

Peace Economy Project  
438 N. Skinker Blvd.  
St. Louis, MO 63130

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. Postage  
**PAID**  
St. Louis, MO  
Permit No. 1081

**PEP News:**

**Read Thoroughly.**

**Share Widely.**

**React Passionately.**

### Justice and Peace Shares

PEP is a proud member of Justice and Peace Shares, a collaboration of seven local groups, all committed to nonviolent social change and justice for the poor.

JPS Shares (\$25/month) save these 7 organizations valuable time and energy otherwise spent fundraising so that they can focus on their important work for peace and justice.

JPS Shareholders are eligible for membership in any or all of the JPS groups but do not receive direct appeals for further contributions from these organizations.

St. Louis Justice & Peace Shares  
438 N. Skinker Blvd.  
St. Louis, MO 63130  
(314) 725-5303  
[www.jps-stl.org](http://www.jps-stl.org)  
[info@jps-stl.org](mailto:info@jps-stl.org)

**To our readers:** If you are not currently a member but like what you have read here, please consider joining PEP. Membership supports PEP's research and work to build a peace-based economy. Clip and mail the form below. Don't forget your email address - it is the quickest way for us to reach you.

**Yes, I want to join PEP.**

*Contributions are tax-deductible.*

- \$50 Sustaining Member
- \$30 Member
- \$100 Major Donor
- \$10 Member on limited income



Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Street \_\_\_\_\_  
City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone \_\_\_\_\_  
Email \_\_\_\_\_

**Return to: Peace Economy Project**  
438 N. Skinker Blvd.,  
St. Louis, MO 63130

# PeaceEconomyNews

Spring 2009



**PEP researches, educates and advocates for conversion of our society from a military to a peace-based economy**

**INSIDE:**

*Cracks in the Impenetrable Wall*  
Andy Heaslet  
-Page 1

*William Hartung's Testimony: 6 Weapons Systems Recommended to be Cut*  
-Page 3

*Positives Signs from Gates*  
Charles Kindleberger  
-Page 6

*The PMA Story*  
-Page 7

## Cracks in the Impenetrable Wall

*Andy Heaslet, Peace Economy Project Coordinator*

For decades, The Peace Economy Project has fought against the massive forces of the Military-Industrial-Congressional Complex (MICC). Despite our efforts, wars have continued and military spending has trended upwards throughout our history, dramatically so for the past eight years. Much of our work has felt as if we were banging our heads against a very dense, firm, and impenetrable wall. With the statement from Defense Secretary Robert Gates on April 6<sup>th</sup>, though, we found that some crumbs of mortar have fallen out of the MICC wall.

These mortar crumbs are not the massive hunks we saw dismantled with the fall of the Berlin wall. These are like flakes that Andy Dufresne found, inspiring his escape in the movie *Shawshank Redemption*. These crumbles represent that progress can be and has been made. They illustrate that with the right tools (our heads might not be the best instruments) this wall can be altered and, perhaps, brought down.

This is a cautious optimism, though. It must be explicitly made clear that, despite some radical cuts, **the Defense Budget is increasing by \$21 Billion**. PEP Board member, Charles Kindleberger takes a look at some of the positive cuts outlined in Gates' address on page \_\_ of this newsletter. Also within these pages are Director of the Arms and Security Initiative's Bill Hartung's arguments for various reductions

in military spending, some of which have been heeded by Secretary Gates. In this particular section, I look at some of the rhetoric in Gates' address and offer our initial reactions.

*"First, this department must consistently demonstrate the commitment and leadership to stop programs that significantly exceed their budget or which spend limited tax dollars to buy more capability than the nation needs. Our conventional modernization goals should be tied to the actual and prospective capabilities of known future adversaries – not by what might be technologically feasible for a potential adversary given unlimited time and resources."*

This is a fantastic sound bite. I hope there is weight behind these words.

*"Second, we must ensure that requirements are reasonable and technology is adequately mature to allow the department to successfully execute the programs. Again, my decisions act on this principle by terminating a number of programs where the requirements were truly in the "exquisite" category and the technologies required were not reasonably available to affordably meet the programs' cost or schedule goals."*

This statement makes me wary. Granted, the cuts that Gates has recommended already represent significant changes that will face stern opposition, but if this were a genuine concern, increased orders of the F-35 would not have occurred at this time, missile defense would have been cut more dramatically, and the Zumwalt Class Destroyer would have been cut completely. The spirit of the comment is positive, but abiding by it will be a struggle.

