

powerfully to the U.S. actions in the Balkans. I hope we will take the time to think through the lucid thoughts he offers.

To: HON. MARK SANFORD

From: Al Baciocco, VADM, USN (Ret), 747 Pitt Street, Mt. Pleasant, SC

DEAR MARK: As you reconvene in Washington, DC, and begin debate on many important issues, I hope that you will consider the current KOSOVO situation an issue of critical and major National Security importance. I have taken the liberty of providing you a copy of an item I wrote to other senior retired military friends a few days ago, reflecting on my feelings about this engagement we have become involved in. I have also provided a copy of one of the responses, this one especially poignant, which I received from other retired senior Admirals. I thought these items might be of interest to you—and perhaps useful in guiding your thoughts.

My somewhat wordy epistle follows:

"To all of John's (and my) Friends—

I worry that I am somewhere out in left field on this Kosovo disaster that we seem to be marching further into, despite continued opportunities for someone (anyone!) to speak up and bring the country to its senses! What we hear and see the Serb military and their leadership engaged in is grossly, morally wrong—beyond the limits of civilized toleration! Given that, it is correct that the United States and the rest of the civilized world be engaged in correcting this outrage—politically, at least; militarily, if necessary! However, the actual endeavor in which we are currently engaged—and the manner in which we have chosen (or allowed ourselves to be eased into) to carry out this endeavor is troubling.

Despite my long professional association with and personal respect for NATO—a mutual defense alliance with a proven track record for deterring aggression—I anguish that we are now engaged in a rather ambiguous mission to "deter with destruction" and to "punish" an offending European leader who clearly has no moral conscience or standards of conduct, with the United States virtually abdicating its visible position of leadership and allowing itself to be represented by a European (NATO) presence, with political and military leadership only vaguely understood by the American people and demonstrating only rather vague definition, judgment and experience. I am offended to find that briefings and statements describing this very dangerous situation are being provided by "glib" NATO political and military "spokesman", not by the elected and/or appointed, potentially-respected ranking officials of the United States. Granted, we have allowed ourselves to become involved and engaged in this NATO (European) show—albeit with some 75-80% of the resources, combat troops, munitions, and "target for ultimate blame" provided by the United States—but, in fact this engagement is truly in the vital National Security interests of the United States of America, then the nation should hear this from its leaders, both political and military, every hour and every day of its duration. We must clearly understand why we are there; we must clearly be on the field exercising bold and realistic military judgment and direction; and we must be willing, in fact, must demand—through our processes—that our national leaders, both political and military, act and be held accountable for their Constitutional and moral responsibilities!

I am deeply troubled and honestly quite offended as an American that we are expected to feel good about seeing our forces calmly (and quite professionally) go about launching cruise missiles and bombs, however accu-

rately guided, against what is perceived by the world as—and in fact, is—a fundamentally civilian infrastructure of a small, rather poor country—albeit led by a ruthless thug! We have seen this happen before in recent months—most of the time with ambiguous results, at best. All too often today, the general populace and the media seem to view the deployment and use of such military force with the same interest, fascination and concern as they view a "video game"! In my view, cruise missiles are becoming—perhaps have become—"TOO EASY" to use! Their use does not demonstrate a clear commitment of our nation's soul—and a clear commitment to the fray of a nation's soul is the only sign that history demonstrates will deter and influence a tyrant to quickly stand down from his adventure.

The National Soul is demonstrated by a willingness to commit "warriors" to the field, and to shed the blood of our young, if necessary, to achieve justice, freedom and what is morally right! Our nation was founded on these principles—and they should be overlooked, blurred, or discarded only at our peril. None of us were brought up believing that we were a nation that was capricious in the use of our military might. We were brought up as, and are a nation and a people of justice, of honesty, of principle founded on high moral ground! Have all of our men and women in positions of leadership and responsibility within our political and military hierarchy forgotten this? Has "political correctness" clouded their recall of history and our heritage, their judgment, and their courage?

We should answer the question as to the fundamental importance to the United States of America of the current situation and of our current endeavor in the Balkans. If the answer clearly measures up to the standards and principles our nation stands for, then we should openly, proudly and aggressively take the political and military lead, and complete the task—however long it takes—with our Soul and our "warriors" fully committed! If it does not, we should depart the field!

