

## COALITION FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE PANEL

[BEGIN FILE]

### FRANK GAFFNEY:

[NOTE, MICROPHONE IS WEAK FOR FIRST MINUTE OR SO] )Okay, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for being here. The appointed hour has already come and slightly gone. We're going to get underway. My name is Frank Gaffney. I'm the president of the Center for Security Policy. And we are very pleased to be sponsoring, among other organizations represented here and a great many who couldn't be here, a tremendously important initiative we believe. We call it the Coalition for the Common Defense. It is an effort made up of people who have expertise in national security matters. Both because they have formerly worn the uniform of the United States [UNCLEAR] senior military capacities. Or because they have held senior positions in the civilian arm of the United States government [UNCLEAR] national security. Or they have been deeply immersed in these issues in the public policy arena [UNCLEAR] government or they are activists from the Tea Party Movement or other entities that are deeply [UNCLEAR] that all of us have a stake in whether the country is, as it has been for many years, secure. At a time when the world is becoming vastly more dangerous and the likelihood that any insecurity on our part will translate into harm to our interests or our people or our country. So with that as sort of the general proposition, which is captured in a joint statement of principles, which I think you all [UNCLEAR] have received, and which you can find if you are seeing this on the web at [forthecommondefense.org](http://forthecommondefense.org). A new website that is trying to help provide a platform for individuals who are working in this space [UNCLEAR] displace what they are doing in their own right, but rather to simply make that work more accessible, more impactful, at a time when, as we are about to hear, it is vital that the American people be made aware of what is in the offing, what is at stake, and what could be the repercussions if we get this wrong. And I'm very pleased to have as our kickoff speaker in this regard a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee who represents the people of Virginia's fourth district. Who has become the chairman in this Congress, we're very pleased to say, of the Readiness Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee and who has been both in the minority and now in the majority one of the most trenchant, thoughtful, articulate, and we think correct legislators when it comes to national security matters. I want to welcome Randy Forbes. Thank you so much for joining us, Congressman. [APPLAUSE]

### REPRESENTATIVE RANDY FORBES:

Well, thank you, Fred, so much for what you're doing and for allowing me to be here. Thank all of you for being here. I know how demanding your schedules. I have about five minutes to tell you what I think is probably the most important thing that any of us can do in the next four to five weeks. And that is to try to turn around this debate on defense. And if I could begin by just telling you a couple of observations that I think you'll find to be true, the first one is wherever I travel in the country today, I find people either asking me one core question or I find that they have thought about this question and asked and answered it themselves. And it's simply this. Is the future of American optimistic or is it pessimistic? Most of you, truth be known, you've asked that same question yourself. You just don't know totally what the answer is. And I sit back and I wonder how in the world did the greatest nation on the face of the earth get to a point where our citizens had to ask the question whether our future was optimistic or pessimistic? I think, in large measure, that answer may be asked and answered for us literally in the next several weeks in what we determine what we're going to do with the national defense of this country. The other observation that I would offer you is I was at a dinner with eleven other members of Congress about a month ago and all of them actually were somewhat supportive of

cuts that they were going to make to the Department of Defense and to the military. And it came to me and they looked and they said what do you think? And I started reeling off to them what it was going to mean to defense. And literally to say like they were a deer caught in the headlights would be an understatement, but one of them, a dear friend of mine, looked at me and he said, Randy, we thought somebody was looking after all of this. And making sure it didn't happen. Now that would be comical, but I will tell you every single day I will have a member of Congress or some American somewhere or an admiral or a general who sits down beside me and says, we thought somebody was looking over all of this. They think somehow magically there's a room with all these computers in it and all these great thinkers and somebody's sitting around and saying, you can play all you want out there, but once it gets to destroying the defense of the country, somebody's going to push a button and say, no, you can't go past that. And when they finally realize that's not true, it horrifies them as it horrifies me every single night. Because if we head down the road we're heading down now, I would suggest to you that we're going to wake up and say, I thought somebody would have the sense to look at all of this and not allow this to happen.

If you look at the cuts that we see that are on the horizon, the Armed Services Committee staff has done a tremendous job over the last six weeks in trying to compile data that we just can't get. I mean, it's very difficult to get it. And I'm going to just give you—in the two or three minutes that I've got, just kind of a couple of those pictures and then I want to tell you something that I think we can do in the next several weeks to help turn this around. If these cuts go through that we're looking at—now, let me back up before I do that and tell you one other thing. If I were going in a department store to buy a gift for somebody, it would make sense that before I walked in I would say, how much money do I want to spend on this gift? And then I'd walk in and I'd try to look at gifts that would match that budget that I had set for myself. That's if I was buying a gift for somebody. But if I was trying to defend a nation, it's kind of foolish for me to use the same approach that I would use to buy a gift. If I'm trying to defend a nation, I better start with a strategy and say what's the strategy I need to defend this country? What do I have to have to defend the country? And then I better go find the resources to do that or at least ask this question. What's the risk that I assume if I don't do it? Just yesterday, I had an ambassador sitting in my office. And he was talking about decisions that they had made in their country based on platforms and forestructure and other kinds of things and at the end of it, I looked at him and I said, there's one big difference between your country and my country. Between your decision making process and my decision making process and I said, it's this. If you get it wrong, guess who your backstop is? And he looked at me and he said, you. And I said, that's right. I said, if we get it wrong, there is no backstop behind us. There's nobody we can look to and say, can you cover this?

And if we get it wrong, if these cuts come into place that we're looking at, one of the things that our projections suggest is that we are going to be moving not to three hundred and thirteen ships, which is the minimum floor the Navy has told us that we need, which we think is too many. Quite honestly, the Navy will admit is too few. Because you and I are living in the first time in our lifetime when the Chinese have more ships in their navy than we have in our navy. But we're going to be moving to two hundred and forty ships. The Chinese moving up and we're moving down. And just so you know, that would be the fewest number of ships that we have had in a hundred years. In addition to that, the Marine Corps would shrink to about a hundred and forty-five thousand people. That's the smallest Marine Corps number in fifty years. Our Army would be reduced by a hundred and fifty thousand people. That is less than we've had in a decade. And the Air Force would have only thirty-five percent of the fighters that we had in 1990. And they'd have one third of the fighters that we had—I mean, the bombers, that we had in 1990. Chinese today have sixty attack subs. We're going to drop below the forty-eight minimum that we thought that we had to have just to maintain what we needed. And already our combatant commanders will tell you we don't have enough subs to meet the requirements that they

need. In terms of missiles, the Chinese are continuing to produce a new class of ballistic missile subs in developing the sub-launched JL-2 missile to establish a sea-based nuclear weapons platform. And what's the United States doing? We're considering delaying procurement or reducing the number of higher-replacement submarines meant to replace our current aging fleet of ballistic missile boats. And General Breedlove said something incredibly important, Vice-Chief of the Air Force, the other day in a hearing before our subcommittee. He said, if the Chinese say they'll have three hundred J-20s in five years, they will have three hundred J-20s in five years. If we say we're going to have a hundred and fifty F-22s, we might get thirty and then we'll shut down the production line. For surface ships, China acquired two next generation guided missile destroyers last year alone. And they've got more under construction. And what are we doing? We're considering retiring some of our highly capable Ticonderoga class cruisers. China launched its first carrier and what are we doing? We are delaying one of ours and perhaps with these cuts we'll have to eliminate two entire carrier groups. Not just carriers.

