Chairman -- PW again ... 1

reductions than now planned would risk destroying the force's high
quality. Accordingly, we will program base force levels as
follows:

 Nuclear Forces: [1]B-52 and B-1 bombers; 550 ICBMs; and 18 SSBNs
 Conventional Forces:
   Army: 12 active, 6 reserve, and 2 cadre divisions
   Navy: 12 aircraft carrier battle groups with 11 active and
          2 reserve air wings; approximately 450 total ships
   Marine Corps: 3 active Marine Expeditionary Forces and one
                  reserve Marine division and wing[2]
   Air Force: 15.25 active and 11.25 reserve fighter wings,
               plus conventional bomber capability including 20 B-2s

[3]
(U)   These forces can and will be provided with **not greater than**
the following military end strengths: *(including with minimum equalities)*

   Army.   536,000 active   567,400 reserve
   Navy.   501,200 active   117,800 reserve
   Marine Corps. 159,100 active   34,900 reserve
   Air Force.   430,300 active   200,000 reserve

(most)   *and most appropriately*
(U)   Required military personnel will be maintained in that
component of the Total Force -- active or reserve -- in which they
can effectively accomplish required missions, [4]~~quickly, with minimum~~
~~casualties, and at the least cost~~. This generally requires forces
for forward presence (including an associated CONUS rotation

---

advisors)." Air Force too would delete as "unnecessary. Given the debate
over defense budget levels, the key point here centers on faster reductions".

[1] Joint Staff, Acquisition and ASD/PA&E would cite B-2 here. Air Force no
comment. See also note 2 on p. 35

[2] PA&E would change to read "3 (-)" MEFs and "one (-)" division/wing
Rationale: "to avoid the impression that the reductions caused no loss in
capability". This is a valid point, but USMC and Joint Staff would likely
object, and the change would constitute an OSD redefinition of the base force
-- to be avoided here. Also, only one of the MEFs is being substantially
reduced in strength. PA&E also proposed adding the training carrier to the
list -- rejected.

[3] PDASD(SO/LIC) proposes inserting here 7 lines of text detailing SOF levels.
Might satisfy them to replace the brief SOF cite of earlier drafts, in the
Crisis Reponse section.

[4] ASD/RA would delete "quickly, with ~~------------------------~~ Rationale:
"It may not be necessary for units to accomplish their missions quickly, but
rather according to the appropriate deployment schedules. Furthermore, if
units are mission-ready, ~~--~~
~~------~~ not the component involved." Response: we could substititute "within
appropriate deployment times" for "quickly" but the real point -- the ability
to end hostilities quickly -- would be lost (and indeed could be clarified by
replacing "accomplish required missions" with "end hostilities").

OSM-1978-A1

Doc #10