

NPS-56-80-008

# NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

## Monterey, California



### COMBAT DAMAGE ASSESSMENT TEAM

A-10/GAU-8 LOW ANGLE FIRINGS

VERSUS

SIMULATED SOVIET TANK COMPANY (ARRAY 22)

(LAVP Lot Number AJD 79A181-001, AEROJET)

(7 NOVEMBER 1979)

R.H.S. STOLFI

R.R. McEACHIN

JUNE 1980

UF  
767  
S84921

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Prepared for: A-10 System Program Office  
Wright Patterson Air Force Base  
Ohio 45433

20091105024

UF  
767  
584921


DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY  
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
MONTEREY CALIF 93940

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
Monterey, California

Rear Admiral J. J. Ekelund  
Superintendent

Jack R. Borsting  
Provost

The work reported herein was supported by the A-10 System Program Office, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. The reproduction of all or part of this report is authorized.




Russel H.S. Stolffy  
Associate Professor of  
History

Reviewed by:



Sherman W. Blandin  
Acting Chairman  
Department of National  
Security Affairs

Released by:



W.M. Tolles  
Dean of Research



Unclassified

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY  
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
MONTEREY CALIF 94064

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER NPS-56-80-008	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) A-10/GAU-8 Low Angle Firing versus Simulated Soviet Tank Company (Array 22) (7 November 1979) LAVP Lot Number AJD 79A181-001, Aerojet		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Special report for Array Firings of 7 November 1979
7. AUTHOR(s) R.H.S. Stolfi R.R. McEachin		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS A-10 System Program Office Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Ohio 45433		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE June 1980
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEOLE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) 1. automatic cannon ammunition      6. empirical firing tests 2. GAU-8 cannon      7. combat stowed targets 3. A-10 aircraft      8. gun ammunition lethality 4. main battle tank (MBT)      9. MBT vulnerability & survivability 5. Lot Acceptance Verification Program (LAVP)      ity		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This report describes firings of the A-10/GAU-9 weapon system on 7 November 1979 against a Soviet tank company simulated by 10 com- bat loaded M-47 tanks. The pilot making the firing passes attacked at low altitude and used correspondingly low dive angles in order to simulate movement through a hostile air defense system. Ammunition used in the attacks comprised Aerojet Lot Number AJD 79A181-001 30mm armor piercing incendiary (API) rounds, which (continued)		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE  
S/N 0102-014-6601

i

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

(block 20 continued)

proved to be effective damage agents against substantial areas of the U.S. MK 47 tanks used as targets. The pilot in ten successful firing passes fired a total of 174 rounds of which 90 impacted the targets. Of the projectiles impacting on targets 30 achieved perforations of the armored envelope. Significant results include catastrophic damage to 3 tanks, 1 tank immobilized and silenced, three tanks immobilized only.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . . .	1
Attack Parameters . . . . .	1
Weapon Effects . . . . .	1
Damage Assessment . . . . .	1
Test Conditions . . . . .	2
Results . . . . .	2
BACKGROUND . . . . .	4
TEST PHILOSOPHY . . . . .	4
SIMULATED GROUND COMBAT SITUATION . . . . .	6
TARGET TANKS . . . . .	7
TEST PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS . . . . .	7
DAMAGE ASSESSMENT . . . . .	15
Tank Number 7 . . . . .	16
Tank Number 28 . . . . .	18
Tank Number 49 . . . . .	20
Tank Number 41 . . . . .	22
Tank Number 47 . . . . .	24
Tank Number 30 . . . . .	26
Tank Number 48 . . . . .	28
Tank Number 33 . . . . .	30
Tank Number 38 . . . . .	32
Tank Number 39 . . . . .	34
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	37
APPENDIX A . . . . .	39
APPENDIX B . . . . .	44

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Russian T-62 Medium Tank . . . . .	8
2. U.S.A.F./Fairchild Republic A-10 Aircraft . . . . .	10
3. Fairchild A-10 Series Aircraft . . . . .	11
4. GAU-8/A 30mm Gun System . . . . .	12
5. 30mm Armor Piercing Incendiary (API) Round . . . . .	13
6. Approximate Target Layout . . . . .	14
7. Impact Diagram, Tank 7 . . . . .	17
8. Impact Diagram, Tank 28 . . . . .	19
9. Impact Diagram, Tank 49 . . . . .	21
10. Impact Diagram, Tank 41 . . . . .	23
11. Impact Diagram, Tank 47 . . . . .	25
12. Impact Diagram, Tank 30 . . . . .	27
13. Impact Diagram, Tank 48 . . . . .	29
14. Impact Diagram, Tank 33 . . . . .	31
15. Impact Diagram, Tank 38 . . . . .	33
16. Impact Diagram, Tank 39, Right Side . . . . .	35
17. Impact Diagram, Tank 39, Front . . . . .	36
A-1. Array 22 Attack Aspect Summary . . . . .	43

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Array 22 Summary of A-10 Aircraft in Low Dive Angle Gun Attack Versus Simulated Soviet Tank Company . .	3
II. Comparison of Ideal and Practical Test Situations .	5
A-I. Array 22 Results Summary . . . . .	40
A-II. Array 22 Perforation Location Summary . . . . .	41
A-III. Array 22 Aircraft Attack Parameters . . . . .	42



## COMBAT DAMAGE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (CDAC) EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Under the technical direction of the Combat Damage Assessment Committee (CDAC), the Combat Damage Assessment Team (CDAT) conducted firings of the A-10/GAU-8 weapon system against an array of 10 tanks simulating a Soviet tank company deployed for an attack. The CDAT used M-47 tanks stowed with main gun ammunition, diesel fuel, lubricating oil, and crew manikins to simulate the Soviet tanks. The pilot of the A-10 aircraft used in the firings conducted firings at low altitudes and low dive angles which simulated attack below the altitude of effective engagement for opposing air defense networks employing acquisition and fire control radar. The purpose of the test was to evaluate the effects of the 30mm API anti-tank ammunition (Aerojet Lot Number AJD 79A181-001) for the GAU-8 gun under challenging conditions of engagement for the A-10/GAU-8 system against realistically simulated Soviet main battle tanks.

The CDAC assessed the results of the low angle cannon firings of the A-10 aircraft against the simulated Soviet tank company as follows:

1. Attack Parameters: The pilot of the A-10 aircraft attacked the simulated Soviet tank company at low altitude and dive angles. The GAU-8 cannon has a cockpit selectable nominal fire rate of either 4200 rounds per minute or 2100 rounds per minute. The system was set to fire at the 2100 round per minute rate during this test. The pilot made a total of 10 passes, each at a primary tank target. The passes resulted in projectile impacts on 10 primary target tanks. The attack dive angles averaged 3.8 degrees for the ten passes against the targets. Open-fire slant range averaged 2470 feet. The pilot fired 174 rounds in ten bursts averaging 17.4 rounds and 0.57 seconds each.

2. Weapons Effects: The A-10/GAU-8 weapon system achieved 90 impacts on the 10 tank targets. The ratio of direct impacts to total rounds fired was a substantial 0.49. Ricochet impacts are also capable of causing damage. If the ricochet impacts are added to the direct impacts, the overall ratio of impacts to rounds fired becomes 0.52. The weapon system achieved 30 perforations of the armored envelopes of the tanks with a ratio of perforations to total impacts of 0.33. The ratio of perforations to direct impacts is 0.35. Many projectiles, which did not perforate armor, severely damaged exterior track and suspension components of the tanks as well as gun tubes.

