

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Good morning from Alexandria, Virginia on a wonderful winter day. I'm Riki Ellison. I'm the chairman and founder of the Missile Defense Advocacy Alliance. We were founded in 2003. Our sole mission is to advocate and educate on the deployment and evolution of missile defense. We soundly believe that having missile defense capabilities makes the world a safer place. We are excited about today. We are going to discuss the NDAA and the missile defense element in it. It was signed yesterday by the US Senate, and it's expected to be signed by the administration. There's some good things about that. We know it is a transition period where this budget was partially started by the previous administration and is also a combination of President Biden's budget. We also know that the missile defense review is going to be coming out and that will shape the following budget in 2023.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

The budget is increased by 25 billion, but more importantly for missile defense we've seen a 5% increase on their MDA budget, which is really positive. And as we look at where our nation is going, with missile defense, beyond being in front of North Korea and Iran, but going into a strategic competition with China and with Russia, and looking at how missile defense plays into that, we're seeing some great initiatives from increasing, probably the biggest initiative that we see is the movement in Guam, to get the architecture up, get the resources, and the urgency of that matter. But there are other great things. There's directed energy. And there's some positiveness with this. So, we want to really look at it in a very clear way. We've got some experts from the committees, and we feel that we can shed some really good light on that.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

And certainly, we are very excited about having coach Senator Tuberville, who has led a lot of the bipartisan effort, who has led this transformation we think that's happening with missile defense to go beyond just a North Korea, Iran capability, to shifting into a bigger, collective integrated deterrent. We also are excited about the PDI, and we know Dr. Hicks is in Hawaii now and INDOPACOM is moving that as well. So our first guest is a great friend, a board member, I think he's been in national security with the US government for 30 years. I think I've known him beyond those 30 years and every year since then, but we couldn't ask for anybody better.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

He was the former undersecretary of defense for OSD policy for two years under the previous administration. So this is going to be a great perspective by John on his thoughts, because some of this budget is from his administration that he served in. And it's exciting because the complexity of the policy movements here are very complex and nobody better, I think in the world can distill it, articulate it, and understand it for us. So welcome my friend, John. The floor is yours.

Mr. John Rood:

Well, it's great to be with you, Riki. And it's great to see everyone, nothing like struggling with a balky wifi connection when you're remotely located. But I think I got it up and working here. Well, again, big day yesterday with the Senate voting to pass the FY22 or the 2022 National Defense Authorization Act, and sending that bill to president Biden's desk. Every year, the annual defense policy bill is a whopper of a bill. They've grown to be typically over a thousand pages. Mark Montgomery, who's going to speak later, once gave me a signed copy and I put it on my shelf and it looked like War and Peace up there. But that bill authorizes of course, 768 billion, including 740 billion for the Department of Defense. The rest is

for the Department of Energy, both to the House and the Senate agreed to add 25 billion more than what President Biden had requested in the bill.

Mr. John Rood:

The NDA has a number of important provisions on air and missile defense that we're going to talk about today. Among the positive things in the bill is that it authorized this funding for the Missile Defense Agency or MDA and other missile defense spending for things like the Army's Patriot program, adding 500 million to the administration's request to bring the tally from 9.9 billion requested by the administration to 10.4 billion. I know one of our colleagues is going to talk more about the specifics of the budget, but there were a few areas where I thought the Congress showed strong support or continuing stable support is probably a better way to put it for the National Missile Defense Mission. The full funding requested by the administration for the next generation interceptor that is so needed to improve on our current National Missile Defense capabilities was funded as well as the requirement to carry the system through critical design review, which is a major milestone, as you know, in the development of these systems.

Mr. John Rood:

There's also of funding for a defense of Hawaii radar. Since Hawaii's located very distant from the rest of the continental US, some additional sensor support significantly improves the defensive capability there. Also, the bill continued the funding for the Ground-based Missile Defense Program, which is important because we're going to be waiting for some time, probably at least until 2028 at the earliest for next generation interceptor, and most likely later. A major step in the bill was the Pacific Deterrence Initiative that I know Mark Montgomery's going to talk about more. 7.6 billion for that critical initiative, which is really central to shifting our military posture to the Pacific, given our growing concerns about China, and ongoing concerns about things like North Korea. But as we talk about missile defense, I think one of the major policy provisions was a requirement that the defense department retain an independent organization for an independent study of the roles and responsibilities for missile defense.

Mr. John Rood:

This is a subject we've looked at here at the Missile Defense Advocacy Alliance. We produced a report on it and the NDAA directs the DOD to enter into that agreement with the National Academy of Public Administration, to look at the roles and responsibilities for missile defense. And I would just say, as we've looked at this question at MDAA, and in our report on the roles and responsibilities, there's a significant opportunity for us as a nation to do better, and to focus more of MDA's resources on the development of new technologies and for the military services to play a bigger role in maintaining, sustaining, and operating systems once they're fielded. When the MDA was founded in 2002, it was given special authorities to develop and deploy missile defenses rapidly. MDA was exempted from the lengthy requirements process, the joint requirements, oversight committee, and other similar bodies, and also exempted from the DOD 5,000 series of acquisition regulations.

Mr. John Rood:

And so what happened? Well, when that was done in 2002, President George W. Bush directed MDA to use those authorities to deploy an NMD system, to defend the United States for the first time, since the 1970s, when we briefly had the safeguard system. And by 2004, we had a system in place that had been fielded to protect all 50 states plus our deployed forces, and allies overseas. And that all occurred under the leadership of General Ron Kadish and MDA using these special authorities. Since that time, of

course, successive generations of the system have been deployed. Upgrades, additional sensors, additional shooters, new systems developed like the SM-6 now in operation all much faster than we ordinarily see at the defense department with 10-to-15-year development cycles, yet, year by year MDA's special authorities have been eroded, and it's been subjected to more and more of the oversight, and the treatment that the rest of the department and the military services receive.

Mr. John Rood:

And the predictable result is the pace of development and deployment is at a much slower pace and very similar to what we see in the military services. No longer, faster, more innovative, and many of the new things, there were successive generations of new technologies birthed, conceived of, and fielded. And so looking at the roles and responsibilities is something that Congress directed. It's something we've looked at. And my personal view is that the pace at which we're developing and fielding new systems to counter the rapid pace of evolution that we see in what China's fielding, what North Korea is fielding and so on is just too slow. And we're going to have to get back to a more nimble, less encumbered approach that keeps pace with a threat. I mean, that's the iron reality. You may think you're moving fast, but if the threat is moving faster, it's not fast enough.

