

American Submariners Inc.  
4370 Twain Ave.  
San Diego, CA 92120-3404

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. Postage Paid  
Permit No. 445  
Chula Vista, CA



## *The Silent Sentinel*

APRIL 2009



### *Our Creed*

To perpetuate the memory of our shipmates who gave their lives in the pursuit of their duties while serving their country. That their dedication, deeds, and supreme sacrifice be a constant source of motivation towards greater accomplishment and patriotism to the United States of America and its Constitution.



# *Submarine Birthday Ball 2009*

*Silent, Vigilant, Dominant*



Doors Open 1700

**Location:**  
San Diego Marriott  
Hotel and Marina  
(619)234-1500

*(Be sure to Ask for  
the Sub Ball rate)*

**Tickets**  
\$55

**Uniform**  
Dinner Dress Blue Jacket  
Dinner Dress Blue/  
Full Dress Blue (optional)  
Covers not required  
Civilian: Formal Attire



Guest Seating 1800

### **Menu**

**Braised Beef  
Short Ribs  
or  
Grilled Chicken Breast  
Topped with Mushrooms  
and Roasted Garlic Sauce**

**Dessert**  
Brandy Snap filled with  
Custard Topped  
with Fresh Berries

**Guest Speaker: Admiral Kirk Donald, Director, Naval Reactors**

For tickets, contact your  
COB/CMC or  
SKC(SS) Mike Murphy at (619) 553-8729  
or ETC(SS) Nick Green at (619) 553-7757

Or send checks payable to  
Navy SubComm Birthday Ball

Submarine Squadron Eleven  
Attention: SKC(SS) Mike Murphy  
140 Sylvester Rd  
San Diego, California 92106 - 5200

## U.S. Submarine Veterans San Diego Base

**Base Commander**

Bob Bissonnette  
1525 Walbollen Street  
Spring Valley, CA 91977  
(H) 619-644-8993  
(CELL) 619-251-7095  
RBisson250@aol.com

**Membership -- Change of Address**

Ron Gorence  
2563 Roseview Place  
San Diego, CA 92105  
Home--(619)264-6995. Cell: (619)264-3327  
mgorence@yahoo.com

**Treasurer**

David Ball  
3804 Wildwood Road  
San Diego, CA 92107-3750  
619-225-0304  
davidball@cox.net

**Senior Vice Commander**

Bill Earl  
2251 Vancouver Ave  
San Diego, CA 92104-5350  
619-2804053  
dinkysan@yahoo.com

**Newsletter Editor**

Mike HYMAN  
3639 Midway Drive, B-320  
San Diego, CA 92110-5254  
Voice/Fax/Message: (619) 223-9344  
stamps@fortunesofwar.com

**Assistant Editor / Photographer**

Jack Kane  
619-602-1801  
jkane32@cox.net

**Junior Vice Commander**

Jim Bilka  
310 E. Bradley Ave., Apt 42  
El Cajon, CA  
92021-8929  
619-277-5758  
sashanman@yahoo.com

**Base Storekeeper**

Mike Hyman  
3639 Midway Drive, B-320  
San Diego, CA 92110-5254  
Voice/Fax/Message: (619) 223-9344  
stamps@fortunesofwar.com

**Chief of the Boat**

Fred Fomby  
858-735-0026

**Secretary**

Manny Burciaga  
8406 Alado Place  
El Cajon, CA 92021-2003  
619-921-5877  
MannyBurciaga@pointloma.edu

**Chaplain**

CJ Glassford  
4905 Coconino Way  
San Diego, CA 92117-2619  
858-204-8323  
"Cjmatlarge@san.rr.com

### The Silent Sentinel via Email

To all of my Shipmates and families who currently receive our Great newsletter via the mail who would like it sent via email or continue to receive it via mail, please fill out the form and mail it to the base or myself. We are trying to cut the cost of the newsletter down from \$3700 to about \$1900 a year. By receiving the Silent Sentinel via email will cut down the printing and mailing cost. The other plus to receiving it via email is you can save it on your computer and not have the paper lying around the house.

*A subscription to the Silent Sentinel newsletter will be available to surviving family members via internet email, at no charge, upon notification of the Membership Chairman. If a printed hard-copy is preferred, via US Post Office delivery, an annual donation of \$5.00 will be requested to cover costs.*

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

CITY/STATE/ZIP: \_\_\_\_\_

EMAIL: \_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

Would like the SILENT SENTINEL emailed: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

Robert Bissonnette  
1525 Walbollen St.  
Spring Valley, CA 91977-3748

USSVI Base Commander  
c/o VFW Post 3787  
4370 Twain Ave.  
San Diego, CA 92120-3404

**DUE TO LOGISTICS CONSTRAINTS, ALL INPUTS FOR THE SILENT SENTINEL MUST BE IN MY HAND NO LATER THAN ONE WEEK AFTER THE MONTHLY MEETING. IF I DO NOT RECEIVE IT BY THIS TIME, THE ITEM WILL NOT GET IN. NO EXCEPTIONS! MIKE**

### ***APRIL Meeting***

Our monthly meetings are held on the second Tuesday of the month at VFW Post 3787, 4370 Twain Ave., San Diego. Our March meeting will be on 14 April, 2009. The post is located one-half block West of Mission Gorge Road, just north of I-8. The meeting begins at 7 p.m. The E-Board meets one hour earlier at 6 p.m.

***Check us out on the World Wide Web***  
**[www.ussvisandiego.org](http://www.ussvisandiego.org)**

### **BINNACLE LIST**

*Ron Gorence* (intestinal surgery--Home)

*Richard Fullen* (recuperating in Santee)

*Mike Hyman* (Crohn's Disease)

*C J Glassford* (recuperating at home)

*Larry Freske*

*Al Strunk* (now recuperating at home)

*Bob Coates* (doing well at home)

*Mike Green's* wife received a condolence letter from National. He is fine. Verified!

*Dick Fullen*, unfortunately is back in the Nursing Home with Pneumonia. Seems to be doing OK, but is no longer recuperating at home. Can be visited/called at: Villa Monte Vista, 12696 Monte Vista, Poway, Ca 92064, 858-487-6242, Room 119. Dick's wife said he'd be pleased to see/hear from any of us.

*Tom Warner's* wife *Sherry* is finally back home recuperating after being seriously injured in a car accident. Tom and Sherry both thank you for the calls and get well wishes.

Submitted by Mike Hyman and Ron Gorence

### ***Submarine Losses in March***

Submitted by C J Glassford



SKATE (SS23) - 21 Men on Board  
Sunk, on 25 Mar 1915, Following Battery Explosion, Off the Coast of Honolulu, Hawaii : "ALL HANDS LOST"

SEAWOLF (SS28) - 23 Men on Board  
Foundered and Sunk, on 12 Mar 1920, Off Santa Margarita Island, California : "4 MEN LOST"

- PERCH (SS 176) - 59 Men on Board:  
Scuttled, on 3 Mar 1942, after Severe Damage suffered from Japanese Destroyers, Entire Crew ended up in POW Camp :  
“ SIX MEN DIED IN POW CAMP “
- GRAMPUS (SS 207) - 71 Men on Board:  
Sunk, on the night of 5 Mar 1943, by Japanese Destroyer, In Blackett Strait :  
“ ALL HANDS LOST “
- TRITON (SS 201) - 74 Men on Board:  
Sunk, on 15 March 1943, either by Japanese Destroyer or by Submarine Chaser, North of Admiralty Islands :  
“ ALL HANDS LOST “
- TULLIBEE (SS 284) - 79 Men on Board:  
Accidentally Sunk, on 29 March 1944, by Circular run of her own Torpedo, Off Palau, Islands :  
“ 78 MEN LOST - ONE SURVIVOR “
- TRIGGER (SS 237) - 89 Men on Board:  
Sunk, on 28 April 1945, by Japanese Patrol Vessel, and Coastal Defense Vessel, In the Nansei Soto Area :  
“ ALL HANDS LOST “



## *Membership Report for April '09*

**New Members:** Welcome Aboard to: Jerry Kochert of San Deigo, who earned dolphins aboard the USS Carbonero SS-337 in 1962; Michael Murphy of Bedford Hills, NY, qualified on USS Ulysses S. Grant SSBN-631 in 1991, and Joel Eikam of San Diego, qual boat USS Redfish SS-395 in 1951; Joel is our latest Life Member, #317.

**Status:** 331 members as of 3/15/09. Eight were dropped from active rolls for delinquent dues; late payment will affect continuous membership for HC induction, longevity awards, etc.

Our drive to increase Life Membership several years ago put our treasury into excellent condition but is now causing our main source of income to decrease each year. The SD Base now has only 77 Annual Members (22%) paying into the treasury. Honoring Holland Club Members with Life Membership was the right thing to do, but it also added to the problem of dwindling cash.

Future income from existing annual members (77 Annual Members X \$20) is expected to be \$1,540—compared to \$1,960 in 2008 and \$2,957 in 2007.

Any member able to donate any amount, any time, is invited to do so. A single yearly \$6 donation from each Life Member would surpass what we anticipate from dues alone and double our income. Make checks out to “USSVI,” in Memo space write: *Holland Club* (which has no other source), *Scholarship Fund*, *Welfare Fund*, etc., or just the word *Donation* and mail it to me or any Base Officer.

Note: Just received a \$30 donation from HC shipmate D. Hanley; thanks Dave, we'll put it to good use.

ABOI,  
RonG

## ***Election of Base Commander***

It's time again to elect a Base Commander. He is elected on the off-year from the rest of the E-Board, as voted on previously.

At our last meeting, nominations were opened and Bob Bissonnette was nominated for the position of Base Commander. At that point a call was made to close nominations, so nominations were closed. We will have another opportunity at our February meeting when nominations will once again be opened. You may than nominate the candidate of your choice. When all nominations are submitted they will be closed. Voting will take place after the nominations are closed. The candidate elected will be sworn in at our March meeting. Come to the meeting and cast a ballot for the nominee of your choice.

Thanks - Charlie Marin

## **Wheelchairs for Veterans**

Tom Warner, one of our members and also a member of *Knights of Columbus* wants us to know that as a Knight, he has access to some wheelchairs for veterans. The caveat is that the chairs have to go to veterans who need them for non military reasons (the VA will take care of them if it is military related injury).

If you or any other veteran has a need such as this, please do not hesitate to let Tom know. He may be reached at 619-884-8471.



A Belated Saint Parick's Day Greeting from Bob Bissonnette in Prudhoe Bay  
A Toasty 40 Degrees Below Zero

**Checking Account Balance @ 1/30/2009****\$3,575.13****INCOME for FEBRUARY 2009**

|          |          |          |
|----------|----------|----------|
| Donation | \$100.00 |          |
| Subtotal |          | \$100.00 |

**Membership**

\$735.00

|                                  |        |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Scholarship Income from 40/30/30 | \$0.00 |
| Donation                         | \$0.00 |
| Other Scholarship Income         | \$0.00 |

**Scholarship Income for February**

\$0.00

**Total Income for February (per Bank Stmt)****\$835.00****EXPENSES for FEBRUARY 2009**

|                                |          |          |
|--------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Membership                     | \$300.00 |          |
| Mid Rats (for January Meeting) | \$30.20  |          |
| Silent Sentinel Postage        | \$47.15  |          |
|                                |          | \$377.35 |

**Total Expenses for February (per Bank Stmt)****\$377.35****Checking Account Balance @ 02/26/2009****\$4,032.78****ASSETS**

|  |            |             |
|--|------------|-------------|
| Base Checking (02/26/09)                   |            | \$4,032.78  |
| Scholarship Fund Included in Base Checking | \$2,915.24 |             |
| Base Savings (02/27/09)                    |            | \$9,324.46  |
| Convention Account (02/27/09)              |            | \$23,447.77 |

**TOTAL ASSETS****\$36,805.01****Checking Account Balance @ 12/31/2008****\$2,474.68****INCOME for JANUARY 2009**

|                           |         |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Base Income from 40/30/30 | \$47.00 |
| Mid Rats                  | \$29.00 |
| Booster Club              | \$20.00 |

|          |         |
|----------|---------|
| Subtotal | \$96.00 |
|----------|---------|

**Membership**

\$1,975.00

|                                  |         |
|----------------------------------|---------|
| Scholarship Income from 40/30/30 | \$46.00 |
| Donation                         | \$10.00 |
| Other Scholarship Income         | \$0.00  |

**Scholarship Income for January**

\$56.00

**Total Income for January (per Bank Stmt)****\$2,127.00****EXPENSES for JANUARY 2009**

|  |          |            |
|--|----------|------------|
| Membership                                   | \$475.00 |            |
| Education Scholarship - S. Paniccia          | \$500.00 |            |
| Printer Monthly Maint - Imaging Technologies | \$51.55  |            |
|  |          | \$1,026.55 |

**Total Expenses for January (per Bank Stmt)****\$1,026.55****Checking Account Balance @ 01/29/2009****\$3,575.13****ASSETS**

|  |            |             |
|--|------------|-------------|
| Base Checking (01/29/09)                   |            | \$ 3,575.13 |
| Scholarship Fund Included in Base Checking | \$2,915.24 |             |
| Base Savings (01/30/09)                    |            | \$9,324.46  |
| Convention Account (01/30/09)              |            | \$15,381.77 |

**TOTAL ASSETS****\$28,281.36****NOTES to REPORT**

Scholarship given in August 2008 - cashed in January 2009

## Navy Inspects Damaged Ships After Collision

*Navy Times, March 23, 2009*

Navy engineering teams were at work Monday in Bahrain inspecting the damage to two warships that collided Friday in the Strait of Hormuz, hurting 15 sailors.

The fast-attack submarine Hartford crashed into the underside of the amphibious transport dock New Orleans early Friday morning while both were underway in the narrow waterway that connects the Persian Gulf with the Indian Ocean. Both ships arrived in Bahrain under their own power on Saturday, although Hartford transited on the surface. At the time of its collision it was at or near periscope depth, about 65 feet below the surface, the Navy said.

Navy photographs show severe damage to Hartford's sail, which cracked on the port side where it joins the ship's hull, apparently because of the impact and strain from colliding with New Orleans. The photos showed a decided rightward lean to the sail, plus damage to the metal and sensors along the leading edge, and a long scrape along its port side. The ship's crew sewed together vinyl sheets from the ship's galley to cover the sensors inside the sail, a Navy spokesman said.

Navy photos did not appear to show any damage to New Orleans above its waterline.

Cmdr. Jane Campbell, spokeswoman for 5th Fleet, had no new information about the ships on Monday other than inspectors were continuing to assess what kind of repairs Hartford and New Orleans will need. She could not say whether the damage New Orleans sustained to its ballast tanks affected its ability to ballast down for well-deck operations.

A Navy press release did say that officials believed the 25,000 gallons of diesel marine fuel that spilled from New Orleans had dissipated; patrol flights over the Strait of Hormuz found the slick had mostly evaporated.



The Navy has released no initial explanation for what could have caused the collision. It's possible Hartford was trying to hide under New Orleans to disguise its entry into the Persian Gulf, although unless that maneuver was coordinated in advance, New Orleans' crew may not have known the submarine was there.

The gator has no sonar with which to listen for submarines, said naval analyst Norman Polmar, and even if it did, Hartford is designed to operate quietly and avoid detection. He also said the submarine's crew members might not have known how close they were to New Orleans if the narrow channel was crowded with surface contacts.

## Navy To Begin Collision Investigation

15 On Attack Sub Hurt In Strait Of Hormuz

*By Steve Liewer, San Diego Union-Tribune, March 21, 2009*

Naval investigators are expected to begin their probe this weekend into the collision of two Navy ships in the strategic Strait of Hormuz early yesterday.

Fifteen sailors aboard the nuclear attack submarine Hartford suffered minor injuries when it collided with the New Orleans, an amphibious transport dock from San Diego that was on its maiden deployment, said Cmdr. Jane Campbell, a spokeswoman for the Navy's 5th Fleet in Bahrain.

Both ships were operating under their own power and were expected to arrive at an undisclosed Middle East port today, she said. The Hartford is based in New London, Conn.

The crash caused no injuries among the approximately 1,000 sailors and Marines aboard the New Orleans. But one fuel tank did rupture, spilling about 25,000 gallons of diesel-marine fuel into the sea, Campbell said.

Aerial surveys by Navy aircraft showed no visible evidence of the spill in the area of the collision, Campbell said, and the ship is no longer leaking fuel.

She said the ships collided on the eastern side of the Strait of Hormuz, a V-shaped passageway that connects the Persian Gulf with the Arabian Sea. About 20 percent of the world's globally traded oil passes through the strait.

The two ships were operating independently and both were preparing to make port visits when they hit each other about 1 a.m. local time (2 p.m. Thursday Pacific Time), Campbell said.

Families of the New Orleans' crew here in San Diego were notified soon after by the ship's ombudsman, said Lt. Cmdr. Brad Fagan of the Naval Surface Forces command.

The Strait of Hormuz is one of the world's narrowest and busiest seaways, with a shipping lane only six miles wide.

"Particularly at night, it is one of the most challenging places to operate a ship," said retired Rear Adm. Steve Clarey of Coronado, who commanded the Pacific Fleet amphibious forces during the Persian Gulf War.

