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Greg Weaver
@weaverg59 · 5h
Replying to @NarangVipin @nukestrat and 3 others
Operational characteristics can and do profoundly affect deterrence, especially deterrence of limited first use. Unless you’re willing to gamble on the credibility of a massive response to such use AND are willing to live with its consequences if deterrence fails.

Greg Weaver
@weaverg59 · 5h
Replying to @NarangVipin @nukestrat and 3 others
How many ALCMs would you like to have to fire to ensure success? And what would be the impact on efforts to restore deterrence of a failed response in kind?

Greg Weaver
@weaverg59 · 5h
Replying to @baklitskiy @nukestrat and 4 others
Same concerns about the increasingly aggressive regime in Moscow and their far more extensive array of low yield nuclear strike capabilities?

Greg Weaver
@weaverg59 · 5h
Replying to @NarangVipin @nukestrat and 3 others
No, not at all. The cruise missile itself must be able to reach the target. Advanced air defenses extend far beyond national borders. Do a deep dive on Russian and Chinese air defenses. Not impenetrable, but one needs very high confidence a limited strike will succeed.

Greg Weaver
@weaverg59 · 8h
Replying to @NarangVipin @nukestrat and 3 others
Penetrability is NOT only relevant to targets deep in adversary territory.

Greg Weaver
@weaverg59 · 14h
Replying to @VAManzo15 @nukestrat and 3 others
Agree, plus it’s available in the near term, filling a gap until we modernize the air delivery platformss and weapons.
Thanks for the comprehensive clarification! That’s what I thought.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · 15h
Replying to @KingstonAReif @Woolaf
I’m curious? Who are you referring to?

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · 17h
Replying to @Woolaf @KingstonAReif
So let me rephrase my question to Kingston: does ACA oppose all US nuclear weapons?

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · 18h
Replying to @NarangVipin @nukestrat and 2 others
The USG policy is what the NPR states. There is always someone who says otherwise.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · 18h
Replying to @NarangVipin @nukestrat and 2 others
USG has never said it would not agree to limits on LRSO in a future agreement. But you have to admit it is Russian behavior that is causing the dismantling of the arms control regime: violation of INF, Open Skies, CWC, Budapest Memorandum, etc. so I don’t understand your point.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · 18h
Replying to @NarangVipin @nukestrat and 2 others
NPR explicitly states that US might be willing to forego the SLCM if Russia agrees to resolve the NSNW imbalance and returns to INF compliance. As you know the US proposed to include ALCMs under New START, but Russia refused to do so, insisting on a bomber counting rule instead.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · 18h
Replying to @Woolaf @KingstonAReif
Again, I recognize and respect both.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · 18h
Replying to @Woolaf @KingstonAReif
We all want to avoid nuclear war. But we differ on how to do so. I don’t think I’m wrong in saying ACA supports the SSBN leg. But I’d like to know if I’m mistaken.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · 18h
Replying to @Woolaf @KingstonAReif
I didn’t say that they have no right to protest. I respect both their right to do so and their moral opposition to nuclear weapons. The point of my question to Kingston was whether ACA agrees with the protesters apparent opposition to the SSBN leg of our forces.
You could be right. But why would the Russians ever agree to limit or reduce their NSNW if we do nothing about their INF violation and present them with no new costs of refusing to negotiate?

Do you think this is a good idea? Doesn’t ACA think the SSBN leg is the most important element of our nuclear forces?

Replying to @nukestrat @BrunoTertrais and 2 others

Replying to @KingstonAReif

But what do you think?

They may believe they’ve identified such requirements but I guarantee you they don’t know they’re right. Nor do they extend deterrence to allies, which presents a different problem in determining requirements altogether.
I didn’t say you, or anyone else, couldn’t ask questions. I asked you why Senior former Democrats with full access to the facts support the NPR’s findings. They might not be able to tell you all their reasons why. But you shouldn’t discount their views.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 4
Replying to @nukestrat @BrunoTertrais and 2 others
I didn’t say Putin’s “misdeeds” (interesting choice of words to describe invasion of their neighbors and covert violations of legally binding arms control obligations) justified force structure changes. I said US perception of threat posed by NSNW imbalance changed as a result.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 4
Replying to @nukestrat @BrunoTertrais and 2 others
I was clearly referring to deterrence sufficiency, not operational sufficiency to achieve other objectives of deterrence fails. Big difference, and one that has always affected US force structure and posture decisions.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 4
Replying to @AtomicAnalyst
SLCM could provide us some much needed leverage to get Russia to consider NSNW limits, and return to INF compliance.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 4
Replying to @nukestrat @BrunoTertrais and 2 others
Help restore what? Arms control? Low yield Trident has no effect on arms control whatsoever. It’s treaty compliant. Russia’s undermining of the disarmament project is a fact. It’s not debatable. RS-26 is not a New START circumvention. The systems Putin announced are.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 4
Replying to @AtomicAnalyst
So you now agree that I didn’t say there was no “logical or rational” basis for our force structure?