Mr. John Rood:

Shifting gears, another major policy provision in the NDAA was about the defense of Guam. And this really points to Congress's view of the importance of Guam, and seeing Guam as part of the United States. It is a United States territory, and the United States citizens live there, and Guam has taken on increasing strategic importance as the United States turns its attention to the Pacific. And we're much more focused on deterring and defending against China, but also dealing with the continuing threat from North Korea. Guam's a vital strategic location. It's located about 3,300 miles west of Hawaii, and about some 1500 miles from Japan. This is a vital location. It serves as a staging ground for projecting US influence and power with key Naval and air bases. Guam's also a hub and portal for submarine cables and satellite communications. And it may look like a small territory, but it would play an outsized role in any kind of US conflict in the Pacific, whether that was with China, North Korea or anyone else.

Mr. John Rood:

And that's why we need to improve the islands air and missile defenses. I think the reality is that we've just got to be able to defend these important power projection points at Anderson air base, and with our submarine bases in Naval bases in Guam. And China and North Korea, by the way, both recognize the strategic importance of Guam. And we see evidence of them continuing to develop and field capabilities that are aimed at negating the ability of the United States to project power forward from Guam in a conflict. Creating a comprehensive missile defense for Guam, been a priority now for two successive INDOPACOM commanders spanning four years, the INDOPACOM commanders has been clear that the threat to Guam will continue to increase, and that the rapid pace of China's buildup, including its hypersonic missile capabilities is going to continue a pace for the coming years.

Mr. John Rood:

So the NDAA directs the secretary defense to identify an architecture in an acquisition approach for implementing a 360 degree integrated air and missile defense capability to defend the people, infrastructure, and territory of Guam from all advanced missile threats. And the bill is clear, both crews, ballistic and hypersonic missile threats. The architecture has to have the capability to integrate numerous multi domain sensors, interceptors, command and control systems while maintaining the full

kill chain performance against that spectrum of threats. The bill was noteworthy, in that it called for that architecture to be submitted by the defense department that leverages existing systems like the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense System, the SM-3 and SM-6 interceptor systems, the THAAD and Patriot systems, and the Integrated Battle Command and Control System called IBCS. The bill took an unusual step of mandating a target date for initial operational capability directing the architecture aim at 2025.

Mr. John Rood:

That's been done by the Congress before, but not recently. When I served as a staffer, for example, in the Congress, there were attempts to mandate initial deployment dates for national missile defense, but it's been quite some time since that was really done. This report will be due 60 days to Congress after the enactment of the NDAA, or when President Biden signs it. Of note the, related to this, but a slightly different topic. The NDAA fully supported the funding request DOD submitted, the president submitted that as to say for the Space Development Agency and Missile Defense Agency for the space sensors that are necessary for the defense of Guam over the next 10 years and beyond specifically the HBTSS that's critical for hypersonic defense.

Mr. John Rood:

And so I think broadly speaking again, the Congress seeing missile defense as an important mission, increasing the funding over the president's request, and supporting some of the key initiatives, particularly, things like the defense of Guam, where clearly the Congress felt the administration was not moving rapidly enough. And putting a strong message forward about there needs to be some looks at more efficiency. And can we be better at the way we structure the roles, and responsibilities for this important mission? So, let me just turn it back to Riki now and say, I look forward to the question and answer period, and hearing from the other panelists. Thank you, Riki.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Yeah. Thanks, John. And I think what you've seen is that urgency. The urgency and the demand of the United States Congress to get this thing moving in Guam to move that process with integrating our missile defense against a bigger threat than North Korea than we're seeing. I'm real excited about this one. We have a younger generation here and an organization that I respect tremendously. The Heritage Foundation has been the leader for missile defense in the world. And we can go all the way back to 1999 Missile Defense Act, which they went out and I was a young kid then. And we went out, and got, I think, 12 state resolutions to get all 50 states having a missile defense system, which ended up in Alaska.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

So they have been the bedrock. They were the foundation that went forward to get us deployed, supported the president 43 initiative to do that. We have with us, Patty-Jane Geller and Patty-Jane has been in the Senate Armed Services Committee this past year. And she's worked the missile defense issue. She's worked the new nuclear posture issue there. She's also was big in putting forward space force, and legislation in there. So we've got a great opportunity to hear her perspective, and her thoughts on the NDAA. Patty-Jane?

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

Awesome. Thanks so much, Riki, for the nice introduction. It's cool to be here with you in person, a lot easier than dealing with wifi issues and also to speak with our other esteemed panelists here. So what I thought I would do is kind of dive deeper into the NDAA, look at the numbers and in particular, go over

how the NDAA does and does not strengthen our position in the competition with Russia and China. So we know that the missile threat is growing both Russia and China are deploying different types of hypersonic...

PART 1 OF 4 ENDS [00:21:04]

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

That is growing. Both Russia and China are deploying different types of hypersonic weapons. Russia threatening just the other day to add more nuclear capable missiles to Europe and China strengthening its missile arsenal in the Indo-Pacific that's capable of striking U.S. forward deployed forces and even territory in the region and missile defense is critical for great power competition with Russia and China because it can convince an adversary that its attack will fail or help convince an adversary that the cost of having to overcome U.S. missile defense is not worth the benefits of success.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

So, I'm going to go over a few things. First thing I build on a bit is on the defense of Guam, which Secretary Rood covered, but I want to dig into some of the numbers. A bit of a different perspective. So, we heard from Secretary Rood, the strategic importance, the location of Guam and how there are thousands of U.S. Citizens on Guam and so, it's important that we work to defend it and INDOPACOM has made it very clear that we need an advanced missile defense capability on the island. That has been on its unfunded priorities list for the last three years, but despite all of this, up until this year, we haven't actually taken action on the defense of Guam. Instead, for the last few years, we've just been studying and studying the problem. Meanwhile, of course, China's not stopping its build up to let us study.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

So, I was glad that this year's budget finally included funding for missile defense of Guam, but we only saw about \$118 million requested, which is less than half of the \$500 million that INDOPACOM had identified in its 1251 report for Guam submitted earlier this year.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

In the NDAA, Congress added \$100 million to Guam defense, which is great. We know that Congress has been an advocate of missile defense of Guam and has been pushing the Missile Defense Agency to figure out the architecture it wants to deploy, but that plus up still leaves us over a \$100 million short of what INDOPACOM wanted. It's also surprisingly less than what the ASC and SASC had initially plussed up in their original NDAA bills.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

So, I'm not sure if I'm missing something there or why we didn't get the rest of the funding, but I think bottom line is that if we want to be serious about the China threat and the potential timeline identified for a Taiwan invasion, we need to act with urgency now in the future with getting this system up on Guam.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

So aside from Guam, there is a lot of good news in this year's NDAA with Congress supportive and adding plus ups to a number of key programs for missile defense. First I'll touch on sensing. Secretary

Rood mentioned that we got full funding for the Hypersonic and Ballistic Tracking Space Sensor, the HBTSS, which would deploy a constellation of sensing satellites in lower earth orbit in order to detect and track all types of missiles throughout the entirety of our flights.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

