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# \*\*\*TRADE OFF DISAD\*\*\*

# 1NC – Military Trade-Off DA

**A. Unique internal link - The F-35 program survived budget cuts, but barely – they could be cut in the future if they face more budget pressures**

**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]

LEON PANETTA is under no illusions about what Barack Obama moved him from the CIA to the Pentagon to do. The wily Mr Panetta, who took over from Robert Gates as defence secretary at the beginning of the month, is everyone’s idea of a safe pair of hands. But his greatest claim to fame (other than presiding over the plan to kill Osama bin Laden) is as the director of the Office of Management and Budget who paved the way to the balanced budget of 1998. Mr Panetta has inherited from his predecessor the outlines of a plan to reduce military spending by $400 billion by 2023. But America’s fiscal crisis (and the lack of any political consensus about how tackle it) makes it almost certain that Mr Panetta will have to cut further and faster than Mr Gates would have wished. That could be bad news for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, the most expensive military-industrial programme in history, and its lead contractor, Lockheed Martin. The plane is expected to come into service six years late (in 2016) and wildly over-budget. The Pentagon still plans to buy 2,443 F-35s over the next 25 years, at a cost of $382 billion. But in a parting shot, Mr Gates gave warning that although he did not think the F-35 faced cancellation, “the size of the buy” might have to be cut. After beating a Boeing design that was deemed technically riskier, Lockheed Martin signed the contract with the Department of Defence to develop the F-35 in 2001. It was an ambitious undertaking. The aim was to reap huge efficiency gains by replacing nearly all of America’s ageing tactical aircraft (the air force’s F-16s and A-10s; the navy’s A/F-18s and the marines’ AV8B jump jets) with three variants of one basic design. There would be a conventional take-off and landing (CTOL) version for the air force, a short take-off and vertical landing (STOVL) version for the marines and a beefier carrier version for the navy. With radar-beating stealth capability and a suite of advanced software and sensors, the F-35 would be a “fifth generation” fighter, far more effective in both its primary ground-attack role and air defence than “legacy” aircraft. (Respectively eight times and four times better, say Lockheed Martin executives, though by what measure is anyone’s guess.)

**B. Links - Space Militarization Funding Would Trade-off with Other Military Budgets - Combat Aircraft Would Be targeted for cuts**

**Dolman 05** - **Associate Professor of Comparative Military Studies US Air Force School of Advanced Air and Space Studies** [US Military Transformation and Weapons in Space, 14 September 2005, [Http://Www.E-Parl.Net/Pages/Space\_Hearing\_Images/Confpaper%20Dolman%20US%20Military%20Transform%20&%20Space.Pdf](http://www.e-parl.net/pages/space_hearing_images/ConfPaper%20Dolman%20US%20Military%20Transform%20%26%20Space.pdf) , for E-Parliament Conference on Space Security, Access July, 12 2011]

There is another, perhaps far more compelling reason that space weaponization will in time be less threatening to the international system than without it. One of the more cacophonous refrains against weapons procurement of any kind is that the money needed to purchase them is better spent elsewhere. It is a simple cliché but a powerful one. Space weapons in particular will be very, very expensive. Are there not a thousand uses that are more beneficial for the money? But funding for weapons does not come directly from education, or housing, or transportation budgets. It comes from military budgets. And so the question should not be directed at particular weapons, but at all weapons. Immediately we see that the impact on the budget of significant increases in space weapons will be decreases in funding for combat aircraft, the surface battle fleet, and ground forces. This creates a dilemma for both pro and anti-space weaponization camps. Space advocates must sell their ideas to fellow pro-weapons groups by making the case that the advantages they provide outweigh the capabilities foregone. This is a mighty task. The tens (likely hundreds) of billions of dollars needed to develop, test, and deploy a minimal space weapons system with the capacity to engage a few targets around the world could displace a half a dozen or more aircraft carrier battle groups, entire aircraft procurement programs (such as the f-22), and several heavy armored divisions. This is a tough sell for supporters of a strong military. It is an even more difficult dilemma for those who oppose weapons in general, and space weapons in particular. Ramifications for the most critical current function of the army, navy, and marines are profound—pacification, occupation, and control of foreign territory. With the downsizing of traditional weapons to accommodate heightened space expenditures, the ability of the us to do all three will wane significantly. At a time when many are calling for increased capability to pacify and police foreign lands, in light of the no-end-in-sight occupation of iraq and afghanistan, space weapons proponents must advocate reduction of these capabilities in favor of a system that will have no direct potential to do so.

