

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



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

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED



The Silent Sentinel

March 2012



Our Creed and Purpose

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 toward greater accomplishments. Pledge loyalty and patriotism to the United States of America and its Constitution.

In addition to perpetuating the memory of departed shipmates, we shall provide a way for all Submariners to gather for the mutual benefit and enjoyment. Our common heritage as Submariners shall be Strengthened by camaraderie. We support a strong U.S. Submarine Force.

The organization will engage in various projects and deeds that will bring about the perpetual remembrance of those shipmates who have given the supreme sacrifice. The organization will also endeavor to educate all third parties it comes in contact with about the services our submarine brothers performed and how their sacrifices made possible the freedom and lifestyle we enjoy today.

If You Receive "The Silent Sentinel" By Regular Mail, PLEASE READ THIS

Over the next three months, "The Silent Sentinel" will be attempting to minimize the number of Sentinels sent via the United States Postal System. Our goal is to become as paperless as possible. Consequently, we would like to hear from you ASAP. You may write to Mike Hyman, Editor (physical address and email are on page two) in order to pass on your email address for Sentinel delivery. ***If you are receiving the Sentinel via the Post Office and do not own a computer, don't worry; we will not drop you!*** However, if you are able to receive the Sentinel electronically, please seriously consider switching. Printing costs and postage are increasing--delivery via email can save the Base a substantial amount of money.

U.S. Submarine Veterans San Diego Base

Base Commander

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

Membership -- Change of Address

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

Treasurer

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

Senior Vice Commander

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

Newsletter Editor

Mike HYMAN
3639 Midway Drive, B-320
San Diego, CA 92110-5254
(619)223-9344
stamps@fortunsofwar.com

Assistant Editor / Photographer

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

Junior Vice Commander

Jim Bilka
563 Broadway, Apt 62
El Cajon, CA
92021
619-277-5758
sashanman@yahoo.com

Base Storekeeper

Phil Richeson
Phillip92071@aol.com
619-922-3230

Chief of the Boat

Fred Fomby
858-735-0026

Secretary
Position Open

Chaplain

John (Jack) Lester
6531 Cowles Mtn. Blvd.
San Diego, Ca. 92119
619-469-8805
lanabjack@cox.net

Assistant Chaplain
Position Open

The Silent Sentinel via Email

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

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

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

CITY/STATE/ZIP: _____

EMAIL: _____

TELEPHONE: _____

Would like the SILENT SENTINEL emailed: YES _____ NO _____

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

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

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

March Meeting

Our monthly meeting is held on the second Tuesday of the month at VFW Post 3787, 4370 Twain Ave., San Diego. Our next meeting will be on 13 March, 2012. The post is located one-half block West of Mission Gorge Road, just north of I-8. The meeting begins at 7 p.m. The E-Board meets one hour earlier at 6 p.m.

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

BINNACLE LIST
Bob Bissonnette
Anne Marie Gorence
Al Strunk

Submarine Losses in February

Submitted by C J Glassford



SHARK # 2. (SS 174) - 58 Men on Board
Sunk, on 11 Feb 1942, by Japanese Destroyer, in Makkasar Strait, 120 Miles East of Mendoa, in the Celebes Sea : "ALL HANDS LOST"

AMBERJACK (SS 219) - 74 Men on Board
Probably Sunk, on 14 Feb 1943, by Combined Efforts of a Japanese Seaplane, Torpedo Boat, and Submarine Chaser, off Cape St. George, New Britain: "ALL HANDS LOST"

GRAYBACK (SS 208) - 80 Men on Board
Probably Succumbed, on 27 Feb 1944, to Damage Inflicted, by Land Based Japanese Naval Aircraft suffered the day before in the East China Sea: "ALL HANDS LOST"

TROUT (SS 202) - 81 Men on Board
Most likely Sunk, on 29 Feb 1944, by Japanese Destroyer, in the Philippine Sea Area, Off Formosa: "ALL HANDS LOST"

BARBELL (SS316) - 81 Men on Board
Sunk, on 4 Feb 1945, by Japanese Naval Aircraft, In the South China Sea, Palawan Passage: "ALL HANDS LOST"

POMODON (SS486) - Duty Section on Board. Battery Explosion and Fire, on 21 Feb 1955, from Hydrogen Buildup during recharging of Battery Cells, at San Francisco Naval Shipyard:
"5 MEN LOST"



Commander's Corner March 2012

Good morning all. I'm writing this message from Balboa Hospital, now called Naval Medical Center San Diego. I guess the Navy can't leave a good thing alone and make life more confusing than it is already. I would like to thank everyone who has called, emailed, and visited me while I was in the hospital. It makes me feel good that folks are thinking of me. I even received a call from shipmates in Japan & Hawaii. Thanks!!!! I expect to be out of here way before the newsletter is sent out. Thanks again for your thoughts & prayers.

As you all know or not know, we have a new USSVI base at Sub Base that meets on the 4th Sat of each month at 1000. The Base is named the Doug Smay Base in honor of Doug Smay who is an associate member of SubVets WWII. He had accomplished a lot of great things within the San Diego Chapter. His father was a WWII SubVet. Some of our members have concerns about this new base and its name. Here are some of the reasons for the new base: (1)once the WWII SubVets stop having meetings at the Submarine Rm, it will be turned back over to MWR for their use. The WWII folks were not charged for using the rm, but they did have to pay for their lunch if they eat. The new base would get the same treatment w/o a meal. (2)To recruit some active duty folks into the organization which they have 4 new members who are active duty and 1 is the Sr. Vice Commander. (3)It will give members of our base & Scamp base another opportunity to attend a USSVI meeting and receive any important information we are putting out for our members. I would like to see our base support the new base at Point Loma. You don't have to become a member of the base because every USSVI member is welcome to attend any base meeting. If you didn't know, you can be a member of more than 1 base, but you do have to pick a primary base for National voting. You can vote at each base you are a member of on local issues. If anyone still has questions, please contact me. The Base Commander is Rocky (past district commander) and member of our base.

Upcoming events I know that's coming up in April: 9-13 SW Regional Meeting in Laughlin NV, 20th Old Timers Luncheon, 21st Submarine Birthday Ball, 21st Linda Vista Parade, and 29th SD Base Breakfast 0800-1200. There will be more

information to follow on the events. If you are planning on going to the Old Timers Luncheon, please let me know ASAP so the base can send an invite to you.

Spring is coming so be safe and think of our shipmates and their families. Lets think of our active duty shipmates who are deployed and their families for a safe deployment & return home.

Sincerely,

Bob Bissonnette
Base Commander

Submarine Sailors Author: Not Known

I had a pair of working Khakis with acid holes in the legs. As “George” the junior officer on the Carp, I had a bunk right under the battery blowers, and they dripped sulfuric acid, especially during battery charges on the finishing rate. You could always tell when the charge was over, the blowers would slow down real fast.

Ah, the good old days. Now I remember how I lost my sense of smell.

Just a good read and a little remembrance of good times past.

One of the benefits of growing old is the gift of time... Time to look back and revisit your collective ‘Life Experiences’, For old smokeboat sailors, that means time to shuffle through memories of pissing against the wind in faded soft dungarees, frayed raghats and zinc chromate-spattered broghans. You can close your eyes and be transported back to a time when men wore acid-eaten uniforms, breathed air worse than the primate house at a poorly managed zoo, whittled mold and rot off food of advanced age being reclaimed by the gods of putrifaction, and surgically carving off the stuff and eating it. You survived and built up an immunity that could handle leprosy, lockjaw and cobra bites. We survived. Submarine duty was rough.

Many of us ‘hotsacked’. For those of you who missed that life experience, hotsacking was sharing sleeping arrangements (to put it in easily understood terms). A system that required lads at the entry level of the undersea service profession, to crawl onto a sweat-soaked flashpad just vacated by another bottom-feeding shipmate. Lads of today’s modern technically advanced undersea service would find it damn near impossible to imagine a day when lads who hadn’t showered in weeks, climbed a tier of racks sharing sock aroma on par with three-day old roadkill, with his bunkmates... A time when raghats communally shared blankets that looked like hobo camp hand-me-downs.

It was a time when the common denominator of the naval supply system was the cockroach, with the longevity of Jack LaLanne. Cockroaches that could deflect claw-hammered blows and could reach rodeo entry size.

In the late 50’s, the submarines built in the years of World War II were rapidly approaching an advanced age comatose state. The navy quit making many of the replacement parts for these seagoing antiques, so we cannibalized the boats in line heading to the scrapyard. It was like harvesting organs from a dead Rockette to keep the chorus line going.

Submarine Memorabilia, Inc.

Bringing You:

- U.S. Submarine WWII War Patrol Reports
- Silent Service Episodes Navy Log Episodes
- Hit Submarine Movies (over 100 years of)

www.ussealion.com

email: webmaster@ussealion.com

After decommissioning, the old boats would have electricians and enginemen crawling all over them with shopping lists and wrenches.

Memory is a wonderful God-given gift. There were sunrises and sunsets, rolling seas, visits to exotic places, and ladies with loose panty elastic and no AIDS. There were consumable combustibles on par with the liquids that propel hardware to outer space.

It was a time when the world's population loved the American submariner. Boat sailors in port meant good times, hell-raising and calling in the night shift at the local brewery. It was a time when the United States Navy had no recruitment problems, paid no incentive money and had to kiss no butts to entice grown men into accepting their manly obligation to their nation. Men signed up for undersea service, motivated by patriotic obligation, a sense of history and adventure, and to follow the gallant submariners who rode the boats against the Japanese empire. We wanted to wear the distinctive insignia universally recognized as the symbol of the most successful and demanding submarine service on earth.

We were proud. We had a right to be. We were accepted as the downline fraternity brothers of the courageous men who put Hirohito's monkey band all over the floor of the Pacific. We rode their boats, ate at their mess tables, slept in their bunks and plugged the ever-increasing leaks in the hulls they left us. We patted the same barmaid butts they had patted when they were far

younger and half as wide. We carved our boats names and hull numbers on gin mill tables in places that would give Methodist ministers cardiac arrest.

We danced with the devil's mistress and all her naughty daughters. We were young, testosterone-driven American bluejackets and let's face it... Every girl in every port establishment around the globe both recognized and appreciated the meaning of a pair of Dolphins over a jumper pocket. Many of these ladies were willing to share smiles and body warmth with the members of America's undersea service.

It was a time when the snapping of American colors in the ports of the world stood for liberation from tyranny and the American sailor in his distinctive uniform and happy-go-lucky manner, stood for John Wayne principles and a universally recognized sense of decency, high ideals and uncompromised values.

It was in every sense of the term, 'A great time to be an American sailor'.

There were few prohibitions. They were looked upon as simply unnecessary. It was a time when 'family values' were taught at family dinner tables, at schools, the nation's playing fields, scout troops, Sunday school or other institutions of worship. We were a good people and we knew it.

We plowed the world's oceans guarding her sea lanes and making her secure for the traffic of international commerce. But at eighteen, let's face it... We never thought much about the noble aspect of what we were doing. Crews looked forward to the next liberty port, the next run, home port visits, what the boat was having for evening chow, the evening movie after chow, or which barmaids were working at Bell's that evening. We were young, invincible and had our whole lives ahead of us. Without being aware of it, we were learning leadership, acceptance of responsibility and teamwork in the finest classroom in the world... A United States submarine.

