

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

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



CHANGE SERVICE REQUESTED



The Silent Sentinel

July 2010



Our Creed

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



Commander, Submarine Squadron Eleven
Requests the pleasure of your company at the
Change of Command Ceremony at which
Captain Brett J. Genoble, United States Navy
Will be relieved by

Captain Richard A. Correll, United States Navy
On Saturday, the twenty-fourth of July
At ten o'clock

Onboard USS ALBUQUERQUE (SSN 706)
At Naval Base Point Loma, North Pier
San Diego, California

R.S.V.P.

White

Informal

katina.pactol-baez@navy.mil

8725-8725-8725 Reception to follow

Military Guests: Summer

Civilian Guests: Civilian



Captain Genoble's
next assignment will be
Executive Assistant
to the

Chief of Naval Personnel
2 Navy Annex
Washington DC 20370-0000

U.S. Submarine Veterans San Diego Base

Base Commander

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

Membership -- Change of Address

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

Treasurer

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

Senior Vice Commander

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

Newsletter Editor

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

Assistant Editor / Photographer

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

Junior Vice Commander

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

Base Storekeeper

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

Chief of the Boat

Fred Fomby
858-735-0026

Secretary

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

Chaplain

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

Assistant Chaplain

Chris Strows
cstrows@gmail.com
619-708-2675

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*

July Meeting

Our monthly meetings are held on the second Tuesday of the month at VFW Post 3787, 4370 Twain Ave., San Diego. Our next meeting will be on 13 July, 2010. 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

No new names reported--and you already know the others. If you know of shipmates who are ill, contact the Base Chaplain (see page 2).

Submarine Losses in June

Submitted by C J Glassford



Submarine losses in June are listed in the minutes of the June meeting



2010 Parade Schedule

July 4th, 2010 - Julian Independence Day Parade - Time TBD (either 11:00am or Noon)

November 11th, 2010 - San Diego Veterans Day Parade - Time TBD (probably 11:00am)

Commander's Corner June 2010

Hello there all, and sorry I missed the last meeting. I was enjoying some wet weather in CT with work. I was working on one of the possible boats that will be heading north for the next Ice Camp I will be working at. Sorry, I can't name the 2 boats yet until it gets closer to the camp. Sorry about both guess speakers not being able to make the meeting. When duty calls... well you know how that going. Matter of fact, when I flew out to CT, the CSS-11 Commodore was on the same plane heading to visit the USS HELENA in Portsmouth NH. He has invited us to his Change of Command on the 24th of July at 1000 onboard the USS ALBUQUERQUE. Please RSVP @ 619-553-8725 (CSS-11 PAO).

I would like to Welcome all the New Members in the last few months. If I didn't say hello to you at the meetings, Sorry and HELLO!!! We have a summer full of events starting with the Julian 4th of July parade (which will have past before you get the newsletter), the Joint Annual SUBVETs picnic with the members of the San Diego Base, Scamp Base, Trieste Base and the San Diego Chapter of WWII SUBVETs. Everyone has a Great time and lots of Food, Drinks, & Fun!!!! There will be games, music, and door prizes!!! Starts at 0900, until 1600 (4pm) or when everyone leaves. Last thing in the near future is our Sunday Breakfast on 29 Aug from 0800 to noon. Hope to see you then.

One more thing I almost forgot about is this years National Convention in Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky, if you're planning on going get your reservations in for the convention and the hotel. It just around the corner.

To all my shipmates out there, have a Great and Safe Summer!!!

Sincerely,

Your Base Commander, Bob Bissonnette

Minutes of 9 March 31, 2010

Bill Earl opened the meeting @ 1900.

Bill Earl read our CREED.

David Ball lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

CJ Glassford lead us in prayer.

A bell was tolled for the following boats lost in the month of June:

O-9 (SS-70)	20 JUN 1941	33 MEN LOST
S-27 (SS-132)	19 JUN 1942	NO HANDS LOST
R-12 (SS-89)	12 JUN 1943	42 MEN LOST 3 SURVIVED
USS HERRING	1 JUN 1944	84 MEN LOST

USS GOLET (SS-361)	14 JUN 1944	82 MEN LOST
USS BONEFISH (SS-223)	6 JUN 1945	85 MEN LOST
USS SARGO (SSN-583)	14 JUN 1960	1 MAN LOST

A moment of silence was observed.

All E-Board member were present with the exception of the secretary.

The Jr. Vive Commander introduced past officers, new members and guests.

37 members were present.

The base treasurer gave his report.

Committee chairmen gave their reports: Chaplain's Binnacle List, Parade, Membership, Scholarship, Storekeeper and Breakfast.

Parades:

4th of July Parade in Julian

Veterans Day Parade 11/11/10

Held 50/50 drawing and raffle

Bill Earl adjourned the meeting @2015

SAILING LIST

DATE: 9 JUN 2010

NAME	NAME	NAME
<u>CHARLIE MARIN</u>	<u>Ed Welch</u>	<u>GLENN GERBRAUD</u>
<u>BILL EARL</u>	<u>Phill Richeson</u>	<u>BOB COATES (DOC)</u>
<u>FRED FOMBY</u>	<u>David Kauppinen</u>	<u>FRANK MCCOY</u>
<u>DAVID BALL</u>	<u>ED FARLEY</u>	<u>ROW GORENCE</u>
<u>WARRY OIKER (THRESHER BASE)</u>	<u>DENNIS MORTENSEN</u>	
<u>CJ GLASSFORD</u>	<u>Robert G Wielage</u>	<u>LIN SCHIMA</u>
<u>TOM POJEN</u>	<u>CHUCK GEORGE</u>	<u>ROY BANNACH</u>
<u>ION WARNER</u>	<u>JACK FERGUSON</u>	<u>Robert Chapman</u>
<u>ART DAVIS</u>	<u>JOE ACAY</u>	<u>Chuck Babcock</u>
<u>BOB FARRELL</u>	<u>CHARLIE TATE</u>	
<u>JIM BILKA</u>	<u>Michael Human</u>	
<u>PAUL HERRICK</u>	<u>DENNIS M. CRIGHT</u>	
<u>David Welch</u>	<u>JACK KANE</u>	
<u>Aaron Welch</u>	<u>JOSEPH DUBOIS</u>	

VOTE!

Before the last National election, I warned the San Diego Base that, although we are the second-largest base in the country, the Groton Base had over 2200 members— compared to our 341 [current numbers]— so we needed a good turn-out if we were to have anything to say about our own organization. Nothing's changed.

Last time, just under 30% of us cast a vote— apparently typical for a Base—but with members in almost every state, and many of our members calling another Base their Primary, it's a little more complicated than saying that 30% is too low. But, just as it will be in our upcoming State and Federal elections this November and next, the more voters, the closer an outcome approaches a more-nearly perfect answer. Our vote matters!

The By-Law changes seem to me to be mostly housekeeping, with exception of a proposal that the National Convention be held every other year vs. annually (opposed by the Board).

There is a ubiquitous email out there (I've received it twice) disparaging two candidates for National Commander, while favoring the third. I know the writer's negative comments are asinine because I happen to know these two men. I honestly believe that the candidates are all good and dedicated men, however the writer has confirmed (not changed) my conviction to vote for who I know — rather than for what he *thinks* he knows.

Be safe,
RonG

IN CONGRESS, JULY 4, 1776

The unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America

When in the Course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, — That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be

changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security. — Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their Public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected, whereby the Legislative Powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavoured to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary Powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil Power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefit of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offences:

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighbouring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation, and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & Perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavoured to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them

of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these united Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States, that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. — And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

— John Hancock

New Hampshire:

Josiah Bartlett, William Whipple, Matthew Thornton

Massachusetts:

John Hancock, Samuel Adams, John Adams, Robert Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry

Rhode Island:

Stephen Hopkins, William Ellery

Connecticut:

Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, William Williams, Oliver Wolcott

New York:

William Floyd, Philip Livingston, Francis Lewis, Lewis Morris

New Jersey:

Richard Stockton, John Witherspoon, Francis Hopkinson, John Hart, Abraham Clark

Pennsylvania:

Robert Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, John Morton, George Clymer, James Smith, George Taylor, James Wilson, George Ross

Delaware:

Caesar Rodney, George Read, Thomas McKean

Maryland:

Samuel Chase, William Paca, Thomas Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton

Virginia:

George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Harrison, Thomas Nelson, Jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton

North Carolina:

William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn

South Carolina:

Edward Rutledge, Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., Arthur Middleton

Georgia:

Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, George Walton

NATO Sends In Stealth Sub to Combat African Pirates*By Joseph Schuman, AOL News, 28 June 2010*

Escalating the international fight against pirates in one of the world's busiest shipping lanes, NATO is sending a Dutch submarine to the east coast of Africa to help monitor communications between pirate vessels and the warlords who control them onshore.

The alliance said today that one of four Walrus-class submarines in the Royal Netherlands Navy will start patrolling waters from the Gulf of Aden to the Indian Ocean starting in September and continuing through November. Walrus-class submarines are among the most modern non-nuclear subs deployed by the NATO-member navies and have stealth technology that makes them difficult to detect even by other submarines.

Deployment of the submarine comes shortly after NATO extended through the end of 2012 its Operation Ocean Shield, one of several international anti-piracy efforts in the region. And it comes as pirates continue to attack from their bases in the lawless coastal regions of Somalia.

Early this morning, pirates operating off the northern Somali coast attacked a Singapore ship and took hostage the 19 Chinese crew members on board, according to the European Union anti-piracy group operating in the region.

The German warship Schleswig-Holstein, part of the EU NAVFOR task force, immediately sent a helicopter to the area when it was alerted to the hijacking and reported seeing pirates on board the MV Golden Blessing.

The tanker, on its way from Saudi Arabia to India, was carrying more than 14,000 tons of glycoethelen, a chemical used in antifreeze. But pirates most often hold the ships and crew for ransom rather than steal the cargo.

EU NAVFOR said the ship was believed to be heading toward the Somali coast.

NATO said the Dutch submarine would target pirates responsible for hijacking commercial ships for ransoms worth millions of dollars.

S. Korea, U.S. To Decide On Naval Exercises In Step With U.N. Action On N. Korea*Yonhap News, 28 June 2010*

SEOUL — South Korea and the United States are expected to fix dates for their joint naval exercises after assessing progress in Seoul's diplomatic efforts to rebuke North Korea at the U.N. Security Council, an official here said Monday.

The two countries agreed last month to hold the drills after a multinational team of investigators blamed North Korea for torpedoing a South Korean warship, the Cheonan, in the Yellow Sea on March 26. The attack left 46 sailors dead.

Seoul has referred the incident to the Security Council, urging its members to punish North Korea.

"The dates for the joint exercises are expected to be fixed after watching progress in discussions of the Cheonan incident at the U.N. Security Council," the official at the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) said on the condition of anonymity.

The large-scale, anti-submarine drills were initially set for early this month, but were postponed to give the U.S. more time for preparations. It was rescheduled for this week, but was again delayed.

Officials here have said the U.S. plans to send the 97,000-ton USS George Washington, an Aegis-equipped destroyer and a nuclear submarine for the exercises. A 4,500-ton destroyer, a submarine and F-15K fighter jets are to participate from the Seoul side.

Last week, China's foreign ministry spokesman Qin Gang said Beijing was "very concerned" about the planned drills.

A neighbor and a strong ally to North Korea, China has yet to hold Pyongyang responsible for the ship sinking and opposes stringent punishment.

Navy Seeks Next Generation Of Acoustic Torpedo Decoys For Ships

Design due in one year

By Cid Standifer, Inside the Navy, 28 June 2010

The Navy is searching for companies to build prototypes for an improved system that protects ships from missiles by interfering with their acoustic homing and wake detection systems.

A notice on Federal Business Opportunities describes the AN/SLQ-25D system as a "digitally controlled, modular design, electro-acoustic soft-kill countermeasure decoy system." The device would be an acoustic projector towed underwater by a ship and emit an acoustic signal to prevent homing.

AN/SLQ-25D will be the next generation of AN/SLQ-25A, a decoy that uses an acoustic signal to draw torpedoes away from the ship that tows it.

Naval Sea Systems Command is searching for companies that can produce two new acoustic/non-acoustic torpedo countermeasures prototypes that use an open-architecture approach and include inverted passive optical network telemetry and anti-tamper security measures.

According to the sources-sought notice, the two systems should be able to operate independently or simultaneously. They also have to be capable of communicating with the existing Torpedo Warning System. AN/SLQ-25D will have a graphic interface on-board the ship and will be remotely controlled from the shipboard fire control network interface through a touch display.

The new system is also required to come with a "level wind" system that will control how much fiberoptic cable the ship lets out to tow the Towed Acoustic Countermeasure portion of the system, which emits the decoy noise, behind the ship.

"The detailed critical design for the AN/SLQ-25D will be delivered to the government within 12 months," the notice states. "The initial AN/SLQ-25D system will be delivered to the government within 24 months."

New Musical Composition Commemorates USS Tang (SS 306) Last Battle during WWII*Reported by Jack R. Nicholas, Jr., CAPT USNR (Ret)*

On April 9, 2010, at a premier concert by the multiple-award winning Parry Hall, Maryland, Middle School "8" Panther Band, a new musical composition entitled "Escape from the Deep" was presented in public for the first time. Guest conductor for the event was Brian Balmages,

composer of the music and resident of nearby Baltimore. Mr. Balmages has a world-wide reputation for producing works for band, orchestra and brass. He has many other musical achievements to his credit.

The composition was inspired by the book authored by Alex Kershaw entitled *Escape from the Deep*, (published April 28th 2008 by Da Capo Press) which tells the true story of loss of USS Tang (SS306) in the Formosa Strait in October 1944. Mr. Balmages was impressed by the entire story of Tang's war record, its loss due to unusual circumstances and the events that occurred during and after its sinking. He felt he could depict the events of Tang's final battle in music, which in the opinion of this reporter, he did with consummate skill.

Earlier brief descriptions of the final battle and its aftermath are included in books by Theodore Roscoe (*United States Submarine Operations in World War II*) and E.B. Potter (*Sea Power; a Naval History*) both published by The Naval Institute of Annapolis, Maryland. A summary of facts and some quotations follow from these references.

Tang's captain was Commander Richard H. O'Kane, who had already led the ship to a distinguished record during four previous war patrols. Before this last battle during Tang's 5th and last war patrol the sub had attacked and sank 5 cargo ships and damaged 4 others. The sub had expended 13 of its original load of 24 torpedoes at that point. In its final engagement Tang attacked a Japanese convoy (the second convoy in twenty-four hours) consisting of escort destroyers, tankers with aircraft on their decks and troop transports with planes and other supplies on deck. The troops and war materials were en route to reinforce Japanese defenders under heavy pressure from U.S. Army, Navy and Marine forces on and around the island of Leyte in the Philippines.

At night on the surface at full speed, drawing a hail of tracer bullets and exploding shells, Tang's attack began. In the first salvo Tang fired six torpedoes, two each at a tanker and two transports. All struck their targets. In the ensuing chaos Tang became "boxed in" by burning ships and attacking escorts, crews of which could now see the sub intermittently in the glare of fires. Tang maneuvered for [torpedo] shots at other targets. Roscoe writes, "O'Kane fired three fast shots to clear the way. The first struck the [nearest] tanker, which promptly spewed a geyser of flame. The second struck [a] troop transport and stopped her dead in the water. The third struck [a] destroyer and stopped this foe with a thunderclap that shook Tang from stem to stern."

Roscoe describes in his book that O'Kane then maneuvered Tang to a safer position while the crew loaded the sub's last two torpedoes. Darting through an opening between escorts, Tang fired the remaining MK 18 (electric) torpedoes at one of the transports previously hit but not yet sunk. The first ran hot, straight and normal, hitting the target. The second, shortly after launch, began "porpoising" in and out of the surface of the water. Each surfacing could be seen by personnel on the bridge and it became clear that the torpedo was turning back towards the sub in a circular run. In spite of attempts by Tang to maneuver out of harm's way, the torpedo struck in the after torpedo room with a huge explosion, about 20 seconds after launch.

Nine (9) submariners on the bridge were blown into the water. An officer who escaped through the conning tower hatch to the bridge joined them after the ship began to flounder. Tang sank in 180 feet of water, at first with only its stern on the bottom and the rest of the sub at a steep angle so that the bow was much shallower before settling to the bottom. Sailors in the stern made their way forward, sealing aft compartment hatches to stem the in-rush of seawater. In the midst of continued depth charge attacks, thirteen men, forced by choking smoke from battery fires, were able to use the escape hatch forward and individual surfacing devices called Monson Lungs to exit the sub. These were the only successful escapes from any of the 52 U.S. subs lost in battle during WWII. Eight of the 13 escapees reached the surface alive. Only nine of those on or reaching the surface survived until the next morning. Then they were picked up by Japanese vessels to begin new chapters of horror. The nine endured savage beatings with clubs and kicking by "burned and mutilated" Japanese survivors of the sub's attacks, before being transferred to a succession of prisoner-of-war camps.

Although its fighting days were cut short, Tang's war record during World War II was truly impressive. According to statistics in Roscoe's book, Tang sank the second largest number of ships (24 – only USS *Tautog*, with 26, sank more) and the fourth largest amount of tonnage sunk of all U.S. subs. Tang also rescued the second highest number of American airmen (22) of all subs in the entire war. Sister sub *Tigrone* rescued 31.

Commander O'Kane was awarded the Medal of Honor after the war for his service and the sub was awarded two Presidential Unit Citations, a record achieved by only three Navy warships (two of them submarines) in WWII.

Mr. Balmages was commissioned by Perry Middle School to compose the music, which he entitled "Escape from the Deep." The commission was funded by a donation from a foundation created by the family of Bryan Thomas Palmer, a student at the school when he died in his sleep in 2004 of unknown cause at the age of 12-1/2. In the concert program the Palmer family stated that the piece "was composed as a remembrance that there is still hope in the midst of tragedy. Bryan's love for music and his passion for life are demonstrated in this work which is infused with energy and excitement, yet tempered with moments of silence and solitude." The foundation, described in more detail at its website www.bryanpalmerfund.org, is dedicated to raising funds for scholarships and making donations to local music and sports programs in the Baltimore area.

This is the second musical piece commissioned in this way by The Perry Hall Middle School "8" Panther Band, which is under the direction of teachers Kelly Clavell and Neil Fishler. In 2007, Mr. Balmages created the piece entitled "Moscow, 1941." According to the composer, that piece has since been played by thousands of bands worldwide. "Escape from the Deep" will be published during the summer of 2010 by FJH Music Company Inc., of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, which Mr. Balmages serves as Director of Instrumental Publications.

Sources used for this article included *United States Submarine Operations in World War II*, by Theodore Roscoe, published by the U.S. Naval Institute in 1949; *Sea Power, a Naval History*, 2nd Edition, edited by E.B. Potter, published by Naval Institute Press 1981; the Perry Hall Middle School Premier Concert Program and a brief discussion with the composer after the concert. There are also many sources in the Internet regarding the USS Tang and its war record.

U.S. Ships And Israeli Nuclear Submarines In The Persian Gulf

By Manlio Dinucci, Voltaire Net, 24 June 2010*

The crossing of a U.S.-Israeli fleet through the Suez Canal should be interpreted less as a signal against Iran than a direct threat against Pakistan. True, it took place just after the Security Council vote on the Iranian sanctions, but it responds first and foremost to the gas agreement concluded between Tehran and Islamabad.

"Israel To Deploy Nuclear Submarines Off Iran Coast", headlined Israeli newspaper Haaretz on 22 June, reporting on an investigation by the British Sunday Times. According to a statement by an Israeli officer, one of the four Dolphin submarines provided by Germany is already positioned in the Gulf. With its cruise missiles equipped with nuclear warheads (1,500 Km range), Israel can reach any target in Iran. At the close of last week, an impressive naval squadron - consisting of more than a dozen U.S. warships and at least one Israeli missile launcher - crossed the Suez Canal on its way to the Persian Gulf: with a view to escalating military pressure on Iran. The reason is not only, as was reported, to prevent Tehran from acquiring nuclear weapons in future.

There is a more compelling factor: at the beginning of last week, Tehran signed a \$7 billion agreement with Pakistan, inaugurating the construction of a gas pipeline from Iran to Pakistan. The project goes back 17 years and had, until now, been obstructed by the United States. Notwithstanding, Iran has already completed 900 Km of the 1500 Km-long gas pipeline, extending from the South Pars field to the border with Pakistan, which will build 700 Km more. As from 2014, 22 million cubic meters of Iranian gas will be delivered to Pakistan through this energy corridor on a daily basis. According to the original project, a branch of the pipeline was to arrive in India, but New Delhi withdrew for fear that Pakistan might interfere with the supply.

China, on the contrary, is ready to import gas from Iran: the China Petroleum Corporation signed a \$5 billion agreement with Iran for the development of the South Pars field, replacing French company Total, whose contract was not renewed by Tehran (whereas the Italian ENI - Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi, Ndt - continues to operate in the South Pars and Darquain oil fields). For Iran, therefore, the project is of strategic importance: the country has the largest gas reserves after Russia and they are to a large extent still unexploited; through the energy corridor towards

the East, Iran can thus elude the sanctions wanted by Washington. However, there is a weakness: South Pars, its biggest oil deposit, is located offshore in the Persian Gulf. It is therefore vulnerable to a naval blockade like the one the United States could impose by virtue of the sanctions adopted by the UN Security Council.