*"Third, realistically estimate program costs, provide budget stability for the*

*continued on page 2*

**Peace Economy News**  
is the newsletter of the non-profit  
**Peace Economy Project,**  
438 N. Skinker Blvd.  
St. Louis, MO 63130  
Tel 314-726-6406, Fax 314-726-6427  
Email: [pep@peaceeconomyproject.org](mailto:pep@peaceeconomyproject.org)  
Website: [www.peaceeconomyproject.org](http://www.peaceeconomyproject.org)

Spring 2009



### Introducing the PEP EZine!

The Peace Economy Project is proud to announce the beginning of a monthly EZine-newsletter to our membership. This Emailed magaZine (hence EZine) keeps you tuned in to the best news and information PEP has to offer on a monthly basis.

This publication offers regular columns under the headings of

1) *The Chopping Block*, a profile of a particularly wasteful military item that could be cut or reduced in order to open up funds for other uses.

2) *Voices of Peace*, a personal reflection by a PEP member, generally answering the question, "What does a Peace Economy look like to me?"

3) *If Not on War, On What*, A hopeful look into how we could evolve from a War Economy to a Peace Economy.

4) *Call to Action*, Ways that you can get involved in PEP's actions and campaigns. And

5) *PEPDate*, a brief update into what the staff and leadership of the Peace Economy Project has been up to for the past month.

To sign-up for the PEP EZine, please email [office@PeaceEconomyProject.org](mailto:office@PeaceEconomyProject.org) Feel free to refer your friends!

continued from page 1

**programs we initiate, adequately staff the government acquisition team, and provide disciplined and constant oversight."**

I am extremely curious to see how this oversight will be implemented and enforced. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) already does a rather effective job of monitoring waste and corruption, but rarely do changes occur as a result of these observations. Just because there are more eyes watching doesn't necessarily mean that anything will change. Again, though, the principle of the statement is very positive.

*"Some will say I am too focused on the wars we are in and not enough on future threats. The allocation of dollars in this budget definitely belies that claim. But, it is important to remember that every defense dollar spent to over-insure against a remote or diminishing risk – or, in effect, to "run up the score" in a capability where the United States is already dominant – is a dollar not available to take care of our people, reset the force, win the wars we are in, and improve capabilities in areas where we are underinvested and potentially vulnerable. That is a risk I will not take."*

This is both troubling and encouraging. Gates clearly recognizes that military funds are not infinite and thus what is allocated should be managed responsibly. While saying this though, he asserts that he is willing to spend; indeed, despite the cuts mentioned elsewhere in the speech, his budget still represents an **increase** in military spending.

I am also troubled by the comments regarding resetting the force and winning the wars we are in. Resetting the force, to Gates and Obama, means more bodies within the active-duty armed forces and replacing/repairing what has been damaged in battle. If we didn't have more than 700 foreign bases to maintain and two wars to fight, would we need an increase in the number of soldiers and marines? As for resetting equipment, those costs were supposed to be included in the annual supplemental war spending bills – any further resetting costs should be carefully scrutinized, asking: "Why weren't these costs built into past requests? Where did the previously authorized money go, if not towards resetting? Are these truly resetting costs or are these wars a convenient excuse to purchase more superfluous equipment?"

"*Winning the wars we are in*" is an aggravating statement. The foreign minister of Al-Qaeda is

not going to march onto the deck of the USS Missouri and sign a statement declaring an end to hostilities. There will be neither a V-I nor a V-A day. Implying that there is a pure, binary, win-lose option in either of these wars is simply false advertising. The only hope I can see in this statement is that, perhaps, Gates is making reference to previous statements calling for a more comprehensive diplomatic strategy in these conflicts.

Overall, as the greater context of this newsletter implies, the presentation by Secretary Gates is an encouraging sign that the Obama administration is prepared to stand up to the Military-Industrial-Congressional Complex. Clearly, the overall increase in spending tells us that there remains significant work to be done in order to shift our nation's funding priorities. This address, though, gives the feeling that Obama and Gates are applying a tourniquet to the defense budget, which has been hemorrhaging money for years. Serious attention needs to be given to the gaping wound caused by the Bush administration and decades of neglect; Gates' words suggest that such attention is on the way.

