# F-35s DA and CP

[\*\*\*COUNTERPLAN\*\*\* 1](#_Toc299961762)

[1NC – F-35s Counterplan 1](#_Toc299961763)

[Solves Aerospace Competitiveness 1](#_Toc299961764)

[Solves Hegemony 4](#_Toc299961765)

[Solves Naval Power 6](#_Toc299961766)

[Solves China 8](#_Toc299961767)

[They Say “Permutation” 10](#_Toc299961768)

[They Say “ We already buy F-35s” 11](#_Toc299961769)

[They Say “No Need for F-35’s – No one can challenge our Airpower Now” 12](#_Toc299961770)

[They Say “High costs” 13](#_Toc299961771)

[They Say “F-22s better” 15](#_Toc299961772)

[They Say “Counterplan Links to politics” 16](#_Toc299961773)

# \*\*\*COUNTERPLAN\*\*\*

# 1NC – F-35s Counterplan

**Text: The United States Federal Government should fully fund the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program.**

**F-35s solve case —it reinvigorates the aerospace industry, increases hegemony and solidifies our alliances – we have worked cooperatively on the F-35 program**

**Donnelly, 2011 - director of the Center for Defense Studies** [7/18/11Thomas, The Weekly Standard, “An Extremely Immodest Proposal,” http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/extremely-immodest-proposal\_576967.html?, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

No doubt the legal and monetary obligations would be great, but the strategic, operational, and defense industrial consequences of terminating the F-35 program would be catastrophic. To begin with, the F-35 is a multinational program. To kill it would not only yank the rug out from under America’s closest friends and allies – long-time partners like Great Britain, Australia, and Canada, for example – but destroy the prospects for closer partnerships in the Middle East and, particularly, the Asia-Pacific, where Japan, Korea and Singapore are likely F-35 customers. And it would forestall the opportunity to share a common fifth-generation aircraft with others like India, which could only turn to Russia or try to develop such an aircraft on its own. Terminating the F-35 would be the clearest signal one can imagine, even beyond retreat from Iraq or Afghanistan, that the United States no longer will assume the burdens of international security. Terminating the F-35, or simply terminating the F-35B short take off vertical landing (or STOVL), would be fatal for the Marine Corps as a serious war fighting service. The modernization of the Marines is already at risk; the V-22 Osprey tilt-rotor transport turned out to be more difficult and more expensive than anticipated, and last year the Obama administration cancelled the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle, which would have given the Marines both enhanced amphibious assault capability but, even more important, more firepower and mobility ashore. The Marines’ AV-8B Harriers – a development of the original British jump jet – are at the end of their service life, and the Marines’ F-18s cannot operate from Marine amphibious assault ships. And there’s hardly reason to have the big-deck amphibs without the F-35B. Conversely, operating a fifth-generation aircraft would give the Marine Corps a new viability in small-scale contingencies – think Libya – and allow them to contribute to more challenging “anti-access, area-denial” contingencies in East Asia or in an Iran-type operation. Similar challenges face the Navy; without a fifth-generation aircraft, its own aircraft carriers are increasingly irrelevant to high-end strike campaigns. Ending the F-35 program would also eviscerate what remains of the American military aviation industry. Only two companies in the world have prime contractor experience in building manned “stealth” aircraft, Northrop Grumman and Lockheed Martin. Northrop’s B-2 bomber, designed in the late 1970s, was last bought in 1997; only 21 of a planned 132 bombers. Northrop is no longer in that business. Lockheed built the F-117 Nighthawk, the first stealth fighter, another 1970s design and also long out of production. Lockheed also builds the F-22 Raptor, but that program was ended (with just 187 of a planned 750 aircraft produced) two years ago and the last F-22 will soon roll off the line. The F-35 line itself was sized (and the workforce planned) to build up to several hundred planes a year; under current plans, it’s not going to reach maximum efficiency. Indeed, the company may have to lay off workers. There’s no other place for the designers, engineers, or management to go; the investment, knowledge, and production experience to make stealthy, manned combat aircraft will rapidly disappear.

# Solves Aerospace Competitiveness

**[ ] F-35 is key to the Aerospace industry – declining orders can spiral to crush the industry**

**The Economist 2011** [7/14/11 [Print edition, “The last manned fighter,” http://www.economist.com/node/18958487?story\_id=18958487&fsrc=rss, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

How worried should Lockheed Martin be? The F-35 is the biggest biscuit in its barrel, by far. And it is not only Mr McCain who is seeking to knock a few chocolate chips out of it. The bipartisan fiscal responsibility and reform commission appointed by Mr Obama last year said that not all military aircraft need to be stealthy. It suggested cancelling the STOVL version of the F-35 and cutting the rest of its order by half, while buying cheaper F-16s and F-18s to keep numbers up. If America decided it could live with such a “high-low” mix, foreign customers might follow suit. The danger for Lockheed Martin is that if orders start to tumble, the F-35 could go into a death spiral. The fewer planes governments order, the more each one will cost and the less attractive the F-35 will be. This happened to the even more sophisticated and expensive F-22. By cutting its order from 750 to 183, the Pentagon helped to drive the programme cost per aircraft of the F-22 up from $149m to $342m. Lockheed Martin’s investors doubt this will happen to the F-35: the share price has been remarkably stable over the past two years. Tom Burbage, the executive who helped run the F-22 programme and who has also been in charge of the F-35’s development from the start, is still in charge—evidence that the company thinks he is doing a decent job. Mr Burbage says that a programme as big as the F-35 is bound to attract barbs. The main cause of the delays and cost over-runs, he says, is a problem with the weight of the STOVL version that came to light in 2004. It was impossible to continue work on the other two variants while this was being dealt with, he says. The plane was slimmed by 2,700lb (1,225kg), but this severely disrupted the supply chain that Lockheed Martin had put together with its main partners (BAE Systems and Northrop Grumman). That set the project back by nearly two years. On the bright side, Mr Burbage says that applying a similar diet to the other two variants yielded better planes.