We know that this is critical for sensing hypersonic missiles, which don't fly directly in view of our current sensors and radars and being able to detect and track missiles throughout the entirety of their flight is so important, not only because being able to track a missile is a prerequisite for intercept, but because it's necessary for deterrence. For instance, even if we can't intercept a hypersonic missile, we can or be able to organize a retaliatory response to deter the threat, but we need to be able to track the missile and see where it's going in order to do that.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

To talk about interceptors for a bit, Congress gave a bunch of funding additions or plus ups to a number of programs compared to what was in the budget. There were additional procurement dollars for SM-3 block IIA intercepts, as well as THAAD, a couple more THAAD interceptors. There was a plus up for a hypersonic defense to work on an interceptor that can address hypersonic missiles in their glide phase instead of their terminal phase and the big plus up, I think, is showing us not only the importance that Congress attributes to hypersonic defense, but how maybe we're behind and we keep moving quicker.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

And finally, there's a bunch of money added for directed energy. In addition to a provision that would give MDA authority over directed energy and with instruction to prioritize this research. That's something that was significant to me because, and I think General Hyten was the one to say that directed energy could help us address cruise and ballistic missiles in a potentially more cost effective way than ground based interceptors and I look at what's going on in the Indo-Pacific in particular, where seems that China is exercising a bit of an offset strategy to overwhelm our ships and assets in the regions with its large missile arsenal. It may be a competitive strategy to get us to spend more and more money on missile defense. So, that's why I think investing in directed energy and other advanced technologies is so important to strengthen our position in the spending race as well.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

So, if you'll notice the theme of what I've been talking about in the last few minutes is Congress has been adding a bunch of funding plus ups to the original budget request in the NDAA and that's great. We're thankful to Congress for doing this, but this is also highlighting more of an underlying problem here and that's with the MDA budget, the Missile Defense Agency budget that we saw this year and in previous years.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

We hear the current and previous administrations talking about the increasingly complex missile threat that we're facing, but this year's MDA budget, about nine billion or so, is actually the lowest that it's been since 2016 and the same number that it was in 2004, believe it or not, when obviously the threats weren't what they were today.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

As another example, I think someone mentioned what Homeland Defense Radar for Hawaii hasn't been in the budget for the last few years and Congress is finding money elsewhere to add to it and really what we're seeing, not just this year, but previous years is Congress piling on plus ups that they have to go dig around for in order to appropriately fund key missile defense programs. And so, I think that this approach is not only unsustainable, but is not helpful in the great power competition with Russia and China. I think we need a clear strategy for missile defense when that's reflected in our budgets and then our future NDAA spending. And good news, you mentioned at the beginning, we have a Missile Defense Review coming out in a month or so. So, I'm hopeful that we'll see a strategy out of that. That'll start to resolve some of these questions that we have. So, I'll stop there with regard to questions.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Patty-Jane, that was well done. Well done. Very impressive. Thank you very much for that. Our next guest, our fellow board member, Mark Montgomery. I know we've talked about Mark a little bit, but I do want to mention that he was the Policy Director for the Senate Armed Services Committee under Senator John McCain for, I think, two years. And also for people that don't know Mark, he did graduate from University of Pennsylvania and Oxford University in England, as well as the U.S. Navy's Nuclear Power Training Program. So, I just want to leave you with that. Mark, you can step in please.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

Hey. Thanks, Riki. Great to listen to John and Patty-Jane. Look, I'll pick up on the Pacific Deterrence Initiative and you got to step back for a second and say, "What's PACOM trying to do?" And PACOM's assessment, INDOPACOM's assessment is that the greatest risk to the future of United States security in the Pacific is the erosion of our conventional deterrence and that without that valid and convincing conventional deterrence, China's really been emboldened to take action in the region and to supplant U.S. interests throughout the First Island Chain. So, INDOPACOM's focus when they originally responded to the Senate, asked on the Pacific Deterrence Initiative, was to ensure they had access, maneuver, and fires. So, when you look at the PDI that they submitted and I'll tell you, when the Congress's PDI is the third attempt at this. The first room was INDOPACOM at the beginning of the year.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

They very clearly talked about \$4.7 billion in funding to get a joint force lethality, forced design imposture, strengthening allies and partners, exercises and experimentation, and logistics and security enablers. I'll just break down one of them and John and Patty-Jane have hit on these. If you just take joint lethality, it's about the Guam Defense System, space-based persistent radar, ground based long range fires and a tactical over the horizon radar in Palau. These are all very specific Pacific requests and as a result, the PACOM submission was about 50% thing services were going to do. They're 25 billion when they looked over five years or 27 billion looking over five years, there's about 50% services, things services were already going to do and just binning them under the PACOM Deterrence Initiative, but 50% new initiatives.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

And that frustrated me that it wasn't 100% new, but I get it. You got to build on something, but that would be the high water mark because the next one that came out was the Department of Defense came out with one that was 100% stuff they're already doing and it was ludicrous. They said, "We're putting a destroyer, an Arleigh Burke, the procurement of a DDG, the procurement of an oiler, the procurement of F-35's." That was about 4.5 billion of their five billion that they claim was a PDI. It was

embarrassing. I think Secretary of Defense was embarrassed trying to defend it at Armed Services Committee and waved it off and said, "I'll get back to you," which is a general acknowledgement that they had not done a good job and they didn't. Bending things that you were going to buy, that might possibly use.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

I mean, you might as well just say, "I'm going to bend the TPY cost of the Sec Dev going to Singapore." Well, there's a PACOM and something you were going to do and you're going to just put as part of the bill. So, they've stopped talking about that, which reflects well on DOD recognizing wrong.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

The third one that's come out is the warm porge in between. That's Congress. The 7.1 billion. I'd say it's about 80% things the department was already doing. The most egregious is they list 4.1 billion worth of steaming hours and flying hours. That's the steaming hours and flying hours that are conducted west of the International Date Line. We were going to do that, right? We weren't going to have our pilots lose their proficiency or our seamen lose their ship handling skills and the choice wasn't do nothing or spend money on PDI here. It was we were going to spend 4.1 billion.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

Now, I think the Senate's idea and the House's idea here is we're going to set a baseline that they'll work off of, but still to claim this is PDI is a little rich. Another 1.5 billions MilCon that's been planned for three to five years as stuff that was happening already. I appreciate that it's better... Hard to break it down. I'm hoping it's deployable air base sets for the Air Force. The kind of sets that you can put around Japan, the Philippines, Australia, maybe anchor them in Guam so that you can rapidly move Air Force squadrons around in a crisis or contingency and certainly, there's a little bit more money, as was mentioned earlier. Guam Defense System went from 100, which was at a zero, basically went from 114 The department asked for to 224 million, but of course, well shorter than the 350 million that PACOM asked for.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