3. Damage Assessment: The attacking A-10/GAU-8 weapon system inflicted three catastrophic kills on tanks in the company array. Four more tanks were immobilized, of which two were deprived of, or seriously degraded in, the use of main armament. Two more tanks sustained such light damage that there was no significant degradation to either mobility or fire-power. Another tank suffered a minor degradation in mobility and fire-power. The Simulated Soviet Tank company was judged to have been effectively neutralized and incapable of continued offensive action, since all



tanks except three were immobilized.

4. Test Conditions: The target tanks were sited in open, flat desert terrain with no cover and little concealment. Aerial weather conditions were ones of unlimited ceiling and visibility. Shortly after the initial firing, clouds of white dust from projectile impacts were evident. Such conditions effectively simulated the actual obscuration which would have been presented to the pilots in combat.

5. Results: The overall results of the test are summarized in Table I.

TABLE I. Array 22 Summary of A-10 Aircraft in Low Angle Gun Attack versus Simulated Soviet Tank Company  
(7 November 1979)

Tank No.	A-10 Primary Pass*	APPROACH		ATTACK		GUN EFFECTS			DAMAGE			Tank Immobilized?	Tank Aspect (Degrees)
		Speed (FPS)	Alt (Feet)	Open Fire Range (Feet)	Dive Angle (Degrees)	Rounds (Each)	Impacts (Each)	Perfs (Each)	M %	F %	K %		
7	1/1	579	473	2699	-3.0	26	6	0	-	-	-		078
28	1/2	559	438	2191	-4.0	16	12	4	100	-	-	Yes	105
49	1/3	561	463	2334	-5.0	18	3	0	-	-	-		110
41	1/4	564	453	2406	-4.0	14	11	6	100	95	-	Yes	078
47	1/5	569	413	2334	-3.0	12	5	3	-	-	100	Yes	088
30	1/6	571	393	2263	-3.0	11	8	6	-	-	100	Yes	075
48	1/7	573	393	2547	-3.0	15	9	4	100	100	-	Yes	078
33	1/8	566	583	2758	-6.0	19	8	2	100	-	-	Yes	097
38	1/9	567	413	2547	-3.0	16	12	0	5	10	-		082
39	1/10	569	463	2618	-4.0	27	16	5	-	-	100	Yes	070
Applicable Totals:						174	90	30				7	
Averages:		568	449	2470	-3.8	17.4	9.0	3.0					

3 K-Kills  
1 M- & F-Kill  
3 M-Kills  
1 minor M & F degradation  
Right Side

\* 1/1 means pilot 1, pass 1; 1/2 means pilot 1, pass 2, etc.

## BACKGROUND

Since February, 1978, the Armament Directorate, A-10 System Program Office, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, has conducted firing tests using the A-10/GAU-8 system in low-level, air-to-ground engagements of armored targets. The tests have been conducted within the framework of the GAU-8 30mm ammunition Lot Acceptance Verification Program (LAVP) - Airborne. The LAVP has the following objectives which apply to the present tests:

- A. To evaluate the performance of existing production lots of GAU-8 ammunition when fired from the air under operational conditions.
- B. To evaluate the lethality of GAU-8 ammunition against armored targets when fired at low level from A-10 aircraft using operational tactics.

To conduct the LAVP program, the Armament Directorate has cooperated with Headquarters, Tactical Air Command, Langley AFB, Virginia and, in turn, with the Tactical Fighter Weapons Center, Nellis AFB, Nevada. Within the framework of that cooperation, the Armament Directorate has set up a Combat Damage Assessment Team (CDAT) to plan and execute the firing tests and evaluate the results. The CDAT functions under the direction of a Combat Damage Assessment Committee (CDAC) which has prepared this report of the firing test of 7 November, 1979.

## TEST PHILOSOPHY

To generate realistic data, the CDAC determined to use a highly empirical technique of destructive testing of actual tank targets. Tests have involved firings at individual tanks in November, 1977 and February - March, 1978, and, more recently, arrays of vehicles in tactical formations. The experimental setup for the firings of 7 November, 1979 involved the use of a multi-target, tactically arrayed tank formation for attack by the A-10/GAU-8 system. The CDAT elected to simulate a Soviet tank company, as organized within a tank division, as the target array for the attacking A-10 aircraft. As few constraints as possible were placed on the attacking pilot in an attempt to develop as much realism as possible. Table II shows the test factors which would have been ideal in the test of 7 November, 1979 and the practicable setup which was achieved.



Table II. Comparison of Ideal & Practical Test Situations

<u>Ideal Test Parameters</u>	<u>Practical Test Parameter</u>
1. <u>Air Attack Realism</u>	1. <u>Air Attack Realism</u>
a. Actual A-10/GAU-8	a. Actual A-10/GAU-8
b. 30mm API	b. 30mm API
c. European Weather & Terrain	c. Nevada Weather & Desert Terrain
d. Optimum open-fire ranges (2000 ft)	d. Average open-fire range (2470 ft)
e. Low Altitude attack angle (< 6 degrees)	e. Low Altitude attack angle (< 6 degrees)
2. <u>Air Defense Realism</u>	2. <u>Air Defense Realism</u>
a. Automatic cannon firing at aircraft	a. Low-altitude, low-angle, minimum-exposure attacks versus assumed AD system
b. Missile systems firing at aircraft	b. Low-altitude, low-angle, minimum-exposure attacks versus assumed AD system
c. Small arms firing at aircraft	c. Low-altitude, low-angle, minimum-exposure attacks versus assumed AD system
d. AD suppression by aircraft	d. No suppression simulation in test
3. <u>Threat Targets and Doctrine</u>	3. <u>Threat Targets and Doctrine</u>
a. T62/T64/T72 high fidelity targets	a. Simulated Soviet Tanks
b. Stowed combat loads (in T62/T64/T72)	b. Stowed combat loads (in US M-47)
c. Realistic crew station postures	c. Wooden crew manikins
d. Dynamic combat formation	d. Static combat formation
e. Maneuvering evasive targets	e. Stationary targets

## SIMULATED GROUND COMBAT SITUATION

The firing test of 7 November, 1979 simulated the attack by an A-10 aircraft on a Soviet tank company. The CDAC hypothesized the Soviet tank company to be the lead march security detachment for its battalion, which in turn, is the advance guard of a larger mobile formation. The lead detachment operates approximately five kilometers in front of the Soviet battalion column. The mission of the advance company is to ensure the uninterrupted advance of the battalion and provide security against attack. Upon meeting heavy resistance, the company deploys into an appropriate combat formation to reduce the resistance, or form a base of fire for offensive action by the remainder of the battalion.

A Soviet tank company, would probably have other units attached to it for its support. Attached units might include any one or all of the following elements: (1) motorized rifle platoon; (2) engineer detachment; (3) chemical defense specialists; (4) 122mm howitzer battery; (5) air defense element. The company simulated in the firing test consisted of tanks alone. The pure tank formation was arranged with two platoons up and one back, simulating an assault posture. The tanks used in the firing test were US M-47 tanks, largely intact, containing crew manikins, and stowed with ammunition, fuel, and oil. The tanks were not maneuvered during the firing test and the formation remained essentially a snapshot of the company at a single point in time.

## TARGET TANKS

The most effective targets available in sufficient numbers to simulate Soviet T-55 and T-62 (Figure 1) tanks were the US M-47 tanks. Both of the Soviet tank models are similar in armor protection to the M-47. With the appropriate purging of the gasoline fuel system of the US tanks, the CDAT managed to field a target similar in survivability to the T-55 and T-62 tanks from the viewpoint of ignitable internal material. Few data are available on the Soviet T-64 and later model tanks from the viewpoints of armor protection and the arrangement of internal components. The decision was made, accordingly, to simulate the earlier model Soviet tanks with the readily available US tanks.

