

American Submariners Inc.  
Silent Sentinel  
c/o VFW Post 3787  
4370 Twain Ave.  
San Diego, CA 92120-3404

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



## *The Silent Sentinel*

*September 2008*



### *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.



# 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

## **Membership -- Change of Address**

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

## **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@fortunessofwar.com

## **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@fortunessofwar.com

## **Secretary**

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

## **Chief of the Boat/Chaplain**

CJ Glassford  
4905 Coconino Way  
San Diego, CA 92117-2619  
858-483-7355  
"Cjtmatl@san.rr.com

## **Treasurer**

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



## 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: \_\_\_\_\_

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

### ***Do not Miss Movement!***

***All submittals for the next Silent Sentinel must be received by the date indicated on page four. Entries received after the due date will be printed in the following month's issue, space permitting. Acceptable format for text files are TXT and DOC (not DOC1). Questions? Call me at 619-980-0846.***

**SEE OR CALL MIKE HYMAN, 619-980-0846, FOR ALL YOUR SUBMARINE STORES NEEDS. ASK ABOUT THE SPECIAL OF THE MONTH. SHIPPING IS AVAILABLE FOR "ANY" SIZE ORDER. Mike**

***ALL INPUTS FOR THE OCTOBER 2008 SILENT SENTINEL MUST BE IN MY HAND BY THE 24<sup>TH</sup> OF AUGUST! IT HAS TO BE RECEIVED BY ME BY THIS DATE. I CANNOT ACCEPT SUBMITTALS FOR THE AUGUST ISSUE ANY LATER, SO GET THEM IN EARLY. MIKE***

***Check us out on the World Wide Web  
www.ussvisandiego.org***

### ***NO MEETING IN SEPTEMBER***

Our monthly meetings are held on the second Tuesday of the month at VFW Post 3787, 4370 Twain Ave., San Diego. There will be no September meeting on account of the National Convention. The post is located one half block West of Mission Gorge Road, just north of I-8.

### ***HAVE FUN AND HELP SUBVETS SAN DIEGO AT THE SAME TIME!***

HELP COLLATE THE SILENT SENTINEL IN ORDER TO KEEP COSTS DOWN.

THE AUGUST 2008 EDITION SILENT SENTINEL COLLATE PARTY WILL BE HELD ON *October 4<sup>th</sup>*, 0900, AT THE TWAIN AVENUE VFW.

---

## **BINNACLE LIST**

Richard Fullen (recuperating in Santee)  
 Don Tetschlag  
 Mike Hyman (Crohn's Disease)  
 C J Glassford (had pacemaker put in and recuperating at home)  
 Larry Freske  
 Al Strunk (now recuperating at home and doing much better)

Submitted by Mike Hyman



## AUGUST “ SUBMARINE LOSSES “

**BULLHEAD (SS 332)** - 84 Men on Board:

Probably Sunk, on 6 August 1945, by Japanese Army Aircraft, Off Bali Coast, in Java Sea: \* Last Submarine Sunk During World War Two : “ALL HANDS LOST “

**FLIER (SS 250)** - 80 Men on Board:

Sunk, on 13 August 1944, by a Japanese Mine, South of Palawan, in Balabac Strait :  
“78 MEN LOST - EIGHT SURVIVORS “

**GRUNION (SS 216)** - 70 Men on Board:

Sunk, on 16 August 1942, by Gunfire from Torpedoed Japanese Transport, 10 Miles North of Segula, near Kiska Island, Aleutians : “ALL HANDS LOST “

**S – 39 (SS 144)** -

Destroyed, on 16 August 1942, after Running Aground on a Reef, South of Rossel Island : “NO LOSS OF LIFE “

**BASS (SS 164)** -

Fire in After Battery Room, on 17 August 1942, Asphyxiates part of the Crew :  
“ 25 MEN LOST “

**HARDER (SS 257)** - 79 Men on Board:

Sunk, on 24 August 1944, by Japanese Coastal Vessel, Off the West Coast of Luzon, Philippines :  
“ ALL HANDS LOST “

**COCHINO (SS345)** - 67 Men on Board

Foundered and Sank, on 26 August 1949, after Battery Explosion During a Severe Storm off the Northern Coast of Norway : “ 1 MAN LOST “

**TUSK (SS 426)** - 81 Men on Board:

Six Crew Members washed Overboard, on 26 August 1949, while rescuing Crew Members of Fire damaged USS Cochino (SS345), in the Norwegian Sea:  
“ SIX MEN LOST “

**POMPANO (SS 181)** - 76 Men on Board:

Sunk, on 29 August 1943, Cause Unknown, Possibly a Japanese Mine, or Combined Air and Surface Attack, Off Northeastern, Honshu, Japan :  
“ ALL HANDS LOST “



---

## *Membership*

---

**New Members:** Welcome Aboard: Newest members Jose Gutierrez, Qualified aboard the USS Louisville in 2002, James Whalen, on Trumpetfish, 1969, and Stephen Andres, on Jackson, 1970.

---

**New Holland Club Members:** Edward Block, who qualified in 1943 on S34 (SS139), has been designated Life Member number 300. James McKenzie, qualified in 1943 on S-20 (SS125), is Life Member number 301, and Harold Lee, qualified in 1939 on Nautilus/V6 (SS168), has been assigned Life Membership # 302 (Buzz Lee also served on USS Sabalo SS-302 in WWII).

---

**Status:** 330 members

---

**News:** As of voting deadline (Aug 25), over 17% of San Diego Base members have voted just on the internet. No word on the mailed ballots yet, but I suspect we will have a respectable turnout.

---

RonG

---

USSVI WESTERN DISTRICT SIX  
*The District of Distinction*  
 District Commander Robert J. (Bob) Miller  
 BobM593@gmail.com - 760-519-7730

I received a table from the Election Master, John Peters, via Dave Harnish, WRD, of the final election results of all the Bases. Here are the WRD6 results of each Base.

Base & Commander	Total Primary Members	Ballots Cast	% Voted
Base 51 - Christopher Gagnon	38	9	23.68
Bonefish - Michael Williamson	17	10	58.82
Bowfin - David Follo	144	37	25.69
LA-Pasadena Harry Moah	138	37	26.81
San Diego - Bob Bissonnette	272	56	20.59
USS Scamp - Len Heiselt	85	39	45.88
Trieste - Kent Weekly	8	2	25.00
USS Parche - Bob Williams	47	7	14.89
<b>Total WRD6</b>	<b>749</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>26.30</b>

I congratulate each of you for your very fine efforts to get your base membership to exercise one of the best opportunities to convey their desires on how they wish the organization to proceed in the years to come. Good job. Bravo Zulu.

Take care,

Robert J (Bob) Miller

WRD6 Commander

Silent Service Pride Runs Deep

**REVISED Checking Account Balance @ 6/28/2008**  
**3,082.42**

\$

**INCOME for JULY 2008**

Booster Club	10.00
Breakfast (\$861 - \$426)	435.00
Ship's Store	100.00
40/30/30	31.00

Subtotal	576.00
----------	--------

<b>Membership</b>	360.00
-------------------	--------

Scholarship Income from 40/30/30	32.00
Other Scholarship Income	202.00

<b>Scholarship Income for July</b>	234.00
------------------------------------	--------

<b>Total Income for July (per Bank Stmt)</b>		<b>\$</b>	<b>1,170.00</b>
--	--	-----------	-----------------

**EXPENSES for JULY 2008**

Silent Sentinel Postage	0.00
Membership	40.00
Printer Monthly Maintenance - June & July	103.10
Picnic Advance	300.00

<b>Total Expenses for July (per Bank Stmt)</b>		<b>\$</b>	<b>443.10</b>
--	--	-----------	---------------

<b>Checking Account Balance @ 07/30/2008</b>		<b>\$</b>	<b>3,809.32</b>
--	--	-----------	-----------------

**ASSETS**

Base Checking (7/30/08)		\$	3,809.32
Scholarship Fund Included in Base Checking	234.00		
Base Savings (7/31/08)			9,323.36
Convention Account (7/31/08)			4,110.56

<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>		<b>\$</b>	<b>17,243.24</b>
---------------------	--	-----------	------------------

**NOTES to REPORT**

## **Commander's Corner September 2008**

Hello All!!!! Hope the Summer is going good for everyone and their families. When this newsletter gets to everyone, we will have had another Breakfast Sunday which I'm sure will have a Great turn out. The USSVI Convention will be past and over until next year when we will be hosting the convention with our brother base "Scamp Base." If you are going I'll see you there. From what I have read via email and the reports, the election was a close one. I will send out an email to let you know who our new National officers are. Thanks to all who voted in this year's election. Your vote did count.

It's that time to be thinking about a Christmas Party and not at Sizzler. If you have any ideas, please send them to me or any of the E-board members. This should be a Great and Fun time for all with little to no work involve, well except for setting it up. Please lets come up with ideas so we can run with it.

Last, I want to thank everyone who has donated to the Booster Club, the Scholarship Fund, the Silent Sentinel, 2009 Convention, and to the Base fund. Every little bit helps for all the events we host or the programs we sponsor. Don't let me forget about the Boat Sponsorship program. You can sponsor a Boat, Command, School NROTC program, or any place you would like the American Submariner to be seen and read. As always, be safe and God Bless you and your families. See you at the next meeting.

Bob Bissonnette,  
San Diego Base  
Commander



## **San Diego Base Submarine Veterans meeting for Aug 12, 2008**

1900 The meeting called to order by Base Commander, Bob Bissonnette. Conducted opening exercises. Reading of the Creed – Pledge of Allegiance – Opening Prayer.

Tolling of the Boats

USS Bullhead (SS-322)

USS Flier (SS-250)

USS S-39 (SS-144)

USS Harder (SS-257)

USS Cochino (SS-345)

USS Pompano (SS-181)32

The E-board is present with the exception of the secretary.

Jr. Vice Commander introduced past officers, a new member: Jim Whalen and 5 guests: John Smith, Sam Radinsky, Ron Workman, Lin Schima and Alexandria Franklin

Secretary report: we have 32 members

Treasurer's report: this month we showing gain of 808.90 in treasury.

Binnacle list:

CJ is still recuperating

Richard Fullen is recouping in Santee.

Mike Hyman, is recouping.

Don Tetshlag

Membership:

Ron Gorence reported on our membership. At present we have 325 members on the rolls.

Scholarship program: Charlie Marin presented scholarships to Alexandria Franklin (Joe McGrievy Scholarship) and Scott Paniccia

Convention Committee: We must have everything in place by the time Ft Worth convention starts. We have different levels to donate funds, from Admiral at 25,000 dollars down to seaman at 25 dollars. Due to the cost of gas, etc. The Fort Worth convention is taking hits on registration; We have info on the website. We need to turn in ticket sales by this month. There is another fund raising idea is called Challenge coins. They are only 5 dollars apiece and we can sell them for 10 each. If you have a small company or would like to sponsor we definitely could use their help. Breakfast committee: The next breakfast will be on Aug 31, we could use more help. We could use a couple more guys to help us out. All breakfast workers must now attend a food handler's class. A next class will be announced. This certificate is good for three years; if you want to help you must take this class.

1936 Break for 50/50

1947 Meeting called to order, new member draw ticket for drawing.

Unfinished business - The next parade will be in November; however we have no info yet.

Selling tickets, we get half of all ticket sales as a fund raiser, this is easy fund raiser.

New business: Motioned and seconded to give Subvets WWII a special offer for life membership of \$20.

Lin Schima: He has a mobile billboard with displays on 3 sides. It will cost \$500/side for the artwork, \$2000 for the 1<sup>st</sup> event and 700 for future events. This mobile billboard can be used in the parades.