Washington is up in arms since Pakistan, its ally, signed the agreement with Iran just a few days after the sanctions were decided by the Security Council. Hence the military manoeuvres, in line with Washington's allies, particularly France. The aircraft carrier Truman, heading the naval squadron which is sailing towards the Persian Gulf, first made a stopover in Marseille, effecting an interoperability maneuver in the Mediterranean between 4 and 7 July which involved its 80 attack aircraft and the aircraft aboard the French carrier Charles de Gaulle. And, on 14 July, while en route to the Suez Canal, Truman received the visit of the German Defence Minister and Navy Chief of Staff.

The most exciting moment occurred on 13 June when in the chapel of the Truman, a French Catholic priest and a rabbi officiated a religious ceremony allowing "the two allied countries to unite on the spiritual level".

Shipyards Speed Up Submarine Production Amid Concerns About Navy's Future Budgets

By Grace V. Jean, National Defense Magazine, July 2010

GROTON, Conn. — Building 260 is better known as the lime-green hangar-like structure visible to drivers on Interstate 95 heading eastbound across the Thames River. Inside the 140-foot tall facility at General Dynamics Electric Boat, workers assemble the Navy's newest attack submarines, the Virginia class.

Beginning next year, the Navy plans to double the production rate to two submarines per year for \$2.5 billion apiece. The work is split between Electric Boat and Northrop Grumman Shipbuilding-Newport News in Virginia.

The Navy intends to build a class of 30 ships to replace the aging Los Angeles-class attack submarines. In the next 30 years, the plan is to buy 25 at a cost of \$63 billion.

The production ramp-up of the Virginia class is being closely watched as it is happening amid growing concerns about the Navy's ability to finance big-ticket programs over the long term.

The Virginia class, as well as most ship programs, will be competing for funds within what is expected to be a flat budget. Adding to the fiscal challenges are plans to begin building yet another new submarine to replace the Ohio-class ballistic missile boomers. This ship potentially could wreck the Navy's budget, analysts predict. The Congressional Budget Office estimates the lead ship of the Ohio replacement class in 2019 will cost \$13 billion, with the total cost for the 12-ship class reaching \$99 billion. That may leave scant room in the Navy's already-stretched shipbuilding budgets to afford other vessels in the Navy's wish list.

Mindful of the political and fiscal pressures that surround the program, Virginia-class managers and shipbuilders are pushing ahead to keep the project on track.

The 377-foot Virginia is being constructed in four 2,000-ton modules — fully outfitted sections of the ship that are connected and welded together in final assembly. At any given time, General Dynamics and Northrop Grumman have about six submarines between them in various stages of construction.

Final assembly of Electric Boat-led submarines takes place in Building 260, where two of the bays have been rebuilt to accommodate the faster construction cycle of the Virginia class. The facility recently received a \$19.2 million upgrade.

New multi-story fixed platforms stretch alongside the submarine to give workers and utilities easier access to the ship. Before, builders had to erect scaffolding and temporary work platforms to climb into the ship and bring in cables supplying power, cooling and other services to the modules. The new structure eliminates having to dismantle the staging several times during assembly as the modules were moved around. It also consolidates the location of tool cribs so that workers can grab what they need on their way up to the ship.

On a tour of the facility, Harold Haugette, manager of ship construction for Mississippi (SSN-782), points out that freight and personnel elevators take only seconds to lift 8,000 pounds of material 40 feet up to the platform. The top floor has 6,000 square feet of open space where workers can stage equipment. An air-conditioned, soundproof room with a capacity for 200 people houses computers and printers for blueprints.

In Newport News, Va., Northrop Grumman is building a new modular outfitting facility, said Becky Stewart, vice president for submarines. The building will be open in 2012 and ready to construct the bow and stern of the Virginia class. The company also is installing new computer-mechanized equipment in the machine shops.

Initial work on SSN-786, the first hull of the two-per-year boats, has already begun. The Navy expects the yards to begin delivering two ships a year beginning in 2017. Under the higher production rate, new ships will commence construction every six months. To keep up the pace, the early-stage manufacturing workers, including welders and pipefitters, must be brought on board sooner.

The challenge for both Northrop Grumman and Electric Boat is ramping up their work forces. Yard officials said a generation of shipbuilders was lost during the 1990s when the Navy drastically cut back on submarine production.

Electric Boat employed 20,000 workers in the 1980s, when it was building three submarines a year, including the SSN-688 Los Angeles class and the SSBN-726 Ohio class. Technical knowledge was being transferred from generation to generation of workers.

On the Virginia-class program, there are veteran submarine builders, but to sustain the production rate of two per year, both companies will have to hire more people, many of whom will have little shipbuilding experience. The yards will rely on veteran workers to train the newcomers.

After rounds of layoffs in the '90s, Northrop Grumman's production force was working primarily during daylight hours. Last year, the company started moving back to a 24-hour operation.

Similar efforts are under way at Electric Boat, primarily at its Quonset Point Facility in North Kingstown, R.I., where construction of the Virginia class begins. The nine manufacturing facilities sit on 125 acres where a naval air station was located until 1973. Ship components take shape in small shops and in noisy buildings as large as six football fields.

To meet the additional workload under the new production rate for Virginia, Quonset Point's work force of 2,000 will grow by 25 percent, said John Holmander, vice president and Virginia-class submarine program manager at Electric Boat.

The companies also are adjusting their supply chains.

"We spent a lot of time visiting vendors to make sure they had the capability to ramp up to support two-per-year production," said Northrop Grumman's Stewart during an interview in Newport News, Va.

Congress approved multi-year procurement funds for blocks two and three ships, which allowed the shipyards to seek suppliers and acquire materials in bulk orders for discounted prices.

To lower the risk of vendors not being able to keep up with the demands of a doubled production rate, program officials are examining second source options, said Capt. Michael Jabaley, program manager of the Virginia-class submarine at Naval Sea Systems Command.

In some cases, suppliers are only one or two companies deep. A two-person firm in Virginia that made a specialty valve years ago was bought by a company that left the shipbuilding business. Electric Boat had to find another vendor to build that valve.

The Navy is buying the block three Virginia boats at a fixed price of \$2 billion each, in 2005 dollars.

The ship's bow redesign helps to reduce the cost of each ship by \$800 million, said shipyard officials. Instead of a sonar sphere, there will be a large aperture bow array; instead of the 12 vertical launch system tubes, there are two large-diameter payload tubes.

Engineers replaced the \$1,000 transducers that had to be changed twice during the life of a ship in its dry dock availabilities with \$800 hydrophones that will work for life and can be changed at sea, said Holmander. The equipment for that sonar costs \$2 million less than the spherical arrays, he said.

Workers built the large aperture bow array prototype in 20 months, compared to the 34 months to build the sonar sphere. "When you look at 14 months of time savings, that's a huge amount of man hours," said Stewart. All told, that change yielded a \$10 million per ship savings.

Congress allocated \$595 million to accelerate Virginia-class production. The new plan puts the ship to a 60-month schedule. It was originally on an 84-month production cycle.

USS New Mexico, which was commissioned in March, was delivered in 70 months, four months earlier than the contract deadline. It took one million fewer man-hours to build than the previous ship, the USS North Carolina, that Northrop Grumman delivered, said Stewart. The next ship of the class, USS Missouri, which Electric Boat will deliver, could be completed in even less time, she said.

Despite the accelerated production cycles, the Navy will see the attack submarine fleet size decline in the 2020s.

Officials are battling around ideas for new capabilities in the block four and block five buys of the Virginia class to help mitigate that shortfall, said Rear Adm. Richard Breckenridge, deputy director of the submarine warfare division. Under consideration are “more features, more capacity, more payload volume,” he said.

Enhanced capabilities in the Virginia class could also help solve another dilemma for the Navy: What to do when the SSGN guided-missile submarines are decommissioned. Chances are the service will not be able to afford to buy new SSGNs on top of the Virginias and the Ohio-class replacement submarines.

Navy Recruits UTSA For Engineering Education Program

San Antonio Business Journal, 23 June 2010

The University of Texas at San Antonio has joined a new Naval Engineering Education Consortium that will help prepare more engineering students for careers in the U.S. Navy.

The Naval Engineering Education Consortium consists of 15 of the country’s top engineering schools. Schools in the consortium expect to share \$50 million.

Over the next six years, UTSA will receive \$1.6 million from the consortium. The consortium will be led by faculty at the University of Michigan and will include UTSA, Virginia Tech, MIT, Penn State, Georgia Tech, Florida State University and others.

The consortium will work with the Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) and the U.S. Navy’s Center for Innovation in Ship Design. NAVSEA is responsible for designing and building the Navy’s fleet of ships.

Engineering students who participate in the consortium will receive scholarships and stipends to pay off their tuition in exchange for service in the Navy. Faculty from these universities will help establish engineering curricula tailored to the Navy’s training needs. In addition, students and faculty will work with NAVSEA engineers to tackle some of the Navy’s toughest engineering challenges.

These projects will focus on the use of alternative energy sources, energy conservation, reduction in total ownership costs, the use of unmanned vehicles, advanced ship design methods and reduction in vessel maintenance.

“We are very pleased to join the naval engineering community in this effort,” says Brent Nowak, associate professor of mechanical engineering and the principal investigator for UTSA’s initiative. “UTSA has a strong tradition in education and research, and we are proud to have this opportunity to support the Navy. We are eager to begin working with our partners to develop the next generation of naval engineers.”

In addition to partnering with NAVSEA, the consortium will partner with the Department of Defense’s highly competitive Science, Mathematics and Research for Transformation (SMART) program, which supports students pursuing degrees in science, technology, engineering and mathematics and will include an outreach component for K-12 schools.

UTSA is working to become a national research university.

The Iowa Class Submarines

By Mike Burlison, New Wars, 22 June 2010

Lance Bacon at Military Time’s Scoop Deck blog writes:

“For the first time ever, all four guided missile subs are deployed to an AOR. We’re not talking about being underway at the same time, and sea trials don’t count. We’re talking about being on the tip of the spear. For you strategists out there, that equals a combined 616 Tomahawk cruise missiles on station, and the ability to deploy up to 264 special ops forces.

The historic mark was hit June 10, according to this Navy release. In the article, Rear Adm. Frank Caldwell, commander of Submarine Group 9 said “... back in the mid 90’s this was just a power point presentation.”

Having the firepower of a battleship, the reach of an aircraft carrier, plus the unmatched stealth expected of submarines, the Ohio SSGNs are a significant, perhaps even a game changing addition to the fleet. It could be they are the answer to the Navy’s fears over Chinese anti-access weapons which currently threatens the US surface warships unless some technological breakthrough saves them from destruction. Here in a ready-made, already deployed package is the revolution without many billions of dollars spent on laser destroyers armed with sci fi weapons. The revolution is already here.

On several occasions New Wars has made compared the SSGNs to the Iowa battleship conversions of the 1980s, including this story titled “The Fleet’s New Capital Ship”:

“Much like the Iowa battleships of the Reagan Era, these Navy missile subs conversions are a bargain with a bang... Unlike the entire surface fleet, these premier underwater battleships are impervious to the primary threat in modern sea conflict: the cruise missile.

The Iowa’s were supreme symbols of both the old Navy and the new. With its big guns, the class of 4×45,000 ton capital ships were the apogee of the line of battle tactics that dominated warfare for centuries. With long-range cruise missiles bolted on their deck in their Space Age makeover, and even unmanned aerial vehicles, the old dreadnoughts became the arbiters of a new Navy in which precision trumped firepower and armor.

Unlike our fleet of very large and expensive aircraft carriers, which since World War 2 have only operated in permissive environments against benign adversaries, the SSGNs are well prepared for future conflicts with stand-off missiles and supreme stealth. For this cause it may be safe to reduce our dependence on very expensive and vulnerable naval airpower, saving only enough for the occasional land battle which carriers are specifically geared to support. The SSGNs are geared for sea control, and as such are survivable, affordable, and available.

All signs continue to point to the need for a return to conventional submarine production (SSK) in the United States, specifically to restore and maintain the number of boats in our over-worked, stretched thin fleet, also for other reasons. Within the same article above, Lance Bacon notices that the need for the deployment of all for SSGNs at the same time is not necessarily good:

“These subs, along with 16 to 18 attack subs and a few boomers, are needed every day to meet 100 percent of critical requirements. But these represent only one of four categories of combatant commander requests. In total, subs meet 50 to 60 percent of critical, high priority, priority and routine requests. Why? Subs are few and missions are many...”

If this keeps up, sub crews could expect a lot more “deployment records” in the near future. And some Virginia class crews may see deployment rotations that are more consistent with the SSGNs. Those submarines deploy for 12 to 15 months, with crews swapping every three months.”

The problem is, the money is tight though as we see the need for submarines remain. Grace V. Jean at National Defense Magazine doesn’t see things getting better, as detailed “In the Navy’s Forecast, a Shrinking Attack Submarine Fleet”:

The Navy two years ago planned to procure 54 attack submarines through 2040 in order to maintain its desired fleet size of 48 ships. In its latest 30-year shipbuilding plan, however, just 44 boats are included.

Given that the average life of an attack submarine is 30 years, cutting 10 ships equates to a 20 percent reduction in the attack submarine force, said Rear Adm. Richard Breckenridge, deputy director of the Navy’s submarine warfare division.

As a result, the Navy faces a 23-year period when the number of attack submarines in the fleet falls below the desired 48 ships.

I personally see even this number as over-optimistic, with numbers in the lower 30s, perhaps even in the 20s if costs are not reined in. All hopes rest on the very large and powerful Virginia class, but as these boats reach the \$3 billion each mark with planned updates, it is difficult imagining 2 boats a year as the budget shrinks. In contrast an SSK could be built in quantity, perhaps as low as \$300 million each, or one-tenth the price of an SSN. I would insist the Navy keep the tonnage at around 1000 tons, in order to stave off costly add-ons that adds little to the mission against mostly low tech powers, but does raise the price, enforce delays and reduce numbers. Keeping tonnage low, as we often argue with surface vessels, would enforce discipline on a tech-happy naval community, that thinks capability will duplicate availability.

What Lies Beneath the South China Sea: Sub Texts

By G. M. Greenwood, Asia Sentinel, 22 June 2010

Southeast Asia's governments, having stocked up on surface weaponry, now want undersea boats

The governments of Southeast Asia, already fertile ground for defence companies, have embarked on a round of buying submarines, the utility, safety and strategic value of which looks doubtful. In fact, they may actually increase tensions in the region as their lurking menace could swiftly turn a naval encounter from an incident into a crisis.

Singapore started it in 1995 by buying a surplus Swedish navy boat, with a further three ordered in 1997, perhaps with designs to manufacture them on license rather than for defense. The first was commissioned in mid-2000 and further orders have since been made as the original boats have been retired.

Malaysia ordered two new Scorpene-class submarines from the Franco-Spanish DCNS/ Navantia consortium in 2002, with the first just having arrived in the country this year.

In late 2009 Vietnam ordered six Kilo-class submarines from a Russian yard, with the first delivery due by 2012. The governments of Indonesia and Thailand are also both considering acquiring new submarines.

However, the growing use of unmanned underwater vehicles, in line with the better-known unmanned aerial 'drones,' is eroding the submarines' raison d'être – particularly as defense budgets are squeezed and technology offers less costly but comparable results.

The economic and technical metrics of operating manned submarines make them among the most expensive weapon in any national arsenal. There are no accurate figures tabulating the capital and recurring costs of submarine programs in Singapore, Malaysia and now Vietnam, including bases and crew training. But in order to keep one submarine operational a minimum of two boats, but preferably three, are needed. Each boat requires two full crews – plus support personnel and facilities.

Rough figures for the three navies make acquisition costs alone well in excess of US\$3 billion, with combined annual running costs unlikely to fall much below US\$1 billion by 2015, to marginally enhance deterrence of an enemy that is unlikely to materialize.

The cost-benefit value of conventional submarines – against the perceived value of boats that carry the nuclear deterrence of major powers - is also questionable. Since the end of World War II, Russia, France, the US, Britain, China and Israel together have lost at least 17 submarines in peacetime accidents. Only two have been recorded as being lost in conflicts. Over the same period just three vessels are acknowledged to have been sunk by submarines – the Indian frigate Khukri during the 1971 war with Pakistan, the Argentine cruiser General Belgrano by a British boat during the 1982 Falklands conflict and the South Korean corvette Cheonan in an attack by a North Korean mini-submarine in 2010.

Even as the Southeast Asians embark on their buying spree, many countries are reducing the size of their submarine fleets - notably Germany - or have scrapped them altogether, like Denmark. Other European powers are set to cancel or delay new building programs based on economic and strategic assessments.

The attraction of submarines to defense planners lies in their stealth, flexibility and deterrence. A conventional diesel-electric submarine armed with torpedoes, mines and anti-ship missiles and equipped with modern air-independent propulsion systems is a formidable weapon that the most advanced navies have to respect.

Their principal weakness is their high acquisition and running cost, the demands placed on an often limited skill base and their vulnerability within confined or shallow waters. These factors have led most Southeast Asian navies to concentrate their resources on developing surface forces rather than invest in submarines that offered doubtful strategic or even tactical benefits.

Run silent...

All countries bordering the South China Sea are members of Asean. While many have unresolved maritime boundary or territorial issues with neighbors or Asean partners, the likelihood that any of these disputes would move beyond rhetoric and military posturing is highly improbable.

The threat from external powers seeking to exert influence in the region is a more realistic scenario, with China and the US able to readily deploy naval forces into the region. But it is inconceivable any regional state would seek to challenge either country to a naval encounter.

...but not deep

Further, while large areas of maritime Southeast Asia may offer submarines the security of depth and maneuver room, few of them are near main ports, cities or other natural targets for attack or observation. The region's key straits – Malacca, Sunda, Karimata, Lombok, Makassar, Palawan, Balabac, Mindoro, Balintang and Luzon – are either deep but narrow or broad and shallow. They are also unavoidable and therefore dangerous for submarines to transit in the event of hostilities. At least 33 Allied and Axis submarines were lost in the region's seas and straits during WWII. Of the 52 submarines lost by the US Navy during the war, 25 percent were sunk in the South China Sea and Indonesian archipelago. Most were sunk by mines rather than depth-charge attacks.

Modern anti-submarine technology and weapons have rendered shallow and confined seas exceptionally dangerous. The ability to peer into the depths is forcing submarines into ever deeper waters and reducing their effectiveness in many of their conventional roles. The absence of any clear combat role for the region's submarine forces means they risk being used on operations that can increase tensions among neighbors and notional allies.

For example, protecting sovereignty is far better served by the transparent deployment of surface vessels that can literally fly the flag and negotiate with their opposite numbers – as occurred between Malaysian and Indonesian patrol boats off Sabah in 2005 and 2009 over a contested oil block. The potential presence of submarines on either side would have further increased tensions and added to the likelihood of dangerous misunderstanding.

Intelligence-gathering and surveillance operations by submarines in shallow littoral waters are also diplomatically fraught. The stranding of a then Soviet submarine close to Sweden's Karlskrona naval base in 1981 proved embarrassing – a similar incident in Southeast Asia could create far deeper problems. Conducting such operations also requires a level of skill and experience unlikely to be mastered by local crews for years.

Special forces operations are also unlikely to offer a serious rationale within the ASEAN context. The ability to discreetly damage an opponent's capabilities – such as severing key undersea communications links (a feat achieved by British mini-submarines in July 1945 when they cut the telegraph cables between Saigon and Hong Kong with Japan in order to force Tokyo to issue orders by radio that could be intercepted and decoded) – may be useful but it is difficult to imagine a situation within the Southeast Asian context when it could be used.

Dive stations

Singapore

While Singapore's size, wealth and ethnic composition has been employed to engender a national sense of encirclement requiring modern arms to provide 'total' defence, other motives may have also driven the decision to acquire submarines, probably to build them for other people.

Singapore's security won't be enhanced markedly by the deployment of submarines – the country's large and highly competent air force can readily deal with any potential incoming threat and the navy's modern surface fleet is capable of keeping any regional opponent at bay. Instead, the acquisition of submarines may fit into the country's industrial strategy of upgrading manufacturing capabilities, particularly in the defence equipment sector.

Singapore's decision to purchase ageing surplus boats from Sweden enabled the navy and the government-controlled Singapore Technologies Engineering to undertake detailed operational and technical studies of them. The skills and knowledge acquired will have been enhanced as newer classes of submarines were ordered. Singapore's shipbuilding industries would be able to build submarines under license within the present decade if the government saw the investment as economically viable.

Malaysia

Malaysia's motive for acquiring submarines is more contentious. The operational rationale for the two Scorpene-class boats is questionable given the difficult operating conditions for submarines in the shallow waters around the Spratlys and off eastern Sabah. Apart from seeking to match Singapore's naval capabilities, the Malaysian position is that the boats will be used to protect the country's contested maritime boundaries and claims. A major naval base has been built at Sepanngar, near Kota Kinabalu in Sabah, to support them.

Another explanation is that the two submarines were acquired with public funds in order to facilitate the payment of huge bribes to a close associate of then defence minister and now Prime Minister Najib Tun Razak. (see Asia Sentinel: Malaysia's Submarine Scandal Surfaces in France, 16 April 2010).

Vietnam

Vietnam's order for six Kilo-class submarines and fighter aircraft from Russia in late 2009 has been variously interpreted as show of strength against China and a tightening of bonds with Moscow.

Another view is that the leadership in Hanoi, accused of sacrificing Vietnam's long-term economic interests by opening key sectors of the economy to Chinese commercial interests, may be seeking to defend its own position behind the mask of national security. The arms deals, which coincided with the 65th anniversary of the foundation the Vietnam's armed forces and ahead of the 11th Communist Party Congress in 2011, may serve to placate military and nationalist sentiment rather than serve as a realistic deterrent against China's 'hegemonic' ambitions in the South China Sea.

