

Critique Analysis on Perin a Comparison of Long-Range Bombers and Naval Forces

This week we are looking at the working paper of David Perin "A comparison of long-range bombers and naval forces." One thing I would like to point out from the article we are critiquing is this article is originally from 1991. This work is not current because new information has become available such as the use and nature of technology and how we currently use it now, I

assume this will refute some of the work offered by Perin. *it may which evidence should be examined?*

* I will also offer assumptions and discuss why the use of naval long-range bombers may no longer be an effective use of military weaponry in the face of current technology. I offer this assumption because in the current time we live in now, technology has a huge impact in our lives. Naval long-range bombers may not be as effective because of the cost of upkeep and maintaining to stay active. With all the upgrades and technology needed it may not be as effective as the use military weapon. With the use of military weapons, it would be used to be effective when

minimizing collateral damage is the goal.

this often is a goal of military operation, but it doesn't

I assume NATO and US will be safer with its presence because of the use and how many they have in arsenal. With this, this can offer deterrence and the ability to maintain the air and control the skies. [But we also have to assume that readiness and NATO political support will be

insubstantial.] *why?*

* distinguish between the alternatives Perin (and Northrop) examined
* the assignment is to identify assumptions the author (Perin) made and discuss them