But let's look just from a selfish economic point of view if we didn't do any more. Secretary Panetta said that these cuts will be 1.5 million jobs that are lost. Now, put a face on that. That's seventy-six percent of all the job losses in manufacturing during the entire recession. It equals—triples, the losses in the leisure and hospitality industry during the recession. It quadruples the losses in transportation and warehousing industry during the recession. And let's say Secretary Panetta is way off and let's take a third of what he said. And let's just say that he's off by two thirds. If that's the case and he's off by two thirds and we take the absolute lowest amount possible of job losses this is going to be, it will still equal all of the unemployed people in West Virginia, New Mexico, Maine, Nebraska, Montana, Hawaii, New Hampshire, Delaware, Alaska, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming, and North Dakota combined. But how are we going to cure that? We're going to give a forty-five hundred dollar credit for any employer who will hire all of these guys that are coming back. And you look at the employers and they just laugh at you and say, do you really think we're going to spend forty thousand or fifty thousand dollars to hire somebody because you give us forty-five hundred dollars? We will be eliminating more jobs than all those lost during the six worst months of 2010. And for our military, in wrapping up let me just tell you what it means for them. Thirteen percent of our war fighters will be pink slipped. One in four defense civilians will be pink slipped. We will have a spike in the unemployment for veterans. National average right now, a little over nine percent. But for Iraq and Afghanistan veterans, it's twenty-two percent already. For our wounded veterans, it's forty-one percent and we're breaking faith with the greatest military the United States has ever seen. Because we're going to have less time at home as services get smaller. The Navy has fewer ships to meet the requirements. Less funding for schools around military based families. They're going to have increased grocery bills as we see savings at commissaries slashed to fifteen percent. Cuts to morale, welfare, and recreation funding. And then, of course, you've heard of the fees for tri-care for life and retail pharmacy copay hikes. And they're even talking about a bracket-styled civilianization of military retirement.

Now, I give you all of that and I'm going to wrap up, but I just want to tell you this. When you ask that core question, is the future of America optimistic or pessimistic? I never like to quote these guys, but sometimes they're right. And the Chinese defense minister said, last year, something that we better pay attention to. He said for China to be great, they've got to have a strong economy and a strong military. And they can't have one without the other. I would suggest to you for American to be great, we've got to have a strong economy and a strong military. We begin to unravel one and we begin to unravel the other. Now, is there anything that we can do? Do we just sit back and wring our hands? Well, let me just suggest to you there is something we can do. We will have a resolution. It's called Strong Defense, Strong America. All of the subcommittee chairmen for the Armed Services Committee has endorsed this resolution today. We will be moving it on the floor to try to get signatures on it and try to get it brought up before the Armed Services Committee, which the chairman has said he's going to do as

quickly as possible. And then bring it to the floor. And it basically says this. It recounts how important defense is for the United States of America and if I could just paraphrase, it says, enough is enough. No more cuts to the military. We cannot balance this crisis on their backs. If you want to do something over the next few weeks, and we only have about a month, you can get as many people as you can to call as many people as they can and say sign on to this resolution so we can send a message to the super committee that we are going to make sure that America continues to have the strongest military in the world. And I wrap up by telling you this—I see my good friend Trent is here and such a good expert on this. Every night when I go to bed, every morning that I wake up and look in the mirror, the one thing that haunts me is that one of our Marines, one of our soldiers, one of our airmen, one of our sailors, will be somewhere someplace in the world and they will not have all the resources they need to keep freedom alive. I don't want them ever to be in a fair fight. I want them to be in a fight that we know that they are going to win. To a large degree, it's in our hands over the next several weeks. Thank you guys for what you're doing. [APPLAUSE]

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Thank you. Now with the signage probably in place, we're good to go. We've asked the indulgence of several of our other panelists to accommodate the vicissitudes of the Congress and as members of the House and hopefully of the Senate come through, we're going to try to accommodate their schedules. That brings us then to Congressman Trent Franks who has, as Congressman Forbes has mentioned, distinguished himself in his time in the United States Congress representing the people of the second district of Arizona, as one of the truly authoritative figures and driving forces on the House Armed Services Committee. While he is a senior member of that committee, he has elected to become the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution on the Judiciary Committee. And in that capacity is, needless to say, in the frontlines of freedom, and presumably will be able to shed some light on what we're talking about here and its implications for the survival of our Constitution. Congressman Trent Franks, welcome. [APPLAUSE]

**REPRESENTATIVE TRENT FRANKS:**

Thank you very much. Well, I know you know that people like me are always running and I want to assure you this is one—that moment that is not an exception. But I can't express to you how honored I am to be here with all of you because I have said it before that I believe that you are all the hidden frontline of freedom. I think you're that invisible line that nobody sees that is absolutely critical to the survival of freedom and I see so many friendly and familiar faces and I'm grateful to all of you. It's a terrible mistake to follow either Frank Gaffney or Randy Forbes. You all know that. And I'm going to try to avoid some of the amazing detail that Randy was able to express. In a fundamental sense, it's very difficult for people like me right now in the Congress because as many of you know, I'm one of the more fiscally conservative members of the entire Congress and people say, well, why does that all change when it comes to military spending? Why do all of a sudden, do you advocate the strongest military possible and say that defense cuts are out of the—they're off base? And I want to say simply that if a person cares about the economy, and I know Randy made this very erudite point already, if we care about this economy, if we want to see America be productive, it has to be in a secure environment. And I think all of us underestimate the reach of the American military across the world, how they're able to keep shipping lanes, to keep markets secure, how they're able to point to this nation being the most secure nation on earth where investment can be dragged from the four corners of the planet, I would just have to say to you that I think if we could only do one thing for our economy, if we could only do one thing as a government, it would be to keep this nation secure and make sure our military was second to none in the world. So I start out with that and I can't thank you again—enough for your

steadfast dedication to the US Constitution and to making sure that common defense continues to be a focal point of everything that we do. And I'm grateful for your work, you know, on and off the Hill here, Frank, that's amazing. Despite the clearly written responsibility in Article I, Section 8, of our Constitution, all of you know that we're now facing a moment where we're in danger of gutting our military to the point of transforming the unipolar superpower of the world into a regional power. Depending on which tables are used, military cuts are ranging now—budget cuts, from three hundred and fifty to four hundred and sixty-five billion dollars over ten years. And to require armed forces to operate on a shoestring is not only unwise, it is a threat to both, again, our national security and our financial security.

Two airplanes hitting two buildings cost this nation's economy two trillion dollars. I don't know if there's a better example of saying that we could be pennywise and very pound foolish here if we're not cautious. The reality is that if maybe we had spent just a little bit more money on intelligence, maybe if our people could have had a little bit more resources, maybe 9-11 would have just been another day. Now, I know as young as I look, none of you think that I was around in 1980. But I was and if you'll remember back with me, some of you that might be able to do that, you remember the disastrous military event dubbed Desert One during which Jimmy Carter greenlighted a rescue mission to rescue hostages held in Tehran. Now what doomed that mission from the beginning was not the skill or courage of our men in arms. Nor was it the mentality of doing more with less. It—they were just asked to do things with a hollow force. And we saw a similar situation following the Clinton procurement holiday that left us unable to adequately respond even to the 9-11 attacks. Going to war in Afghanistan and Iraq with Reagan era platform weapons is what we had to do. As all of us know too well, those who do not learn from history, again, are doomed to repeat it. And I'm told in this place that the only thing we learn from history is that we don't learn from history. And it seems to be the case. Yet here we are with the probability of funding our military at levels not seen since before World War Two if you count it as a percentage of our total authorized budget. Now, I wonder, even in the times of 1939 when we were having, I know most of you don't remember that one, if we—when we were having difficulty financially, I suppose our entire focus was on that. And maybe that's we spent less. Maybe we just didn't have a GDP. But I wonder if, at the time we were ignoring our military if we realized that World War Two was at our door, I wonder if perhaps if we had had a stronger budget, maybe Pearl Harbor would never have occurred. I don't know, but I know that at least the question exists. Let me be very clear. The proposed budgets to the defense that are out there now will cripple our military and leave us with an impotent force.