And just to step back for a second and say, "We can do this." PDI is about Pacific specific procurement, things that are done specifically to help the INDOPACOM commander fight and win and things that she or he isn't getting from the services inherently and the EDI is a good reflection on this, the European Deterrence Initiative, which has spent about 25 billion over six years. They buy things like prepo army equipment, Abrams tanks, thousands of tractored wheeled vehicles. They're all stored in Europe. The army would've never bought that on their own and like, "Hey, where do we want to store these? We'll store them in Germany, the Netherlands and Poland." That is not an intrinsic army responsibility. So, properly DOD paid for it out of a centralized fund Overseas Contingency Operations, OCO.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

And in fact, up till last year, in fact even this year I would say, we spend more on things in EDI, true things in EDI than we do on PDI. So, despite all the lip service over the last seven years or nine years of the Pacific pivot, that whole time we've spent a lot more under all three administrations on very specific things the EUCOM commander needs to defeat Russia, which is important, but I'd say focusing two or 3% of the defense budget or actually in this case, really we're asking to focus 1%, seven billion focused on things the services wouldn't have bought for the Pacific. I don't think that's that hard an ask, but it

turns out it is because it takes leadership. So, what I expect to see next year is I hope INDOPACOM gives us an honest assessment, their tasks of doing it, doing about 60 days of what they need to fight and win to deter China and if we can't deter them, fight and win the Indo-Pacific.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

And then with that answer, the DOD does their own due diligence and provides a PDI that's a lot more like EDI. In other words, making services get things, procure things they weren't intrinsically going to do. Without OCO, that means services have to make other decisions to not buy things or you have to grow the services budget. The DOD would have to make a decision and then third, that would allow the Congress to do what it should be doing, which is actual oversight. Not complete rethinking, which is what Congress has to do almost every year when it comes to this issue because the department is not able to think this way. So, I'm hoping that's where we're heading on this. Again, a mixed bag in this NDAA because it points the way to the right answer, but gives a middling warm porge answer on the way there. Thanks, Riki.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Thanks, Mark. I really appreciate it. Well, it's my great privilege to introduce to you a former student athlete, a former football player, a football coach of over 40 years. In fact, the 2004 best coach of the year and I do want to mention that he started his career as a defensive coordinator. So, I know he is defensive oriented from the start and what better way to integrate both offense, defense, and special teams and have our head coach who is coaching this specific arena in missile defense and has led the charge for what we see in the NDAA. Team coach Tuberville. So, it is a great honor to bring forward to you the Alabama Senator. Coach, the floor is your, sir.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

Riki, that's pretty good. You did good. Hey, thanks for everybody being on. Can we get a few introductions here? Let's see who all's on, Riki.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Sure. Mark Montgomery, the former Rear Admiral of INDOPACOM, the J3. John Rood, the former Undersecretary for OSD Policy at the Department of Defense and Patty-Jane, who works for The Heritage Foundation as the Missile Defense Expert in Nuclear Posture. Those are your three that you are with.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

Good. Awesome. Thank y'all for being on. It's been a big week for us. I think everybody will admit that. It's been a big week for our military and I'm excited about the 2.7%. It ain't a lot, but at least it's some for a raise for our men and women who go out and do something that they probably can make a lot more money, but it is what it is and we won't thank them all for what they've done, but it was a fight. It's been a fight for the last four or five months about what's going on up here and of course, the Democrats, they're pushing money all other places and they kept us in suspense until the end, but I just got a few talking points I want to just read here real quick, so I don't forget anything.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

At the beginning of last century, our country invented the aircraft carrier, but due to a slow moving Department of War and Congress that didn't take innovation seriously, it was the empire of Japan that first used that technology on us. When people ask me why I'm so interested in missile defense, I think back to the hard lesson the United States learned 80 years ago at Pearl Harbor. That's why my number one priority this year was the NDAA and also before that, getting on the Armed Services Committee, which it's as hard a chore as anything and working with the missile defense system for Guam. I talked to Admiral, was it Davidson? When I first got here. I mean, well, first couple of weeks and he looked at me and said, "Coach?" I said, "What do you need?" He said, "We have got to get a missile defense system in Guam. That's our first line of defense," and then we had a changeover in leadership of Admiral Aquilino and he came in my office and I'd be dang. He said the same thing. "Coach, we got to have something in Guan. We've got to defend Guam."

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

And so from that day on, we started working on it and we started asking questions of every Admiral, every General, people not just in that command, but the other commands across the globe. China is often called a near-peer competitor. They aren't near-peer. They are a peer competitor now. We all, I think, would agree with that. I think that they're given a little bit too much credit sometimes, but again, we've got to consider that every day we've got to fight to keep one step ahead or two or three steps ahead and not be trailing. China's number one threat, which makes the INDOPACOM our number one concern, and the commander is our number one combat commander. So, when we went around, we asked everything we possibly could to find out as much about the system, why we needed a land-based system instead of one on a ship, there was a lot of great answers.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

And so at the end of the day, we did a lot of research on both to make sure that we actually needed to spend all this money in Guam itself. I didn't win a lot of friends on the NDAA we passed yesterday, but we added a half a billion dollars to the Missile Defense Agency directly. We added 195 million to the DOD's request for the defense of Guam, which also mandated a 10 year defense of Guam roadmap to be completed hopefully in the next few months. We fully funded the next generation interceptor, the NGI.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

Now, I'll say this and I'm going to probably have this one down and I'll just keep going for just a second and at least on an interim basis, Congress has clearly delineated... Is that how you pronounce that word? The roles and responsibilities of the various DOD stakeholders for space when it comes to space-based sensors and supportive missile defense.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

I'm going to keep asking questions. I've been traveling. The last month, I took a 27,000 mile trip. I went to Hawaii and visited with all the INDOPACOM commanders there. The people in charge, they showed us a plan of China, what they felt like China would do, what would be our reaction. Very interesting. Spent a day in Hawaii. Went to the Philippines, met with them in Manila, with some of the leaders there. They're scared to death, obviously, about the future. I didn't realize how big Manila was, 14 million people.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

The thing that stood out to me was that we cannot afford not to afford, fund our military the way that we have. We have got to continue to put money there and continue to make sure that our missile defense is strong because that's what's going to be so important in that area. I'm going to keep pushing our military for more killing machines and less bureaucracy. I've never seen the bureaucracy up here and if we don't cut some of the red tape up here, we are going to fall so far-

PART 2 OF 4 ENDS [00:42:04]

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

If we don't cut some of the red tape up here, we are going to fall so far behind China we can't catch up. Jinping and Putin, we want them to wake up each morning and look out the window and say, is this the day United States is coming? We have got to put fear in them. Right now, if you just talk to everybody around here, talk to commanders, talk to generals, talk to people on the ships that I've been on in the last few months. I mean, we seem to be fearing them more than them us. So we've got to change the narrative.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