Indonesia

During President Sukarno's turbulent rule, which ended in chaos in 1965, Indonesia received more than 20 submarines from the Soviet Union, far beyond the country's ability to crew or service. Many never put sea and all were scrapped by the early 1970s. Indonesia has operated two German-built Cakra-class submarines since the early 1980s. One was refurbished in 2006, but the hulls are now nearing the end of their operational lives and they have little strategic or tactical value.

The navy has been calling for at least two new boats, but financial constraints and other naval priorities – notably patrol boats able to monitor the country's territorial waters – are likely to ensure any additional acquisitions are stalled by the government.

Thailand

Thailand acquired four submarines from Japan before the Second World War that remained in service until 1951. The navy has been seeking to revive its submarine force over the past decade, to date without success. This partly reflects the army's strong grip on the budget, and possibly the navy's failure to utilise a Spanish-built aircraft carrier commissioned in 1997 but that has since barely left port.

Thailand also faces the problem of having two coastlines separated by the Malay Peninsula. A decision would have to be taken whether sufficient boats would have to be acquired that could operate in both the Andaman Sea to the west and the Gulf of Thailand to the east, requiring duplicated support bases and associated infrastructure of both coasts. The cost would prohibitive and any military gains, particularly in the Gulf, would be minimal if not negative.

G.M. Greenwood is an Associate with Allan & Associates, a Hong Kong-based political and security risk consultancy.

Royal Navy To Allow Female Sailors On Subs (After Fears Over Affects Of Nuclear Reactors)

Daily Mail, 21 June 2010

The Royal Navy is preparing to allow women to serve on its submarine fleet for the first time, defence sources say.

The final barrier to allowing females aboard Britain's 11 nuclear submarines has been broken down after a report found that life aboard a submarine would not adversely affect pregnant women.

Previously, accepted thinking was that recycled air and living and working so close to a nuclear reactor would affect unborn babies. But this has been dispelled.

It is understood that the first female submariners will be about five officers who will join one of the Vanguard submarines carrying Trident nuclear missiles.

Female crews have served on British surface warships since 1990.

At present the Royal Navy only allows three exceptions for women being on board military submarines: female civilian technicians for a few days at most; women midshipmen on an overnight stay during summer training; and family members for one-day dependent cruises.

Most navies - including the U.S. Navy - still prohibit women from serving on submarines. The Royal Norwegian Navy became the first to allow female crew on submarines in 1985. The Royal Danish Navy followed in 1988 and Commonwealth countries Australia and Canada have female submariners.

Recruiting females into the 110-year-old Submarine service will also help overcome significant command shortages aboard subs.

There had been concerns about female crew - that the cramped quarters on board could lead to difficulties with the Royal Navy's 'no touch' policy between the sexes.

There have been a number of incidents when female Navy crew had become pregnant while serving on Royal Navy vessels, and had been immediately sent ashore.

This could be difficult on submarines, which can spend up to six months at sea.

Defence sources say that the submarine living quarters will need to be adapted before female crew came aboard, and that the first female officers would see duty in 2012.

Severodvinsk To Be The World's Most Silent Sub – NF Command

Asian Defence News, 18 June 2010

In spite of being built for 17 years, nuclear-powered submarine Severodvinsk will be armed with most advanced weapons and, perhaps, will become the world most silent sub, said Capt 1 rank Alexei Poteshkin, Northern Fleet (NF) submarine force executive officer.

"State trials of the submarine will be held this year. Hopefully, upon their results Severodvinsk will be recognized the most advanced and silent – which is the main feature of submarines – ship in the world", said A. Poteshkin at Tuesday's press conference.

He pointed out that despite 17 years have passed since the sub's keel laying, arms and equipment were installed in the very recent time. "Basically, 17 years is only the hull's age, but filling is the most up-to date", Poteshkin said.

The submarine has been considerably changed, noted the officer. "The sub will be equipped only with the newest arms and hardware", underlined Poteshkin.

Answering the question of tasks for SSGN Severodvinsk, Poteshkin said it would be escorting strategic ships and performing other functions ordinary for attack subs.

Launching ceremony of SSGN Severodvinsk was triumphantly held on Tuesday at Sevmash shipyard in the presence of Dmitry Medvedev, the President of the Russian Federation.

China Seeks To Neutralize Japan-U.S. Security Treaty

Asahi Shimbun, 21 June 2010

A rapid buildup of nuclear weapons by China and its apparent determination to restrict United States forces' access to the western Pacific is threatening to transform the balance of power in East Asia.

Tensions in the region were demonstrated at a meeting of the foreign ministers of Japan, China and South Korea in Gyeongju in South Korea on May 15.

Though the main topic of the meeting was the sinking of the South Korean corvette Cheonan, a testy exchange between the foreign ministers of Japan and China showed strategic concerns simmering below the surface.

Japanese Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada told the Chinese representative, "Among the countries that possess nuclear weapons, only China is increasing its nuclear weapons."

This angered Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi. Without turning on his microphone, he said, "There is nothing to justify being told such a thing by Japan, which is protected by the U.S. nuclear umbrella." He then started to leave his seat.

Wednesday will mark the 50th anniversary of the beginning of the revised Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, but China's increasing military assertiveness is raising questions about the continuing efficacy of Japan's defense strategy.

China is estimated to have about 400 nuclear warheads, a fraction of the more than 5,000 warheads held by the United States. China has declared that it will not use its nuclear weapons for preemptive strikes.

"We continue to maintain the minimum-level nuclear capabilities that are required for the safety of our country," said Ma Zhaoxu, director-general of the Information Department of the Chinese Foreign Ministry.

But, despite the soothing words, China is quietly transforming its long range nuclear capabilities. New missiles include the Dong Feng 31A, an intercontinental ballistic missile with a range of 14,000 kilometers.

The shorter range Dong Feng 21C missile has Japan well within its range and a new type of anti-ship ballistic missile can pursue vessels at supersonic speeds.

China is also constructing underground bases for nuclear missiles in mountainous areas in Henan and Shanxi provinces, aimed at protecting them from preemptive strikes.

The missile development is a vital part of an emerging "anti-access" theme in Chinese military strategy aimed at preventing U.S. aircraft carriers from advancing into sea areas near China in the case of a stand-off between the two countries over Taiwan.

"If we place U.S. aircraft carriers and U.S. bases in Japan within the range of our missiles, the U.S. fleets will not be able to enter the western Pacific freely. As a result, we will make the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty ineffective," said a source close to China's military.

Submarines are another important pillar of the anti-access strategy. In recent years, China has developed state-of-the-art Song-class and Kilo-class submarines with quiet propulsion technologies that make them difficult to detect.

The new technology has allowed much more aggressive deployment. The Chinese military has told U.S. military officials that two Chinese submarines are permanently stationed in waters near the United States.

In October 2006, a Chinese Song-class submarine surfaced about eight kilometers from the U.S. aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk near Okinawa Prefecture.

The U.S. ship had been unaware of the Chinese submarine's presence and was within the range of the Chinese submarine's torpedoes.

The Chinese navy flexed its muscles again in April this year, when a fleet of 10 vessels, including two Kilo-class submarines, passed between the main Okinawa island and Miyakojima island.

A Chinese helicopter came within about 90 meters of a Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force's escort warship during the incident.

The Chinese Defense Minister Liang Guanglie told a delegation of Japanese Self-Defense Forces' officers in Beijing on June 11 that the passage was part of a training exercise and was not a violation of international law.

"Though the Self-Defense Forces' reconnaissance planes frequently come to (air space over) the Yellow Sea (between China and the Korean Peninsula), the Chinese military forces are not obstructing them. We hope that the Japanese side do not watch us too closely either," Liang said.

However, a military source in Beijing said the maneuver had a more profound motivation: "The passage was made to demonstrate to Japan and the United States the improvement in China's anti-access capabilities in the East China Sea."

According to the Japanese Defense Ministry, Chinese destroyers have been detected near Miyakojima island and Okinotorishima island five times since 2008.

One of the Japanese officers present at the meeting with Liang said, "We felt that China has established superiority and that Chinese naval power is already greater than Japan's."

Chinese military officers say that China's military buildup is focused on Taiwan.

The primary target of its increasing strategic assertiveness is not Japan but the United States, which has been selling weapons to Taiwan. But China recognizes that accidental clashes with Japan in the East China Sea may be a side effect of the policy.

When Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao met with then Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama in Japan in late May, he proposed re-establishing a hotline between the leaders. The hotline had not yet been set up and the Chinese side appeared to have gone cold on the idea.

At the same meeting, the two leaders agreed to improve other crisis management mechanisms to deal with confrontations at sea.

Meanwhile, the sinking of the South Korean corvette Cheonan in late March raised questions about Japanese and South Korean security cooperation. The Japanese government was slow in responding to the incident and did not ask to participate in the investigation into the causes of the incident.

The Cheonan's sinking, which the international investigation blamed on Pyongyang, was a stark reminder of the military power of North Korea. The reclusive country has up to 180,000 special military troops, weapons of mass-destruction, ballistic missiles, and submarine capabilities, all of which threaten both South Korea and Japan's security.

Japanese officials are pushing for greater cooperation with South Korea on security issues but the response from the South Korean side has often been unenthusiastic.

There is a strong resistance in South Korea to establishing a military alliance with Japan because of the friction resulting from Japan's occupation of the Korean Peninsula. There is also concern about China's opposition to such an alliance.

Nevertheless, there is an understanding among some in the South Korean military of the two country's common interests.

A South Korean officer said, "An (military) alliance (between South Korea and Japan) may be impossible. But both countries always need to maintain high-level friendly relations."



HARDWOOD FLAG CASES AVAILABLE

As reported by David Kauppinen at the USSVI San Diego June 2010 General Business Meeting, hardwood flag cases are now available from TRIPOD. David indicated that from his research, these cases are the best value for the dollar. The web address for TRIPOD is <http://www.flagcase.tripod.com>.

Nations Using Robots To Scout Arctic Sea

By Doug Tsuruoka, Investor's Business Daily, 29 June 2010

A deep-diving sub planted this Russian flag on the Arctic Ocean seabed under the North Pole in 2007.

A small army of deep-sea robots is toiling away in the Gulf, trying to plug the oil spill from the Deepwater Horizon rig.

Meanwhile, another crucial test of deep-sea robotic technology is quietly taking place in the frigid waters of the Canadian Arctic.

What's happening there shows how serious some nations are about laying claim to energy and mineral deposits in a resource-hungry world.

Since April, the Canadian government has deployed a robotic submarine called the Arctic Explorer to map the seabed beneath the ice shelf that covers much of the sea surface in Canada's Far North.

The torpedo-shaped, unmanned sub is painted bright yellow — like the peaceful “Yellow Submarine” in the old Beatles song.

But this robot sub is on a competitive mission. Its job is to determine how far Canada's underwater continental shelf extends in order to support Canadian land claims under the U.N.'s Law of the Sea Convention.

Scientists say the Arctic sea floor has vast untapped oil and mineral reserves. Some estimate that the Arctic contains as much as 25% of the world's undiscovered oil and gas. There are also huge underwater deposits of zinc, nickel and other resources.

Under the current Law of the Sea Treaty defining national rights in using the world's oceans, nations like Canada and the U.S. have the right to extend their exclusive economic zones from 200 miles to up to 350 miles off their coast — if they can prove that these underwater areas are part of their continental shelf. The claims for resources include any stocks of commercial fish found there.

The U.S., Russia and Scandinavian nations that border the Arctic Ocean are undertaking similar underwater mapping expeditions to see how much of this natural wealth is situated on their continental shelves.

At some point, the U.N. body will draw lines in the Arctic Ocean delineating the boundaries of, say, Russia's Arctic continental shelf, allowing Moscow to claim all the oil, gas and mineral reserves on the sea floor in those designated areas.

Where there are such valuable resources, nations can also be expected to take steps to defend this wealth from other nations. The players include nations like Canada and Norway that have traditionally adopted a peaceful approach to foreign policy and military affairs.

“Nations are certainly starting to think about Arctic military capability,” said John Pike, the head of Globalsecurity.org, a Washington policy research group. Besides arms, Pike says a lot of the outlays are for gear such as icebreaking ships.

“The Russians have more big icebreakers than anyone on the planet,” Pike said.

Icebreakers will be critical in clearing passages for any oil-drilling operations near the Arctic Circle. “Drilling for oil in the Arctic is going to make drilling for oil in the Gulf look like a day at the beach,” Pike said.

Rob Huebert, the associate director of the Center for Military and Strategic Studies at the University of Calgary, said in an interview last year that territorial claims were spurring a little-publicized Arctic arms race.

Huebert, who couldn't be reached for this story, noted that Norway was building a new “Nansen” class of Navy frigates that can sink enemy subs and fight under Arctic conditions.

The Canadians, who have never had a big navy, are building heavily armed patrol boats to guard the waters off places like Borden Island and Resolute Bay.

The U.S., too, is beefing up its Arctic capability. Since the end of the Cold War, some U.S. Navy submarines haven't been designed to surface in Arctic waters by breaking through the ice cap. So, future U.S. subs will be built with hardened conning towers.

Russia announced in March 2009 that it was creating a “dedicated military force” to help protect its claims in the disputed Arctic region.

Since December, a team of Canadian scientists has been using a German-developed underwater robot called “Wally” to check on ocean currents and water temperatures off Vancouver Island, near Washington State. The robot can crawl around the seafloor on treads at 3,000-foot depths. It can be controlled through a computer connected to the Internet.

USS Cobia May Head To Drier Conditions

Officials: Restoration project would be 4-6 weeks

By Sarah Klopping, Manitowoc Herald Times Reporter, 29 June 2010

MANITOWOC — The USS Cobia at the Wisconsin Maritime Museum may be shipping out next summer — at least temporarily.

Museum officials are working to raise money to dry dock the nearly 312-foot-long World War II fleet submarine for restorations, something that hasn't been done since 1996.

Norma Bishop, executive director of the museum, said the Cobia is more than five years overdue for another dry-docking.

“Originally, we had planned on hauling it out every 10 years,” she said. “We have held up pretty well, but by the same token, it's got to be done. We can't put this off.”

Bishop said the submarine is a main attraction at the museum. Visitors can explore torpedo rooms, a wardroom, crew's quarters and engine rooms, and participate in an overnight program where groups stay aboard the vessel and experience the submarine lifestyle.

She said summer, however, is the best time for repairs.

"Contrary to what most people think, most of our overnight groups come during the school year," she said. "And that is a big part of the programming we run associated with the sub, and we certainly don't want to disappoint them. It's also best for the shipyard, and we probably get a better rate for the work done because they are not busy that time of year."

The estimated cost is \$350,000. The museum applied for a \$150,000 Save America's Treasures federal grant through the National Park District in May to help pay for the restoration, which will take four to six weeks.

Bishop said the museum might not know until January if it will receive the grant.

If the museum is awarded the grant, it must match the amount from its own funds. About \$140,000 was raised by the museum through fundraising and donations.

Plans for restoration in 2011 include replacing deteriorating weather deck and wasted steel, removing zebra mussel infestations and repainting the hull with a treatment meant to last 15 to 20 years. The Cobia also will undergo a thorough inspection, including ultrasound testing, to check the integrity of its metal.

"We are looking forward to getting the submarine all polished up and back here in tip-top shape," Bishop said.

"It should be a pretty thorough job if we can raise the money and get the grant. Of course, if we don't get the grant we may have to scale back that work substantially."

She said if the museum doesn't receive the grant, the board of trustees would discuss the next best option, including whether or not to dry dock the Cobia next summer.

"If we don't get that grant, we will be scrambling," Bishop said. "The only thing that happens if you put it off for another year is that the work becomes more extensive and the prices get higher."

Jim Keim of Eden Prairie, Minn., visited the museum for the first time Monday. He was a radioman on a nuclear submarine for six years stationed around the Atlantic.

Keim said preservation of historic vessels like the Cobia for the public to see is invaluable to America's history.

"It's very important to show what the volunteers did," he said. "I've been to another submarine in Charleston, S.C., and (the Cobia) is in really good shape and surpasses what I saw down there." The submarine would be towed to a shipyard in the area for the repair work. The Cobia was last dry docked at Bay Shipbuilding Co. in Sturgeon Bay. Which shipyard will do the work in 2011 hasn't been decided. During the Cobia's absence, Bishop said the museum is arranging a temporary tall ship exhibit and also may offer bus trips to see the Cobia in dry dock. She said she doesn't think the museum will be impacted.

"We're going to put the word out, and if we can get the tall ships scheduled in I think we'll be just fine," she said. "In fact, it may even give us a little bit of a boost. Most of our market is return visitors." In August, the museum will celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Cobia coming to Manitowoc.

Sub Culture Saturday is scheduled for Aug. 14 and will include WWII re-enactors, trivia contests, live music and a 312-foot Subway sandwich to commemorate the event.

China's Navy To Match S Korea-US War Games

By Michael Sainsbury and Rick Wallace, The Australian, 30 June 2010

CHINA has pushed back at criticism from US President Barack Obama over its handling of the North Korean sinking of the South Korean patrol boat Cheonan.

It has announced its own naval manoeuvres in response to those planned by the US and South Korea.

The People's Liberation Army will launch a six-day, live ammunition drill starting today in the East China Sea, a move seen as a response to a joint exercise between the US and South Korean navies in the Yellow Sea.

The PLA has reportedly banned all vessels from entering a large area of open water off China's east coast until Monday.

"Though the Chinese government did not say anything about the drill, anybody with common sense on military strategy will bet that they are related," Renmin University professor Shi Yinhong, an expert on US studies, told the People's Daily.

The US is reportedly planning to send the 97,000-tonne USS George Washington, along with a destroyer and a nuclear submarine, for the exercises. A 4500-tonne destroyer, a submarine and F-15K fighter jets are to participate from the Seoul side.

Beijing expressed serious concern about the joint exercise this month and is thought to be uneasy at the expected presence of the giant nuclear-powered aircraft carrier near its shores.

The South Korea-US drills were announced in direct response to the Cheonan sinking, which China has refused to blame on North Korea despite investigators blaming Pyongyang.

No dates have been set for the Yellow Sea drills. The Pentagon said they would most likely be held next month.

Meanwhile, China has inked its most significant deal with Taiwan since the two countries split after the 1945-49 civil war in which the once-ruling nationalist, or Kuomintang, party fled to the island.

The ruling Chinese Communist Party sees the free trade pact, known as the Economic Co-operation Framework Agreement, as the first step in a peaceful unification it hopes follows the same path as its reintegration of Hong Kong.

China will reduce tariffs on 539 items from Taiwan, offering \$US13.8 billion (\$15.9bn), but will exclude semi-conductors and polyvinyl chloride. Taiwan will lessen tariffs on 267 items from the mainland worth \$US2.86bn.

Submarine Crunch Hits [Indian] Navy *Pakistan Defence Forum, 30 June 2010*

Despite sounding an alert to the ministry of defence last year, Indian Navy continues to face shortage of submarines.

After Russia delayed the release of Nerpa K-152, an Akula-II class, nuclear-powered attack submarine sought on lease by India for 10 years, indigenous nuclear submarine INS Arihant, launched last year in Visakhapatnam, too may not be inducted into service on time.

Chief of naval staff admiral Nirmal Verma had said last year that Arihant would be inducted into service two years after its launch.

But the submarine's reactor is yet to be started. Nerpa was supposed to join the navy as INS Chakra in June 2010, but will now join only towards the end of this year. The delay is affecting the training for Arihant.

Admiral Verma, however, said, "Arihant is expected to be inducted on time. I don't see any delay."

Sources told 'DNA' Nerpa was being modified to suit Indian requirements, but its trials were delayed after it met with an accident in 2008, killing 20 personnel onboard.

Now, safety aspects of the submarine are being reworked.

The navy's last but one Foxtrot-class submarine, INS Vela, was decommissioned on Friday, while its only diesel-electric, kilo-Class submarine with an integrated Klub missile system, INS Sindhurakshak, left Visakhapatnam for repair and refit in Russia.

Sindhurakshak, which will take over a month to reach Russia, will be at the Zvezdochka shipyard for two years. It will be modernised under a contract signed between the two countries.

With the last of the Foxtrot-class submarines to be decommissioned by yearend and the first Scorpene, being built at Mumbai's Mazgaon dock, slated to join only in 2015, the navy will be left with just 14 operational submarines.

The first of the six Scorpenes was slated to join the navy by 2012, but has been delayed by three years.

US & China play 'chicken' in the Yellow Sea

By C Raja Mohan, Indian Express, 30 June 2010

A first rate crisis is brewing in and around the Korean Peninsula that may well come to a head this week. The escalation of military tensions in the Yellow Sea that separates the Korean Peninsula from the Chinese mainland is likely to take two pathways - one originating in Pyongyang and the other in Beijing - or both.

As Washington and Seoul respond with diplomatic and military measures to the alleged sinking of a South Korean naval ship, 'Cheonan', at the end of March by a small North Korean submarine, Pyongyang is promising more defiant action.

In a statement issued on Monday, the North Korean government referred to its "nuclear deterrent", a term that it had used before conducting nuclear tests in October 2006 and May 2009. This time around it went a step further to warn that it had a new approach to demonstrate its strategic capabilities.

China, in turn, has condemned the US-South Korea military exercises planned for this weekend in the Yellow Sea as a provocation.

According to reports from Beijing on Monday, the Chinese People's Liberation Army plans to conduct live ammunition exercises during June 30 to July 5 in roughly the period when US and South Korea will be conducting their joint anti-submarine exercises.

At the G-20 summit in Toronto over the weekend, President Barack Obama warned North Korean leadership against any irresponsible moves such as the conduct of another nuclear test. Obama was apparently "blunt" in telling the Chinese President Hu Jintao that Beijing must take the responsibility to restrain North Korea.

China, for long the protector of North Korea, has refused to criticise Pyongyang's recent actions. Meanwhile domestic pressures are mounting on the Chinese leadership to stand up against American military moves in the Yellow Sea that many nationalists see as Beijing's "front yard".