Navy officials did not indicate the Hartford's depth at the time of the collision, although the newspaper Navy Times reported it was operating just below the surface.

Because submarines operate out of radio contact and are invisible to surface ships' radar, their commanders are considered responsible for avoiding collisions with other vessels when the sub is under water, said retired Rear Adm. Guy Zeller of Coronado.

"In a dense environment like that, it may have been difficult. There's a lot of shipping, and a lot of noise," said Zeller, who commanded a carrier battle group in the Persian Gulf during the "tanker wars" of 1987-88.

Collisions between Navy ships are rare. In 2005, two Virginia-based destroyers, the Winston S. Churchill and the McFaul, hit each other during an exercise near Florida. And in 2002, the San Diego-based amphibious assault ship Ogdan collided with a submarine, the Greenville, while the two ships transferred sailors.

## Pearl Harbor Shipyard Crew Responds To Sub Collision In Persian Gulf

*Honolulu Advertiser, March 23, 2009*

A rapid deployment team of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard engineers and mechanics flew to the Persian Gulf yesterday to support a U.S. Navy submarine involved in a collision there Friday.

"Our Shipyard Team excels at rapid response in situations such as this," said Capt. Greg R. Thomas, shipyard commander. "True to our legacy, whether flying to Guam or Bahrain to repair stricken submarines or responding to a mishap right off our coast, Pearl Harbor workers consistently adapt and succeed in any adverse situation."

The nuclear submarine USS Hartford collided with the amphibious transport dock ship USS New Orleans in the Strait of Hormuz early Friday morning. The 12 shipyard personnel will assess the damage to Hartford and begin in-theater repairs, officials said.

Additional shipyard personnel will fly to the region later this week. They will return upon completion of their mission.

The New Orleans suffered a ruptured fuel tank, resulting in an oil spill of approximately 25,000 gallons of diesel fuel, the Navy said. The propulsion plant of the submarine was unaffected by the collision, officials said.

According to the Bahrain-based 5th Fleet, 15 sailors aboard the Hartford were slightly injured but able to return to duty. No injuries were reported aboard the New Orleans and both ships were operating under their own power.

Oil prices reversed course and traded higher last week on the news of the collision in the Strait of Hormuz, the portal for about 40 percent of all seaborne traded oil last year.

Shipyard personnel routinely deploy throughout the Asia-Pacific Region for engineering, maintenance and repair missions, officials said. In addition, rapid deployment teams respond to incidents such as the Hartford collision.

A shipyard team deployed to Bahrain on short notice after a Japanese oil tanker and the submarine USS Newport News collided in early January 2007.

The circumstances surrounding the Strait of Hormuz collision are currently under investigation, the Navy said.

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard is the largest industrial employer in the state of Hawaii with a combined civilian and military workforce of about 4,700. It has an operating budget of \$620 million, of which more than \$390 million is payroll for civilian employees.

## Shipyard, Guard To Receive Stimulus Funds

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard will use the money to repair berths and modernize buildings.

*By Dennis Hoey, MaineToday.com, March 24, 2009*

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard will receive nearly \$25 million in federal defense stimulus funds to repair berths and modernize buildings.

Members of Maine's congressional delegation made the announcement Monday, noting that the funds are part of the \$787 billion American Recovery and Reinvestment Act passed by Congress last month.

In addition, Maine's National Guard will receive \$1.1 million for repairs to aging properties.





Camp Keyes in Augusta, the Houlton and Portland armories, and the Guard's Bangor training site will get new windows and doors, boilers, a heating system upgrade and insulation.

"These projects will create jobs and improve facilities important to our national defense. At a time when Maine needs jobs, this funding is very welcome news," Rep. Mike Michaud, D-Maine, said, in a statement.

Michaud said the stimulus package included \$7.4 billion in defense-related funding or about 1 percent of the total.

Most of the projects nationwide will focus on making improvements to military installations, hospitals, child development centers and housing for troops and their families. Some of the funds will go toward caring for wounded soldiers.

Debbie White, spokeswoman for the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, said the funds will be used to repair submarine berths, as well as modernize administrative and training buildings.

"This is great news for the shipyard and our surrounding seacoast communities," White said. "These dollars will be used for repair projects that will upgrade key infrastructure and increase energy efficiency."

According to the Department of Defense, Maine projects receiving funding include:

- Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, \$24.4 million
- Camp Keyes, \$555,000
- Portland Armory, \$304,000
- Bangor training site, \$205,000
- Houlton Armory, \$42,000

## Remembering USS R-14

*From Jay Thomas, Assistant Director, Museums and Collections Naval History and Heritage Command*

In response to numerous inquiries about the sail rigged on R-14 for its wind-powered trip in the Hawaiian Islands, the following information may be of value. The expression of interest stems from the Submarine Research Center's article in *American Submariner Magazine*, Volume 2006, Issue 4, page 21. Records of the exploit are scant and contradictory, however, much can be gleaned from the only picture taken of the boat under sail. This photograph accompanies the article. Having said that, the analysis in this bulletin needs to be considered as somewhere between after-battery conjecture and Sherlock Holmes deduction. Comments are invited on the information provided.

When examining the photograph several details should be noted:

The photographer stood on the boat's port foredeck just forward of its gun. Visible on the conning tower are its two port side deadlights and above them its masthead light. Behind the two left-hand figures are the periscopes and behind them is the billowing sail.

The first note of interest pertaining to the sail itself is its convolution. That is, the sail is convex or blown toward the camera. The sail seems to have a deep curvature and is not dimpled by the extended after periscope. The top of the periscope's window faces forward and seems to be unencumbered by a jury-rigged block for top hauling a riser. The sail is in two colors with each panel having been carefully cut to fit a designed pattern. The sail's clew (loose, leeward bottom corner) is hidden behind the elbow of the figure in the foreground. The sheet for the clew most likely runs aft to one of the boats stanchions.

Above his head is a sharp point in the sail suggesting a tack point for the sail's bridle, which was made from the gun's ram rod. It appears that the sail is extended slightly to port which means the boat is taking the wind from its starboard quarter.

R-14's sail is not a standard spinnaker, but most closely resembles one. The spinnaker is normally used on the foremast of a center line rigged schooner or mast of a sloop to capture light wind on a quartering tack. It requires a tall mast and free forward travel because its balloon shape is delicate to handle.

Many cursory explanations of the R-14's sail have it anchored to the periscopes. The photograph suggests otherwise. Since the sail is aft of the periscopes and is convex in shape it must be supported by a mast aft of the sail. The R-14 had such a mast in its radio antenna. This mast was collapsible and its wire, half-wave, center-fed antenna ran for and aft from its peak to the boat's bow and stern. In sailing terms the antenna, with its for and aft stays, was ideal to support a spinnaker. The antenna's mast was supported athwart ships by shrouds to snap-cleats on the deck's rail anchors. The block for the topping lift could have been rigged when the mast was collapsed to the deck. Likewise, the mast anchors for the bridle and spinnaker pole could have been rigged in the mast's down position. In short, it was a ready made mast for a sail.

It is important to also note that submarines in that era had boatswain's mates who's experience with marlinespike seamanship provided them with the skill to stitch and assemble the sail and rig it with competency. It should also be noted that the submarines of the day had hull shapes that acted as keels.

With a good helmsman in hand power (all electrical had been lost as well as propulsion) and a boatswain to monitor the sail, the R-14 was an acceptable sailboat providing the boat's course took the wind from not more than thirty degrees abaft of the beam. Were this not have been the case, the R-14 could have still made it under sail, but the sail would have had to be a center line rig and the shrouds would have had to be strengthened.

One thing is for sure, the hull shape and crew skills of a modern submarine would not be appropriate for a replication of the R-14's feat.

## USA: A 21st Century Maritime Posture for an Uncertain Future

*By The Heritage Foundation's Mackenzie Eaglen and Eric Sayers, Defense Industry Daily, March 23, 2009*

House Armed Services Committee Chairman Representative Ike Skelton [D-MO] recently expressed his concern about the state of the United States Navy, noting that since the Cold War ended, the U.S. "...forgot that we are a maritime nation. We forgot that lesson of history that only the nations with powerful navies are able to exert power and influence, and when a navy disappears so does that nation's power."

In The Heritage Foundation's Jan 28/09 publication "Quadrennial Defense Review: Building Blocks for National Defense," we argued that:

"The U.S. has 11 aircraft carriers, and that number should increase to 13 over the longer term. The number of cruisers and destroyers should increase from a projected 88 to 100, and the number of attack submarines should rise from 48 to at least 60. This should be facilitated, in part, by reducing the projected number of littoral combat ships from 55 to 20. Further, the QDR should at least consider recommending that the Navy proceed with DDG-1000 procurement instead of extending the construction of DDG-51 Arleigh Burke destroyers by ensuring that the DDG-1000s will have both air and ballistic missile defense capabilities."

This article is set within the context of Heritage's overall QDR recommendations, which were necessarily brief. It expands on the strategic, tactical, and industrial rationales behind the choices that we believe a secure America will require, within the context of Heritage's belief that America needs consistent defense budgets around 4% of national GDP.

A Maritime Nation

An Inherently Uncertain Future

A Navy for Force Projection

Building A Global Maritime Constabulary Force

A Coast Guard for Constabulary Missions

Maintaining a Viable Shipbuilding Industrial Base

Additional Readings

An Inherently Uncertain Future

Chairman Skelton's analysis is largely correct. Unfortunately, for the last 2 decades, the existence of American military primacy has been coupled with the belief that our future will likely mirror our present and recent past. This has created an unfortunate and somewhat predictable foundation for the precipitous decline in American naval power.

The collapse of the Soviet Union, in the wake of Reagan's successful approach during the Cold War, changed power relationships around the world. In America, it reaffirmed the nation's confidence in its maritime superiority, while redirecting national attention from the global battle against communism towards a dispersed set of inter-state and intra-state challenges. This realignment of missions gained even more momentum after 9/11, to the point that authors like Robert Kaplan contend that America has become "obsessed with dirty land wars."

The breadth of America's global counterinsurgency campaign, which is currently focused intensely on Iraq and Afghanistan, has convinced many keen observers inside and outside government of a supposedly inevitable future dominated by irregular warfare missions.

The problem with the belief that the future will likely mirror the present and recent past lies with the lessons of history, which suggest that any present holds useful but limited predictive value. The rise and fall of nations can occur in a matter of decades, and events can shock the international system in new and unforgiving directions.

The Pentagon's Joint Operating Environment for 2008 highlights how in February 1872 – just months before Great Britain found itself engaged in 22 years of sustained warfare with France around the globe – British Prime Minister William Pitt remarked that:

"...unquestionably there never was a time in the history of this country when, from the situation in Europe, we might more reasonably expect 15 years of peace, than we may at the present moment."

Similarly, in 1929 many of the world's most powerful nations felt it appropriate to sign on to the Kellogg-Briand Pact, "providing the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy." Less than a decade later, the largest and bloodiest conflict in the world's history began to ravage Europe, Africa, and Asia. The advent and proliferation of new technologies, the rapid expansion of markets and accumulation of wealth, unanticipated economic turmoil, energy demands, and sharp demographic shifts are all variables that can redefine the global balance of power, and redistribute conflict across the map in new and unexpected ways.

These questions concerning our future strategic landscape continue to prompt discussion and debate over the type of capabilities the U.S. military must acquire.

The posture of nuclear deterrence through mutually assured destruction was the Cold War's strategic underpinning for over 50 years. That long exposure played a prominent role in predisposing many western nations toward the notion that the actions of states, and relations between states, are typically defined by rational notions of behavior.

Actual human behavior over the sweep of history is less encouraging. Thucydides' survey of the causes for war between the ancient Greek alliances led by Athens and Sparta taught that the motivation of fear, honor, and interests remain competing factors that shape the decisions of statesmen. On a more modern note, recent work by Jeffrey Record offers a convincing analysis of the role that similar, non-pragmatic factors played in Japan's decision to go to war with America in 1941. Today, it is not unimaginable to foresee Russia or China miscalculating in Eastern Europe, or the Taiwan Strait, in their quest to further some type of cultural or national pride.

A Maritime Nation

Beyond the vagaries of history and human behavior, a central element of America's national strength is tied to maritime security and stability.

Only a secure global maritime environment will continue to ensure economic viability, and promote global freedom of trade and the movement of people. America's \$14 trillion economy depends on maritime trade as its lifeline. Fully 95% of the nation's imports and 90% of total global commerce are carried by sea. In the last half century, whose defining feature has been a dramatic rise in overall global prosperity, global trade has grown 60% faster than the world's combined Gross Domestic Product.

With over 100 maritime shipping chokepoints around the world, and much of the world economy now operating around a just-in-time delivery business model that requires the steady flow of cargo, the U.S. cannot afford to leave these shipping lanes unprotected. The same imperatives face developing nations like China and India, who see the ability to project maritime power as a

rising national security priority. Chinese President Hu Jiantao has referred to his nation's need to secure the shipment of energy resources through the narrow Strait of Malacca as the "Malacca dilemma."

In 2008, the Heritage Foundation conducted a gaming exercise that simulated the effects on world oil supplies, demand, and prices following a series of terrorist attacks in the Persian Gulf and Pacific Asia. The findings demonstrated the vulnerabilities of the global system's capacity to produce and deliver oil supplies in the face of a concerted transnational terrorist threat. This exercise also suggests that major producer and consumer nations, and key geostrategic allies who can act in concert with one another while protecting their own national interests, can ameliorate the severity of long-term disruptions.

The geographical proximity of a majority of the world's population to the seas (75% live within 200 miles of coastlines) has also ensured that coastal zones will become more immediate security concerns. Further, 65% of the world's oil and 35% of global gas reserves are resident in the littorals. The maritime consequences of weak and failed states have already been demonstrated off the coast of Somalia. Likewise, the trafficking of narcotics and proliferation of both conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction is almost entirely a seaborne enterprise. U.S. Navy leaders are predicting a disorderly future world whose challenges are concentrated along its coasts. These problems will require a multi-faceted maritime solution that includes cooperation with the private sector, between agencies and services, and among nation states.

States are increasingly looking to the seas as a means to project power and secure their territorial and energy interests. Naval analyst Bob Work has observed the "United States may be on the leading edge of a broader, longer-term global naval competition, with either China or Russia, or perhaps both."

Emerging naval powers like China are beginning to challenge our shipbuilding capabilities, with indigenous industrial bases that can produce high-quality maritime assets, in quantity. Indeed, China is in the middle of a peacetime naval buildup that is unprecedented in modern history. The People's Liberation Army's (PLA) foreign procurement and indigenous develop of anti-ship cruise missiles adds to the risks faced by America's major surface combatants.

Though Russia has a long way to go, its intent to again project power globally is leading to a national rearmament drive, beginning with the deployment of a more capable navy. Both Russia and China are also building, and in Russia's case, exporting, modern submarines. They are not alone. U.S. Navy leaders project a startling 280% growth in the number of submarines in operation around the world over the next 2 decades alone, with most of that growth occurring outside the United States or Europe. At the same time, today's Navy has fewer sailors than it has at any period since 1941, and is the smallest fleet since 1960.

An American Navy that could be hedged from vital shipping lanes in times of crisis, or from key maritime theaters of operation, would sharply undercut America's global influence. Yet that is exactly the challenge posed by these and other trends.

The global proliferation of nuclear technology and ballistic missiles also presents challenges. The Chief of Naval Operations recently cautioned that every 3 years since the early 1990s, a nation becomes capable of launching ballistic missiles. Continuing the Navy's evolution into a key component of America's global Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) mission will be one of its primary responsibilities in the decades ahead.

#### A Navy for Force Projection

The future US Navy will require the ability to achieve and maintain access above, on, and below the seas, specifically in the blue waters of the Pacific and Indian Oceans. We believe that aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, amphibious ships, attack submarines, and converted trident submarines should make up the bulk of this force. The enhanced strike platforms China is developing as part of a sophisticated anti-access / battlespace-denial strategy ensure that the United States should be more concerned with fighting and protecting naval and allied forces far out to sea, rather than in Asia-Pacific's littorals.

The carrier strike group (CSG) remains the U.S. Navy's preeminent power projection strike-platform. The current shipbuilding plan calls for 11 aircraft carriers (CVN). Between 2019 and 2037, this number should increase to 12, and potentially even 13 in the long-term. This level is adequate to meet combatant commander requirements, and will offer substantial surge capacity. A consequence of the reduction of America's carrier fleet and tightened budgets in recent decades is the rushed trend towards acquiring multi-mission aircraft and loss of specific capabilities. The F/A-18 Super Hornet is a primary example. In the future, however, with the development of naval unmanned combat air systems (N-UCAS), carrier strike groups could be turned into global strike platforms. While the feasibility of unmanned N-UCAS platforms to perform air superiority missions are decades off and not a high priority, N-UCAS equipped to strike targets at long range could potentially allow a small reduction in the CVN fleet.

