

to physical reality, and—b) to reduce the uncontrolled cost and weight. (Flexible (rubber) Requirements.)

#### *Ultra-High Performance*

The F-22 does not provide a Great Leap Forward in performance relative to the F-15C or MiG-29. At 65,000 lbs, with 18,500-18,750 lbs of fuel, with two nominal 35,000 lb thrust engines—it has the thrust to weight ratio of the F-15C, the fuel fraction of the F-15C, and a wing loading that is only slightly inferior to that of the F-15C, so it will accelerate, climb, and maneuver much like the F-15C for reasons of basic physics.

There are two differences from the F-15—thrust vectoring and supersonic speeds in dry thrust. Thrust vectoring allows the F-22 to maneuver controllably at sub-stall speeds, which other aircraft cannot. This, in the helicopter speed domain, is in seeming contradiction to an aircraft designed for supersonic engagement with slashing attacks using its beyond visual range missiles.

The flight test program to validate maneuverability is utterly inadequate. Using a single number—the maximum steady-state G at 30,000 ft at 0.9 Mach—on an aircraft that operates from 40 knots to beyond Mach 2, from sea level to above 60,000 ft is a throwback to the Dark Ages of aircraft evaluation. Proper presentations are global, all-altitude all-speed plots at the two major power settings. They must be compared to friendly and enemy aircraft. Comparison reveals progress, the whole truth, and even allows the formulation of battle tactics.

#### *Superior Avionics*

The expectations for the avionics are to provide great battle awareness and effective weapons management. The F-22 is to autonomously identify (ID) the enemy from friend, from neutral, regardless of the country that produced the aircraft.

But, testing will not be fully completed before going into production! The pressure is on to meet production schedules and to do incomplete testing to save time and money. Incomplete testing is fatal and extremely wasteful. B-1 avionics, similarly treated, still do not function in the aircraft after two decades, despite large transfusions of funds.

Such refined identification capability has never been achieved though frequently promised. Given failure and dependence on visual identification, the F-22 will be at the level of the F-15 and F-16. The requirement for visual ID made the AIM-7D/E, the Talos, the complex long-range Phoenix missile and the Aegis missile cruiser relatively worthless. The avionics are to be treated as “guilty” until tested and proven to be innocent.

The software is more extensive and complex than that of the Aegis missile cruiser. Dependence on the integrated, complex system belies the dream of a low maintenance requirement.

Most likely result—The F-22 will be declared combat ready much before it is.

#### *Relevance of Air Superiority*

The relevance of air superiority in the modern world is vastly overstated. The USAF has faced no air superiority force since the Korean War. Nor have our ground troops faced an enemy air-to-surface threat.

US air superiority fighters are aimed at enemy fighters—the irrelevant half (of the problem). Our foreseeable enemies achieve air superiority with competent, relatively affordable, highly mobile Russian vehicles carrying surface-to-air missiles (IR radar, and optically guided), and two 30mm cannon (the Tangkuska). These are armed with SA-6, SA-8 and SA-10 missiles. The F-22 only

counters non-existent enemy fighters. Hence air-to-surface F-16s, A-10s, and F-15s become the de facto air superiority aircraft. Attempts to equip the F-22 to suppress enemy defenses are easily defeated by enemy tactics used in Vietnam and Serbia.

The USAF is already over-equipped to handle any imaginable air superiority problem. Today, Air Combat Command is capable of handling any coalition of air superiority threats. Air Combat Command has the most important factor—competent pilots, the second most important factor—large numbers (1,600-2,400 fighters), and the least important advantage—the best aircraft. In Germany during World War II US numbers, not quality, reigned supreme.<sup>5</sup> The USAF has always had and has always depended upon superior numbers to win. Numbers guarantee victory. Numbers develop intensity and allow multiple attacks.

The US has no realistic future air superiority problem facing it. A sane US will not war with India, China, or Russia. Nor will we war with France, England, Japan, and Germany. None of these nations will attack the US. Other countries are not threats. Nor will we war with our friends to whom we sold US aircraft.<sup>6</sup> The US must minimize its enemies, not create them artificially to sustain the arms industry. Even Canada has been listed as a possible threat! Yet, the US continues to seek foreign sales before our modern aircraft see service in the USAF and US Navy. (Examples—the US Navy's F-14, F-18E, and the F-22.)

The conjured need to cope with our weapons places our country in a self-perpetuating arms race with itself.

#### CONCLUSION

Money expended on the program will weaken Air Combat Command and the USAF in two ways—

By getting involved with an aircraft that has no function, and no relevance to modern wars.

By denying themselves funds they really need—for training and for new aircraft to support a US Army, completely shipped of supporting airpower.

Approximately 90 percent of the program funding can still be saved, and reprogrammed to relevant Air Force programs.

ARTICLE BY JAMES L. HECHT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as we go forward with the budget process, I'd like to bring the attention of my colleagues to an article published in the Baltimore Sun. The author is a senior fellow at the Center for Public Policy and Contemporary Issues at the University of Denver. Although I don't necessarily agree with all the points he makes, I think the article is valuable for purposes of informed debate.

