, railroad stock, and China's largest vehicle plant
15	Ta-lien (Dairen)	.9	4	Nationally important in chemicals, shipbuilding, railroad equipment, petroleum port, and military storage
16	Ching-tao (Tsingtao)	.9	4	National naval and naval air force headquarters; submarine base, port, railroad equipment, chemicals and magnesium

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

204

~~SECRET~~

ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX E

PART 2

CHINA--OTHER MAJOR INDUSTRIAL CITIES

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Complex Name</u>	<u>1962 Pop. Est. (Millions)</u>	<u>DGZs</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
1	Anshan	.7	2	One third of China's steel, nationally important in coke and chemicals
2	Fushun	.7	1	Petroleum, aluminum, magnesium, coke, chemicals, and explosives
3	Pao-tou (Paotow)	.6	1	Major heavy weapons and tank manufacturing center, also twelfth largest steel mill in China
4	Chi-nan (Tsinan)	.7	2	Provincial capital, military region headquarters; steel, chemicals, and machine tools
5	Hang-chou (Hangchow)	.7	3	Transportation center, provincial capital, and developing industry with a steel mill
6	Kunming	.7	2	Supplies Southwest China with chemicals, steel, machine tools, military weapons, and optics. Regional military and civil control center
7	Cheng-hsien (Chengchow)	.6	1	Provincial capital, main transportation center for East China, and third largest POL storage in China

SECRET

SECRET

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

~~SECRET~~

ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX E

PART 2 (Cont'd.)

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Complex Name</u>	<u>1962 Pop. Est. (Millions)</u>	<u>DGZs</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
8	Chi-chi-ha-erh (Tsitsihar)	.5	1	Heavy industry such as steel, machine tools, and military weapons; also supply center for North Manchuria
9	Fu-chou (Fochow, Minhow)	.6	2	Regional civil, military, and air control centers, and regional industrial complex
10	Changsha	.6	2	Provincial capital, many medium-sized regional industries (steel, metals, vehicles, chemicals, and POL storage)
11	Loyang	.4	1	New industrial city producing most of China's heavy-duty tractors and ball bearings
12	Shih-men (Shihkiachuang)	.6	1	Coke, chemicals, iron, steel, ammunition, textiles, and fifth largest railroad yard in China
13	Tangshan	.7	2	Sixth largest steel mill, a major railroad manufacturing and repair facility, and a major aluminum plant under construction
14	Chi-lin (Kirin)	.5	1	Largest chemical combine in China, other heavy industries

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX E

PART 3

CHINA--COUNTERFORCE OPERATIONS, 1970

<u>Objectives</u>	<u>DGZs</u>
5 airfields (150 aircraft)	5
20 missile sites (200 missiles)	20

If US intelligence capabilities are less effective than assumed, additional weapons would of course need to be allocated for counterforce operations to compensate for uncertainties.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX F

COMPARATIVE GROUND FORCES--LATE 1960s¹

(ASSUMED CAPABILITIES)

<u>Area</u>	<u>Available for Defense (Indigenous)</u>	<u>Chinese Invasion² Capability</u>
Burma	1½	6-8
Cambodia	3	3
Japan	13	0
Korea	19+2 US	46 ³
Laos	?	6
Philippines	1	0
Malaya	1	0
Republic of China	17	6?
Thailand	4	4-7 ⁴
Vietnam	10	9 ⁴
Pakistan	5	?
India	12	?

1. Division equivalents estimated to be available.
2. Estimated initial threat that can be employed in view of logistic factors.
3. Includes North Korean forces.
4. Includes North Vietnamese forces.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK

210

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX G

THE NATO ANALOGY

It has been suggested that the situation within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] as it has developed over the past twelve years is comparable to the situation in the Far East as it will develop as a result of Chinese nuclear progress, and that US policy must be consistent between Europe and the Far East. The purpose of this appendix is to examine this analogy in light of present US nuclear policy for NATO.