Our Republic defeated fascism. It defeated communism, and it will defeat the authoritarians in China who seek to suppress free trade and free people throughout the world. But we won't defeat the Chinese by out-bureaucrating them. We're going to have to make sure that they understand that they're our number one adversary. They need to understand that that's what we're building for, and that anything that they do, we can answer and answer very quickly.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

So I believe in all my heart, that capitalism freedom will always be the end. Our nation and innovators, like the patriots working for the Missile Defense Agency will be instrumental in getting there. I want to thank all of you for working for the American people. Thank you for allowing me to be here today to talk about this, because again, it's been fun knowing that the game's over at this point, but really this is kind of like the first quarter. We won the first quarter. Now we got to be ahead at halftime and we got to keep rolling.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

In Huntsville we do a lot, and everybody knows that for missile defense, I've been to most of the defense contractors there, I've been to where we build a THAAD missiles down in Troy, Alabama, the Hell fire missiles that they build down there. It's amazing what we do just in the state of Alabama. And I know a lot of other people do things for a missile defense and things across our country. That's [inaudible 00:44:04] their country so great. But I think we're starting to open people's eyes. I think what Jinping is doing is starting to open people's eyes about what's really going on in the world right now.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

And I went and spent an afternoon with the Taiwanese president on this 27,000 mile trip and they're scared to death, and they should be because they took us out to see their microchip plants, and first class. And the thing about China, and I didn't know this, but China makes chips, but they make third rate and fourth rate chips. They don't make the high caliber chips that they make in Taiwan. And that's the reason Taiwan is so important to them. That's the reason they're important to us. They're building an \$8 billion plant in Phoenix, as we speak. They showed us the construction on it. The problem they're

running into is what we're running into with our manufacturing in this country. They couldn't find welders to work in Phoenix. So they had to train their welders and send them from Taiwan, and making big bucks. Now, this thing's going to cost eight times more than the plant in Phoenix.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

So there's a plan, you probably saw too, that I think Samsung's putting a chip plant in Texas, and that's going to be very instrumental to our country, to manufacturing, to building anything military wise. So again, I think we're on the right track. I think more people are starting to wake up to the fact that, hey, I mean, this is serious and we better take it serious. And just getting the extra 25, 26 more billion above the budget of President Biden. And that came from the democratic side as well. So they're starting to wake up.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

Now, you get outside that armed services committee and you don't see the same thing because they don't hear the classified hearings that we hear or just the open hearings, really. They don't pay much attention to it. But there's nothing more important than what we're doing in missile defense and everything that we're doing. So I want to thank all of you for being on and thank you for what you've done. And again, we'll be there for you. We're going to work hard. And hopefully when you get an opportunity to come by, I know Rick's been up here visiting and it's good to build all these relationships, but that's how you win. You get relationships, get people on the same page. And when you do that, it gives you a chance to be successful. One or two people can't do it, it has to be a lot of people. So thanks for letting me be on. And hopefully we can all visit in the near future.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Thanks coach, and your leadership bipartisan to make Guam not expendable, make it a US Homeland position. So China thinks that too, because they don't think that. And some of our military wants it to be expendable. We got to make that thing home. And you said it right, you led that charge and the urgency to put those resources behind that architecture's got to be right on this to make that happen in 25.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

And then the bigger picture is you put us in SM3 fblock, 2A, ICBM interceptors on land in our homeland. And that's going to be a little controversial, but that is what you have to do right now to deter and to compete and to win. And you're absolutely right. This is going to take a team across the board to make this happen and start to Guam. And you let that charge, sir. So I thank you for that. And I think we're right on the goal line on the two yard line to get that thing resourced, to get it happening. And then the bigger fight. And I think the bigger fight with you too, is do we integrate the offense with the defense there and a regional capability to create real deterrents, not just have defense separate. So I just want to pass that over to you, sir.

Senator Tommy Tuberville:

Yeah. We saw the area, we went to the area in Guam where they're going to put it and it's got a lot of work to do, but it's the first step and we just keep taking those. All right, guys, I got to go vote real quick. They're screaming at me. So thanks of your hard work. Let me know what else we can do, but we'll be working every day towards making sure we complete this thing. And plus anything else that we need to do in the missile defense system. It's so important to our future, our kids and grandkids and really us too, because we got a dangerous world we're living in right now. Thank y'all.

Mr. John Rood:

Thank you.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Thanks. So that was great. That was outstanding. He worked very closely with Senator Hirono. This is not a partisan position. This is a bipartisan position to go into Guam.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

I'd like to step back a little, there's a lot of things here to talk about, but I want open up the discussion. I'm going to draw back to our homeland defense capabilities. And I know, as John mentioned, that we have a window of NGI not coming into 28. What is our risk mitigation between now and then? I just want to throw that out there. I know the Hawaii radar's coming, but that's not coming till 28. What is it? And are we capable just on that NGI to go with our 40 interceptors without doing more than that to hold up? And then the bigger question is, do we start moving this into a bigger position than just North Korea? So I'll pass that over to John first and we go from there.

Mr. John Rood:

Well, that's one of the real concerns that I have is that the next generation interceptor program is meant to improve the reliability and the capability of our ground based defense for against ICPMs. But as you say, the target is to produce it by 2028. Our track record is a country of hitting that target has not been that great. So let's assume it will be later. 2029 or 2030. That's a long time from now. And that's a long time. Once you start deploying that, that doesn't mean you have a large capability, either. It takes time place, to complete the deployment of those systems.

Mr. John Rood:

So, you're talking roughly a 10 year period. I think that our gap of vulnerability is too large in that period because the threat is going to continue to grow. We have the means to do things like an underlayer using SM3 either land-based to protect parts of the United States or places that are distributed like Hawaii, and also to use our ship based assets as surge assets. But we have to spend the time and effort to integrate those systems into our force, make the command and control links, and adjust our sensor architecture so that it supports those better.

Mr. John Rood:

I was disappointed not to see that funded more in this budget. There's always a resource fight. But if you look at where we have been in the year over year erosion versus the threat in missiles, I just think we're not prioritizing that admission sufficiently. I was glad to see the Congress prioritize, for example, the spending for space based sensors. I think we've got to not only do space based sensors, but unfortunately, we have not begun the work for a space based interceptor that we really need to deal with these kinds of threats. So I would like to see us tacking more towards that level. It will require us to move faster than we have today.

Mr. John Rood:

Again, I think you got to of free up the Missile Defense Agency to have limber, nimble authorities, which are unencumbered by all these various things that have been put in place to constrain their ability to move fast. And then we've got to have the right, empowered leadership there to move out and get it

done. But if we don't do that, think of the alternative. The reason China, North Korea, Iran are featuring the production of new missile systems is because they see a vulnerability there. They're not investing the same funds in other areas. So for those that say would it really matter? Yes, it would. And these other countries are investing very heavily in their own missile defense capabilities. It's not just that they're pursuing offenses. They too are trying to catch up to us with missile defenses. And you got to have enough to protect your core locations where you can operate from, and you have to have enough that you can maintain a defense until the offense has time to kick in and [inaudible 00:52:35] your attackers, to put your attackers on their back foot.