[The Sun: Tuesday, March 21, 2000]

SPECIAL INTEREST DEFENSE

(By James L. Hecht)

For a while, it looked as if Congress might do the right thing: kill an unneeded weapons program, saving \$60 billion and increasing security. But in the end, Congress gave a higher priority to the interests of Lockheed Martin, providing \$1 billion in this year's budget

to buy up to six F-22 fighters—and keeping alive the possibility of buying more than 300 more at a cost of at least \$187 million each.

The F-22 is an example of how the military budget is driven more by the desire of members of Congress to get re-elected than by security. The public interest is no match for lobbyists for the military-industrial complex who in 1996 contributed an average of \$18,065 to every member of Congress, almost three times the level of tobacco-industry influence peddling.

Why is the F-22 an unneeded weapon? The American F-15 and F-16 fighters are the best in the world and, if more fighters are needed, these can be built for less than one-quarter the cost of an F-22. Moreover, the F-22 may be outdated soon by the Joint Strike Fighter, an even better plane on which the Pentagon is spending billions for development.

We spend more than \$30 billion a year to maintain more than 10,000 nuclear warheads. A 1,000-warhead force with the destructive force of 40,000 Hiroshima explosions would be more than enough—and save about \$17 billion a year.

How political pork supersedes military needs is demonstrated by the appropriation in last year's budget of \$435 million for seven C-130 cargo transport planes. The Pentagon requested only one. They got seven because manufacture of these planes provided jobs in Newt Gingrich's district.

Huge expenditures for unneeded weapons is one reason that U.S. military spending is more than twice as much as all potential adversaries combined, including Russia, China, Iraq, Iran and North Korea. While polls indicate that 72 percent of Americans believe it better to have too much defense than too little, 83 percent think that spending should be no greater than that of all potential adversaries combined.

America's unreasonable military spending also results from the policy that the United States be able to simultaneously fight and win two major regional wars without the help of allies. This two-war doctrine is rooted in the idea that the United States should be able to exercise unilaterally its “global responsibilities.”

But having this capability and then using it to act alone or with little military support from allies—as we did in Kosovo and continue to do in the skies over Iraq—decreases our security. We make bitter enemies of people that are no threat to us militarily, but can be a serious threat if in anger and frustration they resort to terrorism.

Our security also is decreased because our huge military spending consumes money that otherwise could be spent on education. With the economic success of nations becoming increasingly more dependent on a well-educated work force, shortchanging educational needs is a threat to the economic security of Americans in the 21st century.

Security is the most important function of government. But we should not—in the name of dollars—needlessly spend tens of billions of dollars a year for the benefit of politically connected interests.

ISSUES IN CYPRUS AND KOSOVO

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Harry Moskos is the highly-respected editor of the Knoxville

News-Sentinel, the major daily newspaper for East Tennessee. More importantly, everyone who gets to know Mr. Moskos soon realizes he is one of the finest men they have ever known.

Over the years, he has developed a real expertise in foreign policy. He writes honest, sincere thoughtful editorials, without undue prejudices or special axes to grind. He is certainly not beholden to or controlled by any special interests.

Within the last few days, he has written two very important pieces which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

The first is an insightful editorial on the history, current situation, and what needs to be done now to settle the thorny Cyprus issue. He points out that the Turkish invasion in 1974 resulted in 200,000 Greek Cypriots being expelled from their homes and almost that many Turks and Turkish Cypriots living illegally on land and in homes that are not theirs.

The second article is one that was distributed by the Scripps-Howard News-Service and reprinted in the Washington Times and other newspapers. It deals with the situation in Kosovo and the continuing cycle of violence, ethnic cleansing and retribution.

I hope that those in the State Department and in the Congress who deal most directly with these issues will give serious consideration to these editorials by Harry Moskos.

[From The Knoxville News-Sentinel, June 4, 2000]

**TWO SIDES MUST TALK—OPPORTUNITIES MORE FAVORABLE THAN IN PAST FOR SETTLEMENT OF CYPRUS ISSUE**

The eastern Mediterranean sovereign state of Cyprus has been forcibly divided in two since the invasion of the island republic in 1974 by Turkey. Now, 26 years later, the issue of Cyprus remains one of the world's thorniest international problems awaiting resolution.

Reflecting the position of President Clinton, Secretary of Defense William Cohen has stressed that the status quo in Cyprus is not acceptable. Since the invasion, the Cypriot government controls the south of the island while the north is under Turkish occupation with more than 35,000 troops from mainland Turkey stationed there in violation of numerous United Nations Security Council resolutions. In fact, most of the Turks now living in the occupied areas of the island are not Turkish Cypriots but are Turkish settlers.

About 200,000 Greek Cypriots, expelled from their homes in the north, are still prevented from returning.

Historically, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots lived in comparative harmony until recent time. The Turkish invasion further increased the tension—an invasion in which some believe then-American Secretary of State Henry Kissinger played a direct role by working behind the scenes with Greece's then-military junta to successfully oust Archbishop Makarios as Cypriot president. Turkey used the coup against Makarios as a pretext to invade Cyprus.

Of the 780,000 people currently living in Cyprus, there are about 65,000 to 80,000 Turkish Cypriots and about 100,000 Turks who have moved illegally to the island from Anatolia.