The wall we have been banging our heads against remains. Gates' words reveal where the cracks for us to focus on lie. We must support and see through the cuts he has recommended. Hold him accountable to the changes he has pledged to implement regarding the procurement process. And continue to point out areas of waste and corruption. As these cracks become more evident, we will go at them with even more vigor, until the wall of the Military-Industrial-Congressional Complex is finally toppled.

#### Signature Ad with a Twist:

The Peace Economy Project has long held the tradition of developing an annual "Signature Ad for Peace" and we are delighted to continue producing a locally based message addressing national and global concerns in 2009. This year however, we are changing our approach somewhat; we're taking it straight to Congress. When you sign-on (and hopefully donate) to the 2009 Signature Ad for peace, we are going to have the message personally delivered to every signer's Congressperson's office in Washington DC. That's right, we're going to PEP Up Congress!

The statement will be released on Earth Day, April 22<sup>nd</sup>, and delivered to the DC offices in early to mid summer.

PEP staffer, Andy Heaslet, who will be delivering the statement, challenges friends of PEP to make him walk to more than 107 different offices this summer (20% of all Representatives and Senators). To make that happen, PEP will need YOUR HELP getting our message out across the country.

To sign-on (and donate) to the 2009 PEP Up Congress Signature Ad for Peace, log on to [www.PeaceEconomyProject.org](http://www.PeaceEconomyProject.org) starting April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009.

sales will now become the main focus in order to keep the lines open.

- **C-17 Air Lifter.** This tanker would be caped at 205. Most of the plane is built in California, but Senator Kit Bond states that 1800 St. Louis workers are tied to the program. This plane has been on the chopping block for years now and only remains in production due to pressure from industry and congress. If Bond and other congresspersons wanted to help employees working on the C-17, they would find new programs for them to work on rather than dragging out the inevitable death of this program on a year-by-year basis.

- **VH-71 Presidential Helicopter.** The much-publicized program that would buy 26 helicopters for \$13 billion is recommended for cancellation due to doubling in price and being six years behind schedule. Senator John McCain will be pleased with this news for more than one reason.

- **A.B.L. and M.K.V. Missiles.** A prototype for an Airborne Laser that destroys enemy missiles from a modified Boeing 747, and a Multi Kill Vehicle for destroying enemy missiles with multiple warheads would be cancelled.

- **Future Combat Systems.** This massive \$160 billion effort to monitor and electronically tie together soldiers, weapons and transportation vehicles has been scaled back. Some vehicles in this Boeing run program would be cancelled.

- **Transformational Satellite.** This advanced 5-satellite program would be cancelled, but replaced by the acquisition of several existing satellites and acquisition from commercial satellite service providers.

Every single one of these proposed program cuts has been the subject of critique from The Peace Economy Project over the years and we applaud Secretary Gates' willingness to consider and make such difficult decisions.

Over the coming months we will be subjected to a lot of rhetoric. Powerful people and their lobbyists will ask how could the government not buy more F-22s, given the age and wear on existing F-15s and the slow pace of developing the joint strike fighter (F-35)? How could we not be pushing forward with a new bomber to replace the tired B-2 bombers? How could we even think about shrinking the size of navy fleet? And so on.

PEP believes that there are ample important reasons for the proposed changes. In fact many of us think that there should be considerably more cut backs. We concur that the economic state of the nation complicates the situation with so many jobs tied into these wasteful weapons. Yet

to us it is obvious that this nation cannot afford every weapons system desired by senior military officers, defense contractors and congress. The equipment we use and procure should be geared to the kinds of war we are in and the real threats we face, far more than weapons suitable to the cold war of the past, or some theoretical, massive war in the future.

Although our spirits are raised by parts of Gates' announcements, PEP remains concerned that the President wants a 3-4% increase in the FY 2010 Pentagon budget to \$534 billion. We are initially impressed with his 10-year proposed budget that reportedly envisions a decrease in defense spending from 20 percent of the total budget in 2008 to 14 percent in 2016. We welcome the President's bold recommendations in the areas of Health, Education, Energy and Climate Change. Collectively those recommendations sound like a serious move towards a peace economy.

