

Re: Bye-bye INF treaty?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2007-02/msg01349.html>

- *From:* "Jordan" <JSBassior2001@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 25 Feb 2007 22:23:47 -0800
-

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

On Sat, 24 Feb 2007 08:04:02 GMT, h...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Henry Spencer) wrote:

In article <5ijut257ubh8up8634islpcuff4smsr...@xxxxxxx>, Alan Jones <ala...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Intercepting a missile solves nothing.

Sure it does: it prevents the missile from hitting the US, which surely is the US's single highest priority in the matter.

Sure, if you can. But you also have the risk that our commander in chief, just says "Ha ha, we blocked your shot; we are great; we are invulnerable; no harm, no foul." Meanwhile the US People have soiled themselves, realizing that they just dodged a bullet. That is not security. Neutralizing the enemy is security.

There is no system of defense _or_ deterrence which can provide competent military leadership. At best, it can provide competent military leadership the weapons and tactics needed to achieve victory.

Refusing to build ABM's in order to _ensure_ that enemy missiles hit us, thus providing us with the motivation to strike back, is a seriously bizarre and even suicidal policy. And you are ignoring the likelihood that, in the absence of such strategic defenses, an incompetent President would be frozen deer-in-the-headlights fashion before _any_ enemy with _any_ nuclear ICBM capability, because he would know that in an exchange the enemy would be almost _guaranteed_ to do serious damage to our homeland.

Re: Bye-bye INF treaty?

We are not discussing a MAD situation here. What we have is essentially a situation where a madman is losing, knows he can't win, but he still tries to get in a sucker punch. (I don't expect that sucker punch to even come from an ICBM launched from his homeland.)

In a situation where the losing madman tries to get in the sucker punch, it is better if we block this punch than suffer its damage. Such an attack would be far more likely to be achievable by ICBM because a losing madman might not have the time to dispatch a covert action team, submarine, or surface missile ship before going down. And regardless of the situation, we are better off with ABM capability and other defense capabilities than we would be with other defense capabilities and no ABM capability, because in the latter case we are leaving open an obvious avenue of attack.

Perhaps, and perhaps not. Unless you melt the whole country down to slag (which requires ridiculous numbers of warheads and has potentially-ugly side effects, apart from involving mass murder of innocents on a scale not even Hitler or Stalin ever achieved), there might still be a missile or two hidden away somewhere... and the ones that were fired have hit the US... so tell me, exactly what has that approach "solved"?

Increased US security by neutralizing an enemy. You do not have to melt the whole country down to slag. You do not even have to kill every man, woman, and child. Obviously you must destroy their offensive military capability. However, the neutralization can be taken further to destroy the leadership, the religious ideology that spawned the madman, the economy that enabled the offensive development, the schools that educated the people enough to build offensive weapons, the people who empowered the madman...

Sure, in the long run. In the short run, though, your problem might be "the Iranians have just launched nuclear ICBM's," in which case ABM's would work better for saving friendly lives than would any long-term plan for occupation and reconstruction of their country. One can always launch the ABM's, then continue prosecuting the war by whatever means chosen — it is not an either-or situation.

No, the end is enhanced US security by neutralizing an enemy. Deference, is not real security, but in the absence of madmen, it will get you through the day. ...

We are, unfortunately, living in a world in which "madmen" have or are very close to having both nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them across long distances.

Re: Bye-bye INF treaty?

Re: Bye-bye INF treaty?

When neutralization is not possible, or warranted, deference is the next best thing. Now, the madman may be in his after life knowing that he sucker punched the US, but the fruits of his actions will taste bitter knowing that they came at the cost of his people, culture, and homeland. This realization may even deter some madmen.

It is not my vision that the US should be the biggest, strongest, most invulnerable, and most punitive nation on earth. Rather, we should be loving, and peaceful, with concern for other people and nations, and bolster security with stronger social and economic co dependence.

.... and this is harder if we have ABM's, because ... ?

– Jordan

.