With the passing of the Budget Control Act, Congress has taken the future of our military and national defense from the collective minds of five hundred and thirty five members and placed it in the hands of twelve, which is one of the reasons that I voted against the bill. Now, this I'm convinced that if this so-called super committee fails and sequestration is triggered, it will mean undoing the greatest military force in the history of humanity. And potentially the beginning of our financial ruin as well, because it's—of all the things that Randy said earlier about how military monies ripple throughout the economy, all of us know that if there's any government stimulus that does work, if there is, and I think the question's still a worthy question, but if there is, it's the military because we create our—I say military, I shouldn't say we, the military creates all kinds of ripples in our economy and the high paying jobs that result, the ancillary sciences that are effected, all of the things the military do, if there is any true stimulus that the government can make, it is to keep this country strong and to invest in the men and women who give everything they have for all of us. Not only do these cuts jeopardize our national security, of course they endanger our economy. Today, some would demand that those who selflessly do battle on behalf of all of us must find a way to do with even less. Not only is such a mindset shameful, it compromises our national security. It has been proven to be unwise in the past. And it is

sure to be unwise in the future. History reminds us again and again that a robust national security is critical to any economic security. You know, I just returned from Israel. And let me suggest to you that that nation feels under siege. And I think they have every right to. This administration has reserved more over rebuke for our most important ally for building homes in their capital city of Jerusalem than it has reserved rebuke for a madman like Mahmoud Ahmadenijad for building nuclear weapons to threaten the peace of the entire human family. Let me suggest to you that we are going to have to all pull together and make sure that not only do we fight in the next five weeks to make sure that we don't let these critical moments pass and see our military hollowed out, but we need to fight in the next year and a half to make sure that the next Congress and the next president understand some of the challenges that are facing us in the world. I have three year old twins and, of course, I waited a long time for them. They mean more to me than anything I can possibly express to you. And I know more than anything else that what you all do gives them a chance to walk in the sunlight of freedom and for that I thank you and I appreciate your time. [APPLAUSE]

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Thanks to the congressman and thanks to my colleagues for their patience. This is, as I mentioned, something that is going to be something of a moveable feast, so with the proviso that we may have other members dropping in, in which case we'll try to accommodate them quickly. Let me ask Tom Donnelly from the American Enterprise Institute to come forward and provide a little bit more of the specifics building on what Congressman Forbes described in terms of where we are already as a result of cuts that have been made in the United States military and what the implications for power projection, for presence, and international security will be both for our allies and ourselves should anything remotely like the sorts of additional cuts that are in the offing now be made. Tom Donnelly, welcome.

**TOM DONNELLY:**

Thanks very much, Frank. And I'm just pleased as punch to be here and thankful that Frank has helped take up this cause. Before I give you a few more facts and figures, I want to emphasize Frank's initial comments. This is, at this point, really a political question, even a moral question. It's—the problems that the Defense Department faces are beyond what any wonk or expert can possibly solve. The gap between what we're asking our men and women to do and what we will continue to ask them to do and the number of them who do it and the resources that they have to carry out their missions is a gap that no efficiencies, no savings, no reforms, can close adequately. So I really do encourage you to take these comments and take the flag forward to try to get the results that both the congressman and Frank encourage you to do. Really, this is a question not only for the current moment, but for the coming presidential campaign. We'll have a chance to have a new commander-in-chief, but the question is whether the forces that he or she commands will be adequate to the task. This is a problem that is not beginning now. It's been a steady pattern since the end of the Cold War. After the success of the Cold War, the H.W. Bush Administration and then after that, the Clinton Administration, cut that Cold War force, which was already a small force by a third to forty percent. So in the 1990s, when all of us were enjoying a boom economy, the military gave back a trillion dollars to the federal government. Al Gore reinvented government by throwing people out of uniform and terminating weapons programs. When Barack Obama came into office in 2009, he asked Secretary Gates to terminate three hundred and thirty billion dollars worth of procurement programs. A year after that, Secretary Gates was asked to take another hundred billion dollars out of their program. The Budget Control Act as already passed is not cutting three hundred and fifty billion dollars out of the defense program, but four hundred and eighty-nine billion dollars. That's the target that people in the Pentagon are scrambling to meet today. It's

going to cut a hundred thousand soldiers and Marines off the rolls before the wars they're fighting are completed or done. And that's the launching pad for the super committee or sequestration. Or whatever it is that comes next. And the congressmen were quite right to point out what the consequences will be for the forces and for the services. But what are the consequences going to be in the world? We say it's a dangerous world. It's more than a dangerous world. It's not just a question of Iran's nuclear ambitions. It's a question of Pakistan's current nuclear capabilities and terrorist capabilities. Admiral Mullen finally awoke to the danger posed by the Pakistani security services as he was leaving office. Both the congressmen mentioned China's rise. What are they spending that money on? They're spending that money on anti-ship ballistic missiles and attack submarines. These are not systems that will secure international commerce. They can only be used to threaten it or to threaten American capital ships. It's a very dangerous world. And absent what America does, not only for ourselves, but for the entire world, it's going to be a much more unstable, uncertain place, not just for commerce and trade, but for people to move and for us here at home. And for the interests that Americans of both parties, presidents of both parties, since 1945 have always striven and gone to war to protect. So we really are at one of those infamous crossroads moments. I went to pundit school. I get the license to use the term crossroads. We are at a crossroads. We're beyond the crossroads in my judgment. And unfortunately, we're in the dark. And the things that we're groping for are going to hit us before we understand what's happened. I encourage you all to take this message away. All of us have lots of further data. I'm not going to inundate you with more stats and figures. But really, this is the time to make your voices heard. Not just to stop what could be happening or could be about to happen, but actually to reverse the course that we have been on for too long. Thanks, Frank. [APPLAUSE]

#### **FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Since he mentioned that he went to pundit school, I didn't meant to give short shrift to Tom's very impressive CV. Let me just mention he is currently the Director for the Center for Defense Studies at AEI. Author multiple times over, including with another distinguished pundit and strategist, Fred Kagan. Also served up here in the House Armed Services Committee on its professional staff. And with the US/China Economic and Security Review Commission. Editor at *Armed Forces Journal*. Otherwise, a guy you need to pay attention to. To get a perspective from those who are now serving or have served, I'm very pleased to be able to call on a leader of the retired military community. He is retired Rear Admiral Jim Carey. He serves as the chairman, the elected national chairman of the Flag and General Officers Network. In the course of a long and distinguished career, starting as an able-bodied seaman and ultimately achieving the rank of rear admiral, he held seven different commands and has served now with particular distinction leading up an organization with some thirty-two hundred retired flag and general officers, roughly half of all of those still alive. He speaks with authority and I know he speaks with conviction. Admiral Carey. [APPLAUSE]