In a meeting with the South Korean President, Lee Myung-bak, Obama said he was standing "four square" behind South Korea in its gathering confrontation with the North. Obama also announced a decision to fast track the Congressional approval of a free trade agreement with South Korea and strengthen bilateral military alliance.

Days before the summit, Washington had suggested that the US nuclear-powered aircraft carrier USS George Washington might join the planned military exercises with South Korea later this week. The prospect of a rare American deployment of an aircraft carrier has angered Beijing.

As a columnist Huang Xiangyang wrote in the China Daily website on Monday, "Compared with the United States, China is still weak. But to emerge as a great nation in the world community, China has to stand up to the United States militarily, especially near its own shores."

With both the United States and China determined to stand by their respective partners in the Korean Peninsula, the big question is will the aircraft carrier enter the Yellow Sea or turn back before it gets there?

If America does not blink, can China afford to? If neither does, what form might the military escalation take? If there is some room for a face-saving de-escalation between Beijing and Washington, would Pyongyang try and prevent it?

These are the questions that most chancelleries in the Asia Pacific will be debating this week as the first major military confrontation between a rising China and a brooding America shapes up in the Yellow Sea.

Bowing to North Korea

By William R. Hawkins, *Front page Magazine*, 1 July 2010

Reuters reported on June 28 that, according to the Pentagon, a joint U.S.-Republic of Korea naval exercise that had been expected in June will most likely take place in July, though a date has yet to be set. The exercise is supposed to be a show of force in the wake of the sinking of the South Korea corvette Cheonan with the loss of 46 lives in March. An international investigation of the sinking in May concluded that the corvette was sunk by a North Korean torpedo probably fired in ambush from a submarine. The exercise was expected to start June 8, then June 28. The question now is whether it will be held at all.

The People's Republic of China, North Korea's protector, has strongly protested the proposed naval maneuvers in the Yellow Sea between the west coast of the Korean Peninsula and the Chinese mainland. Of particular concern to Beijing is speculation that the aircraft carrier George Washington, (CVN-73) based in Yokosuka, Japan, will take part. The carrier departed on its summer patrol on June 14, leading a strike group consisting of two guided missile cruises and a destroyer squadron. At least one submarine is also normally assigned to such a group. From June 21-25, the task force participated in an undersea warfare exercise with Japanese air and naval units, but far from the contested waters of the Yellow Sea.

A June 9 editorial in the Chinese Communist Party news paper Global Times warned against the joint U.S.-ROK naval operation, arguing that the "Yellow Sea is no place for a U.S. carrier." It states:

The U.S. should reconsider its military movements in the West Pacific. Disguised as a move aimed at maintaining regional stability, the deployment of a carrier off of China's coast is a provocation that will generate hostility among the Chinese public toward the U.S. Who would not be bothered by an opponent hanging around at the door with a gun all day long?

The editorial also called the American carrier "a symbol of its past hegemony," implying that the U.S. Navy was no longer the dominant force in the western Pacific. An earlier editorial had stated that the Obama administration was undecided about whether to include the carrier in the joint exercise and cautioned, "The decision should be made with consideration given to China's wishes. Media outlets in South Korea and Japan have predicted that China will be unhappy if the carrier does indeed join the exercises." Beijing constantly refers to the Yellow Sea as "China's territorial sea," a designation with no standing under international law.

As the United States backed off its planned exercise, China moved ahead with its own naval demonstration, set for June 30-July 5. The area in which the People's Liberation Army Navy will conduct live-fire exercises is just north of Taiwan. "The location of the Chinese drill is set to be held in the East China Sea, which would make the foreign navies entering the Yellow Sea uneasy," said Song Zhongping, a Hong Kong-based military analysis who was quoted [4] in Global Times on June 29. He said the East China Sea is the only way into the Yellow Sea. Song argued it would be easy to form "a favorable war situation" for the Chinese Navy to "shut the dogs up and beat them."

Song was echoing increasingly shrill voices in China denouncing the United States, as reported by the Associated Press. "China should cover the Yellow Sea with ships and missiles and open fire and drive them back should the American military dare invade our territorial waters," a commentary on the popular ccvic.com news website demanded.

The U.S. edition of the state-owned China Daily newspaper reported on June 29:

The People's Liberation Army (PLA) will launch a six-day, live ammunition drill starting on Wednesday in the East China Sea, a move that analysts said is in response to a joint exercise between the United States and Republic of Korea (ROK) navies in the Yellow Sea. The PLA decision was issued on June 24 and posted on major Chinese websites on Monday, when the US-ROK drill was scheduled to start.... But the ROK navy announced on Monday that their joint maneuver has been postponed to July.

The paper cited Shi Yinhong, a senior expert on American studies at Renmin University in Beijing, who stated, "Though the Chinese government did not say anything about the drill, anybody with common sense on military strategy will bet that they are related.... Any large country has its bottom line for military vigilance and pride. The US-ROK drill has drawn angry response from the Chinese public and I think that is one reason behind its delay." Apparently, American pride is not as strong as Chinese, as the U.S. Navy seems to have retreated in the face of the Chinese protest and counter-exercise.

On June 28, North Korea threatened to bolster its nuclear capability to cope with what it said is a hostile United States. Earlier, it had warned all shipping away from its Yellow Sea coast. It was thought that Pyongyang might conduct anti-ship missile tests in the days before the planned U.S.-ROK naval exercise as its own show of force.

Meanwhile, North Korea's other ally, Russia, is commencing on June 29 the largest military exercises it has conducted in the Far East in 15 years. The land, sea and air maneuvers will place Russian warships near the Sea of Japan. Earlier, a team of Russian experts had issued a report claiming that there was no credible evidence that the North Koreans had sunk the Cheonan. Moscow also worked to weaken the statement issued at the G8 summit condemning North Korea for the attack.

Kim Myong Chol, who is billed as an "unofficial" spokesman of Kim Jong-il and North Korea, claimed in a column for Asia Times that China has been circulating a report that the South Korean corvette had actually been sunk by an American mine and North Korea was only being blamed as part of a "false flag" operation to stir up tensions. Kim said the Chinese "leaked" the report to New America Media, which claims to be the "largest national collaboration and advocate of 2000 ethnic news organizations." There it appeared as a column by Yoichi Shimatsu, a former editor of the Japan Times, now an environmental consultant and a commentator for CCTV-9, an international television network run by the Beijing regime.

The Chinese disinformation story is now making the rounds of left-wing websites including Online Journal, Dissident Voice, War Is A Crime (formerly After Downing Street), and the Baltimore Chronicle and Sentinel where the sinking is compared to other alleged "false flags" like the sinking of the battleship Maine, the invited assault on Pearl Harbor, the Gulf of Tonkin incident, and the 9/11 attacks.

Beijing is thus doing much more in regard to North Korea than President Barack Obama charged at the G20 meeting when he said China was simply "turning a blind eye" to Pyongyang's provocations. Beijing is bringing to bear its diplomatic, military and propaganda resources to defend North Korea as it has always done. And under this onslaught, Washington it falling back in disarray.

Deep Sea Divers

By Tim Dougherty, Notre Dame Magazine, Summer 2010

Maybe no man is an island. But pack 135 of them together inside 6,000 tons of airtight steel suspended hundreds of feet beneath the surface of the ocean, and collectively that's what they become.

Enclosed within the walls of the USS Memphis fast-attack submarine is a self-contained universe about the size of a football field. It has no fresh air, no sunlight and traditionally — until a policy reversal by the U.S. Department of Defense in April — no women. Exiled for months on end, the unit's existence is predicated on its ability to keep you from knowing that it exists at all. That's the life of one of the 76 nuclear-powered, missile-armed islands which form the invisible defense against anyone on the high seas who would wish to do the United States harm.

To function as one harmonized unit, a submarine requires a hierarchy of command capped by the authority of one person under whom all order follows. At times the most isolated man among the crew is its captain — the person solely responsible for the performance and safety of the submarine and everyone aboard it. On the Memphis, that duty rests with Commander Charles Maher '90, who took command of the \$3 billion machine and its crew in January.

"Being in command is a great level of responsibility and accountability that is not associated with any other job," says Maher. He is one the U.S. Navy's newest commanders in the long chain of those who have gone before him and who will come after, a group that includes three other Notre Dame alumni: commanders Mark Prokopius, William Houston and Robert Clark — all from the same Class of 1990.

None of that matters to the crew of the Memphis, however. To them, Maher is the beginning and end of their isolated existence, the anchoring force directing orders as his crew simulates anti-surface and anti-submarine warfare situations for several days with the Harry S Truman Strike Group off the Atlantic coast of Florida. The in early April was a part of the Memphis' evaluation to certify for deployment three weeks later to Rio de Janeiro to take part in UNITAS, a two-week scenario training event that brings together a coalition of North, Central and South American navies. Started in 1960, it's the longest running multinational naval exercise in the world.

It's rare for crew like that of the Memphis to ship out so quickly; the certification process usually takes nine months to a year. It took Maher's crew about four months. "It says a lot for the team to take up the challenge and get it ready," says Maher.

Much of Maher's day is spent leading that process of critically monitoring the actions of the other officers on board and holding them accountable for their decisions. It's checking and rechecking innumerable charts; reviewing cryptographic material; monitoring longitude, latitude and depth zones; and overseeing the performance of the nuclear reactor and the safety of those around it. When you're on your own surrounded by ocean in a vessel whose motion is enabled by harnessing the same power responsible for unleashing the most destructive man-made force in human history, perfection has never been more paramount.

"It's an inherently dangerous occupation — essentially you're taking a ship and purposefully sinking it," says Prokopius, who commands USS New Mexico. "If there's any casualty on board, you're under water. There's not a whole lot of places you can go."

You might say it's an alternate universe. Time is not measured by the sun. Days are 18 hours, broken up into six-hour shifts of maintaining watch, training and maintenance, and sleep. Pressure is measured in atmospheres that crew members even create. By periodically scrubbing the submarine's interior walls with a chemical compound called amine, they remove the excess carbon dioxide created through respiration before triggering a process that splits ionized water molecules to create breathable oxygen. And they all share every last bit of it, as the bulk of the crew is tucked away into a living space about the size of a three-bedroom apartment.

From the top down, all submariners share a bond. They've all chosen to be there, and they've had to qualify to be there. The pride of a submariner is worn on his breast: the submarine warfare insignia, or "dolphins," as they call it. In short, it means that should fate ask it of me, I will save your life.

It's the captain's job to maintain that cohesiveness. In part, it's reinforced through the constant scrutiny of performance and, if required, discipline. But ensuring proper execution isn't always about giving orders. Sometimes it means walking off the boat in port on a Friday night, hoping to have a few hours to yourself, only to meet a sailor who has a problem he needs help in solving.

"For him it's the most important issue, so I've got to take the time to make that the most important thing to me," says Maher. "Whether I have alligators chomping at my ankles, I have to respect those needs and do the right thing for the sailor — but also maintain that balance, keep the big picture in mind and keep the ship safe."

That task requires navigating the unknown. Unlike a surface ship, a submarine can't risk receiving a radio communication whose energy emission could compromise its location. It only comes up shallow enough to receive a broadcast related to its mission about every 12 hours before diving deep again. As a result, the captain has a unique level of autonomy to command the boat as he judges best.

"There's an immense amount of professional pride that your bosses trust you enough to send you out there," says Houston, whose wife, Colleen '90, was recently called up from the Navy Reserves — at the same time he's winding down his command of the USS Hampton.

Hiding from the enemy at sea also requires hiding from friends and family ashore, a task all the Notre Dame commanders face as every time they ship out on a mission they each leave a wife and children back home. It means pressing pause on family life, missing birthdays, Christmases, First Communion and even funerals. Even when their duties allow them daily email communication, there's only so much you can give back via radio transmission.

"What gets frustrating is you can't do anything," says Prokopius, whose wife, Kathy, is an '89 Saint Mary's graduate. "You can't fix the washing machine or fix the car. You can't study science with the 15-year-old. You're kind of helpless out there on the home front. That's the big stress with the family you leave behind."

With all there is to worry about within the vessel walls, however, there isn't always time for one's attention to drift beyond the next day, hour or minute. It's a routine that grinds down on even the most rigorously trained men.

"When you're doing a mission that's highly sensitive, you know you have to be on razor's edge all the time for a month and a half," says Maher.

The only first-hand visual confirmation that the outside world still exists comes sometimes only twice a day and only through the small pane of a periscope. This routine part of any day is also inherently dangerous, as there's no guarantee of what you'll see. It could be the sun rising over the Rock of Gibraltar — or it could be several dozen boats, perhaps filled with fishermen. Even when you least expect it, those times when, as Prokopius says, “the hair on the back of your neck starts standing up,” you always have to be prepared to act appropriately.

“Every commanding officer has been in that situation,” Prokopius says. “You end up having to trust your instinct.”

Other times, the crisis comes from within your own boat. Like when the Hampton was performing a casualty training drill in the middle of the sea, and Houston's engineer lost the tip of his finger on a piece of wire used to lock a valve. At that point it was no longer a drill. Houston had to get the sub into position for the engineer to be picked up and flown back stateside for medical care. It's not something Houston had specifically prepared for, but that's when the instincts ingrained into him over time kicked in.

For Maher, those instincts were honed over almost two decades of submarine training and service to prepare for the position he now commands. When he exchanged salutes with his predecessor in his home port of Groton, Connecticut, and was handed the helm, in some ways Maher's entire naval career fulfilled its purpose. Following his initial nuclear power and officer training, as he rose through the ranks from junior officer to commanding officer, he faced constant critiques from his superiors. From spot checks to evaluating drills, every decision was analyzed, graded and, when inevitably necessary, correct.

It's no accident that Maher — like the other Domers before him — finds himself in charge. Notre Dame has maintained a strong ROTC presence on campus long after it served as a World War II hub for the Naval Academy, and submarines have been a primary beneficiary of that commitment. Notre Dame's NROTC is recognized as one of the premier producers of nuclear-trained officers nationwide. Of course, as at least one submariner knows, that respect hasn't kept other sailors from editing incoming communication reports to falsify Notre Dame football scores.

In addition to the commanders, the University's NROTC also has produced former commanders and colleagues of the current group, such as captains John Mosier '88, director of intelligence for the Pacific fleet of submarines, Mike Ryan '85, commanding officer of the Pacific fleet's submarine training center, and Kevin Brenton '85, squadron commander for the Atlantic fleet's ballistic missile submarines. It's a commitment that comes from the top down, as one of a handful of programs around the country — including engineering powerhouses like Duke, Purdue and Georgia Tech — that are always commanded by a former submariner, currently Captain Dale Nees.

Today's Notre Dame submariners have run into each other from time to time over their careers. And they're all people whom Maher couldn't be more proud to have his name associated with. “The technical rigor and stature of the ND guys is definitely something that's remarkable,” he says.

Nonetheless, few choose to undertake the commitment required to stand in Maher's still dutifully polished shoes. Of the junior officers on his first sub, Maher is the only one still in the Navy. But, to those who have gone before him, the reward of command is well worth the wait.

“It's the pinnacle of a naval career,” says Captain Mosier, who commanded the USS Honolulu from 2006-07 before it was decommissioned. “We say that, and it's absolutely true.”

EB's Expansion Into New London May Help Sub Base

By Jennifer McDermott, The Day, 5 July 2010

The president of Electric Boat told the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission five years ago that the Naval Submarine Base should stay open because of the synergy it enjoys with his company.

Having the base near to EB results in more efficiency and effectiveness in the design, construction, repair and modernization of submarines, saving the Navy millions, EB President John P. Casey said at the July 6, 2005, hearing in Boston.

The commission overruled the Pentagon and kept the Groton base open.

Key figures in the fight to save the base now say that EB's expanded footprint in the region will create more synergy between the submarine manufacturer and the base, and hopefully ensure the base's future should there be another BRAC round.

EB announced in June that it was purchasing the former Pfizer World Research Headquarters in New London to accommodate its growing staff of engineers and designers.

“As our industrial base in Connecticut continues to grow, our base will only get stronger as well,” said U.S. Sen. Chris Dodd, D-Conn.

The sales agreement is expected to be finalized within two months. Pfizer agreed to make room for EB personnel at the property prior to the closing, and EB began moving in office furniture last week.

The Pentagon's criteria for evaluating bases does not take into account “synergy”; instead, it judges an installation's “military value.” But John Markowicz, who headed the Subbase Coalition that played a key role in averting the closing, said the coalition would attempt to convince the Pentagon to revise the criteria in a future BRAC round.

“My overall impression was that EB and John Casey participating, particularly in the Boston hearing, had a significant impression upon the commissioners who were there and on the validity of the arguments we were presenting,” he said.

“The interfacing between EB and the base is almost seamless. You cannot ignore that,” added state Sen. Andrew Maynard, D-Stonington. “We have won the day on the strength of our synergy argument and EB making this investment is going to substantially strengthen our position overall.”

EB needs office space for its design and engineering employees, many of whom work in buildings from the 1960s.

The company is also hiring about 700 designers and engineers. Half of these jobs were announced in January and have been filled. The rest of the new employees will be hired in the next two to three years.

They will work on the design for the Navy's next generation of ballistic-missile submarines to replace the current fleet of Ohio-class, or Trident, boats, and on the Virginia-class submarine design to reduce the cost.

“EB's expanded footprint is primarily in the design area, but design leads to construction,” Markowicz said.

EB and Northrop Grumman Newport News in Virginia will start building two submarines a year instead of one in 2011. The production increase for the Virginia class will make the base “more important than ever,” said U.S. Sen. Joe Lieberman, D-Conn. “I don’t think we’ll have another BRAC anytime soon, but when we do, Connecticut will be ready,” Lieberman said.

The design and production of the Ohio replacement program will stretch into the second half of the 21st century.

“This really ensures not only a larger footprint here, but a deep footprint,” said U.S. Rep. Joe Courtney, D-2nd District. “We’ve got to keep our eye on the ball, which is the decision matrix the Navy looks at that deals with military construction, improvements and upgrades to the base, but the synergy aspect creates a good sort of context for the base’s future presence.”

Bob Ross, executive director of the state’s Office of Military Affairs, said, “anything that happens to strengthen EB is good for the state of Connecticut.”

A statement released by EB said, “there have been significant benefits to both the Navy and Electric Boat to being located so close together, and we look forward to continuing that long standing affiliation as we expand our engineering workforce in southeastern Connecticut.”

US Submarines Emerge In Show Of Military Might

Message unlikely to be lost on Beijing as 3 vessels turn up in Asian ports

By Greg Torode, South China Morning Post, 4 July 2010

In a scarcely noticed move last Monday, three of America’s largest submarines surfaced in Asia-Pacific ports in a show of force by the US Seventh Fleet not seen since the end of the cold war.

The appearance of the USS Michigan in Pusan, South Korea, the USS Ohio in Subic Bay, in the Philippines, and the USS Florida in the strategic Indian Ocean outpost of Diego Garcia not only reflects the trend of escalating submarine activity in East Asia, but carries another threat as well.

The three Ohio-class submarines have all been recently converted from carrying cold-war-era nuclear ballistic missiles to other weapons – improved intelligence sensors, special operations troops and, significantly, a vast quantity of Tomahawk cruise missiles, a manoeuvrable low flying weapon designed to strike targets on land.

Between them, the three submarines can carry 462 Tomahawks, boosting by an estimated 60 per cent plus the potential Tomahawk strike force of the entire Japanese-based Seventh Fleet – the core projection of US military power in East Asia.

While the move has been made with little fanfare, it is starting to resonate across the region. US officials insist it reflects long-term deployment plans and is not directed at a single country or crisis – such as intensifying tensions on the Korean peninsula following North Korea’s sinking of a South Korean warship – but the message is unlikely to be lost on Beijing.

One veteran Asian military attaché, who keeps close ties with both Chinese and US forces, noted that “460-odd Tomahawks is a huge amount of potential firepower in anybody’s language”.

“It is another sign that the US is determined to not just maintain its military dominance in Asia, but to be seen doing so ... that is a message for Beijing and for everybody else, whether you are a US ally or a nation sitting on the fence.”

Other Asian diplomats said it might reflect a rising chorus of concern in recent months from China’s neighbours, who have been discreetly urging the US to do more to stand up to China’s growing naval assertiveness in East Asia. Chinese exercises have been expanding in size and scope in recent months, with vessels appearing beyond Japan’s offshore islands and appearing deep in the disputed South China Sea.

“Japan, South Korea, Indonesia, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore and Australia – all these countries have been active behind the scenes in expressing concerns,” another Asian diplomat said. “There is no hotter topic at the moment than China’s naval ambitions.”

In Washington, meanwhile, concern is mounting about missile deployments in East Asia.

Pentagon estimates suggest China is increasing its stocks of short-range ballistic missiles and precision cruise missiles, and boosting their capabilities.

Its last report on China’s military modernisation estimated that a September 2008 stockpile of between 1,050 and 1,150 short-range ballistic missiles was rising at a rate of about 100 per year, the bulk concentrated on Taiwan. South Korean estimates show North Korea has fielded more than 650 short-range ballistic missiles. A recent report from the Washington-based Project 2049 Institute think tank noted that expanded conventional ballistic and groundlaunched cruise missiles were now “the centrepiece of [China’s] political and military strategy”.

Coupled with other improved aerospace capabilities, such as electronic sensors, over the next 15 years China might be “increasingly confident of its ability to dominate the skies around its periphery”, the report said. It noted that the PLA could challenge the defences of Taiwan, Japan and India, as well as US forces in the western Pacific.

“This may lead Beijing to become more assertive in its dealings with its neighbours,” says the report, written by analysts Mark Stokes and Ian Easton.