**C. Impacts - F-35s key to hegemony—cutting them would kill the aerospace industry and alliances**

**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.

**Declining hegemony causes global war – it risks unstably multipolarity, Chinese aggression and miscalculation – empirically**

**Khalilzad, 2011 – former director of planning at the Defense Department** [Zalmay February 8, 2011 The Economy and National Security Accessed July 29 <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad?page=1> The National Review Online]

If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation. The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions. As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression.

# Extend - Uniqueness

[ ] F-35 budget fights succeed narrowly – very costly and McCain opposition

ABC News 7/14/11 [Lee Ferran, July 14th, 2011, ABC News “F-35 Fighter: Price Goes Up $771 Million on Most Expensive Defense Program” <http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/lockheed-martin-35-fighters-cost-771/story?id=14071402> Accessed 8/1/11]

The F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program -- already the most expensive defense acquisition program in U.S. history -- just got even more costly, to the tune of $771 million. The Pentagon informed the Senate Armed Services Committee Monday that the first 28 production models of the F-35, some of the world's most technologically advanced fighters developed by defense contracting giant Lockheed Martin, were going to cost the additional three quarters of a $1 billion, and the government will be picking up part of the tab. The news sparked a brief Twitter spat between Sen. John McCain, the senior Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee and longtime critic of the F-35's cost overruns, and Lockheed Martin. "Congress notified that first F-35 jets have cost overruns of $771M. Outrageous!" McCain tweeted Tuesday. "Pentagon asking for $264M down payment now. Disgraceful." The next day, a tweet from Lockheed Martin said, "The F-35 team is focused on reducing costs of the jets and is showing significant improvement in key areas," and linked to recent Senate testimony by Tom Burbage, Lockheed Martin's executive VP and general manager of the F-35 program. McCain responded just hours later by directing his next tweet at Lockheed Martin: "To most observers, a $771M cost overrun for 28 F-35s doesn't qualify as 'significant improvement.' Taxpayers deserve better." A member of McCain's staff told ABC News that while the Pentagon has hinted at a significant new round of cost overruns for the F-35, Monday was the first time a hard figure was given for the total scope of the problem. In late June, the Pentagon filed a request to transfer $264 million from other programs to help pay for it, the staff member said. Lockheed Martin said the additional cost was due to "inefficiencies" related to a 2004 redesign that was meant to shave thousands of pounds of excess weight from the plane and said that at this phase in production Lockheed shares the cost overruns with the government. Throughout its production, the F-35 has been wracked with unexpected cost overruns and production delays to the point that a recent report by the Government Accountability Office said the cost of purchasing and maintaining each plane has approximately doubled from original projections by Lockheed Martin. The GAO estimates U.S. taxpayers will invest a total of $385 billion to develop and maintain 2,457 planes through 2035. The program has also come under fire for the initial inclusion of a duplicate engine development program that the Pentagon said was unnecessary. It's not the first time McCain has publicly decried what he called "out-of-control cost overruns" by the F-35 program. In June, he proposed an amendment that would saddle Lockheed Martin with the burden of any cost overruns in the latest group of F-35s still under development. "If we fail to act now, continuing cost overruns on the F-35 of the kind we have experienced over the last 10 years will siphon off precious resources and put at risk every other major Defense procurement program," McCain said then. Lockheed said they have learned as the program has grown and later batches of the planes will be made more efficiently and affordably. "Our factory performance metrics are now showing significant improvement in all key areas, we are experiencing excellent learning curve reductions in assembly hours and we have essentially eliminated all traveled work," the company said. Representatives for the Department of Defense's joint F-35 program did not respond to requests for comment on this report.

**[ ] The F-35 program survived budget cuts, but barely – they could be cut in the future if they face more budget pressures**

