

A. KATZ

[REDACTED] /E

[REDACTED] 5709-72  
Pg 1 of 2  
Cy 11

EPILOGUE - April 13, 1972

The conclusion I came to, after extensive discussions in Washington, where I tried the preceding analysis out on a varied audience, is that the Soviets were stimulated, triggered, or catalyzed with their anti-satellite activity (the COSMOS experiments) by our (announced) 437 program (our anti-satellite program started by President Kennedy). Thus 437 started them off, but what kept and keeps the COSMOS ASAT activity going is the Soviet bureaucratic apparatus and its imperative. 437 is still in existence, on a 30 day standby basis. But it turns out that I believe my arguments - the Soviets can't use COSMOS against our recon birds (yes, they can; I mean that they won't).

If I am right in believing that theirs is a dead-end program, then the Soviets are the victims of a large practical joke which we inadvertently played on them (I can only wish that we had been clever enough to have done it deliberately). This line of argument leads me to oppose the initiation of a vigorous anti-satellite program designed to "counter" the Soviet effort. Now let us imagine that the Soviets are about to scrub their program, that they're in the middle of a meeting on this very subject, when the meeting is interrupted by news that the U.S., in a publicly announced spread by the Secretary of Defense, is starting a huge

[REDACTED] /E

[REDACTED]  
Control System Only  
**WORKING COPY**

[REDACTED] -/E

[REDACTED] 5709-72  
Pg 2 of 2  
Cy 11

program to counter Soviet satellites. This is just the push the near-dead COSMOS program would need to insure renewed interest, funding and activity.

Against any scenario that I find credible, knocking off one of our recce systems by the Soviets is incredible. In principle, it should be possible to devise a scenario in which such action by the Soviets is credible. But when I try this, I find that the weight of incredibility has shifted from the destruction of our recce birds to the scenario itself. I confess my limitations in both logic and imagination, and leave the devising of palatable scenarios to others.

Clearly when I say that the Soviets will or won't do something, this is compressed language for what really are probabilistic statements. In this instance, I am suggesting that the chances are something like 90:10 that there is no threat to our recce birds.\* But what do we do about the 10%? Even though the probability of a fire destroying any individual's home is low (say less than 10%), the consequences are so grave, that the prudent man takes out insurance. In the case at hand of course, we should take out insurance; but the size of the premium depends on the risk. This paper is but the first step - all I have tried to do is discuss the risk. The next step, assuming agreement on the size of the risk is to design a workable insurance scheme.

\*There is no way of calculating the probability of single future events. The numbers I'm using are subjective betting odds, and could as easily be stated as 95:5.

[REDACTED] -/E

Handle Via  
[REDACTED]  
Control System Only