

To: Andy Marshall
DIRZTDK, Net Assessment

Dr. Joshua Lederberg
Suite 115
1230 York Avenue
New York, NY 10021-6399

re High Precision Strike Weapons

OCT 25 1993

Bill Perry has already written the book: his paper in foreign affairs.

Some op'n'l implications:

- x of Marshall
- Do we need (so few!) huge carriers? ^(+standoff) Smart weapons can do their job with much smaller payloads, fewer sorties. We don't have enough carriers to go around. Wouldn't we use (more) smaller units? Perhaps less elaborately defended.
 - Reciprocally, our high value targets are put at risk. Moving personnel in ships may be too dangerous. Even with smarter weapons, they're a major part of the logistic load.

DoD ↓

There is also a revolution in a) affordability and b) the level and character of the manifest threats. [and hence the price in treasure and blood that our electorate will be willing to support].

If there is to be an organization to help think this through, I'd suggest an analogue to the CNO's executive, precisely some smart ~~of~~ O-6's and a civilian advisory panel; perhaps some outside contracting, but attached to the Chairman of the JCS. The OSB ~~does not~~ is still too close to existing industrial interests and to be sure a ~~lot~~ of its members to be the

2... not 1993

best suited. DSB could take as some special sub-study.

The proliferation of access and use of WMD's will certainly complicate the environment. BW will be the poorer cousin's revenge for HPSW's. Some analysis about what has deterred or deflected their use in the past is certainly worth while. More broadly: what is the role of deterrence in the future; how build the international consensus to make deterrence still more effective? I am not overwhelmed with optimism or good ideas in this realm.

I don't need to add anything to "information war". But not enough is said about deception and counter-deception. That includes providing attacks as "innocent" facilities. Many examples in Iraq.

I've been party to many studies of technological surprises. That always hangs over our heads; but all concerned the novel ^{operational} ~~innovative~~ use of existing technology was a more likely source of surprise than new physics. The latter can happen but there probably would be substantial lags before military application.

John
Fisher