The M-47 tanks used for targets were in excellent condition from the viewpoint of damage assessment. The exterior components were complete and the tanks have proven to be effective targets for the collection of exterior mobility damage. Interior components were less complete in the target tanks. All of the most essential items were present, e.g., main gun, engine, transmission, fuel tanks, ammunition racks, etc., but other items such as oil coolers, range finders, vision devices, and radios, have not been present in all tanks.

The most sensitive internal items from the viewpoint of catastrophic kills and high percentage M- and F-Kills are the following, which were placed in the test tanks as noted:




<u>Generic Sensitive Item</u>	<u>Test Item</u>
1. Ammunition -----	US Cartridge, 90-mm TP-T
2. Fuel -----	Number 2 Diesel
3. Oil -----	Oil in Engine, Transmission and Drive Components.
4. Personnel -----	Articulated Plywood Manikins

The tanks were static during the test and their engines were not running, with the result that the fuel and oil were much cooler and more inert than would have been the case with a moving tank or a static vehicle with its engine running. The kill ratio achieved in the firing test of 7 November, 1979, therefore, is probably conservative from the viewpoint of fires resulting from ignited fuel and oil.

## TEST PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS


Conduct of the test consisted of bringing together the ammunition, gun, aircraft, pilots, and combat arrayed and loaded tanks into a several minutes simulation of combat. In essence, the






## Russian T62 Medium Tank

Drawn by S. R. Cobb



Scale - 1:32  
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10



© 1976

BARON

AEROJET ORDNANCE  
COMPANY

FIGURE 1. Russian T62 Medium Tank

decisive elements which were fed into the test immediately prior to the firing were the following:

1. Aerojet Lot Number AJD 79A181-001 30mm API ammunition.
2. General Electric GAU-8 Gatling gun.
3. Fairchild Republic A-10 attack aircraft.
4. Fighter Pilot, 66th FWS, Nellis AFB.
5. US Designed M-47 main battle tanks, combat loaded.

The combat simulation itself comprised the aerial fire and maneuver of the attacking A-10 aircraft. A realistic way of presenting the combat simulation is to outline the sequence of pertinent events in each firing pass. These events and the pertinent data which the CDAT attempted to collect, in order to reconstruct the simulated combat firing of 7 November, 1979, were as follows:

<u>Sequence</u>	<u>Event</u>	<u>Data</u>
1.	Aircraft Approach	Speed, Altitude
2.	Aircraft Attack	Open-Fire Range, Dive Angle
3.	Aircraft Attack	Burst Time, Rounds Fired
4.	Aircraft Attack	Cease-Fire Range, Dive Angle
5.	Gun Effects, (Accuracy)	Impacts on Tanks
6.	Gun Effects, (Lethality)	Perforations through armor
7.	Tank Damage	Catastrophic (K-Kill), Mobility (M-Kill and Firepower (F-Kill) Kills

The data noted immediately above were collected through the combined efforts of the CDAT and range support personnel at Nellis AFB. Aerojet Ordnance Manufacturing Company personnel provided the industrial efforts required to repair, refurbish, and field the tank targets. The CDAT applied various systematic research techniques used to describe weapon effects and combat damage. The most basic materiel used in the test; i.e., the aircraft, gun, and projectile are illustrated in Figures 2, 3, 4, and 5. The targets were arrayed in the tactical formation of a Soviet tank company as shown in Figure 6.

The pilot making the attack flew from the base area and employed operational tactics immediately before and during the firing passes. The pilot approached the target area at low altitude and simulated target acquisition with the help of a forward air controller. The pilot then proceeded to attack the entire tank company and acquired targets at low altitudes and dive angles, simulating operation below the altitudes for effective acquisition and engagement by opposing air defense missile and gun systems.





FIGURE 2. U.S.A.F./Fairchild Republic A-10 Aircraft.






FIGURE 3. Fairchild A-10 Series Aircraft.



FIGURE 4. GAU-8/A 30mm Gun System




FIGURE 5. 30mm Armor Piercing Incendiary (API) Projectile






FIGURE 6. Approximate Target Layout.

## DAMAGE ASSESSMENT

The damage assessment conducted by the CDAT is presented on the following pages. Appendix A contains graphical and tabular information relative to the mission in general plus summaries of the damage assessment for easy reference.

Terms used in the damage assessment summaries are defined in Appendix B.

Impacts on the tanks were arbitrarily numbered for identification purposes. The impacts were number sequentially, first at the turret level, then at the hull level. If additional impacts were discovered during the combat damage assessment (as was sometimes the case) they were given the next sequential number; i.e. no attempt was made to "correct" the sequence. THE READER IS CAUTIONED THAT THIS NUMBERING SYSTEM HAS NO RELATIONSHIP WHATSOEVER TO THE ARRIVAL SEQUENCE OF PROJECTILES ON THE TANK OR TO THE PORTION OF THE BURST IMPACTING THE TANK.

## TARGET TANK DAMAGE SUMMARY

M-47 Tank Number 7

### 1. Description:

The attacking A-10 aircraft achieved impacts on the tank from an attack aspect of 078 degrees (right side) during one firing pass at low altitude and low dive angle. The A-10 expended 26 rounds during the firing pass.

### 2. Kill Assessment:

No degradation in mobility or firepower.

a. Perforations	:	0
b. Significant Impacts	:	0
c. Insignificant Impacts:		<u>6</u>

TOTAL IMPACTS : 6 (Figure 7)

### 3. Rationale for Kill Assessment:

No significant damage was inflicted on this target during the test.






FIGURE 7. Impact Diagram, Tank 7.

## TARGET TANK DAMAGE SUMMARY

M-47 Tank Number 28

### 1. Description

The attacking A-10 aircraft achieved impacts on the tank from an attack aspect of 105 degrees (right side) during one firing pass at low altitude and low dive angle. The A-10 expended 16 rounds during the firing pass.

### 2. Kill Assessment:


100% M-Kill resulting from the following observed effects (Figure 8):

a. Perforations	:	4
b. Significant Impacts	:	2
c. Insignificant Impacts:		<u>6</u>

TOTAL IMPACTS	:	12
---------------	---	----

### 3. Rationale for Kill Assessment:

The assessment of 100% M-Kill is based on impact 10, which perforated the engine compartment, penetrating the engine block causing loss of engine oil. Three other perforations and two hits contributed little or nothing to the kill.



LEGEND:    Circled numbers indicate  
                  perforating impacts.

FIGURE 8.    Impact Diagram, Tank 28.



## TARGET TANK DAMAGE SUMMARY

M-47 Tank Number 49

### 1. Description:

The attacking A-10 aircraft achieved impacts on the tank from an attack aspect of 110 degrees (right side) during one firing pass at low altitude and low dive angle. The A-10 expended 18 rounds during the firing pass.

### 2. Kill Assessment:

No degradation to mobility or firepower.

a. Perforations	:	0
b. Significant Impacts	:	0
c. Insignificant Impacts:		<u>3</u>

TOTAL IMPACTS : 3 (Figure 9)

### 3. Rationale for Kill Assessment:

No significant damage was inflicted on the target tank during the tests.




FIGURE 9. Impact Diagram, Tank 49.

## TARGET TANK DAMAGE SUMMARY

M-47 Tank Number 41

### 1. Description:

The attacking A-10 aircraft achieved impacts on the tank from an attack aspect of 078 degrees (right side) during one firing pass at low altitude and low dive angle. The A-10 expended 14 rounds during the firing pass.