**[ ] F-35s are key to the Aerospace industry – they provide huge profits – cancellations can crush the industry**

**Thompson 2011, Chief Operating Officer of the Lexington Institute** [7/27/11 Loren, Forbes Online, “Massive Cost Estimates for Fighter Program is Misleading,” http://blogs.forbes.com/beltway/2011/06/27/massive-cost-estimate-for-fighter-program-is-misleading/?partner=contextstory, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

The F-35 has proven to be a mixed blessing for the companies that build it. If it comes to fruition as planned, it will generate hundreds of billions of dollars in revenue over six decades. But because the program is so huge, it attracts much more scrutiny than other weapons from Pentagon officials, members of Congress, investors and journalists. Every setback is a negative for Lockheed’s stock, in much the same way that delays in the 787 Dreamliner have hammered Boeing shares. And there have been setbacks — testing delays, design issues, software glitches, and all the other problems that typically arise when developing cutting-edge weapons. The problems are manageable, but each one gets magnified because so much money is on the table and so many users are counting on the plane. Pentagon officials say there’s no alternative to the F-35 if the U.S. wants to maintain its longstanding edge in air power. That edge is the main reason why no U.S. soldier has been killed by hostile aircraft since the Korean War, and no U.S. pilot has been downed by an enemy plane since the Vietnam War. However, the urgent need to replace aging air fleets before overseas adversaries catch up with U.S. capabilities has not prevented the Pentagon from slowing down and restructuring the program as development problems were detected. Whatever the merits of those adjustments may have been, they had the effect of increasing expenses in a program where cost is a crucial metric of success.

**[ ] Cancelling F-35s will kill the industry – death spiral**

**Thompson 2011, Chief Operating Officer of the Lexington Institute** [7/27/11 Loren, Forbes Online, “Massive Cost Estimates for Fighter Program is Misleading,” http://blogs.forbes.com/beltway/2011/06/27/massive-cost-estimate-for-fighter-program-is-misleading/?partner=contextstory, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Cost is crucial for two reasons. First, if the price of each plane rises too far, potential users will start dropping out of the program. Fewer users means lower production rates, so economies of scale are lost — leading to further price increases. This dynamic is referred to in the aerospace industry as the budgetary “death spiral,” a process that did in the Air Force’s last new bomber and fighter before production numbers got anywhere near what the service needed. The second reason cost matters so much is that while relatively few people in Congress and the media understand cutting-edge aerospace technology, they all think they understand what a price-tag means. So when former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld started complaining in public that each of the Air Force’s F-22 fighters would cost a quarter-billion dollars, that proved to be the death knell for the program. Rumsfeld was wrong, but the astronomical price-tag became conventional wisdom and his successor killed the program.

**[ ] F-35s key to the aerospace industry—huge profits for defense companies**

**Davidson 2011** [7/12/11 [Michael, Boulder County Business Report, “F-35 program economic boost for state,” http://www.bcbr.com/article.asp?id=58615, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

The plane, named the Lighting II, is the result of the Department of Defense’s Joint Strike Fighter program. The stealthy jet is intended to become the next-generation attack jet and general-purpose fighter for the Air Force, Navy and Marines. Ball Aerospace & Technologies Corp. will build antennas for the planes, and the company held a ribbon cutting ceremony June 29 at the facility in Westminster where the components will be assembled. Boulder-based Ball Aerospace is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Ball Corp. (NYSE: BLL), which is based in Broomfield. The contract is a big deal for Ball. If the military buys the expected number of planes, the company could earn $677.2 million over the next 25 years. The order would call for an estimated 48,000 antennas, with each plane requiring 15. To fill the order, Ball expects to hire 400 employees who would work three shifts at the recently expanded Aerospace Manufacturing Center in Westminster. Ball spent $14.6 million to expand the manufacturing center to accommodate the order.

 **[ ] F-35s key to aerospace success—jobs, profits, and stealth technology**

**Davidson 2011** [7/12/11 [Michael, Boulder County Business Report, “F-35 program economic boost for state,” http://www.bcbr.com/article.asp?id=58615, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Congressman Mike Coffman talked about the importance of protecting military programs from budget cuts. The threat of cuts is something Lockheed Martin (NYSE: LMT) officials discussed openly during the event. The Bethesda, Maryland-based company expects to produce about 2,400 F-35s for the U.S. and 600 to 700 for U.S. allies, Lockheed Martin executive Danny Conroy said. The F-35s will replace Air Force F-16s and Navy F-18s that were designed in the 1970s, before the invention of stealth technology. “If you look at aircraft they’re flying today, they’re getting up there in age. Some of them are on life support,” Conroy said. While Conroy spoke about the F-35’s military value, as much of the presentation was focused on the economic impact Lockheed Martin and contractors like Ball have across the country. The F-35 program currently supports 460 direct and indirect jobs in Colorado, uses 15 suppliers and generates $33 million each year, according to data from Lockheed Martin. Those numbers will jump up as the plane enters a faster production cycle, Conroy said. Currently only test planes have been delivered to the service branches. If the full order is delivered, the F-35 will cost about $65 million per jet, Conroy said.

 **[ ] Fully funding the F-35 saves aerospace competitiveness – jobs and global leadership**

**Buffenbarger 2011 President of the International Association of Machinists** [7/15/11, Thomas, the Huffington Post, “Fund the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter for America’s War Fighters and Workers,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/thomas-buffenbarger/fund-the-f35-joint-strike\_b\_899847.html, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

When the F-35 takes wing, working Americans will benefit from tens of thousands of high-skill, high-wage, high-tech, family-supporting jobs. Even now, before full production ramps up, the F-35 program supports a broad industrial base of more than 1,300 suppliers in 47 states and Puerto Rico. Directly and indirectly, the F-35 program contributes at least 127,000 American jobs and creates over $12 billion in economic activity. These are the kinds of jobs that are absolutely essential to rebuilding the economy and renewing our global competitiveness. These jobs are at the juncture of the aerospace industry, which is America's export powerhouse; the high-tech sector, which represents our economic future; and the manufacturing base, which sustains our middle class but suffered the loss of some 5,000 jobs in May. Make no mistake: Congress must continue to support the F-35 program which maintains our global leadership, militarily and economically, while keeping our commitments to our closest allies. America's allies depend on continuing the F-35. America's war fighters deserve a state-of-the-art fighter jet. America's workers demand more high-wage family-supporting jobs. Now, it's up to Congress to make sure that America remains the world's "arsenal of democracy" and powerhouse of prosperity.

**[ ] F-35s key to offset job losses caused by F-22 cuts**

**Drew 09,** [the New York Times Christopher, 7/22/09, “Obama Wins Crucial Senate Vote on F-22,” http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/22/business/22defense.html?, accessed 7/26/11//HK]

Lockheed Martin, the prime contractor for the F-22, has estimated that work on the plane provides 25,000 jobs and indirectly supports about 70,000 others. But Robert M. Gates, the defense secretary, has said that the Pentagon needs to accelerate a new plane, the F-35, and that doing so would offset the job losses. About 1,000 suppliers in 44 states provide the jobs, which will gradually be phased out as some of the 187 F-22s that have been ordered are completed.

