

UNCLASSIFIED

119

①

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

~~SECRET/EXDIS~~

February 18, 1977

Vertical File -  
Presidential  
Review Memoranda  
Box 105

Presidential Review Memorandum/NSC-10

TO: The Vice President  
The Secretary of State  
The Secretary of Defense

ALSO: The Director, Office of Management and Budget  
The Director, Arms Control and Disarmament  
Agency  
The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff  
The Director of Central Intelligence  
The U. S. Representative to the United Nations

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Net Assessment and  
Military Force Posture Review (U)

I hereby direct that a comprehensive examination be made of overall U. S. national strategy and capabilities. This examination will consist of two parts to be done concurrently.

One part of the examination will be conducted by the Policy Review Committee under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Defense. It will define a wide range of alternative military strategies and construct alternative military force postures and programs to support each of these military strategies. Among other topics, this segment will consider: military force levels; technological developments with regard to new weaponry; alternatives to our reliance on foreign bases; deterrence at reciprocally lowered strategic levels; viability and desirability of the "triad" posture. This portion should also evaluate the relative ability of the U. S. and its allies to achieve U. S. objectives in specified military contingencies. It will identify the key issues for Presidential decisions, including the budgetary implications of each of these postures.

The other part will be a dynamic net assessment conducted by the Special Coordination Committee under the chairmanship of the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. It will consist of review and comparison of the overall trends in the political, diplomatic, economic, technological, and military capabilities of the United States, its allies, and potential

~~SECRET/EXDIS~~

UNCLASSIFIED

Declassified/Released on 1/6/92  
under provisions of E.O. 12356  
by S. Tilley, National Security Council

(F87-19E)

adversaries. It will evaluate the objectives and national strategies that may be pursued by our principal potential adversaries and examine the alternative national objectives and strategies appropriate to the United States.

This two-part analysis should identify for Presidential decisions alternative national strategies and the major defense programs and other initiatives required to implement them. The two parts should be carefully coordinated with one another. In order to achieve this, I have directed the Assistant to the President/National Security Affairs to develop additionally more detailed terms of reference for this analysis.

These terms of reference will be presented for my review by February 24. I also want interim reports to allow further guidance as the study progresses. A summary of the entire report, not to exceed 70 pages, should be submitted for NSC consideration not later than June 1, 1977; the final version should be completed by June 15, 1977.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jimmy Carter". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping "C" for "Carter".

UNCLASSIFIED

~~TOP SECRET~~

(220)  
Vertical File  
Presidential Review  
Memorandum  
Box 105

PRM/NSC-10

MILITARY STRATEGY AND FORCE POSTURE REVIEW

FINAL REPORT

COPY 8 OF 250 COPIES.

CLASSIFIED BY ~~SEC OF DEFENSE~~ SUBJECT TO GENERAL  
DECLASSIFICATION SCHEDULE OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 11652-AUTOMATICALLY  
DOWNGRADED AT TWO YEAR INTERVALS-DECLASSIFIED ON 31 DECEMBER 1987.

UNCLASSIFIED

~~TOP SECRET~~  
DECLASSIFY ON: OADR

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

PRM/NSC-10

MILITARY STRATEGY AND FORCE POSTURE REVIEW

FINAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
I. INTRODUCTION	1-1
A. Purpose	1-1
B. Assumptions	1-2
C. Major Issues	1-2
D. Limitations of the Report	1-3
E. Organization of the Report	1-4
II. CURRENT CAPABILITIES	
A. Purpose and Cautions	11-1
B. US-USSR Worldwide Conflict	11-2
Central Europe	11-2
NATO Flanks	11-4
Non-European Operations	11-4
US-USSR Nuclear Conflict	11-5
C. Other Contingencies	11-6
Middle East	11-6
Sub-Saharan Africa	11-7
Korea	11-8

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

## III. ALTERNATIVE INTEGRATED MILITARY STRATEGIES (AIMS)

A. Introduction	III-1
B. Methodology	III-1
C. Content of AIMS	III-2
D. Forces to Support AIMS	III-7
General Purpose Forces	III-7
Strategic Forces	III-12
E. Costs of AIMS	III-18
F. Comparison Overview	III-22
G. Comparison of AIMS: Dimensions	III-22
Deterrence and the Nuclear Dimension	III-22
The NATO-Warsaw Pact Dimension	III-23
Non-European Dimensions	III-25
H. Comparison of AIMS: Implications	III-27
Soviet Reactions	III-27
Foreign Policy Implications	III-28
Arms Control Implications	III-32
Fiscal Implications	III-34
Domestic Implications	III-42
I. Comparison of AIMS: Non-Military Implementation Initiatives	III-42

