

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138



December 1, 1997

To: Members, Universities Study Group on Grand Terrorism
From: Ash Carter, John Deutch, and Philip Zelikow *re JD/AC*
Subj: First Meeting on Nov. 25; Plans for Next Meetings

The Study Group held its first meeting in Washington on November 25. In attendance were (in alphabetical order) Zoe Baird, Ash Carter, Vic DeMarines, John Deutch, Jamie Gorelick, Fred Ikle, Elaine Kamarck, Matthew Meselson, Larry Potts, Terry Scott, Malcolm Sparrow, and Philip Zelikow.

Discussion at this initial meeting covered:

1. The Group's desire to focus its effort on recommending responses to the danger of Grand Terrorism, not to analyze the threat further.
2. An initial depiction of the Study Group's task, as attached on the following pages.
3. A four-part taxonomy of responses to Grand Terrorism to guide the Study Group's work.

Our next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, January 28, from 1:00 to 4:30 pm** in Cambridge, Massachusetts, either at Harvard University or at the adjoining Charles Hotel. The subsequent meeting will be held on **Monday, February 16, from 1:00 to 4:00 pm**, in Washington, DC, at Fannie Mae's headquarters, 3900 Wisconsin Ave.

DEC 3 - 1997

ELEMENTS OF A POLICY FOR GRAND TERRORISM

I. AN END-TO-END NATIONAL STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE SPECIFIED OBJECTIVES (i.e., a strategy oriented toward objectives, not an amorphous 'threat')

Concerns to be addressed must include:

- Constitutional, legal, historical obstacles
- Bridging chasms: Law Enforcement — National Security
 Domestic — Foreign
 Terror — Enemy Attack
 Non-State — State
- Need to take international approach, vice U.S.-only
- Public awareness
- State/local level relationships in policymaking and implementation
- Risk analysis (as a method for factoring the problem into parts that can be analyzed by relevant organizations, not just 'threat assessment')
- Budget authorities
- New organizations/institutions; redefining missions of existing institutions

Objectives must be specified as desired, tangible operational outcomes, so that we will know if we have achieved them.

II. ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

	NBC	Cyber	Critical Infrastrucs	Other
• Intelligence/Surveillance/Warning				
• Prevention				
• Deterrence				
• Protection				
• Crisis Management: (a) attribution/prosecution (b) covert, other preemptive action (c) retaliation				
• Consequence Management				
• Lessons Learned				

III. FORMULATING CONCEPTS OF OPERATIONS/
CONDUCTING OPERATIONS

	NBC	Cyber	Critical Infrastrucs	Other
• Intelligence/Surveillance/Warning				
• Prevention				
• Deterrence				
• Protection				
• Crisis Management: (a) attribution/prosecution (b) covert, other preemptive action (c) retaliation				
• Consequence Management				
• Lessons Learned				

IV. BUILDING CAPABILITY

- Technology development
- Information management
- Procurement/fielding of needed capabilities
- Exercising/training/awareness