Good of the order: JJ Lynch: If you buy a vest, he will take it to Korea and have it embroidered for cost.

Retirement ceremony for Chief Robbie at ASL 8/22/08 at 1000.

September is convention month will be a dark month. (No meeting)

2021 Meeting adjourned by the Base Commander.

#### Sailing list:

Fred Fomby	Bob Farrell	Everett Mauger
Frank Walker	Harry McGill	Tom Polen
David Kauppinen	Robert Oberting	Ed Farley
Bill Earl	Bob Coates	Jim Maldon
David Ball	Mert Weltzien	Dennis Mortensen
Charlie Marin	Jack Addington	Pete Lustria
John Lynch	Rick Bittner	Ray Ferbrache
John Cameron	Jack Kane	Bob Bissonnette
Bob Medina	Bob Chapman	Fred Dewit
Jim Bilka	Ron Gorence	
Bob Weber	Tom Warder	

---

*The following thoughts are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of USSVI.*

### ***Celebrating Democracy***

Opinion by Michael Hyman

With both presidential campaigns now running at full speed and our own USSVI national election having just ended, I thought that celebrating the mechanism of democracy would have been an appropriate subject to examine at this time. However, after some serious thinking, I decided that it would be a much better idea to discuss the origins of some key ideas, which in fact can masquerade under the guise of democratic ideals but in their quest to make the utopian paradise, are actuality very far from both.

If there were a word common to all political ideologies, “freedom” would probably be it. Still, its definition varies from one ideology to another.

To the French philosopher Rousseau, only persons who live in accordance with the will of the people are “free.” The will of the people, better known as the “general-will,” is always, according to Rousseau, “the things most favorable to the public interest.” And who decides what actually is the general-will at any given time? Why the government, of course. Rousseau intended to “force men to be free” whether they wanted to be so or not. In his concept of government, democratic concepts such as public debate on policy issues and the selection of government representatives were “hardly ever necessary” and certainly never by means of the public vote.

Another Frenchman, Robespierre, expanded on Rousseau’s thinking and came up with the idea that the general-will—the will of God as defined by Rousseau—can only be voiced by the government’s head. Additionally, he believed that “the people” were always more important than the individual.

Now if the general-will is the will of God and if only voiced by one person—the head of government—then where does the traditional idea of God actually fit within all of this? Quite simply, it doesn’t. Rather, the state itself becomes the object of worship and in a sense the populous worships itself.

Such was the philosophical basis—albeit, a simplified one—of the “Reign of Terror” during the French Revolution. To disagree with the general-will—as voiced by the government head—was a direct attack on divinity (now identified as the state). Consequently, persons who held views other than those of the general-will found no place to rest their weary heads, very promptly losing them instead.

American thinker William James and early Twentieth-Century French Nobel Laureate Henri Bergson were instrumental in formulating ideas which became integrated into later political systems—though it is pretty doubtful that either man considered himself a political writer in any sense of the word.

James’ contribution to political thinking was in part his essays, “The Will to Believe” and “The Moral Equivalent of War.” His thinking suggested that anything is possible—regardless of the challenges involved—as long as the motivation to achieve success is behind it (facts take a back seat to zeal). He added to this idea by stating that all causes must be given the same emotional emphasis and physical resources as those used when a country is mobilized for real war. If you have ever wondered about the origin of how just about every cause these days seems to have the word “war” in it, this is its basis—for example, the war on drugs, the war on poverty, the war on homelessness, the war on cancer, the war on . . . well you can fill in the blanks.

Henri Bergson is usually not thought of as a political thinker; however, one of his ideas became ingrained within numerous political ideologies—namely, “intuition.” In Bergson’s thinking, intuition is the source of creativity. He identified it in his writings by using the term *élan vital*, a French word, which simply translated means “vital impulse.” Unfortunately for Bergson, the *élan vital*, the source of everything good and just in his worldview, is also the source of everything bad at the same time (something which Bergson never discussed). It is ironic that Bergson, a French Jew, may have died as a result of his own thinking. While forced to wait for hours outside in the freezing cold and snow of the 1940 Paris winter, Bergson contracted pneumonia—he was standing in line with other Jewish Parisians who were registering their Jewish status with the Gestapo.

Now why would I make a connection between intuition and Bergson’s own demise? It’s simply this. Ideas such as intuition supplanting reason were very popular in the early part of the Twentieth-Century (as they still are today) and Bergson had a major role in popularizing it (rational philosophers such as Alfred North Whitehead and Bertrand Russell criticized Bergson’s theories frequently but their efforts were hardly noticed). Bergson was an internationally recognized intellectual superstar and had a large following among many of the “freethinkers” of his day (were he alive now, Hollywood would flock to sit at Bergson’s feet). His books were widely translated into many languages as were those of William James; and his readership was diverse. How diverse? The Italian dictator Mussolini (coming to power in

1922) had read and admired the works of both James and Bergson. He found the ideas of both thinkers appealing. But he was not the only one. Young Adolf Hitler had certainly read James and if he had not read Bergson specifically, he was certainly familiar with the ideas that Bergson expressed—specifically, intuition (and pragmatism like James). These concepts were integrated within the political thinking of both dictators.

Additionally, another French thinker, (also an irrationalist), Georges Sorel, was instrumental in helping create Mussolini's worldview as well as that of Hitler's. Though Sorel is the originator of numerous ideas used by both despots (as well as others), he is also the originator of another idea which both Mussolini and Hitler took full advantage of—specifically, the thought that myths can be used to implement political agenda. The myth does not have to be based in truth—in fact, it can be an outright lie—but as long as people believe it is true, it remains true.

This idea was not unique to Fascist Italy and NAZI Germany. American President Woodrow Wilson (guided by the muse of Sorel) is credited with having created (during the First World-War) the first government run propaganda bureau seen anywhere in the world.

The Germans extended the use of myth even further by declaring (with help from the writings of German philosopher and theologian Martin Heidegger) that good and evil are simplistic ideas—the only “authentic” choices are those that work to one's advantage, regardless of traditional moral teachings (the German and English words for this process sound almost identical: “deconstruction.”

The self proclaimed “heirs to the French Revolution,” the communist variation of the concepts expressed above (their beliefs are quite similar) reminds me of a hilarious skit on the 1963 recording, *The First Family*. In it, President Kennedy is having a round table summit with international political figures from places such as Israel, Egypt, France, Germany, England, Russia, and so on. When it comes time for lunch, each nation's representative orders what he'd like to eat; and the Soviet premier is the last one to be asked. He looks at the menu for a few minutes and then replies: “Don't order anything special for me, I'll just take a little bit from everybody else's.”

I've already indicated that President Wilson established the world's first government run propaganda bureau. But he was also apparently in agreement with the thinking of Rousseau and Robespierre, and in no small way. He believed that since he was given the highest position of power in the USA, divinity had shined upon him, confirming in his mind that his will was the general-will (does this sound familiar)? He also believed that the U.S. Constitution was a living document (does this also sound familiar?) and that the Bill of Rights was no longer needed with someone like him in charge of things. For the icing on the cake, Wilson classified anyone expressing contrary views as treasonous and/or seditious—and to prove it he arrested thousands of persons during his administration who did not see things in quite the same enlightened way as did he.

The framers of President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal were quite impressed with the changes that had taken place in Mussolini's Italy during the 1920s. Mussolini and Italian fascism were considered at the time the poster children of government and social reform (it should be noted that Italy became an officially anti-Semitic state only in 1939 under pressure from Germany—this is almost 17 years after Mussolini's rise to power—up until then, many Jewish persons held reasonably high positions within the Italian government; moreover, Jews “regardless of nationality” were not deported from Italy or Italian held territory until 1943, when Italy was placed under German occupation).

To a degree, many New Deal framers also admired German fascism in its early years. It was only in 1935 (when Italy invaded Ethiopia) did the American opinion of Mussolini and then Hitler turn sour. Still, it was not an overnight change of opinion. The social and economic programs were still admired here though not the militarism (and in the case of Hitler, the racism also).

In the USA, “Jeffersonian Individualism” was now being replaced with numerous federal programs (such as the National Recovery Act—NRA) so that government could control as many sectors of society as it could. A few years after its creation, the NRA was declared to be unconstitutional by the US Supreme Court even though Roosevelt ran for office by advancing a platform with many of these same defunct programs contained in it and by promising to “recreate Wilson’s WW-I socialism.”

When you go into the voting booth this coming November, keep a few of the things I’ve just discussed in the back of your head. Also keep in mind a few of the signs common to all governments with policies in place to limit personal freedom:

- Crisis—it keeps discussion and the democratic process to a minimum. Often, if a real crisis does not exist, an artificial one is created to achieve the same effect.
- Totalitarianism—a universal program to encompass every area of life. Holistic is a similar word. Everything takes on political significance.
- Traditional beliefs are attacked but at the same time nontraditional beliefs are defended in the name of “spirituality and pluralism.”
- Acting first and analyzing afterwards. Intuition rather than fact is used to make decisions. What many call today, “Getting beyond politics.”
- A utopian mentality—we want to save the world.
- Belief that only the government has the ability to coordinate society.
- Religious concepts (accompanied by emotional excess) put into a secular format.
- Health, nutrition, and the environment “become issues of national scope.” The citizen is “forbidden not to be healthy.”
- Goodness and happiness are imposed by the state on those who may not see them in the same positive way.
- Contrary views are considered part of “the problem.”

*“It must not be forgotten that it is especially dangerous to enslave men in the minor details of life. For my own part, I should be inclined to think freedom less necessary in the great things than in the little ones.”*  
Alexis de Tocqueville

Many of the ideas discussed in this piece came from the work of Yonah Goldberg in *Liberal Facism*. Some additional ideas—for example, intuition, Bergson, and his concept of *élan vital*—were taken from my own research. *Mike Hyman*



SAN DIEGO BASE USSVI SCHOLARSHIP AWARD CEREMONY

## ***The 2008 USSVI Election is history...***

***Submitted by: Pat Householder on 8/26/2008***

***While the final election results are unknown at this writing, it is clear that some damage has been done to USSVI through all the emailed thunder-bolts blasted through the ether relating to this election.***

***It is also clear that we all love this organization and value what it does to perpetuate the memory of all those fine young submarine men who now repose on the ocean floor.***

***Let the healing begin and remember that what binds us together is far more important than what drives us apart.***

***I believe this will be a very close contest for NC to say the least, and as I await the election results let me say that I gladly accept the choice of our voting membership.***

***In the end it really isn't about either John C or I. It's about improving our organization and better serving our membership. Please help the new NC achieve our common goal.***

### **Iran Launches Submarine Production Line**

*Reuters, August 25, 2008*

Iran has launched a submarine production line to ensure its forces are equipped to maintain security in the vital oil shipping route, the Strait of Hormuz waterway, the defence minister said on Monday.

Iran, embroiled in a standoff with the West over its nuclear ambitions, has said it could respond to any military attack by closing the strait at the southern end of the Gulf through which about 40 percent of the world's traded oil passes. The United States, whose navy Fifth Fleet is based in the Gulf state of Bahrain, has vowed to keep shipping lanes opened.

The West accuses Tehran of seeking to build nuclear warheads but Iran, the world's fourth largest oil producer, insists its aim is to master technology to make electricity. Washington has not ruled out military action if diplomacy fails to end the row.

Iran's armed forces "have been the protector of the security of the strategic Strait of Hormuz and regards the security of this waterway as vital for itself and the countries of the region," Defence Minister Mostafa Mohammad Najjar said. Najjar, whose remarks were carried by Iran's ISNA news agency, was speaking at the inauguration of a submarine production line. The agency said it was for a "semi-heavy" class of submarine called Qaim but did not give details. The agency said the submarine could "carry and fire various kinds of torpedoes and subsurface missiles, as well as transport special operations personnel". He said Iran had invested in domestic production to meet its security aims along its coast.