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 4
Replying to @nukestrat @BrunoTertrais and 2 others
Not an answer to my question, sorry. And if you think those unassailably honorable citizens would support NPR’s findings for political reasons you really don’t get what it means to serve as a responsible public servant. You don’t know what they know. Humility is a virtue.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 4
Replying to @nukestrat @BrunoTertrais and 2 others
How do you explain that so many Democratic senior officials who have access to all the facts concur with the NPR’s findings (e.g., Ash Carter, Jim Miller, Brad Rb)?
Russia is destroying use of arms control as a means of enhancing strategic stability and reducing risk of war and nuclear war. IMHO that’s where you should be focused. They’re violating INF, Open Skies, Chemical Weapons Convention, and circumventing New START w/new systems.

Yes, non-strategic gap has existed for decades. What’s new? Russia made clear that what we thought was a remote prospect of war with them is not so remote. They’re changing the borders Europe by force, violating arms control obligations, and expanding their nuclear arsenal.

You can’t be taken seriously if you think such decisions a “hunch”. The FACT that what’s required to deter is not objectively determinable doesn’t mean force structure decisions aren’t well founded. Requirements to meet other objectives are analytically derived.

I agree. Do you agree that the nuclear weapons ban treaty threatens to undermine the NPT?

Depends on what they think we’ll do in response to limited use. If they think we won’t respond in kind, deny them benefits they seek, and impose costs that exceed benefits they can achieve, deterrence is undermined. We might have to pair a promise of restraint with retaliation.

That is not at all what I said. I said it is not possible to determine precisely what force structure is required to deter. Do you think it is? Other objectives US nuclear forces must meet, and the requirements to meet them, ARE derived through objective operational analysis.
Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 4
Replying to @russianforces
I meant are you surprised that Putin's Russia has been secretly developing multiple new strategic nuclear systems that circumvent the New START Treaty?

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 3
Replying to @russianforces
Surprised?

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 2
Replying to @NarangVipin @KingstonAReif
Would you prefer we return those warheads to their full original yield at that point?

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 2
Replying to @NarangVipin @KingstonAReif
We didn't phase out the bomber leg after we invented SSBNs and SLBMs.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 2
Replying to @NarangVipin @KingstonAReif
Why would it be? It provides an additional option the Russians and others must consider and we will already have it at that point.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 2
Replying to @KingstonAReif @NarangVipin
We do disagree. But I'm trying to get you to explain why you think our current posture is sufficient. That's why I'm asking how you would propose we respond to limited Russian first use. If you can't do that I don't know how you can say our current posture is sufficient.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Apr 2
Replying to @KingstonAReif @NarangVipin
Forward deployed bombers more vulnerable to preemption than CONUS based bombers, still aren't as prompt as SLBMs. 3rd question was about promptness of limited US response. Do you want to wait hours to respond to Russian first use? What if they strike again before you respond?

Low yield D-5 warhead has repeatedly been explained as a near term solution to credibility issues associated with current air delivered low yield options.

So I ask again, how would you propose we deter Russian limited limited first use? Threaten a large scale, high yield response or threaten a limited low yield...
Several replies: 1. Russian limited first use likely to be focused on destroying/degrading our ability to continue conventional fight. 2. B-21 with B61-12 and LRSO not available for years and not prompt. 3. How long are you willing to wait to respond before they strike again?

So Kingston, do you advocate adopting a Massive Retaliation policy in response to limited Russian first use of nuclear weapons? Of course it may be impossible to prevent uncontrolled escalation, and that helps deter. But should our declared policy be uncontrolled escalation?

My new favorite video

Agree, but a gangster with 1,000s of nuclear weapons.

A reminder that we get the word courage from the French: police Lieutenant Colonel Arnaud Beltrame traded himself for a hostage. RIP.

The French interior minister confirms this morning that the police officer who swapped himself for a hostage in a #Trèbes terror attack, has died. Lieutenant Colonel Arnaud #Beltrame has been described as a hero who sacrificed himself to save others. twitter.com/gerardcollomb/…

Classified.