Mr. John Rood:

And you don't have to have an Astrodome-like 100% capability to negate everything your enemy can throw at you, but you've got to have sufficient capabilities to deal with the first phases of conflict. And unfortunately, I was disappointed. We didn't invest more in some near term offset capabilities, but-

Mr. Riki Ellison:

I saw something in the slot, but for those 40 that are already in there, we got to get those things as best we can in that ability. But I also saw that the directed energy was taken away from R&E and given the MDA, which is huge. And we haven't invested in cruise missile defense since Airborne laser way back in early 2000s.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

But before, I want to go to Mark real quick and go at the deficiency that I saw on this budget was lack of [inaudible 00:53:26]. And what is that, that didn't seem to come across very strong in the NDAA. And I saw, we got a look at some over horizon radars there. I don't know if it's part of Guam, but why has that not been opened up when we know our bases around the world have this weakness right now and we're not addressing it. So I just wanted to see what your thoughts were on the cruise missile defense with the NDAA.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

Well, I'd say two things. One, we're not addressing the immediate issue, which is the gap. The Senate identified this four years ago, pushed him on it three years ago, the Army went and bought the wrong system two years ago, Iron Dome, and then last year admitted it was wrong. And then for just, I guess, smiles and grins, sent it to Guam to hang out for a few months in case there was a rocket or mortar attack on Guam.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

So, we don't have a short term defense capability of important against cruise missiles for Anderson, and Messawa in the Asia Pacific, and for Mildenhall at Ramstein in Europe. And that's a serious issue. I mean, you could, in theory, align all your Patriot missiles to do this. You'd have a very expensive system that is suboptimal, that would not be able to do explicit missile [inaudible 00:54:50] as well while it's doing it. And there's not near enough of to put around our air fields. We know we need a short or medium range air defense system. And the Army is struggling to get a system called [IFPC 00:55:07] into production.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

We're now at the point where the Army has procrastinated so long that really, realistically we need IFPC to succeed. And that's a bad bet. I just think, in general, betting on a system that's seven or eight years late, already, has got over budget year over year, and has lost the confidence at times of army leadership and the Congress. We're now betting on it to deliver. And maybe it will, but that's still three, four years away. And for really being thick in the force, maybe a decade away.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

So we do have a hole in our swing here on those cruise missiles. If you're in the Navy, you feel a little better, just get out to sea and then you have some defense capabilities, but don't leave your ships in port, because you don't. And if I was the Air Force, I'd be very concerned. My air bases are unprotected. So when you ask, how did we get to this? We got here because a service is not meeting its roles and responsibilities. And so we need to take a little look at this as a rules and responsibility study. That's called for as you know, MDA's looking at this. What's the way forward on cruise missile defense? Do you continue to invest in the Army, restoring itself?

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

And look, the Army did do this very well. In the 1980s, they were 20 plus batteries of Hawk and I Hawk, and there were [inaudible 00:56:37] systems [inaudible 00:56:38] serve other countries stationed all over Western Europe. The Army knows how to do this. They got this hole in their swing now.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

Or do we turn to other services to defend ourselves? Or do you turn to a third party like MDA to do it? I don't want to pre guess the final solution here, but that's something we have to worry about, think about. And it's one of the most important solutions, most important challenges facing the joint force as we go forward into the 2022 and the FY 2023 budget.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

I want to ask Patty-Jane, on the surveillance persistent from space all the way down. I know we didn't mention the E7s, but the overall in that budget to start looking at what those capabilities are, integrating sensor capabilities. You saw that over the horizon aspect. But that's also, and you mentioned very well in HBTSS. Where do you think we stand and how do we go forward with bringing that board to a more aggressive position? Yeah,

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

I think this NDAA puts us in a good place. I talked about funding for the HBTSS. Secretary Rood talked about full funding for the space development agency as well. And we talked about the importance of putting a full tracking layer up into space to be able to detect any missiles throughout the entirety of its flight and the importance of that for deterrence. And I think there's a lot we can do with it. I think HBTSS will be able to link those sensors, I think, to our shooters and increase the accuracy of intercept eventually as well. So I think that Congress and the department do understand the importance of space and we're moving out there on that.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

All right. Can we go back into Guam and the urgency of that? What is left to make sure this happens? Is it that study? And once that study's done, are we full go? Are the resources matching that study? And is there language to force this to happen quickly and not be delayed anymore?

Mr. John Rood:

Maybe I'll start. And Mark obviously will have a lot to say, which is it's a step that Congress took to direct not only a study and to describe the constituent parts, but also I think the key thing was specifying in IOC by 2025. So if you want to achieve that, that forces you to use more of the current systems than some new Greenfield type activity.

Mr. John Rood:

But while that's an important step that the Congress took, it just mandates a report. Number one, departments, no matter the administration are notoriously late on these reports. Secondly, it just specifies what their opinion is. And we'll see how strong the report is once it's done. But the Congress then will have to fund those activities in future years for them to happen. And it's really about, at what point does the defense department leadership embrace this as a key mission and make the trade offs necessary, because you're going to have to do something less elsewhere in order to do more here. But given the importance of Guam and what challenge we're up against, I think you can make that case.

Mr. John Rood:

And this is just the tough decision making that goes on on resource trades. And I do think there is some inner service rivalry, again at play that that happens, but you're going to need senior leadership to come in and tamp that down. It was note worthy to me that the Congress fenced some of the funding to the Cape, withholding 25%. That's a little bit of a message that that's who they think is apparently been holding up previous responses. So a little bit of a shot across the bow there. Mark.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

I agree completely. I'll follow up and I'll leave something for Patty-Jane too. I'll tell you, a couple things frustrate me on this. One, this is a time issue. Saying delivered by 2025 is different than being able to, and losing another year of not getting the full 350. We're really putting ... What we're going to have as an IOC in 2025 is a slightly improved version of what we have right now with THAAD, and Patriot, and probably a ship parked off the shore. But what I'm hoping is that they understand that they need to construct an [inaudible 01:01:22] fairly rapidly there. And they hint at the ... This isn't like two equals giving each other guidance, this guidance. This is like a parent giving a child some instruction. Like you'll do a study, you'll look at these six things, you'll do it within 60 days, and if you don't, we're taking away a bunch of money from people that we think are the source of the problem. That's generally how I talk to my teenager. Not how you have peers talk to each other.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

And look, it's deserved. Guam is us territory with 170,000 US citizens on it. Two critical facilities, Anderson Air Base and a submarine base. And logically, as a planner, and I was an operations planner for INDOPACOM for three years. The nexus of the second island chain support to fight into the first island chain and through the first island chain.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

And so we're not going to give up on Guam, despite a significant cruise missile threat, and therefore we have to plan for it. And the current THAAD Patriot system was really conceived about a North Korean threat some long time ago. This is really about China now and a whole lot of capacity, and a lot of cruise missile capability that can come land based, bomber based, ship based, and submarine based. So we're going to need to put a lot of cruise missile defense capability on the island. We're going to have to have high quality radars, good ballistic missile defense capability, eventually hypersonic missile defense capability, and a lot of shooters, and a network to control that. And possibly the same network could control US offensive fires going out from the second island chain.