“A strategic shift in [the] regional aerospace balance also may increasingly unravel the fabric of US alliances and prompt allies and friends to consider weapons of mass destruction ... as an insurance against unfavourable imbalances,” it says.

In policies drafted under then president George W. Bush, a Republican, and continued by the administration of his successor, Democrat Barack Obama, the Pentagon is shifting 60 per cent of its 53 fast-attack submarines to the Pacific – a process that is now virtually complete.

But the presence of the larger cruise-missile submarines shows that, at times, the US forward posture will be significantly larger.

While nominally based on the west coast of the United States, the Ohio, for example, has been operating out of Guam for most of the last year, taking advantage of the island’s expanding facilities to extend its operations in the western Pacific.

It is due to return soon, but the Florida and the Michigan are likely to remain in the region for many months yet, using Guam and possibly Diego Garcia for essential maintenance and crew changes.

The presence of the Florida, based on the US east coast, appears to confirm the US is still routinely bringing submarines under the arctic ice cap to East Asia. Some US east coast ports are closer, via this route, to the region than some west coast bases, such as San Diego.

Just one other submarine has been converted from ballistic to cruise missiles and all four are currently deployed simultaneously for the first time.

Announcing the move earlier this month, Submarine Squadron 19 Commander Captain John Tammen noted the “transformational capabilities” of the cruise missile submarines. “[They] provide the combatant commander a significant increase in war-fighting ability, and options for resolving and deterring conflict,” he said.

Navy Criticizes Close Relationship Between Academy And Donor

By Brian Witte, Baltimore Sun, 5 July 2010

An anonymous donor whose close relationship with the U.S. Naval Academy caused problems for the school’s finance chief is connected to a Texas company that is a defense contractor, Navy investigators concluded in a report.

The donor was known to insiders at the academy as a generous alumnus who once provided nearly \$100,000 so “fine wines” could be served during receptions at the superintendent’s house, the report said. He maintained such a close relationship with Robert Parsons, the academy’s deputy for finance, that he kept a sport utility vehicle at Parsons’ home for use when the Texas donor was in Annapolis.

The donor’s role became public last week when the Navy released a report into financial irregularities at the academy. The investigation, completed late last year, resulted in the current superintendent’s tenure being cut short to just a few months beyond the minimum three years.

The Navy released only the 110-page report by the Office of the Naval Inspector General after a Freedom of Information Act request was filed by The Navy Times.

The findings prompted a five-day suspension without pay for Parsons, according to Navy Rear Adm. Denny Moynihan, the Navy’s chief spokesman.

The donor’s name is redacted in the report as released to the public. Parsons noted that the donor often bought items from the academy’s store, doing “a lot of buying and giving, most of it for his own company.” That company is identified in the report as the Richardson Trident Company in Richardson, Texas.

Richardson Trident owner Thomas Bentley is a 1954 academy graduate. He did not immediately return calls seeking comment.

The donor was known for spending up to \$50,000 at a time at the Midshipman Store at the academy.

“When you go to his plant and you go to his ranch, everybody that works in his plant is wearing Navy stuff because he gives it to them,” Parsons told investigators.

Investigators said one of the principal problems with the relationship was that it caused Parsons to commit multiple regulatory violations relating to the acceptance of gifts. The Navy concluded that Parsons didn’t do due diligence because he failed to determine the donor’s “status as a defense contractor and prohibited source.”

Bentley’s company is listed as a defense contractor in the Federal Procurement Data System. While the report notes it had no large federal contracts, the company has been a supplier to the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps during the past decade.

“He’s a benefactor, a donor, but he’s getting special treatment and handling because of his eccentricities and the relationship that you have established with him over time,” a Navy investigator said to Parsons during an interview transcribed in a 110-page report.

The report found Parsons improperly solicited gifts to the Naval Academy when he used his relationship with the donor to influence him. The gifts, including watches, sunglasses, coats and purses, went to football coaches and their families as part of a strategy to retain the coaching staff.

Investigators also found Parsons got the donor to provide wine and champagne for the opening of a facility in the Naval Academy Club by asking him whether he was interested in expanding on his wishes to provide fine wine for events at the superintendent’s house.

Parsons also failed to properly get documentation for two Waterford crystal chandeliers purchased by the donor at an estimated value of between \$20,000 and \$30,000 each, investigators found.

Investigators also found that the SUV should have been viewed as a gift because Parsons kept the vehicle at his home, even if he didn’t use it.

In the report, an investigator questions Parsons about the donor’s desire to be anonymous, pointing out donors can’t be anonymous because donations “might be something we want to reject.”

The investigator asked if the donor had any government contracts, and Parsons said the donor told him he had none.

“Well, that’s something that someone will have to verify,” the investigator said during the interview. “But of course, because if he is a defense contractor, that’s another aspect of all the ethical issues that we would have.”

The probe into the gifts was part of a wide-ranging investigation into spending practices at the academy that found a variety of lapses in government rules. The findings were a factor in curtailing the tenure of the superintendent, Vice Adm. Jeffrey Fowler, who did not benefit financially from any of the spending, Moynihan said.

The academy is working with Navy experts in government spending regulations to ensure school officials improve accounting practices, asset control, invoicing and contracting.

Submarine Seized In Ecuador With DEA’s Help

By Mike Levine, FOX News, 3 July 2010

Authorities in Ecuador, joined by agents from the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, have seized a submarine built secretly in the jungles of the South American country, according to a DEA press release.

The electric-powered submarine, 30 feet long, was intended to transport multi-ton quantities of cocaine. But after acting on intelligence obtained by the DEA, authorities in Ecuador were able to seize the clandestine vessel on Friday before it was ever deployed, the DEA said.

One person at the site of the submarine was taken into custody, but no additional details about the suspect were provided. The DEA said the investigation of the captured submarine is ongoing.

In order the evade detection by law enforcement or military personnel, the submarine was constructed in a remote area of jungle near the Ecuador-Colombia border. Friday's operation marks the first seizure of a clandestinely constructed, fully-operational submarine built to facilitate trans-oceanic drug trafficking, according to the DEA.

"The advent of the narco-submarine presents new detection challenges for maritime interdiction forces," DEA Andean Regional Director Jay Bergman said in a statement. "The submarine's nautical range, payload capacity and quantum leap in stealth have raised the stakes for the counter-drug forces and the national security community alike."

DESRON 40, Peruvian Navy Submarine Force Commences Silent Forces Exercise 2010

Navy News, July 7, 2010

CALLAO, Peru — U.S. Navy forces teamed up with their Peruvian Navy counterparts July 6 to begin Silent Forces Exercise (SIFOREX) 2010, a bilateral anti-submarine warfare (ASW) exercise, in Callao, Peru.

The exercise is hosted by the Peruvian submarine force.

SIFOREX, which focuses exclusively on ASW operations, is the longest such exercise in which U.S. units will participate in 2010.

During the exercise, Peruvian naval surface units, including the frigates BAP Bolognesi (FM 57) and BAP Villavicencio (FM 52) will team up with Destroyer Squadron (DESRON) 40, USS Klakring (FFG 42), Helicopter Anti-Submarine Squadron Light (HSL) 42 and Patrol Squadron (VP) 45 to practice ASW against three Peruvian Type 209 diesel submarines, BAP Arica (SS 32), BAP Pisagua (SS 33) and BAP Chipana (SS 34). The units will train in the waters off the coast of Peru until July 11.

DESRON 40 is on a six-month deployment to South America and the Caribbean as part of Southern Seas 2010, a U.S. Southern Command-directed operation that provides U.S. and international forces the opportunity to operate in a multinational environment.

The Persian Gulf And The Future Of The U.S. Navy

Defence Professional, July 7, 2010

If there is a war at sea in the near future, it will likely be in the Persian Gulf. It is the nexus of the geo-strategic, ideological and religious struggle between Iran on one side and the United States, the West and the non-Shia Muslim world on the other. It is also the one place where Iran can attempt to exercise influence over its enemies disproportionate to its real power. Thirty percent of the world's supply of oil is produced in or passes through this body of water. According to a senior Iranian official, "the Persian Gulf is the center and most sensitive point of the world. . . . At any time, we can exert as much pressure in this strait as we may wish to."

Iran is preparing to block the flow of oil out of the Persian Gulf. It is creating a capability to practice hybrid warfare at sea. The Iranian plan is to use a combination of conventional and unconventional or asymmetric systems in large numbers to overwhelm their adversary, particularly the U.S. Navy. In addition to the Iranian Navy's mix of corvettes, patrol boats and Russian-built conventional submarines, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard (IRGC) is deploying a large array of missile and torpedo armed patrol boats, armed speed boats and mine laying vessels. Both the Navy and IRGC have deployed land-based fixed and mobile anti-ship cruise missile launchers as well as obsolescing U.S. and Russian aircraft. The IRGC also possesses and has exercises with a number of innovative platforms including semi-submersible vessels, unmanned boats and even midget submarines similar to the North Korean ship thought to have sunk a South Korean patrol craft. U.S. intelligence sources have suggested that Iran might even use a combination of manned and unmanned aircraft in suicide attacks on high value U.S. naval platforms in a tactic reminiscent of the kamikaze attacks of World War Two.

In the confined waters of the Persian Gulf, Iran stands a significant chance of being able to inflict serious casualties on the U.S. Navy. In 2005, the U.S. Navy conducted a war game focused on a U.S.-Iranian confrontation in the Persian Gulf. According to reports, that war game alarmed commanders at the Pentagon by showing that it would be relatively easy for the Iranians to neutralize the Fifth Fleet through the use of a combination of high-speed gunboats and airborne suicide attacks. While the U.S. Navy is likely eventually to gain control of the Persian Gulf, Iran could win a significant victory, politically and psychologically just by holding off the U.S. for some period of time and inflicting significant casualties.

Since that time the U.S. Navy has taken steps to counter the growing Iranian threat. With the deployment of the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) the Navy will have a platform designed precisely to address the threat posed by small boats, submarines and mines. Armed unmanned aerial systems such as the Fire Scout and Predator would also be useful against Iranian swarm boat tactics. The future of the U.S. Navy as a strategic instrument of U.S. power may well rest on its ability to enforce access to foreign littoral waters and to overseas friends and allies in the face of resistance. Adversaries will have the advantage of proximity, knowledge of the environment, the ability to deploy masses of low-cost platforms and weapons systems, support from shore-based systems and the use of asymmetric tactics and capabilities. The question is whether the U.S. Navy can adapt a force structure and doctrine designed for a different era to meet the challenge posed by Iran today or China tomorrow.

Japan Counters China's Naval Build-Up

By David Ax, World Politics Review, July 7, 2010

On Sunday near Okinawa, the Japanese navy spotted two Chinese warships sailing south into the Pacific. The Chinese vessels were in international waters, but their proximity to Okinawa, which hosts a preponderance of U.S. and Japanese military forces, alarmed Tokyo. As a courtesy, navies traditionally announce their routine cruises in advance, particularly when one nation's ships might pass close to another's territory.

Sunday's infraction of that protocol was not the first for China. Just three months prior, two Japanese warships patrolling around Okinawa had discovered an unannounced flotilla of at least 10 Chinese vessels, including two submarines. During the encounter, a Chinese helicopter buzzed one of the Japanese ships, eliciting a formal protest from Tokyo.

These and other recent incidents seem to portray China as a maritime aggressor among nations apparently unprepared to counter any move by Beijing. But Japan, for one, is quietly enhancing military capabilities that themselves pose a serious threat to the fast-growing Chinese navy. Indeed, for all China's rapid naval expansion, the strategic scales in the Pacific still tilt in favor of the U.S. and Japan — and should continue to do so, provided the ruling Democratic Party of Japan maintains Japan's current course.

In the last decade, China has accelerated its production of large warships, aiming to replace hundreds of Cold War-era coastal patrol vessels with ships capable of traveling far from shore for extended periods of time. In addition to scores of destroyers, frigates and amphibious assault ships, China is also modifying the incomplete, former Soviet aircraft carrier Varyag for potential operational use. The DF-21 ballistic anti-ship missile, still in development, and associated targeting satellites round out the Chinese naval modernization.

One of China's goals is to exert influence across the planet. Another is to limit rival nations' abilities to project power into Chinese waters. But Beijing is not alone in pursuing a defensive, "anti-access" strategy. Japan, too, is testing supersonic anti-ship missiles that could sink Chinese surface ships. And the island nation already possesses the world's most sophisticated non-nuclear submarines — a big threat to China's surface and sub-surface forces — and is bolstering its surveillance capabilities.

"You could argue that China is building anti-access capabilities to prevent U.S. forces from 'kicking down the door,' but Japan is doing the same thing regarding China," said Eric Wertheim, an independent naval analyst and author of the popular "Combat Fleets of the World."

Increasingly, the Pacific theater poses dangers to all nations' navies, not just America's or China's. As a result, "we may be entering what may be called the 'post-power projection' era," said Jim Thomas, an analyst at the Washington, D.C.-based Center for a New American Security, at a recent CNAS conference. In coming years, naval strategy could tip the balance of power to the defender. And for all China's fearsome weaponry, this anti-access paradigm probably favors Japan. "It's more inherent in Japanese naval capability to be able to do that," Wertheim told World Politics Review. "They're a much more flexible force, much more ready to go."

The very fact that Japan spotted underway Chinese vessels this week and in April highlights Tokyo's ability to monitor, and thus control, regional waters. By combining submarines, aircraft, satellites and surface ships, Wertheim said, the Japanese navy can track Chinese vessels and provide targeting information for Japan's own weapons or for those of its American ally.

Beyond preparing to deny its own waters to Chinese ships, Japan is also improving its ability to blunt China's own anti-access systems, particularly the much-hyped DF-21 ballistic anti-ship missile.

"The biggest thing that's been on the minds of anyone is Ballistic Missile Defense and U.S. teamwork," Wertheim said. The Japanese navy's new Kongo-class destroyers, among the most powerful warships in Asia, are fitted with radars and missiles for tracking and shooting down ballistic missiles. The Kongos are used in part to defend the Japanese home islands. But "that BMD capability could also be used to protect U.S. Navy aircraft carriers in the event of hostilities," Wertheim pointed out.

While Japanese technology is probably up to the task of balancing a rising China, it's less certain whether Tokyo is willing to formalize and deepen its security ties to the U.S. in a way that facilitates bringing that technology to bear. Last month, Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama resigned amid public furor after caving in to Washington over the preservation of a U.S. Marine base on Okinawa. Hatoyama had initially sought to relocate the base elsewhere. His successor, Prime Minister Naoto Kan, has carefully sidestepped the base issue since taking office. In the event of a crisis resulting from an incident at sea, for instance, that kind of ambiguous security partnership could undermine military coordination between the U.S. and Japan.

Nicholas Szechenyi, an analyst with the Center for Strategic and International Studies based in Washington, D.C., told World Politics Review that Kan's government is moving in the right direction, albeit slowly. "What we are seeing now, rhetorically, is an emphasis on the critical importance of the U.S.-Japan alliance in countering that [Chinese] threat. Any development will be couched in a bilateral context, perhaps through a strategic dialogue in coming months."

Szechenyi said that it would take time before the details emerge. "But the inclination is going to be engaging in more dialogue with U.S.," he added, "and placing the Chinese threat in a bilateral context."

Navy Moving Closer To Taking Submarine Training Into The Virtual World

By Geoff Fein, Defense Daily, July 8, 2010

The Navy has been using virtual worlds to help foster better collaboration and innovation within the undersea fleet.

Those efforts are being incorporated into training of submariners and design of the future fleet, Steve Aguiar, virtual worlds program lead at Naval Undersea Warfare Center Newport, R.I., told Defense Daily recently.

With the advances being made in Web 2.0, modeling and simulation, computer-aided design, and gaming technologies all coming together in a new capability called virtual worlds, and the rise of Linden Labs'

Second Life, Aguiar was told to go and investigate what this capability might be able to provide across undersea warfare mission areas "That led to a lot of potential being identified, which then led to some internal investments to actually explore and apply virtual worlds to specific USW (undersea warfare) mission problems and that's what we have been doing for the last three years," he said.

Today, it is being used by programs on various aspects of the design of the next generation Virginia-class submarine, Aguiar added.

"That is anything from the design level of how the layout should look, to the analysis of how we expect the fleet to perform in that space, and potentially experimentation where we actually put the fleet into virtual attack centers and measure how well they perform in these future configurations," he said.

And virtual worlds are also about to be applied in training.

“We partnered with the Submarine Learning Center to start carefully deploying virtual world training components, first into their study halls and then into their classrooms,” Aguiar said. “We are installing a virtual work infrastructure down there that will be able to [support] not only a single training concept but really house all of the virtual components, a virtual submarine learning center.”

The SLC is using Second Life Enterprise (Second Life hosted behind its firewall) as part of a Virtual study hall embedded within the Fire Control Technicians (FT) curriculum, Thomas Wohlgemuth, submarine learning center chief technology officer, submarine training systems technical warrant holder, told Defense Daily.

“The FTs on board a submarine have the task of taking the data, from multiple external sensors, and creating a picture for the officers of the deck, to direct ship’s movement and action. Through the use of the Second Life, the students can immerse themselves into the information (literally) and visualize the entire Target Motion Analysis

(TMA) problem: signal generation at the source, signal propagation through the medium, reception at own-ship, system processing, graphical display, and display interpretation,” he said.

Currently, the Submarine Learning Center is deploying a demonstration version for initial assessment, Wohlgemuth said.

“We are in the planning stages of deployment and assessment of a full Virtual SLC campus served out from a single secure virtual world that would be accessible in all SLC classrooms. Initial content will include an improved Immersive TMA Virtual Training Module (VTM) but it will quickly evolve to include other training components such as scenario gaming and SME access,” he added. “There exist three important immediate steps in the adoption of virtual worlds to support our first Immersive TMA Virtual Training Module:

- * Integrate stand-alone study hall capability into classroom setting on Tranet-c;
- * Work with NUWC to complete the virtual Immersive TMA Module capability by: Expanding scenario sets to N (N= some number) and
 - * Improved guidance material via intelligent bots that walk the student through the TMA concepts; and
 - * Assess the performance and actual benefits of deployed virtual world training capabilities so that further curriculum insertion and
 - * future investment can be more effective.

But while the Submarine Learning Center is exploring how virtual worlds could benefit training, the virtual worlds program at NUWC is still facing challenges as they continue to investigate this new technology.

“Some of the challenges we are facing as part of that process are, it’s a very new technology, it’s rapidly evolving, and there are a lot of vendors out there,” Aguiar noted.

“So understanding the maturity, strengths and weaknesses of virtual worlds is kind of a continuous process,” he added. “It’s a running target as we try to match which ones best fit some very specific hard tactical problems.”

For the last 18 months, most of Aguiar’s team’s focus has been on identifying what can be done in virtual worlds that matters to the military. Things that include:

- * Collaborative engineering for future command and control designs of submarines;
- * Visualization and analysis of command information;
- * Concepts of operations experiments;
- * Tactical training scenarios;
- * Dry runs of platform integration;
- * Theater simulation;
- * Cognitive modeling; and
- * Fleet reach back. “As we explore what we can do with virtual worlds, the list isn’t getting smaller, it is getting much much bigger,” he said. “And if you think of what the end state of this technology is when you have fleet fidelity, complete access, all of the virtual and real tools inside of one of these environments, it starts to approach [the idea of] ‘there’s nothing you can’t do in a virtual world.’”

NUWC is using multiple vendors, but the focus is not on the individual technology or vendor but the capabilities that virtual worlds generically provide, Aguiar said.

Currently, NUWC is using Second Life, in the public domain, Second Life enterprise which is their software behind the firewall, OpenSimulator which is an open source equivalent of Second Life, and Teleplace “Those are the four we actively use at this moment,” Aguiar said.

“We are investigating at least five other virtual worlds in-house because of some recent new capabilities and changes and we may move our tool set around a little bit.”

U.S. Deploys ‘New’ Submarines As A Message To China

By Jonathan Manthorpe, Vancouver Sun, July 9, 2010

America’s Ohio-class ballistic missile submarines and their Russian counterparts, the Typhoon class, are the perfect embodiments of the doctrine of mutually assured destruction.

They have no purpose but to lie unseen and undetectable on the seabed to assure any potential enemy, that should he launch a first strike, devastating retribution will soon be on its way from the 14 Ohios, each armed with 24 intercontinental missiles and with each of those missiles carrying five warheads capable of being directed to individual targets.

That’s 1,680 nuclear warheads.

No wonder then that as China rapidly expands its high seas fleet and its capacity to project Beijing’s power and influence around the world, it too has acquired the security of ballistic missile submarines to deter anyone who might consider a first-strike bid to halt its ambitions.

The People’s Liberation Army Navy’s first attempt in the 1980s at a ballistic missile submarine, usually known as SSBNs or, more colloquially, “boomers,” was a pretty crude piece of backyard engineering, which grafted a container for 12 missiles on to a regular nuclear-powered attack submarine.

Attempts to fire the missiles from underwater had a mixed record of success.

In the last 10 years, though, China has been building the much more sophisticated Type 092 SSBNs. The Pentagon believes China's immediate plans are to build five of these submarines, each of which carries 16 missiles with a range of 8,000 kilometres and is capable of hitting about three-quarters of the United States while submerged in Chinese coastal waters.

But although highly sophisticated in their detail, the Ohios, the Type 092s and the Typhoons are blunt instruments only capable of delivering massive and indiscriminate devastation. They are not adaptable. They do not give a military commander options in how to use them. It's press the red button or nothing.

But in the last eight years the U.S. Navy, at a cost of about \$4 billion, has been remodelling four of the Ohio-class boomers that were slated for retirement. These huge vessels, each 170 metres long, 13 metres in beam and with crews of more than 150 sailors, are re-emerging as entirely different and highly adaptable weapons known as SSGNs, offering American military commanders the kind of options SSBNs never did.