## Congressional Ethics and Earmarks Again – The PMA Story.

We have all been angry at AIG lately; how about PMA? Paul Magliochetti, CEO of the PMA Group recently announced that he was closing his firm after being raided by the FBI. A former staffer for Congressman John Murtha, Magliochetti has not said much, but here is what recent newspapers have reported. Since 1998, PMA has contributed \$40 million to members of Congress, including \$7.8 million to members of the House Defense Appropriations Sub-Committee, and \$2.4 million to the Committee chair, Congressman Murtha. It is also alleged that many of Magliochetti's relatives contributed very large amounts to selected congressmen.

And what did the lobbying firm get in return? It turns out that PMA clients received about \$300 million in earmarks to the recent Defense Appropriation bill. That's more than the AIG bonuses. The 2009 bill contained 1000 earmarks which did not get examined during the "markup" process, nor did the House rules allow them to be challenged. This "pay to play" earmark culture is embarrassing to the country and damaging to national security because the Pentagon is forced to do business with companies it has not selected, often for work it doesn't want. Check out the earmark analysis and recommendations of Representative Jeff Flake of Arizona, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and the website "Murtha Must Go" for more information.





**APPEAL TO  
PRESIDENT  
OBAMA AND THE  
U.S. CONGRESS:  
CUT MILITARY  
SPENDING 25% BY  
2010**

In the spirit of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s work to end poverty, racism, and war, we, the people of the United States, call on the Obama administration and the U.S. Congress to end the U.S. wars and occupations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and to address the economic and environmental crises by cutting military spending by 25% in 2010 and redirecting our tax dollars to housing, health care, education, green jobs, and clean energy.

If this statement speaks to you, log onto [www.UnitedForPeace.org/budget](http://www.UnitedForPeace.org/budget) and sign on - alternatively, send and email with your contact information to [office@PeaceEconomyProject.org](mailto:office@PeaceEconomyProject.org) and we'll sign

continued from page 5

aircraft carriers, while there is only one State Department.

Diplomacy must be one part of a more comprehensive security strategy. Foreign assistance is another. Investing in roads, schools, clean water, agriculture, and energy and communications technologies is our best hope for heading off "failed states" and nascent insurgencies in the developing world. That is why so many of us welcome President Obama's pledge to double U.S. foreign assistance over the next four years. Unfortunately, the House Budget Committee has already, initially, cut the president's request by nearly 10%. By contrast, the proposal for the Pentagon was untouched. This counterproductive action seems to reflect a combination of an understandable urge to find places to cut spending in a period of trillion dollar-plus budget deficits and an unfortunate failure to grasp that diplomacy and development assistance are every bit as important to our national security as military forces.

The \$35 billion in savings that can be derived from cutting unnecessary weapons programs could help underwrite President Obama's pledge to dramatically increase development spending, as well as allowing us to invest substantially more in the diplomatic capabilities of the State Department.

Perhaps most importantly of all, more flexibility in the use of our national security budget could help fund the President's new initiatives to counter violent volatility within Afghanistan and Pakistan. A central part of the Obama administration's plan for addressing threats from within Pakistan is a package of civilian support and development assistance valued at \$1.5 billion per year for five years. Yet there is already some concern as to whether this plan will be fully funded by Congress. If we use our existing national security resources wisely, there should be no reason *not* to finance the President's entire aid package for Pakistan.

Let me just conclude by saying that if we want to fund a robust, multi-faceted strategy for addressing terrorism and irregular warfare, we need to realign our national security budget, both within traditional defense areas and across the spectrum of non-military tools that are so essential to success.

## Positive Signs from Secretary of Defense Gates

*Tough Decisions for the Obama Administration; Busy times for Lobbyists*

Charles Kindleberger  
PEP Board Member

It is time for members and friends of the Peace Economy Project to stand up. We knew the battle was coming. Defense Secretary Gates has, at least verbally, indicated that the "spigot of defense spending" is closing, and the 10-year budget put out in February by the new administration recommended an essentially flat budget in the coming years. Following nearly a decade of constant increases, stopping that momentum feels like a good start towards a more sustainable defense infrastructure.

In early April, Secretary Gates set forth particulars for the FY 2010 budget, set to go into effect in October. Needless to say, many congressmen, defense companies and members of the military are not happy. There will be lots of push back. The PEP community must stand up for the positive changes that this request represents and continue to pressure for further positive actions like these.