It was a simpler time. Lack of complexity left us with clear-cut objectives and the ‘bad guys’ were clearly defined. We knew who they were, where they were and that we had the means, will and ability to send them all off to hell in a fiery package deal. We were the ‘good guys’ and literally wore ‘white hats’.

What we lacked in crew comfort, technological advancements and publicity, we made up for in continuity, stability and love of our boats and squadrons. We were a band of brothers and have remained so for over half a century.

Since we were not riding what the present day submariner would call ‘true submersibles’, we got sunrises and sunsets at sea... The sting of wind-blown saltwater on our faces... The roll and pitch of heavy weather swells and the screech of seabirds. I can’t imagine sea duty devoid of contact with these wonders. To me, they are a very real part of being a true mariner.

I’m glad I served in an era of signal lights... Flag messaging... Navigation calculation... Marines manning the gates... Locker clubs... Working girls... Hitchhiking in uniform... Quartermasters, torpedomen and gunner’s mates... Sea store smokes... Hotsacking... Hydraulic oil-laced coffee... Lousy mid rats... Jackassing fish from the skids to the tubes... One and two way trash dumping... Plywood dog shacks... Messy piers... A time when the Chief of the Boat could turn up at morning quarters wearing a Mexican sombrero and Jeezus sandals... When every E-3 in the sub force knew what paint scrapers, chipping hammers and wire brushes were for... When JGs with a pencil were the most dangerous things in the navy. When the navy mobile canteen truck was called the ‘roach coach’ and sold geedunk and pogy bait... When the breakfast of champions was a pitcher of Blue Ribbon, four Slim Jims, a pack of Beer Nuts, a hard-boiled egg, and a game of Eight Ball.

It was a time when, if you saw a boatsailor with more than four ship’s patches on his foul weather jacket, he was at least fifty years old and a lifer. A time when skippers wore hydraulic oil-stained steaming hats and carried a wad of binocular wipes in their shirt pockets. In those days, old barnacle-encrusted chiefs had more body fat than a Hell’s Angel, smoked big, fat, lousy smelling cigars or ‘chewed plug’, and came with a sewer digger’s vocabulary.

It was a time where heterosexuals got married to members of the opposite sex or patronized ‘working girls’, and non-heterosexuals went world Peace Corps.

It was a good time... For some of us, the best time we would ever have. There was a certain satisfaction to be found in serving one’s country without the nation you so dearly loved having to promise you enlistment bonuses, big whopping education benefits, feather bed shore duty, or an ‘A’ school with a sauna and color TV. It was a time when if you told a cook you didn’t eat Spam or creamed chipped beef, everybody laughed and you went away hungry... And if you cussed a messcook, you could find toenail clippings in your salad. Our generation visited cemeteries where legends of World War II undersea service were issued their grass blankets, after receiving their pine peacoats and orders to some old hull number moored at the big silver pier in the sky. We were family. Our common heritage made us brothers. There came a point where we drew a line through our names on the Watch, Quarter and Station Bill, told our shipmates we see them in hell, shook hands with the COB, paid back the slush fund, told the skipper ‘goodbye’, and picked up a disbursing chit and your DD-214. We went up on Hampton Boulevard, bought a couple of rounds at Bells, kissed the barmaids, gave Thelma a hug, then went out to spend the rest of our lives wishing we could hear, “Single up all lines...”, just one more time.

US Ambassador Suggests Nuclear Submarine Sale To Australia

By Oliver Campbell, wsws.org, 29 February 2012

A front page article in the Australian Financial Review on February 22 reported that the US ambassador in Canberra, Jeffrey Bleich, has floated the possibility of Washington selling or leasing nuclear submarines to Australia—a first for any country.

While Defence Minister Stephen Smith restated the Labor Party’s position that it would not consider the “nuclear option”, the report is a further indication of Washington’s moves to strengthen military ties with Australia as it aggressively confronts China. According to the Review, Bleich stressed that “Washington viewed Australia’s subs program as crucial to security in the Asia-Pacific region.”

Bleich’s comments take place in the context of an ongoing discussion within Australian defence and foreign policy circles over the future of the country’s crisis-prone Collins class submarine fleet. A government-commissioned review last December found that, at times, only one or two of the six diesel-electric submarines were available for service. It concluded that the fleet was “unfit for purpose”.

In 2007, the former Liberal Howard government outlined a plan to replace the Collins submarines with a new Australian model of diesel-electric submarines. The Rudd Labor government’s 2009 defence white paper proposed the local construction of a fleet of 12 new submarines to replace the Collins fleet in the long-term. The estimated cost would exceed \$A30 billion and the submarines would not go into service until at least 2025.

The alternative of purchasing US nuclear submarines has been proposed by several prominent figures in the political establishment, including the foreign editor of Murdoch's Australian, Greg Sheridan, and Peter Reith, the former defence minister in the Howard government. The proposal has been justified on the grounds it would cost 30 to 50 percent less than building a new conventional fleet locally, and off-the-shelf American vessels could be put into operation far sooner. Nuclear submarines also have a number of military advantages over conventional models: they can remain submerged for longer periods, have a greater range due to extended intervals between refuelling, and can travel at a high speed for a greater length of time.

The notion of Australia acquiring nuclear submarines cannot be assessed apart from the US perspective of using the north and west of the continent as a key staging base for American military operations. This was unveiled by Australian Prime Minister Julia Gillard and US President Barack Obama during his visit to the country in November. While the military agreements focussed on the stationing of 2,500 US marines in Darwin by 2016, far more regular visits by US warships and aircraft to Australia were also announced. The intention is to expand joint US-Australian operations in the Indian Ocean to assert strategic control over the sea lanes through South East Asia into the Pacific. The US would thus have the capacity to block critical shipping routes on which China depends to import energy and raw materials from the Middle East and Africa.

Following Obama's visit, the initial recommendations of an Australian defence posture review were released in early February. Its authors outlined both shifting Australian military assets to the north and the need to upgrade various ports and airbases to enable greater use by US forces. The review specifically called for HMAS Stirling, a naval base near Perth, to be upgraded so that it could better support American nuclear submarines, and suggested the establishment of a new naval base in Brisbane to host nuclear-powered vessels. American nuclear warships are also cleared to dock at Darwin, Jervis Bay and Hobart.

US nuclear submarines already use HMAS Stirling on a periodic basis, but the base's facilities are tailored to meet the needs of the conventionally-powered Collins fleet. The Review article drew attention to one possible motive behind ambassador's Bleich suggestion. It noted: "Though the idea has been criticised as unworkable because Australia doesn't have a nuclear industry to support a nuclear submarine fleet defence sources suggest that the Australian fleet could be maintained at a US base in the Pacific Ocean or a US nuclear submarine base could be established in Australia." That is, the proposal could provide the rationale to construct a new facility on Australian territory jointly operated with the US military.

All these moves would be viewed in China as highly aggressive. The purchase or leasing of nuclear submarines would give the Australian navy the potential to mount aggressive operations in waters far from Australia, including in the Indian Ocean, the strategic straits through South East Asia and off the Chinese mainland. A US base in Australia would enhance the ability of American nuclear submarines to carry out such operations in the same areas.

On February 7, Professor Ross Babbage, a pro-US foreign policy analyst and founder of the right-wing Kokoda Foundation think-tank, prefigured the US ambassador's suggestion with comments to the Australian. He wrote: "Australia needs to consider purchasing 10-12 of the United States' latest nuclear-powered attack submarines in order to balance, offset and defer the dramatic expansion of China's military capabilities." Babbage claimed that "China's massive military build-up is clearly designed to force the US and its allies out of the Western Pacific." The Australian noted Babbage's view that "a combined force of Australian and US nuclear submarines sharing a base in Australia would send a very strong message to China's military leaders."

A layer of the Australian political establishment is deeply alarmed by the implications of the Gillard government's support for Washington's aggressive stance toward China. Hugh White, professor of strategic studies at the Australian National University, contributed to the debate on new submarines with a column on February 7 in the Sydney Morning Herald. White wrote that "the US shield is no sure bet" as Chinese power increased and an "Asian century" dawned. He asserted that the Australian military needed an "independent capacity to defend the continent" and the country had to be "an independent middle power." He advocated the construction of a fleet of 18 to 24 Australian-built small diesel submarines that were not reliant on the US.

For now, the Labor government has restated its opposition to nuclear-powered submarines. Defence Minister Smith commented last week that "all options are being considered other than nuclear propulsion, which the government has ruled out."

The Defence Department is reportedly in discussion with a number of European companies to develop a fleet of conventionally powered submarines, and is considering purchasing Japanese-designed and built vessels.

That stance could change, however. At its December 2011 national conference, the Labor Party ended its longstanding opposition to uranium sales to India, which has not signed the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. The move, which was aimed at facilitating closer military ties between Canberra, New Delhi and Washington, followed a public call by Ambassador Bleich for the Australian government to do so.

Whether an Australian nuclear submarine fleet eventuates or not, the US ambassador's comments underscore the extent to which Australian capitalism has been drawn into a maelstrom of geo-political tensions.

Juanita J. Mangels
CA DRE# 00350008
(619) 670-0121
rltrbigred@cox.net

Shari Davis
CA DRE# 01334834
(619) 981-1555
fax (619) 956-7008
SD4Realty@gmail.com

KELLER WILLIAMS
REALTY
BROKER ASSOCIATES
www.HomeDreams4Sale.com

Nuclear weapons modernization: not fast enough for Kyl

The Washington Post, February 27

The United States is moving on a costly modernization of its nuclear Triad: the submarines, strategic bombers and land-based missiles that can deliver nuclear weapons to targets across the world.

But the pace is apparently not fast enough for Sen. Jon Kyl (Ariz.), the leading Republican spokesman on the subject.

Speaking about reductions in the 2013 Pentagon budget, Kyl recently said that President Obama had broken the modernization promises he made last year to gain Republican support for ratification of the new Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (START) with Russia. "Congress is going to have to address that," Kyl vowed, speaking at a Feb. 16 conference put together by the American Enterprise Institute, the Foreign Policy Initiative and the Heritage Foundation.

Let me review Kyl's concerns one at a time.

He said the follow-on Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine "has been delayed by two years." That's true, but there is \$565 million in the Navy's 2013 research and development budget for the program, on top of \$2 billion already spent. Another \$1 billion is in the 2013 budget for the sub's nuclear propulsion reactor.

Work is being done on designing the missile-launch system as well as the compartments that hold the missiles. The new sub will hold 16 or 20 missiles where the older ones have 24. To aid the new sub's stealth capability, testing is underway to hide its wake and electric signatures as well as sensors used to determine threats.

The now-projected two-year delay means that the U.S. fleet of nuclear-armed submarines will dip below 12 for a year or two around 2030; the Pentagon says a dozen of the subs are needed to maintain patrols.

Kyl also said he was concerned about "funding for a new strategic bomber, [which is] basically just on the drawing boards and there is no commitment that it will be nuclear certified."