Replying to @nukestrat @KingstonAReif @LFoD_Aaron and 3 others
There is nothing in the NPR, including the two additional capabilities recommended, that lowers the threshold for US first use of nuclear weapons. You should be focused on the threshold for Russian first use.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 22
Replying to @evanbmontgomery
Hahahaha.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 22
Replying to @KingstonAReif @nukestrat
And the Russian stockpile and deployed force changed how over the same period? Not likely to find out the answer through a FOIA request.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 22
Replying to @nukestrat @Cirincione and 2 others
It’s a response in kind because it’s nuclear.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 21
Replying to @LFoD_Aaron @nukestrat and 3 others
Precisely.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 21
Replying to @nukestrat @Cirincione and 2 others
1st, there are not 1,000 low yield weapons in US deployed forces. 2nd, the low yield SLBM warhead provides profoundly different operational characteristics in the near term that are harder for Russia and others to counter. It increases the credibility of a US response in kind.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 21
Replying to @Cirincione @MSNBC @HallieJackson
Joe, why do you say it would be used to start a nuclear war, not prevent one? It’s purpose is to provide an additional low yield RESPONSE to Russian first use.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 20
Replying to @nukestrat
4: Russia returns to compliance with INF treaty, Chemical Weapons Convention, Open Skies treaty, Budapest memorandum, CFE treaty . . .

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 20
Replying to @atomicbell @NarangVipin and 5 others
Reread the NPR. Rationale for additional capabilities is clearly expressed.
Russia accountable. This incident – the first offensive use of a nerve agent on Alliance territory since NATO’s foundation – was a clear breach of international law.

The nerve agent came from Sweden, Ukraine did it to frame Russia, It was contamination from the UK's own research…

Recruit Chesty reporting as ordered, sir! Today the Corps gained a new recruit, Chesty XV. He begins training next week to replace Chesty XIV next Parade Season at Marine Barracks Washington, 8th & I.

But only the actual yields. Not the fact that they are low or high yield.

Think so.

I don't think we've ever deployed a low yield SLBM warhead before. Can't comment on what he meant.

My point was there's not much point to low yield capabilities the other side doesn't know about. No deterrent effect.
Vipin, the US has had multiple low yield ballistic missile warheads. Not trolling, just a fact.

What are those other more effective ways of countering Russia's INF violation that would convince them to return to compliance?

And we had a nuclear SLCM as well.

We have had low yield ballistic missile warheads before.

Maybe, if doing so convinced the Russians that the US is only willing to negotiate/continue nuclear arms control with them if they fully comply with their obligations. Alternative is letting Russia violate those treaties they don't like while binding us under treaties they do.

That's a fair point. However, Russian ongoing violations of their nuclear arms control commitments are destroying the ability of the US to negotiate any future limits/reductions that could enhance strategic stability and US security while avoiding unnecessary arms competition.

I don't know what General Hyten meant to convey.

Black program would have no deterrent effect whatsoever. And why would we need to have a black program?

How about comply with INF and CWC?
Would you extend New START without INF compliance?

Dogs waiting to enter the hospital rooms of sick children for animal therapy time.

59-12, 73CG, 441K but no, name it after Denton

Most likely. The older they get the more maintenance they require between patrols.

Their patrols are longer because they require more and more maintenance between them.
Replying to @JBWolfsthal
Jon, do you agree with the NPR's clear declaratory policy regarding North Korean nuclear attack on the US, our allies, or partners: the Kin regime will not survive?

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 15
Replying to @NarangVipin
Surprised? Nah, couldn't be.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 14
Replying to @NarangVipin @VAManzo15 and 2 others
No criticism implied whatsoever! Just noting that listening to work stuff while exercising is, well, so Manzo!

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 14
Replying to @VAManzo15 @NarangVipin and 2 others
You, my friend, are a glutton for punishment!

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 14
Replying to @bpmckeeon64
He has an adult drug issue?

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @BrunoTertrais
Thanks. I’ll read it.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @nukestrat @RLHeinrichs
Because there’s still not a significant qualitative or quantitative disparity in strategic forces between US and Russia even after Russians deploy the stuff Putin announced. But there IS a significant, and growing disparity in non-strategic capabilities the NPR seeks to address.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @ArmsControlWonk @ajmount and 2 others
The statement I said was a lie said modernization cost alone is over a trillion $. Not life cycle cost. If they had said life cycle cost I would not have objected (though I might have put THAT cost in the context of ~$21 trillion in defense spending over the same period).

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @ArmsControlWonk @ajmount and 2 others
Give me a break. You said I’d lie if it served my interest. That’s a completely unfounded personal insult. What is wrong with you?
Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @ArmsControlWonk @johnkrempasky @BrunoTertrais
I didn’t “throw around” the word lie. If someone knows that the cost of the modernization program is several times less than the figure they repeatedly cite they are lying. It’s not a matter of opinion. It’s a stubborn fact.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @ajmount @ArmsControlWonk and 2 others
Adam, precisely who do you think should stop?

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @ArmsControlWonk @johnkrempasky @BrunoTertrais
Why do you so readily resort to ad hominem attacks on those that disagree with you? You don’t know me. We’ve never met. Nothing I have tweeted is a lie. I have tried to present an alternative view based on facts, not ideologically derived suppositions. You owe me an apology.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @McFaul
Imagine a world where that was even remotely plausible.

