

MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

OSD REVIEWED 17-May-2011: NO OBJECTION TO DECLASSIFICATION

INFORMATION
September 29, 1970

TOP SECRET/SENSITIVE

MEMORANDUM FOR DR. KISSINGER

FROM: K. Wayne Smith *KWS*

SUBJECT: Meeting of Special Defense Panel

Your Special Defense Panel met on September 25 and 26 to discuss the "Net Assessment" papers they had agreed to write at the first meeting. Attending the meeting, in addition to myself, were:

Laurence E. Lynn, Jr.
Charles Herzfeld
Fred Hoffman
William Kaufmann
Jim Schlesinger

General Goodpaster was unable to attend the meeting because of the Middle East crisis and the President's upcoming trip. Andy Marshall was unable to attend because of temporary regulations imposed by the Department of Defense prohibiting commercial air travel by persons with certain security clearances. However, his paper was available for consideration by the group.

Based on your earlier guidance, a briefing on recent events by Jim Schlesinger and me, a lengthy discussion of the papers that had been prepared and a discussion of how the group could best serve you and the President, it was decided that the group's future work would proceed along the following lines. Over the next three weeks, individual members of the group would write papers on various important substantive areas dealing with Defense planning and the Defense posture. The papers would deal with these topics in detail

TOP SECRET/SENSITIVE

DOS REVIEWED 19 APR 2011 NO OBJECTION TO DECLASSIFICATION

TOP SECRET/SENSITIVE

2

and would serve as building blocks for a shorter summary report from you to the President. This report would be similar in concept to the Secretary of Defense's annual budget and posture statement and would be ready by the first of the year. The agreed general outline of this summary report together with the individuals responsible for the initial preparation of its various parts are as follows:

Section I - The Challenges (to be written later)

1. Recent trends in the role and use of military force.
2. Declining U.S. defense budgets.
3. Increasing Soviet capabilities.
4. Tying the U.S. defense posture to the Nixon Doctrine.
5. Problems of improving our processes converting resource inputs into real military capabilities.

Section II - Net Assessment of U.S. and Soviet Military Forces
(Marshall/Schlesinger/Goodpaster)

1. Problems of making a net assessment.
2. Facts of the current military balance.
3. Important trends in the current balance.
4. Comparison of the defense planning processes on both sides to include objectives (stated and perceived), intelligence evaluation problems, doctrine, design criteria, R&D procedures, impact of institutional factors, etc.
5. Important differences and their implications.

TOP SECRET/SENSITIVE

TOP SECRET/SENSITIVE

3

Section III - U.S. Defense Posture

1. Analyses of each of the following major areas to include rationale, alternatives, recommendations, and problems and ways of implementation:

- strategic forces (Lynn)
- tactical air forces (Smith)
- land forces (Kaufmann)
- naval forces (Herzfeld)
- mobility forces (Lynn)
- tactical nuclear forces (Kaufmann)
- manpower/readiness/logistics (Hoffman)
- research and development (Herzfeld)
- command and control (Schlesinger)

2. Priorities in and among different areas (to be written later).

3. Basic policy and posture options (to be written later)

Section IV - Conclusions and Recommendations (to be written later)

It was agreed that the group would meet again in Washington on October 20 and 21 to discuss and review the individual papers and plan the next phase of its work.

I believe we are now making good progress and that with some merciless hounding by me, we will have a good paper in the near future. Certainly there is ample talent in the group to do so. Finally, I do not think it is either necessary or desirable to add additional members to the panel. First of all, there are numerous practical and administrative problems in bringing new members in at this point. Second, the question of balance is an important one, but from what I have seen, we were worried about the wrong direction. Unless I hear differently from you, I will proceed on the basis that the membership of the panel is now set.

TOP SECRET/SENSITIVE