**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]

LEON PANETTA is under no illusions about what Barack Obama moved him from the CIA to the Pentagon to do. The wily Mr Panetta, who took over from Robert Gates as defence secretary at the beginning of the month, is everyone’s idea of a safe pair of hands. But his greatest claim to fame (other than presiding over the plan to kill Osama bin Laden) is as the director of the Office of Management and Budget who paved the way to the balanced budget of 1998. Mr Panetta has inherited from his predecessor the outlines of a plan to reduce military spending by $400 billion by 2023. But America’s fiscal crisis (and the lack of any political consensus about how tackle it) makes it almost certain that Mr Panetta will have to cut further and faster than Mr Gates would have wished. That could be bad news for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, the most expensive military-industrial programme in history, and its lead contractor, Lockheed Martin. The plane is expected to come into service six years late (in 2016) and wildly over-budget. The Pentagon still plans to buy 2,443 F-35s over the next 25 years, at a cost of $382 billion. But in a parting shot, Mr Gates gave warning that although he did not think the F-35 faced cancellation, “the size of the buy” might have to be cut. After beating a Boeing design that was deemed technically riskier, Lockheed Martin signed the contract with the Department of Defence to develop the F-35 in 2001. It was an ambitious undertaking. The aim was to reap huge efficiency gains by replacing nearly all of America’s ageing tactical aircraft (the air force’s F-16s and A-10s; the navy’s A/F-18s and the marines’ AV8B jump jets) with three variants of one basic design. There would be a conventional take-off and landing (CTOL) version for the air force, a short take-off and vertical landing (STOVL) version for the marines and a beefier carrier version for the navy. With radar-beating stealth capability and a suite of advanced software and sensors, the F-35 would be a “fifth generation” fighter, far more effective in both its primary ground-attack role and air defence than “legacy” aircraft. (Respectively eight times and four times better, say Lockheed Martin executives, though by what measure is anyone’s guess.)

**[ ] F-35s are key to aerospace industry now – Lockheed has survived current cutbacks**

**Alexander 2011** [7/26/11, Reuters David, “Defense firms brace for tighter US budgets- analysts,” http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/07/26/usa-defense-industry-idUSN1E76O25320110726, accessed 7/26/11//HK]

Some defense firms have already begun to anticipate the decline. Lockheed Martin (LMT.N) announced a voluntary layoff program for about 6,500 employees last week, a move that followed a series of cutbacks over the past year. McAleese said Lockheed's action appeared aimed at reducing general and administration costs and trimming overhead, steps designed to make the firm more cost-competitive as well as contributing directly to the bottom line. "The Lockheed thing is good corporate governance," McAleese said, adding there was no sign yet of an industrywide trend toward reductions. "Lockheed is getting out ahead of everybody else." Lockheed, the Pentagon's No. 1 defense supplier by sales, topped Wall Street quarterly profit estimates in results reported on Tuesday as sales rose in its fighter jet and military plane division. [ID:nN1E76O14N] McAleese said that due to the nature of defense contracts for big weapons platforms like Lockheed's F-35 Joint Strike Fighter -- the military's most expensive military hardware purchase -- the company was unlikely to feel the effects of any budget tightening for a year or two.

**[ ] 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.

# They Say “F-35s got Cut already”

**[ ] Military officials have barely managed to save the F-35 program—additional spending cuts kill it**

**Cassata 7/29** [Donna, 7/29/11, Associated Press, “Struggling with Debt, Congress Talks Defense Cuts,” <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory?id=14186275>, accessed 8/1/11//HK]

The proposals reflect a rare bipartisan consensus driven by a dire economic outlook. The numbers even outpace what a Democratic commander in chief called for earlier this year. In April, President Barack Obama instructed the Pentagon to find $400 billion in defense savings over 12 years and said no decisions on specifics would be made until the Pentagon had completed a review of options for achieving such reductions. No matter which plan emerges in the latest debt showdown — Reid's or the House GOP plan by Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio — both call for creation of a 12-person, House-Senate bipartisan committee to find trillions in deficit cuts. Defense spending will be a ripe target, especially since the money would come from cuts in projected increases. Defense budgets, not including the costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, consistently have gone up in recent years, from just over $370 billion in the late 1990s to around $550 billion today. Military leaders and lawmakers on the congressional committees overseeing the Pentagon warn of creating a "hollow" fighting force. Army Gen. Martin Dempsey, Obama's choice for chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told a Senate panel this week that cuts of $800 billion or more "would be extraordinarily difficult and very high-risk." Leaders in the Marine Corps, Air Force, Army and Navy told a House panel that cuts of that magnitude would force them to restructure their respective services and cause problems meeting the demands of commanders in the field. On Friday, at a demonstration event for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, a multibillion-dollar aircraft marked by cost overruns and delays, Marine Corps Gen. James Amos said the Pentagon has to do its part to deal with the deficit but that the Marines need the weapons and aircraft to ensure the nation's security.