The development of enhanced naval strike platforms, including anti-ship cruise missiles and both diesel and nuclear submarine, will require a renewed focus on anti-submarine warfare (ASW), area-wide anti-air warfare (AAW), and ballistic missile defense (BMD). The Navy testified in July 2008 that based on new threat assessments, these mission capabilities were important enough to justify truncating the next-generation destroyer DDG-1000 Zumwalt Class in favor of building additional DDG-51 Arleigh Burke Class ships, which the Navy said was more optimized for blue-water AAW/ASW/BMD.

The anti-submarine mission should be led by a fleet of about 60 fast attack submarines (SSN). Even though Navy leaders have called for a requirement of 48 SSNs, this number will fall into the low 40s in the late 2020 timeframe unless production is increased. As the Navy continues to build Virginia Class SSNs to replace the 45 Los Angeles Class SSNs that currently make up the bulk of the fleet, it should consider moving to either a 2-2-2 or 2-3-2 production rate over 3 each 3-year period. The Virginia Class, one of the few defense acquisition programs considered to be on time and under budget, can operate effectively in the littorals, and is being procured in blocks that allow emerging submarine technologies to be incorporated into the platform.

The immense distance separating the Pacific and Indian Ocean theaters from Naval Stations in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, and San Diego, California, makes the region prime for enhancing force presence through the forward homeporting of additional SSNs. The three attack submarines currently operating out of Guam benefit from a different operating cycle than other Pacific submarines, generating more days on station and reducing the total number of submarines needed to fulfill day-to-day requirements. Indeed, it is estimated that one homeported submarine in Guam is equal to the equivalent of about 3 submarines homeported elsewhere. Capitalizing on this by homeporting an additional 8 SSNs in Guam should provide a means to help deal more efficiently with current mission shortfalls, and potential near-term budget restraints.

The ASW mission will also benefit from increasing the number of DDGs from the current requirement of 69 to approximately 73 hulls. The DDG-51 Flight IIA's sonar is optimized for the blue water and littorals. Like the Zumwalt Class, the Arleigh Burkes retain the ability to launch torpedoes from its tubes, from its SH-60/MH-60 helicopter, or via the Vertical Launch Antisubmarine Rocket (VLASROC). Although the Navy testified that the DDG-1000's Lightweight Broadband Variable Depth Sonar and Multi-Function Towed Array sonar suite are more tailored to the cluttered littorals, the feasibility of equipping it with a sonar better suited for open-ocean ASW is necessary before a final decision is made on the Zumwalt Class. Only after this analysis is complete can Congress weigh the proper mix of DDG-51s vs. DDG-1000s to fill out the destroyer fleet.

Procurement of the Navy's Littoral Combat Ships (LCS) could be reduced from the planned number of 55 hulls to between 20 and 30. As designed, the LCS can be outfitted with 3 different mission packages: mine warfare, surface warfare (anti-boat, or close-in naval fire support), and anti-submarine warfare. With the development of enhanced strike platforms, there is a reduced demand for littoral ASW surface combatants that are unable to provide the same open-ocean capabilities as the DDG-51s. This is especially true in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. A fleet of between 20 and 30 LCS hulls – combined with approximately 24 mine and anti-submarine packages and 8 “surface warfare” packages, and outfitted with helicopters, unmanned aerial systems, and unmanned surface vehicles – is sufficient to combat enemy craft, quiet diesel submarines, and mines in the littorals. Furthermore, many of these littoral missions are better suited for a maritime constabulary force led by the Coast Guard.

The area-wide anti-air warfare and ballistic missile defense missions are tasks equally critical to ensuring the Navy can provide fleet and forward basing protection from enhanced sea-skimming ant-ship missiles, cruise missiles, and ballistic missiles. In addition to the strategic disadvantages, enemies that possess anti-ship missiles can gain a unique asymmetric advantage by forcing a vulnerable U.S. fleet to remain much further out to sea in the event of a conflict. For this reason, the 62 DDG-51s in service should undergo the planned life extension program, and upgraded to perform the ballistic missile defense mission.

In addition to expanding the number of DDG hulls to approximately 73, the Navy should raise the number of cruisers (CG) in the fleet from the requirement of 19 to about 27. The mid-life modernization effort for 15 of the 22 Ticonderoga-class CGs should also be completed. Most importantly, the delayed next-generation cruiser program known as CG (X) should be the Navy's highest acquisition priority. While the Navy's FY 2009 budget submission sought to have the first CG (X) built beginning in FY 2011, reports now have that timeline being pushed out to FY 2017 or beyond. Although major issues remain outstanding regarding the future cruiser's radar, propulsion, and hull design, the severity of emerging wide anti-air and BMD threats warrants moving CG (X) toward the middle of the next decade.

Delaying the procurement of CG (X) beyond the middle of the next decade will create considerable shortfalls that will leave the fleet and U.S. forward bases unnecessarily vulnerable. Even with the service-life extensions for the Ticonderoga-class cruisers, the retirement age for the remaining 15 cruisers will fall between 2026 and 2034. With just 15 cruisers at sea in 2025 that were originally built in the 1980s, Navy leaders will be forced to operate under unacceptable risk levels. Choosing not to build an advanced radar and instead improving the CG (X) radar system incrementally, may offer the best course for Navy leadership by reducing technical risks associated with the program.

Finally, in a world where America's ability to project power ashore has become reliant upon a variety of state actors that may not share liberal-democratic values and have proven increasingly unreliable partners, the high seas will continue to replace traditional basing as a means to guarantee access. Basing issues with Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan in recent years have forced the U.S. to scramble to find alternative means. Even obtrusive bases in allied nations like Japan or South Korea may generate negative feelings amongst the populace, creating counterproductive political friction.

The global commons offer a solution to offsetting these difficulties. Aircraft carriers presently provide tactical air capabilities with limited mobility. Amphibious forces will also remain critical to provide sea-based forward presence of personnel and equipment.

#### Building A Global Maritime Constabulary Force LPD-17 & ATF concept

Solutions to complex maritime problems require a proper strategic conceptualization of the roles and missions and division of labor required by the U.S. Navy, U.S. Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to protect America's security and economic interests on the high seas. Building global constabulary maritime power to achieve this objective will require the use of law enforcement and military capabilities to maintain law and order at sea, enforce compliance with domestic laws and applicable treaties, and protect vital national interests. “Constabulary” refers to the hybrid roles and missions that involve both military power and law enforcement capabilities. The use of “maritime” instead of naval is also an important distinction because it aims to include more than 1,900 ports around the world, as well as the world's “brown water” navies and coast guards.

The variable nature of future events combined with the long-term industrial requirements for designing, building, and deploying new surface and subsurface craft, necessitate long-term strategic planning. Seapower advocate Alfred Thayer Mahan once aptly noted that:

“The creation of material for war, under modern conditions, requires a length of time which does not permit the postponement of it to the hour of impending hostilities.”

Attempting to predict what the future may hold, or allowing defense budgets to sway with the tide of Washington's latest conventional wisdom, is a strategically inept force planning model.

The constraints of future calculation and time means that the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard must build budgets and field forces that can allow them to retain a set of core capabilities to meet a range of enduring missions while adequately prepared for a variety of future contingencies.

The historical relationship between the U.S. Navy and Coast Guard has traditionally been one of superior-subordinate. A true constabulary force must delineate roles and missions while ensuring both services are mutually cooperative and supportive of one another. The Navy does not have to broaden its portfolio to maintain its core competencies of blue-water deterrence (power projection) and warfighting. Sea control and forced-entry into contested waters have historically been and should remain the Navy's primary focus.

#### A Coast Guard for Constabulary Missions

Alternatively, the Coast Guard is best suited to take the lead in constabulary missions, including maritime smuggling, defending exclusive economic zones (EEZ), humanitarian assistance, disaster relief, port security, and riverine warfare missions. This is true even when Navy assets like the LCS provide support. Although analysts such as Frank Hoffman have proposed a navy fleet designed solely for managing the clutter of the littorals, the Coast Guard's unique capabilities – including law enforcement and intelligence, maritime interception and domain awareness, port operations and security, coastal sea control, and theater security cooperation – are ideally suited for green-water and brown-water missions.

Building and fostering the constabulary capabilities of other nations – specifically those in key regions like West Africa, the Horn of Africa, East Asia, the Black Sea, and the Caribbean – should be a central mission of the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard's North Pacific and North Atlantic Coast Guard Forums, which build relationships with other nations on combined operations, illegal drug trafficking, maritime security, fisheries enforcement, illegal migration, and maritime domain awareness, are an example of the type of effective multilateral information sharing operations that enhance global constabulary power.

To meet this mission, the Coast Guard must procure a much larger and modern fleet of national security cutters (NSC) and move ahead with the development of the offshore patrol cutter (OPC). This would then allow one national security cutter to deploy with each carrier strike group and expeditionary strike group. This increase would satisfy the growing demand of Combatant Commanders for more Coast Guard assets in theater following recent deployments by the USCGC Dallas last year in support of Africa Partnership Station and relief efforts in Georgia.

Moreover, the NSCs and OPCs, joined by a mixture of helicopters, smaller craft, and unmanned vehicles, could provide the backbone of a force built for global constabulary missions. Because it still reflects the pre-9/11 world in which it was crafted, the Coast Guard's Deepwater program has pursued a more limited version of this vision. The Deepwater program should be expanded, along with the Coast Guard's budget and end strength, to meet a growing mission set with greater international requirements.

#### Maintaining a Viable Shipbuilding Industrial Base

The Navy and Coast Guard's ability to effectively design and field ships with the capabilities necessary to meet their mission requirements and hedge against potential scenarios is inextricably linked with the long-term health of the shipbuilding manufacturing industrial base. Limited design and building opportunities have placed increased pressure on a reduced number of shipbuilders, calling into question the future of the industry, and thus the future of America's maritime capabilities. Decisions concerning future Navy and Coast Guard force structure must therefore equally weigh the impact they have against the viability of the shipbuilding industrial base.

Ultimately, a closer acquisition relationship between the Navy and the Coast Guard, particularly in regard to the Navy Littoral Combat Ship program and Coast Guard Deepwater program, is necessary to ensure coordinated requirements for homeland defense and global constabulary missions. With China's shipbuilding industry at a level that can now be said to rival the United States', nurturing this national security asset is vital to the preservation of American maritime power.

Shipbuilding funds cannot be gauged on a series of high-stakes bets that only littoral or conventional capabilities will be required for the future. The U.S. military does not have the luxury of focusing solely on conventional and state versus unconventional and non-state actors. Rather, it must be able to counter myriad threats and possess unmatched capabilities in varying contingencies. The United States must possess not only the most capable fleet – including aircraft – but also a sufficient number of weapons systems and suppliers to meet national security requirements.

Avoiding budget spikes affords more than platforms, however; it provides stability in defense planning and offers a steadier workload for those constructing them. When budget requests change so dramatically year to year, particularly when requirements stay the same, the industrial base cannot plan ahead. This inability to plan increases the cost of individual systems. The national security of the U.S. is well-served by a competitive industrial base, and defense budget predictability will contribute to this effort.

## Russia To Strengthen Strategic Nuclear Subs

*Xinhuanet, March 23, 2009*

Russia will strengthen its fleet of strategic nuclear submarines, a senior Navy official said Monday.

Russia will maintain and upgrade its fleet of strategic submarines, carrying ballistic missiles, as a naval component of the nuclear triad, the RIA Novosti news agency quoted Vice Admiral Oleg Burtsev, deputy head of the Navy General Staff, as saying.

The nuclear triad refers to the Strategic Rocket Forces, strategic aviation and nuclear submarine fleet.

"There is no longer any need to equip missiles with powerful nuclear warheads. We can install low-yield warheads on existing cruise missiles," said Burtsev.

He also said that Russia's new Severodvinsk nuclear-powered attack submarine will be commissioned with the Navy in 2010-2011.

The new submarine is able to launch long-range cruise missiles with nuclear warheads, and engage hostile submarines and surface warships.

Russia will also build at least six Borey-class strategic submarines to serve in the Northern and the Pacific fleets, Burtsev added.

## Report: Russian Navy To Rely On Tactical Nukes

*The Associated Press, March 23, 2009*

MOSCOW: The role of tactical nuclear weapons in the Russian navy may grow, a news agency quoted a senior Russian admiral as saying Monday.

Vice Adm. Oleg Burtsev told the state-run RIA-Novosti that the increasing range and precision of tactical nuclear weapons makes them an important asset.

"Probably, tactical nuclear weapons will play a key role in the future," said Burtsev, the navy's deputy chief of staff.

He added that the navy may fit new, less powerful nuclear warheads to the existing types of cruise missiles.

“There is no longer any need to equip missiles with powerful nuclear warheads,” Burtsev said. “We can install low-yield warheads on existing cruise missiles.”

Today in Europe

Gone for generations, Russians welcomed home Sweden says no to saving Saab A circumspect Sarkozy ponders the economy Tactical nuclear weapons have a much shorter range compared to strategic nuclear weapons. They are intended for use within a theater of battle.

The United States and the Soviet Union decided in 1991 to eliminate some of their non-strategic nuclear weapons and withdraw others from duty, including those used by navy ships.

But in 2006 Russia signaled it no longer intended to abide by that decision when then-Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov said that Russian submarines were carrying tactical nuclear weapons on patrol.

Last December, chief of the Russian military’s general staff, Gen. Nikolai Makarov, said Russia will keep its arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons, which he said were necessary to counter a massive NATO advantage in conventional weapons.

Burtsev said the navy will also build six new nuclear submarines carrying intercontinental ballistic missiles. The first sub in the series, the Yuri Dolgoruky, already has been built and is undergoing tests.

However, the prospective Bulava missile designed to equip the new submarine has failed repeatedly in tests, making prospects of its deployment dim.

## **Maritime Technical Society San Diego to Hold Special Meeting March 26**

*Submitted by John Sampson, Tele Consultants, Inc., March 19, 2009*

The Maritime Technical Society (MTS) San Diego will honor submariners of World War II by dedicating a newly constructed 52-inch Fleet Type submarine model during a special meeting from 6-9 p.m. March 26, 2009, onboard the San Diego Maritime Museum ship Berkeley.

The model will be dedicated to the U.S. Submarine Veterans of World War II, in honor of Capt. Charles Bishop (USN, Ret.), a well-known member of MTS-San Diego.

The model will be christened the evening of the event by Alnora Bishop, wife of Capt. Bishop, and given to the San Diego Maritime Museum. Captain Bishop served aboard the USS Piranha (SS 389) for five war patrols in World War II, and was its last commanding officer when she was decommissioned in 1946. Capt. Bishop will share first hand accounts of pulling into Pearl Harbor in January 1942 with a thick layer of bunker fuel on the surface of the harbor, submarine operations off the coast of Imperial Japan, torpedo attacks, and evading depth charges.

Doug Smay, a member of the U.S. Submarine Veterans of World War II, will also join us to tell of the recent progress on the 52 Boats Memorial now being incorporated into a plaza at the 40-acre NTC Park at Liberty Station. The 52 Lost Boat Memorial commemorates the 3,617 U.S. submariners lost in World War II.

The cost of the event will be \$30 per person, \$25 for students or retired members. The menu includes a Mexican buffet by El Indio and a cash bar. Cash or check will be accepted at the door. Dress for the event is business casual.

Those interested in attending are encouraged to RSVP by 4 pm, Monday, March 23, to [rsvp@mts-sandiego.org](mailto:rsvp@mts-sandiego.org) or use Paypal by visiting the MTS website at <http://www.mts-sandiego.org/meeting.php>

## **San Diego Submariners to Celebrate Birthday April 18**

*Submitted by Lt. Alli Myrick Ellison, Submarine Squadron 11 Public Affairs Officer, March 10, 2009*

The San Diego submarine community will celebrate the 109th birthday of the United States Navy Submarine Force at the San Diego Marriott Hotel and Marina on Saturday, April 18, 2009.

Admiral Kirkland Donald, Director, Naval Reactors, will be the guest speaker. Tickets are \$55 per person. The event begins at 1700 and the uniform is full dress blue or dinner dress blue; formal attire for civilians.

For additional information or tickets, please contact Chief Storekeeper Michael Murphy at (619) 553-8729 or via e-mail at [michael.l.murphy@navy.mil](mailto:michael.l.murphy@navy.mil).

## **A New Challenge At Sea**

*By James Lyons, Washington Times Commentary Piece, March 22, 2009*

China’s harassment of the civilian crewed U.S. Navy survey ship Impeccable operating in international waters approximately 70 miles south of Hainan Island was unprovoked and a flagrant violation of recognized Law of the Sea regulations. Their harassment of a survey ship operating in international waters within China’s claimed Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) is a direct challenge to the “freedom of seas” concept.

There may have been another recent incident involving an unarmed U.S. Navy survey ship. A Chinese Communist Party newspaper recently reported on a similarly serious incident involving the unarmed USNS Bowditch survey ship in September 2008, operating in international water in the Yellow Sea area. This article cites the “Gazette of Marine Administrative Law Enforcement” published by China’s State Oceanic Administration said U.S. survey ships in Chinese waters may be sunk! The article went on to describe the aggressive actions of Chinese aircraft and warships against the Bowditch. It concluded by stating that if a U.S. survey ship enters China’s sea again, China will sink it! Such provocative statements cannot be ignored or go unchallenged.

