
Sent: Wednesday, 20 August 2008 22:30
To: White Paper
Subject: WWW Submission: 2. Navy/Sea Power [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Name: Joel Robertson

Submission: Why Australia isn't pursuing more Hobart class AF100 Air Warfare Destroyers seems ridiculous considering the good it would do to South Australia's Infrastructure, possessing a world-class defence specialized shipyard for the future, and maintaining over 2,000 jobs or more pushing over 2020, but even more importantly for the RAN and the strategic environment it enters within the very near future.

With the common knowledge of regional nations possessing up to 150 Russian and European sourced Attack Submarines by 2025, and our own purchase of the two Canberra class LHD's which need heavy escort wherever they go, essentially 'sitting ducks' without. Not to mention Indonesia, Vietnam, Malaysia, China and India operating advanced types of Russian SU-27/30MK/MKI Flanker dual-role 1000nm class long-range Strike Fighters, which can be armed with supersonic, sea-skimming long-range anti-ship missiles and standoff cruise missiles, a massive threat if there ever was one, in fact I don't know of any time where there was a greater capability 'against us' at such a close proximity ever, aside from the Vietnam War.

My sources could be wrong, but it would only cost another 1.5 billion to purchase another, and even less, per ship, if another one or two were purchased. Seems like extreme value for money especially after the \$23 billion worth in defence department ****-ups outlined by the government earlier in the year, considering the capability and protection they offer Australia over other vessels, such as the ANZAC class Frigates, (even upgraded with CEA-FAR fixed phased array multifunction radar and CEA-MOUNT X-Band fixed active phased array missile illuminator/fire control radar, Sagem Vampir NG Infra-Red Search & Track system, upgraded SPS-49A volume search radar, and Saab 9LV mk 3E combat management system) cannot provide because of their simple lack of firepower with only an 8-cell mk41 vertical launch system with 32 x RIM-162 Evolved Sea Sparrow SA/AM, not enough to sufficiently escort other vessels from air attack alone and primarily are only tailored for air self-defence.

Why the U/RGM-109 block IV 'Tactical' Tomahawk Land Attack Missile hasn't been bought by the Australian government already amazes me, especially after the retirement of the F-111C/G fleet and the massive blow it left the ADF in terms of stand-off strikepower, and deterrance to hostility. These could be used at will by the Hobart class, and would be used by the Collins class Submarines and its future replacement. Australia should follow Spain's move with the very same type of ship, the F100 Alvaro de Bazan class.

Adelaide class Guided Missile Frigates - why they're being upgraded in the first place seems like an act of stupidity considering their age, not to mention an entirely brand new class (ANZAC) of greater numbers (8 vs 6) and more modern design just purchased, but given basically a very poor armament and capability contradicting the cost and time gone through to make the project a success, because the Frigates could not perform to expectations given to them. Now that they're being upgraded like they should have been initially, "why the money going towards upgrading the four remaining Adelaide FFG's isn't being spent on further upgrading the ANZAC's, especially the addition of another 8-cell mk41 VLS doesn't make sense to me". The acquisition of a standoff anti-submarine munition such as the US VL-ASROC, and European Milas to be used by the additional VLS would be an ideal blend with the Hobart class's greater capability in anti-air warfare, in all-round defensive escort of another vessel, such as the Canberra class.

The Phalanx CIWS of the Adelaide's should be stripped and re-installed aboard the ANZAC's and upgraded to block 1B standard, with additional units purchased to fill gaps. This will offer robust short-range anti-air and anti-surface protection for barely the price of all-new. Some sort of CIWS is required for the Hobart class (x1) & Canberra class (x2) and should be missile based, such as the US RIM-116 RAM and French Mistral 2. The 11-cell 'SeaRAM' SA/AM system should be chosen for its non-deck

penetration ease-of-installation, autonomous operation & fully independent with no fire control provided by other sensors, and capability to better protect against saturation missile attacks over gun-based systems.

The new fleet of Attack Submarines should be boosted from six to atleast 8, preferably 10. Why the Australian Governement believes it has to spend the time and money to design its own entirely new design doesn't make sense when it says "no other submarine offered in the world is likely to offer what Australian geographical environment demands and Navy requirements". the new German designed type U212/214 conventional attack submarine has a range of 12,000nmi which is a longer range than the Collins class of 11,500nmi and can launch a variety of european and US sourced torpedoes and missiles, offers the latest in stealth and hull forms with speed provided by a conventional diesel-electric propulsion augmented by an air-independent propulsion unit enabling sustained underwater operation for much much greater durations than the Collins class can currently.

In the end, if Australia asks itself the question "do we need all this capability?" well i reply to that, " wouldn't you want to send your boys to war with the very best gear mankind can provide? would you like to think that Australia is in the safest hands it possibly can be? i mean the amount of money Australia spends annually makes me wonder why the hell the ADF is receiving \$10bn in defence cuts over the next ten years, i'd much rather have more money spent on defence rather than on education or health considering the high standards already set by them already, by 2045 China will possess the largest air force in the Pacific rim overtaking the US, and when there's changes in global power one can only assume from history that conflicts will arise inevitably and flare up quickly, wouldn't you want to be more than adequately prepared for such a worst case scenario, even if thats all it is, a worst case scenario and say we've learnt the lessons from previous holocausts in the world.

I agree to my submission being published on the Defence website

I agree to my submission being quoted in the Community Consultation Report