The Air Force's 2013 budget has \$292 million for what is now called the Long-Range Strike-B (LRS-B) program, a stealth bomber capable of carrying nuclear weapons that could be flown by remote control. "This follow-on bomber represents a key component to the joint portfolio of conventional and nuclear deep strike capabilities," according to Air Force budget documents. The initial aircraft will be for use with conventional weapons, although they will be structured to carry nuclear weapons in later versions.

Air Force officials have set an initial target price of \$550 million each for the aircraft. One hint of the importance of the program is the sharp increase in proposed spending over the years leading up to 2017. In 2014, spending on the strategic bomber program is set at \$560 million, the next year \$1 billion, followed by \$1.7 billion in 2016 and \$2.7 billion in 2017.

Meanwhile the Air Force plans to retain the upgraded B-52s through at least 2035.

Kyl also said, "there's no clear plan for a new" intercontinental ballistic missile. But the 2013 budget contains \$11.7 million to begin analysis of alternatives for the successor to the Minuteman III ICBM, picking up from a long-range planning project begun in earlier years. Budget documents show the technology development phase is to begin in 2015 and be completed by 2017.

Last year, the Air Force produced a detailed Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Master Plan to upgrade Minuteman IIIs for service through 2030 and keep the industrial base viable while examining potential follow-on systems under the newly named Ground-Based Strategic Deterrence program.

Today the United States has about 1,800 warheads deployed and available for delivery on 450 land-based Minuteman III ICBMs, 14 ballistic missile submarines and 60 strategic bombers. The number of warheads will drop to 1,550 by 2018 under START.

Kyl is right that it would be almost unthinkable for Obama to propose that the United States go down to 300 to 800 warheads, a possibility mentioned in a recent news report. Even fewer than 1,000 would probably bring criticism because of the political and foreign policy reasons that Kyl noted.

But Kyl also said the 300 lower number would not permit the United States to hold an enemy's "military assets at risk."

"If you just have a few, your deterrent is essentially to hold civilians at risk, innocent civilians in cities, because that's all the weapons you have to put against targets," he said.

Hiroshima and Nagasaki were deemed military targets. Just two atomic bombs, each having much less than half the explosive power of almost all U.S. strategic warheads, killed or wounded half the citizens of both those cities. Nuclear weapons are terror weapons. If any are ever used again, civilians will bear the brunt of the attack, no matter what the "target."

Sinking feeling: our subs 'outdated'

Canberratimes.com.au, February 28

Australia's Collins class submarines would almost certainly be blown out of the water if they were sent into action against the modern submarines that will be operating in the region from the 2020s, says the man who built them.

Hans Ohff, the original managing director and chief executive officer of the Australian Submarine Corporation, told The Canberra Times claims the vessels could be kept operational until 2035 are absurd.

Mr Ohff oversaw the delivery of the six Collins class boats between 1996 and 2003.

He also says current Australian Submarine Corporation chief executive Steve Ludlam's recent claim the existing boats could be kept operational without new engines is a flight of fancy.

The managing director and chief executive officer of the Australian Submarine Corporation from 1978 to 1992 and the chairman of Australian Submarine Corporation's engineering services until 2002, Mr Ohff said while the Collins was brilliant in its day, the 1980s design had since been overtaken by three new generations of submarines.

"I am very proud of what we achieved [with Collins] but if one of those went up against a modern submarine such as a German HDW 209 or 214, I would rather be in them," he said. "By 2035 you might just as well stay in port - you'd get blown out of the water [if you put to sea]."

Mr Ohff backs a "military-off-the-shelf solution" to be developed in partnership with a European submarine company. If the future submarines can't be built in Adelaide for less than \$1.5 billion each they should be built overseas.

Australia's most successful submarines, the O-Boats that were in service from 1967 until 2000, were a classic "military-off-the-shelf solution" (see graphic).

Mr Ohff likened trying to keep Collins's notoriously unreliable diesels in operation for another 23 years to maintaining a vintage car.

"Collins doesn't have the diesels it should have had from the start; it [the engines] aren't a good fit for a submarine," he said. "You could run the diesels for another 100 years but they are never going to be the best solution - they will always be less quiet and less reliable than they should be. It wouldn't be efficient." He poured cold water on the current push by the Australian Submarine Corporation, Defence Minister Stephen Smith and Defence Materiel Minister Kim Carr and a Defence faction to keep Collins alive and well until 2035 to allow the development of an "evolved Collins" that would be designed and built in Adelaide.

The Australian Submarine Corporation is lobbying hard for this option, even though it is not known if the life-extension is possible, what it would cost (if it can be done) and how long it would take.

Senator Carr, also the minister for manufacturing, came close to endorsing this approach outright at the Australian Defence Magazine Congress in Canberra last week.

"Defence procurement is not simply about buying modern weapons; it's very much a part of developing a modern country," he said.

"Why shouldn't we support our troops by investing in ourselves? We simply cannot rely upon someone else to do all the jobs that we can't do ourselves."

Mr Ludlam, who hit out at media criticism of the "evolved Collins" model at the conference, conceded it was taking up to one million man hours to carry out deep maintenance on the boats, which he claimed had taken 2.5 million man hours each to build. Mr Ohff said that figure was not correct.

Mr Ludlam was unable to say how long a life extension program to add 10 years service to the Collins would take.

Mr Ohff said an "evolved Collins" would lock Australia into outdated design principles.

"There is not sufficient flexibility in the Collins class design," he said.

At least two or three Collins should be retired sooner rather than later to allow the sustainment effort to be concentrated on the remaining boats.

While this was happening a commercial partner for the design and construction of the new fleet should be sought.

The future submarine should weigh about 3500 tonnes, come with air independent propulsion, the latest hull shape, engine technology and sensor suite.

Mr Ohff said the new vessels should be based on a current European design, such as a German HDW 214, and could be built in Australia for about \$1.5 billion per vessel.

Don't Assume The Sub Base Is Forever

The Day, Feb 25, 2012

Despite reassurances from outgoing U.S. Sen. Joe Lieberman, there are reasons to be concerned that the Pentagon may yet again target the Naval Submarine Base in Groton for closing. And there are certainly reasons to be diligent.

While Washington lawmakers are initially showing resistance to the president's call for beginning a Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process (in fact the administration proposes two, one in 2013 and another in 2015), as pressure increases to address the nation's growing deficit, Congress will likely embrace sizable defense cuts and closing bases can achieve them. Expect an odd coalition of fiscal conservatives and liberals hoping to save social programs from deep cuts to emerge and authorize a BRAC.

The process is a dangerous one for lawmakers, who could find themselves explaining to constituents why they lost a base in their backyard. Once a base is on the Pentagon's closure list, it can only be saved if the independent base closure commission removes it. After the commission finalizes the list, Congress votes the entire package up or down. Congress created the process knowing that without it the party in control would cherry pick bases in favored districts off the list, military value aside.

The Groton base avoided closing in 2005 after a bipartisan effort by state political leaders and their partners in the private sector persuaded the closure commission of the base's military value and its important relationship with submarine manufacturer Electric Boat.

In a meeting with our editorial board on Thursday, Sen. Lieberman, who is not seeking re-election in November, said he considered the odds of the base finding itself on a BRAC list as low. Reassuring Sen. Lieberman were conversations he had with Adm. John Greenert, chief of naval operations, in which the admiral reiterated the long-term military importance of the base.

Yet as pressure grows to find ways to trim the growth of defense spending, the Pentagon may well have to sacrifice weapon systems and facilities that, while militarily important, are less important than others. With the rise of China, attention is shifting to the Asia-Pacific. The Pentagon could potentially see three east coast bases as an unaffordable luxury. The other facilities are the Naval Station Norfolk in Virginia and Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay in Georgia.

That's the concern. The good news is that this region is in a far better position to make a case for the Groton base than it was during the last BRAC process. Since the last round of closings more than \$150 million has been spent to improve the facility, including unprecedented contributions by the state. Connecticut has an Office of Military Affairs to help make its case, an office that did not exist last time, and a consulting firm ready to work Pentagon channels.

More than 30 people Thursday attended a meeting of the reformed Subbase Coalition, showing Connecticut and the region are ready to take a proactive approach, in contrast to the scramble to form a coalition after the surprise news of the base's appearance on the closure list last time. Rep. Joe Courtney sits on the Armed Services Committee in the House, Sen. Richard Blumenthal on the same committee in the Senate.

We would like to learn Sen. Lieberman had it right, the odds are long and Groton never appears on the closure list. But as even he cautioned, its best to be prepared and it appears the state and region are.

UK Prepares For Military Strike Against Iran: The Sun

Presstv.ir, Feb 26, 2012

The United Kingdom has reportedly drawn up plans to send hundreds of troops and an extra nuclear submarine to the Persian Gulf amid escalating war threats against the Islamic Republic.

"MoD planners went into overdrive at the start of the year. Conflict is seen as inevitable as long as the regime (Iran) pursue their nuclear ambitions," The Sun quoted a senior Whitehall official as saying on Sunday.

"Britain would be sucked in whether we like it or not," the official added.

The report said a military attack against Iran is "a matter of when not if ... with 18 to 24 months the likely timescale."

"The UK will first fly an infantry battalion to the United Arab Emirates, our (UK) strong ally in the region," The Sun said. "Further troops could follow if our other allies Oman, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain and Qatar ask for help."

The Royal Navy has already gathered seven warships in the Persian Gulf. HMS Daring - one of its newest and most powerful destroyers - arrived in the region last month to join Type 23 frigate HMS Argyll.

Minesweepers Pembroke, Quora, Middleton and Ramsey are also based in Bahrain and a nuclear submarine is stationed in the area.

According to the report, a second submarine armed with Tomahawk cruise missiles will also be deployed in the region under the UK war plan.

The Royal Air Force is also reportedly planning to send Typhoon and Tornado Jets to reinforce helicopter and transport plane crews already stationed in Qatar, Oman, Bahrain and the UAE.

British Foreign Secretary William Hague once again stressed last week that "all options must remain on the table" regarding Iran, repeating Western military threats against the Islamic Republic.

The United States, Israel, and some of their allies accuse Iran of pursuing military objectives in its nuclear program and have used this pretext to impose international and unilateral sanctions on the Islamic Republic and to call for a military strike against Tehran. Iran has repeatedly refuted Western allegations, arguing that as a signatory to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency, it is entitled to develop and acquire nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

Pakistan Shows Concern Of Indian Nuclear Submarine

Indiandefence.com, Feb 26, 2012

As the Indian Navy is finalizing the addition of two nuclear submarines in to its fleet, the Pakistani navy has raised concerns about the effects this induction will have on the strategic and military balance between the two nations.

Admiral Muhammad Asif Sandila of the Pakistan Navy (PN) was quoted saying that the addition of nuclear weapons to the naval scene will break the already delicate equilibrium which exists in the IOR (Indian Ocean Region). He said to the American weekly Defence News that the peace and stability in the region will be adversely affected, as a result of this move. However, he said that although the Pakistani Navy will be taking adequate responses to this move, his nation is not interested in an arms race. He rubbished plans for induction of similar nuclear subs in the Pakistani navy, saying there is no necessity for such measures as of now and that the financial situation of the country will be worsened if the navy piles up nuclear arsenal.

