Speech to the Long Range Strike Caucus:
NEW PENETRATING BOMBER

LIEUTENANT GENERAL JAMES M. KOWALSKI

7 April 2011

Good afternoon everyone. First, I want to thank Dr. Fleming and Representative Bordallo for their leadership of the Long Range Strike Caucus and for inviting me to speak today. A little more than a year ago, Dr. Fleming and Representative Bordallo identified significant issues concerning the health of our nation's bomber program. They recognized the need to sustain both the nuclear deterrent capability of our force and its capacity to conduct long range strike. Since 2009, when you started this Caucus, you have consistently highlighted the importance of a new platform to ensure our nation continues to have a long range strike capability.

We have always been a nation with power projection requirements and modern long range strike has been a unique U.S. power projection advantage for much of the 20th century. But as we enter the second decade of the 21st century, our unique advantage of long range strike—an advantage critical to protecting our allies, friends, and interests—will be increasingly challenged.

While the term "long range strike" covers a range of capabilities both land- and sea-based, I'd like to focus today on the bomber. In particular, how bombers fit into our national security and military strategies; what bombers need to provide the Joint warfighter; the attributes of, and challenges to, the current bomber force; and then discuss the new penetrating bomber.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND MILITARY STRATEGIES

"Geography is destiny," Napoleon once said, and one only has to look at a map to understand our nation's enduring need to project power. Virtually from the birth of our republic we had to project power at long range to protect our interests and deter or defeat adversaries. In 1801, we deployed the Navy and Marine Corps to fight almost 5,000 miles away in the Barbary Wars off Tripoli. As a young nation we rarely sought to employ forces at long range, but our development into a great power by the late 19th century led to more confident engagements across the globe as we projected power on the high seas and into the littoral

areas.

The advent of airpower provided a new dimension to power projection, allowing us to overfly terrestrial defenses and strike an enemy at the time and place of our choosing. Airpower's role in U.S. power projection continued to grow through World War II and the Cold War.

Today, we remain a nation with extensive global alliances, commitments, and engagements. It has been both our good fortune, and a complex operational problem, that our interests and allies under greatest threat are those far from our shores. Our commitment to deter, dissuade, assure, and if needed—fight and win—means our nation must have the forces to respond quickly to a crisis, with the freedom of action to strike the targets of our choosing, on our timeline.

The 2011 National Military Strategy further clarifies this theme: "our Joint Force must prepare for an increasingly dynamic and uncertain future in which a **full spectrum of military capabilities and attributes** will be required to prevent and win our Nation's wars."

☆☆☆

There is a point here worth emphasizing—"a dynamic and uncertain future" that requires a "full spectrum of capabilities." Bombers are full spectrum—they are part of virtually every regional combatant commander's operation plan, and they can respond to taskings across the range of missions, from information operations to close air support to strategic attack and nuclear deterrence.

WHAT WE NEED A BOMBER TO DO

The role of the penetrating bomber within this strategy is to provide the joint warfighters a full-spectrum Global Attack capability—an Air Force core competency. Secretary of the Air Force Donley reaffirmed this when discussing the need to invest in a new penetrating bomber saying we must, "provide the President with options to hold any target at risk at any point on the globe."

To reiterate, the joint force commander must be able to hold at risk any target—to do otherwise is to give an adversary safe haven. Or to use the words of General Ulysses S. Grant: "The art of war is simple

☆☆☆

enough. Find out where your enemy is. Get at him as soon as you can. Strike him as hard as you can, and keep moving on."

Denying our enemies safe haven for high value assets such as weapons of mass destruction or command and control, remains a pacing challenge for all our forces but especially for our long range strike forces. Those safe havens include heavily defended targets, hard and deeply buried targets, targets deep in enemy territory, and targets that are mobile. But if we can hold that target set at risk, to paraphrase General Grant—get at him as soon as we can and strike him as hard as we can—we then have the best chance to deter conflict, or if we have to fight, win. Bombers today, as part of the joint force, offer the capability to engage across the target set and across the full range of military operations. To illustrate this point, we can look at what we've asked bomber forces to do since the end of the Cold War. Since 1991 our bombers, while maintaining their role as part of the nuclear deterrent triad, have engaged in conventional combat in Operations DESERT STORM, SOUTHERN WATCH, DESERT FOX, DESERT STRIKE, ALLIED FORCE, ENDURING FREEDOM, IRAQI FREEDOM, and

most recently, ODYSSEY DAWN. In every case, our forces struck the enemy from great distance, usually at the edge of the theater of operations. In many of those operations, strikes were launched from U.S. soil.