Iran's state-owned Press TV website quoted Iranian Rear Admiral Habibollah Sayyari last week saying a new submarine using domestic technology had been added to Iran's fleet. But the report did not give details.

Military experts say Iran rarely reveals enough detail about its new military equipment to determine its efficacy but say

the Islamic Republic, despite having much less fire-power than U.S. forces, could still cause havoc in Gulf if it was pushed.

In 2005, Iran said it had launched a production line for midget submarines that experts said would most likely be used for troop transport in amphibious operations.

The experts say Iran's navy has three Russian Kilo class submarines and other smaller submersibles, including the Qadir. Press TV said Iran also operated a submersible called the Nahang, a word meaning whale.

## **Singapore Says Radiation Leak By U.S. Submarine Within Safety Limits**

*Xinhua, August 7, 2008*

A U.S. nuclear-powered submarine which has steadily been leaking a small amount of radiation for over two years stopped at a Singapore port but the radiation leak was within safety limits, Singapore's Defense Ministry said on Thursday.

The Ministry said in a statement that it was informed by the United States Navy (USN) on Thursday that the nuclear-powered submarine USS HOUSTON had been leaking trace amounts of radioactive water since June 2006.

The ministry confirmed the USS HOUSTON made a port call at Changi Naval Base (CNB) from Sept. 22 to 26, 2006, but it said the radioactivity level in the Base was normal and within the safety limits during the port call.

"During the port call, the radioactivity readings registered by the Integrated Environment Monitoring System (IEMS) in CNB were within the safety limits set by the Center for Radiation Protection and Nuclear Science-National Environment Agency (CRPNS-NEA)," said the defense ministry.

It added that the radioactivity level in the naval base is jointly monitored by the Republic of Singapore Navy (RSN) and the radiation monitoring body.

The statement also said Singapore's environment monitoring system, which has been in place at the naval base since 2003, is a continuous real-time radioactivity monitoring system that monitors radioactivity in both the air and water.

The Houston radiation leak caused a big media stir in Japan last week. The U.S. and Japan said on Thursday that it stopped at three Japanese ports but the radiation leak was too small to cause harm.

## **New Sub For Northern Fleet**

*The Barents Observer, August 8, 2008*

The diesel-powered submarine "B-90 Sarov" was today officially handed over to the Russian Northern Fleet. The vessel is built by the Sevmash yard in Severodvinsk, Arkhangelsk Oblast.

The sub was put on the water in December last year, and has since undergone testing, the Northern Fleet press service reports.

The B-90 Sarov is built for testing of new armament and military technology, Rosbalt.nord.ru reports.

Present in the ceremony were representatives of the Russian Navy, the construction design firm "Rubin", the management of the Sevmash yard, as well as representatives of the city of Sarov.

*Subscribe to the E-mail edition of the Silent Sentinel. More than twice the size of the printed version and always and interesting read.*



## Submarine Replica Gives Boost To Loma Linda Hospital Patients

By Darrell R. Santschi, *The Press-Enterprise*, August 15, 2008

*Jaquan Barnett was being wheeled out of Loma Linda University Children's Hospital on Thursday afternoon, about to be released after three months of treatment for a digestive problem, when he saw something strange parked in front of the building.*

It was a submarine.

"I came out with the nurse, looked over and there it was," the 21-year-old Corona student said. "I would like to get in one someday."

Not this one. It was actually a 40-foot-long, 16-foot-tall wooden replica of the "sail," or conning tower, of the USS Catfish, a Korean War-vintage submarine sunk by the British in the Falklands War after the U.S. Navy sold it to Argentina.

The real thing would be a whopping 312 feet long, far too long to tow down a freeway and park in a hospital parking lot.

"It's pretty small for a submarine," 9-year-old John Robinson, of Grand Terrace, said of the replica.

John was one of about 30 children's hospital patients who were brought down from their rooms to see the Catfish, talk to eight former submariners, and collect a batch of goodies that included baseball caps and certificates proclaiming them honorary submariners.

"For these kids it's a break from the daily routine of being in the hospital and dealing with their illness," said Joanna DeLeon, director of the Loma Linda University Children's Hospital Foundation. "It's a really great break from being stuck in their beds" that will likely help them heal faster.

Besides that, DeLeon said, the submarine "is something so unique and different that the kids don't even get to see in a lifetime."

***The replica, assembled in Arizona, took seven months to build, said Michael Bircumshaw, 69, of Temecula, who is Western District 6 commander of the 12,700-member nonprofit United States Submariners Inc. [too bad they got the name wrong. (Editor, Mike H)]***

***A former Navy electronics specialist, Bircumshaw served on the Catfish during the Cuban Missile Crisis in October 1962.***

"This is a float," he said of the replica. "We take it around in parades. Today we are bringing it here to entertain the children."

Johnny Meyer, 79, a former submariner from Calimesa, said the faux submarine is a hit with kids.

He said he hoped it would bring them "some enjoyment, a distraction from the days they have to put in at the hospital."

It is also a chance to reminisce about his days aboard submarines.

"It is terrific," he said of submarine life. "It's a wonderful experience, a tremendous education . . . and the camaraderie and the men that you serve with are outstanding."

The Loma Linda visit was his first at a children's hospital.

"It's a big thrill for me to participate," he said.

It was the first peek at a submarine for 16-year-old Garrett Baeza, of Redlands, who is recovering from surgery to remove a brain tumor.

"It's pretty cool," he said as he looked at the Catfish replica. "It gives me some hope that there's more out there that I could be doing."

## Have A Peek At Russia's New Submarine Monster

*Barents Observer, September 2, 2008*

The submarine "Dmitrii Donskoy" is 172 meter long, has a 49,800 ton deadweight and can carry Russia's state of the art strategic weaponry, the "Bulava" missile. After more than ten years of upgrades, the vessel was last week successfully tested in the White Sea.

The Russian Navy now also confirms that the "Bulava" missile (SS-NX-30), an adjusted model of the Topol-M missile, will undergo final testing in September-October this year, Rossiiskaya Gazeta reports in its weekly edition.

The “Dmitrii Donskoy” (TK-208) is the only of Russia’s six Typhoon subs, which has been modernized to handle the latest of Russia’s missile, the “Bulava”. As BarentsObserver reported last week, the vessel has been undergoing upgrades at the Sevmash plant in Severodvinsk for the last ten years.

Tests have been on a high level and with positive results, the vessel’s captain, Arkadii Romanov, says in a letter to Nikolay Kalistratov, head of the Sevmash yard. -The vessel is now ready for tests of the missile complex, he adds, Sevmash.ru reports.

The vessel – the biggest sub in the world – is unique with sheer size and its double hulls. It has a deadweight of 49,800 tons, a length of 172 meters and a width of 23,3 meters. The “Dmitrii Donskoy” was first put on the water in 1981. It is one of six Russian Typhoon subs, of which only three today remain in service.

The rebuilt vessel can have 20 Bulava missiles on board. That is more than the newest model of the Russian subs. The country’s first fourth generation sub, the “Yuri Dolgorukii” (Project 955 “Borey”), can take only 12 of the missiles.

## **Brazil Spending US\$ 160 Million for Nuclear Sub to Protect Oil Fields**

*Brazil Magazine, August 30, 2008*

The Brazilian government should spend US\$ 160 million by the end of next year on the development of a nuclear-powered submersible to protect the oil reserves found recently off its coast, said Brazil’s Defense minister Nelson Jobim on Friday. The vessel, which officials hope to be complete by 2020, would be the first nuclear-powered submarine in Latin America and is being developed with Brazilian technology and lately French assistance.

Brazil does not have nuclear weapons. The submarine is the highlight of the Brazil’s new defense plan, which is to be made public on September 7, Independence Day.

Brazil is believed to have earmarked US\$ 3.5 billion by the end of 2010 to upgrade its weapon systems, according to reports in the local media.

Speaking in Rio de Janeiro, Jobim said the upgrade includes provisions for a massive technology transfer from France, essential if Brazil hopes to have a nuclear submarine.

In February, French President Nicolas Sarkozy said France would transfer technology to Brazil for construction of the diesel-powered Scorpene attack submarine. It will serve as a model for a nuclear sub, Brazilian officials have said.

Brazil has discussed building a nuclear submarine for decades, and began a formal program in 1979. However with the return of democracy in 1985 plans were delayed and ultimately shelved and only last year Brazilian President, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, announced US\$ 540 million in new funding for the program and for existing uranium enrichment efforts.

The nation has five conventionally powered submarines and is expected to incorporate several of the Scorpene class submarines in the near future. Chile is the other South American country which has two Scorpene submarines delivered two years ago.

Brazil has been discussing defense policy and revamping its armed forces capabilities on mounting worries about protecting the recently discovered massive off-shore oil reserves and the resources rich Amazon

## **A Legendary Texan at the Helm**

*By U.S. Sen. John Cornyn, Texas Times, August 28, 2008*

At the peak of his wartime career, Admiral Chester Nimitz served as commander-in-chief of the U.S. Navy’s Pacific Fleet and as Fleet Admiral during World War II. The record of this famous Texan will be recognized again on Sept. 2, the anniversary of the formal end of the Pacific war in 1945. He was aboard the USS Missouri in Tokyo Bay that day and signed the Japanese surrender papers on behalf of the U.S. government.

Two and a half million naval personnel were under his command in World War II, many of them from his home state. The history of the Pacific war is filled with accounts of brave Texans in all branches of the military. A dozen won the Medal of Honor.

Dallas native Samuel D. Dealey, a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, commanded the submarine USS Harder and sank five Japanese destroyers in four days. His fearlessness, which eventually accounted for 16 sunken enemy vessels, earned him the Medal of Honor.

Cleto L. Rodriguez from San Marcos and San Antonio, a rifleman in the U.S. Army, became the first Mexican-American GI to win the Medal of Honor in the South Pacific. Army pilots Horace S. Carswell, Jr. of Fort Worth and Col. Neel E. Kearby from Wichita Falls also earned the Medal of Honor for their bravery in the Pacific.

Heroism on Iwo Jima resulted in a Medal of Honor for Texans Jack Lummus and William G. Harrell, U.S. Marines. Harlon Block of Weslaco was one of the Marines immortalized in the iconic photograph when he helped raise the U.S. flag on Iwo Jima.

Another inspiring story is found in the wartime bravery of Doris “Dorie” Miller of Waco. When he joined the Navy, African-Americans filled non-combat positions. He was gathering laundry when his ship was bombed in Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 1941. After moving his wounded captain to safety, he began firing an antiaircraft gun at enemy planes. Admiral Nimitz presented the Navy Cross to Dorie Miller.

Valor sometimes comes in groups. Members of the 2nd Battalion, 131st Field Artillery of Texas’ 36th Division became known as the “Lost Battalion” when they endured nearly four years as POWs in Southeast Asia, along with survivors of the USS Houston.

The determination and courage of women in WWII expanded opportunities for future generations to serve in the armed forces. Texan Oveta Culp Hobby served as the first director of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. Women in the nurse corps tirelessly treated soldiers wounded at the front lines. Women pilots trained near Sweetwater flew planes stateside, freeing more pilots for overseas duty.

It is fitting that the National Museum of the Pacific War is located in Fredericksburg, hometown of Admiral Nimitz. His life and career are tributes to the Texas spirit of patriotism, dedication to duty and perseverance in the face of daunting odds.

