This is kind of hard to figure

out.

I really am thankful. The ranking

Republican member, Congressman

MCKEON, does a great job on Armed

Services, and he is so gentlemanly and

scholarly, and he lays the facts out.

I want to just kind of put these

things together and ask anybody if this

makes any sense at all. What we’re

going to do is drop missile defense in

Europe. Now, this is something for

which quite a number of Europeans had

to stick their necks out politically. It

is the Czechs and the Polish who are

agreeing to put this missile defense in.

Now, if you draw a line between Iran

and New York City, guess what’s in

line with that? Well, Poland is.

So now we’re going to drop this missile

defense program to protect our

country and Western Europe from

rogue states, particularly Iran, which

we now know is putting together three

things. They’re putting together long-range

missiles, nuclear warheads and

radical Islam. That’s not a great combination.

So now we’re saying the

threat assessment has been dropped.

How do you figure that? The threat assessment

has been dropped when you’re

putting long-range missiles and nuclear

warheads with radical Islam. I

don’t feel like the threat assessment

should have been dropped. I don’t know

anybody with common sense who

would assert that.

We cut the limb off.

Well, we just basically cut

the limb off from underneath them. I

mean who else is going to want to partner

with us in some sort of a decent effort

to defend the Western World from

either nuclear destruction or at least

blackmail? These guys have gone out

on a limb, and we just cut the limb off

from underneath them.

What’s even worse is the fig leaf of an

excuse from a technical point of view—

for those of us on the committee, we

know this is just a bunch of baloney—

of the idea that we’re going to use the

standard block 3 missile on a ship to

stop intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Look, this missile defense stuff is not

as rocket science as people think. It’s

pretty simple. You’ve got small ones,

medium ones and big ones. The big

ones are called intercontinental ballistic

missiles, and you can’t shoot an

intercontinental ballistic missile with

one of our two-stage missiles off of a

ship. You can’t do that and make it

work very well.

Not only that, think about the logic

of what we’re saying. The Navy is complaining

that they’ve got a lot of demands

in places where they’re going to

put their ships. Now, if you’re going to

try and cover this with ships, you’re

going to have to have probably three

ships on station all the time. That’s

really expensive. It’s a lot simpler to

put the radar on the Czech Republic

and some ground-based interceptors in

Poland.

So we’re talking about, first of all, a

technical solution which is not going

to give us the protection we need. It

doesn’t even make any sense. Then to

say the threat assessments have

dropped, the President is just not making

sense in the kinds of things that

he’s talking about.

I’m the ranking member

on Seapower, and you know, there’s

something that just doesn’t make

sense.

I’ve been aboard our ships that have

these standard block 3-type missiles on

them, okay? I’ve talked to the people

who run those systems, and they tell

me, if North Korea launches an ICBM,

their chance of stopping it is about 1

percent. The reason is that the missile

on the ship is a two-stage missile. It

doesn’t have the velocity and the ability

to get on track with a much faster,

higher-moving missile.

So that’s why I say you’ve got small

ones, medium ones and big ones. You

fight the big ones with big ones, and

the big ones are ground-based interceptors.

It’s a three-stage. That’s why we

have them in Grayling, Alaska, that’s

why we have some in California, and

that’s why there should be some in Poland.

This decision, I believe, was made all

based on politics and not based on

logic. I’ll tell you what makes me secure.

It’s secure when we have American

troops defending American homelands

instead of vague promises from

some Russian or some Iranian leader

that everything is going to be okay.

To me, it seems like

you’ve understated how bad things are,

because not only is the industrial base

closed up, the buildings shuttered, the

engineers working on some other

project at some other place, but it

takes time to get it back on track. If

somebody is shooting missiles at you

and they’re going to arrive in half an

hour, that’s not very much time to

start up a business and to rebuild your

missile defense. You just can’t do it in

that amount of time. This requires

planning.

The gentleman’s numbers and statistics

are right. The only thing is, they

do have ground-based not just in Alaska.

I think there are a few in California,

but it’s not spread out. Am I

wrong on that? I thought there were a

couple of them in California. Anyway,

the point is right, which is that they’re

not spread out. The other point is we’re

using something to kill something that

isn’t designed to work from the beginning.

It just doesn’t make any sense.

As the gentleman has expanded the

topic a little bit, let’s talk about the

different things that have been cut.

I think you just covered

something that is absolutely amazing.

You know, we don’t put enough emphasis,

maybe, on history. You are saying

to the very day 70 years from the time

Russia invaded Poland is when we just

drove the knife in the back of Poland

and cut the ground out for them as

they were trying to defend their own

country and the European countries. Is

that what I just heard, 70 years exactly

to the day we just sold them down the

river?

On the same day that the

IAEA is saying that Iran is gaining nuclear

capabilities; and 70 years before

when Poland was invaded, we make the

brilliant decision to abandon Poland,

to abandon the one tool we have to

stop intercontinental ballistic missiles

and hold this fig leaf of an excuse that

we could use a medium-range missile

to try to stop things. This is a horrible

decision.