#### **REAR ADMIRAL JIM CAREY:**

I'm pleased to announce I'm one of the living members. [LAUGHTER] Let me start out by just saying I fully support what the two congressmen said and what Tom Donnelly said. And in part that allows me not to have to repeat it. But some of the statistics and the specifics that they gave are exactly the things that worry me. I was going to point out with reference to Navy ships, I was in the Reagan campaign and then served in the Reagan Administration. Ronald Reagan had a saying during the campaign. Are you better off now than you were four years ago? That worked pretty well. I would paraphrase that a bit to say is the world a safer place now than it was at the end of World War One? Why do I choose World War One? Because at the end of World War One, the US Navy had two hundred and eighty-four ships. I know. I googled it. So in case any of you ask me. And as you heard Congressman Forbes say, we are

headed to two hundred and forty-some ships. Less than at the end of World War One. And my premise is, I don't think the world is a safer place today than it was at the end of World War One. If nothing else, there's a thing called nukes that we should be concerned about that they didn't have at the end of World War One. And we should be doing all we can to protect ourselves against them. So I would also say if we end up with sequestration and there's four hundred billion dollars jerked out of the Defense Department, I would suggest to you that's not going to be very well planned. And it would be like going into the church used clothing area and you see a loose thread and you pull it and both the sleeves fall off. That is about the kind of result that you can expect if you just rip four hundred billion out of the system. Let me throw out one other thing that I would like you to be aware of. Because I heard just the other day—it was in the paper, I don't remember who said it, but it was someone from the administration who said, we need to move the military retirement system closer to the corporate retirement system. Let me suggest to you that the current military retirement system has served our country pretty well for the last fifty years. Let me suggest to you that the civilian retirement system for, let me say a bookkeeper—a bookkeeper gets to play golf on the weekend. A bookkeeper who gets to watch his kids grow up and to be home with them. A bookkeeper who does not have to risk getting his arms and legs blown off or dying, a bookkeeper who doesn't have to look at his kids attending nine different schools in their K through twelve years. A bookkeeper that doesn't have to look at being away from his family one third to one half of his entire military career. You may be able to sell that to a bookkeeper as a good system. If you shift the military system to that, our kids and grandkids are not stupid. And they are not going to go out and risk losing arms and legs and eyes and their life for a system that is—that they could plug into that they could stay home. And be—and watch their kids grow up. So I will tell you all, as you watch this thing go through, that suggestion scared the hell out of me. And I would ask you all, keep an eye on that. That is not a good idea and it will not serve us well. And I would tell you to, if—to man the force, when the option is that they could stay home and be with their kids and pick up a set of golf clubs, many of them are going to go with that option. But with that, I would just tell you, I fully—I fully, one hundred and one percent, support this coalition and what it stands for and what it's trying to do. As the two congressmen said, as Tom Donnelly said, this needs our focus. We need to get behind this. Because this is scary, what's being talked about and it will do none of us good. Thanks much. [APPLAUSE]

#### **FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Admiral, thank you very much. We're going to come back to this theme of breaking the only military that we've got. As I know all of us have concerns on that score. But before we do, I want to address an issue that I think may explain at least in part why we're here. Why we're even having this conversation. I believe that is in no small measure because people who work in this complex and who more generally work inside the Beltway, have been convinced that the American people at large and most especially those who are most vigorously engaged in and helped determine the outcomes of some of the most important races in the last election cycle, are indifferent to what we've been talking about. That they don't care. That they are so preoccupied with red ink as a threat to our country and our way of life that they believe the United States military and national security broadly defined should be the bill payer for the reduction of our deficit. To address that proposition, I'm very pleased to have a valued friend and colleague, Colin Hanna, the president of Let Freedom Ring, an organization that he has created and has been a very influential force I think within our national polity, but specifically within the Tea Party community, to talk a bit about some surveys that he has had done for Let Freedom Ring, specifically to assess what folks in the Tea Party are thinking about some of these sorts of issues. He comes to this by way of both service as a county commissioner in Chester County, Pennsylvania and as a veteran of the United States Navy. And it is a pleasure to introduce Colin Hanna and have him present some important information. [APPLAUSE]

**COLIN HANNA:**

Well, I'm fortunate cause I'm short enough that you're going to be able to see some slides right over my head without any problem whatsoever. We're all familiar with the metaphor of three—of a three legged stool. The three legged stool of conservatism. And in this particular crunch on spending and the budget, we are encountering some three legged conservatives, some two legged conservatives, and some one legged conservatives. And the real question is, where is the single most potent new force in American politics, namely, the Tea Party? Is the Tea Party an ally of those who are concerned about these budget cuts that might visit themselves in the defense budget and weaken our military? Or are they an antagonist? The popular presentation is that the Tea Party is made up exclusively of people who are budget hawks, spending hawks, and therefore they will look at military spending as every bit as inviting a target as any other kind of spending. And as Frank, I think, has put it very compellingly, will they look at the defense budget as the bill payer for the rest of the budget or the place where the cuts can be most easily found? So I would like to begin, if we could have the slide—how are we doing back there, Tommy? [BACKGROUND VOICES] We do. [BACKGROUND VOICES] Okay, well. . [BACKGROUND VOICES] Okay, you tell me, Frank. I can come back when they get their problem solved?

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

I would like you to come back, if you've got the flexibility of [UNCLEAR]

**COLIN HANNA:**

I sure do.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

It's important to do this presentation properly. I've been told you were good to go. So--

**COLIN HANNA:**

[OVERLAP] Okay. No problem. But for any who do have to leave, let me just give you the conclusion in advance. And then we'll go through the data that support the conclusion. And the point is that the Tea Party, although by its own self-definition focused primarily, even for many perspectives exclusively on fiscal issues, is not antagonistic at all. They are in fact our allies. And that's the point that most folks have not seen or understood or appreciated. Here we go. Let's go—let's go back. All right. So the first question is, and the survey I'm going to show you is—the survey was done just a few months ago, and I'm going to give you virtually every question in two views. The first—or three views. The first view is likely voters. All of them together. And then we're going to break those likely voters into two groups. Those who self define as Tea Party supporters and those who self define as generally unsupportive of the Tea Party. And we've taken the don't know/don't cares out of that. So it's likely voters and then the two split. So the first question was, should the Tea Party maintain its focus on economic issues or broaden its agenda to include such issues as defense and foreign policy? When you look at the total likely voter number, about half say maintain its focus and only about thirty percent say broaden its focus. That's as far as most press coverage of this question has gone. This would document support for what you sometimes read when you see the Tea Party is only interested in fiscal issues. However, when you—[SLIGHT BREAK IN AUDIO] –how it plays out among the Tea Party supporters. So further

documentation that the Tea Party are our allies in this question. Do you think that there's a likelihood that agents of al-Qaeda or other jihadists have penetrated the federal government at the highest levels? Now we're dealing with some very sensitive issues. Overall, twenty-nine percent very likely. Twenty-three percent, somewhat likely. For fifty-two percent, a bare majority, who think that there has been some penetration. Break it down into the two and look at that. Seventy-five percent of pro-Tea Party and only fifty-two percent of anti-Tea Party. So there's further indication that the Tea Party gets it when it comes to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century threat to national security. And that is it. So those—those are the data that I think document that even though the Tea Party doesn't talk a lot about defense, they are in fact pro-defense, pro-strong military, and therefore our allies. So don't look askance at them. Don't think that they are the single leg conservatives who are only interested in budget cutting. They're on our side, even if they don't talk about it much. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Okay. We've been talking a bit about the political dimensions of this. Of course, we've had viewpoints expressed from those in uniform or formerly in uniform. As well as some of our analysts who have been looking at the implications of these troubling questions from a kind of, I would say, a political, strategic perspective. I want to bring another one to bear. Namely, the perspective of those who are currently involved in trying to insure that, as Congressman Forbes put it so powerfully, our men and women in uniform have the kit they need to keep it from being a fair fight, let alone one they would lose. Ah, I was just getting teed up. How pressed are you, congressman? [BACKGROUND VOICES] You've got five minutes? All right, great. Then I will press on. I'd like to introduce Cord Sterling who is a vice-president at the Aerospace Industries Association. Cord is a former Marine and worked on the other side of the House, the Senate Armed Services Committee, as I did, fellow alumni. I want to also mention that he was a military adviser to the chairman of that committee. A man I served under as well. Congressman—Senator John Warner. Cord has a very important story to tell about the future availability of the industrial base necessary to provide for the common defense and we're glad to have you with us here, Cord. Thanks so much for coming. [APPLAUSE]