**[ ] F-35s key to the economy—jobs for bases revitalize local markets**

**Sanders 2011** [7/17/11 [Rebekah L., The Arizona Republic, “Glendale Luke AFB transitions, new missions could ripple,” http://www.azcentral.com/news/articles/2011/07/17/20110717luke-air-force-base-transitions.html, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Luke Air Force Base is scheduled to shrink in the next three years, potentially drying up millions of dollars in economic impact for Arizona as one of the state's largest employers. But base advocates are optimistic the Air Force will replace two F-16 training squadrons scheduled for relocation with a new training mission at Luke: the F-35 Lightning II, known as the Joint Strike Fighter. In a good scenario, the mission would land at Luke, ensure the base's future and make up for the expected financial loss. In a less-optimistic scenario, delays could continue to hamper Lockheed Martin's production of the F-35, Luke could face a gap of activity between missions, and the state could temporarily lose out on jobs and revenue. Worse case, the F-16s could leave and the F-35 training mission could be placed elsewhere.

# Solves Hegemony

**[ ] F-35s solve hegemony—aid allies and keep U.S. aerospace abilities and economy ahead**

**Buffenbarger 2011 President of the International Association of Machinists** [7/15/11, Thomas, the Huffington Post, “Fund the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter for America’s War Fighters and Workers,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/thomas-buffenbarger/fund-the-f35-joint-strike\_b\_899847.html, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Fortunately, there's one strong step that Congress can take to show our nation's leaders are serious about protecting our national security and our economic security. By fully funding the military's newest and most advanced fighter jet, the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, Congress can give our war fighters the air support they need, while generating the good-paying jobs that can jumpstart our economy. Yes, our fighter jets are still the best in the world. But the fleet is aging, and its technologies are being superseded by recent discoveries and developments. By utilizing these next-generation technologies and incorporating economies of scale and commonality, the F-35 program will allow three variants of one advanced plane to serve multiple roles and replace several aging aircraft. With its versatility and cost-effectiveness as well as its impressive roster of prospective customers among our Armed Services and our closest allies, the F-35 makes sense in an era when federal spending is closely scrutinized. The Joint Strike Fighter will serve the US Air Force, Navy and Marines, and eight allied partner countries - the United Kingdom, Canada, Italy, Norway, the Netherlands, Denmark, Australia and Turkey - have already committed substantial investments in the program. Developing any advanced technology isn't easy or error-free. But, at every step along the way, the F-35 program has overcome the obstacles, addressed the challenges, and perfected the product. In fact, the program executive officer for the Jet Strike Fighter, US Navy Admiral David Venter, a former test pilot himself, recently reported that "flight tests are revealing that the F-35 Lightning II will likely hit several performance goals that were once in doubt."

**[ ] Investment in next generation aircraft is necessary for hegemony – it is critical to stay ahead of Russian and Chinese stealth technology**

**Majumdar, 2011 - writer for Defense News** [6/30Dave, Defense News, “Air Force to start operational testing of F-35, http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2011/07/defense-air-force-to-start-opeval-test-f35-071511/, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

In the meantime, the Air Force has started to seriously look at the capabilities it will need in the jet that replaces the F-22 and F-35. “We’re definitely thinking about a sixth-generation fighter,” he said. “But it’s 2030-plus.” He said that the U.S. must continue to invest in new technologies. He said the Chinese and Russians are making slow progress in stealth, a tough technology to master. Neither has yet developed a good pilot vehicle interface, which is an important aspect of building fighters, but is particularly important for stealth aircraft because of the need to manage radar signatures in-flight, Carlisle said. “They’re getting better than they used to be, but they’re still a long ways behind us in pilot vehicle interfaces,” he said. Carlisle is a veteran fighter pilot who in his earlier years was part of an elite group of Air Force aggressor pilots selected to fly Russian and Chinese aircraft acquired via various means. The problem for the United States will be that though the country will continue to lead the world in military technology, other nations will able to match those capabilities far more quickly than in years past due to cyber threats and globalization. Instead of decades at a time, the U.S. edge will last for years at a time — but he reiterated that that does not mean the U.S. is falling behind. “Given the world we live in today,” Carlisle said, “My belief is that we’ll continue to continually push the technological envelope… I just think that our ability to have that technological advantage will be for a shorter period of time.”

**[ ] Slow F-35 procurement decreases readiness - it leads to inventory gap as pilots outnumber planes**

**Trimble 10** [Stephen, 6/4/2010, Flight International, “USAF rules out new F-15s and F-16s to narrow ‘fighter gap’,” http://www.flightglobal.com/articles/2010/04/06/340121/usaf-rules-out-new-f-15s-and-f-16s-to-narrow-fighter.html, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Delays and cost overruns for the Lockheed Martin F-35 have not changed the US Air Force's plans to deactivate about 250 fighters later this year, says its chief of staff, Gen Norton Schwartz. The USAF, however, has begun destructive tests on Boeing F-15s and Lockheed F-16s to prove the viability for a potential service life extension programme, says Schwartz. "At 10-15% of the cost [of a new fighter] you could perform a service life extension programme," Schwartz says, "which would get us close to where we need to be in, we think, a more affordable way." Schwartz rejected buying the latest "fourth-generation-plus" versions of the F-15 and F-16 despite a new two-year slip and nearly 90% projected cost overrun for the F-35. "To be sure, we do not think it prudent to utilise precious procurement dollars for anything but fifth-generation aircraft." But Schwartz added an important caveat, that the USAF still has not determined whether the service life extension programme would be technically or financially viable. The USAF has terminated Lockheed F-22 production with 186 aircraft in inventory after 2011, leaving only plans to acquire 1,763 F-35s over the next 30 years to modernise its fighter fleet. Meanwhile, the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review set the tactical aircraft requirement at about 2,000 fighters. During the F-35's projected lifetime in production, however, the USAF faces a growing fighter inventory gap made even more complicated by Lockheed's cost and schedule problems. In 2009 the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported alarming trends. Twelve Air National Guard units today patrol US airspace with F-16s scheduled for retirement by 2020. As of late 2008, only one of the 12 units was scheduled to receive F-35s by 2020 to continue flying the mission. The increasing gap in the fighter inventory prompted a US lawmaker to predict the air force's dependence on the F-35 will be a "monumental mistake". "When these F-16s and F-15s are no longer able to fly and the F-35s still has problems because somebody hasn't figured it out, you're going to have air guard units that are not going to have planes," says Representative Frank LoBiondo, who represents a district that includes an F-16 base, during a 24 March hearing.