Instead of the 24 Trident intercontinental ballistic missiles in their two-metre-wide launching tubes, these four submarines now each carry 154 Tomahawk cruise missiles, usually armed with conventional explosive warheads and very accurate. The saved space allows the boats to carry any one or a combination of military hardware, including up to 100 special forces troops.

The armaments on each of these submarines is equivalent to what would normally be deployed in an American aircraft carrier battle group, the highly visible symbol of Washington's continuing capacity to project power anywhere in the world.

But these four SSGN submarines, the Ohio, Michigan, Florida and Georgia, can be thought of as invisible aircraft carrier battle groups and they take the capacities of submarine warfare into areas that have been explored with only limited aims and success in the past.

Late last month all four of the submarines were deployed at sea for the first time, three of them in Asia.

U.S. officials deny this carries a message for Beijing, whose increasingly aggressive and assertive use of its navy in the region has embarrassed Washington and raised questions in neighbouring countries about China's super-power intentions.

Indeed, American allies in Asia have been urging Washington to give Beijing pause for thought.

So on June 28 the three submarines all announced their presence. The USS Michigan was at the South Korean port of Pusan, the USS Ohio was in Subic Bay in the Philippines and USS Florida appeared at the British-American base at Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

There was no coincidence in the timing either. It meshed with the "RimPac" war games held off Hawaii every two years and this year involving over three dozen warships from 14 countries: the U.S., Australia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, France, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, the Netherlands, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and Peru.

And in Southeast Asia was another U.S.-led maritime exercise involving 73 warships from Singapore, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Brunei, Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines.

Run Wired, Run Deep: Subs May Finally Get Online

By Olivia Koski, Wired Magazine, July 8, 2010

A nuclear submarine in deep dive may be the last place on Earth where it's impossible to get a phone call, a text message or the day's dose of spam. But all that may soon be over, if a Lockheed-led program works out as planned.

The subs glide quietly along the depths of the ocean for weeks at a time, isolated from communication with surface dwellers save arcane one-way messages delivered at very low bit rates by Extremely Low Frequency (3-3000 Hz) or Very Low Frequency transmissions (3000-30,000 Hz). In order for subs to respond, or if communication beyond slow alphanumeric is required, they must come up for air or stick an antenna above the water.

"Most people think our submarines ... can make phone calls whenever they want at a moment's notice ... but our subs do not have that luxury," says Rod Reints, the man in charge of a Lockheed Martin-led program to bring submarine communications into the 21st century.

At the center of Communications at Speed and Depth program is new technology that could enable stealth submarines to be as connected to the Defense Department's Global Information Grid as any Navy ship. Within a few years, all U.S. Navy subs will be equipped with expendable high-tech communications buoys that will allow two-way real-time chat, data transfer and e-mail.

It seems so much simpler than other attempts at connection with underwater vessels.

Until a few years ago, mind-bogglingly large (as in 52 miles long) ELF and VLF antennas were the state-of-the-art in stealth submarine communication. At such low frequencies, the earth itself must be recruited to generate the signals, which is why subs can only receive, and not send them. The resulting antennas are tens of miles long and generate complaints from neighbors paranoid about possible electromagnetic health effects. There are only a handful of ELF transmitters in the entire world, two in the United States: one in Michigan and one in Wisconsin.

Then, there's the High Frequency Active Auroral Research Program, which tested out ways to use the upper atmosphere as an antenna replacement. The Alaskan array can excite the earth's ionosphere with high-frequency radio waves, inducing it to emit the extremely low-frequency bands needed to covertly penetrate saltwater.

Recent underwater-comm research has transitioned to higher frequency bands in more compact packages (compared to tens of miles, that's not difficult). Qinetiq's Seadeep will enable two-way communication with U.S. subs using airborne blue-green lasers. Raytheon's Deep Siren is a program of expendable pager buoys that can relay messages from satellites to submarines acoustically, but it can only transmit one way.

Comms at Speed and Depth will be the first two-way underwater communication system for submarines. The exact depth at which subs will be able to deploy the buoys is classified, but Reints asserts that the length of the buoy cables is "measured in miles, and it's long enough to allow the submarine to launch at significant depth and continue at normal operational speeds during a mission."

Three buoys are in development by Lockheed Martin and two subcontractors, Ultra Electronics Ocean Systems and Erapsco. Two of them are tethered to the sub and communicate with it using fiber optic cable. One is equipped for communication with the Iridium

satellite constellation, the other for UHF. The third is a freewheeling acoustic-to-RF buoy. It can be dropped out of an aircraft or even launched out of a sub's trash shoot.

The buoy batteries for the tethered systems last for up to 30 minutes. Once it loses power, the buoy scuttles itself. The untethered buoys are designed to be deployed for three days.

Phone calls are technically possible with the new system. Reints says that although his team made an Iridium test call last April, "voice is not the intended purpose right now."

The first buoys are supposed to be delivered to the Navy for operational testing by January 2011. All of this underwater communicativeness might just take the thrill out of boomer movies. What kind of drama will stoke the next *Crimson Tide* if the captain and XO get crystal clear instructions from D.C. that they can verify real-time?

New Buoys Lets Submarines Join Military Data Network

By Stuart Fox, TechNewsDaily, July 8, 2010

In the bad old days of the Cold War, submarines had to rise dangerously close to the surface to send and receive messages. And in the 20 years since the collapse of the Soviet Union, that hasn't changed. Now, new communication buoys from Lockheed Martin may finally give submarines the ability to communicate back and forth with HQ while remaining safely, silently, beneath the waves.

The buoys, which can be launched from the submarine itself or dropped into the vicinity by a plane, serve as relay hubs for the communications of the sub. While the exact bandwidth is classified, we do know that they allow the sub commander to send and receive text messages.

Using current technology, communicating with a sub in that manner remains prohibitively difficult.

"Currently, they have to go up to near periscope depth to communicate," said Rod Reints, a senior program manager at Lockheed Martin. "They become more vulnerable to attack as they get closer to the surface. Ultimately, we're trying to increase the communication availability of the sailors while increasing their safety."

When launched from the submarine, the 40-inch long buoys eject out of the ship's garbage disposal chutes. They remain attached to the sub via miles-long cables, which transmit the signal to and from the vessel. When the sub finishes communicating, it cuts the buoys loose, leaving them to drift harmless amongst the sea.

Subs can also communicate with buoys dropped by planes using a specialized acoustic messaging system. Like sonar, the system uses sound waves to transmit the data.

Importantly, the ability to send and receive text messages in real time finally integrates the submarine service into the rest of the armed forces, said John Pike, director of Globalsecurity.org.

Over the last 10 years, the U.S. military has moved to digitally link together every element on the battlefield, and thanks to these buoys, submarines can now join that network.

"During the Cold War, it didn't require much bandwidth to send a message to destroy the Soviet Union," Pike said. "But in a tactically complex environment, with complex orders, they don't have the bandwidth right now. So anything that increases that data rate could be interesting."

The Big Stick

The United States May Talk Softly In Diplomatic Exchanges With China But The Message Delivered By Its Asia-Pacific Submarine Fleet Is One Of Power

South China Morning Post Magazine, July 4, 2010

The sea makes a low, rising whooosshhh sound as the submarine accelerates, crossing from the shallows of the reef into the luminous midnight blue of the Pacific. As the boat surges forward, its bow throws out a bulging wave that sends water hissing across the hull before it cascades into a vast, tumbling wake. "Feel that speed?" says Commander Richard Seif, with a satisfied grin, as he stands atop the flying bridge of the USS Buffalo, an American fast-attack submarine.

Being perched on top of the narrow bridge feels a bit like riding a giant surfboard as the submarine's brutal contact with the ocean vibrates beneath one's feet.

"That speed and the sustainability of that speed is one of the keys to understanding a nuclear submarine like the Buffalo," Seif says. "With a conventional ship, you're always worried about how much fuel you're using. With us, we just go fast ... and keep going. We can get quickly to anywhere in the western Pacific."

As the mountains of Guam recede beyond the stern, Seif and his officers scan the horizon with binoculars. There is little to see except ocean but the tranquility beneath the surface could soon change. China is expanding its operations in the Asia-Pacific region and Beijing is expected to have more submarines than the Americans within a few years.

China's navy began a major military exercise in the East China Sea on Wednesday. Experts say the operation is designed, in part, to balance a United States- South Korea exercise in the nearby Yellow Sea, which will include submarines and, reportedly, a nuclear-powered US aircraft carrier.

To the south, on Hainan Island, a new submarine base at Sanya will hold the bulk of China's 70-odd submarines, including its giant nuclear-armed ballistic-missile vessels. The People's Liberation Army (PLA) is expected to launch five ballistic submarines over the next 18 months, to be based in underground holding pens on Hainan, which is only a few days sailing from Guam – in late 2004, a PLA Navy Han-class fast-attack submarine surfaced off the island. Reports suggest it was easily followed but the PLA's new vessels are expected to be much more elusive. The Buffalo is one of three Los Angeles-class submarines stationed in Guam and they are the leading edge of a highly strategic build-up to ensure continued US military supremacy in the Asia-Pacific region and which is, in part, a hedge against China's expansion.

Key to the projection of US power during the second world war and the Vietnam war, Guam is once again proving important – this time as the closest sliver of American territory to the Chinese coast. Located east of Manila, in a lonely corner of the Pacific and on the edge of the deepest waters on Earth, the island is about a four-hour flight from Hong Kong.

As one senior US defence official put it recently: “If Guam didn’t exist, someone in the Pentagon would be trying to invent it ... it is that important to our strategic thinking.”

The US has more forces in each of South Korea and Japan but Guam has been US territory since 1898 and so is free from the sensitivities that prove restrictive on foreign soil. Guam plays a key role in supporting other submarines in the western Pacific. The USS Frank Cable, one of only two US naval submarine tenders, is permanently based in Guam, allowing for extended deployments from the island.

For several years, Pentagon policy papers have been steeped in the need for a “forward deterrence” in Asia;

Guam being the base from which potential aggressors can be dissuaded while old allies and newer friends can be reassured. With their inherent stealth and fearsome weapons systems, submarines represent the most sensitive and daring part of that effort; a characteristic recognised by other East Asian nations – from Australia to Vietnam, regional militaries have been following

China’s example by expanding their fleets.

Guam’s strategic history hangs heavily as Seif’s crew guide the Buffalo through the coral heads in the island’s Apra Harbour. The submarine glides past Vietnam war-era facilities – Nissen-style huts and, beyond, miniature 1960s-style homes that were part of an attempt to recreate suburban California for coldwar soldiers within striking distance of Hanoi. At one time, some 155 B-52 bombers were stationed on Guam.

Closer to the shore are the rusting ruins of wharves built by the Japanese during its bloody occupation in the second world war. US forces would recapture Guam amid heavy fighting, using the island as a base to take the fight to Japan itself.

Then there are the remains of the landing point for the Pan Am Clipper flying boats that, in the 30s, linked San Francisco and Canton (Guangzhou) via stops that included Manila and Hong Kong.

Their eyes on the horizon, Seif and his crew have their minds fixed on the present, and the future.

Thirty of the US’ 53 fast-attack submarines patrol the waters of Asia-Pacific – most are based on the US West Coast and in Hawaii – and just a few months into his first command, Seif is acutely aware the Buffalo is what he describes as “the tip of the spear”.

“When you are forward there’s a heightened sense about everything you do,” he says. “It’s not just about developing and maintaining the skills of all on board, as well as maintaining the ship, but being constantly ready to execute missions at a moment’s notice. There is something very special about being forward.

“That means you must think constantly about exploiting the speed, stealth, endurance and flexibility of your ship when required.”

Those missions range from being able to track and attack ships and submarines and protect sea lanes to firing at land targets and intelligence gathering, undertaken through an array of on-board sensors.

A Los Angeles-class submarine is armed with advanced torpedoes, Tomahawk land-attack cruise missiles and mines. It can launch Navy Seals on covert operations from a dry shelter on its stern.

Launched in 1982, the Buffalo is itself a cold-war relic but, like other forward-deployed submarines, it has been regularly refitted and retooled and is considered one of the most advanced boats of any navy.

Seif is unable to talk about specific operations or nations of interest. When asked about China, he says he would prefer “not to single out any specific country”.

“Obviously there are challenges in the western Pacific and that’s why we are here,” he says.

Talk to other military officials, scholars and retired submariners and it’s clear China and North Korea would be of particular interest to the crew of a submarine such as the Buffalo, and intelligence-related operations are a vital part of their work.

This might involve getting close enough to the coast of a rival country to tap cables or listen to communications on land-based sites, or monitor its naval operations.

The submarine base at Sanya would be an obvious site of interest. Being able to identify and

track submarines as they are deployed, learning their individual creaks and noises, is considered crucial.

“A lot of it can be explained as us watching them trying to watch us,” says one veteran submariner. “That involves targets at both land and sea ... and the advantage of a submarine is you can get very, very close.”

Then there is the more routine reconnaissance of areas of the ocean where combat could one day take place. To operate at peak effectiveness, submarines need extensive information on currents, temperatures and the make-up of the sea bed. A submarine’s stealth can be affected by sudden changes in water temperature, for example; currents, thermoclines (temperature layers) and surface activity all affect the way sonar waves travel through water, making it easier or harder for the enemy to locate a submerged vessel.

Antisubmarine exercises are said to be common, ensuring a crew is skilled in co-operating with ships and aircraft. Once at depth and trying to remain hidden, it’s easier for submarines to receive communications than to send them, although ways do exist on ultra-low frequencies. Closer to the surface, routine communications such as e-mails are sent in occasional brief bursts. Given the blanket of operational silence, a key part of such exercises is ensuring a friendly submarine is not mistaken for an enemy target.

If Seif’s role as a barb on the tip of America’s spear prevents him from describing active operations, he’s far more comfortable talking about the challenges of life on board.

“Welcome to my stateroom,” he says.

We’ve clambered down the ladders and hatches through the boat’s superstructure, known as the sail, to the operations and living area of the vessel, home for its 150 personnel. The “stateroom” serves as his cabin, briefing room and rest area. Like a cramped berth in a railway sleeping compartment, it’s a triumph of light wood-veneer cladding and pull-down ingenuity. The bed is hidden in the wall. He shares a toilet and shower with his executive officer, who has the adjoining cabin. The veneer extends along spacious corridors into other living areas. The officers share three-bunk quarters and adjoining bathrooms while the 131 enlisted men are in dormitory-style bunk racks with communal facilities.

The bunks lift to reveal private lockers and the only space for quiet study or reflection is the narrow, curtained confines of the bunk itself. Bunks also appear amid the steel and brass of the torpedo bay and “hot racking” – junior crew having to share bunks; one sleeping while another is on watch – still takes place. They have their own pillow cases and sheets, however.

The lack of privacy has long been stated as a reason for keeping submarines a male-only environment, despite women serving on US Navy vessels since 1993.

That policy is changing, with women now being recruited for submarine training and due to start serving on board next year.

Moving around the submarine, three things become apparent. Firstly, the boat is an intriguing amalgam of old and new technology. While it features state-of-the-art military sensors and radars, the ship is filled with brass and steel fittings, from old-style telephone couplings to gauges.

“That old stuff is pretty solid,” one sailor says. “We keep a close watch on it but, if it ain’t broke, we don’t replace it.”

The second is the importance of duplication – whether it be of commands, equipment or the diverse skills and tasks of an individual crew member. As the submarine left port, its weapons officer was taking charge of the flying bridge, teaching other officers how to navigate by line of sight. Commands were constantly repeated and relayed. Electronic navigation was constantly backed up by manual dead reckoning; no single gauge – digital or analogue – is relied upon to assess the depth of water beneath the hull.

Although Seif may have received a message via intercom or internal telephone, a young crewman will appear to repeat it in person: “The officer of the deck sends his regards. He wishes to inform you that ...”

Even the submarine’s nuclear reactor has a backup, albeit in the form of much older technology: a green and yellow diesel engine designed in 1938 that is the pride of the engineers. It can provide limited propulsion and, in an emergency, can become the boat’s lungs – driving the electrolysis machines that produce a steady flow of oxygen and powering the scrubbers that remove toxins, such as carbon monoxide, from the air.

The third factor is a clear tight camaraderie. There’s an easy fluidity to the way the sailors move past each other, banter and give and receive commands.

“You’ve got to like submarines to be here,” Lieutenant Cameron Aljilani says. “I guess that helps the camaraderie ... and submarines are special like that.”

The places in which these three factors most obviously come together are the officers’ ward room and enlisted men’s mess. On large ships, messes can be soulless places with bland buffet fare.

Not so beneath the waves. Food is a point of pride and a constant source of discussion on a submarine.

The dining rooms are cramped but cosy. The one used by the crew feels like a 50s diner, booths and glass-topped tables flanked by an open kitchen preparing fresh food, with a large griddle and steaming cups of coffee.

The officers call their dining room the “Bison Sports Bistro” and it comes complete with sports and naval memorabilia among the ubiquitous gauges, dials and phones, in a nod to the submarine’s namesake, the sports-mad city of Buffalo, in upstate New York.

“If there’s something going on with the food, you hear about it pretty quickly,” Seif says. “On a submarine, the challenge is keeping people on their toes and sharp for long periods ... and food is at the heart of that.”

Submariners spend weeks and even months beneath the sea during “underways” – missions that, out of Guam, often run for two to three months; double that from West Coast ports. There’s no set schedule for when a submarine will surface and, when they do, there’s no guarantee that all on board will see daylight.

The goal, therefore, is to provide varied and interesting food that covers all nutritional bases – and plenty of it. A printed menu card for Saturday lunch in the “bistro” reveals a four-course feast – salad, chowder, teriyaki steak, breaded shrimp, rice, carrots, corn, Florida lemon pie and ice cream, accompanied by oven-fresh bread rolls.

Vitamin supplements are not mandatory but some sailors take them. Sunlight is an important source of vitamin D but it’s also found in milk and egg yolk.

“We like to pick up fresh food where possible, either from a port or a ship,” Seif says. “When you run out and are on the canned stuff for a while, it does hit the mood ... and the guys let you know.”

That said, the submarine, which produces its own fresh air and clean water, has operated for 83 days without restocking supplies.

Regularity plays a role in fostering morale, as well.

“Without fail, everyone looks forward to pizza night [each Saturday],” Seif says.

While submarines operate around-the-clock, seven days a week at sea, duties are a little lighter on Sundays.

Exercise, too, is important. Pull-up bars and other pieces of equipment are dotted around the vessel.

“It would be nice to have more but there is just not the space,” Seif says. “In many respects in this job I find myself as a father figure ... worrying a lot about whether the guys are eating right or getting enough exercise, looking after themselves.”

In Seif’s stateroom, the issue of sharpness is raised again as he talks with Master Chief Petty Officer Vance Mckinsey, his chief of the boat, also known as the COB.

“We talk about it all the time,” Mckinsey says. “It’s not just about getting skills to a certain level, but keeping them at an edge over time. On a submarine you learn that skills are perishable ... you have to keep working at them.”

To an outsider, that sharpness is most visible in the control room – the cramped operational heart of a submarine that’s inspired scenes in dozens of films, from

The Hunt for Red October, starring Sean Connery, to Clark Gable’s Run Silent, Run Deep.

The Buffalo is preparing to dive and the room is filling with hands. Radar operators and navigators are making final checks. Procedural folders are out and steps are audibly checked and rechecked, ensuring the decks are cleared and hatches secured. The officer of the deck is at the periscope. Its bright, digitally enhanced optics provide a detailed view of the surrounding sea and sky.

After the command is checked and confirmed, a siren sounds twice and the drawn-out call of “Dive, dive” fills the room. The tension builds and the vessel tilts slightly. The eyes of crew and officers are on a bank of monitors, flicking constantly between an array of gauges and screens, from depth and pressure to the angle of the planes, the large, horizontal fins at the stern and on the sail.

Faster submerged than on the surface, a Los Angeles-class submarine is capable of speeds beyond 25 knots and can plumb depths of more than 800 feet.

The precise figures remain secret.

Once submerged, there is little easing in the intensity of the crew on watch. Even during routine exercises close to home, such as today’s, gauges and logs across the vessel are checked as the men move about. In one corridor are gauges displaying air-quality readings, logging a range of toxins.

“That’s the thing about a submarine ... you can never afford to forget that you’re underwater, no matter how long you’ve been under,” Seif says.

A few hours later the Buffalo is near the surface again. The sharp afternoon light of the tropical Pacific is visible through the periscope. It is heading home to Naval Base Guam.

For all the history on show as it re-enters Apra Harbour, the future is apparent, too. The RSS Supreme, one of Singapore's new stealth frigates, is at the wharf across the bay. The Buffalo sailors mention, with impressed chuckles, that its huge pyramid-like radar started revolving as they left port.

As facilities on Guam expand, allied and friendly militaries are expected to visit more frequently, reflecting policies geared to fostering integration and co-operation. As well as new submarine facilities, including a simulator, there will be an aircraft carrier wharf and plans are being finalised for the relocation to the base of about 8,000 marines and their families from the Japanese island of Okinawa.

They will be accompanied by fast-response and amphibious vessels.

At Guam's Andersen Air Force Base, tens of millions of dollars have been spent on upgrading the vast runways. A strategic bomber presence – the closest to East Asia – of B-52s and B-2s is backed by a fleet of giant tankers and F-22 Raptors. The biggest hangar outside the US has just been completed for the arrival of three Global Hawk unmanned reconnaissance planes, in a few months time.

Both bases are supported by some of the US military's largest off-shore communications facilities and firing ranges on islands nearby.

