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ABSTRACT
According to Raytheon, the manufacturer of the Patriot system. The Patriot’s success was certainly a political one. Saudi Arabia could not possibly be on the same side of Israel if Israel counter-attacks Iraq. Because of this political complication, the US provided Israel with the defensive weapon such as the Patriot system. Thus, regardless of the Patriot’s defense effectiveness, the US was able to limit Israel’s military action to directly counter-attack Iraq. In this way, the US could keep the allied forces together, sustaining the US policy in the middle east.
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INTRODUCTION
When the speed of a moving object becomes high enough to create quasi vacuum behind, a compensating air flow toward the back of the object makes a considerable whirling motion of surrounding air. This then in turn generates a circular or a spiral rotation of the moving objects perpendicular to the direction of the motion. At this level of speed, the turbulent motion of the object is so destructively that the object itself starts to break into pieces. At the same time, the object swings sideway (i.e. a side-to-side swing motion) on a horizontal plane of its direction. Thus, a realistic trajectory of the object shows vibrations, circular rotations and sideway swing motions. On top of these, some additional non-linear effects will further complicate an actual trajectory of the object (Shapiro, 1961).

Professor Theodore Postol at MIT and Mr. Robert Stein, manager at Raytheon, had a public discussion on the effectiveness of the Patriot system in April, 1992. The discussion was centered on the criteria of the Patriot’s success. Many criteria were suggested. First, “duded”, the Patriot engaged the Scud with no explosion of the Scud on the ground. Second, “damaged”, the Scud’s strength has been reduced due to the
Patriot. Third,” diverted”, the Scud was led to the region of no people, after engaging with the Patriot. Fourth,” intercepted”, the Patriot approached the Scud and exploded itself as planned. However, all of the above criteria of the Patriot’s success were turned out to be not easy to establish, implying that the Patriot system may not be able to handle the incoming Scud at all, especially at its short range of defense. Eventually, the Patriot’s criterion of indirect success was given, a criterion of some political success (Collins, 2012).

Indirect Success
Raytheon claims that the Patriot system given to Israel was successful because, due to the Patriot’s defense, Israel did not have to counter-attack Iraq even under the Iraqi missile threat. On the other hand, if Israel did counter-attacked Iraq, then Saudi Arabia could not possibly remain in the allied forces together with Israel who were attacking the Islam neighbor, Iraq. From Saudi Arabia’s point of view, no matter how bad, Iraq was still a Islamic neighbor or a brotherhood country of Saudi. In this respect, the Patriot made Saudi remain in the allied forces by not allowing Israel’s counter-attack. So, the allied forces remained together throughout the operation desert storm. On top of it, the public morale in the allied countries were boosted due to the presence of the Patriot and the sale of the Patriot system were also skyrocketed. This further led to some bigger missile defense system such as SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative) or ICBM (Inter Continental Ballistic Missile) interception program in the future.

The reason why Iraq attacked Israel was due to Iraqi’s anticipation that Saudi Arabia could not possibly be on the same side of Israel if Israel counter-attacks Iraq. Thus, because of this political complication, the US provided Israel with the defensive weapon such as the Patriot system. In this respect, regardless of the Patriot’s defense effectiveness, the US was able to limit Israel’s military action to directly counter-attack Iraq. In turn, the US could keep the allied forces of the US, Israel and Saudi Arabia all together, sustaining the US policy in the middle east.

This criterion of the Patriot’s success is certainly a political one. According to this one, the same line of reasoning can be made toward the Patriot system stationed in the far eastern countries. The reason why North Korea tries to attack Japan is due to North Korea’s anticipation that South Korea cannot possible be on the same side of Japan if Japan counter-attacks North Korea. Thus, the US provides Japan with the defensive weapon such as the Patriot system. Regardless of the Patriot’s defense effectiveness, the US is able to limit Japan’s military action to directly counter-attack North Korea. In turn, the US can keep the allied regional relationship between the US, Japan and South Korea all together, sustaining the US policy in the far east.

CONCLUSION
The US provided Israel with the defensive Patriot system, limiting Israel’s military action to directly counter-attack Iraq. In this way, the US could keep the allied forces together, sustaining the US policy in the middle east. Therefore, the Patriot system had some obvious political success. Likewise, the Patriot system in the far east is also very effective and successful in sustaining the US policy in the region.
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