### 2. Kill Assessment:

100% M-Kill and 95% F-Kill resulting from the following observed effects (Figure 10):


a. Perforations	:	6
b. Significant Impacts	:	0
c. Insignificant Impacts:		<u>5</u>

TOTAL IMPACTS	:	11
---------------	---	----

### 3. Rationale for Kill Assessment:

- a. M-Kill: The assessment of 100% M-Kill is based on impact 11, which perforated the right side of the hull into the engine compartment severing an oil cooler line and penetrating one engine valve cover.
- b. F-Kill: The assessment of a 95% F-Kill is based on impacts 1, 2, and 3 which perforated the right turret armor and caused casualties to the commander, gunner, and loader. Two other perforations of the turret caused damage to interior components but contributed nothing to the F-Kill.





LEGEND: Circled numbers indicate perforating impacts.

FIGURE 10. Impact Diagram, Tank 41.

## TARGET TANK DAMAGE SUMMARY

M-47 Tank Number 47

### 1. Description:

The attacking A-10 aircraft achieved impacts on the tank from an attack aspect of 088 degrees (right side) during one firing pass at low altitude and low dive angle. The A-10 expended 12 rounds during the firing pass.

### 2. Kill Assessment:

Catastrophic K-Kill resulting from the following observed effects (Figure 11):


a. Perforations	:	3
b. Significant Impacts	:	**
c. Insignificant Impacts:		<u>**</u>

TOTAL IMPACTS	:	5
---------------	---	---

\*\*Omitted - catastrophic fire and explosion overrode other damage.

### 3. Rationale for Kill Assessment:

A 100% K-Kill was assessed based on 1 perforation into the turret and 2 perforations into the driver's compartment. The tank was observed to be smoking immediately after the attack pass and in flames shortly thereafter, but the cause of the fire could not be determined.



LEGEND: Circled numbers indicate perforating impacts.

FIGURE 11. Impact Diagram, Tank 47.



## TARGET TANK DAMAGE SUMMARY

M-47 Tank Number 30

### 1. Description:

The attacking A-10 aircraft achieved impacts on the tank from an attack aspect of 075 degrees (right side) during one firing pass at low altitude and low dive angle. The A-10 expended 11 rounds during the firing pass.

### 2. Kill Assessment:

Catastrophic K-Kill resulting from the following observed effects (Figure 12):


a. Perforations	:	6
b. Significant Impacts	:	**
c. Insignificant Impacts:		<u>**</u>

TOTAL IMPACTS : 8

\*\*Omitted - catastrophic fire and explosion overrode other damage.

### 3. Rationale for Kill Assessment:

This tank was observed to explode immediately after the attack. Impact 7, which perforated the right hull armor and penetrated the ammunition stowage area, probably caused the explosion. Impact 6 also perforated the hull and could have impacted stowed ammunition as well.



LEGEND: Circled numbers indicate  
perforating impacts.

FIGURE 12. Impact Diagram, Tank 30.

## TARGET TANK DAMAGE SUMMARY

M-47 Tank Number 48

### 1. Description:

The attacking A-10 aircraft achieved impacts on the tank from an attack aspect of 078 degrees (right side) during one firing pass at low altitude and low dive angle. The A-10 expended 15 rounds during the firing pass.

### 2. Kill Assessment:


100% M-Kill and 100% F-Kill resulting from the following observed effects (Figure 13):

a. Perforations	:	4
b. Significant Impacts	:	1
c. Insignificant Impacts:		<u>4</u>

TOTAL IMPACTS	:	9
---------------	---	---

### 3. Rationale for Kill Assessment:

This was a delayed burn occasioned by an explosion and fire occurring a considerable length of time (an estimated 45 minutes) after the A-10 attack, and which damaged only the fighting and driver compartments. There was no evidence of fuel or ammunition fires directly resulting from perforations of the armored envelope. Impacts 3, 4, and 7 were perforations of the hull and turret at locations that could have resulted in casualties to all crewmen. Therefore a 100% M-Kill and a 100% F-Kill was assessed based on a presumption of crew casualties, and the fire was attributed to a cook-off caused by ignition of innocuous materiel such as wooden manikins or crash padding.



LEGEND: Circled numbers indicate perforating impacts.

FIGURE 13. Impact Diagram, Tank 48.



## TARGET TANK DAMAGE SUMMARY

M-47 Tank Number 33

### 1. Description:

The attacking A-10 aircraft achieved impacts on the tank from an attack aspect of 097 degrees (right side) during one firing pass at low altitude and low dive angle. The A-10 expended 19 rounds during the firing pass.

### 2. Kill Assessment:

100% M-Kill resulting from the following observed effects (Figure 14):

a. Perforations	:	2
b. Significant Impacts	:	0
c. Insignificant Impacts:		<u>6</u>

TOTAL IMPACTS : 8

### 3. Rationale for Kill Assessment:

The assessment of 100% M-Kill is based on impact 4 which perforated the right side of the hull, penetrating the fuel tank, causing loss of fuel.




FIGURE 14. Impact Diagram, Tank 33.

## TARGET TANK DAMAGE SUMMARY

M-47 Tank Number 38

### 1. Description:

The attacking A-10 aircraft achieved impacts on the tank from an attack aspect of 082 degrees (right side) during one firing pass at low altitude and low dive angle. The A-10 expended 16 rounds during the firing pass.

### 2. Kill Assessment:


5% M-Kill and 10% F-Kill resulting from the following observed effects (Figure 15):

a. Perforations	:	0
b. Significant Impacts	:	6
c. Insignificant Impacts:		<u>6</u>

TOTAL IMPACTS	:	12
---------------	---	----

### 3. Rationale for Kill Assessment:

- a. M-Kill: The assessment of 5% M-Kill is based on minor cumulative damage to track and suspension system caused by impacts 2, 5, 6, 7, and 12.
- b. F-Kill: The assessment of 10% F-Kill is based on damage caused by impact 1 which perforated one wall of the gun tube.



NOTES:

- a. Hits #8 & #9 are behind #2 Road Wheel
- b. Hit #10 is on Inboard #2 Road Wheel
- c. Hit #11 is on Inboard Middle Track Support Roller

FIGURE 15. Impact Diagram, Tank 38.



## TARGET TANK DAMAGE SUMMARY

M-47 Tank Number 39

### 1. Description:

The attacking A-10 aircraft achieved impacts on the tank from an attack aspect of 070 degrees (right side) during one firing pass at low altitude and low dive angle. The A-10 expended 27 rounds during the firing pass.

### 2. Kill Assessment:

Catastrophic K-Kill resulting from the following observed effects (Figure 16 and 17):


a. Perforations	:	5
b. Significant Impacts	:	**
c. Insignificant Impacts:		<u>**</u>

TOTAL IMPACTS : 16

\*\*Omitted - catastrophic fire and explosion overrode other damage.


### 3. Rationale for Kill Assessment:

100% K-Kill resulting from impact 15 which perforated the right hull armor and penetrated the fuel tank causing a fire which could not be extinguished by the crew because of casualties inflicted by perforations 6, 7, and 8 which penetrated into the fighting compartment and perforation 2 which penetrated into the driver's compartment.



LEGEND: Circled numbers indicate perforating impacts.

FIGURE 16. Impact Diagram, Tank 39 Right Side.



LEGEND: Circled numbers indicate perforating impacts.

FIGURE 17. Impact Diagram, Tank 39 Front.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

On 7 November, 1979, at Nellis AFB, Nevada, the Combat Damage Assessment Team (CDAT) conducted firings of the A-10/GAU-8 weapon system against an array of 10 tanks simulating a Soviet tank company deployed for an attack. The purpose of the firing test was to evaluate the effects of the 30mm API antitank ammunition of the GAU-8 gun under challenging conditions of engagement for the A-10/GAU-8 system against realistically simulated Soviet tank formations. The CDAT used M-47 tanks stowed with main gun ammunition, diesel fuel, lubricating oil, and crew manikins to simulate the Soviet tanks. The pilot of the A-10 aircraft used in the firings conducted his attacks at low altitudes and low dive angles which simulated attack below the altitude of the effective engagement for opposing air defense systems using acquisition and fire control radar.