China has reacted so strongly to the USNS Impeccable survey operations because it was within about 70 nautical miles of Hainan Island, where China now bases its new nuclear ballistic missile submarines as well as attack submarines in underground submarine pens. Our operations there were not provocative and were within accepted norms.

It is essential that we continue these hydrographic operations so that we better understand the maritime environment as it is a critical component for Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW) operations, given that submarines are getting quieter. Submarines operating from Hainan Island will have an advanced capability to interdict the critical sea lines of communications from the Straits of Malacca to our key allies in the region, including Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and the Philippines.

While China is a signatory to the Law of Sea Treaty (LOST), it has chosen to interpret the treaty in a suspect way and has made claims for itself that forbid military and intelligence collection by foreign navies in its declared Exclusive Economic Zone. Of course, the United States and many other maritime nations do not accept such declarations by China.

It should be noted that these illegal declarations helped convince President Reagan to refuse to sign the "Law of the Sea Treaty." The United States contends that the right of its ships and aircraft to transit through or operate in the EEZs is the same as their rights on the high seas, including surveying and intelligence collection.

In his recent article "Conflict Prevention and Confidence Building Measures between Japan and China," retired Japanese Vice Adm. Ota Fumio notes how China has demonstrated a pattern of maritime expansion since 1974. When the United States terminated its base arrangement with the Philippines in 1991, China in 1992 passed a law unilaterally (and illegally) declaring sovereignty over various disputed islands in the South China Sea including the Paracels, Spratlys, Taiwan - and Senkaku, which belongs to Japan. In 1994, China built a facility on the Philippines Mischief Reef. In 1996, China "illegally" laid claims to the entire South China Sea.

It should be noted that China has frequently conducted ocean surveillance and survey operations in the Japanese EEZ beyond the East China Sea. In 2001, the governments of Japan and China reached an agreement that China would notify Japan when Chinese survey ships were to conduct operations in the Japanese EEZ. The implication is that Japan would similarly notify China.

However, even with this agreement there have been numerous violations by Chinese surveillance ships in Japan's EEZ. In 2004, there were 18 such violations.

A prior notification requirement is a direct infringement on the established principle of "freedom of transit" in international waters including the EEZ. In our Incidents at Sea agreement with the Soviet Navy we never included a prior notification clause for operations in declared EEZ. There were no sanctuaries other than recognized territorial waters.

If we withdraw and cease our legitimate survey operations in these important areas of concern, it will be a clear signal that the South China Sea will become a safe haven for Chinese nuclear ballistic submarines targeting the United States and Japan.

The U.S. Navy did not and does not allow Russia's northern waters to be a safe zone for Soviet/Russian nuclear ballistic missiles aimed at America. Therefore, there is no legitimate reason we should let the South China Sea become a "safe haven" for China to launch ballistic missiles at the United States or our allies.

The United States as it should has protested this recent Chinese provocation. However, if we think avoiding future confrontations will cause problems to go away, we are making a serious miscalculation. Make no mistake, our friends, allies and potential enemies throughout the world are watching how the Obama administration responds to this provocation. Mr. President, as Vice President Biden predicted, you are being tested.

James Lyons, U.S. Navy retired admiral, was commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, senior U.S. military representative to the United Nations, and deputy chief of naval operations, where he was principal adviser on all Joint Chiefs of Staff matters.

### **The Truth About The S. China Sea**

*By Joe Hung, Special to The China Post, March 23, 2009*

Unlike an aerial incident eight years ago, a recent maritime incident in the South China Sea is resulting in a fadeout, for neither the United States nor the People's Republic of China wants any more tension rising in their relations.

In 2001, tensions mounted to crisis proportions after a U.S. intelligence gathering EP-3 collided with a Chinese fighter over international waters in the South China Sea.

On March 8, a U.S. oceanographic survey ship was confronted by five Chinese vessels within what the PRC claims as its exclusive economic zone (EEZ). The Chinese ships surrounded the survey ship Impeccable, which is unarmed, and blocked its path. Washington protested and a guided missile destroyer was dispatched to the South China Sea to escort the Impeccable. Beijing rejected the protest and charged the U.S. with conducting illegal surveying activities in China's EEZ of 200 nautical miles off its coast. No confrontation is possible, however. The curtain is falling on this brief non-confrontation play.

What's behind this incident in the South China Sea?

One thing is certain: The incident occurred because the U.S. is gathering information on the new thrust of China's naval power to its "first island chain," which includes Taiwan and all the small archipelagoes in the South China Sea, under whose waters are rich oil reserves. The People's Liberation Army (PLA) is boosting its first island chain defense to back up its leading role in an emerging Asian free trade zone.

The PLA Navy is setting up China's largest submarine base on Hainan Island and planning to build an aircraft carrier. It is developing a blue-water navy. Intelligence gathering in the South China Sea is a must for the U.S. Navy. As a matter of fact, the U.S. had surveyed the waters around Taiwan exhaustively again not long before the Impeccable met with the hostile Chinese boats.

But intelligence gathering in a Chinese EEZ is considered a very unfriendly act, about which Beijing wanted to be informed beforehand. Washington didn't give Beijing any notice, claiming the Impeccable was operating in international waters just as its EP-3 plane did in 2001. So the Chinese had to respond in kind. They had the Impeccable blocked to frustrate its survey mission.

There's a parallel between the two incidents. Both happened immediately after a new U.S. president was inaugurated. George W. Bush was sworn in in January 2001. Barack Obama took office a little more than two months ago. It isn't too much of a coincidence that the U.S. high command wanted to find out how the new chief executive really was planning to cope militarily with the PRC.

The top brass needed to know what the president was thinking to do so that they might be able to better plan for the next four years. After the aerial incident, they found out Bush didn't want to follow Bill Clinton's softer line. Bush wanted "encirclement," a modified "containment" of China, and the brass hats prepared their defense plans accordingly. It's time to find out how Obama wanted to cope with the PRC. The dispatch of the destroyer was ordered almost at the same time President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo's confirmation of Philippine sovereignty over the Spratlys and another island group in the South China Sea. Beijing filed protests with Manila. China, as well as Taiwan, claims sovereignty over those islands. Beijing and Taipei both claim all other island groups in the South China Sea, including the Pratas, the Paracels, and the Macclesfield Bank.

In the meantime, the PLA Navy sent its largest and most modern patrol ship, a remodeled destroyer, to the Spratlys, the largest one of which Taiwan has stationed a small garrison and has built an airstrip. The announced purpose of sending the powerful patrol ship is to strengthen "fishery administration," but no one doubts it's a show of force to warn the Philippines against any more "provocative" action.

China has already fought a sea battle with Vietnam over a fishing rights issue. The Philippines has no naval power to stand up against the PLA Navy. The easiest way out for the Philippines, which has forced the U.S. military out of Subic Bay and the Clark Air Force Base in Luzon, is to ask for U.S. help in time of need. The Filipinos may have to negotiate and conclude a "mutual defense" arrangement with the U.S.

Obama needs a rapport with the PRC, particularly at a time Chinese help is needed to cope with the global economic crisis, triggered by the U.S. financial meltdown. The U.S. is bitterly offended because it is excluded from the Asian free trade sphere — the ASEAN-plus-One scheduled to come into being on next January 1, and the ASEAN-plus-Three by 2015 (the zone includes all ten members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the PRC, known also as the Ten-plus-One. The other two in the ASEAN-plus-Three are Japan and South Korea).

As the situation now stands, the best option open to Washington is to weaken the leadership role of the PRC, whose PLA Navy is posing a threat to the security of the ASEAN countries. If Manila seeks U.S., all other ASEAN member states, Vietnam and Indonesia in particular, will follow suit. The U. S. may revive a SEATO (Southeast Asian Treaty Organization) and reestablish its strong military presence, which contributes in no small measure to the defense of vital U.S. economic interests in the region.

What started as a test of Obama's future China policy led up to the sea incident by accident, which is being followed up by the U.S. initiative to reassert its leadership role in Southeast Asia.

**NAVAL BASE POINT LOMA**  
**Cordially invites you to attend the**  
**2009 Old Timers Luncheon**  
**Friday, April 17 at the Harbor Inn**  
**Aboard**  
**Naval Base Point Loma**  
**\$22.00 per person**

*10:30 Tolling of the Boats*  
*11:15 No-Host Social*  
*12:30 Lunch*

**RSVP by Wednesday, April 8th**  
**by returning the form below.**

\*\* You may contact ETCS Christopher Clausing (NBPL) at (619) 553-7177 for further details or to give him a heads-up that you will be attending \*\*

Please detach and mail this reservation form along with check payable to: "CPO ASSOCIATION"

Mail RSVP to: COMMANDING OFFICER NBPL  
 ATTN CMC  
 140 SYLVESTER ROAD  
 SAN DIEGO CA 92106

Name(s) of attendee(s) \_\_\_\_\_

***SPONSORS WANTED FOR 2009 SUBVETS CONVENTION: All Levels***

***Make Checks Payable to: 2009 USSVI Convention***

*P.O. Box 420159*  
*San Diego, CA 92142-0159*





## **Russians To Be Asked To Explain Arctic Operations**

*By The Canadian Press, The Edmonton Sun*

OTTAWA – A senior Russian official in Ottawa will be asked to explain why his country is sending bombers to the edge of Arctic airspace, and possibly nuclear submarines to the edge of waters claimed by Canada.

Dmitry Trofimov, head of the Russian embassy's political section, will face those questions tomorrow when he appears before the Commons defence committee.

Trofimov's appearance comes five weeks after Canada sent fighter jets to intercept two Russian bombers that approached Canadian airspace in the High Arctic.

Opposition MPs also plan to question Trofimov about reports a foreign submarine was seen last August off northern Baffin Island near the eastern entrance of the Northwest Passage.

However, Conservative MP Laurie Hawn, a member of the Commons defence committee, says he doesn't expect Trofimov will say much about the movements of Russian subs.

## **Submarine Base New London Tears Down to Build Up**

*By Mass Communication Specialist 2nd Class Peter D. Blair, Naval Submarine Base New London Public Affairs, March 19, 2009*

GROTON, Conn. – Naval Submarine Base (SUBASE) New London held a double ceremony March 13, opening a new crane maintenance facility (CMF) and beginning the deconstruction of two former barracks buildings, as elements of the Navy's Shore Vision 2035 plan continue to transform the base.

Shore Vision 2035 is the Navy's new vision for shore basing. It includes a substantial reduction of base infrastructure and a model of base layout that zones infrastructure along functional lines.

Certainly the function of the base's waterfront is to support its homeported submarines, and the new CMF will make an immediate impact.

"A lot of people here today may believe that submarine support at SUBASE begins and ends with modern piers," said base Commanding Officer Capt. Mark S. Ginda at the crane facility's ribbon cutting. "We drove by one of those new modern, double-wide piers, Pier 6, to get here... But if submarines are the heart of the base, and the piers its bones, then cranes are the life blood."

The base's mobile cranes are used for evolutions ranging from weapons and stores loading, to periscope and mast maintenance, and battery change outs.

A nearly four million dollar design and build project by the M.A. Mortenson Company, the new CMF allows the mobile cranes to be stored and maintained indoors, protected from harsh New England winters. The 10,000 square-foot facility will enhance reliable crane availability, extend crane life, and provide a safe environment for maintenance work.

Neither the day's date nor the nature of the day's second ceremony would prove "safe" for two of the base's former barracks, buildings 442 and 447.

"Friday the thirteenth... The only unlucky thing about this day is if you're an old excess building on the base, because you will no longer exist," Ginda jokingly told the group travelling with him to the ceremony.

Pointing out that equally important to construction in Shore Vision 2035 is demolition, Ginda explained that reducing unneeded and excess infrastructure reduces financial drains and allows for the Navy's recapitalization.

SUBASE's demolition of the two buildings is part of one of the most ambitious demolition undertakings in the Navy. SUBASE has plans to raze more than 35 buildings and structures through efforts totaling more than \$18 million and resulting in an infrastructure footprint reduction of more than 470,000 square feet.

Building 429, a former barracks, has undergone a major repurposing and now has new life as an innovative retail, recreation, and lodging facility. The building is not only home to base's Officers Club and Chiefs Club, but also to a newly relocated branch of the Navy Federal Credit Union. Moreover, SUBASE's temporary lodging facility for visitors, Navy Gateway Inns and Suites, will be moving their operation to the building by this summer.

With the clearing of Buildings 442 and 447, their 4 acre site will become another step closer to becoming a retail facility or restaurant that may not only benefit the young Sailor population living on the base but also the community. That step is possible through the Enhanced Use Lease program that allows underutilized, non-excess real property to be leased; and in return, the Navy can obtain consideration in cash or in-kind services.

Before Ginda boarded an excavator to assist prime contractor P and S Construction with tearing down the two buildings, he summed up his enthusiasm for the on-going transformations at SUBASE.

"This is part of the continuing effort to put some shine back on the crown jewel of the submarine capital of the world," said Ginda.

For more news from Naval Submarine Base New London, visit [www.navy.mil/local/subasenlon/](http://www.navy.mil/local/subasenlon/).

## **Navy's ERM Program Projects \$1.8B Maintenance Savings Over 20 Years**

*By Naval Sea Systems Command Office of Corporate Communications, March 19, 2009*

WASHINGTON – Shipboard coatings initiatives managed by Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) Engineering for Reduced Maintenance (ERM) program are projected to save the Navy more than \$1.8 billion over 20 years, as outlined by naval engineers March 13.

"These are excellent examples of significant achievements in Lean Manufacturing," explained NAVSEA ERM Program Manager Vernon Parrish.

"These tasks use new, commercially available coating products and technologies to address old, expensive Navy coating preservation and inspection issues."

Parrish credited the teamwork of ERM members from NAVSEA and the Naval Research Laboratory for tackling the expensive and time-consuming tasks of inspecting and re-preserving shipboard tanks that contain fuel, ballast and waste water as well as dry voids and bilges.

One of the initiatives, which is being worked in conjunction with the NAVSEA Cumbersome Work Practices Task Force, calls for a new, high-solids, rapid-cure, single-coat painting process that requires less application time than current three-coat systems. Prepping and painting the tanks and voids has traditionally been a lengthy, tedious and labor-intensive process. The single-coat initiative uses new paints that can be rapidly applied in a single coat and take much less time to dry than previous paints. This cuts the time waiting for the initial coat to dry, along with the time required to apply two additional coats of paint and the days-long drying period between each coat.

Single-coat paints have been successfully demonstrated on aircraft carriers, submarines, amphibious ships and surface combatants. The coatings are projected to last as long as 20 years, reducing the fleet need to replace coatings for decades to come.

“The initiative should be ready for fleet-wide implementation in fiscal year 2010,” said Parrish. “Once fully implemented, the projected repair and maintenance cost avoidance is \$125 thousand per Los Angeles (SSN 688)-class submarine major availability and \$433 thousand per aircraft carrier major availability. The potential fleet-wide cost savings over the coatings’ expected 20-year lifecycle is \$1.8 billion.”

Another coatings initiative is the development and installation of tank wireless corrosion sensors in ballast tanks on Navy amphibious ships.

The sensors constantly track the performance of the coating in a ballast tank by monitoring how effectively the coating is controlling corrosion in the tank.

Because the devices are wireless, inspectors can remotely monitor the tanks, avoiding the time and expense of opening, gas-freeing and inspecting the tanks. Wireless corrosion sensors reduce the time required to inspect a tank from days to a matter of minutes, resulting in an average tank inspection cost savings of around \$12 thousand per tank.

The team is also developing a tank inspection tool called the Insertable Stalk Inspection System (ISIS) that links directly to Navy paperless maintenance database systems added Parrish. This should reduce overall maintenance planning and inspection costs. ISIS essentially provides a safe and low-cost method to assess coating conditions with a high degree of accuracy in tanks that are corroding.

### **Analysts’ View: China’s Moves In The S.China Sea**

*Reuters, March 19, 2009*

China may convert more retired navy ships into fishing patrol vessels for the South China Sea, the China Daily on Thursday quoted an official as saying. Such a move would cause alarm in several other countries in the region that also claim all or part of the maritime territory. Here are the views of some analysts about the situation:

#### **George Tsai, Chinese Culture University, Taiwan**

“China would like to send a signal to the outside world on one hand, but on the other hand it doesn’t want to let the issue get out of control. A military showing would be its last resort. The Chinese don’t want open competition.”

#### **Shane Lee, Chang Jung University, Taiwan**

“China wants control in the Spratlys because of possible undersea energy deposits and for military control. The more territorial waters you own, the more benefits you have.

“The U.S. hasn’t shown that much interest in the area, although of course they know very well there are rich energy deposits.”

#### **Dr. Ian Storey, Institute Of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore**

“Sovereignty is so sensitive in Asia, particularly sensitive in China for historical reasons. This month is a sensitive month because it is the 50th anniversary of China’s annexation of Tibet. During this kind of period, there is more heightened sensitivity over sovereignty issues. It may be as well they are kind of testing the new U.S. administration, testing the limit see how they react. It is quite astonishing that the EP3 incident happened almost within the same timeframe, a bit earlier, with the first Bush Administration. Also, U.S. Congress just passed a resolution in support of Tibet. That would rile China...”

“Such incidents are likely to continue, they may even increase. The importance of this incident, the one last week, underscore the importance for the need for the U.S. and China make an agreement to manage this kind of problem.”