**CORD STERLING:**

Thank you, Frank. And Tom, it's good to see you again. Tom and I were colleagues. He was on the House, I was on the Senate. So we conferenced a lot together. I didn't have a prepared statement. Wasn't going to go into much detail. Except Frank asked me to give the perspective of what we've been looking at. We've had a number of conversations over the course of the last several months on what is going to be the long term impact of these cuts should they go into place. We know part of them will and it's whether or not the rest do that are equated to the sequester. AIA has approximately three hundred and fifty members. These are the large air, space, and defense companies. The Aerospace Industries Association. That's an easy way to look at it if you think of Boeing, Lockheed, and Northrup. But in reality, what we consist of are about one million members of the US manufacturing workforce. These are high skilled, highly capable, scientists, engineers, skilled technicians. These are skills that do not get created overnight. But they can be lost overnight. As we look at our initial estimates of what will happen if these cuts go into place, we will lose, out of a workforce of approximately one million, at least a third to a half of that workforce could be lost. It really all depends on how these cuts are implemented as they go forward. But if you look at the traditional way in which defense has broken up the spending between the procurement and R and D accounts, you look at the personnel accounts, if you equally distribute those cuts across the accounts, the impact on the industrial base—and this is a very fragile industrial base. This is not the industrial base that Eisenhower talked about. This is one that after the cutbacks of the 1990s, you had a great deal of consolidation where we went through roughly a

hundred and thirty large prime contractors down to where you're now looking at five prime contractors. But you also have a very—I'm going to call it an at risk, a very capable, but it is susceptible to downturns. This is the supply base. These are areas—companies, five, ten, a hundred people that are within them that are really niche providing key capabilities to whatever your system is. Whether it be an aircraft carrier, whether it be an aircraft, a land system. Information technology system, a satellite. These workers are those that are producing the equipment that the armed forces are using today. If the cuts go into place as they're currently projected, we could lose a great deal of those workers, many of those companies, key sectors of the aerospace and defense community. If that happens, we will find ourselves relying more and more upon overseas—our competitors today, but our counterparts, whether they're in Europe or elsewhere.

I think some of you may remember about ten years ago, we had lost the capability to produce TNT. One of the most basic of all elements. If you're looking at the military. We had lost that capability. The reports went out that we were going to buy it from China. Created such an uproar, stepped in and it took a considerable cost, but the Army recreated the capability down at Radford Army Ammunition plant. That was an easy one to recreate, though expensive. There are other key technologies that are in there today. When you look at what we are dealing with. That if we lose those, we're not going to be able to recreate them overnight. We will be forced to rely upon others. When you look at what happened to Britain when it downsized its armed forces and it downsized its navy and its ability to produce things as simple as submarines, they had us to rely upon to retrain those skills. If we lose our capability, if the United States loses its key cutting edge, technological leadership, who will we rely upon in order to relearn that capability should the budgets ever be restored? We can't rely upon the Europeans or the Chinese. We can't be sure that they will have the capability or that they will even teach it. We must remain—we must continue our leadership. We have started our second to none campaign. Because our industry, our capability is second to none in producing the best systems for the best armed forces. If we are going to continue that, we need to have the predictability, but we need to have a sustainable level within the military in order to insure the industrial base and in this case the industrial base is that one million workforce, has got the systems to work on, that they are employed and that they continue to be employed. So with that, thank you very much. [APPLAUSE]

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

We now have two members of Congress and Congressman Lamborn who arrived first is kind enough to yield to his colleague from Georgia, Congressman Paul Brown. He represents the tenth district of Georgia. He is a medical doctor. A man who has served both in the Marine Corps and in the United States Navy. He is on the House Homeland Security Committee, which brings another dimension to the larger picture we're talking about here today. No less important, obviously, for the overall security of the American people, but also under assault in ways that we're going to hear from him about. Suffice it to say that there are few members of the Congress of the United States who have for longer been more closely associated with fiscal discipline than Congressman Brown. And it's very much appreciated to have him come and bring his perspective on why this is a place where being penny—well, I call it pennystupid and pound insane, [LAUGHTER] is not consistent with his constitutional responsibility. Congressman? [APPLAUSE]

**REPRESENTATIVE PAUL BROWN:**

Insane is correct, Frank, and I believe in the Constitution as our founding fathers meant it to be. Which means that my job as a member of Congress should be a part time job. I should be coming up here periodically to make sure we have a strong national defense, make sure we have a strong national

security. In fact, I carry a copy of the Constitution in my pocket and our founding fathers enumerated the powers of the federal government. And defense is the most critical, national security is the most critical functions of this government. So going into sequestration where defense and homeland security both are going to be cut markedly is totally against the best interests of this country. Frank mentioned that I was in the Marine Corps. I am a Marine, though right now I'm in the Navy reserve. I'm a lieutenant commander in the Navy reserve. General Malakoff's currently seeing patients out at the Naval Academy in the primary care clinic there. And the reason I got back in the Navy reserves is because I do believe in a strong national defense. I believe in, as a Marine, that I want to do my duty to support this country. And I'll do everything as a member of Congress to do so. The founding fathers believed so firmly that the powers of government are very few and limited as James Madison said in the *Federalist Papers*, in that they wrote the Tenth Amendment. They said, by golly, we mean it. If a power's not specifically given the federal government by the eighteen things, article I, section 8, that we're supposed to be voting on, eighteen things. If it's not prohibited from the states Those rights that are reserved for the states and the people.

We've put in place a form that is going to be disastrous for this country. In my opinion, we don't have enough Marines. We don't have enough brigades in the Army. We don't have enough ships in the Air Force. We don't have enough wings—I mean, enough ships in the Navy. And enough wings in the Air Force. We need to be building our military, not tearing it down. I know as I talked to Marines and sailors in my capacity in the reserves, as well as serving as the congressman for Fort Gordon, Georgia, at Eisenhower Hospital. Our military is stretched to the limits. Families are being destroyed because of multiple deployments and our military is tired. Tired in the personnel, tired in the equipment. We need to be spending more on the military which is the constitutional function of the federal government under the original intent. We need to secure our border, Frank, because that's a national security interest also. It's absolutely critical. We've had four presidents. Two Republican and two Democrats that haven't wanted to secure our border. We need to do that. It's absolutely critical for the safety of this nation. On the Homeland Security Committee, I can tell you that we have people coming across the border both north and south that want to harm us. They want to destroy everything that we believe in. They wanted to kill Americans. Why? Because they hate our freedom. They hate the principles by which this country was founded. So coming to sequestration and making these marked cuts, in the constitutional function of the federal government, it's absolutely critical that that not happen. The super committee needs to take into consideration how critical a strong national defense, national security, border security, dealing with them, illegal aliens in this country, is today. The American people want us to stop spending the outrageous sums that Congress has done. And both Republican as well as Democrat, that you all have been doing.

