

S/P FILE COPY

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TOP SECRET COVER SHEET

1. TOP SECRET CONTROL NUMBER **NSAM**

OD- S/P-61-163/2

7

S/P FILE COPY

4. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF ATTACHED DOCUMENT(S) (Origin, subject, reference no. or other pertinent data) **OCTOBER 23, 1961**

NSAM #109. US Policy on Military Actions in a Berlin Conflict.

2. COPY INFORMATION

ACTION COPY _____ INFORMATION COPY _____

TELEGRAMS, DESPATCHES, ETC. _____

COPY NO. _____ OF _____ COPIES

5. FORWARDED

November 8, 1961
(Date)

I. Stotler
(Top Secret Control Officer)

3. DATE AND NAME OF PERSON PREPARING FORM
11/8/61 E. Cahill

6. PERSONS TO WHOM ROUTED OR READING DOCUMENT	7. OFFICE SYMBOL	8. SIGNATURES	9. DATE RECEIVED	10. DATE READ	11. DATE RELEASED
Mr. Curtis		<i>[Signature]</i>	11/8/61	11/8/61	11/8/61
Mr. Morgan		<i>[Signature]</i>			
Mr. Fuller		<i>[Signature]</i>	11/9		11/9
Mr. Lindley		<i>[Signature]</i>	11/9		11/9
Mr. Harvey		<i>[Signature]</i>	11/13		11/28
Mr. Owen		<i>[Signature]</i>	11/28		11/28/61
Mr. France		<i>[Signature]</i>	11/28		11/28
E. FRIED	S/P	<i>[Signature]</i>	8/31/62		9/4/62
H. Ransdell	S/P	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/31/62		
7261A					

TOP SECRET attachment
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

November 6, 1961

S/P - Mr. McGhee ✓
S/O - Mr. Achilles
G/PM - Mr. Kitchen

S/P FILE COPY

NSAM 109

Attached for your information is National Security Action Memorandum no. 109. By direction of the President earlier, this document was given a very limited distribution. It is now being released for your file.

copy
L. D. Battle

Attachment:

NSAM 109, copy 2

NOV 11 1961
TOP SECRET attachment

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

16869

October 23, 1961

OD-S/P-61-163/2

TOP SECRET

NATIONAL SECURITY ACTION MEMORANDUM NO. 109

TO: The Secretary of State
The Secretary of Defense

S/P FILE COPY

SUBJECT: U.S. Policy on Military Actions in a Berlin Conflict

The President has approved the following statement of U.S. policy on military actions in a Berlin conflict:

In the event military force is applied in the Berlin situation, it is United States policy that the nature and sequence of such use should preferably be:

I If Soviet/GDR administrative or other action interferes with Berlin access by ground or air but is short of definitive blockage, then the tripartite powers should execute Berlin contingency plans, to include tripartitely agreed probes of Soviet intentions by a platoon or smaller force on the ground and by fighter escort in the air; they should continue to use fully any unblocked mode of access.

(COMMENT: Through this point, risks of major war, unless Soviets wish to start one, are not materially raised by any tripartite action, and therefore, decision on execution is tripartite rather than NATO responsibility.)

II If, despite the above tripartite actions, Soviet/GDR action indicates a determination to maintain significant blockage of our access to Berlin, then the NATO Allies should undertake such non-combatant activity as economic embargo, maritime harassment, and UN action. Simultaneously, they should mobilize and reinforce rapidly to improve capability for taking actions listed below. Meanwhile, they should use fully any unblocked access to Berlin. (If, however, the situation has so developed that NATO forces have been substantially reinforced, after appropriate non-combatant measures undertake without delay one or more

TOP SECRET

of the courses of military action shown below.)

(COMMENT: Since the Alliance proposes to exploit other means before initiating major military operations, non-combatant efforts to restore ground access will precede the military efforts shown below in any case. A separate issue is the choice between delay while reinforcing in Europe, and prompt action. Without a build-up by the Allies, the range of options for early military action by us is limited. Undue delay could weaken nuclear credibility, threaten the viability of West Berlin, and erode Alliance resolve, but these potential disadvantages may be outweighed by the higher risk of nuclear escalation if early non-nuclear action were taken with no more than the currently available forces. To the extent that Alliance forces in Europe are raised above present levels, the delays in initiating military action can be reduced or the military action can be tailored to the existing force levels.)

III If, despite the above Allied actions, our Berlin access is not restored, the Allies should take appropriate further action to clarify whether the Soviets/GDR intend to maintain blockage of air or ground access, or both, while making clear our intention to obtain re-opened access. Then embark on one or more of the following expanded military courses of action:

A. European Theatre

1. Expanding non-nuclear air action, against a background of expanded ground defensive strength, to gain local air superiority. Extend size and scope as necessary.