# Solves Naval Power

**[ ] F-35s are key to US naval power projection – they are key to respond to Chinese naval modernization**

**Cheng 2011 Research Fellow at the Asian Studies Center** [7/11/11, Dean, States News Service, “Sea Power and the Chinese State: China’s Maritime Ambitions,” http://www.militaryaerospace.com/index/display/avi-wire-news-display/1454399439.html, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

In this regard, even as it recognizes China's maritime interests, the United States must also protect its own maritime interests. Such protection will require action in several different areas of U.S. defense policy. First, America must sustain a strong set of maritime forces. The United States Navy and Marine Corps are the ultimate guarantors of U.S. maritime interests around the world. Unlike the PLAN, U.S. naval forces must operate far from their own shores, which increases wear and tear on ships while extending transit time from home ports to patrol areas. Consequently, the U.S. must maintain robust and substantial naval forces in the Asia-Pacific region, as well as the Indian Ocean, if it is to be able to dissuade and deter potential opponents and support national interests. This, in turn, means that reductions in the size of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps and their operational tempo will have a disproportionate effect not only on actual abilities to operate in the region, but also on perceptions of American commitment and credibility. Far from reducing Navy and Marine resources, it may be that additional resources are necessary. The U.S. cannot afford to see its navy shrink further. At the same time, training must be strengthened and, in some cases, revived. When the Cold War ended, certain missions-including anti-shipping strikes and open-ocean anti-submarine warfare-were seen as no longer important; certain capabilities, such as the ability to launch anti-ship cruise missiles from submarines, were also abandoned.[26] Those missions and capabilities are likely to become important once again as the Chinese navy presents the first blue-water challenge since the late 1980s. Regaining proficiency will require not just shifts in priorities, but also increases in funds for training and for operations and maintenance. The rise of the Chinese navy also means that the U.S. Navy must reinvigorate its research and development efforts. Currently, there are no new surface or subsurface combatants in the design phase-an unprecedented situation that could result in the Navy's having to respond to a Chinese challenge with outdated combatants or, even worse, face a PLAN that has more advanced capabilities. To avoid such a scenario, Congress should require the development of a comprehensive naval research and development plan that exploits advances in such technologies as unmanned aerial vehicles, unmanned submersibles, and space systems.[27] The U.S. military operates jointly, so careful attention must also be paid to Air Force and Army operations throughout the Asia-Pacific region. Given that both Chinese naval air capabilities and PLA Air Force systems are being modernized-including the proliferation of advanced SAM systems such as the S-400 and HQ-9-the U.S. Pacific Air Force cannot afford to fall behind in its own modernization program. Low observable aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) are especially important, as are electronic warfare capabilities. It is essential that the U.S. Air Force sustain funding for the F-35, especially in light of the shortsighted decision to end the F-22 program. Meanwhile, Congress should consider acquiring additional E/A-18 Growler electronic warfare aircraft and advanced UAV systems to facilitate air operations within the Chinese air defense envelope. Similarly, special operations forces and space forces can play a role in effecting deterrence and presence. The United States should also seek to expand its already robust interactions in these areas with allied and selected other Asian militaries.

**[ ] F-35s are key to US naval power projection – they are key to respond to Chinese naval modernization**

**Cheng 2011 Research Fellow at the Asian Studies Center** [7/11/11, Dean, States News Service, “Sea Power and the Chinese State: China’s Maritime Ambitions,” http://www.militaryaerospace.com/index/display/avi-wire-news-display/1454399439.html, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

In this regard, even as it recognizes China's maritime interests, the United States must also protect its own maritime interests. Such protection will require action in several different areas of U.S. defense policy. First, America must sustain a strong set of maritime forces. The United States Navy and Marine Corps are the ultimate guarantors of U.S. maritime interests around the world. Unlike the PLAN, U.S. naval forces must operate far from their own shores, which increases wear and tear on ships while extending transit time from home ports to patrol areas. Consequently, the U.S. must maintain robust and substantial naval forces in the Asia-Pacific region, as well as the Indian Ocean, if it is to be able to dissuade and deter potential opponents and support national interests. This, in turn, means that reductions in the size of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps and their operational tempo will have a disproportionate effect not only on actual abilities to operate in the region, but also on perceptions of American commitment and credibility. Far from reducing Navy and Marine resources, it may be that additional resources are necessary. The U.S. cannot afford to see its navy shrink further. At the same time, training must be strengthened and, in some cases, revived. When the Cold War ended, certain missions-including anti-shipping strikes and open-ocean anti-submarine warfare-were seen as no longer important; certain capabilities, such as the ability to launch anti-ship cruise missiles from submarines, were also abandoned.[26] Those missions and capabilities are likely to become important once again as the Chinese navy presents the first blue-water challenge since the late 1980s. Regaining proficiency will require not just shifts in priorities, but also increases in funds for training and for operations and maintenance. The rise of the Chinese navy also means that the U.S. Navy must reinvigorate its research and development efforts. Currently, there are no new surface or subsurface combatants in the design phase-an unprecedented situation that could result in the Navy's having to respond to a Chinese challenge with outdated combatants or, even worse, face a PLAN that has more advanced capabilities. To avoid such a scenario, Congress should require the development of a comprehensive naval research and development plan that exploits advances in such technologies as unmanned aerial vehicles, unmanned submersibles, and space systems.[27] The U.S. military operates jointly, so careful attention must also be paid to Air Force and Army operations throughout the Asia-Pacific region. Given that both Chinese naval air capabilities and PLA Air Force systems are being modernized-including the proliferation of advanced SAM systems such as the S-400 and HQ-9-the U.S. Pacific Air Force cannot afford to fall behind in its own modernization program. Low observable aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) are especially important, as are electronic warfare capabilities. It is essential that the U.S. Air Force sustain funding for the F-35, especially in light of the shortsighted decision to end the F-22 program. Meanwhile, Congress should consider acquiring additional E/A-18 Growler electronic warfare aircraft and advanced UAV systems to facilitate air operations within the Chinese air defense envelope. Similarly, special operations forces and space forces can play a role in effecting deterrence and presence. The United States should also seek to expand its already robust interactions in these areas with allied and selected other Asian militaries.

