CONFIDENTIAL

Reference SPFE/93/A

2304.
OFFICE OF
16 AUG 1961
A.D.D.

Admiral P. W. B. Brooking,
A.D.D.,
Building F6.1.

M E A W

Further to my PFE/93/A dated 25th April, 1961, I had suggested to Beards that it would be best to have positive action by withdrawing the manual. I have now received a letter which says - "the majority of holders have now replied and the consensus of opinion is that no objection would be raised to the withdrawal of the manual."

In my view withdrawal of the manual would cause no hardship because:-

(a) new variations of "Capabilities" and "Effects" are due to be issued shortly,

(b) specialist handbooks like DASA 1200 are now available to those who need them,

(c) the new issue of N.W.C.G.(4) will mean that a good deal of British weapon effects information will become more generally available.

I therefore recommend that we take steps to withdraw the manual.

Since the manual was sponsored by the Ministry of Defence no doubt you will wish to explore the implications with them.

E. R. Drake Seager,
SPFE

Building F6.A.
AWRE Aldermaston.

Extn. 7958.

15th August, 1961.

c.c. Mr. C. L. Farror, HTS.

HTS
Would you can I take this one on - by L
for Williams's agreement I withdrawing this
was very useful publication, what is my view
has anything is ? usefulness

17 AUG 1961

CONFIDENTIAL

16/8

ADD
I have spoken to Williams about this and he agrees that MEAW is now not needed and should be withdrawn. I am taking action. 17/8

Code 18-75

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Storey's Gate, LONDON S.W.1
Telephone: WHITEHALL 7000 Ext. 546

Our reference: RP/365/61
Your reference:

14th June, 1961

CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Admiral,

Thank you for your letter AD/205/6/61 of 8th June. The subject matter of interest to Magnusson certainly appears to be that published by the U.S. in "The Effects of Nuclear Weapons". When his request arrives I shall probably introduce JIGSAW and the Home Office.

Yours sincerely,

R. Press

Admiral P.W.B. Brooking, CB, DSO,
ADD/A.W.R.E.,
ALDERMASTON,
Berkshire.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Minute to Sir C. Pelly
by Sir W. Penney
returned to D. with his
letter.

AD/205/6/61

8th June, 1961 Copy of this letter.

Dear Press,

On his recent visit to Sweden in connection with the "Dragon" Reactor Project, Sir William Penney had some discussion with a Mr. Magnusson, who is concerned with defence aspects of atomic energy.

Mr. Magnusson asked if it would be possible for some of his staff to discuss with U.K. Scientists certain basic phenomena of blast, heat radiation and damage effects from nuclear explosions. Sir William replied that the information concerned was very similar to that contained in the U.S. publication "Effect of Atomic Weapons", and that there would probably be no difficulty. It was then suggested that Mr. Magnusson put his request in writing through formal channels to Ministry of Defence, and this he undertook to do.

You may wish to consider how to treat this request when it arrives.

Mr. Magnusson also said that his Group is buying an I.B.M. 7090 Computer and that the first use would be detailed calculations of civil defence casualties resulting from an Atomic Bomb attack on certain Swedish cities.

Apparently these calculations take into account the details of the actual houses, buildings and shelters and so on in the cities. The programme is nearly written and seems to be on similar lines to those being prepared in U.S.A. He said he had benefited very much from discussions with the Civil Defence scientists in Washington and that his work followed suggestions made by them.

In Sir William's view these studies are far more elaborate than any U.K. has done and he thought M.O.D. (and maybe other departments) would be interested.

Yours sincerely,

P. W. B. BROOKING

P. W. B. BROOKING, Admiral, (Retd).

Dr. R. Press,
Ministry of Defence,
Storey's Gate,
LONDON, S.W.1.

Copy to Director

CONFIDENTIAL

ADD/175/5/59

Mr. R. Pilgrim,
H.S.C.,
Building F6.1

I find myself unfortunately against almost all of Drake's proposals! - but most of all on artistic grounds of his suggested 'cover'. Whatever may be wrong with the contents of A.W.R.E. publications, at least their external appearance has had dignity and restraint! This one seems more applicable to a new detergent!

As regards 'References'. I have no intention of modifying the Establishment rules for this book. If SECRET references are required, the book itself must be SECRET (paragraph 3(a) of Drake's covering Memo).

As regards Drakes paragraph 3(b). I see no point in classifying titles. It is not the title which usually warrants classification but the contents.

I have a fairly open mind on the choice of the title "E N E" but I find it hard to swallow that "it is sufficiently different from ENW" (page 3 last line of paragraph 3). Perhaps "MENW" would be the best compromise.

Finally I want to be quite clear about the object of this Manual. Are we writing it as part of our Contract to M.O.S. (or M.O.D.) to fill a need in Service Ministries, or even in Services (?and Civil Defence), or are we doing it as a spontaneous A.E.A. contribution to British knowledge? If the former, then I think we should consult the Services about the scope of its contents and whether it should be loose leaf, or loose chapters, or what. At the moment we seem more interested in the colour spectrum of the production than in the use of the end product.

