

Re: Bye-bye INF treaty?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2007-02/msg01348.html>

- *From:* "Jordan" <JSBassior2001@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 25 Feb 2007 22:33:59 -0800
-

On Feb 25, 9:49 pm, Alan Jones <ala...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On 24 Feb 2007 11:11:14 -0800, "Jordan" <JSBassior2...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

What would a "calm and rational" response to Iran launching a war against America by firing ICBM's at American cities look like? As opposed to the "panic" one?
- Jordan

The response could be exactly the same. The immediate response would be the politically correct one. The delayed response would show a political weakness of the Commander in Chief to take action. After weeks of study, focus groups, public opinion polls, building congressional support, public debate, etc., the response would seem cold and calculating, rather than dutiful.

???

I think you're missing the point here. Once Iran had launched any ICBM's at American cities, America and Iran would be at war. Why would any even marginally-competent President not strike to neutralize Iranian military assets, especially strategic ones, as rapidly as possible? The situation would cry out for rapid action, because of the very strong possibility that the Iranians might have additional missiles in reserve, missiles which (if we failed to take them out on the ground) might be launched in a follow-on attack, one which might take advantage of the fact that we had expended some of our ABM's and revealed some of our deployment and tactics, and hence be more likely to penetrate to score severe damage upon American cities, forces or installations.

I'm not saying that we would have to act before we were ready, but we normally keep some forces in readiness to deal with just the scenario given (a surprise nuclear attack). If there was an SSBN anywhere near the Persian Gulf, it could pop its nukes over Iranian

Re: Bye-bye INF treaty?

strategic force targets in a matter of 15–45 minutes (depending on its position and depth); American ICBM's could be hitting their targets within 30–60 minutes; manned bombers within a matter of hours. I would be utterly astonished to hear that the Pentagon does not have some at least basic plans for rapid retaliation against each of the Terrorist States, or any of them in combination, which they could have before the President within minutes of such an attack (in this age of electronic communications).

Taking out the Iranian strategic capability, to ensure that there would be no follow-on strikes, would be the top priority of any American President. After the damage caused (if any) by the Iranian attack had been determined, then there could be war policy meetings to decide whether our goal should be force neutralization, regime change, or cultural elimination (a nice way to say "kill the bastards and hunt down any survivors, so that Farsi will be spoken only in Hell.").

Force neutralization would be certainly the minimum politically acceptable goal in this scenario. Any President who responded to a nuclear attack on the American homeland by a third-rate Power like Iran without at least launching a campaign of some sort against Iran, and making sure they couldn't launch a second attack, would be facing impeachment, even if he went into the situation with a majority in the Congress.

Under far less provocation, Jimmy Carter essentially lost his bid for re-election for failing to punish that very same country -- I think that US Presidents can read history!

– Jordan