The INS Chakra II (-152 Nerpa), an 8,000 tonne Akula II type nuclear-powered attack submarine was leased out to the Indian Navy by Russia in December 2011. INS Arihant, the 6,000 tonne Indian indigenous made nuclear powered submarine is expected to be fully operational by the end of this year.

Defence experts were quoted saying that the Pakistan Navy lacks the technological skills to develop a similar nuclear submarine, and therefore were likely to ask the Chinese for help. However Admiral Sandila denied these rumours and said that the Pakistan Navy can't afford a nuclear submarine at this time due to difficult financial conditions. He also said that the naval strategy of his country is not based on an Indo-centric platform, but based on the strategic and defence needs of his nation.

Nuclear Sub Dispatched To Falklands Argument

Conflict heating up after discovery of major oil reserves

Wnd.com, Feb 22, 2012

WASHINGTON – Great Britain has dispatched additional military forces – including a nuclear submarine – to the region of the Falkland Islands in a bid to reassert its claim for the region against those of Argentina, according to a report in Joseph Farah’s G2 Bulletin.

The move comes in light of the discovery of major oil reserves, estimated at eight billion barrels, there. Britain had laid claim to the islands in the 19th century and reinforced that claim in a limited war in 1982 with American assistance.

With the recent discovery of the vast petroleum reserves, it is highly unlikely that Britain will relinquish those claims even though the Falklands are half a world away.

The Argentines, however, still regard the Falklands as belonging to them and asserted that claim in its 1994 revised constitution. The Argentines viewed their 1982 action on the Falklands as an attempt to reoccupy their own territory, while Britain regarded it as an invasion of a British dependent territory.

Regional analysts see the latest flare-up of tensions over the Falklands as a domestic political effort to ignite the latent dislike by Argentinians of the British in light of the discovery of the vast oil deposits.

In this way, the Argentines hope to win over international opinion and force the British to the negotiating table to work up an agreement to give the Argentinians a share of the vast reserves.

While the latest dust-up isn’t expected to result in another shooting war, analysts don’t see Argentina’s effort succeeding in getting a share of the reserves which London views as an economic bonanza to bring it out of its current recession.

Submarine Gives Taste Of Mariana Trench Dive

BBC, Feb 22, 2012

Four teams are diving to the deepest part of the ocean, the Mariana Trench, which lies 11km down in the western Pacific.

One of them is Triton submarines, a Florida-based company.

Their team has been in the Bahamas to test out a prototype submersible, which their full-ocean-depth model will be based on. Science reporter Rebecca Morelle joined them for the sub’s first night dive, which was piloted by Patrick Lahey.

Navy’s New Super-Sub Revealed

By Udi Etsion, ynetnews.com, Feb 22, 2012

Foreign media say Israel’s navy ready to test advanced, German-made submarine said to be virtually undetectable by radar, able to launch nuclear missiles

Israel’s “doomsday weapon” revealed? The Navy will soon begin its test-deployment of Israel’s new super-submarine, Yedioth Ahronoth reported Wednesday.

The report quoted various foreign newspapers as saying that the new Dolphin-Class submarine’s systems will enable it to spend prolonged periods of time at sea and fire nuclear missiles.

The submarine, names the “INS Tannin,” is also said to be equipped with special diesel and hydrogen conversion systems that will allow it to produce its own fuel; as well as with a stealth system making its acoustic signature virtually undetectable by sonar.

The INS Tannin (“Alligator”) is the namesake of the Israel Navy’s first ever S-Class submarine, which was retired from active duty in 1972.

According to German media, the Tannin – which will be supplied by the end of 2012 – is the first of three super-submarine slated to eventually be deployed by the Navy. A second super-sub – the INS Rahav (“Splendor”) will arrive in 2014 and the third, which has yet to be named, by 2015.

Germany’s Kieler Nachrichten newspaper said that the super-sub is the biggest and most advanced underwater vessel to be constructed in Germany since World War II.

It has also been acquired by the German and Italian naval forces.

The boatyard where the submarine is under construction is said to be under heavy guard. A team of Israeli experts is on-site, assisting their German counterparts.

Israel To Receive 4th German-Made Dolphin Class Submarine

Ahlul Bayt News Agency, Feb 22, 2012

(Ahlul Bayt News Agency) - According to an Israeli security official, the construction of the submarine is almost over and it will be transferred to Israel after undergoing deep sea tests.

Germany has already provided Israel with three Dolphin submarines, two of which were donated by Berlin and the third half-funded. Two more Dolphin-class submarines are expected to be delivered to Israel by 2013 as part of Tel Aviv plans to transform its navy into a deep-water navy.

The diesel-electric submarine built by Germany's HDW shipyard, which is a division of ThyssenKrupp AG, is reportedly capable of carrying nuclear missiles.

The 68-meter long boat is believed to be the longest German-made submarine after World War II.

US Submarines Remain Arms Procurement Priority: Navy

The China Post, Feb 21, 2012

Taiwan still considers the United States arms sale as the main source for the country to acquire submarines. However, the Navy said yesterday that it will not rule out other possible ways to obtain the submarines.

The Navy's comment came after a local newspaper report yesterday that Taiwan is studying the feasibility of building diesel-electric submarines itself after the U.S. shelved its procurement request for many years.

A total of three countries are now willing to offer Taiwan military assistance to build its own submarines, or are prepared to sell submarines that are currently under service, the United Daily News report yesterday quoted military sources as saying.

The report, however, did not specify the three countries in question.

Currently four submarines are in active service in Taiwan: two Dutch-built submarines from the 1980s, and two U.S. Guppy-class submarines built during World War II.

In the hope of replacing these decades-old submarines, Taiwan has been asking the U.S. to sell diesel-powered submarines, the report said.

In 2001, the administration of former U.S. President George Bush offered to provide eight diesel-electric submarines. But so far, no significant process of the sale has been made.

The report also said that the ancient vessels had seriously hurt the morale of Navy crews serving aboard the submarines, with many of them choosing to apply for early retirement, especially after the drowning of a submarine captain last September.

Chen Chi-tung, captain of the submarine Hai Lung, was found dead after being knocked off his vessel by big waves during a drill at southern Zuoying naval base in September, 2011.

The incident highlights the importance for the Navy to replace old vessels with new ones, the report said.

Other Possibilities of Procurement Still on the Table

In response, the Navy said yesterday it was not informed that three countries are offering to help Taiwan build its own submarines or sell Taiwan submarines. It did stress but that it will not reject any other options through which Taiwan can obtain submarines.

The Navy also said the U.S. government has not shut the door on selling diesel submarines to Taiwan as it is currently holding a cross-branch review on whether to approve the project.

Bilateral communications have remained smooth on arms sale issue, the Navy said, adding that it will continue to push the deal based on government policy.

The Navy also denied that its morale was affected by the old vessels and the death of Chen, saying that there is no "retirement wave" as claimed in the report and the Navy's submarines' crew remains on high alert and combat-ready at all times.

Navy Not Ruling Out Restoring SSN To Budget Plans, Mabus says

Mike McCarthy, Defense Daily, February 17, 2012

The Navy will look for ways to restore a Virginia-class (SSN-774) attack submarine to the five-year procurement plan despite this week's budget proposal that removed one of them from the books in fiscal 2014, Navy Secretary Ray Mabus said yesterday.

"We are exploring ways that we can creatively pull that ship back. We cannot now because of budget constraints," Mabus told the House Armed Services Committee (HASC) three days after the Pentagon unveiled its fiscal 2013 budget and five-year defense plan.

"We would clearly like to have that ship in (20)'14 instead of moving it to (20)'18," Mabus said during testimony alongside Adm. Jonathan Greenert, the chief of naval operations, and Gen. James Amos, the commandant of the Marine Corps.

The Navy has proposed taking 16 ships from the five-year plan, reducing the number that will go under construction from 57 to 41. The service cut the number by pushing some ships out of the timeframe and by terminating the Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV), buying only 10 instead of the envisioned 23. Two Littoral Combat Ships will also slip out of the five year plan, but Mabus emphasized the Navy is sticking to plans to build 55 of them.

The spending plan calls for construction of two SSN-774s in fiscal 2013, one in 2014 and two per year through 2017.

The decision to delay construction on one of the subs was "purely" financial as the Pentagon tries to cope with a projected reduction of \$487 million in defense funds over the next decade, Mabus said.

Mabus said that when the five-year period ends, the size of the Navy's fleet will be unchanged from the current level of 285 ships. He predicted the Navy will reach 300 ships by 2019, as the LCSs and JHSVs arrive to the fleet.

Several years ago the Navy set goal of building and sustaining a fleet of 313 ships, but the objective could be on hold because of the constrained budget environment.

Mabus said the service is conducting a new strategic assessment to determine the number of ships required in light of the Obama administration's revised global strategy outlined last month that places renewed focus on the Asia-Pacific.

Rep. Howard "Buck" McKeon (R-Calif.), the HASC chairman, criticized the shipbuilding cuts, saying it weakens the Navy's ability to counter the anti-access area denial environment it will be facing in the Asia-Pacific region.

"I'm concerned that budget cuts of this significance to our Navy and armed forces will increase our risk in this theater," McKeon said.

Also taking a hit from the budget was the next generation ballistic missile submarine, SSBN(X), to replace the Ohio class. The first two of the 12 Ohio boomers are slated for retirement in 2029, when the first SSBN(X) was scheduled for delivery.

The SSBN(X) plans have been pushed back by two years, with construction of the first vessel now set to begin in 2021, meaning the ballistic missile sub fleet will temporarily drop to 10, Greenert said, calling the dip acceptable.

"We see that to be OK. We'll watch very closely," he said. He added the two-year delay will have the extra benefit of allowing the design to mature.

In reworking the design, Mabus said the projected cost for each ship has lowered from \$7 billion to \$5 billion, but he cautioned that cost will be a burden on the shipbuilding budget once SSBN(X) construction begins.

"When that class is being built, it will clearly have a major impact on the rest of our shipbuilding program," he said.

Amos reaffirmed the Marine Corps stated goal of buying a total of 360 V-22 Osprey tilt-rotor aircraft, even as 24 were pushed into years following the five-year plan.

"We are still going to buy those V-22s," he said.

British Submariners Honor Crew Of Confederate Sub

By Bruce Smith, Associated Press, Feb 17, 2012

CHARLESTON, S.C. — British submariners are in South Carolina to pay tribute to the crew of the first submarine in history to sink an enemy warship.

Members of the Portsmouth Submariners Association in the United Kingdom place a poppy wreath Friday at the graves of the crew of the Confederate submarine H.L. Hunley in Charleston. The poppy is a symbol of courage and sacrifice.

Association members have sent a poppy wreath to the grave every year since 2004, when the last Hunley crew was buried in what has been called the last Confederate funeral.

It was 148 years ago Friday that the hand-cranked sub sank the Union blockade ship Housatonic off Charleston. But the Hunley itself sank before returning.

The sub was raised from the Atlantic Ocean 12 years ago.

