



PROJECT REPORT MISSILE DEFENSE AND THE ROLE OF THE STATES

Project Overview

In September 2005, the Defense and Security programs of The Institute of the North (Anchorage, AK) and The Claremont Institute (Claremont, CA) jointly presented a briefing to a number of Adjutants General participating at the National Guard Association of the United States annual conference in Hawaii. Following this briefing, the two institutes designed a questionnaire to identify the levels of training and preparedness of state emergency response and defense forces to counter ballistic missiles, weapons of mass destruction (WMD), electromagnetic pulse (EMP) and other threats.

The questionnaire, titled *Missile Defense and the Role of the States*, was sent by both e-mail and surface mail to the Adjutants General of all 50 states and four U.S. territories. Follow up phone calls were made to each survey recipient to encourage their response, either electronically through a survey website (www.zoomerang.com) or by completing and returning the mailed questionnaire.

The Adjutants General of 26 states had completed the survey at the time of this summary.

Summary of Key Findings

Several key findings of the questionnaire stand out:

- None of the Adjutants General responding believed that their state was fully prepared to respond to an EMP attack, while 42% believed they were somewhat prepared.
- There was overwhelming agreement (93%) that the United States needs an effective missile defense system.
- The Adjutants General are unsatisfied with the Department of Defense's legal position that only the branches of the federal government, and not the National Guard, take the lead in developing a major response effort to a possible terrorist attack.
- Respondents strongly supported threat briefings to state emergency response agencies and planning groups.

Questionnaire Responses and Analysis

The first seven of 27 questions focused on the preparedness levels of state and military organizations to respond to traditional emergencies as well as emerging 21st century threats to the United States.

Respondents indicated that while they felt “somewhat prepared” or “fully prepared” to respond to natural disasters such as hurricanes, earthquakes, and fires, they felt far less prepared to deal with WMD/EMP attacks.

None of the Adjutants General responding to the survey said they were fully prepared to deal with an EMP attack.

A substantial majority (71%) believe that the Cold War doctrine of “Mutually Assured Destruction” no longer provides an effective deterrent. An even stronger majority (93%) believe that the post-Cold War proliferation on WMD technologies and delivery systems requires the United States to have an effective missile defense system.

The levels at which state military leaders had been briefed on specific threats varied substantially. A majority indicated that they had received some briefings or full briefings on missile threats from Russia (74%), China (67%), and North Korea (63%). But 55% of respondents said that they had received little or no briefing on Iran's growing missile program and 41% indicated that they do not receive briefings on these threats on a regular basis.

The questionnaire included attachments outlining specific threats created by China's growing military programs and by dangers related to an EMP attack. After reviewing these attachments, substantial majorities of respondents indicated some concern or high concern about these threats (China 81%; EMP 96%.)

Significantly, 63% of respondents indicated that their organizations had done very little or no analysis of the impact of an overhead EMP attack to potential targets.

The next eight questions addressed the role of the National Guard in developing and implementing responses to these new threats.

A majority of the respondents (59%) stated that they were not satisfied with the DoD's position that only the branches of the federal military, and not the National Guard, take the lead in developing a major response effort to WMD and EMP attacks.

Assessing their preparation to respond to a WMD attack, most respondents considered their organizations somewhat prepared or fully prepared in the areas of training, detection, equipment, and exercises/procedures.

A majority of respondents stated that they envisioned their state's National Guard having a role in the development, testing, manning and deployment of missile defense systems and preparation against EMP attack.

When asked their level of preparedness to deal with an EMP attack that could disable electronic infrastructure in their region, however, a majority (55%) responded that they had little or no preparation in the areas of training, equipment/EMP hardening, and exercises/procedure.

Most of the respondents (88%) stated they were somewhat satisfied that the current ground-based midcourse missile defense now being developed was a sufficient system to protect U.S. targets. But they strongly supported the

development of additional systems to provide a “layered” missile defense system with 54% calling for the full development of boost-phase defenses, 58% calling for full development of mid-course phase developments, and 65% calling for full development of terminal-phase defenses.

By similar majorities, respondents supported the development of ground-based systems (56%), sea-based systems (66%), air-based systems (70%), space-based systems (81%), EMP hardening of ground assets (63%) and the development of responses to EMP attacks of space assets (63%). A majority (59%) of respondents stated that they envisioned their state’s National Guard having a role in the development, testing, manning, and deployment of those systems.

The next five questions focused on political support and threat awareness in non-military areas of state governments. Some 92% of respondents stated that state emergency response commissions or similar planning groups should receive threat briefings in order to incorporate these threats into state emergency planning. The state legislatures of 46% of respondents had oversight committees which could play a role in developing both an understanding of WMD and EMP threats as well as protective measures and responses.

Almost all of the respondents (96%) were unaware of efforts to review state government investment portfolios to see if they were investing in securities of firms doing business in nations harboring international terrorists or supporting the proliferation of technology for weapons of mass destruction. None had been involved in such a review but 62% expressed interest in receiving information to support one.

Overwhelmingly, 93% of the respondents agreed that the United States needs an effective missile defense system and supported a layered defense.

The final questions asked respondents to express their interest in further information and involvement on these subjects. Of those surveyed, 58% would be interested in joining an ad-hoc working group to maintain awareness of these issues.

Policy Options for States

Based on the responses from Adjutants General to this questionnaire, The Claremont Institute and The Institute of the North suggest the following policy options state officials may consider to improve local, state and federal preparedness against missile attack or space-based EMP detonation:

- Arrange for regular classified briefings to be offered to the Adjutants General by representatives of the DoD, the Department of Homeland Security, and the congressionally mandated EMP Commission on the various threats posed by ballistic [and cruise] missiles, weapons of mass destruction and electromagnetic pulse attack.
- State policy makers, including governors, legislators and state emergency responders, should request regular unclassified briefings about missile, WMD and EMP threats.
- Direct state contingency planning and response drills by creating realistic scenarios that demonstrate the potential effects of missile, WMD, and EMP attacks to aid in state preparedness.
- State officials should take an active role in understanding, improving and expanding our national missile defense by promoting the completion of a layered missile defense system including space interceptions that would reduce the threat of EMP attack.
- State policy makers should consider further ways state agencies may be involved in increasing the national defense capability.

***STATE ADJUTANTS GENERAL
RESPONDING TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE***

Alabama
Alaska
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Delaware
Hawaii
Indiana
Iowa
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
Nebraska
New Hampshire
New Mexico
North Carolina
North Dakota
Oklahoma
Oregon
South Carolina
South Dakota
Texas
Wisconsin
Wyoming

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Claremont Institute and The Institute of the North wish to thank the following:

Major General Craig Campbell (AK), Major General Robert G. F. Lee (HI) and Major General Roger P. Lempke (NE) for their assistance in introducing their colleagues to this study

The Institute of the North and Claremont Institute staff members Mead Treadwell and Tom Karako for initiating the report, and Brian Kennedy, Ben Ellis, Matt Moon, Chris Nelson and Michaela Goertzen for their contributions and support

Members of the Independent Working Group

Members of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) attack