So much for "Views from the Low Country"! I hope my stream of consciousness (and conscience) is not too far off the mark!

Warm regards,

AL"

The response from another retired senior Admiral follows:

"Dear Al,

Right on the mark in my opinion. I share your views and I believe that a large number of the active duty senior leadership does as well. The military power of our country is being applied to solve the world's humanitarian problems and we are creating more problems in the process. The United States of America is no longer perceived as a protector of freedom, but it is now an enforcer of "our way of life." The image of the GI slogging through the mud or riding in the back of a jeep sharing some candy with the children of a devastated community has been replaced with cruise missiles launched from ships that are 500 miles away or from aircraft that nobody ever sees.

We need to stop this madness and return to the values that have made this country great. Tom Brokaw's book, *The Greatest Generation*, talks about these values and the

men and women who not only believed in these values, but lived them as well.

Best regards,"

## WE NEED TO DEFEND OUR FREEDOM

**HON. BOB SCHAFFER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 27, 1999*

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed this Congress a number of times regarding the very real and serious threat our country faces from ballistic missile attack. Very few citizens realize our nation, the world's only superpower, could not stop one single ballistic missile from striking American soil today. This is not due to a lack of technological capability, but rather, is a direct result of President Clinton's deliberate policy of vulnerability.

I have frequently and consistently engaged the President and his administration on this issue because I believe it is one of the most important ones facing our nation. No other issue deals so directly with the security and future of our democracy than one which concerns the very defense of our territory and our citizenry.

Today, I responded rather directly to a letter I received from Lieutenant General Lester L. Lyles, Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), on March 12, 1999. In his letter, General Lyles acknowledged the clear and present threat to our nation, but failed to contradict, even once, the policy of assured vulnerability established by the Clinton administration.

In composing this response, I consulted many colleagues who share my concerns. They have asked that the final draft be distributed to all Members.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for the RECORD, the full text of the letter I have today posted to General Lyles.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
*April 15, 1999.*

LT. GEN. LESTER L. LYLES,  
*Director, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization,  
Washington, DC*

DEAR GENERAL LYLES: Your letter of March 12, 1999, and Defense Secretary Cohen's January 20, 1999 remarks regarding our ballistic missile defense program have made clear to the Congress the reluctance of the Clinton administration to defend the American people from the growing threat of long-range ballistic missile attack. Despite the clear and growing threat posed by long-range ballistic missiles, Secretary Cohen cannot even admit the need to deploy a ballistic missile defense.

The threats are obvious and commanding. On August 31, 1998, North Korea successfully tested a ballistic missile capable of striking the United States. In July 1998, the Rumsfeld Commission issued an alarming and erudite warning on the threat and proliferation of ballistic missiles. In April 1998, Pakistan's test of an intermediate range ballistic missile set off the May 1998 nuclear arms testing race between India and Pakistan. In July 1998, Iran tested an intermediate range ballistic missile, a step in its program for building long-range ballistic missiles to attack the United States.

During 1998, we learned China has 13 long-range ballistic missiles aimed at various American cities. We also learned China is

building two new models of ICBMS which are road-mobile and capable of striking the United States. In February 1999, reports revealed China's active build-up of intermediate and short-range ballistic missiles threatening Taiwan, following in the footsteps of China's use of ballistic missiles to intimidate Taiwan in 1995 and 1996.

In 1998, in spite of grace economic problems, Russia continued construction on its new, road-mobile, long-range ballistic missile designed to pierce ballistic missile defenses, the Topol-M. In addition, Russia, operating under a decaying command and control structure, still possesses hundreds of ballistic missiles and thousands of nuclear warheads capable of destroying the United States.

The deployment of a ballistic missile defense is thoroughly warranted. The Clinton administration's policy to delay the deployment of a ballistic missile defense until the year 2005, or later, is incompatible with the purpose of the federal government's responsibility to provide for the common defense. I fear it will take a nuclear missile strike on American soil before this administration and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) admits to the need to deploy a ballistic missile defense.