 **[ ] F-35s barely escaped cuts—without sustainable spending, McCain’s opposition will succeed**

**Baron 7/28, Pentagon reporter** [Kevin, reporter specializing in national security and foreign policy, 7/28/11, Stars and Stripes, “McCain to Navy: Get shipshape or face severe cuts,” <http://www.stripes.com/blogs/stripes-central/stripes-central-1.8040/mccain-to-navy-get-shipshape-or-face-severe-cuts-1.150432>, accessed 8/1/11//HK]

WASHINGTON – Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., warned Thursday that the Navy could see the most severe budget cuts of all the services, especially if it doesn’t get its act together on two major weapons systems that Congress has put under hot lamps: the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter and the Littoral Combat Ship. “The Navy,” McCain said, “…could be the service that’s most adversely affected.” Of those big-ticket items, McCain said the Navy’s “recent track record has been less than admirable,” and if its performance in developing those two programs doesn’t improve, the Navy would have a hard time fighting budget cuts. His comments came during the confirmation hearing for Adm. Jonathan W. Greenert, vice chief of naval operations, to be the next chief of naval operations, the Navy’s top officer who sits on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Greenert takes over at a time when there are many concerns about how President Barack Obama’s budget cutting demands will force the Navy to cut back or reschedule plans for the F-35 and LCS, but also how cuts will affect building or refitting submarines and the next aircraft carrier.

[ ] F-35 barely survives – Marine Corps general supports it

Washington Times 7/14/11 [Stephen Levy, July 14th, 2011, Washington Times “Marine Corps general supports F-35 program” <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jul/27/marine-corps-general-supports-f-35-program/> Accessed 8/1/11]

The commandant of the Marine Corps on Wednesday said that the much-maligned Joint Strike Fighter Program will play an essential role in preserving America’s military force in the future. Gen. James F. Amos told a military contractor conference on Wednesday that **cancellation of the program as several budget hawks advocate would devastate America’s fighter fleet** within 15 years. “Our nation will have 50 percent less ability to do whatever our bidding is because the joint strike fighter program was canceled,” Gen. Amos said. “There is nothing that is going to be a replacement besides the Joint Strike Fighter.” The general said that **while the program had gone through many technical and financing difficulties since its beginning in 1993, most have been resolved**. He said that Lockheed Martin, the company behind the program, has installed equipment that corrected all engineering issues with the test planes currently being used by the Marine Corps. “The airplane and the program are both doing very well,” he said. The Joint Strike Fighter Program, designed to create an aircraft that could be used by the Air Force, Navy and Marines, has been plagued with design flaws and cost overruns. The Pentagon is still planning to purchase 2,443 of the fighters, designated as the F-35, but previous Defense Secretary Robert Gates suggested that the order might be cut in early July. Of particular difficulty for Lockheed Martin is the Marine Corps‘ request for planes that can land vertically like helicopters and take off on short runways. They require a different thrust system than the other planes. With the program reaching its 18th year, Mr. Gates gave Lockheed Martin only two more years to mechanical problems and complete testing. If the model cannot solve its flaws by 2013, the Marine portion of the program will be canceled. Gen. Amos said that he is confident that the plane will meet the deadline He said 30 of the aircraft have already been delivered and that the test flights have been going well. In March, he told the Senate Armed Services Committee that there is no “Plan B” for the Marine Corps in replacing the AV-8B Harrier, which has been in use since the 1980s. The general said that the Marine Corps‘ mission “fits very well” with Defense Secretary Leon Panetta’s vision of the Pentagon. He **and said keeping the defense budget down is a priority to the branch, despite his support for the Joint Strike Fighter program**.

# Extend - Link

**[ ] Space Militarization Will Trade off with Other Military Programs Because It is Expensive**

**Dolman, 2006 - Professor of Comparative Military Studies at the US Air Force’s School of Advanced Air and Space Studies** [Everett Washington Roundtable on Science & Public Policy Toward a U.S. Grand Strategy in Space, March 10 [Http://Www.Marshall.Org/Pdf/Materials/408.Pdf](http://www.marshall.org/pdf/materials/408.pdf)