After the enemy attack on Pearl Harbor, Admiral Nimitz was chosen to reassemble America's Pacific Fleet. Over the next four years, he directed the counterattack that culminated on V-J Day.

The Texas spirit exemplified by Admiral Nimitz springs from cities, small towns, farms and ranches. Texas men and women serving in the military today superbly carry on this proud tradition.

The September anniversary of one of America's greatest victories, the war in the Pacific, is another opportunity to honor all who have served in the armed forces. Their service and sacrifice provide all the rest of us with the gift of freedom.

## **Man Still Haunted By North Wales Sub Disaster**

Man, 87, still haunted by questions about '30s sub disaster

*By Owen R. Hughes, The Daily Post, August 28, 2008*

A MARITIME historian who has spent decades investigating a sea tragedy off the North Wales coast returned to Llandudno this week determined to find more answers.

Seventy years ago shipyard apprentice Harry McLeish watched the launch of the submarine HMS Thetis from the Cammell Laird boatyard in Birkenhead.

A year later on June 2, 1939, the Thetis went down 15 miles off Llandudno with 103 men on board.

Four were saved while 99 others perished in the sea.

Mr McLeish, now 87 and in a wheelchair, has been gripped by the tragedy since that fateful day.

He said: "The disaster still fascinates me and I wanted to come to Llandudno again.

"There are still questions to be answered and despite my age I still want to find those answers.

"I still have doubts about the official findings and I continue to investigate this for the sake of the family of the torpedo officer.

"The finger has been pointed at him since the disaster but I have some serious concerns about this and believe there was more to the disaster.

"I will not give up on this."

The dead were 68 Royal Navy personnel, 24 Cammell Laird workers, four observers from other yards, a Mersey pilot and the two caterers who had provided lunch on board.

An attempt by widows to gain compensation for the loss of their husbands was doomed by the Admiralty's decision not to allow details of the Thetis's blueprint to be released because of national security.

But it is generally accepted that, in preparing the vessel for her dive, it had been decided to open a torpedo tube's rear-door.

A small blockage prevented them knowing that the outer-door was already open.

An instant, high- pressure torrent entered the Group 1 T-class submarine, which was 275ft long with a beam of 26ft, weighing 1,560 tons submerged.

Other problems included a failure to close the bulkhead door to the torpedo room and inadequate escape systems.

The dead were not collected from the Thetis until September 3, the day war broke out. The submarine was successfully salvaged and repaired, and commissioned in 1940 as Thunderbolt under the command of Lt. Commander Richard Crouch.

In 1943 Thunderbolt was sunk on Cap St Vito by the Italian corvette Cicogna, which had detected her and attacked with depth charges.

All hands were lost and the sub settled to the bottom of the sea in 738 fathoms of water.

## **New Challenge In Drug War: Semi-Subs**

**At \$2 Million Apiece, The Craft Poke Out Only A Foot Above Water And Can Carry 12 Tons Of Drugs.**

*By Gordon Lubold, Christian Science Monitor, 25 August 2008*

Washington – Drug cartels have turned to a new and effective vehicle to smuggle their goods, using small, homemade "semi-submersibles" that are hard to detect and yet effective at carrying millions of dollars worth of cocaine and other illicit drugs that end up in the United States.

Military officials who oversee Latin and South America have grown alarmed by the increased use of these boats, which poke out above the water only a foot or so but carry more than 12 tons of cargo. The military's ability to interdict the craft is hampered in part because its attention has been focused on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and on border security.

“We’re in a holding pattern,” says Rear Adm. Joseph Nimmich, who heads a military joint task force in the Florida Keys overseeing the drug fight. “We are maintaining our own but not making huge progress.”

The semi-submersibles, known as “self-propelled semi-submersibles,” also represent a serious national security threat: Today it’s drugs, but tomorrow’s cargo could be heavy weaponry, senior defense officials warn.

### **Interdictions set to double from 2006**

Military officials, working in conjunction with the US Coast Guard and law-enforcement agencies, say they apprehended about 25 of the hard-to-find semi-submersibles a couple of years ago but this year are on track to find as many as 60. Another military official says that number could be as high as 100 by the end of the year.

Meanwhile, the semi-submersibles have an estimated success rate – actual delivery of cargo – of about 80 percent, Admiral Nimmich says, adding that he is confident the US can tackle the problem given more focus and resources.

Most of the boats have been intercepted in the eastern Pacific between South and Central America. In the last two years, the vessels have emerged as an increasingly viable way to transport large quantities of drugs that ultimately make their way into the US.

Built of a combination of fiberglass and wood and now steel, the 40- to 80-foot long semi-submersibles can travel as far as 2,000 miles, carrying a payload that represents, according to Nimmich, “10 hits of cocaine for every senior high school student in the US.”

Costing an average of \$2 million per ship, the semi-submersibles are typically built under cover of the jungle canopy in South and Central America and can take a year to construct.

Drug cartels are using them increasingly, military officials say, because the US Southern Command and other government agencies have successfully foiled other methods, including so-called Go Fast boats, high-performance craft that have been used to smuggle drugs for years.

### **Lack of consensus in how to respond**

But the US is challenged in responding to a constantly adapting enemy.

That’s due in part to the focus on the wars overseas; in part to a lack of consensus about how to approach the problem, drug and defense experts say.

For example: even before 9/11, then Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld had discouraged actively battling drug cartels. Today’s antidrug effort continues to be divided over questions about whether to emphasize reducing the supply or the demand for drugs.

American drug policy has been too focused on addressing drug demand and not enough on attacking supply routes, says Peter Hakim, president of Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington-based policy group. “US drug policy is something of a disaster in terms of any concrete results or progress.”

The wars have weakened the effort even more.

“Given Iraq, Afghanistan, and the war on terror, they completely walked away from Latin American policy,” says Barry McCaffrey, a retired Army four-star general who also served as the so-called drug czar in the White House under Presidents Clinton and George W. Bush.

Although US Southern Command, headed by Adm. James Stavridis, has not received as much attention support as its sister commands, particularly US Central Command, which oversees the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, it has quietly focused on the drug fight, interdicting about 200 metric tons of cocaine last year.

To make more headway, General McCaffrey says, the American government as a whole needs a broader strategic policy in Latin America that would help address the growth in effectiveness of drug cartels.

If semi-submersibles represent one way in which narcotics traffickers have adapted, the growing use of tunnels on the US-Mexico border represent another.

“These narcotics traffickers, much like terrorists in other parts of the world, are learning adversaries,” said Gen. Victor “Gene” Renuart, head of US Northern Command, on C-SPAN’s “Newsmakers” program on Sunday. “As you close one loop, they will open another.” General Renuart, who among other things focuses on border-security issues, said: “If we believe we have solved the problem, we are almost guaranteeing it will come back. You can’t take your eye off the ball in this kind of situation.”

## **Russia says number of NATO ships in Black Sea increasing**

*RIA Novosti, 27 August 2008*

SUKHUMI – A Russian naval official reported an increase in NATO warships near the Georgian coast on Wednesday.

“According to our information, NATO ships are in the Black Sea and their numbers are increasing,” said Vice Adm. Sergei Menyailo, commander of the Novorossiisk naval base.

He said some of the ships were at the port of Batumi in southwest Georgia. “We are monitoring the situation,” he added.

Russia is concerned that NATO is continuing to build up its forces in the Black Sea. The military alliance announced its decision to deliver humanitarian aid to Georgia after the conclusion of hostilities between Tbilisi and Moscow over breakaway South Ossetia on August 12. Moscow recognized both South Ossetia and Abkhazia, another breakaway Georgia republic, on Tuesday, despite warnings by Western leaders not to do so.

Moscow has questioned why the U.S. military is needed to deliver aid to Georgia. According to a Russian military intelligence source, the NATO warships that have entered the Black Sea are carrying over 100 Tomahawk cruise missiles and Harpoon anti-ship missiles between them.

A U.S. Embassy spokesman said on Wednesday that a warship that was due to deliver aid to the Georgian port of Poti, where Russian troops have been carrying out patrols, would dock at Batumi. He did not explain the reason for the decision.

Menyailo said that the Moskva missile cruiser, the flagship of Russia's Black Sea Fleet, was approaching the port of Sukhumi, Abkhazia's capital.

According to Anatoly Nogovitsyn, the deputy chief of the Russian General Staff, the cruiser should have returned to its base in Sevastopol on Tuesday night.

Menyailo also said that the Russian naval group patrolling the waters off Abkhazia was sufficient to maintain peace and stability in the region. "We are not planning to increase the number of our ships there, but everything depends on regional stability," Menyailo said.

He said the ships differed in kind, ranging from landing vessels to missile ships and submarine chasers.

"We are controlling territorial waters and the adjacent area, ensuring shipping safety, and preventing the smuggling of arms and military vehicles," the official said.

Russia's General Staff said on Tuesday there were ten NATO ships in the Black Sea – three U.S. warships, the Polish frigate General Pulaski, the German frigate FGS Lubeck, and the Spanish navy ship Admiral Juan de Borbon, as well as four Turkish vessels. [Back to top](#)

## **Russia starts naval exercise off Far East's Kamchatka**

*RIA Novosti, 26 August 2008*

VLADIVOSTOK – Russia's Pacific Fleet, Naval Aviation and coastal defense troops have launched a joint exercise off the Far East's Kamchatka Peninsula, a spokesman for the fleet said on Tuesday.

Captain 1st rank Roman Martov said the scheduled combat exercise of diversified forces would involve over 15 ships, as well as submarines and aircraft.

He also said that during the maneuvers the troops "will master crew interaction, forces interoperability and perform over 20 kinds of combat drills".

Besides missile and gunnery firing and torpedo attacks, the exercise will feature minefield training.

The centerpiece of the maneuvers will be joint cruise missile launch at a surface target performed by a surface ship, a submarine and coast-based weaponry.

## **Eying One Another, Iran And Israel Shore Up Their Navies**

*Haaretz (Israel), 26 August 2008*

The arms race between Israel and Iran is moving to the sea.

In Iran, the production of domestically-made submarines recently began. The Iranian defense minister, who visited the production line on Monday, said the purpose of the submarines would be to defend the oil pipelines in the Strait of Hormuz, through which up to 40% of the world's oil supply passes.

But of particular interest to Israel is the fact that the submarines will have the capability to launch what the Iranian state media called "various kinds of missiles." No further details were provided.

Meanwhile, the Israel Navy has its own plans. Two years after Hezbollah almost sank one of Israel's top warships in the Second Lebanon War, naval supremacy has moved up on the military's list of priorities.

Haaretz, or "The land", (referring to the Land of Israel), founded in 1918, is Israel's oldest daily newspaper.

## **Legal Setback For Man Who Claims He Found Hunley**

*By Bruce Smith, The Associated Press, August 25, 2008*

An underwater archaeologist who claims he found the Confederate submarine H.L. Hunley said Monday he will keep fighting for official credit for the discovery, despite a lawsuit over the matter being dismissed.

Lee Spence claimed he found the Hunley in 1970 when a fishing net snagged on the submarine's wreckage and says he has the documents to prove it. But the state gave shipwreck hunter Clive Cussler credit, saying he located the sub off Sullivans Island near Charleston in 1995.

Cussler's National Underwater and Marine Agency sued Spence, arguing that his claim of finding the submarine damaged the agency's reputation. Cussler's agency still believes its allegations are correct but "does not desire to pursue litigation against a defendant who, in turn, has professed such litigation has caused him mental trauma resulting in institutionalization and in assorted physical ailments," according to court documents filed Friday.

Spence said he will keep fighting for credit, but doesn't know exactly what his next step will be.

"I'm extremely disappointed that they have dropped this suit. I don't know what other solutions are available to me. But this certainly does not settle who found it," Spence said.

