

Subject: Army Capstone Concept
From: "John W. Hall" <jwhall3@wisc.edu>
Date: Fri, 21 Aug 2009 13:09:56 -0500
To: Jeremi Suri <suri@wisc.edu>, Scott Mobley <mobley@wisc.edu>

Gentlemen,

TRADOC is planning on sending a delegation (2-3?) of concept developers to Madison to meet with the JASONS ISS on 21 October. I have proposed a late morning meeting. I will send you an e-copy of the draft concept under review as soon as it is available. In the meantime, I suggest we set about the business of enlisting reviewers and setting aside facilities (might we have lunch on site?).

I have attached the current version of the Army Capstone Concept. I would direct our committee's attention to the forward for an adequate explanation of the document's purpose. Laden with jargon and buzz-phrases, the pamphlet is not a pleasurable read. The revision, I have learned, is about 25-pages long and bears little resemblance to this predecessor; I am hopeful. I offer the following as potential "selling points" for participating in this effort:

- The Army Capstone Concept is a theoretical expression of the way the U.S. Army expects to fight in the no-too-distant future. This "proto-doctrine" engenders an array of experiments, wargames, and studies used to evaluate the theory and its prescriptions. Pursuant to these activities, the army prioritizes the capabilities it wants to develop and apportions resources. Ultimately, then, this document influences the way in which the army spends its money.
- We have undertaken this review at the personal request of Brig. Gen. H.R. McMaster, Director of Concept Development and Experimentation for the U.S. Army. One of the army's leading intellects and most celebrated combat commanders, General McMaster (a UNC Ph.D. and author of *Dereliction of Duty: Johnson, McNamara, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Lies That Led to Vietnam*) is an outspoken critic of the way this process has operated in the past. He has increasingly turned to the academic community to lend sophistication to the army's corporate thinking on subjects important to national security and defense policy, and in this vein he has asked us to review a document that will ultimately bear his imprimatur.

(You both know our audience better than do I, so I will not be offended by redaction or rejection).

To review (and refine) my proposed methodology:

1. Upon receipt of the draft, we will distribute to participants for an initial review.
2. Subsequently, we will meet to discuss with one another. I can open with an overview, provide some context/backstory, and answer any questions. The purpose is not to approach consensus but to assure a common understanding and (ideally) to have a stimulating exchange based in initial impressions.
3. Participants independently, thoroughly review the concept in preparation for the 21 OCT visit.
4. On 21 October, we convene a "thesis defense" of the concept. (We need to discuss designation of a chair).

Please share your thoughts, questions, concerns.

Best,
John

p525-3-0.pdf	Content-Type: application/octet-stream Content-Encoding: base64
--------------	--