What we have to think about then is what would a space-weapons-heavy american military force structure look like? And here we get a number of issues. It would be very, very expensive. L would like to leave you with one thought here: what are the opportunity costs forgone? The money that will have to go into space is not going to come from school budgets or from transportation budgets; it is going to come from the dod. It is going to be at the cost of other military things. It has been pointed out that space weaponization and military space operations are not going to do anything new. These things could be done by other cheaper and possibly less incendiary means. The billions it would cost for a proper recapitalization of all of the aging space support systems that we have and for potentially using space as an integral part of our ability to project violence abroad, which we will be doing - we are not going to give up the right to do that - means that we will have to atrophy some of our existing capabilities to go into other countries and stay there for a long time. Space-enabled force application for the united states, in the sense of going in and getting the job done, was amply demonstrated in operation iraqi freedom. The conventional part of that war was a spectacular success. The occupation has been equivocal, to say the least. Now we could imagine, say, that for the price of what we are talking about for space weapons, we could get another five heavy divisions, three more carrier battle groups, and/or fund all of the weapons systems that the air force might want. Fine. What is more threatening to foreign states: the ability of the united states to apply a limited amount of violence in a very precise way anywhere on the globe at almost any time, or five more heavy divisions, three more carrier battle groups, or whatever, giving the united states the capacity to occupy and control foreign states physically? I submit to you that space weaponization and military space is not an attempt by the united states to become an imperial power around the world, but to extend its current period of hegemony into the foreseeable future. This is the point that i was sidetracked on. L will plot an example: say ten or fifteen years from now, china sees taking space as a way of guaranteeing its sovereignty and giving it advantages in the taiwan straits or any place else it deems in its security interest. Seizing low-earth orbit would thus be an attempt to overthrow the existing international order (not continue it), and the united states would have to oppose such actions. On the other hand, the united states militarizing space aggressively, at least through an aggressive doctrine of space supremacy, would not be an attempt to overthrow the extant global system, but to extend it and it may not - it probably would not be directly challenged in its efforts. Well, i think that is incendiary enough and i will stop here.

# Extend - Internal Link

**[ ] F-35s is vulnerable to cuts – 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.

# Extend – Hegemony Impact

**[ ] 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.

**[ ] 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.

# Extend – China Impacts

**[ ] 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.

**[ ] 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.

**[ ] 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.”

# Extend – Economy Impacts – Aerospace

**[ ] 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.

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

# Aff – Uniqueness

**[ ] Non-unique—F-35s inevitably cut in the status quo—bipartisan opposition**

**Cassata 7/29** [Donna, 7/29/11, Associated Press, “Struggling with Debt, Congress Talks Defense Cuts,” <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory?id=14186275>, accessed 8/1/11//HK]

Although the long-range proposals favor significant defense cuts, many Republicans and Democrats have been reluctant this year to vote for reductions. Earlier this month, the House overwhelmingly backed a $649 billion defense spending bill that boosted the Pentagon budget by $17 billion. The legislation included $119 billion for the two wars. During debate, the House easily turned back efforts by liberal Democrats and tea party Republicans to slash billions. Still, tea party-backed Republicans have prevailed on occasion, most notably in February when they led the effort to eliminate funds for a second engine for the next-generation F-35 fighter plane. John Isaacs, executive director of Council for a Livable World and Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, said if "tea party Republicans were willing to cut defense spending, it would give more courage to Democrats" worried about the weak-on-national security label they've often faced since the Vietnam War. At the Pentagon, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, who served as director of the White House's Office of Management and Budget, is overseeing a review of the consequences of budget reductions of $400 billion and above. Panetta's predecessor, Robert Gates, initiated the review and it would include an assessment of what changes in defense strategy would be required as a result of such cuts and how they would affect military capabilities.

**[ ] Non-unique—F-35 cuts are imminent—cost overruns and McCain opposition**

**Bennett 7/14** [John T., 7/14/11, The Hill, “Aide: McCain will oppose Pentagon plan to pay for new F-35 fighter cost spike,” <http://thehill.com/news-by-subject/defense-homeland-security/171601-aide-mccain-will-oppose-pentagon-plan-to-pay-for-new-f-35-cost-spike?page=1#comments>, accessed 8/1/11//HK]

