



An F-35B Lightning II performs a vertical landing aboard Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort. (Flickr/U.S. Marine Corps/Cpl. Jonah Lovy)



by Mary Ann McGivern

[View Author Profile](#)

## [\*\*Join the Conversation\*\*](#)

January 31, 2019

[Share on Bluesky](#)[Share on Facebook](#)[Share on Twitter](#)[Email to a friend](#)[Print](#)

A few weeks ago the CBS drama "Madam Secretary," about a fictional U.S. secretary of state, a woman, Elizabeth McCord, presented a military, diplomatic and commercial crisis about a fictional fighter plane, the so-called F-40. The manufacturer had a cost overrun and was demanding that the U.S. buy 20 more planes. The Pentagon was proposing the planes be given to Taiwan. The total cost would run, as best I remember, about \$40 billion.

And to further complicate things, Madam Secretary's husband, a retired fighter pilot, had flown the plane and called it a "brick," sluggish, but with lots of bells and whistles like stealth radar.

The show caught my attention because for years I've been tracking the F-35 fighter plane. [According to POGO](#), the Project on Government Oversight, the F-35 was to be fully functional and in the air by 2008 at a cost of \$40 or \$50 million per plane. But to save money, the competing manufacturers, Lockheed and Boeing, didn't build a prototype. And flaws have plagued the plane.

Cost-overrun fails to capture the magnitude of the cost increase, currently estimated at \$150 million per plane – that is if we actually build 2,500 of them. [Currently](#), congressional appropriations committees recommend producing 93 planes in FY19; Lockheed [has delivered](#) more than 355 planes, as of [mid-January](#).

[The POGO article](#) cited above says the planes are not combat-ready, based on a report by Air Force Secretary Deborah Lee James who certified in 2016 that the planes would be [combat-ready by 2018](#). Besides that, a [plane crashed](#) in October; the Pentagon [grounded them](#) while investigating the cause.

There's a lot of criticism of the F-35. And "Madam Secretary" attempted to catch and explain the criticisms. Indeed, I would say the show took sides, with the secretary of state declaring the plane to be a boondoggle. In the end, spoiler alert, Madam Secretary loses to a cabal of the president, defense secretary and chief of staff, men who cannot imagine actually rejecting a weapons system. It's pretty shocking television, naming one of the Pentagon's dirty secrets.

Advertisement