#### **Dr. Craig Snyder, School Of International And Political Studies, Deakin University, Australia**

“This is about the Chinese wanting to stop the U.S. ‘spying’ in waters that are close to China. There is a dispute as to what states can do in the EEZs (Exclusive Economic Zones) of other states.”

“(This is) not so much an attempt by China to extend its naval reach but to deny access to the U.S. Navy of Chinese coastal waters. Yes, the Chinese ultimately want to exercise sea control or at least sea denial throughout the South China Sea, but at this point they simply want to make the Americans think twice when operating in and around Chinese waters.”

“China is seeking to expand its naval influence and in the first instance they want to stop the U.S. Navy from operating in and around Chinese waters. The issue is particularly sensitive as the Impeccable was acquiring marine data for submarine and anti-submarine operations as well as mine warfare. This is particularly important to the Chinese as they are developing their submarine capabilities in order to potentially engage U.S. carrier battle groups should conflict occur over Taiwan.”

#### **Ron Huisken, Senior Fellow At Australian National University’s Strategic And Defense Studies Center**

“China has a demonstrated interest in trying to shift the goal posts in the grey areas, by pushing the United States further toward its own goals.”

On why ‘fishery patrols’ instead of naval vessels: “If you get opposing vessels with significant armament facing each other, it becomes a flashpoint that makes everyone have to be more careful.”

On whether South China Sea will continue to be a focal point for tension: “The forces that are propelling people that way are irresistible. There’s a huge amount of traffic and the importance of the ingress and egress to the Malacca Straits. The Chinese see the security focus to be very strong in the South China Sea.”

### **Clarita Carlos, Political Science Professor At University Of The Philippines**

“No country would go to war now, so we should not be alarmed or overreact to such an incident. The economy would always trump politics. It would be in China’s best interest to keep us in their good books.”

### **Dolphin Scholarship Foundation Establishes “Scorpion Circle”**

*From Randi Klein, Executive Director, Dolphin Scholarship Foundation, March 9, 2009*

As part of its 50th Anniversary activities, the Dolphin Scholarship Foundation (DSF) is looking for children of crewmembers of the USS Scorpion (SSN 589) who received college scholarship assistance through the Scorpion Memorial Fund, which was established and administered by DSF following the loss of Scorpion at sea with all hands in 1968.

DSF has now established the Scorpion Circle of Family & Friends to recognize family and friends of Scorpion crewmembers. If you were a “Scorpion Scholar,” or for more information about the Scorpion Circle of Family & Friends, please contact Mrs. Randi Klein, Executive Director, Dolphin Scholarship Foundation, at [rklein@dolphin scholarship.org](mailto:rklein@dolphin scholarship.org).

### **San Francisco At Sea Again After Nose Repair**

*By Andrew Scutro, Navy Times, April 8, 2009*

The once-crashed attack submarine San Francisco left Puget Sound for San Diego on Tuesday morning, more than four years after an accident that killed one crewman and injured 97 of 137 sailors on board.

On Jan. 8, 2005, the ship crashed into an undersea mountain 350 miles south of Guam, crushing the nose. After crossing the Pacific Ocean on the surface it arrived at the naval complex near Kitsap, Wash., in September 2005 and went into the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility for repairs in October 2006, according to Lt. Kyle Raines, spokesman at Submarine Group 9. He said it went into dry dock in December 2006 and was returned to the water in October 2008.

The nose of the decommissioned sub Honolulu replaced the destroyed portions on San Francisco.

San Francisco was formerly homeported in Guam but will now be based in San Diego with Submarine Squadron 11, Raines said, though was not certain when the San Francisco would rejoin the fleet or be ready for deployment again. The Kitsap Sun newspaper reported that the nose replacement repairs cost \$134 million.

### **Australia Moves To Avert Submarine Manning Crisis**

*By Tim Fish, Jane’s, April 9, 2009*

The Royal Australian Navy (RAN) is planning to re-establish four sustainable submarine crews by 2012, in preparation for the transition from the Collins class to a successor boat.

Each crew will expand from 46 submariners to 58, in an effort to ease the strain on existing personnel, and they will be rotated between hulls, ending the tradition of attachment to a single submarine.

A manpower shortfall has placed the RAN’s submarine capability under pressure in recent years. Short-term measures introduced in 2008-09 alleviated the situation, but senior officers accept that long-term measures are required.

In a response to the Submarine Workforce Sustainability Review on 8 April, the RAN stated: “The success of stabilising the submarine workforce over the next two years will be measured by achieving three sustainable crews and a sustainable Submarine Support Group and shore positions. With this stabilised workforce as the foundation, [the] navy will move to a recovery phase to achieve a fourth sustainable crew.”

---

## **Submarine Reunion Notices**

### **USS George Bancroft (SSBN 643)**

**Dates:** April 16-19, 2009

**Location:** Mission Valley Resort in San Diego, CA (limited number of rooms available at a special rate)

**For more info:** Visit the association website at <http://www.ssb643.org/>, or call Bill Badalucca at 828-735-0831.

### **USS Sea Devil (SS 400 & SSN 664)**

**Date:** April 23-26, 2009

**Location:** Norfolk Hilton, Norfolk, VA

**For more info:** Visit [www.seadevilssn664.org](http://www.seadevilssn664.org) and click on "All Hands." You may also contact Jim Schenk, P.O. Box 476, Morrisville, NY 13408, call (315) 824-3162 or (315) 886-9180, or e-mail at [submareener@msn.com](mailto:submareener@msn.com)

### **USS Sam Rayburn (SSBN 635)**

**Date:** April 26-30, 2009

**Location:** Fredericksburg Inn and Suites, Fredericksburg, TX

**For more info:** Please contact the inn at 1-800-446-0202 or 1-830-997-0202, or through their website, [www.fredericksburg-inn.com/](http://www.fredericksburg-inn.com/) for your reservation. One highlight of this reunion will be the dedication of the SSBN 635 Memorial Plaque at the Walk of Honor at The National Museum of the Pacific War, also known as the Nimitz Museum, in Fredericksburg.

### **Florida Base Submarine Veterans Joint Convention**

**Dates:** April 29 – May 3, 2009

**Location:** St. Augustine Beach, FL

**For more info:** For registration forms and lodging information, please visit <http://www.ussfloridabase.com/>.

### **USS Scamp (SSN 588)**

**Dates:** May 6-9, 2009

**Location:** Crowne Plaza Hotel, Portland, OR

**For more info:** Visit [www.uss-scamp.com](http://www.uss-scamp.com) and click on "2009 Reunion Plans." You may also contact Lou Minor, 2233 E Boones Trail, Sierra Vista, AZ 85650, call at (520) 732-1750, or e-mail [lou@uss-scamp.com](mailto:lou@uss-scamp.com).

### **The B-Girls – USS Barbel (SS 580), USS Blueback (SS 581) and USS Bonefish (SS 582)**

**Dates:** May 28-30, 2009

**Location:** Crowne Plaza Hotel, Portland, OR

**For more info:** Visit the "B-Girls Forever!" website for more information and a registration form: [http://bgirlsforever.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=55&Itemid=71](http://bgirlsforever.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=55&Itemid=71).

### **USS Segundo (SS 398)**

**Dates:** May 31-June 5, 2009

**Location:** Edgewater Hotel, Laughlin, Nev.

**For more info:** To make reservations, call the Edgewater Hotel at (800) 477-4837 and specify that you are with the USS Segundo Group. Hotel reservations can be made at any time, but must be made no later than April 31<sup>st</sup> to guarantee the group rate. Contact Ken Owen at (760) 744-1771 or email [kenowen1@cox.net](mailto:kenowen1@cox.net). Details can also be found at [www.segundo398.org](http://www.segundo398.org).

### **Class of 593 Reunion, presented by USS Guardfish (SSN 612)**

**Dates:** June 23-27, 2009 – all vets of Thresher class submarines are invited

**Location:** Radisson Hotel, New London, CT

**For more info:** Contact: R. E. "Twig" Armstrong, 15 Duckworth Rd., Hebron, NH 03241. You can also call him at (603) 744-2078 or e-mail [uss\\_guardfish@metrocast.net](mailto:uss_guardfish@metrocast.net).

### **USS James Madison (SSBN 627)**

**Dates:** July 8-12, 2009

**Location:** Silverdale Beach Hotel, Bremerton, WA

**For more info:** Contact Fred Huwe at [fchuwe@cheqnet.net](mailto:fchuwe@cheqnet.net) or visit [www.ussjamesmadison627.com](http://www.ussjamesmadison627.com). You may also contact the hotel at 1-800-544-9799 (ask for USS James Madison reunion rates)

### **USS Tullibee (SSN-597) Reunion**

**Date/Time:** July 9-12, 2009

**Location:** Groton, CT (Host hotel to be announced soon.)

**For more info:** Contact Bill Keel at [bill\\_597@yahoo.com](mailto:bill_597@yahoo.com) or (815) 715-9966.

### **USS Dace SSN 247 and SSN 607 Reunion**

**Dates/Time:** August 7 through 10, 2009

**Location:** Best Western Hotel, Groton, CT

**For more info:** Contact Dick Geiler at [Mrgitch@comcast.net](mailto:Mrgitch@comcast.net) (860) 889-2846 or Karl Jens @ [Jenskh@hotmail.com](mailto:Jenskh@hotmail.com) (860) 445-0124 or visit <http://ussdace.org/>

## **USS William H Bates (SSN 680) REGROUPEX 09, hosted by the 82-85 Core Group**

**Dates:** September 4-7, 2009

**Location:** Town & Country Resort and Convention Center, San Diego, CA

**For more info:** Visit [www.ssn-680.org](http://www.ssn-680.org), or contact Brad Williamson at [bradwmson@ssn-680.org](mailto:bradwmson@ssn-680.org) or at (269) 405-1083.

## **U.S. Submarine Veterans, Inc. 2009 National Convention**

*A joint convention with the International Submariners Association and the Submariners Association of Canada*

**Dates:** Sept 8-12, 2009

**Location:** Town & Country Resort and Convention Center, San Diego, CA

**For more info:** Visit <http://www.ussvisandiego.org/Convention2009/index.htm> or contact Mike Hacking at (858) 495-0562 or [mrhacking@san.rr.com](mailto:mrhacking@san.rr.com). More than 35 boat reunions are also scheduled for the San Diego convention.

## **USS Carbonero (SS 337)**

**Date:** Sept. 10, 2009 (in conjunction with the annual USSVI Convention listed above)

**Location:** Town & Country Resort and Convention Center, San Diego, CA

**For more info:** Look for details in the March newsletter, or contact Dan O'Dwyer, 1108 W. Bloomfield Dr. Inverness, FL 34453, call (352) 341-0316, or e-mail at [subvet08@tampabay.rr.com](mailto:subvet08@tampabay.rr.com).

## **USS Sealion (a.k.a. Sea Lion) including SS, SSP, ASSP, APSS & LPSS-315**

**Date:** September 11, 2009 at 1830 (in conjunction with the annual USSVI Convention listed above)

**Location:** Town & Country Resort, San Diego, CA

**For details contact:** EMC(SS) John Clear, USN Ret., 180 Robin Lane, Port Ludlow, WA 98365, call (360) 437-1143 or email [webmaster@usssealion.com](mailto:webmaster@usssealion.com).

## **USS Charr (SS 328)**

**Dates:** Sept. 17-20, 2009

**Location:** Crowne Plaza Convention Center, Portland, OR

**For more info:** Contact Carl Klein, Secretary/Treasurer, 1900 Rollingwood Road, Baltimore, Md., 21228, call at (410) 747-7292, or e-mail at [ckleinsr@gmail.com](mailto:ckleinsr@gmail.com).

## **USS Lapon (SS 260 & SSN 661)**

**Dates:** Sept. 24-27, 2009

**Location:** Landmark Resort, Myrtle Beach, SC

**For more info:** Visit <http://www.usslapon.com>, or contact reunion coordinator Raymond Zieverink at (803) 324-1414 or [lapon.reunion@yahoo.com](mailto:lapon.reunion@yahoo.com).

## **USS Trumpetfish (SS 425)**

**Dates:** Oct. 8-12, 2009

**Location:** Hyatt Fair Lakes Hotel, Fairfax, VA

**For more info:** Contact Terry Trump at 843-873-9563 or email: [ss425@hotmail.com](mailto:ss425@hotmail.com).

---

## **China's Naval Gambit**

A challenge to America's dominance of the seas.

*By Michael Mazza, The Weekly Standard, April 8, 2009*

The future of America's long-running dominance of the seas is under threat. The Department of Defense reported recently that the Chinese navy is continuing to modernize at a rapid clip. It is adding guided missile destroyers and nuclear and diesel-electric attack submarines to its fleet, and is developing over-the-horizon radars and next-generation anti-ship cruise missiles, and possibly even the first ever anti-ship ballistic missile. Not only have Chinese ships recently harassed unarmed U.S. naval vessels in the South China Sea, but according to reports emanating from Japan, China will likely complete construction on two conventional aircraft carriers by 2015, and will begin construction on two more nuclear carriers in 2020.

Recently, an influential People's Liberation Army (PLA) publication put these power projection plans in context. The newspaper described the concept of a "national interest frontier": national defense will be extended to include all areas of the globe where China has interests.

Unfortunately, these developments have received little attention in the United States. China, the thinking goes, presents only a potential long-term threat and its efforts to build carriers are not as frightening as North Korean and Iranian efforts to develop nuclear weapons arsenals. But China is already a nuclear power, and its ambitions far outreach those of its erstwhile friends in Pyongyang or its newfound friends in Iran.

Indeed, while the prospect of nuclear-armed rogues is alarming, China's rise provides a great threat to broader U.S. interests and to global stability and security. As a country whose "behavior as a responsible stakeholder has yet to be consistently demonstrated," as PACOM commander Admiral Timothy Keating has said, China's plan to acquire carriers should be raising alarm bells.

To be sure, China's efforts to develop a modernized, deployable fleet are not entirely unreasonable. China's economy is heavily dependent on maritime trade, and thus the safeguarding of shipping lanes is critical to Chinese security. One cannot fault China for sending destroyers to East African waters to protect its merchant fleet.

But given the many divergent U.S.-Chinese interests, it is important to consider the downsides of China's future naval plans. Protection of China's merchant fleet is certainly not the PLA Navy's only reason for building carriers and deploying ships far outside its territorial waters. China is acting to alter the balance of power in Asia and working to diminish U.S. presence in the region. The PLA has engaged in a significant build-up over the past twenty years. China's Air Force is on pace to have the largest air fleet in the region within the next decade. Their navy is developing blue-water capabilities, deploying new submarines at an unparalleled rate, and, now, is determined to add aircraft carriers to its fleet. And the PLA has modernized and grown its strategic conventional and nuclear missile force. In short, China is developing considerable power projection capabilities at a time when it faces no discernable external threats. Its cutting edge cyber and space weaponry are explicitly aimed at attacking American vulnerabilities. While China's strategic plans are not made public, the nature of its military build-up suggests that China is intent on reasserting itself as the dominant power in Asia. Only the United States stands in its way.

## Greening up the Defense Department

Energy-efficient military systems make sense for multiple reasons

By Scott Hamilton, *Armed Forces Journal*, April 6, 2009

Aboard the ballistic-missile submarine *Maryland*, on the surface en route from Kings Bay, Ga., to deep water off the continental shelf for diving, a group of journalists was being briefed by the chief of the boat when the ship began vibrating and shaking. The source of the vibration was a mystery until later, when the skipper, Cmdr. Jeffrey Grimes, joined the group and explained that a pod of right whales crossed the course of the *Maryland*. Full reverse was applied to bring the nuclear-powered submarine to a halt, giving the whales the right of way.

Whales, Grimes said, get preference if there is time to stop — even in times of world crisis.

Whenever a ship comes to port, bobbing lines go around the ship to contain any leaking fuel or other contaminants. In Iraq, the Army engages in recycling, employing locals to dispose of the materials and creating jobs in the process. The Air Force has been using alternative and renewable energy sources at bases for years. The Marine Corps follows the policies of the Department of the Navy.

The four services have comprehensive environmental plans, including restoration, pollution prevention, cleanup and general environmental quality.

"Green" acquisition and environmental sensitivity may be in vogue in civilian life, but these don't immediately come to mind when thinking of the military. High-profile disputes between the Navy and environmentalists over sonar training, in which pings might disturb whales, or between the Army and groups wanting to protect sensitive lands used for training, give the services an anti-environmental image.

To be sure, there have been some what-were-they-thinking moments, such as when the Navy proposed putting an airport for carrier fighter training next to a bird sanctuary in Virginia, a move that would have put the birds and the airplanes at risk.

But the Defense Department and its suppliers, from those for pencils all the way to major procurement programs, are doing more in the area of environmental improvements than is recognized.

In 2004, the Pentagon issued a policy paper, the "Department of Defense Green Procurement Strategy," outlining its thinking and using words like "REQUIRE" and stating that green procurement "must be considered as the first choice in ALL procurements." (Capitalization is the Pentagon's.)