## IV. EVALUATION OF AIMS

A. Introduction	IV-1
B. Question One	IV-2
C. Question Two	IV-7
D. Question Three	IV-10
E. Question Four	IV-15
F. Question Five	IV-20
G. Question Six	IV-24

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose. The purpose of the PRM-10 Force Postures Study is to elicit policy guidance from the President on key issues pertaining to national military strategy. The scope of this study is intentionally broad. It partakes of all, but exhausts none, of the numerous topics and factors which enter into the determination of national military strategy. It is designed to provide a solid basis for further detailed work on defense force structure and program issues, using either the interagency process or the normal PPBS decision process, as appropriate.

Approach. In order to develop alternative integrated military strategies (AIMS), Substrategy building blocks were constructed to identify a range of options in each of five analytical areas:

1. NATO-Warsaw Pact conflict in Europe (including the NATO Flanks and the North Atlantic).
2. Operations outside Europe during a NATO-WP war.
3. East Asia.
4. Peacekeeping activities and potential local wars.
5. US-USSR nuclear conflict.

The major issues in each analytical area, or conflict category, were isolated. Then, using this building block technique, the substrategies shown below were developed to focus on what the US should achieve as well as the threats to that achievement.

Summary of Substrategies

<u>NATO-WP IN EUROPE</u>	<u>NON-EUROPEAN OPERATIONS DURING A NATO-WP WAR</u>	<u>EAST ASIA</u>	<u>PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES AND POTENTIAL LOCAL WARS</u>	<u>US-USSR NUCLEAR CONFLICT</u>
COUNTEROFFENSIVE				
OFFSETTING ATTACKS				
DIRECT DEFENSE	INITIATIVES	INCREASED PRESENCE	HEAVY INTERVENTION	CLEAR SUPERIORITY
LIMIT LOSS	LIMITED ACTION	CURRENT PRESENCE	LIGHT INTERVENTION	RETAIN US FORCE ADVANTAGES
ELASTIC TRIPWIRE	MINIMAL EFFORT	REDUCED PRESENCE	LIMITED ACTION	MAINTAIN OVERALL FORCE BALANCE
TRIPWIRE		MODIFIED WITHDRAWAL	PROXY RELIANCE	ASSURED RETALIATION ONLY
		WITHDRAWAL		

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Alternative Integrated Military Strategies (AIMS) were formulated from the analytical area substrategies by excluding unworkable combinations of substrategies. Eight final AIMS were selected for detailed evaluation in terms of their military, economic, political (both in technical and domestic) and arms control implications. Each AIMS addresses in a different way the major military issues facing the United States. The range of AIMS is intentionally broad so that they will provide a comprehensive analytical framework for evaluation of the major elements of defense policy.

The composition of the eight final AIMS in terms of their analytical area substrategies is shown in the table below:

ALTERNATIVE INTEGRATED MILITARY STRATEGIES (AIMS)

AIMS	RATO/WP Conflict in Europe	Operations Outside Europe in US-USSR War	East Asia	Peacekeeping and Potential Local Wars	US-USSR Nuclear Conflict
E	Limit Loss: Hold 86-52 division threat at Weser-Lech w/90-day sustainability	Limited Action	Reduced Presence	Limited Action	Maintain Overall force balance
F		Limited Action	Current Presence	Light Intervention	Retain US Force Advantages
G		Initiatives	Current Presence	Heavy Intervention	Maintain Overall force balance
F(Variant)	Limit Loss: Hold 130 division threat at Weser-Lech w/90-day sustainability	Limited Action	Current Presence	Light Intervention	Retain US Force Advantages
H	Direct Defense: Restore pre-war line against 130 division threat w/90-day sustainability	Limited Action	Reduced Presence	Limited Action	Maintain Overall force balance
I		Limited Action	Current Presence	Light Intervention	Retain US Force Advantages
J	Direct Defense: w/indefinite sustainability	Initiatives	Current Presence	Heavy Intervention	Assured Detach- ment only
K	Offsetting Attacks: Flank attack on Pact while holding in central Region against 130+ division threat w/indefinite sustainability	Initiatives	Increased Presence	Heavy Intervention	Clear Superiority

Each of these strategies has a specific rationale for linking building blocks into coherent AIMS, as summarized below.

~~SECRET~~



# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.