Senate Armed Services Committee Ranking Member John McCain (R-Ariz.) will oppose a Pentagon request to transfer $264 million from other accounts to begin paying for a new $771 million cost spike, a Senate aide tells The Hill. That news comes two days after McCain revealed this on Twitter: "Congress notified that first F-35 jets have cost overruns of $771M." McCain, long a critic of the Lockheed Martin-led program, and one of the Senate's most outspoken and blunt members let his feelings about the new cost spikes be known in the same tweet. "Outrageous! Pentagon asking for $264M down payment now. Disgraceful," he tweeted. The $771 million overrun covers the first 28 F-35s the Pentagon is buying. The Pentagon informed lawmakers on Monday of a need to move monies within its budget for a $264 million down payment, as the aide called it, via a reprogramming request sent across the Potomac River in June. “I intend to strongly oppose future ‘reprogramming requests’ unless they can be fully justified to the American taxpayer," McCain said later Thursday in a statement. “Any new requests for additional funding by the Department of Defense should be submitted to the Congress for formal review, debate, amendment, and approval by the appropriate defense committees and the full body of both Houses of Congress," McCain said. "This should be done as a request for emergency funding or be funded through supplemental appropriations legislation by Congress and offset against commensurate, identified cuts in spending.”

**[ ] Non-unique—F-35 cuts now—even supporters recognize rising expenses**

**The Economist 7/14** [7/14/11, “Coming up short: America should cut back orders for its late and expensive new fighter—and spend the cash on a more useful kit,” <http://www.economist.com/node/18958367?story_id=18958367&fsrc=rss>, accessed 8/1/11//HK]

Things look less rosy a decade on. The F-35 is now unlikely to enter service before 2016; programme costs have risen to more than $380 billion; the average price of each plane has nearly doubled; and the Pentagon now thinks the F-35 will be a third more expensive to run than “legacy” aircraft, with lifetime costs of $1 trillion. Senator John McCain calls the project “a train wreck”. Even supporters, such as Robert Gates, the former defence secretary who was forced to restructure the programme last year, reckon numbers may have to be cut. What should be done? The radical answer would be to abandon the entire F-35 programme. But it is too late for that: it would mean America relying on updated versions of aircraft based on 40-year-old designs. However, the size of the planned order for what is almost certain to be America’s last manned strike fighter makes little sense and should be cut.

[ ] F-35 cut during budget compromise – bipartisan opposition despite support from some

ABC News 11 [John R. Parkinson and Matthew Mosk, February 16th, 2011, ABC News “House Cuts F-35 Engine From Spending Bill” <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/budget-cut-house-kills-35-joint-strike-fighter/story?id=12933195> Accessed 8/1/11]

**Congress voted to strip federal funding for a jet engine the President doesn't want and the Pentagon says it doesn't need**. The second engine for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter has long been viewed by good-government groups as the prime example of government spending and pork barrel politics run amok. But members of the House of Representatives voted to strip funding for the spare engine Wednesday despite high-profile support from House Speaker John Boehner and other leading Congressmen. Lawmakers are considering a stopgap bill to fund the government through the end of the year. Republicans, newly in control of the House, have laid out a slate of painful spending cuts to appease new members who align themselves with Tea Party and helped Republicans take majority control of the House in November. The **vote to strip funding was bipartisan**. Republicans and Democrats voted 233-198 to amend the GOP's spending package and cut the F-35 extra-engine program. A hundred and ten House Republicans -- the majority of whom were Tea Party-affiliated freshmen -- joined 123 Democrats in defeating the bill. A vote on final passage of the spending bill is expected Thursday evening in the House. The Senate must also approve the spending measure before funding runs out March 4. And the future of the full funding bill is far from certain. President Obama has threatened to veto the spending bill because it cuts other programs he's called important. But the vote by the House demonstrates an important step against the powerful defense lobby. **Funding for the spare F-35 engine has drawn heavy criticism from some lawmakers in Congress and the Defense Department**, but enjoyed the support of the House GOP leadership. Plants that produce local jobs are located in or near the districts of the two top Republicans in the House. Congress Cuts a Defense Program Today, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates testified before the House Armed Services Committee that the program was wasteful and called on Congress to terminate funding beyond that cut in the amendment to the CR. "The **American taxpayers are spending $28 million a month for an excess and unjustified program that is slated for termination**. The president, the military services and I continue to oppose this extra engine," Gates testified. "It would be a waste of nearly $3 billion in a time of economic distress, and the money is needed for higher-priority defense efforts." After the amendment was approved, Congressional watchdogs quickly praised its passage as "a big victory for taxpayers." "This was an important vote to demonstrate that nothing should be off limits when it comes to cutting wasteful spending," Ryan Alexander, President of Taxpayers for Common Sense, said. "If we're going to deal with the enormous deficits, everything has to be on the table and that certainly includes defense spending. We hope this will lead the House to further scrutinize defense, entitlements and tax expenditures. The math is straightforward; we cannot balance the books on the back on non-security discretionary spending." For more than an hour Tuesday night on the House floor, lawmakers debated the amendment -- which would cut $450 million dollars over the next seven months. Rep. Thomas Rooney, R-Fla., a two-term member who introduced the amendment to strike the F-35 engine, said his proposed cut would show voters that lawmakers are serious about cutting spending. "**It is dubious why Congress continues to fund a program that the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Department of Defense adamantly state they do not want**." Rooney said. "The American people sent us here to change the way that Washington works. This amendment is a perfect opportunity to show your constituents that business as usual in Washington is over."