The policy paper focused principally on office products, printing, fleet vehicles and other non-weapons acquisitions. But it also identified bio-based products, alternative fuels and fuel efficiency and non-ozone depleting substances as part of its Green Procurement Program.

In the bitter competition for the Air Force's KC-X aerial tanker contract, Boeing promoted its KC-767 as being more environmentally friendly than the Northrop Grumman/Airbus KC-30 because, being a smaller airplane, it burned less fuel and therefore produced fewer greenhouse gases. Boeing's announcement was framed in the context of the then-high profile debate going on in Europe in the commercial aviation industry. The pitch didn't do well as a public relations effort, largely because few understood or

even knew of Pentagon policies toward procurement that promoted more environmentally friendly acquisitions, and Boeing didn't tell anyone, either.

This is not to suggest that a "greener" product (which Northrop disputed in any case) would win the day over technical considerations. But it demonstrates that a major contractor tried to interject environmentalism into a major defense department procurement.

The services have embarked on a program to find alternatives to traditional carbon-based fuels. The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) is spending vast sums of money investigating bio-fuels and synthetic fuels for military aircraft. The main motivation seems to be that the Defense Department doesn't want to be captive to foreign oil and the fluctuating costs experienced during 2008, when the price went as high as \$150 per barrel; fuel is one of the largest items in the defense budget. Still, switching from carbon-based fuels to alternatives will help the environment.

Boeing has been working for years to develop more environmentally friendly commercial airliners, but acknowledges it's been slow to apply these initiatives to the defense business. This is now changing. Through its own program inherited from the merger with McDonnell Douglas, it is developing the Blended Wing Body jointly with NASA. The technology promises to reduce fuel consumption by about 30 percent compared with current generation airplanes. The Air Force is interested in the Blended Wing Body as a cargo transport and potentially an aerial tanker.

The Pentagon's Green Procurement Program is slowly expanding into tactical acquisition programs. Three years ago a department called Emerging Containments was formed, since renamed the Chemicals and Materials Risk Management Directorate, which is the part of the Office of Secretary of Defense charged with changing the way the services look at procuring systems. Reducing the use of hazardous materials, acquiring systems with total life-cycle programs (from delivery to dismantling in a recyclable way) and complying with environmental regulations worldwide are the key goals.

Carole LeBlanc, special expert at the directorate, said: "This is a totally different approach to be proactive, not just with existing regulations but also with proposed regulations."

By selecting environmentally friendly chemicals at the design and acquisition stages, it becomes safer to dispose of the materials when the time comes and service personnel are safer when using the things the chemicals are in, LeBlanc said.

The Green Procurement Program includes supplies used every day: paint, solvents, cleaning materials and recycled paper, to name a few. There have also been policies adopted to implement green processes and avoiding hazardous chemicals entirely.

#### Living In A Green Submarine

The Virginia-class attack submarine is an example in which the Navy asked contractors to take environmental considerations into account.

Michael V. Parulis, principal engineer at General Dynamics' Electric Boat Division, described the thinking that went into the new attack submarine.

"We set out to build a green submarine, through the life cycle — in the yard, operating it and cutting up the boat on decommissioning it," he said. "We set out on ambitious programs. We set out a list of consumable products in manufacturing and ultimately we have a savings in hazardous waste disposals."

The contractors, including Northrop Grumman, which shares construction and assembly of the Virginias with Electric Boat, achieved a 60 percent reduction in adhesives, 80 percent in solvents and cleaning products and 30 percent in painting and coating. There is no asbestos and no ozone-depleting substances in Virginia class.

Electric Boat's new hull-painting procedure uses a powder paint instead of epoxy and a process that saves about 8,000 pounds of volatile organic compounds (ozone and smog-producing substances) and 500 pounds of hazardous waste (cleaners, leftover paint). The Virginias even have a space designed for on-board storage of used plastics and other trash, compared with the Los Angeles- and Ohio-class subs that don't have them and require crews to store the trash wherever they can.

The Navy gave the direction to build a green submarine but left it up to the contractors to figure out how. Electric Boat analyzed 170 systems, getting rid of, among other things, cadmium and chromium, with plans to map all parts in the sub so repair crews know if there are any hazardous materials to be concerned about. About 35,000 parts have been mapped so far.

Northrop Grumman uses paints on its ships that are more environmentally friendly and employs the latest technologies and techniques for controlling the paints that are applied.

The company closely monitors the chemicals and gases used in its manufacturing processes and employs continuous process improvements programs to find ways to reduce emissions and use more environmentally friendly alternatives.

Boeing is working with the Defense Department to reduce hazardous and ozone-producing chemicals. For example, Boeing's AH-64 Apache helicopters now use chrome-free primer and the F/A-18 Super Hornet fighter uses non-ozone depleting fire suppressant.

Boeing also has an aggressive internal goal to reduce hazardous waste and greenhouse gas emissions by 25 percent.

Lockheed Martin's F-22 fighter aircraft program achieved green sustainability accomplishments through several initiatives. The F-22 Hazardous Materials Program reduces hazardous materials, and environmental and health impacts from design through the life cycle. For example, Lockheed eliminated cadmium on landing gear and on aircraft exterior surface fasteners, reduced volatile organics in coatings and eliminated chrome in sealants. Environmental, safety and health/hazmat support is provided by Lockheed Martin to sustain F-22 Air Force bases through the company's F-22 Environmental and Health Working Group.

The Lockheed Martin F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program has a 75 percent reduction in hazardous materials used to support the aircraft system. The F-35 will use chrome-free primer and sealants, water-based cleaners, and will extensively use adhesive coating applications instead of paint.

Lockheed's F-35 program also includes energy conservation and emissions control in the facility's operation. Chilled-water use is reduced by 40 percent and steam use is cut by 60 percent over previous systems. Air-handling equipment, which controls temperature and humidity conditions, extracts up to 10,000 gallons of water per day from the outside air and recycles it in a cooling tower. Similar to processes used by Northrop and Electric Boat, aircraft paint and coatings are free of volatile organic compounds and a high-efficiency air-filtration system will remove more than 99 percent of particulate emissions from the facility.

#### Earth-Friendly It Systems

A major source of landfill debris and power requirements historically has been electronic materials from computers and other electronic sources. In the increasingly digitized world, contractors and the services want to reduce the number of servers, increasing the power and making the internal components recyclable.

"What we're seeing in the information systems areas is a lot more attention to weight, power and cooling requirements, all known as green IT," said Robert Brammer, vice president and chief technology officer at Northrop Grumman.

"A lot of technical developments are being done with major IT firms like IBM, Cisco and Intel that are less power-hungry and use less toxic materials," he said. "We design architectures that implement these new technologies and environmental footprint but meet the requirements of the customers. We're seeing more of these energy standards, such as Energy Star, in RFPs than we even saw just a few years ago in procurements and ground-based buildings. In Navy ships, space and building and power requirements need less space, less power and improved security requirements."

Brammer said the Air Force recently had procurement requirements for consolidation of IT operations for a number of military bases, seeking more efficiency to run more software applications in a given server rather than a number of servers. "This is going on all over the Defense Department these days."

Steve Fugarazzo, manager of facility engineering at Raytheon, said there was a push to green up IT. Information systems requirements and contractors, including Raytheon, are developing virtual servers that get nearly double the output and throughput with same energy as original servers, he said. Circuit card assemblies have been greened up substantially in a number of ways, cutting the carbon footprint by reducing electricity and waste. Creating recyclable circuit cards is part of this effort, although not all fit this goal.

Boeing has been developing technology for unmanned surveillance vehicles that reduces the need for carbon-based fuels. Its High Altitude Long Endurance and Solar Eagle (formerly Vulture) aircraft are intended to loiter for extended periods on limited fuel. The Solar Eagle, as the name implies, uses solar power. These two programs are DARPA initiatives.

Spectra Lab is a Boeing subsidiary that produces a photo cell used in satellite and space equipment. The unit holds a world record for the ability to translate sunlight into energy.

Contractors have been greening up their operations, reducing carbon footprints and energy costs with efficiencies benefiting the Defense Department. Several companies pursue Energy Star and ISO 14001 ratings.

Raytheon has a huge energy program that reduces the cost of doing business and is good for the Earth, Fugarazzo said, adding that this reduces costs for the customer. Energy usage was reduced 12 percent last year on a 45 percent increase in business. Raytheon reduced greenhouse gases by 38 percent between 2002 and 2008, a year earlier than planned and better than the 33 percent goal.

Jeffrey P. Cohen, process improvement engineering specialist at Electric Boat, said that going green has another benefit, also cited by other contractors: It can save money.

Cohen is a black belt (think of judo and karate rankings) for Lean Six Sigma, a widely used industrial process designed to reduce waste and increase efficiency. He was charged with reducing energy usage at Electric Boat. He cited two examples of savings from reduced energy usage: Replacing old, leaking piping for the compressed air system resulted in taking one of two air compressors off line, saving about \$500,000 a year. And by retrofitting 1,000-watt light bulbs — the kind used in giant production spaces — with 750 watt bulbs, Electric Boat saved between \$300,000 and \$500,000 annually.

Northrop Grumman's Brammer said his company was under contract with the Air Force for a facility energy reduction program. In 2007, energy was reduced by more than 12 percent, exceeding mandated goals.

The big contractors have been moving toward better environmental stewardship, not only in their own production systems but also in what they offer to the Pentagon. Many have obtained the ISO 14001 rating, which validates their efforts to reduce their environmental footprint. Boeing, Lockheed Martin and other contracts have achieved this rating on many production facilities.

Have the armed services and the contractors done enough for environmental protection? The answer, in a historical context, is no. The Defense Department and contractors have generally been late to the party — after all, the environmental movement has been around for more than 30 years. But the Pentagon has made significant strides.

The debate continues over whether global warming is caused by humans or is a natural cycle, and the commercial aviation industry continues to resist mandated regulations by insisting it's only responsible for between 2 percent and 3 percent of carbon dioxide emissions. But this is hardly the point. That humans harm the environment is indisputable, and while those who point to natural pollutants also are correct, it's impossible to regulate or prevent goose poop, so man, including military man, has to do his part. AFJ



## Gates' Proposed Cuts Seen As Good Sign By Sub Supporters

Virginia-class vessel not mentioned in Pentagon weapons-reduction plan

By Jennifer Grogan, *The Day*, April 7, 2009

Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates did not mention the Virginia-class submarine program at all Monday when he unveiled a series of cuts he would like to make to major weapons programs - an omission that submarine supporters say is a good sign.

"The program meets all of the secretary's tests, the costs are under control and it fills a real national security need," U.S. Rep. Joe Courtney, D-2nd District, said Monday. "The fact that it was left unmentioned is very positive."

In what he is calling a "fundamental overhaul" to weapons procurement, acquisition and contracting, Gates announced the Pentagon's request for the 2010 fiscal year before the White House submits a budget to Congress because of the scope of the changes.

He proposed eliminating programs that are over budget or provide more capability than needed, including the Air Force's F-22 jet fighter and a new fleet of presidential helicopters, and shifting resources to programs he hopes will help the military fight irregular wars.

Electric Boat in Groton, which co-builds Virginia-class submarines with Northrop Grumman Newport News in Virginia, learned Monday that Gates wants to begin the program to build the next-generation ballistic-missile submarines to replace the current fleet of Ohio-class submarines in 2010.

EB President John P. Casey has called this replacement program critical to the company's well-being since it will keep designers busy and prevent their skills from atrophying.

"Today's announcement by Secretary Gates regarding the Department of Defense's shipbuilding priorities is consistent with Electric Boat's vision," Casey said in a statement Monday. "We will strive to ensure our products continue to affordably satisfy our national security requirements."

Gov. M. Jodi Rell said this represents "good news for jobs in southeastern Connecticut," while U.S. Sen. Chris Dodd, D-Conn., called it "a vote of confidence in Connecticut's skilled workers."

But Connecticut officials, including the governor and the congressional delegation, were upset to learn that Gates wants to end production of the F-22 fighter at 187, when more than 300 were planned, and invest instead in the next-generation fighter jet known as the F-35.

The F-22s are powered by jet engines manufactured by Pratt & Whitney and include parts from Hamilton Sundstrand, two Connecticut-based units of United Technologies Corp. in East Hartford.

The work done in Connecticut on the F-35 may not be enough to make up for the loss of the F-22, Courtney said.

"Thousands of critical Connecticut jobs depend on the future of the F-22 program and I will be working with our state's congressional delegation to fight for those jobs every step of the way," Rell said in a statement. "It is important to remember that today's recommendation is no more than that, the final decision rests with Congress and the president."

The Pentagon proposals are a step in drafting the final spending plan for 2010. Many of the proposed cuts, like the F-22, are sure to face stiff opposition in Congress. The budget is expected to be submitted to Congress in May.

Sen. Joe Lieberman, D-Conn., is already planning to hold hearings to assess Gates' proposals and modify them. He said he supports reforming the Defense Department but disagrees with some of the specific proposals, including the F-22.

Gates also wants to cancel the contract for a new version of the Marine One presidential helicopter, a contract that was awarded to Lockheed Martin over Stratford-based Sikorsky Aircraft and has since doubled in cost.

Dodd said Sikorsky was not given a fair shot at the contract and the cancellation announcement gives him hope that that the company will have another chance to compete.

## Pentagon Cuts Divide Lawmakers

By Jen Dimascio, *politico.com*, April 7, 2009

Now that Defense Secretary Robert Gates has rolled out major cuts to some of the Pentagon's largest weapons systems, the decision to accept or reject those changes falls on Congress.

The "plus-up" practice, as it is known at the Pentagon, has been around for ages: When the executive branch cuts money with one hand, Congress restores it with the other.

But this year, lawmakers have a lot on their plate — a major economic crisis, a new administration and two ongoing wars. So here's a primer on six broad voting blocs on the Hill and the sort of negotiating posture each will likely adopt to give and take away. Keep in mind that even programs not cut by Gates could end up on the chopping block in the congressional wheeling and dealing; the nation's nearly \$700 billion-a-year war machine has rich targets of opportunity.

### Appropriators

With all the advance speculation about Gates' cuts, Rep. John P. Murtha (D-Pa.), chairman of the House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, has already put forward a few recommendations of his own.

If the administration wants to slow a new competition for aerial refueling tankers, he'll try to get appropriators to add funding in the war spending bill to start one.

But he's also willing to compromise.

The VH-71 presidential helicopter has come under scrutiny because its budget has more than doubled since the program began. The government was supposed to buy a total of 28 choppers — five of an initial capability and 23 of a more advanced variety. Murtha's proposing that the Navy scrap the extra advancements and keep buying the more-limited but still new Marine One aircraft.

Slash-spending Democrats

Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.) and other influential members of Congress are lining up for their turn to swing the budget ax. They may not have a lot of sway with two wars under way. But the group's strong demand to reduce spending could lay the groundwork for cuts in years to come, particularly as U.S. troops begin to redeploy home from Iraq.

Frank has been adamant in pushing for deep reductions, calling for a \$100 billion cut by ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Frank estimates he could whack another \$60 billion from Defense using a list pitched by Larry Korb of the Center for American Progress that takes aim at weapons systems such as Virginia-class submarines and the Missile Defense Agency's entire budget of about \$10 billion.

Defense insiders dismiss the \$60 billion figure as unrealistic. Even if the Virginia-class submarine were to fall to budget knives, the Navy still needs a submarine capability, and the Pentagon would have to use some of the estimated \$3 billion in savings to buy or develop another sub, which could be even more expensive, industry officials say.

Moderate Democrats

On the other end, a number of pro-military Democrats — particularly those on the Armed Services committees — are not expected to push as hard for cuts to defense while the nation is still fighting wars.

But Michigan Sen. Carl Levin, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Rhode Island Sen. Jack Reed, an Army veteran and member of both the Armed Services and Appropriations committees, may be receptive to cutting deals instead of budgets.

Take, for example, Levin's rhetoric on missile defense. Unlike hard-line missile defense opponents within the Democratic Party, he advocates the more nuanced approach that would perhaps slow development of the futuristic but unproven systems while increasing efforts to test them.

That argument was advanced by President Barack Obama last weekend when he pledged support for a missile defense shield in Europe to counter threats from Iran, as long as the system was "cost effective and proven."

Blue Dog Democrats

Closely related to the congressional moderates are the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Democrats in the House, who buck the notion that Dems are weak on defense. Since their home districts tend to be conservative and heavy with military veterans and bases, they typically offer strong support for noncontroversial defense spending, such as additional body and vehicle armor.

Several are members of the House Armed Services Committee, including Reps. John M. Spratt Jr. of South Carolina, Gene Taylor of Mississippi and Jim Cooper of Tennessee.

The group favors pay-as-you-go budgeting and wants to end supplemental funding of the wars. But doing so without substantially increasing the overall size of the defense budget means that something in the defense budget has to give — and the prime candidates are weapons systems.

Good-government Republicans

From where the Blue Dogs sit, it's not a far leap across the partisan aisle to moderate Republicans, who have seen a few weapons systems they don't like.

The chief example: Arizona Sen. John McCain, who helped earn his maverick label by downing Boeing Corp.'s bid to make aerial refueling tankers early in the decade.