The firing test can be summarized in terms of the following data which were collected and/or extracted from the firings:

### Aircraft Parameters

1. Open-fire speed (average)----- 568 ft/sec
2. Dive Angle (average)----- 3.8 degrees
3. Open-fire Slant Range (average)-- 2470 ft
4. Burst Length/Rounds (averages)--- .57 sec/17.4 rds.
5. Number Passes (primary)----- 10
6. Target Aspects (predominantly)--- Right Side

### Weapon Effects

### Target Damage

- |                           |     |                   |   |
|---------------------------|-----|-------------------|---|
| 1. Rounds Fired-----      | 174 | 1. K-Kills-----   | 3 |
| 2. Impacts-----           | 90  | 2. M+F-Kills----- | 1 |
| 3. Ricochets (off grnd)-- | 4   | 3. M-Kill-----    | 3 |
| 4. Direct Impacts-----    | 86  | 4. F-Kill-----    | 0 |
| 5. Perforation-----       | 30  | 5. Light Damage-- | 3 |

These data and the more detailed base from which they were extracted can be arranged into measures of effectiveness for the A-10/GAU-8 system under conditions similar to those in the firing test, i.e., empirical combat simulation. The following values of effectiveness are based on the firing test on 7 November, 1979:



### Measures of Effectiveness

#### Accuracy Related Ratio:

$$\frac{\text{Total Impacts}}{\text{Rounds Fired}} = 0.52$$

$$\frac{\text{Direct Impacts}}{\text{Rounds Fired}} = 0.49$$

#### Lethality Related Ratio:

$$\frac{\text{Perforations}}{\text{Total Impacts}} = 0.33$$

$$\frac{\text{Perforations}}{\text{Direct Impacts}} = 0.35$$

#### Weapon System Effectiveness Ratio:

$$\frac{\text{Tanks Immobilized}}{\text{Passes}} = 0.70$$

$$\frac{\text{Tanks K-Killed}}{\text{Passes}} = 0.33$$

The ten target tanks were attacked predominately from the right side and suffered the severe damage shown in Table I and Table A-I.

The data and measures summarized above, and the other data contained in this report, support several inferences or conclusions:

1. The A-10/GAU-8 system in realistic simulation of combat is capable of inflicting catastrophic K-Kills as well as M- and F-Kills on M-47 and similarly protected main battle tanks, e.g., Soviet T-55 and T-62 tanks.

2. The weapon system in low level attacks can perforate specifically the side surfaces of the hulls and turrets of M-47 and similarly protected main battle tanks.

3. The weapon system is an effective killing agent against the side surfaces of M-47 and similar tanks when firing moderate length bursts of 0.40-0.85 seconds, containing 11-27 rounds.

4. From the viewpoint of GAU-8 30mm API ammunition effects and resulting damage to combat stowed main battle tanks, the tactic of low level attack in this firing test was shown to be a succesful one.

## APPENDIX A

### Graphical and Summary Information

Table A-I contains a summary of the results of mission 22 of 7 November, 1979. Table A-II relates the assessment of damages in Table A-I to locations of perforations. Table A-III summarizes the Aircraft Attack Parameters Altitude, Attitude, Airspeed, Firing Slant Range and Burst length for each pass on each target. Figure A-1 relates aircraft attack aspect by tank number to burst length in feet.

Table A-I. Array 22 Mission Results Summary  
(7 November 1980)

Target Tank No.	Damage Assessment (M%) (F%) (K%)	All Target Impacts	Direct Impacts	Rounds Fired	Total Perforations
7	— — —	6	4	26	0
28	100 — —	12	11	16	4
49	— — —	3	3	18	0
41	100 95 —	11	11	14	6
47	— — 100	5	5	12	3
30	— — 100	8	8	11	6
48	100 100 —	9	9	15	4
33	100 — —	8	8	19	2
38	5 10 —	12	11	16	0
39	— — 100	16	16	27	5
TOTALS:					30
				90	86
				174	30

K = Catastrophic Kill; M = Mobility Kill; F = Firepower Kill

Table A-II. Array 22 Perforation Location Summary  
(7 November 1979)

Target Tank	Damage Assessment*		Turret Perforations (Fighting Compt)	Hull Perforations		Total perforations
	(M%)	(F%) (K%)		Fighting Compt	Drivers Compt	
7	---	---	0	0	0	0
28	100	---	0	0	0	4
49	---	---	0	0	0	0
41	100	95	5	0	0	1
47	---	---	1	0	2	0
30	---	---	2	4	0	0
48	100	100	3	1	0	0
33	100	---	1	0	0	1
38	5	10	0	0	0	0
39	---	---	3	0	1	1

\*K = Catastrophic Kill; M = Mobility Kill; F = Firepower Kill



TABLE A-III. Array 22 Aircraft Attack Parameters  
(7 November 1980)

Acft Tank Pass No.	Slant Range Open/Cease feet	Dive Angle Open/Cease degrees	Altitude feet	Velocity Open/Cease knots	Burst Length (Seconds)	Source
1/1 7	2699./2227	-3.0/-3.0	473.	579./581.	.81	HUD
1/2 28	2191./ *	-4.0/-3.0	438.	559./574.	.52	HUD
1/3 49	2334./2007.	-4.0/-4.0	463.	561./561.	.58	HUD
1/4 41	2406./2146.	-4.0/-4.0	453.	334./337.	.46	HUD
1/5 47	2334./2097.	-3.0/-3.0	413.	564./569.	.42	HUD
1/6 30	2263./2037.	-3.0/-3.0	393.	571./571.	.40	HUD
1/7 48	2547./2261.	-3.0/-5.0	393.	573./574.	.50	HUD
1/8 33	2758./2404.	-6.0/-6.0	583.	566./569.	.63	HUD
1/9 38	2547./2239.	-3.0/-3.0	413.	567./571.	.54	HUD
1/10 39	2618./2131.	-4.0/-4.0	463.	569./571.	.85	HUD

\* Position uncertain.


Nominal HUD film Tolerances:

Slant Ranges: Plus zero minus 150. feet

Dive Angles : Plus .5 minus .5 degrees

Velocities : Plus 5 minus 5 knots

Burst times : Plus 0. minus .021 seconds



Pass #	Open Fire Range	Cease Fire Range	Relative Approach Angle
1	2699	2227	078
2	2191	*	105
3	2334	2007	110
4	2406	2146	078
5	2334	2097	088
6	2263	2037	075
7	2547	2261	078
8	2758	2404	097
9	2547	2239	082
10	2618	2131	070

\* Position uncertain

FIGURE A-1. Mission 21 Attack Aspect Summary.

## APPENDIX B

### DEFINITIONS

The terms used in this report are defined below:

**IMPACT** -- Any evidence of a projectile strike against any portion of the target. Ground ricochets striking the target were classified as "impacts".

**PERFORATION** -- Any rupture of the armored envelope caused by an impacting projectile which results in a complete rupture of an armored surface by the projectile or spall fragments. A perforation can occur only when the armor is impacted. The word "Perforation" was deliberately selected to avoid the ambiguities which may occur through use of the word "penetration". Behind-the-plate effects may or may not result from a perforation.

