Date: Thu, 10 Mar 2011 14:58:07 -0500
To: "Dr. Baruch Fischhoff - Chair, National Academy Committee on Improving Intelligence" <baruch@cmu.edu>, "Bill Nordhaus - National Academy of Sciences" <william.nordhaus@yale.edu>, "Dr. Carole Pateman - President, APSA" <pateman@ucla.edu>, "Dr. Robert Keohane-National Academy of Sciences" <rkeohane@princeton.edu>, "Dr. Robert Axelrod - National Academy of Sciences" <axe@umich.edu>, "Dr. Jonathan Cole - CASBS" <jrc5@columbia.edu>, "Dr. Richard Atkinson - Chair - NRC/DBASSE" <rcatkinson@ucsd.edu>, "Dr. Kenneth Prewitt - Chair, Committee on Social Science Evidence for Use" <kp2058@columbia.edu>, "Mr. Jake Sullivan - Director, Policy Planning Staff via Ms. Marisa S. McAuliffe" <mcauliffems@state.gov>, "Dr. John Deutch" <jmd@mit.edu>
From: Lloyd Etheredge <lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net>

Subject: 248. <u>Red Team: The Afghanistan Disclosure: Urgent Forecasting of Behavioral & Technology Counter-Learning; Thinking ahead & Aegis implications</u>

Dear Dr. Fischhoff and Colleagues:

Concerning my earlier message (# 247 archived at www.policyscience.net at II. D) and the former Assistant Secretary's disclosure of the extraordinary aerial monitoring technology net deployed across much of Afghanistan and (probably) part of Pakistan: Mr. West's policy implication, supporting draw-downs of US forces, requires an urgent Red Team evaluation of behavioral assumptions about the potential rates of behavioral and technological adaptation and learning. The policy implication might be too hasty.

The technical questions - before basing changes in US policy on the new technology - include how difficult it would be for the Taliban and its supporters to bring down the new aerial network of blimps at their (reported) one mile altitude and/or neutralize the capabilities by counter-tactics? And how quickly their counter-move technology could be

1

neutralized by special coatings (etc.) on the Air Force's side? If the Taliban's financial supporters include the international drug cartel, there may be a new technology battle instead of a rapid victory.

Advice to President Obama?

There also is a range of further US counter-moves that, hopefully, somebody is developing and that should be evaluated by a Red Team assessment for President Obama. How hard would it be to develop an Automated Defense Gun for US Army or Afghan Army outposts that can recognize incoming rounds (from the metal bullets, muzzle flashes, and even complex sound echoes), quickly compute the origin, and assuredly hit the enemy marksman with a spread of return fire in a fraction of a second? Human observers, marksmen, and reaction times can still be used, but a new 100% Quick Kill technology could have a rapid demoralizing and deterrent effect. Thus, Mr. West's policy implication could still follow if there is a package of new, overlapping DARPA/DNI technology to tilt the wartime advantages strongly to the Defense.

[It's puzzling that the Army has not yet developed the Automated Defense Gun idea to upgrade its many Afghan outposts that are fired upon periodically. The Navy's Aegis (fast reaction) system might be downsized and adapted quickly for initial experiments and change the balance of the Afghan war by a technology that the Taliban probably could not neutralize.[

LE

Dr. Lloyd S. Etheredge, Director - Government Learning Project
Policy Sciences Center
URL: www.policyscience.net
301-365-5241 (v); lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net (email)

[The Policy Sciences Center, Inc. is a public foundation that develops and integrates knowledge and practice to advance human dignity. Its headquarters are 127 Wall St.,

Room 322 PO Box 208215 in New Haven, CT 06520-8215. It may be contacted at the office of its Chair, Michael Reisman (michael.reisman@yale.edu), 203-432-1993. Further information about the Policy Sciences Center and its projects, Society, and journal is available at www.policysciences.org.]