Here is quick summary of Gates' hit list, with a particular focus on Boeing and the St Louis region:

- F-22 Raptor. Only four more of this terribly expensive plane would be funded, with production ending in 2011 at 187 planes. Originally there were to be 650-750. Predictably, given that 44 states participate in building some piece of the F 22, congress is outraged. Many claim that 95,000 jobs will be lost and the national security endangered, unwilling to admit that these employment figures are inflated and exaggerated, the plane is not affordable, and it is currently ready to fly only 62 percent of the time. Boeing reportedly subcontracts for about one third of the F-22 business.

- F/A-18 Super Hornet. The added emphasis given to the nascent and developing F-35, Joint Strike Fighter, signals the winding down of F/A-18 Super Hornet sales to the US Navy. Boeing will still produce both the F/A-18 and the E/A-18 Growler, although foreign

## Terrorism and the New Age of Irregular Warfare: Challenges and Opportunities

*An Amended Version of Testimony Before the House Armed Services Committee Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capability*

By [William D. Hartung](#)  
Director of the Arms and Security Initiative  
New America Foundation  
April 2, 2009

We have already spent over \$173 billion on the war in Afghanistan, an average of over \$20 billion per year. That number will rise significantly as we send more troops and spend more on training Afghan security forces. Military and economic aid to Pakistan will increase sharply. And additional civilian development aid to Afghanistan will be a crucial part of the mix as well. These will be long-term efforts, not the work of a year, or two years, or even five years. And while Afghanistan and Pakistan may be the central front, dealing with the threats posed by terrorism and irregular warfare will require investments on a global scale. Where will the funds to underwrite this new strategy come from?

The Congressional Budget Office has projected a deficit of \$1.8 trillion this year and \$1.4 trillion for FY 2010. This suggests that we can't simply put the costs of implementing a more comprehensive approach to terrorism on our great national credit card.

Contrary to popular belief, savings generated by reductions in U.S. forces in Iraq are also unlikely to be significant, at least for the next few years. The planned reductions are fairly gradual. Even after the end of 2011 we may leave a residual force of 50,000 or more military personnel, along with an expanded effort to train and equip the Iraqi armed forces. These factors and others suggest that the short-term personnel reductions in Iraq will not free up significant resources that can be applied to other objectives.

We must ensure that every defense dollar is spent as efficiently and effectively as possible. The days of a "both/and" approach to national

security spending are over. We can't afford to simultaneously fund Cold War era weapons, *and* equipment designed for use in current conflicts, *and* sophisticated systems destined to address distant threats that may or may not emerge decades down the road. Continuing to do so will have significant negative consequences on our ability to train, equip, and sustain forces designed to address the immediate threats posed by terrorism and other forms of irregular warfare.

Secretary of Defense Robert Gates has acknowledged the need to make choices within the military budget. He has suggested that we should place more emphasis on the wars of the present than on the potential conflicts of the future. President Obama reinforced this point in his recent address to Congress when he said that we need to "reform our defense budget, so that we're not paying for Cold War-era weapons systems we don't use."

The tendency to buy virtually everything the Department of Defense asks for without scrutinizing the merits of the requests, as demonstrated by the Bush administration, is evidenced by the fact that the Pentagon's core budget has risen rapidly, even though it plays no role in funding the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Up until now these conflicts have been financed by separate emergency appropriations.

The Pentagon's baseline budget rose by 82% between FY 2002 and FY 2009, *after* adjusting for inflation. Add to that the costs of the wars, and we are now spending more in real terms than we have spent at any time since World War II. In light of the current economic crisis and competing social, infrastructure, environmental, and foreign policy demands, these levels of military spending are no longer sustainable.

Thankfully, there are early signs that the Obama administration is prepared to make some real choices. Although the Obama administration has budgeted an increase of about 3% over the Bush administration's Pentagon budget for FY 2009, it is \$50 billion less than the Pentagon requested. The Pentagon's number was a "wish list" budget that was designed to test the new president. Would he dare to say no to a request made by the military services and the Department of Defense during wartime? If he did so, wouldn't he be labeled "soft on defense"?

President Obama did say no to portions of the Pentagon's wish list, and thus far he has paid no political price for doing so. Aside from articles by a few conservative commentators, there has been no suggestion that imposing some fiscal discipline on the Pentagon undermines our national security.