**HIT** -- Any impact not classified as a perforation.

**MOBILITY KILL (M-KILL)** -- Loss of tactical mobility resulting from damage which cannot be repaired by the crew on the battlefield. A tank is considered to have sustained a 100% M-Kill when it is no longer capable of executing controlled movement on the battlefield. Mobility is DEGRADED when a tank can no longer maintain its position in the formation of which it is a part.

**FIREPOWER KILL (F-KILL)** -- Loss of tactical firepower resulting from damage which cannot be repaired by the crew on the battlefield. A tank is considered to have sustained a 100% F-Kill when it is incapable of delivering controlled fire from its main armament. Firepower is DEGRADED when a tank can no longer maintain its "normal" rate-of-fire, velocity, accuracy, time to shift targets, etc.

**CATASTROPHIC KILL (K-KILL)** -- A tank is considered to have sustained a K-Kill when both an M-Kill and a F-Kill have occurred as the result of killing fires and explosions from ignited fuel and/or ammunition. A tank which has suffered a K-Kill is considered not to be economically repairable, and, by U.S. standards, would be abandoned on the battlefield.

**ATTACK ASPECT** -- The angle of approach of the aircraft with respect to the orientation of the target with zero degrees representing the front of the tank (gun forward) and 180 degrees representing the rear of the tank.

SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS -- Impacts which damage systems, components or sub-systems resulting in their destruction or partial loss of function. This type damage contributes to the assessed kill.

INSIGNIFICANT IMPACTS -- Impacts which damage non-critical structural, convenience, or accessory components and which may result in their destruction or partial loss of function, but with no impact on mobility or firepower considerations. Good maintenance practices contemplates repair or replacement of such items at the earliest opportunity consistent with accomplishment of the mission.



# DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR LAVP RESULTS

	No. Copies
1. Mr. R.L. Saley Aerojet 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. 12th Floor Washington, DC 20036	1
2. Mr. Marshall Hoyler, Analyst Congressional Budget Office 2nd & D Streets, S.W. Washington, DC 20024	1
3. Dr. John Barmby U.S. General Account Office 441 C Street N.W. Washington, DC 20548	1
4. Lt. Col. Neal Edward Tash USAF/XOOTR Pentagon Washington, DC 20330	1
5. Lt. Col. Donald E. Madonna BQ AFSC/XRLA Andrews AFB, MD Washington, DC 20331	1
6. Col. John R. Boyd USAF, (ret.) OASD/PA&E, Room 2C 281 Pentagon Washington, DC 20301	1
7. Dept. of the Air Force The Albert F. Simpson Historical Research Center/HOH Arthur W. McCants, Jr., Lt. Col. Chief, Oral History Branch Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama 36112	1
8. 354 TFW/DOW Myrtle Beach AFB, SC 29577	5
9. 81 TFW/CC RAF Bentwaters APO NY 09755	1

10.	81 TFW/DO RAF Bentwaters APO NY 09755	20
11.	23 TFW/DO England AFB, LA 71301	2
12.	USAF/TFWC/TE Nellis AFB, NV 89191	5
13.	Mr. Jerome H. Stolarow U.S. General Accounting Office 441 C Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20548	1
14.	MGEN Bernard E. Trainor Education Center MCDEC Quantico, VA 22134	1
15.	Maj O.W. McCormack Supporting Arms Instruction Division Education Center MCDEC Quantico, VA 22134	1
16.	Library (Attn: Reports Section) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
17.	Mr. William Lind Office of Senator Gary Hart 254 Russel Building Washington, DC 20510	2
18.	Capt. Kenneth W. Estes USMC 102 Clemson Court Jacksonville, NC 28540	1
19.	Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence Headquarters Tactical Air Command Col. Herrmann Langley AFB, VA 23665	5
20.	Mr. James O. Carson Central Intelligence Agency/OSR Washington, DC 20505	1

21.	Mr. Robert Korn Central Intelligence Agency Washington, DC 20505	1
22.	Mr. John Cuzzordo Central Intelligence Agency Washington, DC 20505	1
23.	Mr. Richard R. Hallock Intrac, Inc. 606 Wilshire Boulevard - Suite 400 Santa Monica, CA 90401	5
24.	Mr. C.M. Gordon GE 777 14th, N.W. Washington, DC 20005	1
25.	Maj. M.R. Janay, USMC HQ DARCOM - Code DRCGS-F 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22304	1
26.	Mr. Raymond R. McEachin P.O. Box 273 Hazlehurst, GA 31539	5
27.	L.C. Hayes, USMC Headquarters, Marine Corps Washington, DC 20380	1
28.	K.R. Town, USMC Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps Washington, DC 20380	1
29.	John C. McKay, USMC Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps Washington, DC 20380	1
30.	Mr. Tyler W. Tandler 1012 Deadrun Drive McLean, VA 22101	1
31.	Mr. E. Elko AOMC 9236 Rast Hall Road Downey, CA 90241	1

32. Mr. K.H. Wolvington 5  
GE  
Lakeside Avenue  
Burlington, VT 05401
33. Mr. Kwai Chan 1  
U.S. General Accounting Office  
441 C Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20548
34. HQ TAC/D000 2  
Langley AFB, VA 23665
35. USAF Academy 2  
Library  
USAF Academy, CO 80840
36. Herrn Dr. Horst Boog 2  
Wiss Oberrat  
Militargeschichtliches Forschungsamt  
7800 Freiburg im Breisgau  
West Germany
37. Albert F. Simpson 2  
Historical Research Center  
Attention: Mr. Fletcher  
Maxwell AFB, AL 36112
38. CMDR Naval Air Systems Command 1  
Attention: PMA 235 B  
Washington, DC 20361
39. DASD/ISA/ED 1  
Room 4D800  
The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301
40. Lt. Col. Howard J. Pierson 10  
139 Booker Street  
Little Rock, AR 72204
41. USAF 2  
DCS/Plans & Operations Tactical Division  
BF939B  
The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301



42.	USAF DCS/Programs & Resources Director of Programs Tactical Branch 4C152 The Pentagon Washington, DC 20301	2
43.	USAF DCS/Research & Development Directorate of Operational Requirements & Development Plans Tactical Division 5E381 The Pentagon Washington, DC 20301	2
44.	HQ TAC/DO AT Langley AFB, VA 23665	1
45.	HQ TAC/DO O Langley AFB, VA 23665	5
46.	Mr. Andrew W. Marshall Director Not Assessment Room 3A930 Pentagon Washington, DC 20301	5
47.	Dr. James A. Ross Institute for Defense Analyses 400 Army Navy Drive Arlington, VA 22202	1
48.	Lt. Col. Lanny T. Lancaster HDQ TAC/CCS Langley AFB, VA 23665	10
49.	Mr. Thomas E. Gaines P.O. Box 225907 Vought Corporation Dallas, TX 75265	1
50.	Mr. Emil H. Seaman Aerojet Ordnance Company 9236 East Hall Road Downey, CA 90241	1
51.	Mr. Charles E. Myers 2000 S. Eads #113 Arlington, VA 22202	1

52.	Mr. David G. Opheim Honeywell, Inc. 600 Second Street, N.E. Hopkins, MN 55343	1
53.	Mr. John D. Pafenberg HQ USAF/ING - Pentagon, Room 4A882 Washington, DC 20330	1
54.	Col. W.E. Barrineau, Jr. TFW/DO APO NY 01923	1
55.	HQ TAC/DOOF Langley AFB, VA 23665	1
56.	HQ TAC/XP Langley AFB, VA 23665	1
57.	USAF TFWC/SA Nellis AFB, NV 89191	1
58.	57 FWW/DO Nellis AFB, NV 89191	1
59.	12 AF/DO Bergstrom AFB, TX 78743	2
60.	9 AF/DO Shaw AFB, SC 29152	2
61.	CINCUSAFE/DO Ramstein AFB APO 09012	1
62.	CINCUSAFE/DOOF Ramstein AFB APO 09012	2
63.	CINCUSAFE/DOOT Ramstein AFB APO 09012	2
64.	CINCUSAFE/DOST Ramstein AFB APO 09012	2
65.	USAF Maj. Gen. Kelly TFWC/CC Nellis AFB, NV 89191	5