**[ ] F-35s already 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.

**[ ] 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-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.

**[ ] F-22s Fail – oxygen systems and crashes**

**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]

The current U.S. fiscal crisis, combined with technical problem related to an onboard oxygen generating system (OBOGS), which grounded the Air Force's cutting edge Lockheed Martin F-22 Raptor stealth fighter for over two months, since May 5, 2011, may foreshadow the aircraft's ultimate demise, according to reports by The Economist, the Project On Government Oversight (POGO), DOD Buzz, Flight Global, Defense News, and other news sources published on Thursday, July 14, 2011. Critics of the F-22, built by Lockheed Martin and The Boeing Company, have called the advanced systems military jet too difficult to fly, and one of the most expensive hangar queens in the U.S. arsenal. The single-seat, twin-engine fifth-generation super maneuverable fighter aircraft which uses stealth technology costs $150 million U.S. Dollars a copy, with 168 planes built as of October 2010, out of 187 aircraft planned, which pegs the project cost at US$65 billion, as shown in the attached slide show and video clip which accompany this report. The aircraft had been first restricted to flights under 25,000 feet, and then entirely grounded resulting from the crash of an F-22 on November 16, 2010 over Alaska, flown by Captain Jeffrey Haney, at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (EDF), in Anchorage, Alaska. Investigators have not yet positively determined that the accident was the result of hypoxia, or oxygen deprivation. Instead of bulky and payload consuming oxygen tanks, the aircraft uses an onboard oxygen generating system (OBOGS), and other systems which divert, filter, and collect air from the plane's jet engine compressors.

**[ ] F-22s are already delayed – oxygen problems**

**McGlaun 2011** [7/11/11 [Shane, blogger for Daily Tech, “Lockheed Sits on Undelivered F-22s as Stand Down Drags On,” http://www.dailytech.com/Lockheed+Sits+on+Undelivered+F22s+as+Stand+Down+Drags+On/article22112.htm, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

The F-22 fighter is the premiere air superiority fighter in the Air Force arsenal. The aircraft has been on stand-down status after the USAF ordered an investigation into the possibility that there is an issue with the aircraft's on-boards oxygen generation system. Deliveries of the remaining F-22 aircraft that were ordered are now at a halt and no new aircraft can be flight-tested. Lockheed Martin continues to build the aircraft and the stores them in "near flight ready" status and minus their all-important radar absorbent coatings. The aircraft have to undergo a certain number of test flights only clad in primer before the stealth coatings can be applied. Since the aircraft are effectively grounded, Lockheed is unable to deliver the aircraft for their final flight tests to be accepted into the Air Force arsenal. The Pentagon Defense Contract Management Agency must fly a series of acceptance flights before the aircraft is accepted. Lockheed spokeswoman Stephanie Stinn said, "Our final assembly is scheduled through December 2011. That is still ongoing at Marietta. We delivered aircraft 4181, and that was on June 22, to the Air Force, so they have that as their aircraft. After that aircraft, we can't do the required acceptance flights."

**[ ] Aerospace industry decreasing - Oxygen problems are delaying the entire F-22 delivery**

**McGlaun 2011** [7/11/11 [Shane, blogger for Daily Tech, “Lockheed Sits on Undelivered F-22s as Stand Down Drags On,” http://www.dailytech.com/Lockheed+Sits+on+Undelivered+F22s+as+Stand+Down+Drags+On/article22112.htm, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