A second sign that the Pentagon is going to be required to put its budgetary house in order is the administration's decision to subject war spending to the same level of scrutiny that applies to the regular Department of Defense appropriations, starting with the FY 2010 budget.

Perhaps most importantly of all, the administration has indicated that it will seriously consider deep cuts in or elimination of a number of major weapons projects [*see Kindleberger article for details on Gates' planned cuts and increases*]. Doing so will make it easier to accommodate both

continued on page 4



### Introducing PEP Talk!

The latest addition to our ever-improving website, PEP Talk will be a somewhat more informal means of outreach for people interested in what PEP does. This will be an outlet for sharing what news is on our radar and our general reflections on and reactions to said news and events. The words and materials published here won't be quite as detailed as what you might find throughout the rest of the website, but we will endeavor to include links, cite sources, and maintain a high level of integrity with this page. Simultaneously, we intended to keep you plugged into the personal side of waging peace. And, like all good blogs, we look forward to hearing your thoughts as well!

Check it out: [www.PeaceEconomyProject.org/blog](http://www.PeaceEconomyProject.org/blog)

### Are You a Blogger? Would you like to help PEP?

An easy way to support the Peace Economy Project is to "dig" and/or repost articles you've found on the PEP website ([www.PeaceEconomyProject.org](http://www.PeaceEconomyProject.org)). For information on how to join PEP's "Blog Squad," please email [office@PeaceEconomyProject.org](mailto:office@PeaceEconomyProject.org).

continued from page 3

military and non-military security costs.

My recommendations for six weapons systems that can be cut without undermining our security are as follows:

**The F-22 "Raptor":** Designed to engage in air-to-air combat with a Soviet fighter plane that was never built, the F-22 is the most expensive fighter plane ever developed. Counting R&D expenditures, each F-22 costs over \$350 million. The marginal cost - the immediate cost of adding one new aircraft to the inventory, not counting R&D costs already incurred - is still \$143 million per plane. The Air Force has already purchased 187 F-22s at a cost of over \$65 billion.

The F-22 is a plane in search of a mission. In an era in which current adversaries like the Taliban and the Iraqi insurgency have no air forces and potential future adversaries like Russia and China cannot match the capabilities of current U.S. fighter planes, whatever new capabilities the F-22 may bring with it are not worth the cost.

Over the past few years, it has cost the Pentagon an average of \$4.2 billion per year to purchase about 20 F-22s. Ending the program now would free up that \$4 billion-plus for other purposes.

**The F-35 Joint Strike Fighter:** The Joint Strike Fighter was designed to be a versatile, affordable aircraft that would be produced in large quantities for the United States and its key allies. In an effort to simplify logistics and benefit from economies of scale, variants of the plane are being developed for the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force. As a next-generation fighter and attack aircraft it will fill a real need, but the Pentagon and the prime contractor should take the time to get the design right before going into full-scale production.

Current plans call for the military services to buy over 2,400 F-35s at a total cost of \$240 billion, or about \$100 million per plane. It is still at the very early testing stage, however. The cost of the program has already increased by nearly 20%, even as the number of aircraft to be purchased has decreased by over 400 planes. If current plans are allowed to go forward, the Department of Defense will buy the first 360 F-35s *before full flight testing has occurred*, at a cost of \$57 billion. Many

of these planes will be purchased on cost-plus contracts, which means that for the most part the manufacturer will receive more money for running over budget than it would for coming in on time and on budget. With no incentive to cut costs, further overruns are inevitable.

Rather than rushing the F-35 into production, the Pentagon should slow down purchases of the plane while development and testing proceed. That way any changes that need to be made can be done up front as part of initial production, instead of as expensive retrofits later. Cutting purchases of the F-35 in half relative to the Pentagon's current procurement schedule would save \$3 to \$4 billion per year.

**The Zumwalt Class Destroyer (DDG-1000):** The DDG-1000 has been described as a "multi-mission" destroyer which can engage in combat against enemy ships, fire cruise missiles from long-range, and provide support to ground forces by use its two 155mm cannons. It is a massive ship, displacing 15,000 tons of water, 50% more than any current Navy surface combatant.

