

Talking points
for
Congressman Joe Wilson
June 17, 2003
Minuteman Institute for National Defense Studies (MINDS)

National Guard and National Security points for review in preparation

Thesis: Congress intends to keep the Guard fighting alongside the federal military as a front line combat power, tasked, trained, and equipped for both constitutionally-mandated missions: State and federal; homeland security and national defense.

- I. We got it right in the post-Vietnam era: The federal military never should possess the capability for independent blitzkrieg warfare—The Minuteman must be part of everything America’s Army and Air Force do and this means true Total Force integration without Total Force absorption
- II. The National Guard Bureau has a critical function that cannot be absorbed into the federal military staff because of its unique capabilities, knowledge, responsibility, and mission: Congress will keep NGB, a vital partner in the Joint Force and specifically, the Chief of the National Guard as the single point of contact between the Several States and the Department of Defense.
- III. Homeland Security is a mission made for the Militia concept—the Guard will continue to be the principal force supporting the State first responders, and will be trained and equipped for this added mission as required...but not at the expense of the Guard’s national defense responsibility.
- IV. Congress will continue to meet its responsibility under the Constitution: The Guard will be trained, equipped, and ready to meet all enemies, foreign and domestic, and will continue to show the face of the American warrior in every community.

A few key elements for review:

1. Strong National Guard vital to health of strong America
2. Guard has become a necessary element of US combat power by design
 - a. Vision of the Founding Fathers written into the constitution
 - i. Small federal force and large mobilization force
 - ii. State and federal missions
 - iii. Essential to checks and balances inside every administration
 - b. Total Force Policy and Abrams Doctrine have not outlived their usefulness
 - i. Build a strong, front line combat power
 - ii. Never go to war without the Guard shoulder-to-shoulder with the federal military
3. Guardsmen work homeland security in the Spirit of the Minuteman – defending their own homes and businesses
4. Strong and engaged Guard has been a success story for over 30 years and the proof is in the results
 - a. Deploy for every collision between America and Evil

- i. Willing to pay the cost of freedom in overseas deployments and blood—just like the federal military
 - ii. That is the way it must remain—taking the battle to the enemy, anytime, any place
 - b. “Dime to the Dollar” economy for force structure in the Guard: The Guard is cost effective combat power
 - i. Secret of a mobilization asset—efficiency, stability, quality, seasoned professionalism
 - ii. Win the competitions in peacetime
 - iii. World’s best maintenance
 - iv. Master the toughest missions in combat
 - 1. Fly front-line fighters and bombers
 - 2. Tackle the most intensive Army challenges
 - 3. Critical to combat support and combat service support success
 - c. International engagement for creating sustainable democracy
 - i. National Guard State Partnership Program
 - ii. Stability forces in the Balkans
- 5. Troubling Trends
 - a. Rumor about confining the Guard to the States in the name of transformation and homeland security
 - i. National Governors Conference doesn’t agree
 - ii. TAGs don’t agree
 - iii. Congress doesn’t agree
 - iv. Constitution doesn’t really agree, either
 - v. Don’t think this will happen!
 - 1. Guard needs to keep one foot on Main Street and one on the Battle Line
 - a. Tasked, trained, and equipped as a part of all elements of the American military of the 21st century
 - b. There are good reasons (above) to integrate the Guard into all aspects of the federal military footprint
 - 2. Guard will not become a constabulary, relegated to crossing-guard duty...civilian first responders have that job
 - b. Total Force Policy is rumored to be dead...
 - i. We don’t think it should die...sounds like it is still needed!
 - ii. Since Melvin Laird invented the Total Force, Congress has had to protect the Guard and Reserve from misguided budget cutters, short-sighted force structure manipulators, and well-intentioned but uninformed federal visionaries
 - iii. And, what has changed? Very little...seems that Total Force Policy needs Congress
 - 1. For example, equipment cascading from the active military is still a trickle not a waterfall in most cases

- a. HWMMV is a good example—Guard warriors need the up-armored HWMMV in Iraq and Afghanistan, too!
- b. Can't cure these equipment problems by keeping the Guard in the CONUS—
 - i. In these terrible days, Homeland Security contains similar threats whether the homeland is Afghanistan or America
 - ii. Homeland Security forces are on the front line
- 2. The secretive environment during transformation of the Department of Defense has locked the National Guard Bureau leadership out of the deliberations and the results have been as you would expect—less than favorable
 - a. Rumors suggest the National Guard Bureau is fighting for its survival against the uninformed streamliners
 - b. Somebody just doesn't get it! The National Guard Bureau stays!
 - c. May need to break out the National Guard Bureau budget from the Army and Air Force—give the Guard the appropriations for procurement, construction, manpower, and etc.
 - i. Not the best solution
 - ii. Congress is searching for compromise
- c. Need to re-educate some about the grass-roots support for the National Guard and explain: the **Vision of Congress for the National Guard of the 21st century—Combat Ready, Community-Based, a partner in the Total Force**