

Weekly ICBM EAR Report



Image: Illustration of the Sentinel next-generation ICBM. Credit: Northrop Grumman - Space News

Prepared by Peter Huessy

President of GeoStrategic Analysis

Senior Fellow at the National Institute for Deterrence Studies (NIDS)

Senior Fellow at the Gold Institute for International Strategy

Edition: Week of July 20, 2026

(C) Copyright GeoStrategic Analysis, 2026. All Rights Reserved.

ICBM EAR Week of July 20th

Prepared by Peter Huessy, President of Geostrategic Analysis, Senior Fellow, National Institute for Deterrence Studies and Senior Fellow, Gold Institute for International Strategy

Quotes and Commentary of the Week

President Trump told Axios that he is “close” to deciding whether to order a “massive attack” against Iran that would be “bigger than ever before,” adding that the U.S. military is “all set for it” if he gives the order.

House Speaker Mike Johnson: The passage of the NDAA “strengthens our nuclear deterrence and missile defense.”

Japanese Defense Minister Shinjiro Koizumi: Tokyo should more openly debate the role of nuclear weapons in the country’s defense. [The Japan Times described the comments as “a rare instance of a sitting Cabinet member broaching the highly contentious issue.”]

Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy: “I am grateful to our warriors for their accuracy. Once again, there have been successful long-range sanctions against Russia for this war. In particular, the Security Service of Ukraine destroyed a Tu-95 military aircraft in Engels that had been used for Russian missile strikes against our country. The distance from our state border is approximately 800 kilometers.”

Assistant to the Secretary of War for Public Affairs Sean Parnell: “One year ago, the Department of War established the Office of Golden Dome for America with a single, no-fail mission: shield the Homeland. Golden Dome is the shield that will protect Americans against the very real, evolving threats our great nation faces. From drone swarms to ballistic and cruise missiles to hypersonics—global conflicts demonstrate that today's adversaries are playing by new rules. We are not standing still. We are aggressively harnessing American innovation to build a dynamic, impenetrable defense to protect our cities, our families, and our future.”

International Developments of Interest

Japan seeks stronger deterrence after China submarine missile launch.

Houthis say they attacked Saudi tankers in the Red Sea, threatening new chokepoint in Iran war.

British government says the country’s armed forces are ready to defend the United Kingdom from any attack after Iran’s Revolutionary Guards issued a warning over allowing U.S. bombers to fly from UK bases.

Tehran on Thursday vowed to keep attacking U.S. bases in the region so long as Iran remains under threat.

American Administration Strategic Developments of Interest

Lt. Gen. Gregory J. Gagnon, head of Space Force Combat Forces Command, said that the electromagnetic spectrum has emerged as a key domain during the conflict with Iran and underscored that there is a renewed focus on achieving U.S. “spectrum dominance.”

Secretary of War, Pete Hegseth, testifies on Capitol Hill for the first time since the demise of the U.S.-Iran ceasefire and as the administration seeks tens of billions to pay for the war, according to a post from Bloomberg News.

Secretary of State Marco Rubio: “Met [on Thursday] with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov on the sidelines of the ASEAN Ministerial. We discussed the U.S.-Russia relationship and the need to end the Russia-Ukraine war.”

U.S. officials confirmed to Axios that a B-1 bomber conducted airstrikes against IRGC targets in Iran on Tuesday.

USCENTCOM announced that its forces carried out a twelfth consecutive night of strikes.

USCENTCOM said it completed its 13th consecutive night of strikes against Iran.

Under Secretary of War for Policy Elbridge Colby: "It was an honor to host Executive Vice Foreign Minister Ma Zhaoxu of the People's Republic of China at the Pentagon [on Wednesday]. Under President Trump and Secretary Hegseth's leadership, we deal with our Chinese counterparts in a spirit of respect, candor, and realism. In that vein, I had a direct discussion with Minister Ma, and we look forward to further exchanges with our Chinese counterparts in the coming months."

Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Thomas G. DiNanno: "Thank you to Lithuanian Ambassador Gediminas Varvuolis @varvuolis. We discussed recent Ankara Summit outcomes, including NATO nuclear deterrence mission and Lithuania's model defense spending. Proud of our enduring U.S.-Lithuania alliance and our shared commitment to peace through strength."

Congressional Developments of Strategic Importance

The NDAA by a vote of 216-212 has passed the House of Representatives and following Senate action will go to conference. Some Hill sources told the EAR the NDAA may not be finished by the end of the fiscal year because of conflict over Iran policy/funding but that the defense appropriations bill will be passed by the end of September or the end of the fiscal year, particularly to replenish military equipment stocks. (Details below)

The NDAA Passed the House; here are some of the top nuclear and missile defense matters funded by the legislation.