US POLICY FOR EUROPE

In Europe, NATO faces essentially a single enemy--the Soviet Union. Any major military operations in Europe would involve the forces both of the United States and of the Soviet Union. If these operations become nuclear, NATO nuclear objectives would thus include Soviet nuclear forces. These forces must be considered an indivisible target, and if nuclear operations are involved, NATO must therefore attack all Soviet nuclear forces. Since the target system is indivisible, NATO nuclear forces must also be indivisible--that is, capable of being used as a single instrument against a single, indivisible, target system.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

SECRET

NATO nuclear forces include US and some allied tactical air forces and intermediate-range ballistic missile units under NATO operational command. They include British forces and will include (more loosely) French forces, both under national command. But these NATO nuclear forces also include US strategic strike forces, which comprise by far the largest part of the nuclear capability available to NATO. Backed by the certain intervention of this massive nuclear power when it is needed, forces positioned in Europe can contribute only marginally to the total nuclear power available, and can accept great risks if necessary to permit them to operate effectively in a non-nuclear role.

Thus forces in Europe should be designed primarily for non-nuclear operations with a secondary capability for "battlefield" nuclear operations if the latter should become necessary. The survivability of these forces should be secured through the deterrent effectiveness of centrally controlled strategic forces. These strategic forces will consist essentially of forces under US command, but should also include British strategic forces and also any other strategic strike forces that may be created in Europe. In view of the capability of US strategic forces, however, and the inability of other forces to contribute significantly to the over-all NATO capability, additional strategic forces in Europe, whether under national or NATO command, are unnecessary and would be counterproductive. It is of course a major objective of the Soviet Union to separate the

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

CLASSIFIED

United States from its allies in NATO and the existence of other strategic nuclear forces would be used by the Soviet Union to forward this objective.

THE SITUATION IN THE FAR EAST

When China attains a nuclear capability, there will be two separate major Communist centers of nuclear power in Asia, which, unless there is a sharp reversal of the trend in Sino-Soviet relations, will not be in complete harmony. By reason of this disharmony, and in the absence of Soviet force and other commitments to China, if hostilities occur in the Far East, the USSR will not be automatically involved (and in fact is likely to remain on the sidelines if the United States acts with adroitness). Thus, if bilateral nuclear operations involving the People's Republic of China [CPR] should occur, these need not entail nuclear strikes against the indivisible Soviet nuclear forces. In sharp contrast to Europe, where Communist nuclear power has been, until now at least, under unified control, in Asia Communist nuclear power will be divided; and it is strongly to the advantage of the United States to take all possible action to see that this nuclear power remains divided.

Free World nuclear power in the Far East is now and will continue to be exclusively a US capability. There is no practical possibility that any non-Communist Asian state will create an

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

effective nuclear capability within the next decade or so. There is no single Free World operational command. Free World nuclear strength in the Far East is wholly under US unilateral control, and will remain so unless the United States decides to share this responsibility with one or more allies. There is thus no dual nuclear control that the Communists can exploit. No pressures now exist to dilute US control of these forces; there is no apparent benefit to be secured by, nor is there any significant influence to cause, a division of responsibility for nuclear operations against China between the United States and its many disparate allies in the Far East.

If consideration is limited to those Free World forces in the Pacific and Far East that face a nuclear-capable Communist China, the situation then becomes more nearly analogous to that in NATO, although with major differences. In such a situation, the United States and its allies face a single major enemy (the CPR), whose nuclear forces must be considered as a single indivisible target. If an effective US regional nuclear strike force exists, it then provides a single instrument under central US control for destruction of the indivisible nuclear force facing it. With this US force in being, forces deployed to forward areas can also accept risks as necessary to permit them to fight effectively in the local action. The regional deterrent force would thus correspond roughly to the position of the entire US strategic force as related

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

to Europe; forces committed to local areas of hostilities in Asia would correspond roughly to forces positioned in Europe.