In all, about US\$40 billion is being spent to create a robust forward presence for decades to come.

For the sailors returning to port, however, thoughts are turning to the simple pleasures of a few precious hours with their families and/or a night out off base before an expected lengthy mission begins in a few days.

For all the uniqueness of their working life, the submariners' Guam has a marked hometown

USA feel to it, despite the dominance of the native Chamorro people and Filipinos across its 150,000 population. The base is like a suburb, complete with bowling alleys and fast-food outlets. Beyond that, and apart from the glitz of the Tumon beach strip, popular with Japanese tourists, Guam could be backstreet New Jersey or Alabama, aside from the flame trees and frangipani, that is. The Kmart supermarket is considered a landmark.

Nestled in among the low-rise strip malls, chain restaurants and used-car lots is a large unremarkable building called the Horse and Cow. It is the submariners' tavern, for some the first port of call to mark the end of a long, dry voyage.

Filled with hundreds of submarine pictures and mementos, the Horse and Cow was once situated in San Diego – a major port for cold-war submariners engaged in hunting Soviet foe. A few years ago, its owners shifted it to Guam. And now they're considering expanding the premises.

Some 3,000 kilometres away, another homeaway-from-home for submariners is being created.

Hainan Island is the only part of the Chinese coast that gives deep-water access to the South China Sea, a crucial maritime outlet to both the Pacific and Indian oceans.

They may not be the best of friends but Chinese and US submariners will increasingly share the same western Pacific waters. Already, Chinese naval patrols – including submarines – are moving beyond Japan and east of the Philippines.

How these two silent forces interact across the wider region in the years to come is likely to be one of the great strategic issues of our time.

Boulava Russian Ballistic Missile Falls Under The Blows Of New START Treaty

World Aeronautical Press Agency, July 9, 2010

A shower cold as the weather in the Country: one of the flagships of the Russian defense, ballistic missile naval Boulava, fell under the blows of the new amendment to the strategic arms reduction treaty, the new Russian-American START because of his test made by a submarine. To disclose, agency "RIA Novosti" reporting the announcement made yesterday by deputy head of the Russian defence staff general Alexander Bouroutine. He, in recent days, had said in front of the Duma (lower house of parliament), the country would not give up the program to launch ballistic missiles by 2020, providing for ten a year (see news about AVIONEWS).

"This is common international practice: all missiles launched from a strategic submarine fall under the weight of the system of checks and inspections", explained Bouroutine to Duma.

All these launches were made from the nuclear submarine "Dmitry Donskoy" class Akoula - or Typhoon, in NATO code. Russian classification for this type of vessel is Rpkns (Raketyny Podvodnyy Strategicheskogo Nazhacheniya, ballistic missile ship). But Russia also has nuclear missile submarines of the fourth generation, "Iouri Dolgorouki" type (project 995, class Borej), for its Boulava.

The Russian naval ballistic missile RSM-56 Boulava (NATO reporting name SS-NX-30 Mace) is the latest sub-launched type weapon now in circulation. Directly derived from terrestrial SS-27 ballistic missile, is expected to embark on submarine class Borej. For now it has been tested on a Typhoon class submarine, the Dmitry Donskoy precisely.

A three-stage solid propellant, Boulava has a range of 8000 km. It can be equipped with ten independent trajectory hypersonic nuclear warheads of 100-150 kilotons. Between October 2005 and December 2009, Russia has conducted 12 tests on this missile, but only five of these were successful.

The Treaty Start

The START II treaty was signed January 3, 1993 between US President Bush and Russian Yeltsin. With it, was banned use of MIRV (multiple system operators and the launch of warheads). First ratified in January 1996 by the US Senate, the treaty has been pending at Russian Duma for years, ratification was postponed several times in protest against US military interventions in Iraq and Kosovo, and against NATO expansion in Eastern Europe. Over time, parties lost interest in the Treaty, the United States began to press for an amendment to the ABM treaty, in order to develop anti-missile technology (see the well-known "Space shield), changes that met the decisive rejection of Russia, which saw the shield as a threat to the country.

On April 14, 2000 Moscow finally ratified by linking to ABM treaty untouchability. START II was officially passed by SORT Treaty, signed by Presidents George W. Bush and Vladimir Putin in May 24, 2002, by which the parties abandon the logic of previous treaties

- or their accuracy limitations on the number of specific weapons - and instead undertake both of their states to an independent unilateral reduction of the total number of warheads.

New Start

The New START (for Strategic Arms Reduction treaty, Russian: I¹-III) is the new bilateral treaty between the US and Russia on nuclear disarmament, signed in Prague this year. Following the START I, which expired in December 2009, START II and the Treaty of Moscow, expiring in December 2012. This new agreement was announced by US President Barack Obama and by Russian President Dmitry Medvedev, 26 March 2010 and was then signed April 8, 2010 in Prague by the same presidents.

After Limited Testing, Dot&E Calls E-IBct Reliability Goals 'Not Achievable'

By Jason Sherman, Inside Defense, July 12, 2010

Two major Army acquisition efforts — the Early Infantry Brigade Increment I and Warfighter Information Network-Tactical — were singled out by the Pentagon's top weapons tester last month for significant reliability shortfalls as part of an effort to underscore wider reliability difficulties he said were "pervasive across all services and all types of systems."

On June 30, Micheal Gilmore, director of operational test and evaluation, sent a memo to Pentagon acquisition executive Ashton Carter highlighting difficulties many major defense acquisition programs have experienced trying to develop weapon systems that are operationally suitable and operational effective — designations that require a program to meet planned reliability rates (DefenseAlert, July 7).

As an attachment to the memo, Gilmore provided examples of specific system reliability problems with major procurements, including the Virginia-class submarine program, the Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile program, the Amphibious Transport Dock LPD-18 program as well as Army programs.

On E-IBCT, it states, "We cite this example first because, of all the services, the Army has the most intense focus on reliability. Yet, even Army systems have serious reliability problems, and those problems span across system components.

"Bottom line: reliability desired for E-IBCT Increment 1 systems is not achievable without an extensive design for reliability effort," the memo warns.

Last summer the Army conducted the E-IBCT Increment 1 limited user test, and in February the service completed a two-month limited user test of the Non-Line-of-Sight Launch System (NLOS-NS), a key component of the E-IBCT Increment 1 effort the Army later terminated.

During these tests, the "demonstrated operational reliability for each of the systems fell significantly below the user threshold requirements," the attachment to Gilmore's memo states.

During the NLOS-LS user test, conducted in January and February, six missiles were fired, two of which hit their targets. Of the four that missed, two were particularly off, impacting 14 kilometers short of their targets, according to the DOT&E document.

The attachment also lists the results of recent testing of the Army's WIN-T system.

"Testing in June 2010: Mean Time Between Essential Failure (MTBEFF) did not meet requirements, due to many reliability issues," according to the attachment to Gilmore's memo.

Cited in the document are a handful of WIN-T supporting systems that did not meet required MTBEFF thresholds, including the Tactical Communications Node, which fell short of the 900-hour requirement, demonstrating 196 hours; Point of Presence, which demonstrated 134 hours, falling short of a 900-hour requirement; the Solider Network Extension, which has a 300-hour requirement, demonstrated 60 hours; and the Network Operations Security Center demonstrated 438 hours, falling short of a 900-hour requirement.

Other key components of the E-IBCT procurement also had difficulty during testing.

The Class I Block 0 unmanned aerial system — required to operate for 23 hours between system abort — demonstrated a rate of 1.5 hours, less than one-tenth the requirement. "It would require 129 spare UAS to provide sufficient number to support the brigade's operations, which is clearly infeasible," Gilmore wrote in the memo to Carter, underscoring the complication such reliability problems poses.

The Small Unmanned Ground Vehicle Block 1 "demonstrated 5.2 mean time between system abort versus 42 hour requirement," states the attachment.

Similarly, the Urban Unattended Ground Sensor (U-UGS) fell short of the 105-hour requirement for mean time between system abort, demonstrating only 25 hours, according to DOT&E. This result was an even tinier fraction of what the "Army supplier had predicted," according to DOT&E: 4,187 hours between system abort. Textron Defense Systems is building the U-UGS for the Army. The U-UGS must be capable of detecting a person in motion within 15 meters of the sensor, and of providing an alert to the operator in less than two seconds when an object enters the sensor area under nominal conditions, according to a Pentagon document.

The Tactical Unattended Ground Sensor had results that were slight better, but still far from the Army's reliability goals. T-UGS must be capable of classifying wheeled and tracked vehicles at 350 meters and detecting dismounted personnel at 50 meters, according to a Pentagon document that summarizes the threshold capability requirement for T-UGS. During the user test, the T-UGS demonstrated mean time between system abort of 52 hours vs. a 127-hour requirement, according to DOT&E, which notes the equipment supplier had predicted the sensor could operate an average of 1,258 hours before having a problem.

The Submarine Deals That Helped Sink Greece

By CHRISTOPHER RHOADS, Wall Street Journal, July 10, 2010

ATHENS—As Greece slashes spending to avoid default, it hasn't moved to skimp on one area: defense.

The deeply indebted Mediterranean nation, whose financial crisis roiled the global financial system this year, is spending more than a billion euros on two submarines from Germany.

It's also looking to spend big on six frigates and 15 search-and-rescue helicopters from France. In recent years, Greece has bought more than two dozen F16 fighter jets from the U.S. at a cost of more than \$1.5 billion.

Much of the equipment comes from Germany, the country that has had to shoulder most of the burden of bailing out Greece and has been loudest in condemning Athens for living beyond its means. German Chancellor Angela Merkel has admonished the Greek government “to do its homework” on debt reduction.

The military deals illustrate how Germany and other creditors have in some ways benefited from Greece’s profligacy, and how that is coming back to haunt them.

Greece, with a population of just 11 million, is the largest importer of conventional weapons in Europe—and ranks fifth in the world behind China, India, the United Arab Emirates and South Korea. Its military spending is the highest in the European Union as a percentage of gross domestic product. That spending was one of the factors behind Greece’s stratospheric national debt.

The German submarine deal in particular, announced in March as the country lurched toward bankruptcy, has cast a spotlight on the Greek military budget and on the foreign vendors supplying the hardware. The deal includes a total of six subs in a complicated transaction that began a decade ago with German firms.

The arms sales are drawing heat from Turkey, Greece’s neighbor and arch-rival. “Even those countries trying to help Greece at this time of difficulty are offering to sell them new military equipment,” said Egemen Bagis, Turkey’s top European Union negotiator, shortly after the sub deal was announced. “Greece doesn’t need new tanks or missiles or submarines or fighter planes, neither does Turkey.”

Greece’s deputy prime minister, Theodore Pangalos, said during an Athens visit in May by Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan that he felt “forced to buy weapons we do not need,” and that the deals made him feel “national shame.”

Other European officials have charged France and Germany with making their military dealings with Greece a condition of their participation in the country’s huge financial rescue. French and German officials deny the accusations.

A spokesman for German Chancellor Merkel says the submarine transaction was the culmination of an old contract signed long before Greece’s debt crisis. In May, France’s defense ministry said Greek authorities have confirmed their willingness to pursue talks on several arm-procurement deals.

In May, Greece’s economic crimes unit began investigating all weapons deals of the past decade—totaling about •16 billion—to determine if Greece overpaid or bought unnecessary hardware.

German prosecutors are investigating whether millions of euros in bribes were paid to Greek officials in connection with the sub deal. In May, the chief executive of one of the German companies helping to build the submarines, called Ferrostaal AG, resigned amid the probe.

For some prominent Greeks, the latest submarine deal was the last straw. In late April, Stelios Fenekos, a 52-year-old vice admiral of the 22,000-person strong Greek Navy, resigned his position, bringing a three-decade Navy career to an end. He says he did so to protest the Greek defense minister’s decision to purchase the subs, as well as other decisions taken in recent months that Mr. Fenekos considers “politically motivated.”

“How can you say to people we are buying more subs at the same time we want you to cut your salaries and pensions?” says Adm. Fenekos, in his first interview with a reporter. He was referring to the government’s 5% cut in most pensions and even deeper slashes to public-sector wages enacted in response to the crisis. The Greek Navy, he says, cannot afford to maintain the additional submarines. It currently has eight subs.

A spokesman for the Greek Ministry of Defense said Mr. Fenekos’ resignation was accepted. In stepping down, “Mr. Fenekos did not refer to the submarine deal,” he said.

Greece became the first battleground in the Cold War, with the U.S. backing anti-Communists in the Greek civil war in the late-1940s against Communist insurgents. The conflict led U.S. President Harry Truman, in 1947, to pledge unlimited military support for nations under Communist threat, known as the Truman Doctrine.

While the rest of Western Europe used U.S. aid to rebuild its economy from the second World War, in Greece, the emphasis was on building up the military.

“Greece became the front line in the Cold War, and that began, right then and there, the Greek economic crisis of today,” says Andre Gerolymatos, a professor of Hellenic studies at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver.

By the mid-1950s, the U.S. pulled back aid, much of which had been in the form of military hardware, shifting much of the burden for Greek military spending to Athens.

By this time, Greece’s worsening relations with Turkey led to yet more arms spending. Despite being fellow members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the two nations are bitter rivals. The discovery of oil in the northern Aegean Sea and disagreements over territorial waters and airspace became the source of numerous—and expensive—altercations between the two countries.

An incident in 1996, involving a Turkish ship running aground on a rocky, uninhabited Greek islet, almost led to war. Greece later that year announced a 10-year modernization program of its armed services, costing nearly \$17 billion.

The U.S. over the years catered to the two NATO members under a 7:10 ratio, meaning for every \$7 million dollars of equipment it sold to Greece it sold \$10 million to the more populous Turkey.

It was in that environment that Greece in 1998 went shopping for submarines. It decided on three German-built class-214 submarines, a state-of-the-art diesel-electric powered vessel, with the option of buying a fourth—for a total of •1.8 billion. The first was to be built at the Kiel headquarters of Howaldtswerke-Deutsche Werft GmbH, with the others built at the affiliated Hellenic Shipyards SA, in Skaramangas, Greece.

The arrangement, called the Archimedes Program, would preserve thousands of jobs at the Greek shipyard.

Greek officials in 2002 expanded it to include the modernization of three older class-209 submarines—work to be done at the Skaramangas shipyard using materials and help from the Germans. The increase would cost another •985 million.

The German side consisted of a company owned by German truckmaker MAN SE, called Ferrostaal, and Howaldtswerke-Deutsche Werft, now owned by ThyssenKrupp Marine Systems AG. (MAN has since reduced its stake in Ferrostaal to 30%.)

The total cost of the new and renovated subs: •2.84 billion.

As the military expenditures rose, Greece’s two main political parties used them as a political football, each trying to make the budget deficit figures look worse when the other was in charge.

When the Socialist government first bought the submarines, it post-dated the accounting for them to the day when the vessels were to be delivered, rather than when they were purchased.

The government at the time was struggling to meet budget criteria for entry into the euro zone, which it joined a year behind other members in 2001. Pushing back the expenses saddled the bill with the Socialists' successors, the conservative New Democracy party, which came to power in March 2004.

The New Democracy government that year then used a similar tactic, by retroactively accounting for the expenditures on the date of purchase. That inflated the budget deficits of the previous government—while making it easier for the New Democracy government to meet its own deficit goals.

Both accounting methods at the time were allowed by the European Union. The resulting massive deficit revisions made in 2004 for the previous years—4.6% of gross domestic product versus 1.7% for 2003—triggered an investigation in 2004 by Eurostat, the European Union's statistics agency, to understand what caused the revisions. The findings did not result in any sanctions.

Military spending accounted for nearly a quarter of the difference in the 2003 figures, and even more in revisions made on the deficits for preceding years.

After the Socialist party, PASOK, returned to power in October 2009, it made a similar maneuver: It announced the federal deficit was much worse than the outgoing government had let on, mainly due to public hospital debts, setting in motion the financial crisis.

Meanwhile, not one of the subs had been delivered. When Greek officials traveled to Kiel to test the first sub, called the Papanikolis, they said that they found that in certain sea conditions the submarine listed to the right. "The Navy said we cannot accept this sub," said Mr. Fenekos, the admiral who recently resigned. "But the politicians did not want to stop it because they needed the production for the workers in the shipyard here."

ThyssenKrupp Marine Systems said the criticism was baseless and was made to delay payment.

By last fall, Greece had paid •2.032 billion, about 70% of the total owed. With the deal at an impasse, the German companies cancelled the contract.

Finally, in March, the two sides announced they had begun negotiating a new deal. Instead of having three older subs modernized, just one would be modernized, and Greece would buy two additional new ones, bringing the total to six new submarines—costing a total of •1.3 billion.

Abu Dhabi MAR LLC, a shipbuilding company in Abu Dhabi, would buy 75.1% of the Greek shipyard, with the expanded submarine deal a condition of the sale. The Greek government finally accepted the sub, with the understanding it would immediately resell it. No deal has been finalized.

Greece's defense minister, Evangelos Venizelos, speaking to the Greek parliament in March, explained that the deal was an attempt to end the mess, to "sever the Gordian knot" that the new government had inherited.

With 1,200 shipyard jobs at stake, Germany demanding concessions on the complex deal, and Greece having already paid two billion euros without receiving a single sub, the new arrangement was necessary, he said.

But in February, just as a solution appeared to be at hand, German prosecutors in Munich began turning up evidence of unsavory dealings, according to records of their investigation.

Ferrostaal executives authorized payments worth millions of euros to politicians to win the initial deal in 2000, through a Greek company called Marine Industrial Enterprises, according to the Munich prosecutor's records.

To do this, Ferrostaal used sham consulting contracts, according to the records. That company then distributed payments to "officials and decision-makers" in Greece, according to the records. The investigation is ongoing. No charges have been filed.

Adamos Seraphides, chairman of MIE Group Limited, a successor company to a division of Marine Industrial Enterprises, said he doesn't believe that the company's prior leadership was involved in bribery.

In March, police searched Ferrostaal offices, in Essen, seeking evidence of bribe payments. In May, several executives stepped down.

"Ferrostaal will continue to pursue the intensive dialogue with the state prosecutor's office in Munich and has pledged full and comprehensive support and cooperation," says a Ferrostaal spokesman.

A ThyssenKrupp spokesperson says the company got into the business only in 2005, when it bought Howaldtswerke-Deutsche Werft.

Despite the tortuous, decade-long journey of the submarine deal—and Greece's precarious financial standing—Germany stands ready for more business.

Guido Westerwelle, the German foreign minister, in February told a Greek newspaper that Germany doesn't want to force Greece to buy anything.

But "whenever it comes to the point when it's ready to buy fighter planes," a European fighter-plane consortium, which Germany represents in Greece, "wants to be considered in the decision."

A spokesman for Mr. Westerwelle says the minister didn't discuss fighter sales with the Greek government during the visit.

The Drums of War? Pentagon Provokes New Crisis With China *[An Example of Marxist Propaganda, Mike Hyman, Ed.]*

By Rick Rozoff, Global Research, July 10, 2010

Three news features appearing earlier this week highlight tensions between the United States and the People's Republic of China that, at least in relation to the language used to describe them, would have seemed unimaginable even a few months ago and are evocative more of the Korean War era than of any time since the entente cordiale initiated by the Richard Nixon-Mao Zedong meeting in Beijing in 1972.

To indicate the seriousness of the matter, the stories are from Global Times, a daily newspaper published in conjunction with the People's Daily, official press organ of the ruling Communist Party of China, and Time, preeminent American weekly news magazine. Both accounts use as their point of departure and source of key information a July 4 report in Hong Kong's major English-language daily.

On July 6 writer Li Jing penned a news article for Global Times called "US subs reach Asian ports: report," which detailed the following recent developments:

"Three of the largest submarines of the US Seventh Fleet surfaced in Asia-Pacific ports last week, the South China Morning Post reported Monday [July 5]. The appearance of the USS Michigan in Pusan, South Korea, the USS Ohio in Subic Bay, the Philippines, and the USS Florida in the strategic Indian Ocean outpost of Diego Garcia was a show of force not seen since the end of the Cold War, the paper said, adding that the position of those three ports looks like a siege of China."

The piece from the Hong Kong newspaper cited was entitled "US submarines emerge in show of military might: Message unlikely to be lost on Beijing as 3 vessels turn up in Asian ports," and was in fact dated July 4.

The author, South China Morning Post Asia correspondent Greg Torode, described the simultaneous arrival of three "Ohio-class submarines" equipped with "a vast quantity of Tomahawk cruise missiles" as a reflection of "the trend of escalating submarine activity in East Asia..."

He further added this noteworthy data: "Between them, the three submarines can carry 462 Tomahawks, boosting by an estimated 60 per cent-plus the potential Tomahawk strike force of the entire Japanese-based Seventh Fleet - the core projection of US military power in East Asia."

The author quotes without identifying his name or nation a veteran Asian military attache with reported close ties to both Chinese and U.S. military officials: "460-odd Tomahawks is a huge amount of potential firepower in anybody's language."

"It is another sign that the US is determined to not just maintain its military dominance in Asia, but to be seen doing so...that is a message for Beijing and for everybody else, whether you are a US ally or a nation sitting on the fence."

On July 8 Time magazine's Mark Thompson elaborated on the earlier report with language, including that of his title, "U.S. Missiles Deployed Near China Send a Message," derived from the South China Morning Post piece, which Thompson claims contained information planted by "U.S. officials...on July 4, no less" in a clear signal to the government in mainland China.

The Time journalist added details, though, not in the original story, replete with a good deal of editorializing that perhaps serves the same source he attributes the contents of the Hong Kong article to and for the same reason: As a shot across the bow to China.

His account of last week's deployments included: "A new class of U.S. superweapon had suddenly surfaced nearby. It was an Ohio-class submarine, which for decades carried only nuclear missiles targeted against the Soviet Union, and then Russia."