66.	66 FWC/CC Nellis AFB, NV 89191	50
67.	Thomas P. Christie DASD (Tactical Air Program) PA&E Room 2E330 Pentagon Washington, DC 20301	50
68.	Maj. Davies (ASD/YXA) USAF/Aeronautical Systems Division A-10 System Program Office Directorate of Armament Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433	10
69.	Battele Columbus Laboratories Tactical Technology Center Room 13-4127 Attention: Mr. J. Tuck Brown 505 King Avenue Columbus, OH 43201	5
70.	HQ USAF DSC/RDF Pentagon - 4D283 Washington, DC 20330	5
71.	Lt. Gen. (USA Ret) H.R. Aaron 7722 Kalorama Road Annandale, VA 22003	1
72.	Maj. Robert. K. Redlin Commandant of the Marine Corps Code R&P Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps Washington, DC 20380	1
73.	Lt General P. X. Kelly, USMC Commander Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force MacDill AFB, FL 33608	1
74.	Lt. Col. G. W. Keiser (Code RP) U.S. Marine Corps Requirements & Programs Washington, DC 20380	1

75.	Mr. John F. Blake 9312 Crown Place Alexandria, VA 22308	1
76.	Mr. Richard Eppard Central Intelligence Agency Office of Logistics Washington, DC 20505	1
77.	Mr. Rudolf A. Endors 10101 Colebrook Avenue Potomac, MD 20854	1
78.	Maj. Gen. Thomas P. Lynch Commanding General U.S. Army Armor Center Fort Knox, KY 40121	1
79.	Lt. Col. John H. Ridge U.S. Army Armor Center Fort Knox, KY 40121	1
80.	Maj. Barry D. Watts OSD/Office of Net Assessment Pentagon - 3A930 Washington, DC 20301	1
81.	HQ TAC/CC Langley AFB, VA 23665	2
82.	Library, Code 0212 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	2
83.	Dept. Chairman Dept. of National Security Affairs Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	2
84.	Professor R.H.S. Stolfi Dept. of National Security Affairs Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	30
85.	AFIT/CIP (Library) Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433	2
86.	AFIS/INH Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060	1



87.	Brig. Gen. Reed 355 TFW/CC Davis Monthan AFB, AZ 85707	5
88.	Col. Wayne E. Davis 1411 Gemini Circle Moody AFB Valdosta, CA 31601	1
89.	Brig. Gen. W.S. Harpe 14 TFW Columbus, MS 39701	5
90.	354 TFW/DCM Myrtle Beach AFB, SC 29577	1
91.	TAC/DR Langley AFB, VA 23665	1
92.	CIA/HQ Washington, DC 20505	2
93.	General Elwood Quesada (Retd.) L'Enfanc Plaza Washington, DC 20024	1
94.	Mr. P.M. Sprey Box 264, R.D. 1 Glenn Dale, MD 20769	5
95.	Mr. Mike Mecca Fairchild Industries Germantown, MD 20767	2
96.	Industrial College of the Armed Forces Library Ft. Lesley J. McNair Washington, DC 20319	1
97.	Mr. Bernard Kornhauser System Planning Corp. 1500 Wilson Blvd. Suite 1500 Arlington, VA 22209	1
98.	Maj. Gerald H. Felix, USAF 112 TFG Greater Pittsburgh Airport Pennsylvania Air Guard Pittsburgh, PA 15180	5

99.	USMCDEC Firepower Division Air Branch/Code D092 Attention: Ms. Kearns Quantico, VA 22134	5
100.	USAF TAWC Eglin AFB, FL 32542	1
101.	Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps Chief of Staff Arlington Annex Room 2010 Columbia Pike & Arlington Ridge Road Arlington, VA 20370	5
102.	USAF Air University Library Maxwell AFB, AL 36112	2
103.	CMDR, Naval Weapons Center Attention: Mr. Bates China Lake, CA 93555	2
104.	Col. Robert M. Gomez/DRXSR Deputy Director/Commanding Officer Ballistic Research Laboratory Building 328 Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	1
105.	GE, Armament Systems Dept. Director Lakeside Ave. Burlington, VT 05401	1
106.	HQ TAC/DO Langley AFB, VA 23665	5
107.	354 TFW/CC Myrtle Beach AFB, SC 29577	5
108.	23 TFW/CC England AFB, LA 71301	1
109.	356 TFS/DO Attention: Maj. Lt. Col. Jenny Myrtle Beach AFB, SC 29577	5
110.	USAC 4SC Ft. Leavenworth, KS 66027	1

111.	355 TFW/DOW Davis Monthan AFB, AZ 85707	1
112.	355 TFW/DO (A-7) Davis Monthan AFB, AZ 85707	5
113.	355 TFW/DO (A-10) Davis Monthan AFB, AZ 85707	5
114.	333 TFTS/CC Davis Monthan AFB, AZ 85707	1
115.	333 TFTS/DO Davis Monthan AFB, AZ 85707	5
116.	OLAC 4444 OPS SQ (ISD) Davis Monthan AFB, AZ 85707	1
117.	355 TTS/CC Davis Monthan AFB, AZ 85707	1
118.	Herrn Dr. Stahl Bundesarchiv-Militararchiv <u>78 Freiburg im Breisgau</u> Wiesentr 10 West Germany	2
119.	Mr. Richard E. Tuck U.S. General Accounting Office 441 C Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20548	1
120.	Col. Paul N. Chase HQ USAF AF/SAGP Pentagon - 1D373 Washington, DC 20330	1
121.	Mr. Peter McDavitt Honeywell 600 Second Street, N.E. Hopkins, MN 55343	1
122.	Col. Carl Case Fighter Division Air Force Studies & Analysis Pentagon - 1D380B Washington, DC 20330	1

123. Lt. Col. John L. Welde 1  
354 TFW/DO  
MB AFB, SC 29577
124. Dr. Dieter H. Schwebs 1  
U.S. General Accounting Office  
441 C Street, N.W.  
Room 6478  
Washington, DC 20548
125. Col. Michael L. Wardinski 1  
HQ Department of the Army  
DAMI-RT  
Pentagon - BF722  
Washington, DC 20310
126. Mr. John Sloan 1  
HQ Department of the Army  
DAMI-RT  
Pentagon - BF722  
Washington, DC 20310
127. Mr. W.R. Beuch 1  
HQ Department of the ARmy  
DAMI-RT  
Pentagon - BF722  
Washington, DC 20310
128. FMC Corporation 1  
1105 Coleman Avenue  
Box 1201  
Attention: Mr. Don Loughlin, MD510  
San Jose, CA 95108
129. Lt. Col. J.W. Lent 1  
HQ MC (Code RPR-7)  
Washington, DC 20380
130. Edward Fuge (Major, Retired, USAF) 1  
Department of Political Science  
University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
131. Mr. Arthur G. Hanley 1  
Central Intelligence Agency  
Procurement Management Staff  
Washington, DC 20505
132. 50 TFW/CC 1  
APO NY 09109