U.S. considers sharp cuts to nuclear force

Cbsnews.com, February 15

(AP) WASHINGTON - The Obama administration is weighing options for sharp new cuts to the U.S. nuclear force, including a reduction of up to 80 percent in the number of deployed weapons, The Associated Press has learned.

Even the most modest option now under consideration would be an historic and politically bold disarmament step in a presidential election year, although the plan is in line with President Barack Obama's 2009 pledge to pursue the elimination of nuclear weapons.

No final decision has been made, but the administration is considering at least three options for lower total numbers of deployed strategic nuclear weapons cutting to around 1,000 to 1,100, 700 to 800, or 300 to 400, according to a former government official and a congressional staffer. Both spoke on condition of anonymity in order to reveal internal administration deliberations.

The potential cuts would be from a current treaty limit of 1,550 deployed strategic warheads.

A level of 300 deployed strategic nuclear weapons would take the U.S. back to levels not seen since 1950 when the nation was ramping up production in an arms race with the Soviet Union. The U.S. numbers peaked at above 12,000 in the late 1980s and first dropped below 5,000 in 2003.

Obama has often cited his desire to seek lower levels of nuclear weapons, but specific options for a further round of cuts had been kept under wraps until the AP learned of the three options now on the table.

A spokesman for the White House's National Security Council, Tommy Vietor, said Tuesday that the options developed by the Pentagon have not yet been presented to Obama.

The Pentagon's press secretary, George Little, declined to comment on specific force level options because they are classified. He said Obama had asked the Pentagon to develop several "alternative approaches" to nuclear deterrence.

The U.S. could make further weapons reductions on its own but is seen as more likely to propose a new round of arms negotiations with Russia, in which cuts in deployed weapons would be one element in a possible new treaty between the former Cold War adversaries.

Stephen Young, senior analyst at the Union of Concerned Scientists, which favors nuclear arms reductions, said Tuesday, “The administration is absolutely correct to look at deep cuts like this. The United States does not rely on nuclear weapons as a central part of our security.”

Even small proposed cuts are likely to draw heavy criticism from Republicans who have argued that a smaller nuclear force would weaken the U.S. at a time when Russia, China and others are strengthening their nuclear capabilities. They also argue that shrinking the American arsenal would undermine the credibility of the nuclear “umbrella” that the United States provides for allies such as Japan, South Korea and Turkey, who might otherwise build their own nuclear forces.

The administration last year began considering a range of possible future reductions below the levels agreed in the New START treaty with Russia that took effect one year ago. Options are expected to be presented to Obama soon. The force levels he settles on will form the basis of a new strategic nuclear war plan to be produced by the Pentagon.

The U.S. already is on track to reduce to 1,550 deployed strategic nuclear warheads by 2018, as required by New START. As of last Sept. 1, the United States had 1,790 warheads and Russia had 1,566, according to treaty-mandated reports by each. The treaty does not bar either country from cutting below 1,550 on their own.

Those who favor additional cuts argue that nuclear weapons have no role in major security threats of the 21st century, such as terrorism. A 2010 nuclear policy review by the Pentagon said the U.S. nuclear arsenal also is “poorly suited” to deal with challenges posed by “unfriendly regimes seeking nuclear weapons” — an apparent reference to Iran.

It’s unclear what calculus went into each of the three options now under consideration at the White House.

The notion of a 300-weapon arsenal is featured prominently in a paper written for the Pentagon by a RAND National Defense Project Institute analyst last October, in the early stages of the administration’s review of nuclear requirements. The author, Paul K. Davis, wrote that he was not advocating any particular course of action but sought to provide an analytic guide for how policymakers could think about the implications of various levels of nuclear reductions.

Davis wrote that an arsenal of 300 weapons might be considered adequate for deterrence purposes if that force level was part of a treaty with sound anti-cheating provisions; if the U.S. deployed additional non-nuclear weapons with global reach, and if the U.S. had “hypothetically excellent,” if limited, defenses against long- and medium-range nuclear missiles.

In 2010, three Air Force analysts wrote in *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, an Air Force publication, that the U.S. could get by with as few as 311 deployed nuclear weapons, and that it didn’t matter whether Russia followed suit with its own cuts.

New U.S. cuts could open the prospect for a historic reshaping of the American nuclear arsenal, which for decades has stood on three legs: submarine-launched ballistic missiles, ground-based ballistic missiles and weapons launched from big bombers like the B-52 and the stealthy B-2. The traditional rationale for this “triad” of weaponry is that it is essential to surviving any nuclear exchange.

As recently as last month the administration said it was keeping the triad intact under current plans, while also hinting at future cuts to the force. In the 2013 defense budget submitted to Congress on Monday, the administration proposed a two-year delay in the development of a new generation of ballistic missile submarines that carry nuclear weapons. That will save an estimated \$4.3 billion over five years.

In congressional testimony last November, the Pentagon’s point man on nuclear policy, James N. Miller, declined to say what options for force reductions the administration was considering. Rep. Michael Turner, R-Ohio, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee’s strategic forces subcommittee, unsuccessfully pressed Miller for key details about his policy review. As recently as last month Turner said in an interview that he feared the administration was bent on cutting the force.

In his written testimony at a Nov. 2 hearing chaired by Turner, Miller made it clear that the administration was making a fundamental reassessment of nuclear weapons requirements. In unusually stark terms he said the critical question at hand was “what to do” if a nuclear-armed state or non-state entity could not be deterred from launching an attack.

“In effect, we are asking: what are the guiding concepts for employing nuclear weapons to deter adversaries of the United States, and what are the guiding concepts for ending a nuclear conflict on the best possible terms if one has started?” he said.

Nuclear stockpile numbers are closely guarded secrets in most states that possess them, but private nuclear policy experts say no countries other than the U.S. and Russia are thought to have more than 300. The Federation of American Scientists estimates that France has about 300, China about 240, Britain about 225, and Israel, India and Pakistan roughly 100 each. Since taking office Obama has put heavy emphasis on reducing the role and number of nuclear weapons as part of a broader strategy for limiting the global spread of nuclear arms technology and containing the threat of nuclear terrorism. That strategy is being put to the test most urgently by Iran’s suspected pursuit of a nuclear bomb.

Navy: Iran capable of sea-based suicide attacks

CBSnews.com, February 13

(CBS/AP) MANAMA, Bahrain - The top U.S. Navy official in the Gulf said Iran has the capability to launch suicide attacks with small vessels, but insists his forces are prepared to confront any Iranian aggression in the region.

Vice Adm. Mark Fox, commander of the 5th Fleet, told reporters Sunday at the naval force’s Bahrain headquarters that the Navy has “built a wide range of potential options to give the president” and is “ready today” to confront any hostile action by Tehran.

But Fox acknowledged that Iran's military is "capable of striking a blow" against American forces in the Gulf, particularly using unconventional means such as small attack boats or mines laid along shipping lanes. "We're not bulletproof. There are people that can take a swipe at us," Fox said.

"They have increased the number of submarines ... they increased the number of fast attack craft," Fox said, according to Reuters. "Some of the small boats have been outfitted with a large warhead that could be used as a suicide explosive device. The Iranians have a large mine inventory."

But he added that he has reminded officers under his command that they "have a right and an obligation of self defense" if attacked.

He did not outline specifically how the Navy might answer an Iranian strike or an effort to shut the entrance to the Persian Gulf, though any response would likely involve the two U.S. aircraft carriers and other warships cruising the waters off Iran.

"We've developed very precise and lethal weapons that are very effective, and we're prepared," Fox said. "We're just ready for any contingency."

Faced with tightening Western sanctions, Iranian officials have stepped up threats to close the Strait of Hormuz if the country's oil exports are blocked. A fifth of the world's oil supply passes through the narrow waterway, which is only about 30 miles across at its narrowest point.

Iran and Oman share control of the waterway, but it is considered an international strait, meaning free transit passage is guaranteed under international law.

Iran's army chief, Gen. Ataollah Salehi, early last month warned an American warship not to return to the Gulf shortly after the aircraft carrier USS John C. Stennis and another vessel left. Another carrier, the USS Abraham Lincoln, entered the Gulf without incident on Jan. 22.

The admiral's comments echo those of other Western officials, who say they will respond swiftly to any Iranian attempt to shut the Strait of Hormuz. Gen. Martin Dempsey, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, told CBS' "Face the Nation" last month that Iranian forces could block shipping through the strait "for a period of time," but added, "We can defeat that." (Watch Dempsey and Defense Secretary Leon Panetta appear on "Face the Nation" at left.)

In his briefing in the Bahraini capital Manama, Fox voiced support for the tiny island nation that has hosted U.S. Navy vessels for decades.

"They are a long-term partner and a very important piece of our ability to do our mission," he said of the country.

Bahrain has been rocked by protests led by the country's majority Shiites against the country's Sunni monarchy that erupted in force a year ago. Street battles between security forces and protesters still flare up almost daily in the predominantly Shiite villages around the capital.

Fox's command encompasses the bulk of the Middle East, including the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf and a large swath of the Indian Ocean along the east African coast. There are about 25,000 sailors under his command.

Submarine Drones Must Be Self-Navigating, Naval Experts Say

W.J. Hennigan, Los Angeles Times, Feb 9, 2012

WASHINGTON - Achieving complete autonomy in future robotic submarines is crucial to the Navy's plans to use drone technology.

This was the message of several speakers at the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International's robotic conference at Washington's Omni Shoreham Hotel, who said that submarine drones could be useful in a variety of roles in science and national security.

Unlike aerial drones, which are remotely controlled using GPS signals and data links, robotic submarines would not be able to receive satellite commands as they scour the ocean floor. So the machines need to be able to navigate on their own to carry out missions.

Submarine drones would need advanced onboard computers to detect and dodge mountains jutting from the sea bed.

Rear Admiral Matthew Klunder, chief of naval research at the Office of Naval Research in Arlington, Va., said autonomy would someday have a place on the short list of historic naval achievements.

There are development projects underway around the country. In Southern California, Boeing Co. has been testing an 18-foot bright-yellow submarine drone off the coast of Santa Catalina Island.

Boeing first tested the sub in its 1-million-gallon test pool at its Anaheim, Calif., facility, which was the birthplace of the guidance systems for the world's first nuclear submarine.



New Ships Will Account For Asia-Pacific Buildup, SECNAV Says

Defense Daily, March 8

The planned increase of the Navy's presence in the Asia-Pacific region will largely be done by procuring new ships rather than by reducing the fleet in other vital areas of the world, Navy Secretary Ray Mabus said yesterday.

Currently about 55 percent of the Navy's force is based in the Pacific while 45 percent is Atlantic oriented, but those numbers will "gradually" shift to more along the lines of 60 to 40 percent favoring the Pacific as the Pentagon executes a new global strategy, Mabus said at a conference hosted by Credit Suisse in Arlington, Va.

"We're going to try to do most of that from new builds," Mabus said.

"We're going to be putting ships that are coming out of the shipyards into the Pacific, because we still have vast responsibilities, particularly in the Middle East."

Part of the plan will be stationing at least one Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) in Singapore. Two LCSs have been delivered to the Navy.

Construction of 20 is already under contract with the builders of the two variants, Lockheed Martin [LMT] and Austal USA. The Navy intends to build 55 in the long run.