PART 3 OF 4 ENDS [01:03:04]

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

... control US offensive fires going out from the second island chain from the Marianas and maybe the compact states, places like that. So to do all that takes investment now. We will overcome these inner service, whether or not it's going to be based on an Aegis, a shore radar, whether it's SPY-6 or SPY-7, who knows. If IBCS is functional, the Army IBCS system, it'll be interlaid on top of it to make the Army components even more effective enabling.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

So in the end, we're going to end up with a good joint force system. We just need to get over it, put MDA in charge of the architecture, and get it moving, and then understand that our 2025 IOC is an avert your eyes capability, that hopefully in 2027 is a robust capacity, just about the time I think we need to really be worrying about China and Taiwan.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

Yeah. And you know, I've been frustrated, similarly, with the obsession over getting this architecture reported and figuring out what we're going to do before we go do it on Guam. We've been studying for the last couple of years. And if the defense of Guam is so important, if it's so urgent, why don't we go start building an Aegis ashore on Guam? We know that we can do that. The Senate tried to put money in the NDAA last year for SM-3 ground-based interceptors for Guam, but then instead, Congress said, let's keep on studying.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

So if we're really serious, we would go start putting interceptors, sensors in there. We can do that, and then we can continue getting the architecture just right as we go along. And there was something in the NDAA about adding future interceptors that we develop to Guam. But yeah, point being, we need to get going and stop studying, get the report in and then move out.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Talking about study, when we refer to it, I think, especially you, John, this is a transition kind of budget. So we're waiting on a missile defense review. And that missile defense review, right now, doesn't have ahead of it because we're still confirming people to do it. And that missile defense review is really going to make a decision whether we're going to outpace North Korea or we're going to move in a direction of strategic competition on missile defense.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

So from everybody's perspective, I'll just go around the room, what's your perspective, looking out from this budget to the next, is the next budget really the truth of where the administration's going with this, or is it not on it? This looks like a hopeful... I'm looking at this budget and it looks like it's going that direction. I'm just asking, from your objectivity, what your thoughts are to follow on this.

Mr. John Rood:

Well, just briefly, I'll mention this is the first full year that the administration's been in office. And so the next budget that comes, well, really should reflect their priorities. To argue it won't I don't think is serious because after you've been in office for a year, you've formed an opinion about this subject. And so it'll be interesting to see where they're at. I'm hopeful that it continues the trajectory of up because you've got to keep pace or exceed what the threat is doing. And we haven't. We're living off the fruits of some investments that were made early on, where we sprinted to get ahead of the threat in the early 2000s. And then since then, we've watched our position erode, and we've let ourselves become much slower in responding and less efficient with how we're we're spending money.

Mr. John Rood:

Just witnessed this conversation about Guam. We should be moving out for producing an architecture, and we should have done that some time ago. And if it's not perfect, it can be improved upon. But one of the tactics that people that are generally opposed to an idea do is they argue for studying it more. And you study it more and you study it more, but you never actually pursue the activity. That's easier to say than, I disagree with defending Guam, or something of that nature.

Mr. John Rood:

So we've got to fight through that. But I'm hopeful that it continues that priority. And I'm not sure how you could explain. I'm hopeful that the missile defense review will recognize just the proliferation of these capabilities throughout the Indo-Pacific, but also in the Middle East.

Mr. John Rood:

I mean, it was noteworthy to me, when I served as under secretary for policy, that when we knew that Iran was going to conduct a military strike against the United States, in some way, of all their capabilities and all the areas around the Middle East where they could have done that, they chose to use missiles, ballistic missiles, and only ballistic missiles, to strike the United States. And that's because they felt that's where they had the primary advantage, where we didn't have enough defenses. And they didn't choose the bases that were defended with missile defenses. They chose bases that were not defended with missile defenses.

Mr. John Rood:

And to me, that's the clearest illustration that you don't have to have enough to negate the entire Iranian missile force, but you need enough to deter and defend against. And the same thing applies in the Pacific. And that's the capability our adversaries are futuring. We have to have a credible and capable response, and we've fallen behind.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

I'm going to go around. So the roles and responsibilities question that Congress has put in that bill, that's got to shape the MDR. I think that's done on purpose, to work with the administration and say, hey, we've got a problem here. And we've all mentioned that, on that aspect. Mark, you want to comment on it?

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

So you would hope it would shape the MDR, but I'm pretty confident the MDR is going to finish before the roles and responsibilities starts. So I support your logic, Riki. I don't believe the processes are married properly to do that. And probably, in roles and responsibilities, they're thinking about more than just missile defense. There's other roles and responsibilities in the force, particularly with the advent of Space Force now, and some changes at Cyber Command. There's some other issues that need to be addressed.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

But what I'll say is, you described the perfectly logical path. And so I will go ahead and bet a good chunk of my kid's 529 that doesn't happen. And I think roles and responsibilities will come second.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

We're well into the weeds over dollars and programs of missile defense, but there's a broader policy debate going on over missile defense that I wanted to touch on. We hear Russia and China claiming that our missile defenses are provoking them to build new offensive weapons. They want to talk about missile defense and arms control negotiations, and we even hear some proposals in the US to agree to limits on missile defense. So I'm really hopeful that the missile defense review will accept the importance of missile defense. We know that the NGI is critical for deterring, just outpacing the North Korean threat. And Congress understands that, as reflected in the NDAA bill.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

So I'm hopeful that we'll see a missile defense review that doesn't listen to what Russia and China are saying about our missile defense and will continue the long-standing bipartisan strategy to outpace the North Korean threat at minimum. And then I do think there's a conversation to be had about the role that missile defense could play in strategic competition with Russia and China as well.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

There's nobody better in the world that can answer that first question than John Rood, on what she stated on Russian and Chinese thinking that they're... This is forcing it. go ahead, John. That's a softball out of the park for you, so go ahead and address that.

Mr. John Rood:

Well, thanks for that intro, Riki. I can say I've spent dozens and dozens of hours across tables with Chinese and Russian officials on this very question. For example, this is not a new argument they make, that your pursuit of defense is somehow provocative. But it's preposterous, if you think about it. And having explained this to them at the table, they don't necessarily argue with you about it either.

