

**Boeing Shareholder Meeting Question**  
**David Almasi**  
**Executive Director**  
**The National Center for Public Policy Research**  
**April 29, 2013**

My name is David Almasi, and I am representing the National Center for Public Policy Research – a conservative, free-market think-tank. I am a personal shareholder in our company. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today.

Let's face facts. President Obama was never a fan of missile defense. At least, not until lately.

Since taking office, President Obama's cancelled missile interceptors set to be deployed in the Czech Republic and two such deployments in Poland. He's downgraded the capabilities of what was deployed and he's cancelled a radar system intended for the Czech Republic.

Furthermore, the White House and Capitol Hill still lack the interest in reviving the SHIELD Act. This bill would charge the government with hardening our electrical infrastructure against the threat of a devastating Electromagnetic Pulse missile attack on our power grid. This is a particularly scary scenario since such an attack could easily be mounted from a ship in our currently defenseless Gulf region.

Yet, despite all of this antipathy for missile defense, Kim Jong-un's sabre-rattling in North Korea has suddenly brought the White House to the realization that it might be a good idea to rush 14 interceptors into service in Alaska.

Barack Obama's backhanded endorsement of missile defense leads me to my question.

We know that a strong missile defense strategy is the only way we truly keep our homeland safe from a missile attack. What is your "wish list" for meeting this threat facing our nation? What should we be doing? Where are we behind? What technology is available right now, or will be in the near future (with the proper support), to help protect our nation from attack?

In short, what does the White House need to know? What do the American people need to know?