McCain, the ranking Republican on the Armed Services Committee, has aligned with the chairman to co-sponsor an acquisition reform bill. Eliminating waste from the Pentagon's weapons buying system has long been a campaign point for the senator, and, by some calculations, there's plenty to aim for: A recent report by the Government Accountability Office found that the Pentagon's top weapons systems were nearly \$300 billion over budget.

But don't take that to mean McCain wants to cut to the bone. He remains an advocate for robust defense spending.

Four percent for freedom

The strongest defense industry supporters on Capitol Hill have been a tad quiet since the election, when the push was on to fund Defense at 4 percent or greater of the gross domestic product. Then again, that was also before the worst of the economic crisis.

Against the background of cuts to major weapons systems, this group is beginning to protest that rolling war-spending bills into the larger Pentagon budget means a de facto cut for weapons systems. Add to that growing personnel costs, and the pressure to cut prized procurement and research accounts is unavoidable.

With reports emerging that the Missile Defense Agency may be dissolving — following North Korea's controversial ballistic missile launch on Sunday — expect Sen. Jon Kyl and Rep. Trent Franks, both Arizona Republicans, as well as Alabama Republican Sens. Jeff Sessions and Richard Shelby to argue that cutting missile defense will harm national security.

Alaskans are watching, too.

“With this launch, I remain disappointed to hear continued rumors of budget cuts to our missile defense programs,” said Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska). “In light of the actions taken by North Korea, now is not the time to make cuts to these essential programs.”

## **Obama’s Nuclear Nonproliferation Plan Heralds Changes For DOE Labs**

*By Katherine Ling, The New York Times, April 6, 2009*

President Obama’s plans for reducing the U.S. stockpile of nuclear weapons and production of fissile materials signal changes ahead for the nation’s nuclear strategy and weapons labs.

“The basic bargain is sound: Countries with nuclear weapons will move toward disarmament, countries without nuclear weapons will not acquire them, and all countries can access peaceful nuclear energy,” Obama said in a speech yesterday in Prague.

“If we are serious about stopping the spread of these weapons, then we should put an end to the dedicated production of weapons-grade materials that create them. That’s the first step.”

While much of the speech pointed to long-term goals, Obama said that in four years he aims to safeguard currently unsecured radioactive material on black markets through better detection of materials in transit and through “financial tools.”

Obama particularly highlighted the U.S.-Russia collaboration, urging its expansion as well as the creation of new partnerships and higher standards. In a meeting last week, Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev said they will begin negotiations in July to further reduce both nations’ nuclear weapons stockpiles.

To further his goal, Obama said he will seek to “strengthen” the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty by providing resources for international inspections and establishing “real and immediate consequences for countries caught breaking the rules or trying to leave the treaty without cause.” He will also boost support for the nation’s Proliferation Security Initiative and the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism to make them into “durable international institutions.” Obama’s blueprint budget released in February shows an increase in funds for nonproliferation programs.

Obama also said he plans to host a global summit on nuclear security within the next year.

Obama said he will “aggressively” push for the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which bans the testing of nuclear weapons. The United States has not tested a nuclear weapon since 1993 and has signed the treaty but has yet to ratify it, along with China, North Korea, Pakistan and several other countries.

Laura Holgate, vice president for Russia/new independent states programs at the Nuclear Threat Initiative, said Obama’s commitment and focus on nuclear nonproliferation should turn nonproliferation initiatives from an ad hoc effort to “more institutionalized mechanisms for nonproliferation.”

As for Obama’s four-year goal on securing nuclear material, Holgate said it will be “tough” but worthy.

“There is a lot to be done, unfortunately,” Holgate said. “I think there has been a lot of damage done to the U.S. stature in the world. I think we need to repair that damage. It’s a lofty goal, a worthy one, [and] certainly a goal the U.S. cannot accomplish on its own.”

### **DOE impact**

All of these goals will have serious consequences for the Energy Department’s nuclear weapons labs, which have been the subject of intense debate recently.

DOE’s nuclear weapons programs — including nonproliferation — received \$9 billion in funds for the past two years, which is about one-third of the department’s budget. Almost two-thirds of the budget is used to maintain the nation’s nuclear weapons stockpile.

Efforts to shrink the weapons stockpile or Obama’s decision to cancel work on the advanced nuclear weapon known as the “reliable replacement warhead” in his recent budget puts into question NNSA’s size and budget for the future, said Philip Coyle, a senior adviser at the World Security Institute and a former top official for nuclear operations and testing in the Defense Department.

“Assumptions made about how many nuclear warheads might be produced in the future are key to sizing the NNSA production complex for the future,” Coyle said at a recent congressional hearing. “Now that the Obama administration has made a decision to halt the RRW, the production workload for complex transformation can be cut in half,” he said.

A small nuclear weapons stockpile will mean less work and less funding for the nation’s laboratories — an alarming scenario for the labs’ thousands of scientists and other workers in places like New Mexico, California, Nevada, Tennessee and Idaho. Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) has said laying off the scientists in the labs could potentially be a national security threat, as scientists could be tempted to seek employment elsewhere.

The changing role of the labs and DOE’s focus on renewable energy and technology have also prompted calls for a transfer of the nuclear weapons responsibility to the Defense Department or an independent entity. The Office of Management and Budget directed DOE, DOD and the National Nuclear Security Administration — the independent agency under DOE that manages the nuclear stockpile — to review such a move and report their findings in a report by September.

Lawmakers have been asking the administration to hold off on making any major decisions about the nuclear weapons labs until Obama officially releases his “nuclear posture review” in January 2010 — although this could be a strong indication of what that report will find. They have also been emphasizing a lot of the other missions the labs work on, including nonproliferation and forensics (E&ENews PM, March 30).

## Nuclear energy

Obama also emphasized that all countries that renounce nuclear weapons should have access to peaceful nuclear energy, listing the fight against global warming alongside the need to reduce nuclear weapons.

“We must harness the power of nuclear energy on behalf of our efforts to combat climate change and to advance peace opportunity for all people,” Obama said.

The world must create an international fuel bank so countries can get fuel without having to enrich uranium themselves — a road that could lead to the capacity to create nuclear weapons, Obama said. Obama introduced legislation supporting such a bank when he was a senator. The International Atomic Energy Agency recently achieved a \$100 million financial benchmark laid out by the Nuclear Threat Initiative, which will match it with \$50 million contribution (E&ENews PM, March 6).

The United Arab Emirates has been praised for its decision to move forward with a civil nuclear program by promising not to seek enrichment capabilities. President George W. Bush signed a civil nuclear agreement with the country last year but did not submit it to the Senate. The Obama administration is still considering the agreement.

But others are concerned about the two dozen countries previously without a reactor currently showing interest in nuclear power, including Algeria, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela.

## Nuclear Dreams And Nightmares

*The Guardian, April 7, 2009*

President Obama’s commitment to a “global zero” as the goal of a nuclear-free future could signify the start of an important shift in America’s legitimacy in tackling the worldwide nuclear arms race (Reports, 6 April).

By prioritising disarmament alongside non-proliferation, and seeking to ensure the US fulfils its obligations under the nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT), Obama could help restore confidence in a treaty which his predecessors have done much to undermine.

In recent years it has proved difficult for the US to legitimately challenge countries for breaches of the NPT while violating the treaty itself. America has consistently refused to reduce its own nuclear arsenal (as required under article VI) as well as developing and deploying new generations of tactical nuclear weapons around the world (in violation of articles I and II).

President Obama’s vision is not just built of words but is already backed by some action. He has stopped funding for the development of a replacement nuclear warhead and is pushing the Senate to ratify the comprehensive test ban treaty. Gordon Brown, who has committed Britain to spending £20bn on Trident replacement, should take note.

Stefan Simanowitz

London

President Obama’s words on the possibility of a nuclear-weapons-free world could fill us with hope. But his statement was made at the time of the Nato summit and there was no word at all from the meeting about Nato’s policies of minimum nuclear deterrence, nuclear sharing and the first use of nuclear weapons. It is the latter, that is obligations to Nato, which, according to successive UK ministers, means that the UK government would use nuclear weapons first. The Nato states must face up to new ways of thinking and stop claiming nuclear weapons are needed for security or “to preserve the peace”. Nato should produce a nuclear-weapons-free defence policy in the revised Strategic Concept expected next year at the summit in Portugal.

Let us hope that the UK government can now take the lead in Nato and begin to carry out its NPT obligations, as well as disarm in good faith. It is now crucially important that UK ministers stop iterating empty comments, such as John Hutton did at the weekend, that the UK needs a “minimum nuclear deterrent”.

Rae Street

North Korea is not the only challenge to Obama’s admirable ambition to see a world free of nuclear weapons. Aside from the obvious difficulties of persuading the current nuclear powers to disarm, he will also at some stage have to face up to Israel’s nuclear arsenal. With perhaps 250 warheads, it has a significant proportion of the world’s total and yet the US has never contradicted Israel’s “strategic ambiguity” as to whether it even possesses them or not.

At some point, the US and Israel will have to openly admit the truth - that Israel has nuclear weapons. Iran and others will always feel threatened until that is acknowledged. Without Israel playing its part in a disarmament process, Obama’s dream of a world free of nuclear weapons will remain just that, a dream.

Dr Stephen Leah

York

The fuss over North Korea’s missile launch should be kept in perspective. It was the United States that created the North Korean state in August 1945 by ordering Colonels Dean Rusk and Charles Bonesteel to draw an arbitrary line on a map of the peninsula. This strategic partition divided a nation that had been united under the Yi dynasty for more than five centuries. The missile launch violated several UN security council resolutions, but when did such violations worry a US indifferent to Turkey’s posture in Cyprus and Israel’s occupation of Palestine? It is true that North Korea opposes IAEA inspections, but when did the US or Israel allow UN inspections of their nuclear facilities? Complaints that North Korea ignores the nuclear non-proliferation treaty are specious. It withdrew as it is entitled to do under article X of the treaty.

Geoff Simons

Author, *Korea: The Search for Sovereignty*

## British Subs Involved in 14 Accidents in Two Decades

NTI, April 6, 2009

British submarines carrying Trident nuclear missiles have experienced 14 collisions and 234 fires over the last two decades, the London Times reported Saturday (see GSN, Feb. 17).

In the latest incident, the HMS Vanguard collided in February with the French submarine Le Triomphant in the Atlantic Ocean.

Five of the incidents — which included the grounding of the HMS Trafalgar in 1996 and a similar incident involving the HMS Spartan nearly six years earlier — had not previously been made public. Dozens of fires had also not been reported.

Defense Minister Bob Ainsworth gave a full accounting following a request from Scottish National Party lawmaker Angus Robertson.

“One collision is too many — especially when it involves a submarine carrying weapons of mass destruction,” Robertson said. “The possible consequences do not bear thinking about.”

All unreported incidents were minor, the Defense Ministry said.

“During the 40 years of operating nuclear submarines in a unique and challenging environment, no fire, grounding or collision has ever compromised nuclear safety,” a spokesman said (Lorraine Davidson, London Times, April 4).

## Exclusive: Shock New Figures Reveal Entire Submarine Crew's Worth Of Sailors Have Gone Missing From Scotland

By Stephen Stewart, DailyRecord.co.uk, April 7, 2009

SCORES of Scottish sailors - enough to crew a nuclear submarine - have gone AWOL or been declared unfit to serve, according to figures.

A total of 42 staff left their posts without permission at HM Naval Base Clyde at Faslane, near Helensburgh, home of the UK's nuclear strategic nuclear deterrent.

Another 80 personnel from various Scottish naval bases were found to be medically unfit.

The Ministry of Defence's previously unpublished figures revealed that 122 staff were either AWOL or unfit.

A typical British submarine would have a crew of around 120 officers and men.

A wide range of ranks - up to lieutenant level - were too sick to serve at Faslane, HMS Gannet and HMS Caledonia.

Last year, 10 Royal Navy personnel went awol from Faslane, more than double the figure for the year before.

The Daily Record used freedom of information laws to get the latest absence and sickness figures for 2005 to 2008 from the Ministry of Defence. We previously revealed that 615 Scottish soldiers, the equivalent of a full battalion, were AWOL or off sick.

Liberal Democrat Alan Reid MP - whose Argyll and Bute constituency covers Faslane - said the armed forces were clearly overstretched.

He said: “This applies to the Navy as much as to the Army. It should be remembered that many sailors, as well as soldiers, are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan.

“Long voyages and other tours of duty place strains on family relationships. Our armed forces risk their lives for their country and their welfare should be a top priority for the government.

“More resources should be devoted to equipping our armed forces properly for the tasks they undertake and taking care of the welfare of them and their families, who often live in substandard housing.”

More than 3000 Royal Navy personnel work at Faslane while less than 30 service staff work at HMS Gannet - based at Prestwick airport.

HMS Gannet provides 24-hour military and civilian search and rescue across a large part of Scotland, northern England and Northern Ireland.

Former Royal Navy Commander John Muxworthy is chief executive of the UK National Defence Association which campaigns for greater resources for the armed forces.

He said: “These are definitely interesting statistics. The Army is just more manpower intensive so it's no surprise that their figures are much higher than the Navy's.

“All of the branches of the armed forces are very much overstretched. If this continues, we will undoubtedly see the figures for sickness and AWOL rates rise very significantly.” A survey by the MoD recently found that job satisfaction, job security and pay were the three most important factors in retaining Royal Navy personnel.

Promotion prospects and the impact of service on domestic life remained the most significant challenges to retaining staff.

Some 70 per cent of Royal Navy officers and 58 per cent of naval ratings said they were satisfied with the frequency of their operational deployments.

In 2008, 360 troops from the Royal Regiment of Scotland were AWOL and 255 had been signed off by medics. The regiment's total strength is 2400. A year previously, the figure for absence was 500.

## Taiwan May Build Its Own Submarines

By David Young, *The China Post*, April 7, 2009

TAIPEI, Taiwan — President Ma Ying-jeou is trying to resurrect Project Diving Dragon to create more job opportunities in the shipbuilding industry.

Under the project, which was aborted five years ago, Taiwan would build eight conventional diesel-powered submarines, which President George W. Bush authorized as part of the U.S. arms sales in 2001.

At least five top-level defense meetings have been held to evaluate the possibility that the eight underwater warships can be locally assembled, sources close to the National Security Council said yesterday.

No unanimous agreement was reached, sources said.

Final reports on the meetings, which offered a number of options but recommended construction of the submarines in Taiwan, are being prepared for President Ma's approval.

Ma is likely to give the green light for the local construction to stimulate the economy and help reduce unemployment, sources revealed.

It's not an easy job to resurrect Project Diving Dragon.

First of all, Washington's nod is required. America's full support is needed to arm the submarines and make them operable, too.

The previous Democratic Progressive Party administration took no action on the purchase of the eight submarines for years until 2004.

When it finally proposed a special budget for the purchase, the Legislative Yuan under control of the then-opposition Kuomintang refused to act on it because an exorbitant NT\$412.1 billion price tag was attached to the eight conventional submarines.

James Soong, chairman of the People First Party, called the deal "a fool's arms purchase." His party, together with the Kuomintang, formed a paper-thin majority in the Legislative Yuan.

The United States has already phased out construction of conventional submarines and the Pentagon wanted Taiwan to buy them from a third country. Taiwan proposed Project Diving Dragon.

Washington modified the sales in 2007, after Taiwan's submarine building project was turned down. The Ministry of National Defense has continued to phase in the purchase in small installments, which has yet to be concluded. The fact is that the deal is being stalled.

Opinion is divided over whether the eight submarines should be built in Taiwan.

Just like at the time the project was aborted, many brass hats doubt Taiwan's shipbuilding capability. General Tang Yao-ming, the then-minister of national defense, testified at a Legislative Yuan committee meeting in 2004 nobody could guarantee the seaworthiness of locally built submarines.

"If sailors are killed in a test run, who is going to take responsibility?" questioned Tang, an air force general. Similar questions are being asked now.

But shipbuilders are confident they are up to the job.

"A research plan is under way to build submarine hulls up to the international standard," said Wang Keh-hsuan, vice general manager of the CSBC Corp., Taiwan.

Wang said his state-owned company formerly known as China Shipbuilding Corporation is fully equipped to build submarines with 2,000 to 3,000 deadweight tons.

"Of course, all weapons and communications systems will have to be purchased from abroad," Wang added. "We are all set to undertake the construction, if it is offered," he stressed.

Fears over the safety of locally-built submarines is legitimate, but that's the challenge Taiwan has to take if it wants to have submarines of its own.

Opponents should be reminded that Japan sacrificed hundreds of officers and men to finally succeed in building its own submarines and the Zero fighter, both the best in the world at the time of their debut prior to Pearl Harbor in 1941.

A number of newly built submarines submerged but never came up in their test runs. Many test pilots were killed when their new Zero fighters crash-landed.

Even if a locally-built submarine is more costly than one purchased from abroad, Taiwan has to build its own underwater fighting craft, because naval powers around the world refuse to sell them to Taiwan for fear they might offend the People's Republic.

## Extensions Of Refueled Attack Subs Could Lower Fleet Gap By Two

McCullough testifies to latest study

By Rebekah Gordon, *Inside the Navy*, April 6, 2009

The Navy appears to have determined that extending the service lives of about 16 more Los Angeles-class (SSN) subs that have been through their mid-life nuclear refueling could close the impending gap in the attack fleet by another two subs, a top Navy official told lawmakers last week.