The Obama administration unveiled a revised global posture strategy in January that puts greater emphasis on the Asia-Pacific, even as the number of ships in the Navy's fleet in five years is expected to remain at today's level of about 285. Mabus said, however, he expects the fleet to reach 300 ships by 2019—below the 313 ships envisioned several years ago.

The Navy is undergoing a review of its force structure following the administration's revised global strategy. Mabus said the Navy was working through the new 30-year shipbuilding plan and it would be released "very soon."

A critical aspect of the plan will be incorporating the next generation of costly ballistic missile submarines (SSBN-X) while minimizing the impact on other shipbuilding programs, he said. In its fiscal 2013 budget proposal and five-year procurement plan outlined last month, the Navy said it would delay starting construction on the first SSBN-X vessel, originally planned for 2019, by two years. The move is estimated to save \$4.3 billion over the next five years.

The SSBN-Xs are to replace the Ohio-class fleet of boomers scheduled to begin retirement at the end of the next decade, but could also add significant pressure to the shipbuilding budget for other programs.

"If we took that out of our normal shipbuilding account it would have a dramatic, adverse impact on the rest of the fleet," he said, before adding: "Not only on the rest of the fleet, but on the industrial base that builds the rest of the fleet—including attack subs."

Mabus said the Navy intends to sustain a shipbuilding rate that will keep the industrial base stable, but in return expected the contractors to bring ships in on time and budget, and to apply lessons learned from previous builds.

He pointed out cost overruns on the ongoing construction of the Gerald R Ford (CVN-78) aircraft carrier, the first in the class of the same name being built by Huntington Ingalls Industries [HII] at its Newport News Shipbuilding yard in Virginia.

Mabus said the Navy has been withholding fees that were to be paid to HII to account for the increased costs.

He faulted the Pentagon's deviation from a plan 10 years ago to phase in all of the new technologies for the class over the first three ships to minimize risk.

Instead, the Pentagon changed the plan and crammed all of the "brand new" systems into the first ship, thereby increasing the potential for technical problems and cost growth, he said. That added complexities that delayed not getting the construction contract done until 2008 with only 30 percent of the design complete, he said.

"That is not the way to build a ship. That is not the way to build a weapon system. It is not the way to build anything," Mabus said. "So now you have, understandably, cost overruns."

The Navy's fiscal 2013 budget request seeks \$811 million to pay for cost overruns on the Gerald R Ford, which is about halfway complete, and another \$608.2 million for the first year of construction on the next carrier, the John F Kennedy (CVN-79).

The Gerald R Ford was projected to come in at a cost of about \$11 billion. Rear Adm. Thomas Moore, the program executive officer for aircraft carriers, said media reports suggesting the ship could cost more than \$12 billion were probably accurate.

That figure, however, includes \$3.7 billion in research and development costs and another \$3.3 billion in design costs that will not be non-recurring and apply to the construction of the rest of the carriers in the class.

Moore added the Navy has begun to rein in the cost growth. "We have some cost stability," he said.

Maine sub yard to get \$38M upgrade

Associated Press, March 8

KITTERY, Maine - Officials say a \$38 million defense contract has been awarded to a Environmental Chemical Corp. to repair and upgrade the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery.

U.S. Sen. Susan Collins of Maine says the Navy's awarded a contract to Environmental Chemical, based in Marlborough, Mass., for energy and structural repairs at the submarine repair yard.

The contract follows a 2010 the Government Accountability Office report that found that the Navy's modernization requirements at nation's four public shipyards, including Portsmouth, were underestimated. Work under the contract is expected to be completed by December 2014.

Congresswoman Wants Va.-class Funding Restored

By Mike McCarthy, Defense Daily, March 7, 2012

Rep. Rosa DeLauro (D-Conn.) said yesterday she will strive to restore funding for the procurement of a Virginia-class (SSN-774) attack submarine that the Navy has delayed.

The Navy pushed the start of construction on one of the subs back from fiscal 2014 to 2018 when it rolled out its five-year procurement plan last month, but has not ruled out looking for ways to restore the funds. The move comes as the service for the first time in more than 20 years got two of the ships under construction in the same year during fiscal 2011. As it currently stands, the Navy has only one sub on the books for 2014.

DeLauro, whose state is the home of sub builder General Dynamics [GD] Electric Boat, said delaying one of the vessels has the potential to weaken the industrial base and she will work to get the funding back into the budget.

"We will fight," DeLauro, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, told a gathering on Capitol Hill hosted by the Submarine Industrial Base Council.

Navy Secretary Ray Mabus told the House Armed Services Committee in February that the decision to delay construction on one sub was "purely" financial as the Pentagon tries to cope with a projected reduction of \$487 billion in defense funds over the next decade (Defense Daily, Feb. 17, 2012). Mabus also said, however, that the Navy would look for ways to get the funding for 2014.

"We are exploring ways that we can creatively pull that ship back. We cannot now because of budget constraints," Mabus said.

Submarine Contractors Lead Lobbying March Amid U.S. Defense Cuts

Bgov.com, March 7

The makers of submarines and the parts that go into them are bringing 300 executives and engineers to Washington to lobby Congress for money to develop components for new boats.

The defense lobbying season begins in earnest today, as the submarine contractors visit Capitol Hill and the aerospace industry presents a report citing its contributions to the economy. General Dynamics Corp. and its suppliers are preparing a congressional visit this month to seek backing for upgrading the Abrams battle tank, and Lockheed Martin Corp. is readying a fight against congressional cuts in a missile defense program.

The customary push by defense contractors to boost spending on weapons or to shield them from budget cuts comes this year amid increasing pressure to reduce the U.S. deficit, forecast by the Treasury Department at \$1.33 trillion. President Barack Obama's budget proposal released last month doesn't spare defense programs from spending cuts.

"Congress will certainly make adjustments to the president's defense funding request," Jeff Green, the president of J.A. Green & Company, a Washington-based lobbying and strategy firm, said in an e-mail. "The difference this year is those changes will come within a more constrained budget."

The Obama administration has proposed \$525.4 billion in military spending for fiscal 2013, \$45 billion less than projected a year ago, and lawmakers have deadlocked so far on efforts to avert an additional \$500 billion in automatic defense cuts over the next decade.

'Little Wiggle Room'

"There is very little wiggle room," Representative Duncan Hunter, a California Republican and member of the House Armed Services Committee, said in an interview.

That isn't deterring members of the Submarine Industrial Base Council who are seeking \$150 million for development of components for a new class of ballistic-missile submarines. While the Navy has requested \$565 million for research and development of the new submarine, the industry groups want added funds for components that would otherwise be delayed.

The group represents submarine builders General Dynamics of Falls Church, Virginia, and Huntington Ingalls Industries Inc. of Newport News, Virginia, and about 5,000 other contractors, according to its website.

The submarine lobby also will press lawmakers to back the Pentagon's request for about \$100 million so that Virginia-class attack submarines can carry more Tomahawk cruise missiles made by Raytheon Co. of Waltham, Massachusetts, as well as missiles developed in the future.

"We really want to get to Congress and make certain they understand the significance of the strategic deterrence" provided by the new submarine, said Dan DePompei, the council's co-chairman and the Sudbury, Massachusetts-based product development manager for Dresser-Rand Group Inc.

General Dynamics plans to bring about 200 suppliers for its Abrams tanks to Capitol Hill at the end of this month, as it does annually. They will push to override the Army's plan to save money by suspending upgrades of Abrams tanks that would convert them to the latest M1A2 model. The Army wants to stop that work at a Lima, Ohio-based tank plant from 2013 to 2015.

General Dynamics "will ask for only an additional \$181 million, or 33 tanks," to fill the production gap and complement international orders, such as the Namer infantry fighting vehicle for the Israeli Army, according to Kendell Pease, General Dynamics' vice president of communications and government relations.

Aerospace Report

The Aerospace Industries Association, representing companies such as Lockheed Martin, Boeing Co. and Northrop Grumman Corp., will make its case for defense funding by releasing a study it commissioned from Deloitte LLP.

The report highlights the contribution that the aerospace and defense industry brings to employment, revenue and the gross domestic product. AIA said it plans to distribute the study to labor organizations, lawmakers and voters in all 50 states.

Marion Blakey, president of the trade group, has called the Obama administration's defense budget a "direct hit" on American defense and aerospace workers.

Instead of lobbying for more money than requested, Lockheed Martin is seeking to protect the Pentagon's proposal to provide \$401 million as a final year of funding for a missile defense program that the Bethesda, Maryland-based company is developing with Italy and Germany.

Lawmakers led by Senator Mark Begich, an Alaska Democrat, want to terminate all funding for the Medium Extended Air Defense System, or Meads.

The \$4.2 billion development program is managed from Orlando, Florida, by Meads International Inc., a joint venture of Lockheed, Lfk-Lenkflugkoerpersysteme Gmbh of Germany and MBDA of Italy. MBDA is jointly owned by BAE Systems Plc, European Aeronautic Defence and Space Co. and Finmeccanica SpA.

Lockheed will cite its successful first test flight to make the case for funding, Marty Coyne, director of business development for Meads International, said in an interview.

Lawmakers on congressional armed services committees say the industry groups gearing up to lobby them shouldn't expect much give in the defense budget.

Republican Representatives Howard P. "Buck" McKeon of California, who heads the House Armed Services Committee, and Todd Akin of Missouri, a senior member of the panel, are pressing the House Budget Committee to increase the Pentagon budget over Obama's request.

Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan, an Ohio Republican, said Feb. 29 that he was concerned about "arbitrary and deep cuts" to the defense budget and may have to win support for more money from his panel members.

'More Anti-Defense'

"The budget committee has a lot of people who are not strong on defense, so as a committee it is a little more anti-defense than pro-defense," Akin, also a member of the budget committee, said in an interview.

Nor are lawmakers making progress in averting the automatic defense cuts that would begin in January because a congressional supercommittee failed to meet deficit-reduction goals, according to Senator Carl Levin, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

"It will happen, I predict, after the election," Levin, a Michigan Democrat who calls for added revenue as part of any solution, said in an interview.

Republicans McKeon and Hunter have sponsored legislation to avert automatic cuts in both defense and non-defense spending next year by trimming government payrolls through attrition.

House Speaker John Boehner, an Ohio Republican, may insist on finding ways to reduce the federal deficit by \$1.2 trillion to avoid all of the automatic cuts over a decade, rather than rely on short-term plans, according to Hunter.

"The speaker has said that he'll let things play out," Hunter said in an e-mail. "Any effort to protect the defense budget from even deeper cuts deserves attention, but there's an uphill fight with the president and Senate leaders closing the door to workable alternatives."

Female officers kicked off subs in fraud probe

Navy Times, March 2

Three female supply officers were pulled from submarine crews within months of joining the force for allegedly committing fraud prior to checking in at their boats, a Submarine Forces spokeswoman confirmed Friday. These three were among the eight Supply Corps lieutenants that reported to the submarine force, a cadre chosen to be role models for the younger female submariners reporting straight from training to the previously all-male force.

"The alleged actions under investigation involve financial misconduct and in no way involved their performance while assigned to their current operational units," said Submarine Forces spokeswoman Cmdr. Monica Rousselow, who explained the allegations concerned fraudulent travel claims while on temporary assigned duty.