The 40-foot, hand-cranked sub rammed a spar with a black powder charge into the Union blockade ship Housatonic on Feb. 17, 1864, becoming the first sub in history to sink an enemy warship. The Hunley sank with its crew and was raised in 2000. It is now at a conservation lab at the old Charleston Naval Base.

Spence countersued Cussler in 2002, asking the court to give him credit for discovering the sub, but a judge ruled he did not file the lawsuit in time. The judge upheld that decision in June.

Spence said he filed documents in maritime court in 1980 claiming ownership of the sub and later published a chart showing where the sub was, though the state said his coordinates were not correct.

Talk of raising the submarine, a delicate process that took several years, didn't surface until after Cussler announced he had found it.

In a statement, Cussler commended Spence's perseverance but said "it has been proven time and time again that he did not locate the H.L. Hunley. In fact, both the S.C. Hunley Commission and the National Park Service have rejected Mr. Spence's claims."

## **Donnelly: Virginia-Class Sub On The Brink Of Reaching \$2 Billion Goal \$25 Million Left To Eliminate**

*By Dan Taylor, Inside the Navy, August 25, 2008*

The Virginia-class submarine program is now \$25 million from its goal of cutting the cost of building new subs to \$2 billion-per-sub in fiscal year 2005 dollars, and the rest should be eliminated in contract negotiations that are currently taking place, Vice Adm. Jay Donnelly said last week.

"Our challenge was to cut that cost [of \$2.4 billion per sub in FY-05 dollars] by \$400 million ... and we are at about \$25 million to go, so 94 percent progress," Donnelly said Aug. 21 in an interview with Inside the Navy at the Pentagon. "The rest, I think, will be [eliminated through] the contract negotiations."

The price tag of \$2 billion in FY-05 dollars is equivalent to \$2.59 billion FY-12 dollars.

In November, Rear Adm. William Hilarides, program executive officer for submarines, said the Virginia-class program was \$50 million from its goal, and there was a backup plan to leave capabilities off the sub in order to meet the cost goals should the program have difficulty doing so.

Donnelly, however, claimed that the program had been able to meet its goals without reducing capabilities on the submarine.

The Government Accountability Office released a report in March questioning the Navy's ability to reach its price goal of \$2 billion per sub by FY-12. However, Hilarides told ITN in April that the report used figures that were no longer current, and the cost-reduction program was on track.

The original plan was to reach the cost goal by the time the Navy started building two subs in FY-12, but the Navy has opted to move that start point up to FY-11, and Congress has mulled increasing that up further to FY-10, meaning that the subs will cost more than \$2 billion in FY-05 dollars when the service starts buying two per year.

## **Donnelly: No Easy Answers In Mitigating Attack Sub Shortfall Fleet's Surge Ability At Issue**

*By Dan Taylor, Inside the Navy, August 25, 2008*

The Navy should be able to eliminate a projected attack submarine shortfall with a combination of mitigation measures that would allow a full forward presence, but would detrimentally impact the service's ability to surge the sub fleet in time of war, Vice Adm. Jay Donnelly, commander of submarine forces, said last week.

By reducing construction time of new Virginia-class subs to 60 months, building two subs per year as soon as possible, extending the service lives of Los Angeles-class subs and extending deployments, the Navy could have a full forward presence of 48 submarines during the lean years of 2022 to 2033, but it would reduce the availability of subs should war break out, Donnelly told Inside the Navy in an Aug. 21 interview at the Pentagon.

"I think I can mitigate" the forward-presence shortfall, the three-star admiral said. Increasing deployments, however, "has a negative impact on my ability to surge," he added. "It actually makes my surge problem worse, and so although I can have the boats I need forward-deployed if I take each of these mitigation measures, I still don't have the number I need to surge in time of war.

"There's only so many hulls," he continued. "If we had a time of war where we need to get every available SSN out to sea, if I don't have 48 SSNs, I can't really mitigate that very well. I'll give them all I have, but I'm going to be a little short."

Donnelly showed ITN a graph mapping out the service's options that he said he planned to show congressional staffers at his next meeting. The graph combines a number of mitigation efforts to deal with an attack sub shortfall that the Navy currently projects to be as low as 41 subs in 2028 if nothing is done.

The first mitigation measure involves cutting the build rate down from 72 to 60 months per sub, which cuts the shortfall "almost about half," he said.

The second measure would be to extend the service lives of as many as 19 Los Angeles-class subs, giving the fleet 10 additional 6-month deployments. However, the maintenance to accomplish that would come with a price tag of about \$600 million, he said.

"I'm going to have to do some maintenance to get those ships certified to go beyond their normal hull life," he said. "But that helps mitigate it."

A third option is to have every other deployment extended by one month – from six months to seven months – but that option would negatively impact the fleet's ability to surge in time of war and would place stress on sailors, so it is a last resort, Donnelly said.

"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," he said.

Donnelly said the only way to fully deal with the shortfall without negatively impacting the fleet's ability to surge is to buy more ships and build them faster. Talk on Capitol Hill of adding another Virginia-class sub in fiscal year 2010 would "help that a little bit," he said.

In May, the House Armed Services Committee added \$422 million, for a total of \$722 million, in advance procurement funds to help the Navy buy two Virginia-class subs in FY-10 and FY-11 in its full-committee mark-up of the FY-09 defense authorization bill. However, the Navy has opposed bumping up production of two subs per year to FY-10, which Navy Secretary Donald Winter said was not "feasible within the Navy budget."

Another option for further reducing the shortfall would be to reduce ship construction time down to as low as 54 months, but Donnelly noted that would be a stretch.

"I'm not sure the shipbuilder could do that — that's a challenge," he said. "But that would give me more hulls during that time frame." Donnelly said he believes the service will ultimately find a way to deal with the problem, but admitted "it's not going to be easy."

## **Settlement Allows For Limited Use Of LFA Sonar In Pacific Ocean**

*By Suzanne Yohannan, Inside the Navy, August 25, 2008*

The Navy and environmentalists earlier this month reached a settlement that allows the service limited use of low frequency active (LFA) sonar in the western Pacific Ocean and in Hawaiian waters, following a court ruling earlier this year that found the federal government's planned measures to mitigate the impact of LFA sonar during training on marine mammals insufficient.

The compromise over LFA sonar – a type of sonar that may be used on up to four of the Navy's ships – comes even as the service and the same environmentalists are dueling before the Supreme Court over what restrictions should apply to the Navy's training with mid-frequency active (MFA) sonar – a type of sonar the service frequently uses in training to gain skills in detecting enemy submarines. The two parties are slated to argue their MFA sonar case before the high court Oct. 8.

Both sides say, however, that the deal on LFA sonar has no bearing on the outcome of the MFA sonar case, which raises different legal issues. MFA sonar is also much more broadly used by the Navy.

One environmentalist says the LFA settlement relates to the timing of the five-year permit the Navy must obtain to continue using LFA sonar.

Under a court-sanctioned settlement, the Navy and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) agreed to allow LFA testing and training in a defined area of the western Pacific Ocean and around Hawaii, with additional protective measures, such as seasonal restrictions and coastal exclusions aimed at protecting whale breeding areas and other significant habitat.

For instance, in Hawaii, the Navy cannot train with LFA sonar near the Hawaii Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary or the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument, and is limited to waters more than 50 nautical miles from the main islands, to protect vital habitat for various marine mammal populations, NRDC says in a press release.

The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California in San Francisco approved the settlement Aug. 12.

The agreement references maps and coordinates setting out specific limits on use of LFA sonar in the western Pacific and around the restricted areas of Hawaii. For the western Pacific areas, it says sound-pressure levels must not exceed 180 decibels at certain distances. The pact also allows the Navy to operate LFA sonar in certain areas outside the prescribed operating areas only "when necessary to continue tracking an existing underwater contact or when operationally necessary to detect a new underwater contact to maximize opportunities for detection."

But the agreement says this allowance "applies to operations only, and does not apply to any testing or training activities, including multinational training exercises such as the Rim of the Pacific Exercise."

"We don't have to choose between national security and protecting the environment," Michael Jasny, senior policy analyst with NRDC, said in an Aug. 12 press statement. "Today's agreement maintains the Navy's ability to test and train, while shielding whales and other vulnerable species from harmful underwater noise."

The settlement is the second such deal between environmentalists and the Navy over LFA sonar. Several years ago, the parties settled an earlier case, agreeing to allow the Navy to use LFA sonar only in an area of the Pacific off East Asia. The first settlement agreement expired last year as the Navy's five-year permit for LFA sonar expired. As a result, the Navy last year sought, under a new permit, to significantly expand its training with LFA sonar beyond the geographical limits set by the first settlement, prompting NRDC and other environmental groups to sue again.

In a Feb. 6 ruling, the district court ordered the parties to come to agreement on the precise terms of a preliminary injunction in concert with the ruling, which requires the Navy to avoid LFA sonar training in ecologically sensitive areas and in a broader coastal range than the

Navy had planned. The ruling sought to re-impose many of the same restrictions it had ordered in 2003, but set less-severe limits than imposed under that original decision.

In February, the court found that the defendants likely violated the Marine Mammal Protection Act, National Environmental Policy Act and the Administrative Policy Act, noting that at a minimum marine mammals will “be harassed by the extremely loud and far traveling LFA sonar.”

According to a spokeswoman for NRDC, in the latest settlement, the parties compromised on the area in which the Navy can use LFA sonar.

“They wanted to broaden the scope by 70 percent and we wanted to limit the area,” resulting in the compromise agreement, the spokeswoman says.

A Navy spokesman declined to comment on the settlement other than to emphasize it was unrelated to the MFA sonar issue now in litigation.

## **A Taste Of Close-Quarter Undersea Living at USS Nautilus Museum**

*By Jim Shea, The Courant, August 21, 2008*

This being the 50th anniversary of the USS Nautilus’ historic crossing of the North Pole, it seemed like a good time to get down to Groton and tour the world’s first nuclear-powered submarine.

The long-since-decommissioned Nautilus is moored at the U.S. Navy Submarine Force Museum on the Thames River, just a few minutes off of I-95.

Arriving at the museum’s parking lot, which is just outside the gate of the Navy’s submarine base, you have no doubt this is the right place.

Outside the museum entrance, several mini-submarines from various eras are on display, affording a quick history of the vessels’ evolution. All the subs are sealed, not that most people would have a great desire to see the inside firsthand.

Entering the museum building, the visitor is faced with a most pleasant surprise. There is no charge.

A friendly docent approaches and volunteers a thorough and somewhat exhausting overview of the layout, which is helpful since there are no guided tours. His suggestion is to go through the Nautilus first.

It is a short walk from the museum to where the Nautilus is moored. The day is bright and sunny and turning warm. The ambience is enhanced by the presence of Navy personnel in crisp white uniforms gathering for some type of ceremony.

A small glass shelter sits atop the Nautilus where the public enters. The vessel at this point has been altered somewhat to accommodate a narrow stairway. For those in the XXXL-size range, this stairway is a good gauge. If you have trouble squeezing down here, there is no way you will fit through the sub’s oval-shaped hatches.

Before beginning down the stairs, you are handed a listening device, which is automatically triggered at predetermined points to explain what you are seeing.

The self-guided tour takes you past the radio room, the senior enlisted officers ward room and the crews’ mess, all of which are walled off with plexiglass.

You also see the ship’s galley (kitchen). Because of the difficulty of living in such tight quarters for long periods, it is said that submarine crews are served the best food in the Navy, which may or may not be saying something.

Of particular interest are the sleeping quarters with their small lockers, fold-out desks and tiny sinks. In some quarters, narrow bunk beds are stacked four high with what appears to be about a foot of space separating one bunk from the one above.