Greg Weaver Retweeted
David B Larter @DavidLarter · Mar 12
Get ’em, TM

NBC News @NBCNews
British PM May after saying it’s "highly likely that Russia was responsible" for nerve agent attack:

"We will not tolerate such a brazen attempt to murder…"
Show this thread

Greg Weaver Retweeted
Kai Ryssdal @kaiyssdal · Mar 12
I feel much better now...

41 Strange @41Strange
Boston Dynamics Robot Dog Slips on Banana Peel

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @BrunoTertrais
Go for it!

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @NarangVipin
Thanks!

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @johnkrempasky @BrunoTertrais
I, for one, would not trade a fact for a lie.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @NarangVipin
And doesn't that concern you a bit?

Greg Weaver Retweeted
Michael S. Schmidt @nytmike · Mar 12
"The writer of the story, Maggie Haberman, a Hillary flunky, knows nothing about me and is not given access."

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @NarangVipin
You're joking, right? Nobody claims their nuclear forces deter either adversary nuclear weapons development and fielding, nor do they claim those forces deter targeted assassinations.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @BrunoTertrais
Bruno, do you disagree with either the facts as portrayed, or the implications of them?

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 12
Replying to @JBWolfsthal
I assure you the Secretary has read the NPR. The NPR doesn't say the systems Putin announced fundamentally change the strategic balance. The NPR says the aggregate of Russian strategy, doctrine, modernization, and expansion pose
the aggregate of Russian strategy, doctrine, modernization, and expansion pose a threat that requires a measured US response.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 11
Replying to @bpmckeon64
Brian, it would be great if you weighed in on the 2018 NPR discussion here.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 10
Replying to @nukestrat @SecDef19
Nobody in USG is overreacting.

Greg Weaver Retweeted
Brian Krassenstein @krassenstein · Feb 25
An NRA Political boycott is what we need

@realDonaldTrump $30M
@SenJohnMcCain $7.7M
@RichardBurr_DN $6.9M
@RoyBlunt $4.5M
@SenThomTillis $4.4M
@SenCoryGardner $3.8M
@marcorubio $3.3M
@joniernst $3M
@senrobportman $3M

I Pledge Not to Vote for Anyone accepting NRA Money

RETWEET

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 8
Replying to @KingstonAReif @AtomicAnalyst
Good you should urge others to do so as well. And no.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 8
Replying to @AtomicAnalyst @KingstonAReif
Not higher than $1.7 trillion for modernization. You’re off by approximately a factor of 4. Do the math honestly.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 8
Replying to @AtomicAnalyst @KingstonAReif
But they don’t cost the same amount. Opponents repeatedly falsely claim that the cost to modernize the force is over $1 trillion. That is simply not true. In fact, it is a lie. BTW, if we project the FY19 DoD budget out 30 years it would be over $21 trillion.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 8
Replying to @AtomicAnalyst @KingstonAReif
You really need to stop saying that the modernization program will cost $1.7 trillion. This is simply not true. All of the >$1 trillion estimates include the cost of operating and sustaining US nuclear forces over a 30 year period. The cost to
modernize the force is far, far less

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 8
Replying to @Cirincliene
Joe,
I agree with you that US citizens that oppose nuclear weapons should not be subject to charges that they are somehow tools of a foreign adversary. What I don’t agree with you on is that somehow the US has embarked on a massive nuclear buildup. That's just not true.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 7
Replying to @nukestrat
The US has nowhere near 1,000 deployed low yield weapons.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 7
Replying to @SpaceCat4NonPro @nukestrat
Thanks for re-reading!

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 7
Replying to @SpaceCat4NonPro @nukestrat
Yes. If you read the entire section of the NPR on our hedge strategy I think you’ll agree that it is clear that strategy is to address future developments, whether they are geopolitical, technical, operational, or programmatic.

Greg Weaver @weaverg59 · Mar 6
Replying to @steven_pifer
Thanks for your expert and dedicated service to us all Steve!

Greg Weaver Retweeted
Shawn Donnan @sdonnan · Mar 6
“‘We are going to keep explaining this until we are blue in the face but countries do not “lose” money on trade deficits.’"
Read the declaratory policy in the 2018 NPR literally. It says that what might trigger a US nuclear response is the effect an adversary action has on US, allied, and partner vital interests, not on the means they use to achieve those effects. This is NOT a radical change.

To be hedged against, not responded to with nuclear weapons. That's just not what it says. Like any policy document this one needs to be read carefully and without presuppositions about what it actually says might I suggest you reread the 2018 NPR with this approach?

Didn't the 2010 NPR leave adversaries, allies, and Americans guessing about what "extreme circumstances in defense of vital interest" means? Of course it did, because the US has always maintained varying levels of ambiguity regarding when we might use nuclear weapons.

It means ensuring that your modernized force anticipates future cyber threat development and accounts for it in both weapon system and command, control, and communications design.
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