# Solves China

**[ ] F-35s are necessary to deter China – their aerospace industry will soon be able to match our current planes**

**Majumdar 2011 writer for Defense News** [ 6/30, Dave, Defense News, “China Nears Jet Engine Breakthrough: Report,” http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=6967956&c=ASI&s=AIR, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

"We estimate that based on current knowledge and assuming no major setbacks or loss of mission focus, China will need 2-3 years before it achieves comprehensive capabilities commensurate with the aggregate inputs in the jet engine sector," wrote authors Andrew Erickson, an associate professor at the U.S. Naval War College, and Gabe Collins, a commodity and security specialist focused on China and Russia. Collins said via email that the Chinese are close to matching the performance of the F-15C's Pratt & Whitney F100-PW-100 engine. "They are really close on the PW-100-level engine technology," Collins said. "But the devil is in the details, and until the Chinese aerospace industry masters milspec quality control processes, it will be very hard to produce enough consistently good engines to truly reduce China's dependence on the Russians for high-performance tactical aircraft jet engines." The major weak points of the Chinese aircraft engine industry are in building turbine blades and standardizing processes, Collins said. "Standardization and integration may be the one area in which the costs of China's ad hoc, eclectic approach to strategic technology development truly manifest themselves," he said. It will take the Chinese five to 10 years to develop an engine that could power a fifth-generation stealth fighter jet comparable to the U.S. military's F-22 Raptor or F-35 Lightning II, Collins said. "The existence of the WS-15 program suggests that attaining the capability to manufacture an indigenous F119-class engine [which powers the F-22] to power the J-20 is a high priority," he said. The J-20 is a new stealth fighter under development in China.

# They Say “Permutation”

**[ ] The Permutation links to the net benefits – they all link to space policies – our counterplan alone avoids them**

**[ ] There is no double solvency – we both solve enough to solve all of the Affirmative advantage – it has a threshold.**

# They Say “ We already buy F-35s”

**[ ] F-35s will be cut due to budget constraints**

**Siegfried 2011, - airlines examiner** [7/14Joel, The Examiner, “F-22 jet faces oxygen issues and budget cuts,” http://www.examiner.com/airlines-airport-in-national/f-22-jet-faces-oxygen-issues-and-budget-cuts, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

In the current deficit budget crisis, financial analysts may end up with more impact on the outcome of this issue than aerospace engineers, although it would be nearly impossible to nix an aircraft program for a plane that was first introduced on December 15, 2005, after so many of them have already been built. Doing so would be creating a very large white elephant graveyard, and also an uncomfortable embarrassment for politicians. Even more at risk, as the Economist points out, is the Lockheed Martin F-35 Lightning II single-seat, single-engine, fifth generation multi function fighters that are currently under development to perform ground attack, reconnaissance, and air defense missions with stealth capability. The plane was planned for operational introduction around 2016 to 2018. Each of the 13 test aircraft cost about $150 million, plus an additional $183.5 million for its weapon systems, and an undetermined cost for program development. Dubbed the last manned fighter, it would be the most expensive military project ever attempted. Working on a plan to reduce military spending by $400 billion by 2023 designed by former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, the current head of the Department of Defense (DoD), Leon Panetta, knows a lot about number crunching from his previous experience as the director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Some are already predicting that the F-35 will be red-lined in favor of must less costly unmanned drone aircraft, along with the remainder of the yet to be built F-22s.

**[ ] F-35s is in trouble – public criticism has jeopardized the program**

**Thompson 2011, Chief Operating Officer of the Lexington Institute** [7/27/11 Loren, Forbes Online, “Massive Cost Estimates for Fighter Program is Misleading,” http://blogs.forbes.com/beltway/2011/06/27/massive-cost-estimate-for-fighter-program-is-misleading/?partner=contextstory, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

So when former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld started complaining in public that each of the Air Force’s F-22 fighters would cost a quarter-billion dollars, that proved to be the death knell for the program. Rumsfeld was wrong, but the astronomical price-tag became conventional wisdom and his successor killed the program. The F-35 needs to avoid suffering a similar fate, however it hasn’t been getting much help lately from the officials overseeing the program. The problem is that the Pentagon periodically generates speculative projections about the long-term costs of the program that provoke anger and punitive responses on Capitol Hill. For instance, on April 21 the respected military web-site insidedefense.com ran a story by star reporter Jason Sherman with this lead: Rising costs over the last year pushed the estimated life-cycle operating and support price tag for the Joint Strike Fighter program over the $1 trillion threshold, the Pentagon told Congress last week in a report, marking a 9 percent increase over the Defense Department’s 2010 calculations and bringing the government’s forecast of cradle-to-grave cost for the F-35 program to more than $1.3 trillion. Nobody in Congress had ever heard of a weapons program costing that much, so by the time senior Pentagon officials appeared at a hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee on May 19 to explain the new cost estimates, they faced a firestorm of criticism. Defense acquisition chief Ashton Carter told committee members the projected price-tag was “unacceptable” and “unaffordable,” vowing to drive down the cost of the program. The committee’s senior Republican member, Senator John McCain of Arizona, responded that it was time to start thinking about alternatives to the F-35.

# They Say “No Need for F-35’s – No one can challenge our Airpower Now”

 **[ ] China is closer to developing strong airpower than the aff assumes – experts conclude**

**Majumdar 2011 writer for Defense News** [ 6/30, Dave, Defense News, “China Nears Jet Engine Breakthrough: Report,” http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=6967956&c=ASI&s=AIR, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Loren Thompson, an analyst at the Lexington Institute, Arlington, Va., disagreed, saying that the Chinese could develop a fighter engine comparable to the Raptor's F119 far sooner than Western analysts expect. "U.S. academics and intelligence analysts have consistently underestimated the rate of Chinese progress both economically and technologically," he said. The Chinese, Thompson said, have developed economically much more quickly than anyone expected, and one should not expect any less from their technological development. Further, he said, China's progress is aided by technology gleaned both legally and illegally from abroad. Thompson also dismissed suggestions that Chinese society is less innovative than Western ones. Industrializing countries typically don't spend a lot on research and development until they have reached a more competitive position, he said. "There is no reason for China to invest in research and development when they can steal it at a fraction of the cost."

**[ ] We’ve underestimated China’s jets—they’ve got a fifth-generation plane**

**Gertz 11, the Washington Times** [Bill, 1/9/2011, “China’s stealth jet coming on, Gates confirms,” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jan/9/chinas-stealth-jet-coming-on-gates-confirms/, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates confirmed Sunday that U.S. intelligence agencies underestimated China’s progress in developing a new stealth jet fighter. Speaking to reporters en route to Beijing, the first visit there by a U.S. defense secretary since 2005, Mr. Gates said he hopes to develop closer military relations with China's military to avoid miscalculations. Asked about recent disclosures on China’s Internet of a prototype fifth-generation jet, dubbed the J-20, Mr. Gates said U.S. intelligence has been “watching these developments all along. “We knew they were working on a stealth aircraft,” he said. “I think that what we’ve seen is that they may be somewhat further ahead in the development of that aircraft than our intelligence had earlier predicted.” The comments echo those last week by Navy Vice Adm. David Dorsett, director of naval Intelligence, who told a group of defense reporters Wednesday that China’s new jet did not surprise U.S. intelligence, but he noted that the U.S. underestimated “the speed at which they are making progress.”