This might be a good time to talk about being claustrophobic. If this is a big problem for you – and I emphasize big – you might want to skip this tour. You are, after all, in a submarine.

That said, the quarters are well-lit and ventilated, and you are never very far from the exit, since only about half the ship is open to the public. Depending on your level of interest, figure on about 30 minutes or so for this leg.

Leaving the Nautilus and heading back to the main Submarine Force Museum, you will find an exhibition room on the second floor featuring lots of Nautilus memorabilia.

The Submarine Force Museum maintains the most extensive collection of submarine artifacts in the world.

The museum traces the development of the submarine from the Revolutionary War to the present, via an array of historic photos, exhibits and simulations. You can even sit in a chair actually used to steer a submarine or look through working periscopes at the Thames River outside. There is also a museum gift shop.

The Submarine Force Museum is off Crystal Lake Road in Groton. Its summer hours (May 1 to Oct. 31) are 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily, except Tuesdays, 1 p.m. to 5 p.m. There is no admission charge. For more information, call 800-343-0079. See more photos of the USS Nautilus past and present, and learn about the submarine through the eyes of a journalist who toured her before her first voyage at

[www.courant.com/nautilus](http://www.courant.com/nautilus).



## **Our View: Sub A Key Part Of Region's History**

*The Norwich Bulletin, August 24, 2008*

The USS Nautilus, the nation's first nuclear submarine, is berthed on the Thames River, a part of the Submarine Force Library and Museum. It is a fitting tribute to the ship that stands as a symbol of southeastern Connecticut's claim as the Submarine Capital of the World.

A new effort was launched last week to add to that exhibit by including the NR-1. The nation's only nuclear, deep-diving engineering and research submarine, home ported at the Groton submarine base, is scheduled to be decommissioned at the end of the year, dismantled and reduced to scrap iron.

We support the effort to save the NR-1 and hope the same forces that joined together to save the sub base from closure during the 2005 base closing process also would join the effort. History is an important part of Eastern Connecticut, and this historic ship deserves a much better fate than what the Navy has planned.

### **Varied missions**

The NR-1, standing for Navy Research vessel, was launched in 1969. Some of its missions are known, but much of what it did during the past 40 years is classified and may never be known. What is known is that it played a role in the discovery of the Titanic and was part of the recovery effort of the space shuttle Challenger in 1986.

The NR-1 is a unique vessel with the ability to dive a half-mile below the sea and remain submerged for long periods of time. That ability has been critical to the important oceanographic research conducted by the ship through the years.

### **Local effort**

The submarine library board of directors is leading the effort to save the ship and have it retired in Groton as part of the library exhibit. The effort has attracted support from local lawmakers and others, such as former Congressman Rob Simmons, who cherish the region's designation as the Submarine Capital of the World. But in order to succeed, it will require congressional action.

U.S. Rep. Joe Courtney, D-2nd District, has pledged his support. It also will require funding, both federal and private donations.

The NR-1 would make a wonderful addition to the library, complementing the USS Nautilus. It is an important part of the submarine history of our region and should be preserved and honored alongside the Nautilus.

## **Will The US Develop A Death Ray?**

### **A New Pentagon Proposal Would Convert Trident Nuclear Missiles Like This One To More Conventional Weapons.**

*By Mark Thompson, Time Magazine, August 22, 2008*

A band of pre-eminent scientists and war-fighters has concluded that the nation's military might isn't powerful enough for the 21st Century; and so the National Research Council (NRC), an independent, congressionally-chartered body charged with assessing scientific issues, is urging the Pentagon and Congress to get cracking on developing a weapon capable of hitting any target in the world within an hour of being launched.

The NRC's Committee on Conventional Prompt Global Strike Capability believes that there are threats (like nuclear terrorism) that the Pentagon's fleets of attack planes and missiles cannot handle and which have to be stopped with the immediacy of the push of a button by a future U.S. President. It's not quite a "death ray" but it's the closest existing technology can get to that fantasy weapon. Still, skeptics roll their eyes and say that the report's authors are like a bunch of junior high school boys who have seen all the James Bond movies and believe that if a weapon can be built, it must be built.

To be sure, there are serious arguments both for and against developing such a system. Part of the justification is that the U.S. military already has such a capability. Unfortunately, it's nuclear, which renders it worthless for anything but Armageddon. But for about \$1 billion, over the next three years, the nation could convert some Trident missiles – now limited to carrying nuclear warheads in their submarine launchers – to non-nuclear weapons. The plan favored by the NRC panel would replace two of the 24 nuclear missiles on each of the Navy's 12 Trident subs with conventional-armed missiles.

For the past two years, Congress has blocked Bush Administration plans to develop such a weapon. Lawmakers are concerned that Russia, and soon China, might mistake the launch of a conventionally-armed Trident with the start of a nuclear war against them – and respond in kind before realizing they were mistaken. The NRC panel dismissed this concern, saying various steps – including informing Moscow and Beijing of conventional launches – could be taken to minimize such an error.

The plan backed by the panel calls for putting up to four non-explosive "dispersible kinetic energy projectiles" atop each missile. Each GPS-guided projectile would contain about 1,000 tungsten rods that would strike the target at a mile a second (a fuse could spew them more widely across the ground, with less impact, or let all 250 pounds hit the same point for maximum destruction). The force of a

single rod, the report says, would be similar to that of a hefty 50-caliber bullet. The lack of any explosive would generate precise mayhem, “comparable to the type of limited damage caused by meteor strikes,” it adds.

Sounds nifty, until you read the fine print. It notes that Pentagon studies “indicate that in most cases, a single CTM [Conventional Trident Modification] KEP [Kinetic Energy Projectile] will have a high kill probability against fixed soft targets if target geolocation accuracy and guidance, navigation, and control accuracy are as predicted.” That’s eight caveats right there. Such a weapon would be worthless against moving or heavily-defended targets (developing such a capability would take at least a decade and cost as much as \$25 billion) and represents only a “niche capability” designed to attack stationary terrorists or nuclear weapons or supplies.

Which raises the most important question of all: a hammer is worthless if you can’t find the nail. “There remains the challenge of finding a target in the first place,” the report concurs, before explaining that future constellations of space-based spy satellites will make the task easier. Yet despite repeated tries, the U.S. has failed to locate Osama bin Laden, and missed killing Saddam Hussein at the beginning of the last Iraq war when attacking sites where he reportedly was present. The NRC panel implies that both men were in the cross hairs but moved before cruise missiles or bombs obliterated their purported locations, but that remains far from clear.

Still, the NRC report suggests taking out such elusive prey is easy. “Experience tells us that intelligence may exist about when a shipment is planned or may be en route, or where loading, unloading, or temporary stops may occur,” it says. “Details may be lacking until late – perhaps when those doing the transporting stop for rest or maintenance, or when delays occur at a port, bridge, or border, including stops associated with routine inspections.”

Beyond picking off terrorists and nuclear warheads stuck at border crossings, the report cites a couple of potentially cataclysmic events where a conventional strike from out of the blue could save the day. The system would be perfect for destroying an enemy missile carrying a nuclear warhead on its launch pad (apparently, the NRC has some doubts about the effectiveness of the nation’s “Star Wars” missile shield and the utility of hundreds of warplanes). It would also be ideal for taking out an unexplained super-weapon (perhaps an electro-magnetic pulse nuclear bomb) that could lead to the “loss of numerous satellites crucial to U.S. command and control.” The report does point out one area of potential trouble in its own proposal. Deploying two kinds of missiles together in the same submarine “raises at least the possibility of an accidental launch of a nuclear weapon instead of the intended launch of a conventional weapon because... prompt global strikes may often allow little time for second checks.” Command and control becomes a dicey issue. Among other safeguards, the Navy has proposed separate “firing keys” for each kind of missile, each kept in its own safe, and each under the control of a different senior officer on the submarine. Now, that sounds like the premise for a James Bond movie.

## Menace Of The Growing Red Fleet

*By Cameron Stewart, The Australian, August 23, 2008*

As the gleaming Great White Fleet of the US Navy sailed into Sydney Harbour 100 years ago this week, Australia was given the first glimpse of its own strategic future.

“When the fleet entered the Pacific we remarked that the centre of gravity of sea power had changed,” The Sydney Morning Herald observed. “What the future of the Pacific is to be only the future can disclose (but) it is likely enough that America may become our first line of defence against Asia.” Two world wars and one Cold War later, there is still a powerful ring of truth to these prophetic words. The US Navy still rules the waves across the vast Pacific Ocean and the US fleet, in a time of crisis, would be pivotal to Australia’s ability to repel a regional aggressor.

But just as the Great White Fleet symbolised the rise of American naval power, the strategic balance in the Pacific a century later is being tested by a new player.

The slow, steady rise of China as a maritime power is increasingly concentrating the minds of defence planners in Washington and Canberra as they try to gauge its significance and weigh its implications for the region. The latest and most stunning example of China’s expanding naval ambitions in the Pacific is the recent confirmation of a new underground nuclear submarine base near Sanya, on Hainan Island off China’s southern coast.

Western intelligence agencies have been trying to glean information about the construction of Sanya for years because the new base says much about China’s ambitions to create a genuine blue water navy that can project power well beyond China’s shores and throughout the Pacific.

Sanya is reportedly being fitted out with underground berths for up to 20 advanced submarines and has facilities to house several aircraft carriers that China does not yet own. “China’s nuclear and naval build-up at Sanya underlines Beijing’s desire to assert tight control over this region,” according to the respected defence journal Jane’s Defence Weekly.

“This development, so close to the Southeast Asian sea lanes so vital to the economies of Asia, can only cause concern far beyond these straits.”

Concern in Australian defence circles about China’s naval expansion is real and rising but it is also kept firmly behind closed doors. While politicians and diplomats speak glowingly about Australia’s relations with China, the burgeoning trade links and shared interests, a small team of defence planners in Canberra is planning how best to handle China’s naval challenge to the region. The new defence white paper to be released at the end of the year will be framed with China’s naval expansion prominent in the minds of the authors. “I don’t think there is any serious view in the Australian defence establishment that Australia somehow needs to be prepared to face China single-handedly,” says Rory Medcalf, director of international security at Sydney’s Lowy Institute for International Policy.

“The question is, would we be called upon to assist in some sort of contingency, and what would we contribute?”

In Washington there is also much debate about how to deal with China's naval ambitions, including ways to strengthen co-operation and trust between the two navies. So far there has been little progress.

"The US-China naval partnership remains weak," Medcalf says. "The US Pacific Command's early efforts to draw Beijing into co-operation and transparency - such as naval exercises, visits and dialogue - have struggled. China last year cancelled US ship visits to Hong Kong to show disapproval over US Tibet and Taiwan policies. This reinforced US mistrust. And China remains deeply suspicious of American intent."

But what is China's naval intent? Is it merely trying to build a capability to better defend its coastline, or is it seeking to challenge the power balance in the Pacific?

A US congressional report on the modernisation of the Chinese navy last month concluded that Beijing's near-term focus was to "field a force that can succeed in a short-duration conflict with Taiwan and act as an anti-access force to deter US intervention or delay the arrival of US forces". "Longer-term goals of China's naval modernisation include asserting China's regional military leadership and protecting China's maritime territorial, economic and energy interests," it says. In late 2006, Chinese President Hu Jintao declared that his country wanted a powerful navy to protect the country's interests "at any time". "In the process of protecting the nation's authority and security and maintaining our maritime rights, the navy's role is very important. It is a glorious task," he said.

But beyond this, China has been opaque about the extent and purpose of its naval build-up. Beijing has used much of its double-digit defence outlays during the past 15 years to purchase potent surface ships, submarines and weapons. It is developing homegrown warship designs and is assumed to have a desire for aircraft carriers.