Mr. John Rood:

For example, when I was in Beijing in the 2000s, in 2008, they said, you have sold missile defenses to Taiwan. That threatens our security. I said, well, as I said to the officials there and the generals, a missile defense system can only be used in Taiwan to shoot down a missile after you've launched one against Taiwan from China. And you have hundreds and are now pursuing thousands. Do you honestly think that you have some fear, some credible fear, that Taiwan is about to invade the mainland?

Mr. John Rood:

I mean, this is not serious. This is simply ridiculous. And they don't take issue with that or disagree with it. I mean, it's that they might mount a credible defense of the island, is the issue.

Mr. John Rood:

But the same thing with the Russians, bleeding, frankly, about, well, you might put defenses in places like Poland or in other locations in Europe. But there, again, no one, a credible person, thinks that those in some way threaten Russia's security, or that NATO is about to invade mother Russia or something silly like that.

Mr. John Rood:

So these are not serious arguments, but they are arguments more about they want the ability to threaten, they want the ability to hold those locations at risk, and they want the ability, should they choose to use force, for there to be minimum possible resistance. And again, this isn't something that you spend a lot of time with them credibly arguing the alternative. They don't disagree that you're providing defenses to others that could mount a credible defense, whether it's in Ukraine or what China's posturing to do in Taiwan. They want the ability to appear menacing and threatening with little resistance.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Thanks, John. Is there anything to follow on that? From another perspective, we did the policy NDAA, is there going to be some variances, do you think, with the appropriators matching these policies? We never see that the same, so I'm just going to spin it around a little bit and say, are the appropriators going to back what they authorize the budget.

Mr. John Rood:

The appropriators will have their own in views, and they always do. It's moved on, but as an example, in my time serving as a staffer in the Senate, nobody was using pencils anymore, but the appropriators, it was kind of a fun thing, quite a few of them would carry around pencils in their suit pockets to make the point that whatever number I write down for you, I can just erase later and write down a new number, as sort of a badge of honor by carrying around a number two pencil in your pocket.

Mr. John Rood:

I think they will be influenced by the authorized numbers, but it won't be deterministic. But I think as much as the appropriators point out they're independent, they don't want to see a lot of extra headroom in the authorization bill. And there, I'm sure, have been conversations between the different committees to try to avoid that situation, that you've got empty or hollow authorized budget space. So I

don't think it'll depart radically, but I wouldn't expect to see it track exactly like what you see in the authorization bill.

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

Honestly, I just hope the appropriators get the chance to appropriate and that we don't extend the CR even further.

Mr. John Rood:

Yeah. And those CRs, it's hard for folks to understand why a delay is so damaging. But it is incredibly damaging. And it reduces our purchasing power enormously. If I were to take a back of the envelope WAG guess at it, I'd say probably takes away a quarter of our purchasing power simply by not getting our act together as a country and appropriating funds on time.

Mr. John Rood:

Because what you do in a continuing resolution is you issue thousands, and I mean literally thousands of instructions to programs and contractors and different elements in the department not to spend additional money. You delay the arrival of the money, typically, until several months into the fiscal year. They then rush, after spending lots of extra time administering for this freeze, to expend the money. And then they expend it inefficiently at the tail end of the year. And with all of that waste and time lost, you have real, real losses in the amount of purchasing power, which you really get for your money.

Mr. John Rood:

And so the one year recently, where we passed the appropriations bill before the end of the fiscal year, it made an enormous difference. Enormous difference. So that's what I'd love to see us get back to.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

I'll jump in on that. And Riki, I have to leave after this. But I'll say, I agree completely with what John said. But what I'd say is what has to happen, if we do a CR for the year, this February, we'll have already experienced the CR pain for six months. But on top of it, we have to make sure that when there's a list of anomalies, the Guam Defense System is one of them. Otherwise, there'll be no spending on it because of not putting it in previous bills.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

So it's a small amount, but you really need to get started so that you can do some of initial work. You'll lose another six months. And so we'll just have to stay on top of them and highlight the need, if we do head into a year long CR, that among the many, many anomalies that occur to get some program started, one of them is the Guam Defense System, one as needed.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Mark, we're going to wrap up now, so why don't you do a closing perspective of what this was about and certainly the NDAA, from your perspective, after our discussions here, to wrap this up.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

Sure. Well, it's great to hear everybody else's opinions, John, and Patty-Jane, and certainly Coach or Senator Tuberville.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

This is a serious issue. And the delays going on in this... The only beneficiary of the trepidation and procrastination is China. And they know that. They study our say/do mismatch more than anybody. We say a lot about missile defense. We say a lot about Guam. We do very little. We need to match the rhetoric of the INDOPAYCOM commander, which is that things are getting worse, the timeline for China potentially doing something serious is getting closer, with investments that deter China, and if deterrence fails, allow the joint force to defeat China.

RADM (Ret) Mark Montgomery:

Guam defense system, and more broadly, the Pacific Deterrence Initiative, are critical elements of that. So we need to end the procrastination and get moving. But thanks a lot for the opportunity to talk, Riki.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Thank you, Mark. Patty-Jane?

Ms. Patty-Jane Geller:

Yeah, not much to add. This has been a great discussion. We're all highlighting the urgency with which we need to move forward. The China threat isn't going to wait for us to study and to build new missile defense. Congress is supportive. Just hoping to see budgets that reflect the importance of missile defense, and as an addition and a strategy in the MDR.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Thank you, Patty-Jane. John?

Mr. John Rood:

All I'd say is our enemies will not wait for us. And we've just got to get moving out here. The tide waits for no man, as the British would say. So thanks a lot, Riki, for having us all on.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

Yeah, thanks, John. And just from my perspective, over the past 20 years, I'm seeing a departure from a Korea-driven missile defense of our country to something much bigger. This is the first time it's actually being put on paper, being funded by bipartisan and by the administration, to do the actions which include the Guam defense, which include the roles and responsibility, which include space directed energy space. So you're seeing a shift, and the shift has started, and it is documented, and this will go forward. So I think we're in a good place. Obviously, we need more resources and we need to be much more efficient with what we've got than what we are today to fight this fight.

Mr. Riki Ellison:

So I think it's a good story. I know there are things that are not in it, but it's pretty big, and that MDR is going to be important. Next year's budget is going to be important. Bipartisan leadership's going to be important. But the signal that the SecDef and the president writes on that line item, on Guam defense, that, right now, sends a deterrent issue right now to China. And that's where we got to start. And it's great to hear Congress, the people, stand up and say, we want our homeland defended. We see the threat and it needs to be defended and deterred.

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2021

Mr. Riki Ellison:

So thank you for a great conversation. I appreciate it. It was an honor to be with all of you. Thank you and have a great day. And Merry Christmas, happy holidays to all.

PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [01:21:02]