There remain major differences, in this limited context, between the situation in NATO and that in the Far East:

a) All non-Communist nuclear power in the Far East is (and should remain) under complete US control.

b) The United States will have, and can use if needed, its long-range strategic capability against the CPR. It thus has a "super SAC" as an additional enforcement agency directed at the CPR. Conversely, US nuclear power in the Pacific will not be exclusively committed to operations against China--it will be available to augment US strategic forces or perform other tasks, as the United States may decide. It will remain an integral part of the total US nuclear strength. For the purpose of Single Integrated Operational Plan [SIOF] operations, the US regional deterrent force will be no more divided from other US nuclear forces than any other element (e.g., Polaris) of US nuclear strength.

c) Until the CPR approaches superpower status, it can be anticipated that its technology will be five to ten years behind that of the United States and the USSR. Thus, the problem of deterrence of, or nuclear engagement with, the CPR will be technically less difficult than the problem facing NATO.

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

SECRET

d) US long-range strike forces have been designed basically for attack on the USSR, and their participation in lesser hostilities, particularly non-nuclear hostilities, is unlikely on a significant scale. US nuclear-capable forces in the Pacific Command PACOM on the contrary, though considered the primary threat to and deterrent of the CPR, may also be called upon to participate in large-scale, non-nuclear operations. Thus, nuclear-capable forces in the PACOM must in large part be designed so that they can be effective in a non-nuclear role without destroying their nuclear capability and hence their deterrent effect on the CPR. It should be possible to harmonize these conflicting requirements by the conscious design of forces to that end--an objective simplified by China's relatively primitive capabilities.

SUMMATION

In Europe, the nuclear threat stems solely from the Soviet Union. This monolithic threat is opposed by nuclear forces unified (in spite of internal differences within the NATO alliance, which the Soviets have tried, unsuccessfully to date, to exploit) by an uncompromising commitment by the United States, the stationing of US forces in Europe, and the creation of a unified command for forces in Europe. In the Far East the Communists face a single nuclear threat (the United States), but Communist power is divided because of strong Sino-Soviet differences, the absence of a clear guarantee from the

SECRET

UNCLASSIFIED

Soviets (who speak of "volunteers" to aid their Asian allies), and the lack of force commitments or other military unity between the two major Far Eastern Communist powers. In the Pacific there is a genuine opportunity to exploit the differences that already exist in the adversary's camp.

100222

UNCLASSIFIED

SECRET

d) US long-range strike forces have been designed basically for attack on the USSR, and their participation in lesser hostilities, particularly non-nuclear hostilities, is unlikely on a significant scale. US nuclear-capable forces in the Pacific Command /PACOM/ on the contrary, though considered the primary threat to and deterrent of the CPR, may also be called upon to participate in large-scale, non-nuclear operations. Thus, nuclear-capable forces in the PACOM must in large part be designed so that they can be effective in a non-nuclear role without destroying their nuclear capability and hence their deterrent effect on the CPR. It should be possible to harmonize these conflicting requirements by the conscious design of forces to that end--an objective simplified by China's relatively primitive capabilities.

SUMMATION

In Europe, the nuclear threat stems solely from the Soviet Union. This monolithic threat is opposed by nuclear forces unified (in spite of internal differences within the NATO alliance, which the Soviets have tried, unsuccessfully to date, to exploit) by an uncompromising commitment by the United States, the stationing of US forces in Europe, and the creation of a unified command for forces in Europe. In the Far East the Communists face a single nuclear threat (the United States), but Communist power is divided because of strong Sino-Soviet differences, the absence of a clear guarantee from the

SECRET

**NATIONAL
SECURITY
ARCHIVE**

This document is from the holdings of:

The National Security Archive

Suite 701, Gelman Library, The George Washington University

2130 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20037

Phone: 202/994-7000, Fax: 202/994-7005, nsarchiv@gwu.edu