The Naval Criminal Investigative Service investigation began in February, Rousselow said, but she declined to comment further on the nature of the allegations or who had first reported them because the investigation is still open.

The three reliefs are a setback for the ongoing integration of the undersea force. But officials characterized the disruption as “minimal” — pointing out this is not the first time supply lieutenants had been removed from subs — and that the larger effort is still on track.

“Overall, the integration of women onboard submarines continues to progress smoothly and the reassignment of the three Supply Corps officers will have a minimal impact on the integration process,” Rousselow said.

Each of the female Supply Corps lieutenants volunteered for sub duty and had been vetted. Once chosen for sub duty, they attended the 10-week-long Submarine Officer Basic Course, Rousselow said. Each lieutenant was to report to the sub along with two female submariners. In total, there were eight of these groups, one each for the Blue and Gold crews of the four subs selected: the ballistic-missile submarines Wyoming and Maine, and the guided-missile subs Georgia and Ohio.

None of the female officers had been taken to mast as of Friday, Rousselow said. She declined to release their names or the subs they had been assigned to, citing privacy concerns. They are being reassigned to Submarine Group 10 in Kings Bay, Ga., she said.

Three women pulled from submarine duty for alleged fraud

The Day, March 3

Groton - Three of the first female submariners are being taken off their boats to face allegations of financial misconduct.

The alleged travel claim fraud occurred before the women, who are supply officers, reported to their submarines, according to Cmdr. Monica Rousselow, spokeswoman for the commander of the submarine force.

Their reassignments are part of an ongoing investigation, she said Friday.

“The integration of women on submarines will be minimally impacted,” she said. “Overall, the process has gone smoothly with positive results.”

Rousselow said that other Navy personnel are involved in the alleged misconduct but they are not assigned to submarines, and she could not say how many there are.

The three women are being temporarily reassigned to Submarine Group 10 in Kings Bay, Ga.

Rousselow said the submarine force is looking at the different options for replacing the women on the three submarine crews.

The Navy officially lifted its ban of women on submarines in 2010 and began preparing to bring female officers aboard ballistic-missile and guided-missile submarines.

Navy Reassigns 3 Female Submariners in Fraud Probe

AP, March 3

HARTFORD, Conn. — The U.S. Navy has reassigned three female submarine officers as the military investigates allegations they were involved in financial misconduct before reporting to their vessels, a spokeswoman said Friday.

The investigation into alleged travel claim fraud, which also involves other personnel not assigned to submarines, is led by the Naval Criminal Investigative Service, according to Navy Cmdr. Monica Rousselow, a spokeswoman for the submarine force.

The officers are among the first women assigned to U.S. submarines in a high-profile initiative for the Navy, which reversed a ban on women serving aboard the cramped vessels in 2010. The initial class of 24 female submarine officers completed training at sites including Groton, Conn., last year before joining the undersea force in recent months.

“The alleged actions under investigation involve financial misconduct and in no way involved their performance while assigned to their current operational units,” Rousselow said in a statement. “Overall the integration of women onboard submarines continues to progress smoothly and the reassignment of the three Supply Corps officers will have minimal impact on the integration process.”

The women are being temporarily reassigned to a submarine group at Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay in Georgia.

Rousselow, who is based in Norfolk, Va., said the investigation began in February, but she could not say where or provide further details of the alleged fraud.

Digitizing Our U.S. Submarine WWII War Patrol Reports

Forward:

"This effort by EMC (SS) John Clear USN (Ret) is truly remarkable. For over 40 years, although declassified, the remarkable exploits of the U. S. Submarine Force during WWII sat on microfilm in a few museums and files, essentially untouched. His initiative revealed factual accounts of each U. S. submarine war patrol during WWII. In my view, that delay in publication was a travesty which should not have occurred for our WWII submarine veterans.

The Cold War is over. It should not take four decades before the importance of U. S. Submarine efforts during that period are made public."

Very Respectfully, VADM Roger F. Bacon, USN (Ret)

Digitizing Our U.S. Submarine WWII War Patrol Reports

I first became acquainted with the WWII U.S. Submarine War Patrol Reports microfilm collection at the Naval Undersea Museum, Keyport, WA in the summer of 2006, while volunteering as a docent at the museum. This little known and very infrequently used collection is housed within the 3rd floor, non-lending library of this outstanding facility which is one of only a small hand full in our nation where these reports can be viewed.

Being a retired SubLant and SubPac Chief, whose naval career had included tours of duty on three of these WWII veteran submarines, I was interested in their war time history and achievements. With help from the museum's staff (in particular Jennifer Heinzelman, Collections Manager), I soon became well versed with the library's microfilm reader as to how to set-up and peruse the film rolls of the 255 U.S. submarine's war patrol records. These numerous microfilm rolls are housed in large collection drawers there within the library.

What immediately struck me in reading these histories from the microfilm copies of the original paper reports was the succinct manner in which these histories had been recorded at the time of and where these events occurred. Some of these reports were almost "casual" in their presentation of these awesome events. As an example: one of my previous tours of duty was on the USS Sealion SS-315 which just happened to be the only submarine in history to sink an enemy battleship in wartime. To read the pertinent pages from within this particular report of this patrol one would think that this type of occurrence was rather commonplace and not of such monumental importance as it had been. Well known submarines and individual heroes of these times seem to be "alive" in their patrol report depictions. The officers making the input and the yeomen that typed up these multi-copy reports on their old Underwood typewriters did so with an almost clinical detachment, ultimately providing an insight as no other form of written historical log or book has given us.

Again with the aid of the staff I was able to print out some of these pages but it was a very slow and cumbersome chore. It wasn't until I was able to reconnect the microfilm reader's output directly to a computer and hence save pages in a digital format that this effort began to come together and make sense. From my research I had found that nearly half of these microfilmed reports were photographed in 16mm and the rest in 35mm, in that, again, I found another problem. The 16 mm pages were an easy and direct "save to" on the p.c., but the 35mm had to be worked on with an average of three shots and then laboriously "stitched" together with the computers software. To say that this slowed down the procedure is an understatement. Fast calculations showed that I had about 5 years of 8 hour days ahead of me at the rate that I was preceding.

By the fall of the year I had been hooked on this project. One day while talking with an active duty LCDR and Jennifer, I decided that this project had to be taken on in earnest in order to more easily share these historic times with the many rather than just the few that had access to these microfilm libraries. I wanted to get these stories out while we still had some of our WWII submarine veterans with us, whose stories were told within these pages.

Further research found that recent technology had been developed that could now take on this conversion in a manner that would not require the manual, laborious efforts thus far expended. This newer technology was basically a huge machine that could read and convert these microfilm rolls faster than I ever could hope to accomplish. Two major companies were queried as to cost. The pricing, while fair (quoted at over six thousand dollars), was not something that the museum, nor its supporting foundation, would be able to fund. With the help of a long time friend, Dan Martini EMCM (SS), USN Ret., a partnership was formed and registered in Jefferson County of Washington State

with the express purpose of handling this project. The museum agreed to lend out the microfilm rolls (some 255) to the company that we had agreed upon and the partnership would pay the cost of the conversion process.

It was at about this time that Vice Admiral Roger Bacon, of the museums foundation, had heard of our project and wanted to help make the project move into reality. Admiral Bacon's father had been a highly respected WWII submarine Commanding Officer and thus Admiral Bacon's interest in these reports had been in mind for many years.

The initial run received from the conversion company came down to 28 full DVDs containing all of the 1,600+ war patrol reports of the 255 submarines involved. We were provided with two master copies, one in .jpg (picture) format and the other in .pdf (Adobe Reader) format. These reports were assembled in hull number sequence, oldest to the newest of the participating WWII subs. As per SubPacs instructions, the vast majority of the war patrol reports were written within the require guidelines as follows;

- | | |
|---|--|
| (A) Prologue | (M) Radar |
| (B) Narrative (date & time) | (N) Sound gear & conditions |
| (C) Weather | (O) Density Layers |
| (D) Tidal information | (P) Health, food & habitability |
| (E) Navigational aids | (Q) Personnel |
| (F) Ship Contacts | (R) Miles steamed, fuel used |
| (G) Aircraft | (S) Duration |
| (H) Attacks | (T) Factors of endurance remaining |
| (I) Mines | (U) Communication, radar and sonar countermeasures |
| (J) Anti-submarine measures and evasive tactics | (V) Remarks |
| (K) Major defects | |
| (L) Radio | |

It was also at this point that we registered our newly converted war patrol reports and were issued an ISBN number of 13: 978-0-615-17769-4. together with an intellectual copyright being filed (to protect the digital conversion).

By early 2007 we had the final masters on hand and began further production from these sets. Admiral Bacon (as our mentor) financed the first (costly) five sets and donated these to the Newport, RI and Monterey, CA Naval War College libraries, the St. Mary's, Georgia Museum, USS Nautilus Museum, Groton, CN and the USS Bowfin Museum, Honolulu, HI. The partnership in turn provided a master set to the Naval Undersea Museum and to some eight submarines stationed at Bangor Submarine Base, WA during our quarterly NSL NW meetings.

Later that year, during the 2007 USSVI Alaskan Cruise Convention, these patrol reports were first introduced, in their new user friendly digital format to the submarine community at large. We also posted this information on the internet at the same time. It was the partnership's agreement, to provide at no cost, any copy of any submarine reports to any WWII sub vet or his immediate family, several hundred individual boat's patrol reports were thus sent out. Many submarine authors, (Tom Clancy, et al), researchers, and historians were among the initial purchasers.

By 2009 it was decided to make these reports available for free viewing to the general public directly on the internet. Rich Pekelney of the Historic Naval Ships Association, (HNSA), was contacted and uploaded all of the reports onto their website with a bravo zulu sent back to the partnership and our mentor Admiral Bacon. While able to view the reports for free via the internet, these pages are not easily copied or printed out.

In quick order further improvements in computer software allowed the reports to be further converted to a "compressed pdf" format greatly reducing the production time and lowering the overall cost to less than 1/10 of the initial offering. The total of the reports including all of the appendices (which include some fifteen cross references, by boat, C.O. etc.) are now on just 4 DVD's in this compressed .pdf format.

We have archived the initial run in the .jpeg format to allow for further "cleaning up" (in time) of some of the reports that were either too light, dark, smudged or had any other problems in their reading quality.

The outcome of this effort has provided an easy to use reference of the thousands of pages that if printed out on single sided paper, would be a book at over 22 feet across, a massive work!

The company, (now a corporation), has continued to provide these reports at an extremely low cost to a world wide audience. Our initial desire to acknowledge our WWII Submarine Veterans still alive has been well met and we will continue in our stated efforts through Submarine Memorabilia, Inc...