China has more than 50 submarines, the potential threat of which was underlined in October 2006 when a Chinese Song-class attack submarine surfaced unexpectedly in close proximity to the USS Kitty Hawk carrier battle group in international waters near Okinawa. But official statements about the purpose of China's future nuclear submarine force are all but non-existent.

So far, the growth in China's naval assets has not been matched by a commensurate growth in Chinese naval activity in the Pacific. The US Navy says Chinese submarines conducted only six patrols last year: a record, but hardly comparable to the US submarine force, which musters more than 100 patrols a year. At present China's submarine fleet is used almost exclusively as a coastal defence force but Washington suspects the ultimate aim is to develop a near-continuous sea-based force of nuclear-armed submarines that would pose serious dangers for the US Pacific fleet. The Lowy Institute this week held a symposium on maritime security co-operation in Asia, and Medcalf says there was broad consensus that China wants a serious blue water capability and "that it is not just about Taiwan".

"It is inconceivable that China will continue to accept the security of its (commercial) sea lanes to the Gulf and elsewhere being outsourced to the US and Indian navies," Medcalf says.

But Jonathan Pollack, professor of Asian and Pacific studies at the US Naval War College, told The Australian this week that while China would become a much more potent military force, it was unlikely to be provocative. "For all the shiny new (military) systems they are acquiring, China has not gone to war for 30 years," he says. "I don't see (it) as a kind of budding overlord."

So how is the US tailoring its naval strategy in response to the burgeoning Chinese navy at a time when the size of its own navy has shrunk from almost 600 ships during the Cold War to about 300 today? Last October, in the first significant revision of US naval strategy in 25 years, naval chiefs implied they would focus on carrots rather than sticks, emphasising the importance of international co-operation and collective security as a way to prevent misunderstandings. China was not mentioned by name but the implication was clear.

"Although our forces can surge when necessary to respond to crises, trust and co-operation cannot be surged," says the policy, entitled *A Co-operative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower*.

For Australia's navy, the rise of China will not have implications for the basic structure of the fleet, which is largely predetermined for the next two decades with the planned additions of new air warfare destroyers, amphibious ships and, eventually, subs. The question will be at the margins: the extent to which it drives closer ties between our navy and the US Pacific fleet, and how Australia seeks to engage China's navy beyond the modest maritime co-operation program that exists. This includes periodic ship visits and participation by China last year in a search and rescue exercise with Australian and New Zealand navy ships in the Tasman Sea. Whatever transpires, today's Great White Fleet of the US and its naval allies will increasingly be engaged by the slow rise of what might one day be dubbed the great red fleet.

## **N.Y. Man Sentenced for Theft of Public Property and False Statements**

*WAVY TV (Norfolk), August 21, 2008*

NORFOLK, Va. — The U.S. Attorney's office in Norfolk announced Thursday that a New York man has been sentenced on charges relating to his stealing submarine parts from Naval Station in Norfolk.

The U.S. Attorney's office provided this account of the incident and prosecution:

Frank E. Spaulding, also known as Khalif Immanuel Bey, age 37, of Jamaica, New York, was sentenced today to 18 months in prison for theft of public property and false statements. Chuck Rosenberg, United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia and Thomas A. Betro, Director, Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS), made the announcement after the sentence was announced by United States District Judge Jerome B. Friedman. Spaulding had been convicted by a jury on May 20, 2008. According to court documents, in December 2006 Spaulding was onboard the Naval Station Norfolk and happened across a pair of submarine acoustic device countermeasure domes that had been removed from the submarine USS HAMPTON for refurbishment. After examining the domes closely,

Spaulding believed that they were a valuable type of metal that he could sell for scrap. He loaded the domes in the back of his pickup truck and removed them from the Naval Station Norfolk. The next day, Spaulding contacted several local scrap dealers in an effort to sell the domes. Spaulding successfully sold the domes to a scrap dealer in Virginia Beach for approximately \$2,000.

Approximately a week later, a Navy sailor who had previously worked on the submarine domes, spotted them sitting in at the scrap yard in Virginia Beach. NCIS launched an investigation and was able to determine through the scrap yard paperwork that Spaulding had sold the domes. Shortly thereafter, Special Agents of NCIS interviewed Spaulding concerning his sale of the domes to the scrap yard. Spaulding initially denied any role in the theft of the domes, claiming instead that he had discovered them behind the dumpster of a Chinese restaurant in Hampton, Virginia. Spaulding repeated this false statement to investigators and went so far as to identify a real Chinese restaurant at a specific location in Hampton. The manager of this restaurant and the surrounding merchants were interviewed and told NCIS agents that they never seen anything near the dumpsters that resembled the stolen submarine domes.

In February 2008, Spaulding was arrested on these charges. At the time of his arrest, Spaulding confessed to stealing the domes and lying to NCIS agents about where he had discovered them. Had the domes gone unrecovered, the Navy would have had to spend approximately \$21,000 to replace them. The case was investigated by the Naval Criminal Investigative Service. Special Assistant United States Attorney Joseph L. Kosky prosecuted the case for the United States.

Related court documents and information may be found on the website of the District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia at [vaed.uscourts.gov](http://vaed.uscourts.gov) or on [pacer.uspci.uscourts.gov](http://pacer.uspci.uscourts.gov).

## Undersea Nuke ‘War’ With US

Latest Edition Of Malabar Naval Exercises To Include Nuclear Subs

*By Sujan Dutta, The Telegraph (India), August 21, 2008*

A mock encounter between a US nuclear-powered submarine and an Indian submarine is among a set of manoeuvres planned for the latest edition of the India-US “Malabar” series, a senior naval officer said here today.

The US flotilla from the Carrier Strike Group-7 with the USS Ronald Reagan, the latest nuclear-powered supercarrier, will be off India’s west coast for the Malabar war game from October 15 to 24.

The duel between the submarines that is at the core of the latest edition of the exercise indicates just how the India-US military engagement has been scaled up in intensity and complexity. Both navies now claim that they are able to operate jointly in a battle group.

The last edition of the exercise in the Bay of Bengal (September 2007) — which also had four other navies participating — became a political issue with the Left alleging it was part of a programme to integrate the Indian military with America’s ambitions.

The USS Ronald Reagan is on its way to replace the USS Kitty Hawk — which was de-commissioned in May — which led the US flotilla in the last war game.

India’s only aircraft carrier, the INS Viraat, is not usable right now. The carrier is being put through a major refit to extend its life.

The USSN Springfield nuclear-powered submarine and the Indian Navy’s INS Shishumar — made by German firm HDW — will face off in the Malabar “encounter-ex” to test searching, tracking and killing capability. On paper, the nuclear-powered submarine is noisier — making it easier to detect — than the diesel-electric Shishumar, but it is more powerful.

The Indian Navy is understood to have refused to pit one of its quieter Kilo-class (or Sindhughosh-class) submarines for the exercise. It had refused to deploy a submarine in the last Malabar exercise though the US had sent one.

The Indian Navy’s Sindhughosh-class submarines have recently been equipped with Klub missiles from Russia. The Iranian navy is also known to operate Kilo-class submarines.

“The exercise will involve alternating command-and-control,” said assistant chief of naval staff (foreign co-operation) Rear Admiral Pradeep Chauhan. “For part of the exercise, the US rear admiral commanding CSG-7 will be in command and for the rest it will be our western fleet commander.”

The USSN Springfield is nuclear-powered and, technically, not classified as a submarine equipped to fire nuclear warheads. The INS Shishumar is classified as an SSK — a sub-surface killer.

The “encounter-ex” — in which the Indian and US forces will face off — is scheduled from October 15 to 17. During the harbour phase of the exercise, US vessels will be berthing or anchoring off Goa and Mumbai on October 18 and 19.

Manoeuvres after the harbour phase will include visit, board, search and seizure drills, naval air patrols, airborne early warning and strike missions of aircraft on board the USS Ronald Reagan and from shore-based Sea Harriers of the Indian Navy.

## Russia's Nuclear Threat Is More Than Words

By Gabriel Schoenfeld, *The Wall Street Journal*, August 21, 2008

What lies behind Moscow's willingness to crush Georgia with overwhelming force? Analysts have highlighted Russia's newfound economic confidence, its determination to undo its humiliation of the 1990s, and its grievances over Kosovo, U.S. missile-defense plans involving Poland and the Czech Republic, and the eastward expansion of NATO.

But there may be another major, overlooked element: Has a shift in the nuclear balance between the U.S. and Russia helped embolden the bear?

Under the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which went into force in 1994, both the U.S. and the USSR made radical cuts in their strategic nuclear arsenals — that is, in weapons of intercontinental range. The 2002 Moscow Treaty pushed the numbers down even further, until each side's strategic nuclear umbrella was pocket-size.

Yet matters are very different at the tactical, or short-range, level. Here, the U.S., acting unilaterally and with virtually no fanfare, sharply cut back its stockpile of nonstrategic nuclear warheads. As far back as 1991, the U.S. began to retire all of its nuclear warheads for short-range ballistic missiles, artillery and antisubmarine warfare. According to the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, not one of these weapons exists today. The same authoritative publication estimates that the number of tactical warheads in the U.S. arsenal has dwindled from thousands to approximately 500.

Russia has also reduced the size of its tactical nuclear arsenal, but starting from much higher levels and at a slower pace, leaving it with an estimated 5,000 such devices — 10 times the number of tactical weapons held by the U.S. Such a disparity would be one thing if we were contending with a stable, postcommunist regime moving in the direction of democracy and integration with the West. That was the Russia we anticipated when we began our nuclear build-down. But it is not the Russia we are facing today.

Not only has Russia retained a sizable nuclear arsenal, its military and political leaders regularly engage in aggressive bluster about expanded deployment and possible use, and sometimes they order is seven submarines. We do not know yet when exactly it is going to happen. I hope soon," the official said at a press conference devoted to ten years since the establishment of the joint venture BrahMos.

Dergachev said that India would announce the tender for seven submarines in the nearest future. Submarine-makers from Russia and other countries of the world will participate in the tender. The tender stipulates BrahMos cruise missiles for the submarines.

Sivathanu Pilai, the chief executive of the Indo-Russian aerospace joint venture BrahMos, stated that India already had a contract for the production of six submarines on the base of Scorpio project (France).

India's order to the joint enterprise is evaluate at \$2 billion, Pilai said. BrahMos makes land and sea-based supersonic cruise missiles for the Indian Armed Forces.

BrahMos Aerospace is a joint Indo-Russian venture established in 1998 to design, develop, produce and market a unique supersonic cruise missile.

BrahMos is a supersonic cruise missile that can be launched from submarines, ships, aircraft or land. The acronym BrahMos is perceived as the confluence of the two nations represented by two great rivers, the Brahmaputra of India and the Moskva of Russia. It is a joint venture between India's Defense Research and Development Organization and Russia's NPO Mashinostroeyenia who have together formed the BrahMos Corp. Propulsion is based on the Russian Yakhont missile, and guidance has been developed by BrahMos Corp. At speeds of Mach 2.5 to 2.8, is the world's fastest cruise missile. It is about three and a half times faster than the American subsonic Harpoon cruise missile.

Between late 2004 and early 2008, the missile has undergone several tests from variety of platforms including a land based test from Pokhran desert, in which the S maneuver at Mach 2.8 was demonstrated for the Indian Army and a launch in which the land attack capability from sea was demonstrated.