Cost is the key variable here. At \$5 billion per ship for the first two and an estimated \$3.6 billion for every ship thereafter, the DDG-1000 is a luxury that we can't afford in a time of tightening defense budgets. Its main mission of engaging other combat ships on the high seas was conceived in 1991, just as the Soviet Union was falling apart. With China at most looking to develop a force of surface combatants that can operate within its region, there is no pressing need for a huge, costly destroyer.

As for providing fire support for the Army and Marines, there has to be a cheaper way to launch cruise missiles and put two 155mm cannons in reach of a land battle. This program should be ended at the two ships already authorized, rather than proceeding to the seven ship level that has been discussed. The savings would be \$3.6 billion per year over the next five years.

**Virginia-class submarine (SSN-74):** Similarly to the DDG-1000, the main mission envisioned for this submarine is no longer relevant. In a conventional battle with other combat ships, a submarine of this type can play an important role, but as noted above, the likelihood of this kind of combat occurring has diminished dramatically since the end of the

Cold War. Other missions cited for the SSN-74 - from intelligence gathering, to providing a platform for inserting or removing Special Operations Forces, to launching conventionally-armed cruise missiles - can all be carried out more affordably by adapting or upgrading existing submarines. Ending production of the Virginia-class submarine would save over \$3 billion per year.

**Missile defense:** Missile defense has been caricatured as "a weapon that doesn't work aimed at a threat that doesn't exist." While this may overstate the case, there is no question that the over \$10 billion per year devoted to ground-, sea-, and air-based forms of missile defense could be far better spent on other defense, foreign policy, or domestic priorities.

President Obama has asserted that he will take an "evidence-based" approach to missile defense. If so, the evidence is in. In the 26 years since Reagan's "Star Wars" speech, there has yet to be realistic test that indicates that we can reliably shoot down incoming nuclear warheads launched from a long-range ballistic missile. There is some indication, though that mid-range systems designed to protect troops or nearby allies from medium-range missiles may prove to be more effective.

It makes sense to scale back missile defense spending dramatically, to perhaps \$3 billion per year to cover the costs of ongoing research and development, and for refining technologies for defending against medium-range missiles. This would save \$7 billion per year.

**Nuclear Weapons:** At this point in our history, the liabilities of maintaining a huge

arsenal of nuclear weapons far outweigh any benefit they could possibly provide. President Obama has pledged to work for a world free of nuclear weapons, and to pursue immediate, concrete measures towards that goal, including negotiating a new treaty with Russia involving deep cuts in our respective nuclear arsenals; seeking ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT); accelerating spending designed to eliminate "loose nukes" and bomb-making materials (plutonium and enriched uranium) in Russia and beyond; and ending all new production of bomb-making materials worldwide.

The time for eliminating or drastically reducing global nuclear arsenals is long overdue, as has been noted by a wide range of current and former government officials. The common thread uniting the arguments about the need to eliminate nuclear weapons is that since the greatest danger is the possibility of a terrorist organization acquiring one, we need to reduce that risk by cutting back global arsenals to the lowest levels possible. Substantially reducing our arsenal will also give us greater leverage in persuading other nations to scale back their own nuclear stockpiles or abandon their pursuit of these weapons. The fewer nuclear weapons there are, the safer we will be.

Moving from an active stockpile of roughly 5,000 deployed nuclear weapons to an arsenal of 1,000 total weapons - 600 deployed and 400 in reserve - would save on the order of \$14.5 billion per year. Net savings after accounting for additional investments in securing "loose nukes" would be about \$11 billion per year. This would still leave the United States with a more than adequate deterrent against any existing nuclear-armed state, while providing a first step towards President Obama's goal of eliminating all nuclear armaments.

These are my six candidates of weapons programs that can either be eliminated or steeply cut back without harming our security at a time when the greatest threats to our safety are posed by terrorism and other forms of irregular warfare. Taken together they would free up over \$35 billion per year that could be applied to other objectives.

An important element of President Obama's new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan is to address the current imbalance between military and economic assistance. For example, a recent report by the Center for American Progress notes that thus far Department of

Defense spending devoted to the conflict in Afghanistan has been more than ten times the amount spent on non-military foreign aid and diplomatic operations. On a larger scale, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates has noted that there are more personnel engaged in running one aircraft carrier task force than there are trained diplomats in the entire U.S. Foreign Service. He could have added that the Navy has eleven

continued on page 6