#### RECORD

In 1993, the Clinton administration inherited a balanced and sophisticated ballistic missile defense program utilizing space-based interceptors, high-energy lasers, and theater missile defenses such as Navy Theater Wide (Navy Upper Tier). These space-based programs were in an advanced state of development. For example, *Brilliant Pebbles* was ready to move into the acquisition stage, having acquired approval by the Defense Acquisition Board. The time-frame for *Brilliant Pebbles* deployment, assuming a program of modest acquisition streamlining, would have led to deployment before the year 2000, or perhaps sooner, according to former Strategic Defense Initiative Organization director, Ambassador Henry F. Cooper:

"In both the Space-Based Interceptor [*Brilliant Pebbles*] and other follow-on R&D areas, the pace at which system concepts can be fully developed and fielded is set by the available funding—not the state of technology [emphasis added]. Present schedules could be considerably shortened, perhaps up to half, if technology limited development programs were funded." [Ambassador Henry F. Cooper, *Summary of SDI Programs and Plans for Theater and National Ballistic Missile Defense*, January 4, 1993, p. 12.]

Furthermore, a March 15, 1995 letter from Dr. Edward T. Gerry to Senator Strom Thurmond confirmed the Space Based Laser program was entering a ten-year development and acquisition phase in a program using modest streamlining, as pointed out in Dr. Gerry's letter, signed by representatives of Lockheed Martin and TRW, which included a summary of the Space Based Laser program status and a ten-page attachment.

Had the Clinton administration vigorously funded and pursued these ballistic missile defense programs, including Space Based Interceptors, Space Based Lasers, and Navy Upper Tier, we would already have ballistic missile defenses deployed. Instead, in the nearly eight years of its tenure, this administration has gone out of its way to block deployment of a ballistic missile defense, fighting the will of Congress in the mistaken belief it is better to leave the United States vulnerable to attack than to defend our freedom and our lives.

The record is clear. After two full terms in office, Mr. Clinton will have failed to deploy any defense against long-range ballistic missile attack.

Moreover, his administration plans to delay the deployment of any National Missile Defense system until the year 2005 (this particular system would exclude much of our territory and assets), and plans not to deploy the Navy Theater Wide missile defense program until the year 2007.

President Clinton, through his actions, will ensure the American people remain undefended against the threat of long-range ballistic missile attack for five years or more after the end of his administration. This record deserves emphasis and understanding by every American. Despite a clear and growing threat from ballistic missile attack, this administration has ensured no defense in the short term, and a lasting legacy of little or no defense for years to come.

#### ARCHITECTURE

The only ballistic missile program even contemplated is limited in scope and intrinsically limited in effectiveness. Rather than vigorously pursuing a variety of ballistic missile defense technologies and basing modes to provide multiple opportunities for intercepting long-range ballistic missiles over the full course of their flight, the Clinton administration has instead limited our ballistic missile defense program to a single mid-course defense, foregoing the advantage of a boost phase defense.

The proposal for a mid-course defense consists of ground-based interceptors deployed at two sites, one in Alaska, and one in North Dakota, along with their associated radar. This defense, while situated for ballistic missiles coming over the North Pole, is misplaced to deal with the threat of ballistic missiles launched from sea, as in the case of Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles.

The basic architecture of the Clinton administration's ballistic missile defense program forgoes the advantages of space-based defenses. Such a defense would provide global coverage and a boost phase defense capability ground-based interceptors do not possess. The administration's proposal also limits its effectiveness against countermeasures such as submunitions, which even the Director of the BMDO admits is an advantage in favor of a boost phase defense.

The Clinton administration is intentionally rejecting the advantages of space-based defenses under various guises, claiming either adherence to the ABM Treaty, a desire not to "weaponize" space (as if long-range ballistic missiles armed with nuclear warheads traveling through space are not weapons), or denial of the technological maturity, cost effectiveness, and quick deployability of space-based defenses.

To fortify its policy of non-deployment in space, the administration in early 1993 canceled the *Brilliant Pebbles* program to build and deploy Space Based Interceptors and reduced funding for the Space Based Laser program to a token. Even today's Space Based Laser program is operating at a budget 10% or less than what is necessary to build a constellation of Space Based Lasers.

Furthermore, in overseeing the Space Based Laser program, the administration has delayed the necessary development steps, under the guise of waiting for new technology, rather than advancing it today using current technology. By consistently confusing management teams and contractors by transitioning from competition to a "community" team, and by de-emphasizing the goal of testing a Space Based Laser in space, the Clinton administration has greatly weakened the program. By placing the Space Based Laser in competition with the AirBorne Laser, rather than recognizing the unique and separate applications of each program, the administration will even further delay the development of Space Based Lasers.