I introduced a balanced budget amendment to try to hold Congress responsible and presidents responsible. It's the strongest balanced budget that's been introduced in the last Congress and as well as in this one. We've got to stop the spending, but going down this road that the House and Senate have put forward with a super committee and sequestration is insane in my opinion. That's the reason I voted against that bill. It's absolutely critical for you, for the American citizens, all across this nation, to contact their congressman, their senators, and say we cannot go down this road. We cannot destroy our military. We cannot destroy our border patrol. We must secure the border. We must do what's absolutely critical to keep this nation free. Solve it fiscally, but secure militarily. And that's what Frank and this is all about. And I appreciate all of you all being here. I appreciate you all's fight for the future of our nation. Because that's what this is all about. We're really standing on the edge of a precipice, staring down in a deep dark chasm of socialism here as a nation. And the question is, are we going to jump off or be pushed off? Are we going to turn around and march up the hill of liberty here in America? And I think the American people want to turn around and march up that hill. It's absolutely critical for every

voice to be sounded all across this land saying we must have a strong national defense. We must have a strong effort to protect our borders and to stop this invasion that's going on today. And I'll do everything I can to try to sound that trumpet and I encourage every one of you and every person across this land to sound that trumpet. Because the future of our nation depends upon it. Thank you all so very much. God bless you. [APPLAUSE]

### **FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Thank you, congressman. Congressman Doug Lamborn as I mentioned is also with us. He is a member of the House Armed Services Committee. He chairs the subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources of the House Committee on Natural Resources. He formerly served in state government in his native Colorado. He represents the fifth district in this body and was both in the House and Senate in the state of Colorado. It's terrific to have you with us, Congressman Lamborn. A great champion, particularly of some of the aspects of national security that are being most seriously debilitated at the moment, notably missile defense and our deterrent. Congressman, thank you. [APPLAUSE]

### **REPRESENTATIVE DOUG LAMBORN:**

Thank you, Frank. And thank all of you. This is an important initiative that you're promoting, Frank, so thank you. Thank each of you for your interest and your dedication to our nation's defense. And I'll go Paul Brown, a friend of mine and colleague I admire, one further. It's not just our nation that's at stake. I think our world is at stake. We live in a dangerous world. And the US is the best force for good in this dangerous world. And if American values and Western Civilization values erode because we have less vibrant and robust military, then I think that that's bad for the entire world. So thank you for inviting me to be here. One other position I have on the Armed Services Committee that I need to mention is I am on the subcommittee for Strategic Forces. Which has to do with our nuclear missile defense and space missions. So I'm very—and I'm from Colorado Springs, Colorado, where there are five major military installations. So these are issues that are near and dear to my heart. Like Paul said a minute ago, Congress's first constitutional duty is to defend our country. So let's get back to sensible fiscal policies, but not sacrifice our national defense. And we can and should do both.

So I will take it upon myself as my mission to educate my fellow members, whether they're liberals, conservatives, Tea Party members, moderates, whomever. And I will educate them on the importance of these issues. Some really don't have the window to look in on these issues that those of us who are on the Armed Services Committee have. You know, we'll hear daily classified, unclassified what's going on in the world and the state of our military and what the needs are going forward. And a lot of members don't have that and so they really don't know how critical and how finely balanced the future of our military really is. Unfortunately, the Obama administration has repeatedly turned to the armed services for where to cut first. And that's been a pattern for two years and eight months now. And there are liberals in Congress who enabled that perspective and go along with that. Domestic spending increased by nearly twenty percent in the first two years of this administration, but military budgets were cut by about half a trillion dollars. Now, it depends—the exact dollar amount depends on what baseline you're starting from. Especially for future amounts. So we have to be—there may be a little discrepancy there. But that only—that depends on where you start as a baseline. The Obama administration wants to cut another four hundred and seventy billion dollars over the next ten years and all of that was sort of baked in the cake, unless we have any changes or reversals, before the super committee was ever formed. Now with the super committee on top of all that, we could have a cut of up to half a trillion dollars again in defense if the 1.2 trillion dollars in savings is not met. If it's partially met, that would be proportional. But if that's not met at all and with a six-six Republican

Democrat breakdown on the committee, that is entirely a possibility. So even though defense is less than twenty percent of the overall budget, it would get forty percent of the sequestration cuts. Once again, that's out of proportion. These put vital missions such as nuclear forces and missile defenses at risk. Specifically, cuts would undermine the only missile defense system that protects the homeland by delaying the ground based mid-course defense return to flight program.

The proposed cuts would significantly delay the achievement of the European phased adaptive approach. Which in it—in itself, when first proposed by president Obama, that is the second—the second approach, the first one under Bush had the third site in there. You may remember that. That's already gone. That was the only capability in the European phased adaptive approach that would have protected the US homeland. But by getting rid of the third site and sort of jilting some allies in the process, we have a more limited European system. It's still better than nothing. It's still a good thing. It's still worth pursuing. But even that now runs the risk of being delayed and capabilities being undermined with these kinds of cuts that could happen with sequestration. We would be delaying upgrades to Navy ships needed for missile defense and cuts in procuring the standard missile three interceptors needed by various combatant commanders. So that bodes ill for missile defense. With nuclear deterrence, there is also a bleak picture should sequestration happen. The triad, the nuclear triad, which defends the US and thirty-one allies, becomes seriously undermined. Some people are talking about a diad. I don't know if you talked about that earlier, Frank, cause I missed the—most of the program cause I was in an amendment markup process in a committee that I had to be there for recorded votes. But if you have a diad, if you get rid of one of the three legs of that three legged stool, it's—it really puts our nuclear deterrence at risk. It's easier to target from a—by an adversary. If you only have two of the three out there. So this—the kinds of things that are happening with sequestration are horrible should they take place. We would be reducing modernization and sustainment of the current fleet of Minutemen 3 ICBMs. There are about four hundred and fifty ICBMs on alert today. But we could cut a quarter of those if sequestration takes place. So three things could happen in particular to our nuclear deterrent. We would have less early warning about a nuclear missile launch. Some of that has to do with erosion of satellite capability. For the first time in seventy years, allies and adversaries would question our ability to provide a nuclear response to an attack. And more about that in a moment. And our ability to defend against incoming missiles is degraded – excuse me, is degraded. Now shrinking the US nuclear umbrella, I referred to that a minute ago, that promotes global instability. It's a classic case of being pennywise and pound foolish. Although I guess you would phrase it slightly differently, Frank. But nevertheless, that's true.

Other countries, if they question our nuclear deterrence, our nuclear umbrella, because it's shrinking, they would have incentive to go develop their own. That promotes instability cause more countries are out there developing an active nuclear program. And to the defense workforce and industrial base, I heard about that just a few moments ago, jobs would be destroyed, jobs would be cut. The Armed Services Committee expects at least twenty-five percent of the civilian workforce to be furloughed if this sequestration takes place. And according to Secretary Leon Panetta, at least a million jobs would be lost. He calls this a doomsday mechanism. So in closing, deeper cuts to our military would be so detrimental to our national security it's horrible to contemplate. There's no doubt that we can find efficiencies in a large budget like the Department of Defense has. And I am a fiscal conservative. But we don't want to cut capabilities. That's what I'm concerned about. Not just—let's find efficiencies, yes. Let's make procurement work better. Let's save dollars wherever we can on less essential things that can be identified. But let's don't cut capability. So the choice between a strong military and a strong economy is not—they're not diametrically opposed. There's no—that's a false dichotomy to say you can't have both. We can and have had both in the past. So I will work with you together to make sure that we have a strong economy. Thank you for what you're doing. Frank, thanks for what you're doing.