The U.S. has eighteen nuclear-powered Ohio class ballistic missile submarines, fourteen still armed with nuclear warhead-tipped Trident missiles and four which "hold up to 154 Tomahawk cruise missiles each, capable of hitting anything within 1,000 miles with non-nuclear warheads."

"The 14 Trident-carrying subs are useful in the unlikely event of a nuclear Armageddon, and Russia remains their prime target. But the Tomahawk-outfitted quartet carries a weapon that the U.S. military has used repeatedly against targets in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Iraq and Sudan."

With the arrival of the USS Ohio in the Philippines, the USS Michigan in South Korea and the USS Florida "in the strategic Indian Ocean outpost of Diego Garcia" on the same day, "the Chinese military awoke to find as many as 462 new Tomahawks deployed by the U.S. in its neighborhood."

The Time report also revealed that all four Ohio class Tomahawk-armed submarines were operationally deployed away from their home ports for the first time.

Thompson wrote that the coordinated actions were "part of a policy by the U.S. government to shift firepower from the Atlantic to the Pacific theater, which Washington sees as the military focus of the 21st century."

Regarding the submarines still carrying Trident missiles, he rhetorically added, "Why 14 subs, as well as bombers and land-based missiles carrying nuclear weapons, are still required to deal with the Russian threat is a topic for another day."

All three journalists cited - Jing, Torode and Thompson - place the U.S. submarine deployments within a broader and also a more pressing context.

The South China Morning Post writer stated: "In policies drafted under then-president George W. Bush, a Republican, and continued by the administration of his successor, Democrat Barack Obama, the Pentagon is shifting 60 per cent of its 53 fast-attack [as distinct from ballistic and guided missile] submarines to the Pacific - a process that is now virtually complete."

"But the presence of the larger cruise-missile submarines shows that, at times, the US forward posture will be significantly larger."

The USS Ohio, for example, "has been operating out of Guam for most of the last year, taking advantage of the island's expanding facilities to extend its operations in the western Pacific."

"It is due to return soon, but the Florida and the Michigan are likely to remain in the region for many months yet, using Guam and possibly Diego Garcia for essential maintenance and crew changes."

Additionally, "The presence of the Florida, based on the US east coast, appears to confirm the US is still routinely bringing submarines under the arctic ice cap to East Asia."

Just as the Pentagon is moving nuclear submarines under the northern polar ice cap to the Indian Ocean, so it has recently reached an "agreement [that] will allow troops to fly directly from the United States over the North Pole" to Afghanistan and "the region" by way of Kazakhstan, which borders China as well as Russia.

The U.S. military "siege of China" is proceeding on several fronts, on land as well as under water and in Central as well as South and East Asia. But what primarily had been a policy of surveillance and probing China's perimeter is now entering a new phase.

That the U.S. currently has over 60 per cent of the Tomahawk cruise missiles assigned to its Japan-based Seventh Fleet near China emphasizes the qualitative escalation of Washington's show of strength vis-a-vis Beijing. One related to, as was seen above, a strategic shift of attack submarines nearer China and also to the crisis on the Korean Peninsula that was exacerbated by the sinking of a South Korean warship, the Cheonan, in March.

There has even been speculation that U.S. submarine deployments and other "messages" delivered to China of late were designed to pressure Beijing into taking a tougher stance toward North Korea over the Cheonan incident. What journalists have been referring to as messages would in an earlier age have been called saber-rattling and gunboat diplomacy.

U.S.-China relations sharply deteriorated this January when the Obama administration finalized an almost \$6.5 billion arms sales package for Taiwan which includes 200 Patriot missiles. An article on the subject in the New York Times on January 31 was titled, revealing enough, "U.S. Arms for Taiwan Send Beijing a Message."

China suspended military ties with the U.S., and bad blood has persisted throughout the year, resulting in Secretary of Defense Robert Gates scrapping plans to visit Beijing early last month when he was effectively disinvented by Chinese officialdom on the prompting of the military.

The White House and the Pentagon have been sending a number of unequivocal - and increasingly provocative - messages to China this year.

The new U.S. administration signalled a confrontational approach early on. In May of 2009 Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, barely three months in her post, stated, "The Obama administration is working to improve deteriorating U.S. relations with a number of Latin American nations to counter growing Iranian, Chinese and Russian influence in the Western Hemisphere...."

Later in the year then Director of National Intelligence (and retired admiral and former commander-in-chief of the Pacific Command) Dennis Blair released the latest quadrennial National Intelligence Strategy report which said "Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea pose the greatest challenges to the United States' national interests.

While Blair headed up the Pacific Command (PACOM) from 1999-2002, his role included overseeing a vast area of the planet that includes China (since the Ronald Reagan administration assigned it to that military command in 1983).

Arrogating the right to divide the entire world into military zones, areas of operation, has never been attempted by any other nation, any group of nations, not even all the nations of the world collectively (in the United Nations or otherwise). But the U.S. has and does do just that. It has even added two new Unified Combatant Commands - Northern Command and Africa Command - in recent years, in 2002 and 2007 respectively.

The Pacific Command is the oldest and largest of the six current regional commands (the others being the Africa, Northern, European, Central and Southern Commands), and was formed during the dawning of the Cold War in 1947. Its area of responsibility takes in over 50 per cent of the world - 105 million square miles - 36 nations and almost 60 per cent of the world's population.

300,000 troops from all major branches of the U.S. armed forces - the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps and Navy - are assigned to it, 20 per cent of all active duty American service members.

Pacific Command is in charge of military defense treaties with Australia, Japan, New Zealand, the Philippines and South Korea.

The U.S. is also alone in assigning the world's oceans and seas to naval commands. Washington has six naval fleets - the Fourth Fleet (the Caribbean, Central and South America) was reactivated in 2008 after being disbanded in 1950) - and just as Pacific Command is the largest unified, multi-service command, so the Seventh is the largest forward-deployed fleet, with 50-60 warships, 350 aircraft and as many as 60,000 Sailors and Marines at any given time. It is based in Japan and its area of responsibility includes over 50 million square miles of the (largely western) Pacific and Indian Oceans.

The U.S. also has eleven aircraft carriers, ten of them nuclear-powered and all eleven part of strike groups. (China has no and Russia one carrier.)

The Time magazine article quoted from earlier mentioned that the deployment of four U.S. guided missile submarines to East Asia and the Indian Ocean is not the only development that China needs to be concerned about. The U.S. is simultaneously presiding over six-week biennial Rim of the Pacific (RIMPAC) military exercises in Hawaii with over 20,000 troops, 36 warships and submarines (25 American) and 180 planes and helicopters.

This year's RIMPAC, which began on June 23 and is to be completed by the end of July, includes for the first time the participation of France, Colombia - with which the U.S. has recently concluded an agreement for the use of seven of its military bases - and the Southeast Asia nations of Malaysia and Singapore. The other countries involved are Australia, Canada, Chile, Indonesia, Japan, the Netherlands, Peru, South Korea and Thailand. The five-week war games involve "missile exercises and the sinking of three abandoned vessels playing the role of enemy ships."

The combined task force commander for RIMPAC 2010 is commander of the U.S. Third Fleet, whose area of responsibility is approximately 50 million square miles of the eastern Pacific, Vice Admiral Richard Hunt, who stated, "This is the largest RIMPAC that we've had," and one which "clearly focuses on maritime domain awareness dealing with expanded military operations across the complete spectrum of warfare."

Time's Mark Thompson also wrote: "Closer to China, CARAT 2010 - for Cooperation Afloat Readiness and Training - just got underway [July 5] off Singapore. The operation involves 17,000 personnel and 73 ships from the U.S., Singapore, Bangladesh, Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand.

"China is absent from both exercises, and that's no oversight."

This February Cobra Gold 2010, "the largest multinational military exercise in the world," was launched in Thailand (separated from China by only one nation, either Laos or Myanmar) and as with all previous Cobra Gold war games was run by U.S. Pacific Command and the Royal Thai Supreme Command. Joining the U.S. and Thailand in this year's exercises, designed "to build interoperability between the United States and its Asia-Pacific regional partners," were the armed forces of Japan, Indonesia, Singapore and, for the first time, South Korea.

From June 8-25 the latest U.S. Air Force-led Red Flag Alaska air maneuvers were held near the eastern Pacific. "The Red Flag exercises, conducted in four-to-six cycles a year by the 414th Combat Training Squadron of the 57th Wing, are very realistic aerial war games. The purpose is to train pilots from the U.S., NATO and other allied countries for real combat situations."

Over a thousand airmen from five nations - the U.S., Japan, South Korea, Romania and Belgium - assembled at Alaska's Elmendorf and Eielson Air Force Bases for air combat training which "unites forces from all over the world."

"South Korea, a country already accustomed to working with U.S. troops, is also in Alaska to strengthen the two nations' ties after the sinking of a South Korean warship by a North Korean submarine.

"We have the American Air Force in Korea, and the coalition and the combined working environment is very important," said Lt. Hoon Min Kim, a member of South Korea's air force. "And being able to perform under a combined environment is therefore essential as well."

The incorporation of progressively more Asia-Pacific nations into what has been referred to as an Asian NATO is by no means directed solely at North Korea nor is it understood as such by officials in Beijing.

Participants in that arrangement, among them Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, South Korea and Mongolia, have troops serving under NATO in Afghanistan. Recently 140 new South Korean forces arrived at the Bagram Air Base in Afghanistan to reinforce a base in Parwan province recently subjected to repeated rocket attacks. Seoul's troop strength in the war zone is now at 230.

This month the government of Singapore announced it will increase its soldiers in the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force to "a record 162, from 97 last year."

"Next month, the Singapore Armed Forces (SAF) will send a 52-man unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) team - its biggest deployment to Afghanistan - to Oruzgan [Uruzgan], one of two provinces where Singapore has troops."

Earlier this year NATO announced that Mongolia and South Korea have become the 45th and 46th nations to provide it with troops for the war in Afghanistan. Mongolia borders both China and Russia and is the object of intense efforts by the U.S. to increase military cooperation and integration. On July 6 NATO's Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy Dirk Brengelmann paid a two-day visit to South Korea, where he stated, "Our security interests and security interests of countries like Korea coincide today more than ever."

A news report of his visit paraphrased his comments as asserting that "The world's biggest military alliance, NATO, is looking to increase cooperation with South Korea and other partners beyond Europe and North America," and added that "Speaking of cooperation, Brengelmann noted NATO's show of support for South Korea in light of the sinking of its warship Cheonan.... The diplomat said some NATO members also serve on the U.N. Security Council and that the NATO members will try to ensure any Security Council action on the Cheonan sinking will represent their views expressed in the NATO statement."

Another country that shares borders with China and Russia, Kazakhstan, has allowed the U.S. and NATO transit and overflight rights for the Afghan war and last week the nation's president, Nursultan Nazarbayev, signed a law permitting the Pentagon to ship "special cargo" - armored vehicles - through his country.

The U.S. and NATO have transited hundreds of thousands of troops through the Manas Air Base (now Transit Center at Manas) in Kyrgyzstan, which also borders China, since 2001 and in recent months troops have passed in and out from Afghanistan at the rate of 55,000 a month, 660,000 a year. Washington has announced plans to open new training bases in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, the second nation also adjoining China.

With Afghanistan and Pakistan, which also have borders with China, the U.S. and NATO have a military presence in five nations on China's western flank and a foothold in Mongolia. The U.S. and NATO war in South Asia will enter its tenth year this autumn with no sign of Western military presence departing from China's backyard.

The U.S. military remains ensconced in Japan and South Korea, has returned to the Philippines (including camps in Mindanao), is solidifying bilateral and multilateral military relations with practically all nations in Southeast Asia, and for the past five years has cultivated India as a military partner. [India is currently an observer at the RIMPAC exercises.] Japan, Taiwan and Australia are being integrated into a U.S.-designed regional and broader global interceptor missile system.

The U.S. is conducting regular military exercises, building military partnerships, stationing troops and opening bases around China's periphery, in addition to the positioning of warships, submarines and aircraft carriers in the waters off its coasts.

What alarms China most at the moment, though, is a proposed joint U.S.-South Korean military exercise in the Yellow Sea, enclosed by both Koreas to the east and China to the north and west.

China's Global Times recently quoted Xu Guangqian, military strategist at the People's Liberation Army's Academy of Military Sciences, issuing this warning: "China's position on the Yellow Sea issue demonstrates its resolution to safeguard national rights and interests. It also reflects that China is increasingly aware of the fact that its strategic space has confronted threats from other countries."

China, which just concluded six days of naval drills of its own in the East China Sea, had more reason to be concerned when it was disclosed earlier this month that a U.S. aircraft carrier would join the maneuvers off its Yellow Sea coast.

On July 8 China renewed its opposition to the planned U.S.-South Korean war games, with Foreign Ministry spokesman Qin Gang telling reporters, "China has expressed its serious concerns with relevant parties. We are firmly opposed to foreign military vessels engaging in activities that undermine China's security interests in the Yellow Sea or waters close to China."

An unsigned editorial in the Chinese Global Times of July 8 stated, "Beijing sees the joint exercise not only as being aimed at Pyongyang, but also as a direct threat to its territorial waters and coastline," and blamed South Korean President Lee Myung-bak for worsening relations between the two nations:

"It is not known whether Lee had thought of China's reaction when he announced in May the drill with the US.

"Did he foresee Chinese people's anger? Or, did he intend to provoke the country on the other side of the Yellow Sea?"

"It is a shame and a provocation on China's doorstep.

"If a US aircraft carrier enters the Yellow Sea, it will mean a major setback to Seoul's diplomacy, as hostility between the peoples of China and South Korea will probably escalate, which Beijing and Seoul have been working for years to avoid."

President Lee met with his American counterpart, Barack Obama, on the sidelines of the Group of Eight summit in Toronto late last month, during which a previous arrangement to transfer wartime command of South Korean forces to the nation in 2012 were postponed if not abandoned. In Obama's words, "One of the topics that we discussed is that we have arrived at an agreement that the transition of operational control for alliance activities in the Korean peninsula will take place in 2015." In the five-year interim "if war were to break out on the Korean peninsula the United States would assume operational command of South Korean forces."

If Washington is planning direct intervention on the Korean Peninsula as its military buildup in the region, including off China's shores, might indicate, the words of former South Korean president Kim Young-Sam a decade ago are worth recalling. Two years after stepping down as head of state, Kim revealed to one of his nation's main newspapers that he had intervened to prevent a second Korean war, that his government "stopped US President Bill Clinton from launching an air strike against North Korea's nuclear facilities in June 1994."

He initiated a last-minute phone conversation with the U.S. president which “saved the Korean peninsula from an imminent war,” as “The Clinton government was preparing a war” by deploying an aircraft carrier off the eastern coast of North Korea “close enough for its war planes to hit the North’s nuclear facilities in Yongbyon.”

Furthermore, Kim warned the U.S. ambassador in Seoul that “another war on the Korean peninsula would turn all of Korea into a bloodbath, killing between 10 and 20 million people and destroying South Korea’s prosperous economy.”

Any catastrophic event on the Korean Peninsula, and war is the ultimate cataclysm, could lead to hundreds of thousands of North Korean refugees fleeing to Russia and millions to China.

The nearly nine-year war in Afghanistan being waged by the U.S. and NATO has led to an explosion of violence and destabilization in three nations flanking China: Afghanistan itself, Pakistan and Kyrgyzstan.

Also, since 2001 Afghanistan has become the world’s largest producer of opium and hashish, flooding the European and other drug markets. A forum entitled “Afghan Drug Production - A Challenge to the International Community” was held in Moscow a month ago.

A Russian report on the meeting stated “The situation around drug production in Afghanistan has gained a catastrophic character. Some 100,000 people died globally from Afghan drugs in 2009 alone. In all, Afghan-made opiates have claimed one million human lives in the past decade, and 16 million more ruined their health.” 30,000 of the drug-related deaths occurred in Russia. The United Nations estimates that Afghanistan currently accounts for 92 per cent of world opium cultivation.

China and Russia are viewed as, if not challengers to U.S. global dominance, impediments to its further consolidation. And not in the military sphere but in the fields of economics, trade, energy and transportation. Destabilization of their neighborhoods and frontiers is one manner of limiting competition.

All means fair and foul are employed to eliminate obstacles to uncontested supremacy, and what the world’s sole military superpower (the term is President Obama’s from his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech) truly excels at is expanding its international military machine with an unflinching willingness to use it.

Seoul Proceeds With U.S. War Drills

United Press International, July 9, 2010

SEOUL — South Korea announced plans to proceed with war games with the United States despite warnings advising against such maneuvers from North Korea and China.

South Korea has said that the exercise would follow any prospective condemnation by the United Nations in regards the alleged sinking of a South Korean warship.

Last month, the United States and South Korea announced a combined military drill in a bid to counter North Korea’s suspected sinking of the warship Cheonan, which killed 46 South Korean sailors on board.

Media services from the peninsula’s North have billed the war games a near-act of aggression against North Korea while the government in Pyongyang said the maneuver would push the situation on the Korean Peninsula to “the edge of a nuclear war,” disturbing peace and security in the region.

The dates timing and scale of the drill in the Yellow Sea are yet to be announced. Still, Seoul’s decision comes days after China had live-fire drills off its eastern coast in exercises seemed to taunt Seoul and Washington.

China’s deputy chief of general staff of the Chinese People’s Liberation recently told reporters that the proposed location of what he described as an anti-submarine drill was “very close” to Chinese territorial waters.

China is Pyongyang’s closest ally and can knock down a prospective condemnation given its veto-holding powers within the U.N. Security Council. Both China and Russia, also a permanent member of the Security Council, have held off from laying blame on North Korea for the sinking of the Cheonan.

The combined U.S.-South Korean exercise was scheduled for last month but, by certain accounts, has been rescheduled twice. At the time of that initial announcement, a senior South Korean official was cited by the Yonhap news agency as saying that the United States would mobilize its nuclear-powered 97,000-ton carrier USS George Washington along with a destroyer and a nuclear submarine.

Alternatively, South Korea would deploy a 4,500-ton destroyer, a submarine and F-15K fighter jets. The official, who was speaking on condition of anonymity, said cannons would be fired during the exercise, while anti-submarine bombs would be dropped and enemy communications intercepted “in a way similar to actual warfare.”

An estimated 28,500 U.S. troops are based in South Korea to deter potential aggression from North Korea.

Although the Korean War ended in 1953, the countries haven’t signed a peace agreement, remaining divided by one of the world’s most fortified borders.

Relations between North and South have soured since the sinking. In response to the international investigation, North Korea has demanded a probe of its own, with investigators permitted to go to the South. Seoul has rejected the demand and Pyongyang has repeatedly denied any responsibility in the warship sinking.

Worthwhile Reading! Mike H., Ed.

The Constitution of the United States of America

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Article 1.

Section 1

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons.

The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five and Georgia three.

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

Section 3

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise,

during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.

No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall choose their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

Section 4

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Place of Choosing Senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

Section 5

Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.

Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

Section 6

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the

Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

Section 7

All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by Yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten Days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return, in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Section 9

The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

The privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from,

one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince or foreign State.

Section 10

No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws: and the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

Article 2.

Section 1

The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice-President chosen for the same Term, be elected, as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector.

The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two persons, of whom one at least shall not lie an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner choose the President. But in choosing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; a quorum for this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the States, and a Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In

every Case, after the Choice of the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate shall choose from them by Ballot the Vice-President.

The Congress may determine the Time of choosing the Electors, and the Day on which they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States, or any of them.

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Section 2

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to Grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Section 3

He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge

necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Section 4

The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

Article 3.

Section 1

The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behavior, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services a Compensation which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Section 2

The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority; to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls; to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party; to Controversies between two or more States; between a State and Citizens of another State; between Citizens of different States; between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Section 3

Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attainted.

Article 4.

Section 1

Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be

proved, and the Effect thereof.

Section 2

The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

No Person held to Service or Labour in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labour, But shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labour may be due.

Section 3

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new States shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Section 4

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

Article 5.

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

Article 6.

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

Article 7.

The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.

Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth. In Witness whereof We have hereunto subscribed our Names.

George Washington - President and deputy from Virginia

New Hampshire - John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman

Massachusetts - Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King

Connecticut - William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman

New York - Alexander Hamilton

New Jersey - William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton

Pennsylvania - Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas Fitzsimons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris

Delaware - George Read, Gunning Bedford Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom

Maryland - James McHenry, Daniel of St Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll

Virginia - John Blair, James Madison Jr.

North Carolina - William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson

South Carolina - John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler

Georgia - William Few, Abraham Baldwin

Attest: William Jackson, Secretary

Amendment 1

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment 2

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the

right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment 3

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment 4

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment 5

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment 6

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Amendment 7

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

Amendment 8

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment 9

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment 10

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Amendment 11

The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.

Amendment 12

The Electors shall meet in their respective states, and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate;

The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;

The person having the greatest Number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.

The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

Amendment 13

1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment 14

1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or

the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Amendment 15

1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment 16

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

Amendment 17

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

Amendment 18

1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale,

or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Amendment 19

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment 20

1. The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.

6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.

Amendment 21

1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

3. The article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Amendment 22

1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of the President more than once. But this Article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President, when this Article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this Article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

Amendment 23

1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct: A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment 24

1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment 25

1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers

of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.

Amendment 26

1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Amendment 27

No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.



Jack Kane's Photos from Memorial Day at the Roncodor Memorial, Sub Base San Diego









Jack Kane's Photos of the La Mesa Flag Day Parade









SUBMARINE FORCE BIRTHDAY BALL, SAN DIEGO
(a photo which proves that the old guys always get the chicks)