133. 50 TFW/DO APO NY 09109	5
134. 50 TFW/DO 496 TFS Attention: Maj. Ratley APO NY 09109	5
135. Energy Efficiency System Attention: Mr. Verdi 187 W. Orangethorpe Road Suite P Placentia, CA 92670	1
136. Col. Richard C. Head Council on Foreign Relations The Harold Pratt House 58 East 68 Street New York, NY 10021	1
137. General Hermann Balck <u>7144 Asperg</u> Egerstr. 23 Federal Republic of Germany	1
138. Col. Faybanic AWC/DAUM Maxwell AFB, AL 36112	1
139. Mr. Cobleigh Hughes Aircraft Canoga Park, CA 91304	1
140. Boeing Attention: Mr. Bud Nelson P.O. Box 3999, M/S 40-30 Seattle, WA 98124	1
141. IDA Attention: Dr. Whittemore 400 Army Navy Drive Arlington, VA 22202	1
143. Lt. Gen. Mahlke <u>2350 Heikendorf</u> Steenkamp 8 Federal Republic of Germany	1

144. HQ USAF 1  
Attention: Lt. Gen. John Pustay  
Office of Chief of Staff  
Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20330
145. Studiengruppe Luftwaffe 1  
Sicherung Akademie der Bundeswehr  
2000 Hamburg 55  
Manteuffelstr. 20  
Federal Republic of Germany
146. Gen. Wilke 1  
31 Alle  
Schlepegrellstr. 30  
Federal Republic of Germany
147. General F.W. von Mellenthin 1  
Box 67759  
Bryanston 2021  
Johannesburg  
Republic of South Africa
148. Herrn Brigadegeneral a.D. Paul-Werner Hozzel 1  
Salierster. 4  
D7500 Karlsruhe  
Federal Republic of Germany
149. 91 TFS/CC/Dow 1  
APO 09405  
New York, New York 09012
150. 78 TFS/CC/DOW 1  
APO 09405  
New York, New York 09012
151. 92 TFS/CC/DOW 1  
APO 09755  
New York, New York 09012
152. Military Attache 1  
U.S. Embassy (Rome, Italy)  
APO 90794  
New York, New York 09012
153. Millitary Attache 1  
U.S. Embassy (Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany)  
APO 09080  
New York, New York 09012

154. Military Attache U.S. Embassy (Saudi, Arabia) APO 09697 New York, New York 09012	1
155. Military Attache U.S. Embassy Attention: Air Attache New Delhi, India	1
156. Military Attache U.S. Embassy Attention: Maj. McBaron Canberra, Australia	1
157. AFIS/INC Attention: Col. Kuiper Building 520 Bolling AFB, DC 20332	1
158. Mr. William Jenisch Aerojet Ordnance Manufacturing Company 9336 East Hall Road Downey, CA 90241	1
159. USAFE/DOOW Attention: Maj. Lindsey APO New York, New York 09012	1
160. Mr. James Simon Central Intelligence Agency Washington, DC 20505	1
161. Mr. David Keener Central Intelligence Agency Washington, DC 20505	1
162. Mr. Aris Pappas Central Intelligence Agency Washington, DC 20505	1
163. Mr. Andrew Hamilton Congressional Budget Office/NSIA 4th Floor HOB, Annex #2 U.S. Congress Washington, DC 20515	1
164. Mr. Pat Hillier Congressional Budget Office/NSIA 4th Floor HOB, Annex #2 U.S. Congress	1

Washington, DC 20515

165. Dr. Dov Zakheim 1  
Congressional Budget Office/NSIA  
4th Floor HOB, Annex #2  
Washington, DC 20515
166. Mr. John Hamre 1  
Congressional Budget Office/NSIA  
4th Floor HOB, Annex #2  
U.S. Congress  
Washington, DC 20515
167. Ms. Grace P. Hayes 1  
T.K. Dupuy Associates, Inc.  
P.O. Box 157  
Dunn Loring, VA 22027
168. Mr. C. Curtiss Johnson 1  
T.N. Dupuy Associates, Inc.  
P.O. Box 157  
Dunn Loring, VA 22027
169. Ms. Lucille Patterson 1  
T.N. Dupuy Associates, Inc.  
P.O. Box 157  
Dunn Loring, VA 22027
170. Col. A.J. Kettering 1  
OSD/OUSDR&E  
Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301
171. Mr. Robert S. Dotson 1  
Senate Armed Services Committee  
212 Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510
172. Mr. Steven Canby 1  
10871 Springknoll Drive  
Potomac, MD 20854
173. Director 1  
U.S. Army Aberdeen Research & Development Center  
Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity/DRXSY  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005
174. Mr. Michael W. Iten/DRXSY-C 1  
U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005



175.	Mr. G.A. Zoller U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity/DRXSY Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	1
176.	Maj. J.F. Balda U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity/DRXSY Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	1
177.	Mr Arif R. Zaky U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity/DRXSY Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	1
178.	Mr. Arthur W. Garrett U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity/DRXSY Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	1
179.	Mr. T.A. Romanko U.S. Army Material Systems Analysis Activity/DRXSY Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	1
180.	Mr. Stanley Eibertz U.S. General Accounting Office 441 C Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20548	1
181.	Mr. Fredic S. Feer Analytical Assessments Cooperation P.O. Box 9102 Arlington, VA 22209	1
182.	Mr. Dan Costello OMB New Executive Office Building R10026 Washington, DC 20503	1
183.	Mr. Gordon P. Lynch Boeing Aerospace Company Box 3999 - M/S 47-63 Seattle, WA 98124	1
184.	Lt. Col. George W. Burkley 1875 Temple Hills Drive Laguna Beach, CA 96215	1
185.	Mr. Gerald Mayefskie Quest Research Corporation 6845 Elm Street McLean, VA 22101	1

186. Dr. John E. Tashjean BDM 7915 Jones Branch Drive McLean, VA 22101	1
187. Mr. David A. Brinkman U.S. General Accounting Office 441 C Street, N.W. - Room 6478 Washington, DC 20548	1
188. Mr. Wayne H. Coloney P.O. Box 5258 Tallahassee, FL 32301	1
189. Lt. Gen. M.P. Casey, USAF (ret.) Wayne H. Coloney Company P.O. Box 5258 Tallahassee, FL 32301	5
190. Mr. Richard W. Oates General Electric Lakeside Avenue Burlington, VT 05401	5
191. Lt. Col. James Cord Command and Staff College Marine Corps Development & Education Command Quantico, VA 22314	1
192. Brig. General W.H. Fitch Deputy Chief of Staff, R&D and Studies USMC Arlington Annex Washington, DC 20380	1
193. Mr. Jim Erickson Grumman Aerospace BOS-05 Bethpage, NY 11714	1

194. Professor Andrew Cyorgy 1  
Sino-Soviet Institute  
George Washington University  
2029 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20052
195. Mr. Charles Bernard 1  
Director, Land Warfare  
OSD/OUUSDRE  
Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301
196. 162 TFG/FWS 10  
P.O. Box 11037  
Tucson, AZ 85734  
Attention: Lt. Col. O'Donnell
197. Mr. P. Nichols 1  
Ayres Corp.  
P.O. Box 3090  
Albany, GA 31706
198. Herrn Brigadegeneral a.D Loytved-Hardegg 1  
41 Odenbergerstr.  
5800 Nurnberg  
Federal Republic of Germany
199. Herrn Oberst a.D. Poetter 1  
21-2 Alter Remise  
8941 Kronburg  
Federal Republic of Germany
200. Dr. Richard Staar 1  
Dir. International Studies Pgms.  
Hoover Institute  
Stanford, CA 94305
201. Armament Systems, Inc. 1  
712-F North Valley Street  
Anaheim, CA 92801  
Attention: Mr. Tom Gilbert
202. Defense Technical Information Center 2  
(DTIC)  
Cameron Station  
Alexandria Virginia, 22314
203. Dean of Research 1  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940