

Space-Based Missile Defense: Still Grounded

Theresa Hitchens
CISSM
March 23, 2018

History

- 🌐 March 23, 1983: Reagan's "Star Wars" speech raising issue of a "peace shield" vs Soviet arsenal (35 years ago Friday)
- 🌐 1984: SDIO set up, pursues SBI, lasers, particle beams
- 🌐 1984-1986: focus on limited "Phase 1" deployment; estimated cost: \$75-150 B
- 🌐 First SBI hardware contracts issued Sept. 1987
 - 🌐 APS 1987 study: DE tech not ready
 - 🌐 1989 JASONS Brilliant Pebbles : tech not ready
- 🌐 1991: Bush approves GPALS/Brilliant Pebbles
 - 🌐 Estimated \$10-20 B price tag balloons to \$55 B

History, cont'd

- 1993: Clinton restructures SDIO to BMDO, GBI/theater focus
 - 1994: Brilliant Pebbles terminated/not replaced
- 2003: GWBush restructures BMDO to MDA, GBI/limited national defense focus
 - Includes “space-based test bed” for applied SBI research
 - APS: 1,600 SBIs in best case; program deemed “impractical”
- 2009: Obama kills test bed; SBI research (P-gon has requested no funds for SBI since 2008)

History, cont'd

- 🌐 2015: FY2016 NDAA calls for “concept definition” for SBI “layer” for BPI or to counter ASATs
- 🌐 2017: FY2018 NDAA calls for research into boost-phase, restart of space-based test bed if consistent with new P-gon BMD review (yet to be finished)
- 🌐 March 2018: Hyten “not convinced” SBI needed

Challenges

- 4 categories of challenges to SB Missile Defense have remained since SDI was conceived: technical, practical, cost, geostrategic
- Technical
 - SB lasers: power, beam coherence
 - SBI deployment technically possible but ...
 - Interceptor size/speed (mass to orbit)
 - Detection, tracking, discrimination still not adequate
 - Short time for kill (2-3 mins)
 - Countermeasures (easy to create gaps, decoys)

Challenges cont'd

- 🌐 Practical
 - 🌐 Thousands of SBIs needed to kill even one incoming
 - 🌐 Absentee ratios
 - 🌐 Required increase in launch capacity
 - 🌐 Very short decision to fire time – likely would require automated launch on detection
 - 🌐 C2 for constellation
 - 🌐 Heightened debris/collision risks

Challenges, con't



Costs



CBO 2004: constellation to kill one liquid fuel NK missile plus 20 years ops \$24B to \$78B; one solid fuel NK missile \$57B to \$224B



IDA 2011: \$26B for launch of “limited” system; \$60B for a “medium capacity;” \$200B for a “global” capacity








NAS 2012: SB boost-phase “10 times as expensive as any other alternatives,” \$300B in 2010 dollars for a very limited capacity (650 SBIs)



Despite falling costs of launch, the mass to orbit requirements for SBI still mean exorbitant costs







Challenges, cont'd

Geopolitical

-  Since Reagan years, Russia/China fears re impact on deterrent capability
 -  Historical concern re Russia/China increased nuke deployment to counter
 -  Negative impact on nuclear security
-  SBI = weapons in space: controversial in most countries including allies and U.S. public
 -  Potential for use as ASATs, or as strike weapons re terrestrial targets

Challenges, cont'd

Geopolitical, cont'd

-  Raises incentives for adversaries to target US space assets, including EW sats used for launch detection
 -  Increases risk of nuclear conflict
 -  Justifies adversary counterspace actions
-  Even a “limited” system aimed at regional threats (NK, Iran) would cover parts of China (laws of physics)
-  Russia/China deployment of SBI in response would greatly increase risks to US space assets
 -  Thus fueling current trends toward space arms race

Conclusions

- 🌐 Technical, practical, cost and geopolitical challenges to SBI (whether KE or DE based) still fails cost/benefit analysis
- 🌐 Potential effects on nuclear deterrence unchanged
- 🌐 Potential effects on space security highly negative

STILL A BAD IDEA