Vice Adm. Barry McCullough, the deputy chief of naval operations for integration of capabilities and resources, testified in an April 1 House Appropriations defense subcommittee hearing on shipbuilding that the examination, which is now in his office for briefing to the chief of naval operations, centered on the subs' nuclear fuel consumption and projected consumption.

"That would mitigate the gap, I think, by an additional two if we extended an additional 16 submarines," McCullough told the panel.

The Navy says that it needs at least 48 nuclear-powered attack submarines for an adequate force; today it has 53. In about 2027, McCullough testified, as the older Los Angeles-class subs are retired and newer Virginia-class subs are commissioned, the fleet total could drop to 41, and the number wouldn't return to 48 until 2034.

Following the hearing, McCullough told reporters that the study encompassed "Los Angeles class submarines that have been refueled," and examined whether it is "feasible to maintain them for a couple more years of service life to help mitigate the gap." It covered "extending the service life of the 16 that have been refueled, not any further refueling," he added.

Beyond the "couple of years" figure, McCullough said he could not remember the exact duration of the extension period offhand.

The Navy has undertaken other measures to mitigate the shortage as well, including moving up its plans for buying two Virginia-class subs per year to fiscal year 2011 from FY-12. Some lawmakers have called for moving up the two-a-year buy to FY-10, but the Navy has publicly opposed the suggestion.

The service has also trimmed the build period for each Virginia-class sub from 84 months down to 66 months, McCullough testified. Vice Adm. Jay Donnelly, the commander of submarine forces, told *Inside the Navy* in August that the service wants to get the period down to 60 months, which would cut the shortfall by almost half.

McCullough said the Navy has also already kept active some Los Angeles-class subs that were headed for decommissioning. In August, Donnelly said such a move was possible for as many as 19 vessels, giving the fleet 10 additional six-month deployments.

Finally, the Navy has also looked at extending sub deployments by one month — from six months to seven. Donnelly has noted, however, that the option would negatively impact the fleet's ability to surge in time of war and would place stress on sailors.

"I don't want to balance the budget on the backs of the sailors, so that would be the last mitigation step that I would offer up," Donnelly said in August.

In response to lawmakers' concerns about the rise in submarine activity by other nations, and whether the United States might be outflanked, McCullough said the Navy takes "very seriously the submarine threat posed by potential adversaries globally."

"We monitor their activities on a daily basis," McCullough said "So we've got many programs, not only with our submarines, but things associated with surface ships . . . to try to reduce that threat."

## India Should Have Nuclear Attack Submarines

*France AFP, April 3, 2009*

MUMBAI (AFP) — France on Friday gave its backing to India developing a nuclear attack submarine fleet, with a senior naval officer saying it was a "legitimate" step as the country emerges as a major global force.

The commander of the French Joint Forces in the Indian Ocean, Vice Admiral Gerard Valin, said India's military assets had to develop to reflect its position as a key world player, including in maintaining world stability.

Asked if that meant having nuclear attack submarines, he told reporters in Mumbai: "For me it's legitimate."

"A nuclear-propelled submarine gives you mobility. France has a nuclear deterrent. To have a nuclear deterrent you must have submarines capable of ensuring the security of a large area," he added.

"I think that India will be in the same situation" in the future, he said.

India's naval chief said in 2007 that the country's first domestically built nuclear-powered submarine would be ready for sea trials by this year.

The vessel is expected to be an adaptation of the Russian Charlie II class submarine and capable of firing nuclear warheads.

Since then, India has test-fired nuclear-capable ballistic missiles from undersea platforms as part of an ongoing programme to develop land and sea-borne nuclear and conventional missile systems.

France and India have been steadily developing military ties.

Last week the Indian and French navies took part in anti-submarine exercises off the coast of the western state of Goa, said Valin.

India's navy is also involved in the international effort to combat piracy off the Horn of Africa. Part of Valin's mandate is marine law enforcement, including targeting high seas hijacks by armed bandits in the same area.

In October 2005 India signed contracts worth 2.4 billion euros (3.8 billion dollars) with Armaris, which is owned by France's Thales, and European defence firm MBDA to buy six Scorpene submarines.

They are being assembled in India and are slated to begin operations from 2015.

French companies are also looking to make inroads into India's civilian atomic energy market, following the lifting last year of an embargo on nuclear deals with India imposed in 1974 after New Delhi staged nuclear tests.

## “Kursk” Memorial Will Be Raised

*Barents Observer, April 6, 2009*

Murmansk Oblast Governor Dmitry Dmitriyenko has taken personal responsibility for raising of a monument over the sailors on “Kursk”.

As BarentsObserver reported, the sail (tower) from the Northern Fleet submarine “Kursk”, which sank with 118 sailors in the Barents Sea in 2000, was recently found rusting at a scrap metal ground in Murmansk. The discovery has created much indignation amongst Russians.

Dmitry Dmitriyenko, the newly appointed Governor of Murmansk Oblast has now established a working group of representatives from the Murmansk town administration and the Northern Fleet Command, a press release from the regional government says. The working group shall within a matter of days work out cost estimating documentation for two memorial projects – one by the Lake Semyonovskaya in Murmansk and one by the war memorial “Alyosha”, a 30-meter-tall statue of a soldier overlooking the city.

## Keeping History Alive

*By ET3 Alexander Lockman, The Dolphin, April 2, 2009*

GROTON, Conn. - Birthdays can be viewed as a sign of one’s aging or as a celebration of one’s legacy and place in history. Through America’s history, the submarine has played an integral part in shaping the way our Navy operates. Beginning with the USS Holland (SS 1) on April 11, 1900, and through the Virginia class subs of today, submarines, submariners, and submarine technology have flourished.

Naval Submarine Base New London has been at the forefront of this evolution.

Originally designated a Navy yard and storage depot on April 11, 1868, becoming a homeport to three G-class submarines in 1915, and re-designated the Navy’s first Submarine Base on June 21, 1916, Naval Submarine Base New London has been more than the home of the Submarine Force, it has been the home of the Submarine Force legacy.

By the end of WWI, 81 buildings had been built to support 1,400 men and 20 submarines. In 1930, one of the most recognizable buildings was built on SUBASE: the Submarine Escape Trainer. Commonly known as the ‘Dive-Tower,’ this 100-foot column of water was used by generations of submariners to practice escaping from disabled submarines. The tower became an icon of the base for more than 60 years before it was demolished in 1992. Today, a new Submarine Escape Trainer with its own 40 foot column of water, the new Momsen Hall, Building 592, will soon be training the next generation of submariners.

The future indeed grows from history, and SUBASE nourishes that concept by putting the Navy’s past on display. Street signs and building names pay homage to famous boats and submariners, while the world’s first nuclear powered submarine, USS Nautilus (SSN 571), the featured exhibit at the Submarine Force Library and Museum, is a bold display of our technological prowess.

Anchors, torpedoes and even submarine sails surface throughout the base, each marking their unique contributions to naval service. The two 6-inch / 53 caliber guns outside of the base gym were once mounted on the deck of USS Narwhal (SS 167). Narwhal was credited with shooting down two Japanese torpedo planes during the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 and later would sink 10 Japanese ships during WWII - four by those very guns, the largest to have ever been mounted on a United States submarine.

So, when you find yourself walking around SUBASE, take a moment and read the street signs with their somber messages such as ‘60 lost 2/16/1943,’ or stop and read a plaque under one of the torpedoes decorating the base, you may be surprised by what you discover. After all, while Naval Submarine base New London may be our Nation’s “first” submarine base by virtue of historical record, the base has been, is, and will remain the “finest” by virtue of the men and women that serve and support it.

Happy Birthday Submarine Force and Naval Submarine Base New London!

## Nuclear battle: Perhaps not as unthinkable as it once was

*By Joe Buff, The Day, April 2, 2009*

The Associated Press recently reported that Russian Vice Adm. Oleg Burtsev told a state-run news agency that tactical nuclear weapons are now “an important asset,” and the Russian Navy may soon begin fitting tactical nukes to its current arsenal of cruise missile delivery platforms. This goes beyond the tactical nukes that prior defense minister Sergei Ivanov said are already being deployed on Russian submarines.

These public statements are consistent with occasional pronouncements by other Russian senior officials going back several years, suggesting that as Russia’s defense spending and population growth declined from Cold War peaks, the country would have to rely more on the sheer destructive power of nuclear arms, because it no longer had the troops and ships and planes and so on to defend the motherland from NATO and other threats by conventional means.

### Efficient nuke delivery

Low-yield tactical nukes are lighter, smaller, cheaper and easier to make than high-yield strategic nuclear weapons; being smaller and lighter, the same delivery system can hurl one to greater range at greater speed. And Russia continues to deploy some two dozen respectable nuclear subs, while designing and building more - as is China.



A tactical nuke is a fission weapon, a plutonium (and sometimes uranium) bomb, with a yield nominally of about 20 kilotons (or even much less). By comparison, the Hiroshima bomb exploded with an energy of about 15 kilotons. Hiroshima and Nagasaki were each destroyed in 1945 by such fission bombs, the infamous Fat Man and Little Boy. They might be considered low yield in the peculiar calculus of nuclear war and deterrence, but they're still plenty scary. Imagine what a near miss would do to a carrier battle group or an amphibious strike group.

The Pentagon has for decades recognized "Limited Tactical Nuclear War at Sea" as one type of conflict scenario that the U.S. might be forced to fight in the future. Part of "thinking the unthinkable" is, alas, to recognize that such a scenario, in which a foreign aggressive power inflicts the first mushroom cloud on the U.S. Navy, is not really all that unthinkable.

For America to rely on the premise that tactical nuclear war is effectively deterred by the fact that it would inevitably escalate to global thermonuclear annihilation is very risky. Some pundits question whether the premise of inevitable escalation is valid at all - the catastrophic leap from A-bombs at sea to far more devastating H-bombs on land may represent a daunting mental and military barrier.

### **Nukes at sea**

Tactical nukes at sea, far from population centers, where the oceans themselves would dilute the relatively small fallout created, may be, pragmatically, just usable enough in theory to be tragically used sooner or later in practice.

Soviet doctrine long considered them to be just really heavy battlefield artillery. Russia, which had to mentally absorb the mass destruction of World War II and the massive fallout from Chernobyl, may be less squeamish than we think. Certainly it has to be appreciated by Americans of all walks of life that Moscow does not necessarily mirror our own national nuke-o-phobia. Putin's New Russia is not acting like our friend.

All of which ought to give pause to U.S. military, policy and budget planners. Effective national defense is getting a lot more complicated than it was between 1991, the fall of the Soviet Union, and 2001, the rise of Islamo-fascism. We dare not overly fixate and obsess on defeating small-state terror alone, at the cost of failing to prevent super-state nuclear intimidation and even – maybe some day – defeating outright nautical A-bomb aggression.

# USSVI CONVENTION SPONSOR INFORMATION



## 2009 United States Submarine Veterans, Inc. National Convention



### Contact:

Mike Hacking

2009 USSVI Convention  
P.O. Box 420159  
San Diego, CA 92142-0159

(858) 495-0562

[mrhacking@san.rr.com](mailto:mrhacking@san.rr.com)

September 8 – 12, 2009

Town & Country Resort and Convention Center  
San Diego, CA

The 2009 convention in San Diego is being hosted by the San Diego Base and the USS Scamp Base of the United States Submarine Veterans, Inc. (USSVI). USSVI is a fraternal veteran's association whose creed is:

*"To perpetuate the memory of our shipmates who gave their lives in the pursuit of duties while serving their country. That their dedication, deeds and supreme sacrifice be a constant source of motivation toward greater accomplishments. Pledge loyalty and patriotism to the United States Government."*



Joining USSVI in San Diego will be members of the International Submariners Association (who will be holding their 46<sup>th</sup> International Congress), U.S. World War II Submarine Veterans, and veterans from the Canadian Submariners Association. With the participation of the local military community this convention will be one of the largest gatherings of submariners in history!

We are seeking your support to make this a truly historic occasion. Your donation to the 2009 USSVI Convention will benefit all Submarine Veterans and their families who will be attending this gathering of Submarine Veterans from around the world.



Website: [www.ussvisandiego.org/Convention2009/index.htm](http://www.ussvisandiego.org/Convention2009/index.htm)

The United States Submarine Veterans, Inc. (USSVI - our national organization), the San Diego Base and the USS Scamp Base (hosts of the convention) are 501(c)19 veteran organizations, as designated by the Internal Revenue Service.

# LEVELS OF SPONSOR PARTICIPATION



## 2009 United States Submarine Veterans, Inc. National Convention

September 8 – 12, 2009

Town & Country Resort and Convention Center  
San Diego, CA

| <u>Levels</u>  | <u>Contribution Level</u> |
|--|---------------------------|
| <b>Admiral</b>   | \$ 25,000                 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full-page ad in the Convention Program*</li> <li>Full-page ad in each of the quarterly publications of the American Submariner leading up to the Convention (\$6,000 value)*</li> <li>Recognition in the Convention Program as Admiral level sponsor</li> <li>Seating for 16 (2 Reserved Tables for 8 each) at the Annual Awards Banquet</li> <li>Banner advertising in conventions halls and / convention lobby</li> </ul> |                           |
| <b>Captain</b>   | \$ 15,000                 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Half-page ad in the Convention Program*</li> <li>Half-page ad in each of the quarterly publications of the American Submariner leading up to the Convention (\$4,000 value)*</li> <li>Recognition in the Convention Program as Captain level sponsor</li> <li>Seating for 8 at the Annual Awards Banquet</li> <li>Banner advertising in conventions halls and / convention lobby</li> </ul>                                 |                           |
| <b>Commander</b>   | \$ 10,000                 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarter-page ad in the Convention Program*</li> <li>Quarter-page ad in each of the quarterly publications of the American Submariner leading up to the Convention (\$2,800 value)*</li> <li>Recognition in the Convention Program as Commander level sponsor</li> <li>Seating for 4 at the Annual Awards Banquet</li> <li>Banner advertising in conventions halls and / convention lobby</li> </ul>                         |                           |
| <b>Lieutenant</b>  | \$ 5,000                  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarter-page ad in the Convention Program*</li> <li>One-Sixth-page ad in each of the quarterly publications of the American Submariner leading up to the Convention (\$1,600 value)*</li> <li>Recognition in the Convention Program as Lieutenant level sponsor</li> <li>Seating for 2 at the Annual Awards Banquet</li> </ul>  |                           |
| <b>Ensign</b>  | \$ 1,000                  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarter-page ad in the Convention Program*</li> <li>Recognition in the Convention Program as Ensign level sponsor</li> </ul>  |                           |
| <b>Warrant</b>   | \$ 500                    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognition in the Convention Program as Warrant level sponsor</li> </ul>   |                           |
| <b>Chief Petty Officer</b>   | \$ 250                    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognition in the Convention Program as Chief Petty Officer level sponsor</li> </ul>   |                           |
| <b>Petty Officer</b>   | \$ 100                    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognition in the Convention Program as Petty Officer level sponsor</li> </ul>   |                           |
| <b>Seaman</b>  | \$ 25                     |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognition in the Convention Program as Seaman level sponsor</li> </ul>  |                           |

**Note:** To support preparation of Convention Program and recognition items the deadline for all donations is May 1, 2009. American Submariner publication deadlines are: Oct 1, 2008; Dec 15, 2008; Apr 1, 2009; and Jun 15, 2009.

\* Sponsor responsible for providing camera-ready artwork for Convention Program and / or American Submariner Magazine.

Website: [www.ussvisandiego.org/Convention2009/index.htm](http://www.ussvisandiego.org/Convention2009/index.htm)

# SPONSOR REGISTRATION



**2009 United States Submarine Veterans, Inc.  
National Convention**

**September 8 – 12, 2009  
Town & Country Resort and Convention Center  
San Diego, CA**

Name of Company / Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP Code \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

- |                          |          |                       |                 |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | \$ _____ | Admiral Sponsor       | \$ 25,000 Level |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | \$ _____ | Captain Sponsor       | \$ 15,000 Level |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | \$ _____ | Commander Sponsor     | \$ 10,000 Level |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | \$ _____ | Lieutenant Sponsor    | \$ 5,000 Level  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | \$ _____ | Ensign Sponsor        | \$ 1,000 Level  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | \$ _____ | Warrant Sponsor       | \$ 500 Level    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | \$ _____ | CPO Sponsor           | \$ 250 Level    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | \$ _____ | Petty Officer Sponsor | \$ 100 Level    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | \$ _____ | Seaman Sponsor        | \$ 25 Level     |



**Make checks payable to: "2009 USSVI Convention"**

Mail to:

2009 USSVI Convention  
P.O. Box 420159  
San Diego, CA 92142-0159

For Credit Card payments – contact us!



**Note:** To support preparation of Convention Program and recognition items the deadline for all donations is May 1, 2009. American Submariner publication deadlines are: Oct 1, 2008; Dec 15, 2008; Apr 1, 2009; and Jun 15, 2009.

Website: [www.ussvisandiego.org/Convention2009/index.htm](http://www.ussvisandiego.org/Convention2009/index.htm)