ATTRIBUTES OF A BOMBER FORCE

I have had five assignments at the Pentagon and have seen how the word "bomber" causes groups to coalesce instantly, and emotionally, into supporters or opponents. The very word "bomber" is loaded with imagery—from the brave aviators of the "Memphis Belle" striking at the heart of the German war machine in World War II to Slim Pickens riding the nuclear bomb out of the bay of a B-52 in the movie "Dr. Strangelove." From the 1950s through the 1980s our nation progressed through a series of long range bombers as we responded to the demands of the Cold War. When the Berlin Wall fell and the Soviet Union dissolved, the bomber force had a new challenge—that challenge was partly to align the range and payload capabilities of the bomber force with post-DESERT STORM advances in our conventional capabilities

such as joint precision weapons and improved connectivity. But the challenge was also partly to get decision makers to see past the clichés of popular culture—the association with Dr. Strangelove caricatures and Vietnam era carpet bombing—and focus on the military attributes bombers bring to the Joint Commander.

More than 25 studies in the last 16 years point to the unique attributes and capabilities, the bomber brings to the battle space. A penetrating bomber allows effects against multiple objectives in a single mission with a single platform. In addition to the classic attributes of range and payload, characteristics of our bomber force now include speed, precision, flexibility, persistence, and stealth. Let's give some examples of these attributes. The attribute of range is the ability to engage global targets. The first combat aircraft to launch on the opening night of Operation DESERT STORM were seven B-52Gs from Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana. They flew what was then the longest combat mission in history, over 35 hours, to execute a conventional cruise missile strike on critical communication nodes and power plants.
A good example of the importance of payload was demonstrated in

☆☆☆

Operation IRAQI FREEDOM, where B-1 bombers, flying just 1% of the sorties, delivered 44% of the Joint Direct Attack Munitions, or JDAMs, and 15% of the total munitions dropped. Recently three B-2's exhibited precision in support of Operation ODYSSEY DAWN. They flew from Whiteman Air Force Base to attack Gadhafi's Air Force. They released 45 guided, 2,000 pound JDAMs, and successfully destroyed the targeted hardened aircraft shelters. During IRAQI FREEDOM, the flexibility of bombers was demonstrated by B-1s which would, often on the same sortie, conduct surveillance and reconnaissance operations in the western Iraqi desert to suppress SCUD missiles, then be tasked against dynamic and time-sensitive targets near Baghdad, followed by offensive counter-air targets near Tikrit, and finally respond to a troops-in-contact call from ground forces in Northern Iraq. Those bombers provided 24/7 coverage of virtually the entire target set throughout major combat operations. Today, and for the past 9 years, 14-hour B-1 sorties from Al Udeid provide 24/7 coverage over Afghanistan ensuring persistence with the ability to loiter and to instantly respond to joint terminal attack controller's requests for close air support. Stealth is now a modern requirement as bomber forces retain the ability to

☆☆☆

operate in contested airspace. In Operation ALLIED FORCE, stealthy B-2s entered enemy territory in the Balkans and conducted air strikes with the first-ever combat use of JDAMs, despite a capable integrated air defense system.

While the bomber has seen extensive conventional use in the last 20 years, it also remains a lynchpin of the traditional strategic nuclear forces triad. The triad of forces is mutually reinforcing—intercontinental ballistic missiles provide a robust and responsive deterrent on alert at 450 dispersed locations; ballistic missile submarines provide our most survivable alert force, and bombers give us the flexibility to demonstrate national intent through generation, dispersal, and the ability to be recalled.

CHALLENGES TO OUR BOMBER FORCE

Our nation's ability to conduct strikes against high value targets is both recognized and challenged. Our bombers face increasingly complex air defense challenges requiring changes to tactics and procedures,

☆☆☆

modernization of the aircraft and systems, and the fielding of enabling capabilities such as the miniature air launch decoy. Potential adversaries will continue to develop, field, or seek advanced air defense and anti-access capabilities.