[APPLAUSE] One more thing. I hope that a lot of you were last night at Frank's event, the annual Keeper of the Flame Awards Dinner. Were some of you there at that event? That was really a great event. I sure enjoyed it. And, Frank, you do great work with that also. Thanks. [APPLAUSE]

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

One piece of this story that I think is important to come back to is one we talked about at the top of the program. The prospect of breaking the military. As has been noted by a number of our speakers, it is the only one we've got. And the question of whether it is perishable in part depends on something that may be intangible or simply incomprehensible to those of us who are not in uniform. Who have not served in uniform. And that is the culture of the military. Its condition is perhaps as important to the willingness of people to serve in the kinds of conditions that Admiral Carey talked about. Let alone those that might be in prospect if they are improperly armed and facing far more formidable adversaries. No one has, I think, been tracking and warning about and encouraging steps to insure the culture of the military, certainly outside of the armed forces, more than our next speaker, Elaine Donnelly. She is the founder and president of a terrific organization known as the Center for Military Readiness, which she founded in 1993. She has drawn on the experience of that organization as well as that of her service on the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Armed Services. DACOAS, as it's been called. And I have really come to rely upon her as I think all of us in the Coalition for the Common Defense have to think through and help address this particular piece of the larger equation. And Elaine, it's great to have you with us. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

**ELAINE DONNELLY:**

Thank you so much, Frank. Actually, today, I want to talk about this super committee and how to survive the super committee. And I'm going to draw on the experience that I had as a member of a presidential commission on the assignment of women in the armed forces. In 1992, we worked for a full year. There were fifteen members. Kate O'Bern [PH] was also on the committee. When you're appointed to a presidential commission, there's no guidebook. There's really no one to tell you what to do and how to get from point a to point b. But I have to really credit Kate O'Bern for strategic thinking in a way that got us through some very difficult times. I'm concerned about this super committee because even though Leader Boehner, Speaker Boehner, did get at least a temporary victory, there was no increase in taxes in the process on the debt ceiling thing, however, the president may have outmaneuvered him on process. So I want to talk about this process these members have to deal with. It's an even number. Twelve. And the Republicans only have half. That means the quadrant that comes from the House, the members from the House, are reduced in the amount of influence they ought to have with the brand new Congress, the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress, they're only one quadrant, one part of four. Only one effector, [UNCLEAR] we'll call it. Somebody, if they vote for a deal that includes an increase in taxes, this would really put all the Republicans very much on the spot. This morning, Senator Kyl said in order to avoid a draconian doomsday threat we're all concerned about, it's important to define success. He said we want the committee to succeed, but he said, well, how do you define success? The media defines success as raising taxes. Okay? And this morning, Senator Kyl pretty much said, these Democrats are not very cooperative. They all want to raise taxes. And the media is on their side. So if they don't adopt a solid standard of review, which was one of the things we did on the presidential commission, we're going to see some tough—some very difficult times ahead. The principles that they need to adhere to, number one, they have to adhere to the US Constitution. They shouldn't recommend anything outside of that. And secondly, they need to affirm what all of us are gathered around a very simple statement. A strong military requires a strong economy. And economic prosperity depends on a strong national defense. You cannot—as Congressman Lamborn just said, you can't have one or the

other. This is—we shouldn't create false choices. A prosperous economy that's first rate requires a military that's first rate. And you can't have one existing without the other. So if the other side, these other segments on this committee, balks at these basic principles, and they start saying, well, we've got to have tax increases that go contrary to—I'm not talking about adjustments in the tax code that are reasonable, it may be necessary to discredit this committee. We faced a choice similar to this on the presidential commission on which I served. This super committee—it should not be given the aura of the final authority. Of being so wise and so smart in everything they're going to do that everybody has to bow down.

If that happens, there are two bad results that would happen. Republicans would be carrying water for bad policy. Either high taxes or drastic cuts to national defense. If either one of those happens and the Republicans have to be out there lobbying for it, it'll destroy the brand of the Republicans. So if the members go off on the wrong track and they define success in a way that is harmful to our economy, by raising taxes, or harmful to national defense—again, I think all of us here, we're all concerned about defense, but we also have to be concerned about taxes, the effect on the economy, cause we can't have a strong national defense if we don't have a strong economy. I think we have to consider that sometimes you have to pull the pillars down. And I said to Senator Kyl this morning, if things really get bad, if it really gets rough, you've done everything you can do, the opposition is not being reasonable, the media is on their side, they're cranking it out, they're issuing and leaking things to the media as we saw with another committee earlier last year, if all of these things start to happen, then you're going to have to bring the pillars down. You're going to have to discredit the committee before it hurts the Republicans. Before it has the Republicans doing the wrong things. Sometimes you have to blow something up. If the process is the problem, substance is important, process is important. We have got a very flawed process to deal with here. So when this happens, we all have to watch what Senator Kyl and the other Republicans do. And we need to lend support to them. So that we can somehow survive to the end of this year without doing harm to our economy or to our military. It's going to be a complicated process. It's not going to be easy. I gave him condolences for being appointed to this committee. But if we all work together and keep a strategic view in mind, I think we'll somehow all survive. Thank you.  
[APPLAUSE]

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

The hour is late and I appreciate everybody's forbearance. We've got three important presentations I'd like to ask your indulgence to make very quickly. The first signer on the statement of principles of the Coalition for the Common Defense, I'm very happy to say, is our next speaker Joel Arends. He is a captain in the United States Army and at the moment serving in the reserves. A combat veteran. Decorated combat veteran. Indeed, one of the fifty heroes in the global war on terror as recognized such by the Secretary of Defense in 2006. He currently serves and we've asked him to speak as Chairman of the Veterans For a Strong America, a new organization that we hope will be a very important element of the coalition and look forward to working closely with you, Joel, in bringing the voice of the veteran community to bear here.

**JOEL ARREND'S:**

Thank you, Frank. I appreciate it. [APPLAUSE] I hope to be very brief. My name is Joel Arends. I'm the chairman of Veterans for a Strong America. I also served in Iraq with the Army's First Cavalry Division from late 2003 to early 2005. I served as an infantry platoon leader and also as a company commander during my time there. And what's interesting what Congressman Forbes started out with today is he said, what kind of national defense do we want to have in this country? Are we going to

have the kind of defense planned around what kind of resources and what kind of economy we have? Or are we going to have a national defense based upon what the threats are? As a platoon leader, at the very most fundamental level of combat, we didn't—when I got a mission from my boss, we didn't devise our plan around how many humvees or how many M-16s or M-4s I had. We devised our plan around the threat and then went out and gathered the resources around there. We didn't always have all the resources we needed. But at the end of the day, a soldier, sailor, airman, or a Marine will do whatever it takes to help accomplish the mission. And so the first thing I want to talk about that we face with the specter of looming budget cuts is doing more with less. What we potentially face is a cut of two hundred thousand more troops from our force structure. That means doing more with less. It means soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines on the ground are going to have to bear a heavier burden. They're going to have to do with fewer replacements. Fewer and far between. They're also going to have to face the question of whether or not, because we're going to see a troop drawdown, or a reduction from forces, is they're also going to face the question of whether they'll be able to serve an entire career in the military.

You may have a platoon sergeant who's had fifteen years in the military fighting in combat right now wondering if when he comes home he's going to be able to make twenty years. Whether he's going to have a career. And so we don't need that kind of anxiety in the force. We need a strong, stable force prepared to serve a career. I mean, we're even—with these kind of personnel cuts, we are potentially facing bringing the draft back. And it's unacceptable to a career professional stable military. So again, we're doing more with less. The second thing I want to talk about is doing more with broken equipment. When I served on the ground in Iraq, I had a humvee that was built in 1985. Almost—and I served there in 2004. Number one, it's a testament to the durability of American military equipment. It's also a red flag. Not only do we have twenty year old humvees, we have captains in the Air Force, as late as 2008, who are flying airplanes that their fathers had flown before them. We have a United States aircraft carrier, the USS Enterprise, that's been sailing the seas since 1961. It's set to be commissioned here in 2013. We have an aging fleet. It needs to be replaced. It is going to take a certain amount of investment to do that. We will not be able to make any of those upgrades. In fact, we'll be drawing down two aircraft carrier battle groups in terms of the Navy as a result of these cuts. Now the last thing I want to leave you with is the fact—and Tom has mentioned this, Congressman Forbes mentioned this at the beginning, we are already going through the process, DOD is, of cutting four hundred and eighty-nine billion dollars out of its budget. Cuts have been made. Efficiencies are being found. We're at the bone.