In summary, the Clinton administration, despite inheriting over forty years of research and analysis into ballistic defense architecture, has yet to present or pursue the basic principles of an effective ballistic missile defense architecture, which includes multiple opportunities for intercepting a ballistic missile; continuous, global coverage to protect the entire United States; and a boost phase defense capability.

#### PROGRAM

It is no small matter the Clinton administration believes and maintains space-based defenses are less technologically mature than ground-based defenses. Certainly the administration is aware of America's space superiority over the past 40 years, particularly in the realm of payload transport and positioning. It is much easier to position in advance an interceptor in space than to booster launch one under extreme reactionary duress and severe time-constraints.

The deployment of interceptors or high-energy lasers in space provides continuous, global coverage—an advantage not shared by the BMDO's ground-based ballistic missile defense architecture. The BMDO is pursuing an architecture inherently limited in its capability and guaranteed to provide a sub-optimal defense.

According to prior cost estimates by the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, the BMDO's proposed ground-based interceptor system, consisting of approximately 100 interceptors, can be expected to cost between \$20-\$30 billion. Yet, for \$10-\$20 billion, we could build a system of Space Based Interceptors, such as *Brilliant Pebbles*, which would consist of approximately 1,000 interceptors and include 10-year life cycle replacement. For an additional \$20-\$30 billion, we could build a constellation of Space Based Lasers providing a boost phase defense. But rather than endorse a cost-effective and technologically-feasible system of space-based defenses, President Clinton fervently argues against them.

The administration's method of relying on only one contractor team to develop its ballistic missile defense program, and postponing a deployment decision until after a 2000 test, virtually guarantees the only option America will have is a limited system at a later time. Should this one test fail, the United States would remain undefended and without further options to field a ballistic missile defense. Such a situation, wherein the very security and future of our nation could hinge upon a single, limited system of defense, is entirely unacceptable.

#### BOOST PHASE DEFENSE

The advantages of a boost phase defense, largely unrecognized by the BMDO's plan for a national missile defense program, are worthy of mention. These advantages include:

- (1) Simplified target detection and identification, aided by the boosting missile's burning rocket and hot exhaust plume;
- (2) Simplified identification and targeting due to the larger size of a boosting rocket over a hardened reentry vehicle traveling through the cold of space;
- (3) Simplified target destruction because a boosting missile is under aerodynamic stress and is unarmored compared to a hardened reentry vehicle.

To these inherent advantages of a Boost Phase Defense is added the ability to intercept a ballistic missile before releasing its payload of multiple warheads, decoys, and/or clustered submunitions. A boost defense will greatly mitigate the difficulties encountered by an integrated ballistic missile defense downstream from the boost phase.

Yet, the administration has chosen not to pursue the development of a boost phase defense capability for a national missile defense.

## SUMMARY

The Clinton administration opposes the deployment of a national missile defense. Whether cloaking its opposition in a limited, ineffective defense program, rejecting the advantages of space-based defenses by claiming technological infeasibility, restricting our ballistic missile defense program to ground-based interceptors, or adhering to an outdated and ineffective Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, the record of this administration is clear—no ballistic missile defense for the American people.

The Clinton administration claims the ABM Treaty is the cornerstone of our “arms control” policy, even though the Soviet Union freely violated the ABM Treaty in its pursuit of a national missile defense and through its massive buildup of offensive nuclear missiles. The ABM Treaty is outdated, a fact which even its author, Henry Kissinger, has admitted. Yet, President Clinton, through the BMDO Congressional liaison, Commander John M. Pollin, is parading the ABM Treaty and its unratified amendments as a reason to delay the development of

space-based defenses. [Commander John M. Pollin, *There Are Limits on Sea-Based NMD*, Naval Institute Proceedings, April 1999, pp. 44-47.]

The Clinton administration's policy of leaving the American people undefended from long-range ballistic missiles is dangerous, unconscionable, and indeed, an embarrassing chapter in our nation's history. We need to defend our freedom.

Very truly yours,

BOB SCHAFFER,  
*Member of Congress.*