A.D.D.

Building F6.1.,
5th May, 1959.

Copy to Mr. Drake Seager.

Reference SPT/93/A

Admiral P. W. B. Brooking,
A.D.D.,
Building F6.1.

5th MAY 1959
7872

Manual on effects of Atomic Weapons

1. Three new drafts of chapters for this manual will soon be ready for reproduction, one more is in preparation, and a fourth is about to be started. The time is, therefore, ripe for considering the make-up and appearance of the revised manual, and I attach a copy of my proposals for your approval. If you agree I will then distribute, as AWRE proposals, a condensed version for comment by the main users of the Manual, outside AWRE.

2. You may also be interested to see how I think the cover of the new manual might look. I attach a print of this.

3. I would like to make two points on security at this stage.

(a) Would it not be possible to relax Security Instruction No. 19 slightly by permitting, as a general principle, reference, in a CONFIDENTIAL document like the revised manual, to a SECRET report (i.e. only one grade higher, and with no restrictive marking like ATOMIC, UKUSA etc) provided this is limited to the reference number, date and matter which requires only a lower grading? Para 3.3(a) of UKUSA Security Handbook amended December 1956 refers.

(b) Arising out of (a), but worth considering independently, would it not be worth while to endeavour to have the titles of AWRE Reports classified no higher than CONFIDENTIAL and to quote the classification of the title in each report? "Capabilities of Atomic Weapons (U)" is a good example.

F. R. Drake Seager.

Building F6.1.
Extn. 7952.

28th April, 1959.

c.c. HSO. (with copy of cover print)
[illegible]
Mr. Wolfe.

51-6987
V.P.&Co.
(REGIMINT)
Code 18-75

199/4/58/ADD

Your Ref: 42/58/SWP

Mr. E.P. Hicks

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

THE EFFECTS MANUAL

I am glad you agree that the Effects Manual should be Confidential, if in fact there is a case for its retention.

I cannot remember whether the Manual was launched as a result of A.W.R.E. initiative, or from a request by C.A.W. (now D.G.A.W.) or the Services.

I do remember the prestige point being raised that the U.K. should not have to be dependant on a U.S. book for its Effects information ("Effects of Atomic Weapons") and maybe this point is equally valid now that "Capabilities" has been issued.

If as you say the useful survival of the Manual is only a matter of finding a plodding EO/SEO type, we are surely not entitled to kill it, but before making serious efforts to find such a man, I believe we should discuss the policy with the "originator" - do you know who he was - M.O.W., M.O.D. or D.A.W.R.E.?

S

A.D.D.

F6.1
Aldermaston
23rd April, 1958

c.c. Dr. Corner
Dr. Pike
Mr. Burrows

END

CONFIDENTIAL

42/58/SWP

Admiral P. W. BROCKLE.G.

The Effects Manual

Burrows has been to see me about re-classification of the British Effects Manual, and I agreed to put the position, as I see it, on paper for your consideration.

1. Following the down-grading of Capabilities, I believe we should accept as a principle that the Effects Manual should be Confidential only. Most sections can be made to fit this limitation without serious difficulty, and the exceptions should be amended accordingly.

2. The actual mechanics of downgrading should await a decision on the future of the Manual, and should only be carried through if it is decided to keep the Manual up-to-date.

3. The Manual was largely written before Capabilities (Revised Edition) was given to us, and the need which the Manual was intended to fill is also filled by Capabilities. I think it very likely that the Manual would never have been commenced had Capabilities been in our hands at the time.

4. Nevertheless, the two publications are not written in quite the same way. In particular, Capabilities tends to adopt a "this is the answer, take it or leave it" attitude, while the Manual is perhaps more scientific and critical. In addition, there are many results in Capabilities which we would not regard as correct. These comments support the case for the continuation of the Manual.

5. My personal opinion is that the Manual ought to be kept alive, but only provided that it is kept up-to-date. As I see it, there is a job for a plodding E.O./S.E.O. type, with a good general armaments background. He should go through the Manual section by section, reviewing what is already written in the light of any later evidence, and amending accordingly. I have in fact tried to recruit such a man, without success so far, though I have not been trying very hard.

6. A further complication is that the Physics Division will shortly be re-organized, and the present plan envisages that effects, presumably including the Manual, will go to Pike. I do not know what his views on this topic will be.

7. Finally, I hold a draft Manual chapter on Cratering and Earth Shock, and should shortly have a completely revised chapter on Initial Nuclear Radiations. It would hardly seem worth issuing them if the Manual is to be abandoned.

E. P. HICKS
S.W.P.

Building E.3.
21st April, 1958.

Copies to:- Dr. Corner
Dr. Pike
Mr. Burrows

CONFIDENTIAL