TO: Andy Marshall
DIRECTOR, Net Assessment

re High Precision Strike Weapons

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

OCT 25 1993

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

Some opn'l implications:

- Do we need (so few!) huge carriers? Smart (+standoff) weapons can do their job with much smaller payloads, fewer sorties. We don't have enough carriers to go around. Shouldn't we have (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 minor part of the logistic load

DoD x f Marshall

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's to be an organization to help think this through, I'd suggest an analogue to the CNO's executive, primarily some smart ~~O-6~~ O-6's and a civilian advisory panel; perhaps some outside contracting, but attached to the Chairman of the JCS. The DSB ~~does not~~ is still too close to existing industry rice bowls and too low-ham active uniforms to be the

best suited. DSB could take on some special sub-studi

The proliferation of access and use of WMD's will certainly complicate the environment. BW will be the poorer countries' revenge for HPSW's. Some analysis about what has deterred or deferred 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 overburdened 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 provoking attacks on "innocent" facilities. Many examples in Iraq.

I've been party to many studies of technological surprise. That always hangs over our heads; but all concurred that novel ~~innovative~~ operational 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.

Yours,

[illegible]