# They Say “High costs”

**[ ] F-35 costs are exaggerated—final expenses are empirically cheaper than estimates**

**Thompson 2011, Chief Operating Officer of the Lexington Institute** [7/27/11 Loren, Forbes Online, “Massive Cost Estimates for Fighter Program is Misleading,” http://blogs.forbes.com/beltway/2011/06/27/massive-cost-estimate-for-fighter-program-is-misleading/?partner=contextstory, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

That reaction is understandable given the pace at which cost estimates are rising. However, what got lost in the exchange was the distinction between estimates and actual costs. The more you examine the program’s track record to date and the methods utilized to calculate future costs, the less clear the program’s real price-tag becomes. In terms of the track record so far, the contractor has repeatedly delivered early production planes for less than the Pentagon estimated they would cost, and its internal projection is that it will be able to market the most common version of the plane at about the same price that its F-16 fighter currently sells for overseas — about $65 million each. That is far below what some of the cost projections coming out of the Pentagon suggest will be possible, reflecting divergent methods and assumptions used in calculating costs. Unfortunately, there is no consensus on which methods and assumptions are most valid when calculating forward costs, especially costs incurred in the distant future. With that in mind, though, let’s take a look at the biggest component of projected F-35 costs, the expenditures that are required to operate and maintain the F-35 after it is manufactured. The latest official estimates peg those at about a trillion dollars, roughly two-thirds of what reporter Sherman calls the program’s cradle-to-grave costs. However, a review of the way the trillion dollar figure was calculated suggests the current cost controversy is more of a misunderstanding than a debate about real things.

**[ ] Costs are exaggerated – they don’t assume the time frame or military context of the program**

**Thompson 2011, Chief Operating Officer of the Lexington Institute** [7/27/11 Loren, Forbes Online, “Massive Cost Estimates for Fighter Program is Misleading,” http://blogs.forbes.com/beltway/2011/06/27/massive-cost-estimate-for-fighter-program-is-misleading/?partner=contextstory, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Timeframe. The most important thing to understand about the estimated support costs for the F-35 is that they are projected over a 50-year period, through 2065. That inevitably creates misconceptions about costs for two reasons. First, the cumulative cost of any ongoing item is going to look huge if it is projected out over a half-century. For instance, the 50-year cost of the various music bands the military sustains is around $50 billion, if you assume present funding levels persist and inflation continues at its current pace. The second reason long-term cost projections distort reality is that no one can possibly know what future inflation rates will be. If the projected F-35 support costs are expressed in constant dollars for the baseline year of 2002 when development began, they total $417 billion through 2065; but if they are expressed using the inflation rates Pentagon estimators assumed (around 2.4 percent annually), they exceed a trillion dollars. Obviously, any cost estimates based on presumed inflation rates decades in the future are likely to be wildly wrong. Context. A second level of distortion is introduced by failing to provide any context for the future cost estimates. Obvious questions like how big the economy will be in 2065 or what it would cost to maintain the current air fleet through that year are left unanswered, so policymakers and legislators have little basis for comparing F-35 support costs with available resources or alternative modernization strategies. With regard to the availability of budgetary resources, if the U.S. economy continues its current unspectacular rate of growth and inflation remains subdued, then the nation will generate at least three quadrillion dollars in value through 2065. A trillion dollars in support costs is a rounding error for an economy operating on that scale. With regard to the price of alternative modernization strategies, it already costs more each year to sustain the legacy fleet of tactical aircraft the F-35 will replace than the highest official projection of F-35 annual support costs. In fact, if the same assumptions used to project F-35 support costs are applied to legacy aircraft, it would cost four times as much — $4 trillion — in “then-year” dollars to maintain the current fleet rather than transitioning to F-35. So context is crucial to understanding what F-35 cost projections mean.

 **[ ] High costs are exaggerated – it is just media hype**

**Thompson 2011, Chief Operating Officer of the Lexington Institute** [7/27/11 Loren, Forbes Online, “Massive Cost Estimates for Fighter Program is Misleading,” http://blogs.forbes.com/beltway/2011/06/27/massive-cost-estimate-for-fighter-program-is-misleading/?partner=contextstory, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

I could go on, but you get the point. The unsettling estimates driving the latest controversy about Pentagon weapons costs result in large part from unknowable inflation rates, lack of contextual data, arbitrary counting rules and neglect of mitigating factors. In other words, they are deeply misleading and simply confuse the discussion of military modernization options. Claiming that the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter will cost a trillion dollars to keep flying over the next several decades is a great way to get attention, but it’s no way to frame choices in a system where most of the alternatives are likely to cost more. On the other hand, the way the Pentagon currently calculates long-term weapons costs is so speculative that finding “savings” in the years ahead should be easy. All it needs to do is change its assumptions.

 **[ ] F-35 costs are exaggerated—lack of context and arbitrary methods**

**Phoenix Business Journal 2011** [6/29 [“Report: F-35 fighter jet costs may be exaggerated,” http://www.bizjournals.com/phoenix/news/2011/06/29/report-f-35-fighter-jet-costs-may-be.html, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Reports of cost overruns and estimates that the F-35 Joint Strike Figher jet program will cost $1 trillion over 30 years may be exaggerated and misleading, according to a report by Forbes. The magazine posted an examination of the costs of the controversial fighter jet program and determined that what is likely the most-expensive weapons system in the Pentagon's arsenal is actually costing far less than what the official estimates say. For instance, the report says that the contractor for the F-35 has delivered early production planes for less than what the Defense Department estimated it would, and the final version of the plane is likely to cost $65 million each. That would put it at about the same cost per plane as the F-16, and far less than the $250 million per plane cost estimate for the F-22 fighter that had been bantered about in the past before it was killed by the Pentagon. "The unsettling estimates driving the latest controversy about Pentagon weapons costs result in large part from unknowable inflation rates, lack of contextual data, arbitrary counting rules and neglect of mitigating factors," according to Forbes. "In other words, they are deeply misleading and simply confuse the discussion of military modernization options." The F-35 project is important to the Phoenix area as one of the training bases for pilots of the aircraft will be at Luke Air Force Base in Glendale.