The F-22 fighter is the premiere air superiority fighter in the Air Force arsenal. The aircraft has been on stand-down status after the USAF ordered an investigation into the possibility that there is an issue with the aircraft's on-boards oxygen generation system. Deliveries of the remaining F-22 aircraft that were ordered are now at a halt and no new aircraft can be flight-tested. Lockheed Martin continues to build the aircraft and the stores them in "near flight ready" status and minus their all-important radar absorbent coatings. The aircraft have to undergo a certain number of test flights only clad in primer before the stealth coatings can be applied. Since the aircraft are effectively grounded, Lockheed is unable to deliver the aircraft for their final flight tests to be accepted into the Air Force arsenal. The Pentagon Defense Contract Management Agency must fly a series of acceptance flights before the aircraft is accepted. Lockheed spokeswoman Stephanie Stinn said, "Our final assembly is scheduled through December 2011. That is still ongoing at Marietta. We delivered aircraft 4181, and that was on June 22, to the Air Force, so they have that as their aircraft. After that aircraft, we can't do the required acceptance flights."

**[ ] Alternative Causality – F-22 cancellation kills the aerospace industry**

**Cogliano 2011** [7/1/11, senior reporter [Joe, Dayton Business Journal, “Lockheed Martin job cuts part of a larger strategy,” http://www.bizjournals.com/dayton/news/2011/07/01/lockheed-martin-job-cuts-part-of.html?page=all, accessed 7/24/11//HK]

Lockheed Martin is cutting 1,500 jobs as part of a larger plan to make it's products more affordable and become more efficient. The company made the F-22 fighter jet that was canceled by the Pentagon because it was too expensive. The Bethesda, Md.-based company announced Thursday it would cut jobs as part of a larger plan to improve the affordability of its products and increase operational efficiency. In Dayton, Lockheed has about 140 employees. Most of those jobs are not in the aeronautics division. A spokesperson for the company said the aeronautics division jobs that are in Dayton are deemed critical to ongoing work and likely won't be affected. Reductions may occur across the enterprise, following an assessment yet to be done, with the greatest impacts occurring at the larger sites, according to a news release. Lockheed currently has about 28,000 employees at its main aeronautics sites in Texas, Georgia and California and at six smaller locations in as many states. Lockheed has 800 total jobs in Ohio. The company said it will offer eligible salaried employees an opportunity for a voluntary layoff to minimize the number of involuntary layoffs. “We will use a disciplined process to review every organization and position, considering all factors rather than making arbitrary reductions,” the release said. “We expect the greatest impact to be on employees in higher level labor grades.” Employees eligible for voluntary layoffs will be notified in August. An involuntary reduction in force begins in mid-September. Lockheed products include the F-35 Lighting II Joint Strike Fighter, F-22 Raptor, F-16, C-130, C-5, P-3, U-2 aircraft and advanced development programs. The company employs about 126,000 people worldwide and is principally engaged in the research, design, development, manufacture, integration and sustainment of advanced technology systems, products and services. The F-22 was canceled by the Pentagon because it was deemed too expensive. That program has an office in Dayton at Wright-Patt that has 200 jobs here. It reported nearly $46 billion on 2010 sales.

# Aff – Impact Responses

**[ ] F-35s fail—can’t carry enough missiles, short range, and outpaced by unmanned aircraft**

**The Economist 7/14** [7/14/11, “Coming up short: America should cut back orders for its late and expensive new fighter—and spend the cash on a more useful kit,” <http://www.economist.com/node/18958367?story_id=18958367&fsrc=rss>, accessed 8/1/11//HK]

With the air force and navy versions of the F-35, the debate is more nuanced. Although a far more capable aircraft than those it is replacing, it may not be useful enough for long enough to justify the size of the planned order. Analysts question whether it is as stealthy as claimed and its ability to penetrate the best future air-defence systems. And to be as stealthy as it is, the F-35 can carry only two air-to-air missiles. The head of the air dominance branch of the Air Combat Command says he “wakes up in a cold sweat” thinking about it. The F-35’s range of around 600 miles (1,000km) is another problem. The potential adversary that will dominate American military planning in the decades ahead is China. Even now, China is acquiring weapons, such as accurate anti-ship ballistic missiles, that will push American carriers out into the western Pacific, well beyond the range of seaborne F-35s. For all its sophistication, against a “near peer” opponent the F-35 may not be able to do the job for which it has been intended nearly as well as the next generation of pilotless armed drones and hypersonic cruise missiles. Indeed, it could be obsolescent only a few years after it enters service. At a time of shrinking defence budgets, the F-35’s huge cost and the affection of service chiefs for fast jets flown by brave chaps should not be allowed to crowd out the development of more capable weapon systems. Cut back the F-35s and spend the money there.

**[ ] 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.