The next question is, do we want to cut into the bone? Do we want to start that amputation process? To follow the analogy through further. And the answer is no. We can't afford it. Cause as Congressman Lamborn said, we're then starting to cut into capabilities. You know, I have three little children at home. And every night, the last line in our prayer is praying for the soldiers and sailors who defend America. We pray for America. And certainly what VSA will be doing here in the future is organizing and mobilizing a vast network of veterans around the country to talk to members of the super committee, to talk to members of Congress in their districts to insure that they're voting with the kind of defense not based around what kind of resources we have, but based upon what kinds of threats we faced. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

#### **FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Joel, thank you. It perhaps goes without saying, but I think it also is important to, at least, throw into this mix, the proposed cuts are going to create a lot more veterans and as Joel can attest, a lot of those veterans that we already now have out of uniform are unemployed. Many of them are homeless. Some

of them are in rather bad medical condition as well. We risk compounding that problem, in addition to all of the others that we've described, by taking people who are currently serving where we need them and making them no longer part of the armed forces. So this is another part of the story, Joel, that I hope you all will be speaking to in the course of the campaign that you're waging independently and together with us. I'm given to understand that we can get a very brief presentation from our friend Jim Martin who has also been very patient. Jim is a Marine, Marine sergeant, having joined the Corps at the age of seventeen at the tail end of the Korean War. He speaks for a great generation indeed. And—maybe not the greatest, but a great generation. Also served up here on Capitol Hill for the late Senator Edward Gurney both in the Senate and previous to that in the House. He has been most noted nationally for his leadership of an organization of five hundred thousand citizens of this country, senior citizens of this country, by and large. Members of the organization he chairs and leads brilliantly, Sixty Plus. Jim Martin. Thank you for being here. [APPLAUSE]

### **JIM MARTIN:**

I got to make this quick. Look, when I came to Washington—yes, I'm a former Marine. Always will be, obviously. I came here about fifty years ago. I felt that the government had two essential functions. It was my firm conviction that those two were to, one, defend our country, two, deliver the mail. Well, fifty years later, I think I'm a little bit wiser. And I think the government has one mandatory function and it sure as hell ain't delivering the mail. [LAUGHTER] You know, if they run the post office, our military like they do the post office, they may cut back national defense to five days a week. Look, I represents seniors all over the country. And I got to tell you, most of them are—served in the military or they're from military families. They've seen more war, more military tension than any other age group. And they know that we cannot—we cannot have less national security, if you will. My seniors—let me go to my military record a minute. You mentioned the Korean War. They called it a conflict back in those days, I believe. I served in the Marine Corps for six years on active duty. I'm from a military family. My kid brother left some of the family blood in Vietnam. He fought there for a couple of years. I have an uncle who was the bombardier on the Enola Gay. Colonel Ferebee. And so the military is rooted in my family very strongly. You know, we can talk about entitlements, but it's not entitlements I'm going to talk about today. It's a strong national defense. And, you know, catchphrases like Randy Forbes mentioned earlier, you know, we don't want to be—we're a world power. We're headed to a regional power. That's scary. I remember the phrase Peace Through Strength. Back in the old days. That's how you keep peace—peace. With a strong military defense. When I was a reporter here back fifty years ago, 1962, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee was a guy named Richard Russell from Georgia, a Democrat. We're non-partisan at Sixty Plus. We like Democrats as well as Republicans. That was a great Democrat. The chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, also from Georgia, Congressman Carl Vinson. Another great Democrat. They kept a strong military defense. It is a scary thought now what is happening to our military. The cutbacks that are coming, Frank, you know, the Marines can live with those, they always get hand me downs anyway, from the other branches, admiral. You know that as well as I do. But we do have to keep a strong national defense and by the way we do have about seven million seniors now nationally. Most of them are—have served in one branch or the other of the services and I got to tell you this, when I get out of here tonight, I'm going to be motivating those seniors, I'll just have to tell them what's going on. They're going to be calling House and Senate offices demanding that they—and, look, Elaine made a good point. The super committee, baloney. There's five hundred and thirty-five members of the House and the Senate. That's who should be arguing these questions. Not some super committee. The committee—the committee, the gang of six and the gang of seven and the super—nonsense. You got a hundred senators and four hundred and thirty-five members of the House. They're the ones that should decide these issues. Not some little group off to the side. And my seniors, Frank, and thank you very much for your leadership.

Tommy Sears has done a great job. Admiral Carey and I go way back. He said, we're getting old. No, admiral, we're never old. We're just older. Keep up the good fight. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

**FRANK GAFFNEY:**

Last and certainly not least, we're going to come back to a theme that Colin Hanna spoke of earlier. We're very pleased to have a national leader of the Tea Party Movement based here in the Commonwealth of Virginia. To talk briefly and in conclusion about this question that keeps coming up. Do the people who are now most active, most focused, most invigorated, to some most worrisome, in this country, namely Americans who have come together under the banner of the Tea Party, and for that matter, other Americans who, as Colin's data suggests, are sympathetic to the Tea Party but may not be formally members of it in a sense, are they prepared to have done to their national security what we've been describing is now in the offing? Scott Cooper is, among other things, the son of an old friend and colleague of mine, Hank Cooper, both of them, it's a father/son team here on the Coalition for the Common Defense. He currently serves as the membership coordinator for the Virginia Tea Party Patriot Federation. But also as a state coordinator in the Virginia for the Tea Party Patriots Program as well as the Coalition of Tea Party organizations nationwide. He's a man who takes this business very seriously. And I think it's important that we close the program with your thoughts. Scott, welcome. [APPLAUSE]

**SCOTT COOPER:**

I just want to say thank you to Frank for inviting me here. It's a real honor to be amongst so many distinguished individuals. You know, I was thinking a little bit about the Tea Party Movement and maybe many of you don't know what's going on within the movement. So I kind of want to end with an encouraging note. I know we have a clear and present danger with this issue. But first of all, I want to say I am a membership coordinator for the Tea Party Federation of Virginia and I'm a state coordinator for Tea Party Patriots. But one thing that is unique about us and you need to know is we're bottoms up. We're not top down. So I'm here as an individual. But what I want to say to encourage you is that we are engaged—while you may not hear about us, we're engaged at the local level, fighting to win local elections. And we want to build a base of individuals, citizen legislators, who are going to come to Washington in the future and lend support to those that are understaffed and undermanned here on Capitol Hill now. So Congressman Franks said a few minutes ago or at the beginning, he talked about cycles. He talked about the Carter administration. And he talked about the Clinton administration. Well, I think we're going to have a cycle where we turn back and we make our common defense a priority. So for the common defense. Tea Party is three fold. Colin talked a lot about financial. But we're for constitutionally limited government. Then we're for financial/fiscal responsibility. And then we're for free markets. And when you think about for the common defense, that is the primary issue that is laid out in the preamble of the Constitution. And we just celebrated Constitution Day. And I know for a fact that we handed out over a half a million Constitutions to citizens who are getting engaged in the process for the first time. So I believe there's great hope for our future. And if this is being recorded, I would just say go back to your home tonight, go on the website, [forthecommondefense](http://forthecommondefense), post it on your social media, send it out to your newsletters and encourage your friends to do the same. There's an action link on your website that tells us to do three things. And if we all do these three things, and then encourage our friends to do the same three things, we can get this message out and we can win this fight. One is to write the super committee. The other one is to write our own legislators. And then, two, host a meeting in your home or your hometown. Get your citizens--[FILE ENDS HERE]

**[END OF FILE]**