Some of the latest air defense systems are advertised as being capable of simultaneously engaging multiple targets with long range missiles at over-the-horizon distances; altitudes ranging from the treetops to well over 100,000 feet. These same systems are also reported to be more capable against low-observable platforms than systems deployed when B-2s first rolled off the line.

Furthermore, advanced air defense missile systems are proliferating. It has been widely reported that Iran, Algeria, Libya, Venezuela, and Syria already have, or are seeking, Russia's S-300 surface to air missile, or SAM. China already has the S-300, and according to defense publications, reportedly partnered with Russia to jointly develop and field their own version of the S-400. Recently, Aviation Week reported that Libya, prior to the current strife, indicated an interest in

purchasing the S-400 from Russia. As for Russia itself, press reports indicate the Russians are currently developing an S-500 SAM that is even more capable in terms of speed, range, and altitude than either the S-300 or S-400.

As the effectiveness of an adversary's air defenses increase, we respond with larger and more complex force packages dedicated to defensive counter air, suppression of enemy air defenses, and other missions. That type of well-supported strike package has a large footprint and delays the responsiveness of our long range strike. Further, these force packages face increased risk from modern and future Integrated Air Defense Systems, or IADS, and SAMs, and their in-theater presence is challenged by the proliferation and increasing accuracy of short and intermediate range missiles.

We can also respond to advanced air defenses with stand-off missiles such Tomahawk Land Attack Missiles, the extended range Joint Air to Surface Stand-off Missile, and the Conventional Air Launched Cruise Missile. While an important part of a campaign to establish freedom of

☆☆☆

action, these weapons are limited by a number of factors, to include cost and time-of-flight, and are often best suited for attack against static air defense systems and other fixed high-value targets.

NEW PENETRATING BOMBER

To meet our nation's enduring need to globally project power, we must collectively champion the need for a new long range penetrating bomber. Current bombers are increasingly at risk to rapidly modernizing air defenses while anti-access weapons complicate our ability to project short range airpower from aircraft carriers and regional bases.

The importance of a new penetrating bomber is directly in line with the 2010 National Security Strategy, which states, "As we face multiple threats—from nations, non-state actors, and failed states—we will maintain the military superiority that has secured our country, and underpinned global security, for decades." And it goes on to state that "As we fight the wars in front of us, we must see the horizon beyond

☆☆☆

them." Given our global commitments, that horizon is both figurative and literal.

Guided by the National Security Strategy and National Military Strategy, the 2011 Air Force Posture Statement details a Long-Range Strike Family of Systems to provide a broad range of military options. The Air Force strategy consists of three precision-strike pillars: a new penetrating bomber, a Long Range Stand-off Missile, and a Conventional Prompt Global Strike capability. This overarching family of systems recognizes the need for a complementary, survivable cruise missile arsenal as well as continued exploration of conventional prompt global strike. As part of that family of long range strike systems, a new penetrating bomber would sustain our ability to hold targets at risk and maneuver and operate at will within a global threat environment.

The President's Budget for fiscal year 2012 includes $197 million for the Department of Defense Long Range Strike bomber; with a total of $3.7 billion programmed in fiscal years 2012 through 2016 to develop a long range penetrating bomber designed to accommodate manned or

unmanned operations. These initial investments suggest fielding of the bomber could commence in the mid-2020s, with a projected 80 to 100 aircraft fleet of long range strike bombers.

The Air Force will use a streamlined acquisition process with an open architecture approach and off-the-shelf technologies, to develop and deliver the new penetrating bomber. The Long Range Strike program puts emphasis on affordability, making capability adjustments to incrementally grow the platform as necessary to hold down procurement costs over the long-term production cycle.

Power projection via long range airpower has been a core Air Force competency for our nation since 1947. The Long Range Strike Family of Systems ensures we will be prepared to respond to any attack at the time and place of our nation's choosing. For at the heart of deterrence is the truth that no enemy can be allowed to feel safe from our retaliation.

☆☆☆

CONCLUSION

In closing, we must make the commitment now to a new long range penetrating bomber. It is time to advance this bomber through the procurement cycle towards delivery in the field—the Air Force is prepared to develop and field the long range strike capability our nation and the joint warfighter needs.

And with the support and guidance from the Long Range Strike Caucus, we can succeed.

Once again, I appreciate this opportunity to speak to you today. I assure you that Air Force Global Strike Command is committed to providing the combat ready forces for nuclear deterrence and long range global strike operations in support of our national security.