John Clear EMC(SS) USN Ret.
Submarine Memorabilia, Inc.
180 Robin Lane
Port Ludlow, WA 98365-9522
webmaster@usssealion.com

Listing of all U.S. Submarines in WWII (Pacific) by Name (alpha), Hull Number (i.e. SS-218), Number of Patrols Made & Total Pages Within War Patrol Reports.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-----|----|-----|------------|-----|----|-----|-------------|-----|----|-----|--------------|-----|----|-----|-------------|-----|----|-----|
| Albacore | 218 | 10 | 551 | Cero | 225 | 8 | 485 | Herring | 233 | 7 | 156 | Razorback | 394 | 5 | 275 | Seadragon | 194 | 12 | 468 |
| Amberjack | 219 | 3 | 82 | Charr | 328 | 3 | 114 | Hoe | 258 | 8 | 320 | Redfin | 272 | 7 | 290 | Seahorse | 304 | 8 | 439 |
| Angler | 240 | 7 | 338 | Chub | 329 | 3 | 138 | Icefish | 367 | 5 | 177 | Redfish | 395 | 2 | 201 | Seal | 183 | 12 | 557 |
| Apogon | 308 | 8 | 253 | Cobia | 245 | 6 | 269 | Jack | 259 | 9 | 304 | Robalo | 273 | 3 | 143 | Sealion | 315 | 6 | 330 |
| Archerfish | 311 | 7 | 223 | Cod | 274 | 7 | 466 | Jallao | 368 | 4 | 127 | Rock | 274 | 6 | 67 | Searaven | 196 | 13 | 594 |
| Argonaut | 166 | 2 | 82 | Crevalle | 291 | 7 | 506 | Kete | 369 | 2 | 36 | Ronquill | 396 | 5 | 251 | Segundo | 398 | 5 | 236 |
| Argonaut | 475 | 1 | 78 | Croaker | 246 | 6 | 266 | Kingfish | 234 | 12 | 522 | Runner | 275 | 3 | 94 | Sennet | 408 | 4 | 146 |
| Aspro | 309 | 7 | 286 | Cutlass | 478 | 1 | 21 | Kraken | 370 | 4 | 144 | Runner | 476 | 1 | 77 | Shad | 235 | 11 | 362 |
| Atule | 403 | 4 | 190 | Cuttiefish | 171 | 3 | 92 | Lagarto | 371 | 2 | 43 | S-11 | 116 | 6 | 40 | Shark | 174 | 3 | 201 |
| Balao | 285 | 10 | 410 | Dace | 247 | 7 | 691 | Lamprey | 372 | 3 | 85 | S-13 | 118 | 4 | 36 | Shark | 314 | 7 | 777 |
| Bang | 385 | 6 | 235 | Darter | 227 | 4 | 290 | Lapon | 260 | 8 | 325 | S-15 | 120 | 3 | 25 | Silversides | 236 | 14 | 467 |
| Barb | 220 | 12 | 503 | Dentuda | 335 | 1 | 47 | Lionfish | 298 | 2 | 74 | S-17 | 122 | 6 | 63 | Skate | 305 | 7 | 108 |
| Barbel | 316 | 4 | 139 | Devilfish | 292 | 4 | 97 | Lizardfish | 373 | 2 | 101 | S-18 | 123 | 7 | 72 | Skipjack | 184 | 10 | 391 |
| Barbero | 317 | 2 | 100 | Diablo | 479 | 2 | 17 | Loggerhead | 374 | 2 | 59 | S-23 | 128 | 7 | 61 | Snapper | 185 | 11 | 371 |
| Barracuda | 163 | 6 | 36 | Dolphin | 169 | 3 | 61 | Macabi | 375 | 1 | 32 | S-26 | 131 | 2 | 120 | Snook | 279 | 9 | 334 |
| Beshaw | 241 | 6 | 312 | Dragonet | 293 | 3 | 117 | Manta | 299 | 1 | 37 | S-27 | 132 | 1 | 107 | Spadefish | 411 | 5 | 308 |
| Bass | 164 | 4 | 47 | Drum | 228 | 13 | 350 | Mingo | 261 | 7 | 257 | S-28 | 133 | 7 | 451 | Spearfish | 190 | 12 | 495 |
| Batfish | 310 | 6 | 331 | Entemedor | 340 | 1 | 26 | Moray | 300 | 1 | 29 | S-30 | 135 | 9 | 152 | Spikefish | 404 | 4 | 113 |
| Baya | 318 | 5 | 229 | Finback | 230 | 12 | 417 | Muskellunge | 262 | 7 | 250 | S-31 | 136 | 8 | 152 | Spot | 413 | 3 | 189 |
| Becuna | 319 | 5 | 200 | Flasher | 249 | 6 | 265 | Narwhal | 167 | 16 | 357 | S-32 | 137 | 8 | 120 | Springer | 414 | 3 | 86 |
| Bergall | 320 | 5 | 175 | Flier | 250 | 2 | 130 | Nautilus | 168 | 15 | 452 | S-33 | 138 | 8 | 128 | Steelhead | 280 | 7 | 308 |
| Besugo | 321 | 5 | 268 | Flounder | 251 | 6 | 278 | Paddle | 263 | 8 | 381 | S-34 | 139 | 7 | 92 | Sterlet | 392 | 5 | 237 |
| Billfish | 286 | 8 | 285 | Flyingfish | 229 | 12 | 555 | Pampanito | 383 | 6 | 240 | S-35 | 140 | 8 | 143 | Stickleback | 415 | 1 | 33 |
| Blackfin | 322 | 5 | 60 | Gablian | 252 | 6 | 225 | Parche | 384 | 6 | 274 | S-36 | 141 | 2 | 87 | Stingray | 186 | 16 | 470 |
| Blackfish | 221 | 12 | 432 | Gar | 206 | 15 | 347 | Pargo | 264 | 8 | 482 | S-37 | 142 | 7 | 173 | Sturgeon | 187 | 11 | 315 |
| Blenny | 324 | 4 | 495 | Gato | 212 | 13 | 552 | Perch | 176 | 2 | 349 | S-38 | 143 | 9 | 40 | Sunfish | 281 | 11 | 459 |
| Blower | 325 | 3 | 123 | Golet | 361 | 2 | 27 | Pernit | 178 | 14 | 598 | S-39 | 144 | 5 | 117 | Swordfish | 193 | 13 | 422 |
| Blueback | 326 | 3 | 267 | Grampus | 207 | 6 | 243 | Peto | 265 | 10 | 380 | S-40 | 145 | 9 | 146 | Tambor | 198 | 12 | 461 |
| Bluefish | 222 | 9 | 402 | Grayback | 208 | 10 | 477 | Pickrel | 177 | 7 | 254 | S-41 | 146 | 8 | 160 | Tang | 306 | 5 | 206 |
| Bluegill | 242 | 6 | 389 | Grayling | 209 | 8 | 143 | Picuda | 382 | 6 | 291 | S-43 | 154 | 3 | 107 | Tarpon | 175 | 12 | 393 |
| Boarfish | 327 | 4 | 154 | Greenling | 213 | 12 | 427 | Pike | 173 | 8 | 219 | S-44 | 155 | 4 | 99 | Tautog | 199 | 13 | 653 |
| Bonefish | 223 | 8 | 508 | Grenadier | 210 | 6 | 199 | Pilotfish | 386 | 6 | 203 | S-45 | 156 | 4 | 95 | Tench | 417 | 3 | 125 |
| Bonita | 165 | 7 | 43 | Grouper | 214 | 12 | 311 | Pintado | 387 | 6 | 236 | S-46 | 157 | 5 | 133 | Thornback | 418 | 1 | 76 |
| Bowfin | 287 | 9 | 524 | Growler | 215 | 11 | 404 | Pipefish | 388 | 6 | 248 | S-47 | 158 | 7 | 186 | Threadfin | 410 | 3 | 146 |
| Bream | 243 | 6 | 365 | Grunion | 216 | 1 | 30 | Piper | 409 | 3 | 111 | Sailfish | 192 | 12 | 366 | Thresher | 200 | 15 | 120 |
| Brill | 330 | 3 | 89 | Guardfish | 217 | 12 | 590 | Piranha | 389 | 5 | 227 | Salmon | 182 | 11 | 431 | Tigrona | 419 | 3 | 200 |
| Bugara | 331 | 3 | 62 | Guavina | 362 | 6 | 242 | Plaice | 390 | 6 | 354 | Sand Lance | 381 | 5 | 168 | Tilefish | 307 | 6 | 257 |
| Bullhead | 332 | 3 | 75 | Gudgeon | 211 | 12 | 566 | Plunger | 179 | 12 | 357 | Sargo | 188 | 12 | 447 | Tinosa | 283 | 11 | 521 |
| Bumper | 333 | 2 | 82 | Guitarro | 363 | 5 | 300 | Pogy | 266 | 10 | 334 | Saury | 189 | 11 | 431 | Tirante | 420 | 2 | 131 |
| Burnfish | 312 | 6 | 297 | Gunnel | 253 | 8 | 352 | Pollack | 180 | 11 | 372 | Sawfish | 276 | 10 | 364 | Toro | 422 | 2 | 51 |
| Cabezon | 334 | 1 | 36 | Gumard | 254 | 9 | 489 | Pomfret | 391 | 6 | 359 | Scabbardfish | 397 | 5 | 223 | Torsk | 423 | 2 | 70 |
| Cabrilla | 288 | 8 | 368 | Hackleback | 295 | 2 | 95 | Pompano | 181 | 7 | 182 | Scamp | 277 | 8 | 229 | Trepang | 412 | 5 | 326 |
| Cachalot | 170 | 3 | 52 | Haddo | 255 | 10 | 384 | Pompon | 267 | 9 | 227 | Scorpion | 278 | 4 | 102 | Trigger | 237 | 12 | 381 |
| Calman | 323 | 4 | 117 | Haddock | 231 | 13 | 334 | Porpoise | 172 | 6 | 213 | Sculpin | 191 | 9 | 285 | Triton | 201 | 6 | 205 |
| Capelin | 289 | 1 | 64 | Hake | 256 | 9 | 320 | Puffer | 268 | 9 | 483 | Sea Cat | 399 | 4 | 155 | Trout | 202 | 11 | 289 |
| Captaine | 336 | 1 | 61 | Hallbut | 232 | 10 | 357 | Queenfish | 393 | 5 | 248 | Sea Devil | 400 | 4 | 228 | Trutta | 421 | 2 | 154 |
| Carbonero | 337 | 2 | 50 | Hammerhead | 364 | 7 | 283 | Quilback | 424 | 1 | 63 | Sea Dog | 401 | 4 | 199 | Tullibee | 284 | 4 | 125 |
| Carp | 338 | 1 | 56 | Harder | 257 | 6 | 325 | Rasher | 269 | 8 | 543 | Sea Fox | 402 | 4 | 148 | Tuna | 203 | 13 | 497 |
| Catfish | 339 | 1 | 38 | Hardhead | 365 | 6 | 314 | Raton | 270 | 8 | 317 | Sea Owl | 405 | 3 | 184 | Tunny | 282 | 9 | 472 |
| Cavalla | 244 | 6 | 323 | Hawkbill | 366 | 5 | 250 | Ray | 271 | 8 | 399 | Sea Poacher | 406 | 4 | 193 | Wahoo | 238 | 7 | 165 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Sea Robin | 407 | 3 | 177 | Whale | 239 | 8 | 427 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Sea Wolf | 197 | 15 | 590 | | | | |