(Comment: Opposing strengths probably will be roughly comparable. Military success locally is not impossible. As a political operation, this shows the Soviets visibly higher risks of nuclear war. The pace and volatility of extended air operations raise risks of rapid escalation.)

2. Expanding non-nuclear ground operations into GDR territory in division and greater strength, with strong air support.

(Comment: This is a politically oriented military operation aiming to display to the Soviets the approaching danger of possibly irreversible escalation. Military overpowering of determined Soviet resistance is not feasible. The risks rise, as do the military pressures on the Soviets.)

B. World Wide

Maritime control, naval blockade, or other world-wide measures, both for reprisal and to add to general pressure on the Soviets.

(Comment: This action, by itself, is not apt to be effective and might lead to Soviet initiation of action on the European central front in any case. It lacks direct relation to Berlin and may entail political liabilities. It exploits pronounced Allied naval superiority. It would have a delayed impact on nuclear risks. It is the view of the JCS and the principal unified commanders that a naval blockade should be accompanied by other military action in Central Europe.)

IV If, despite Allied use of substantial non-nuclear forces, the Soviets continue to encroach upon our vital interests, then the Allies should use nuclear weapons, starting with one of the following courses of action but continuing through C below if necessary:

A. Selective nuclear attacks for the primary purpose of demonstrating the will to use nuclear weapons.

B. Limited tactical employment of nuclear weapons to achieve in addition significant tactical advantage such as preservation of the integrity of Allied forces committed, or to extend pressure toward the objective.

TOP SECRET

C. General Nuclear War.

(Comment: The Allies only partially control the timing and scale of nuclear weapons use. Such use might be initiated by the Soviets, at any time after the opening of small-scale hostilities. Allied initiation of limited nuclear action may elicit a reply in kind; it may also prompt unrestrained pre-emptive attack.)

In view of the President's approval of the above statement, Supplement I, "U.S. Policy on Berlin", to NSC 5803, "U.S. Policy Toward Germany," is declared to be no longer applicable.

McGeorge Bundy
McGeorge Bundy

Information Copies to:

General Maxwell Taylor
The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

STATE DEPT DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW
Relate to: Change/delete
 Lock/identify
with occurrence of
date

1. TOP SECRET CONTROL NUMBER

S/P-61-175-8

NSA 4 (3)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SKUSAN 8/31/60

TOP SECRET COVER SHEET

128-3

S/P FILE COPY

4. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF ATTACHED DOCUMENT(S) (Origin, subject, reference no. or other pertinent data)

Nov 29
~~DECEMBER~~ 1, 1961

NSAM #117. Contingency Planning on Berlin

2. COPY INFORMATION

ACTION COPY _____ INFORMATION COPY _____

TELEGRAMS, DESPATCHES, ETC. _____

COPY NO. _____ OF _____ COPIES

5. FORWARDED

Dec. 4, 1961

(Date)

I. Stotler

(Top Secret Control Officer)

3. DATE AND NAME OF PERSON PREPARING FORM

12/4/61

E. Cahill

6. PERSONS TO WHOM ROUTED OR READING DOCUMENT	7. OFFICE SYMBOL	8. SIGNATURES	9. DATE RECEIVED	10. DATE READ	11. DATE RELEASED
Mr. Morgan	S/P	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/4/61		
<i>Mr. Rowlow</i>		<i>[Signature]</i>		12/7/61	
Mr. Owen		<i>[Signature]</i>			1/26
Mr. Fuller		<i>[Signature]</i>	1/30/62		1/30/62
Mr. Lindley		<i>[Signature]</i>	1/31/62		1/31/62
7261A					

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

18735

November 29, 1961

TOP SECRET

S/P FILE COPY

NATIONAL SECURITY ACTION MEMORANDUM NO. 117

TO: The Secretary of State

SUBJECT: Contingency Planning on Berlin

In reviewing the latest reports on the status of contingency planning on Berlin, I do not find any contingency plan for the case of disturbance along the sector border which might lead to riots on both sides and possible rebellion in East Berlin. The recent protests of West Berliners, at a time of relatively low tension, suggest that one of the real possibilities in this situation is that we may have a citizen explosion of some sort at a later stage of the crisis.

I would like to have your recommendation as to possible courses of action in this range of contingencies. I recognize the difficulty of framing precise plans ahead of time for a matter so unpredictable as a civilian uprising, but it does seem to me that we should be thinking ahead on this one.

/s/ John F. Kennedy

Copies to: The Secretary of Defense
The Military Representative of the President

TOP SECRET