A solution to the Cyprus problem has been elusive for more than a quarter-of-century with President Clinton raising the Cyprus

issue in his State of the Union Address this year, terming it one of his highest priorities. It was the first time in 20 years that a president had mentioned the Cyprus question in that annual speech.

Clinton, who has actively immersed himself in other international issues including Ireland and the Middle East, still has seven months remaining in office to push for a Cyprus settlement.

There are hopeful signs that the situation is improving.

Devastating earthquakes that hit both Greece and Turkey last year resulted in both countries coming to the aid of victims. In Cyprus itself, Turkish and Greek Cypriots worked together to solve common issues, such as in the divided city of Nicosia when officials resolved sewage problems and other municipal issues. And hundreds of Turkish Cypriots volunteered to have their blood tested to see if they could provide a bone marrow transplant for a six-year-old Greek Cypriot boy fighting for his life.

Another round of U.N.-sponsored talks aimed at reunifying the island will get underway July 5 in Geneva.

U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan hopes the pace of the talks will accelerate but stresses it is difficult to anticipate what progress will be made. He urges both parties to discuss key issues.

The European Union and the United States are pushing for a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation, the framework for a solution that has repeatedly been endorsed by the U.N. Security Council.

Cypriot President Glafcos Clerides fully supports the actions of the international community for a solution along the U.N. guidelines. Turkey, however, has remained intransigent in seeking an island with two separate states, which is a wholly unacceptable solution.

While Clerides is recognized internationally as the head of Cyprus, only Turkey has recognized the self-proclaimed "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" in the occupied area of the island headed by Rauf Denktash, who to date has refused to budge from his hard line.

Compromise is needed. The U.N. plan is the framework to follow since it is a carefully constructed outline that both communities previously accepted, but the Turkish side keeps changing its position.

An eventual solution needs to include a complete demilitarization of the island, with the Turkish troops leaving and the illegal settlers returning to where they came from.

Reunification also will allow both communities to enjoy the benefits of EU membership since Cyprus is expected to join the organization within a few years.

Lellos Demetriades, the Greek Cypriot mayor of Nicosia, points out that "you can't live next to each other and not talk."

This is what is needed most at this time—constructive and substantive talks that will lead to a settlement of the Cyprus issue. As Defense Secretary Cohen points out, a resolution is needed sooner rather than later. Active leadership from the United States is needed now more than ever to solve this issue.

[From the Washington Times, June 6, 2000]

**KOSOVO'S ONGOING AGONIES**

(HARRY MOSKOS)

Nato Secretary-General Lord Robertson took a walking tour this week to see for himself what it is like in Pristina after the allied war in Kosovo.

Where he didn't walk illustrates that nearly one year after NATO's 78-day bombing of the province that all is not well—or safe.

Lord Robertson's stroll took him down a central shopping street where he was met with cheers from ethnic Albanians. He also toured parts of Kosovska but bypassed the northern, predominantly Serbian, part of the city.

Tensions between Serbians and Albanians remain high. Lord Robertson stressed that the violence has to be reduced or there is danger that ethnic Albanians could lose the sympathy of the international community.

His comments came a few days after an attacker opened fire on a group of Serbs gathered in a store in Cernica, killing a 4-year-old boy, his 60-year-old grandfather and another man. Cernica, 28 miles southeast of Pristina, is patrolled by U.S. peacekeepers who were only 200 yards away when the gunman, an ethnic Albanian, opened fire and escaped.

In another unsolved case, a 25-year-old Serbian U.N. translator was found stabbed to death. The translator was murdered after a newspaper closely tied to Kosovo Albanian leader Hashim Thaci accused the translator of membership in a Serbian paramilitary unit—a rash accusation made without any formal charge or much less even an investigation.

As the Canonical Conference of Orthodox Christian Bishops in America rightly observed recently, the international community must not allow the cycle of violence, ethnic cleansing and retribution to continue in Kosovo.

NATO's troubles are not limited to continuing atrocities in Kosovo.

Three teachers at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point have raised the issue of whether NATO violated the rules of land warfare by using tactics that protected combatants by placing civilian bystanders at greater risk, resulting in a corrosion of the professional military ethic. And another military study has shown that NATO had overstated—roughly by a factor of 10—the effectiveness of its attacks against Serbian forces during last year's conflict.

The 78-day bombing campaign did accomplish its goal to end Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic's dictatorial grip on Kosovo, but this has not brought the promise of better times.

NATO entered this fray to help the ethnic Albanians, but unless they are now kept from taking the law into their own hands, the aftermath of Kosovo will only see more 4-year-old boys dying at the hands of assassins.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DR.  
DAVID JEFFERSON, SR.

**HON. DONALD M. PAYNE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues here in the United States House of Representatives to join me in honoring a very special person, Reverend Dr. David Jefferson, Sr., who has earned an outstanding reputation as a teacher, preacher, civic leader, community servant, attorney, and visionary. He has excelled spiritually, academically, and professionally and has made valuable contributions to his community.

Reverend Jefferson has provided vital leadership to his church in creating formidable