

The Need to Maintain a Highly Technically Advanced Defense

Allan M. Salzberg MD, PhD

Republican Candidate for Congress, District 1.

National Defense- We live in a dangerous world. First, we are engaged in a deadly war on terrorism, regardless of what the administration calls it. Of equal import our potential opponents are becoming military more able. We can not afford to cut back on our future weapons technology, again the administration is doing just that to finance more social engineering Secretary Gates is not correct when he says it is safe to cutback on items such as the stealthy supersonic highly maneuverable F-22 and Ballistic Missile defense.

If we are overly technically advanced for an Iraqi type, war we can adapt. However, if we end up in a shooting war against an advanced enemy, the outcome will be determined in large part by our technology. It has been remarked that China while not desirous of any conflict with us, is developing the forces that might let them win a high-tech short, intense action with us near their homeland. A strong, technically advanced defense is absolutely critical, in spite of statements of the administration which has threatened cutbacks in missile defense and the F-22, In this scenario, we will not get a second chance. For specific details see the Appendix.

1.

Appendix : Specific Details of some threats

We have to face 5'th Generation Russian fighters, and the SAM 300/400, a sophisticated Russian Air Defense Missile, at least as capable as Patriot 3, There is a marked buildup of quiet Chinese Submarines that will soon outnumber ours. China has developed an Anti-ship hypersonic ballistic missile, range greater than 1000 km with 12 Minute with either a Nuclear Warhead or some form of terminal guidance. Aegis is the only sea based weapon that might be able to combat this threat. Also an Aegis ship positioned in international water off of North Korea could help counter their ICBM threat by accomplishing a boost phase intercept of a North Korean ICBM. Its ability to do so might well depend on obtaining launch information such as satellites. I do respect Secretary Gates in attempting the impossible task of maximizing our defense with inadequate funding brought on by the administration's 'inadequate world view' .

The flyaway cost of an F-22 Raptor now that R&D costs are done, could be comparable to that of a less capable F-35 Lightning. The F-22 is stealthy in all aspects, and it has supersonic cruise which lets it pass through a defended area in much less time than the F-35. In view of rogue nations, the Missile Defense program needs to be continued at least as with the present program. Our National Missile Defense is needed because of the growing threats from Iran and North Korea.

Placing an Aegis ship with enhanced SM-3 missiles which we used to shoot down our failed satellite, coupled with space and other sensors, can counter reduce the North Korean Threat. This is due to the size of the Korean Peninsular coupled with the fact that any long range missile targeting either the US or Japan must have an Easterly trajectory. However, long range interceptors are needed to protect the homeland if our forward defense is neutralized or if there is some leakage. Multi-layered defenses can be individually "leaky"; whereas, a single layer must have far higher intercept probabilities. We must not slash defense spending for misguided ideals. The longer range ABMs are also needed to counter an emerging Iranian threat to Europe, and eventually the US. If they have 50 instead of 10 interceptors, it would not be a threat to Russia due to the size of their missile forces.