# They Say “F-22s better”

**[ ] F-35s are better than F-22s – better countermeasures and sensors**

**Majumdar, 2011 - writer for Defense News** [6/30Dave, Defense News, “Air Force to start operational testing of F-35, http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2011/07/defense-air-force-to-start-opeval-test-f35-071511/, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

The F-35 even outpaces its larger twin-engine cousin, the F-22 Raptor, in certain areas, including electronic countermeasures and electronic counter-counter measures. Carlisle also praised the jet’s infrared sensors and air-to-ground radar as “phenomenal.” Carlisle said the Raptor retains a huge kinematic advantage — “at 51,000 feet and [Mach] 1.7, it’s a pretty hard target to hit” — but said the F-35 can “take out those [integrated air defense] systems and to penetrate using all of its attributes to the point that it can do incredible damage.” Carlisle said the operating cost of the both the F-22 and F-35 are a major concern. But he said that F-22 operating costs would likely decrease over time. The service is learning how to better maintain the jet’s stealth coating, and many lessons have been learned that will carry over to the F-35. Further, he said, while the operating costs estimates for the F-35 are high, they are speculative at this point because there is very little real world data to backup those estimates.

# They Say “Counterplan Links to politics”

**[ ] Counterplan is popular – defense lobbyists**

**Siegfried 2011, - airlines examiner** [7/14Joel, The Examiner, “F-22 jet faces oxygen issues and budget cuts,” http://www.examiner.com/airlines-airport-in-national/f-22-jet-faces-oxygen-issues-and-budget-cuts, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Some are already predicting that the F-35 will be red-lined in favor of must less costly unmanned drone aircraft, along with the remainder of the yet to be built F-22s. However, that is not cast in concrete. Lockheed Martin, along with its lobbyists and elected supporters in Congress know that military defense projects have long been regarded as sacred cows, to the detriment of social welfare programs, the development of high speed rail (HSR), and even repairs to such infrastructure as Interstate highways, tunnels, and bridges.

# \*\*\*AFF\*\*\*

# Aff – Status Quo Solves

**[ ] The F-35 program is still alive—the Air Force is just beginning testing**

**Majumdar, 2011 - writer for Defense News** [6/30Dave, Defense News, “Air Force to start operational testing of F-35, http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2011/07/defense-air-force-to-start-opeval-test-f35-071511/, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Even as the first F-35 Lightning IIs arrive at the training unit at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., the Air Force is preparing for operational testing of the aircraft, said the service’s deputy chief of staff for operations, plans and requirements. “There are going to be 422[nd Test and Evaluation Squadron] guys flying the F-35 at Edwards [AFB, Calif.,] right away,” Lt. Gen. Herbert “Hawk” Carlisle said. “As the F-35s are going to Eglin, there’s F-35 [operational test pilots]… that are going to Edwards and do Operational Test and Evaluation.” The soon-to-be-activated Edwards detachment will do its initial operational evaluations at the California base, but the remainder of the evaluation will be done by the main body of the 422nd TES at Nellis Air Force Base, Nev. One series of tests is planned for the Block 3C software needed for initial operational capability, as well as the preceding software blocks, Carlisle said. The service, along with the F-35 Joint Program Office, is still working on a Test and Evaluation Master Plan, slated for release in November.

**[ ] F-22s will recover from oxygen problems – pilots will get new training when the grounding is lifted**

**Ewing 2011** [7/11/11, Politico reporter [Philip, DoD Buzz, online defense journal, “AF: No word when F-22s could fly again,” http://www.dodbuzz.com/2011/07/11/af-no-word-when-f-22s-could-fly-again/, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

The Air Force’s fleet of F-22 super-jets has been grounded for more than two months now, but service officials had no details Friday about when the F-22s may fly again or even when engineers could finish the investigation into the fighters’ onboard oxygen systems. “The safety of our airmen is paramount and we will take the necessary time to ensure we perform a thorough investigation,” said Master Sgt. Pamela Anderson, a spokeswoman for Air Combat Command. Anderson told Buzz that when the grounding is lifted, there may be a bow wave in optempo for F-22 units — Buzz’s phrase, not hers — as everyone involved gets re-qualified on their jobs under operational conditions, as opposed to working with simulators or static aircraft.

# Aff – Solvency

**[ ] The F-35 cannot improve the military – cost overruns cause drastic delays**

**The Economist 2011** [7/14/11 [Print edition, “The last manned fighter,” http://www.economist.com/node/18958487?story\_id=18958487&fsrc=rss, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Burning banknotes Above all, the F-35 was meant to be affordable. Development costs would be shared across the three versions and with eight foreign partners who were also buying and helping to build the F-35. Manufacturing scale economies were assured because more than 3,000 planes were to be sold—2,443 to Uncle Sam and the rest to his NATO allies. And because 80% of the parts were common to all three versions, maintenance and logistics would be simpler and cheaper. Deliveries of operational aircraft were to begin in 2010. That was the idea, anyway. The F-35’s critics have long argued that its performance is compromised by having to fulfil too many roles and that an over-complicated design lashed to an over-optimistic schedule was asking for trouble. In the past 18 months, as delays have mounted and costs escalated, even some of the plane’s ardent fans have become alarmed. In 2009 the Pentagon realised that a breach of the Nunn-McCurdy rules on over-budget defence-procurement programmes was inevitable, because costs would exceed the original baseline by more than 50%. An internal report declared: “Affordability is no longer embraced as a core pillar.”

**[ ] The F-35 fails – cost overruns, take off and landing difficulties, software problems and the plane hasn’t even been tested yet**

**The Economist 2011** [7/14/11 [Print edition, “The last manned fighter,” http://www.economist.com/node/18958487?story\_id=18958487&fsrc=rss, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Anticipating the breach, in March 2010 Mr Gates restated his support for the F-35, but hit out at “unacceptable delays and cost overruns”. He said he was “fundamentally restructuring” the programme, adding more money and time for development. He also withheld $614m in performance payments to Lockheed Martin, tying its future earnings to specific criteria rather than the subjective ones that he believed had stiffed the taxpayer. In January this year Mr Gates made a series of further announcements which included spending another $4.6 billion on development, slowing down initial production to avoid building aircraft that would later have to be expensively upgraded and putting the marines’ STOVL version on two-year “probation” because of problems with the aircraft’s structure and propulsion system. Condemning the failure to get costs under control, which he blamed partly on the lack of financial discipline in the defence department during George Bush’s presidency and partly on execution failures by Lockheed Martin and its partners, Mr Gates said that “the culture of endless money that has taken hold must be replaced by a culture of restraint”. The latest cost estimates from the Government Accountability Office (GAO), published in May to coincide with a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing on the F-35 programme, were shocking. The average price of each plane in “then-year” dollars had risen from $69m in 2001 to $133m today. Adding in $56.4 billion of development costs, the price rises from $81m to $156m. The GAO report concluded that since 2007 development costs had risen by 26% and the timetable had slipped by five years. Mr Gates’s 2010 restructuring helped. But still, “after more than nine years in development and four in production, the JSF programme has not fully demonstrated that the aircraft design is stable, manufacturing processes are mature and the system is reliable”. Apart from the STOVL version’s problems, the biggest issue was integrating and testing the software that runs the aircraft’s electronics and sensors. At the hearing, Senator John McCain described it as “a train wreck” and accused Lockheed Martin of doing “an abysmal job”.