BrahMos claims to have the capability of attacking surface targets as low as 10 meters in altitude. It can gain a speed of Mach 2.8, and has a maximum range of 290 km. The ship-launched and land-based missiles can carry a 200 kg warhead, whereas the aircraft-launched variant (BrahMos A) can carry a 300 kg warhead. It has a two-stage propulsion system, with a solid-propellant rocket for initial acceleration and a liquid-fueled ramjet responsible for sustained supersonic cruise. Air-breathing ramjet propulsion is much more fuel-efficient than rocket propulsion, giving the BrahMos a longer range than a pure rocket-powered missile would achieve.

The high speed of the BrahMos likely gives it better target-penetration characteristics than lighter subsonic cruise-missiles such as the Tomahawk. Being twice as heavy and almost four times faster than the Tomahawk, the BrahMos has almost 32 times the initial kinetic energy of a Tomahawk missile (although it pays for this by having only 3/5 the payload and a fraction of the range despite weighting twice as much, suggesting a different tactical paradigm).

Although BrahMos is primarily an anti-ship missile, it can also engage land based targets. It can be launched either in a vertical or inclined position and is capable of covering targets over a 360 degree horizon. The BrahMos missile has an identical configuration for land, sea, and sub-sea platforms. The air-launched version has a smaller booster and additional tail fins for added stability during launch. The BrahMos is currently being configured for aerial deployment with the Su-30MKI as its carrier.

## Hype My Pride

*TheStrategyPage.com, August 21, 2008*

August 21, 2008: Iran has outdone itself in the last month, announcing three breakthroughs in military technology, describing new systems that, on close examination amount to, well, nothing. First there was the announcement of a new robotic submarine. No details were given, but it was soon discovered that such devices are available on the commercial market, mainly for scientific research. Some nations buy them for military purposes. Apparently Iranian submarine designers know how to use Google, but their counterparts in the publicity department did not.

Then came the announcement of having combat aircraft that can fly 3,000 kilometers without refueling. Amazing? No, as Iran has had such aircraft (the U.S. F-4 fighter) for over thirty years. What were the Iranians thinking when they issued this press release?

Then came last weeks ballistic missile launch, which the Iranians touted as a successful test of a satellite launcher. Up until now, Iran has been buying satellite launching services from Russia (as does the United States and many other countries). The reality, as monitored by the radars of U.S. warships off the Iranian coast, was a launch failure. When the missile reached an altitude of about 16 kilometers, it broke up as the second stage fired. Information later leaked out of Iran that the missile was carrying a low tech communications satellite. Apparently even the Iranians were not willing to entrust this new version of their Safir ballistic missile with an expensive satellite. The real mystery here is, why go ahead with these lies when it is so obvious that the truth will eventually come out? Apparently the Iranians believe that the initial lie will impress more people, than the eventual debunking will even reach. The Iranian religious dictatorship is preaching to their base, which tends to be poorly educated and suspicious of anyone who would criticize their religious leaders.

All this phony hype is nothing new. It's been going on for years. Earlier this year, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), announced that they had flight tested a new, Iranian made, helicopter gunship. They also announced a new UAV with a range of 2,000 kilometers. Late last year, the Iranians showed off a new Iranian made jet fighter, which appeared to be a make-work project for unemployed engineers. It's a bunch of rearranged parts on an old U.S. made F-5 (which was roughly equivalent to a 1950s era MiG-21). The new fighter, like so many other Iranian weapons projects, is more for PR than for improving military power.

If you go back and look at the many Iranian announcements of newly developed, high tech, weapons, all you find is a photo op for a prototype. Production versions of these weapons rarely show up. Iranians know that, while the clerics and politicians talk a tough game, they rarely do anything. Even Iranian support of Islamic terrorism has been far less effective than the rhetoric. The Iranians have always been cautious, which is one reason Arabs fear them. When the Iranians do make their move, it tends to be decisive. But at the moment, the Iranians have no means to make a decisive move. Their military is mostly myth, having been run down by decades of sanctions, and the disruptions of the 1980s war with Iraq. Their most effective weapon is bluster, and, so far, it appears to be working.

But the Iranians know that nuclear weapons would make their bluff and bluster even more muscular. Even the suspicion that they had nukes would be beneficial. And that appears to be the current plan. One new weapon the Iranians do put a lot of money and effort into are ballistic missiles. They are building an extended range (from 1,300 to 1,800 kilometer) version of their Shahab 3 ballistic missile. The new version puts all of Israel within range, even if fired from deep inside Iran. Chemical warheads (with nerve gas) are thought to be available for these missiles. But Israel has threatened to reply with nuclear weapons if the Iranians attack this way. Iran would probably get the worst of such an exchange, and the Iranians are aware of it.

Not all of the clerics that run the country are eager to go to war with Israel, or even threaten it. But because the clerical factions do not want to appear at odds with each other in public, the more radical leaders are allowed to rant away about attacking Israel. That's also the thinking behind the many IRGC press conferences announcing imaginary new weapons. The clerics are not going spend billions on mass production of second rate systems that are most notable for being designed in Iran.

## Navy Should Keep Little Sub That Could

**Without Intervention, The One-Of-A-Kind NR-1 Submarine Will Be Reduced To Scrap Iron.**

*The Day, August 20, 2008*

The Navy should preserve for posterity its only nuclear-powered, deep-diving engineering and research submarine. A place of honor beside the historic USS Nautilus at the Submarine Force Library & Museum is the appropriate destination.

Navy plans, however, now call for the NR-1, launched in Groton on Jan. 25, 1969, to be taken out of service at the end of the year, inactivated and eventually sent to the scrap heap.

So top secret are the details of many NR-1 missions, they may forever remain undisclosed. Its participation in the recovery of the disintegrated space shuttle Challenger in 1986 and retrieval of the engines from Egyptair Flight 990 following its crash in 1999 are just two of the important jobs the submarine conducted during a nearly 40-year career.

The ability of this one-of-a-kind, 146-foot submarine to dive almost a half-mile also allowed it to play an important role in oceanographic research.

Many people in southeastern Connecticut would like to see the NR-1 retired to Groton, and the Navy and Congress should work to make that happen. Without intervention, the submarine will be sent to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in New Hampshire to remove its

fuel, and then to the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in Washington state to cut out its nuclear reactor, reduce the ship to scrap and bury its pieces.

A better choice is to remove the nuclear reactor at the back of the ship, but preserve the forward spaces, where its crew lived and worked, and send it back to Groton as an exhibit. A combination of federal funding and private donations could pay the costs.

Save the NR-1, not just for southeastern Connecticut, but for all Americans. This little submarine is a national treasure.

## **Non-Nuclear Warhead Urged For Trident Missile**

*By Walter Pincus, Washington Post, August 16, 2008*

A National Research Council blue-ribbon panel of defense experts is recommending development and testing of a conventional warhead for submarine-launched intercontinental Trident missiles to give the president an alternative to using nuclear weapons for a prompt strike anywhere in the world.

In critical situations, such an immediate global strike weapon “would eliminate the dilemma of having to choose between responding to a sudden threat either by using nuclear weapons or by not responding at all,” the panel said in a final report requested by Congress in early 2007 and released yesterday.

Congress has delayed funding the conventional Trident program for two years while providing more than \$200 million for research and development of additional, longer-term concepts for quick global strikes. One major congressional concern was that to other countries, such as Russia or China, the launch of a conventional Trident missile could not be distinguished from a nuclear one and could be mistaken for the start of a nuclear war.

The panel recognized that problem and suggested several ways to mitigate it, but in the end it concluded that the benefits outweighed the risks. The panel said that before any deployment takes place, there should be diplomatic discussions, particularly with partner countries. It said these talks should include “the doctrine for its use, immediate notifying of launches against countries, and installing devices (such as monitoring systems) to increase confidence that conventional warheads had not been replaced by nuclear ones.

The panel also said that few countries, other than Russia and perhaps China, would be able to detect a sub-launched missile “in the next five years,” and that because of the few warheads that would be involved, “the risk of the observing nation’s launching a nuclear retaliatory attack is very low.”

In its study, the panel focused on scenarios in which it said the Defense Department in the past “seriously contemplated strikes.” These involved the need for an immediate conventional strike to preempt an adversary whose missile system was poised to launch a nuclear weapon at the United States or an ally; a gathering of terrorist leaders; a shipment of weapons of mass destruction during a moment when it could be hit; and an opportunity when an opponent’s command and control capability could be struck before broader combat operations began.

The panel also adopted the Defense Department’s idea that the goal of having one-hour capability for execution of a strike anywhere in the world is “sensible.” It noted that in the 1990s, several attempts to kill Osama bin Laden or other al-Qaeda leaders failed because weapons systems available then, such as sub-launched cruise missiles, were not fast enough.

The panel described sub-launched conventional missile programs as “attractive in the near term” as well as the longer term because they have lower technical risk and could be modified as time went on. But the panel added that technology development of longer-term delivery options, such as hypersonic cruise missiles, though technically risky “could provide some advantages” to sub-launched missiles.

The fiscal 2009 defense authorization bill, which has yet to pass Congress, authorizes additional funding for conceptual studies, and the Senate Armed Services Committee’s version requires a report on all concepts before the presentation of the fiscal 2010 budget.

The panel was chaired by Albert Carnesale, former chancellor of the University of California at Los Angeles and former provost at Harvard who served as a negotiator on the SALT I arms-control treaty. The panel also included John S. Foster Jr., a former director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Defense Department director of research and development and chairman of the Committee on the Present Danger; Richard L. Garwin, IBM fellow emeritus at the Thomas J. Watson Research Center who from 1993 to 2001 chaired the Arms Control and Nonproliferation Advisory Board of the State Department; and retired Air Force Gen. Eugene E. Habiger, former head of Strategic Command.

## **Russia Looking To Send A Navy Fleet To Caribbean, Chavez Says**

*By Daniel Cancel, Bloomberg, August 17, 2008*

Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez said Russia has expressed interest in sending a naval fleet to the Caribbean. He said Venezuela would welcome the visit.

The naval fleet would come to Caribbean waters on a trip of “friendship and work,” Chavez said in comments on state television. Venezuela has bought Sukhoi fighter jets from Russia and is evaluating the purchase of submarines, Chavez said.

“We’ve been informed that the Russian government wants to visit Venezuela,” Chavez said. “They want a Russian fleet to come to the Caribbean. If they come, they’ll be welcomed.”

Venezuela has spent billions of dollars in modernizing its armed forces in recent years, purchasing arms mainly from Russia. The South American country has also criticized the U.S.'s reactivation of the Navy's Fourth Fleet to patrol the Caribbean on anti-narcotics missions.

Chavez said he's interested in buying K-8 Chinese training jets after the U.S. stopped selling replacement parts for existing Venezuelan aircraft. He said he'll visit China in September.

## **Navy Identifies Ships Leaving The Fleet**

*Navy Times, August 14, 2008*

Seven surface ships are scheduled to leave the fleet before the end of fiscal 2009, according to a fleet-wide message released Tuesday. Also slated to end its career is the Navy's one-of-a-kind nuclear-powered research submarine, the NR-1.

The best-known ship on the list is the carrier Kitty Hawk, which returned to the U.S. on Aug. 7 after a decade of being stationed in Japan as the Navy's only forward-deployed carrier.

Also on the inactive list are the amphibious assault ship Tarawa; the amphibious transport docks Juneau and Nashville; the combat stores ships Saturn and Concord; and the acoustic survey ship Hayes.

The Saturn, Concord and Hayes likely will be sunk as targets in upcoming naval exercises. The carrier and the destroyers will go into the Navy's inactive reserve fleet.

NR-1, which returned from its final deployment this summer to search for the shipwreck of Capt. John Paul Jones' Revolutionary War frigate Bonhomme Richard, is to enter the Navy's nuclear submarine recycling program this November.