**[ ] Cutting F-35’s won’t kill the industry – other nations will still buy them**

**The Economist 2011** [7/14/11 [Print edition, “The last manned fighter,” http://www.economist.com/node/18958487?story\_id=18958487&fsrc=rss, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Even if Mr Burbage is too sanguine, the F-35 is in no imminent danger. Its position is strengthened by two inarguable propositions. The first is that many of the current generation of fighters are approaching 30 years in service and must soon be replaced. The second is that because the F-35 was designed to replace so many types of aircraft, it has, in effect, a monopolist’s grip on the future fighter market. Even if America and some of its NATO allies cut their orders, Lockheed Martin is confident that the numbers will be more than made up by countries such as Japan, South Korea, Singapore and Taiwan. All these nations are rich and nervous of Beijing. Mr Burbage draws comparison with the F-16, of which more than 4,500 will be built over its long life.

**[ ] F-35s aren’t key to the military – limited range and drone replacements**

**The Economist 2011** [7/14/11 [Print edition, “The last manned fighter,” http://www.economist.com/node/18958487?story\_id=18958487&fsrc=rss, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

The future belongs to the drones. But the longer-term outlook for the F-35 is uncertain. Its costly capabilities are intended to make it effective against the air defences of a sophisticated enemy, such as China. But the growing vulnerability of American aircraft carriers to Chinese missiles will mean operating from well beyond the F-35’s 600-mile (1,000km) range. Some military strategists already think that the job the F-35 is meant to do can be better handled by cruise missiles and remotely piloted drones. In many roles, unmanned planes are more efficient: they carry neither a bulky pilot nor the kit that keeps him alive, which means they can both turn faster and be stealthier. And if they are shot down, no one dies. Even the F-35’s champions concede that it will probably be the last manned strike fighter aircraft the West will build.

**[ ] F-35s not key to hegemony – no other nation is close to our current airpower**

**Majumdar 2011 writer for Defense News** [ 6/30, Dave, Defense News, “China Nears Jet Engine Breakthrough: Report,” http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=6967956&c=ASI&s=AIR, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

It will probably take a lot longer than five to 10 years before China can build fighter engines comparable to modern U.S. engines, said Richard Aboulafia, an analyst at the Teal Group, Fairfax, Va., "They're a very long way from an F119/F135/F136 level of technology," Aboulafia said. "They'd have to make huge strides in materials, design and manufacturing. And by the time they got there, the West will have made major strides, too." That being said, the Chinese have made major strides in advancing their engine technology, he said. "The Chinese are making aero engine improvements, and could get to a reasonable level of autonomy in five-10 years. That means copying Western or Russian capabilities from the 1980s," Aboulafia said.

# Aff – F-35s Link to Politics

**[ ] The Counterplan is unpopular—delays and high costs**

**McGlaun 2011** [7/11/11 [Shane, blogger for Daily Tech, “Senators Want Alternatives to Lockheed F-35 Joint Strike Fighter,” http://www.dailytech.com/Senators+Want+Alternatives+to+Lockheed+F35+Joint+Strike+Fighter/article21704.htm, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

It's well known that the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) has turned into the most costly weapons program in history for the armed forces. When complete, multiple branches of the armed forces will use the F-35 and it will be sold abroad to allies.The problem for some in Washington is that the delays in delivering the aircraft are mounting, as are the costs to build and maintain the aircraft over its lifespan. The F-35 program has been going for ten years now and some in the Senate Armed Services Committee are now indicating it's time to start looking for a backup plan. Most will find little sense in considering an alternative to the F-35 when it is finally so close to completion. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) said, "It seems to me [prudent that] we at least begin considering alternatives." The reason some in the Senate want to start looking for alternatives is the report published last week showing the costs to maintain the F-35 through 2065 spiraling to $1 trillion. Top acquisition official Ashton Carter has maintained that the $1 trillion figure will be reduced when he completes a "should-cost" review of the F-35 in the next few months. Carter is aiming at a 20% to 50% reduction in that $1 trillion figure.

**[ ] Counterplan costs political capital – Obama has supported cutting aircraft procurement – the F-22 empirically proves**

**Drew 09,** [the New York Times Christopher, 7/22/09, “Obama Wins Crucial Senate Vote on F-22,” http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/22/business/22defense.html?, accessed 7/26/11//HK]

With some of his political capital on the line, President Obama won a crucial victory on Tuesday when the Senate voted to strip out $1.75 billion in financing for seven more F-22 jet fighters from a military authorization bill. The president had repeatedly threatened to veto the $679.8 billion bill if it included any money for the planes. The 58-to-40 vote clearly gives the Obama administration more leeway to overhaul military spending. The F-22, the world’s most advanced fighter, has been a flashpoint in a battle over the administration’s push to shift more of the Pentagon’s resources away from conventional warfare projects, like the F-22, to provide more money for fighting insurgencies. Senate aides said that some Democrats who otherwise might have voted for more planes sided with the president out of concern that a loss could have hurt him in the fight for health care reform.

**[ ] Fighter jet spending is unpopular—seen as wasteful and unnecessary**

**Drew 09,** [the New York Times Christopher, 7/22/09, “Obama Wins Crucial Senate Vote on F-22,” http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/22/business/22defense.html?, accessed 7/26/11//HK]

Immediately after the vote, Mr. Obama praised the Senate’s decision, saying that any money spent on the fighter was an “inexcusable waste” — and that by following his lead the Senate had demonstrated a commitment to changing Washington’s ingrained habits. He also received crucial support from his Republican rival in last year’s presidential election, Senator John McCain of Arizona, who co-sponsored an amendment with Mr. Levin to remove the $1.75 billion from the bill. Mr. McCain told reporters after the vote that the result was “definitely attributable” to the strong push by the president and Mr. Gates. Mr. McCain added that the vote “really means there’s a chance of us changing the way we do business in Washington,” particularly in terms of Pentagon contracting.