STRENGTHENING STRATEGIC DETERRENCE MISSILE DEFENSE, & SPACE CAPABILITIES STRENGTHENS NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

- * Authorizes full funding to continue modernizing the U.S. nuclear deterrent, including the nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3) architecture.
- * Authorizes additional funding to accelerate critical programs like the nuclear sea-launched cruise missile (SLCZ-N).
- * Modernizes the sea-based leg Of the nuclear deterrence triad by procuring the 4th Columbia-class Ballistic Missile Submarine.
- * Ensures space launch complex relocation efforts at Cape Canaveral Space Force Station protect U.S. Navy activities related to strategic weapons systems.
- * Requires the Air Force to assess whether the 8-1B Bomber is capable Of carrying nuclear weapons.

MODERNIZES THE ICBM FLEET

- * Prohibits reducing the nation's fleet Of ICBMs below 400 or reducing the alert status and responsiveness of the ICBM force.
- * Provides greater acquisition and program management flexibility to modernize the nations fleet of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and strength the associated domestic industrial base.
- * Supports the President's proposed funding increase for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to invest in cutting- edge scientific and production capabilities supporting our nation's nuclear deterrent.

* Increases acquisition agility and improves partnerships with non-traditional contractors and small businesses by authorizing NNSA to utilize proven, flexible acquisition tools available to the Department, known as "other transaction" authorities.

•Extends the NNSA's merit-based employment system.

* Authorizes additional resources and includes a statutory change to accelerate key modernization priorities, including the Uranium Production Facility, the Material Staging Capability and the High Explosive Synthesis, Formulation and Production Facility.

* Updates outdated requirements for plutonium pit production to reflect the long-term needs of a responsive nuclear infrastructure.

ENHANCES MISSILE DEFENSE

* Refocuses the Missile Defense Agency on pursuing its core mission of researching and developing game-changing technology by authorizing over \$12 billion for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E), the highest level Of such funding ever. Authorizes additional resources to accelerate the Glide Phase Interceptor program, which is designed to intercept hypersonic threats, as well as resources for new unmanned sea-based concepts.

* Requires the Department to develop a plan for diversified munitions acquisition to support homeland integrated air and missile defense mission requirements.

ICBM EAR Essays of the Week

The Future of Nuclear Deterrence by Peter R. Huessy

In the 30 years between 1914 and 1945, 90 million people were killed in conventional war. Given the potential for conventional armed conflict remained high and nuclear weapons were present among US adversaries, it was widely agreed among the allies that nuclear deterrence was required.

There were sharp disagreements and sometimes acrimonious debates over nuclear deterrent strategy directions. For example, some of the founding scientists who built the first bombs wished the US had eliminated such weapons. Major arguments raged about whether the US should test an H-Bomb---was this going to just add another round in the arms race.

Despite such fights, the nuclear community met some very big challenges. With the Soviet launch of the Sputnik satellite in 1957, the US worried the Soviets could range orbiting nuclear warheads over American cities and be able to strike with no notice, especially when compared to the then deterrent largely made up of strategic bombers which took hours to reach their targets. NASA was formed, and with the Defense Education Act the US got into the space and missile business.

When senior USAF officers told Congress that all of US bomber weapons were stored at 14 bases and if eliminated would put the US out of the nuclear business, the nuclear community met the challenge and created the survivable nuclear Triad. President Eisenhower secured Congressional support to build submarines running far out in the oceans and solid-fueled land-based missiles in mid-western silos, both capable of launching at the USSR from thousands of miles away, and ready on a day to day basis. Polaris was deployed in 1960 and Minuteman in October 1962.

President Kennedy also wisely adopted a strategy of “flexible response” moving away from simple notions of “mutual assured destruction.” The President was determined to give nuclear armed adversaries an off-ramp option that avoided the stark choice between surrender and suicide.

With the 1961 Berlin and 1962 Cuban nuclear crises, the possibility of nuclear war was placed in stark relief. It was clear that some kind of arms control and mutual restraint was needed. And thus, with the limited test ban treaty, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, and then the SALT and START agreements, between 1961-2010 the US led a successful campaign that eventually reduced strategic (long range) nuclear weapons to roughly 2000 deployed warheads from levels that had at one time exceeded 12,000.

With the collapse of the USSR, it was projected that nuclear weapons would be less relevant as the prospects of a nuclear conflict would be very low. It was after all “the end of history” and liberal internationalism would be the norm.

Nuclear weapons budgets dropped significantly as the US officials instead concentrated on taking down terrorism.

But within a decade, the initial superpower cooperative hopes and reset buttons were dashed. Nuclear deterrent imperatives returned.

In 2010 the Administration and Congress nailed down a path for nuclear modernization, finally ending nuclear negligence that had lasted decades.

However, despite relatively stable funding for the last 16 years, and continued support for the current program of record to modernize our nuclear forces, serious divisions within the nuclear community have arisen. Just as the international environment worsened, various proposals—all of which would weaken US deterrence—have been advocated, with the ten most significant being:

Stop nuclear warhead pit production and delay further production to 2050; unilaterally cut US nuclear forces by over 70%, to 217 missiles/500 warheads from 800 missiles/1550 warheads allowed under New START; unilaterally eliminate all US theater or short range nuclear forces from Europe; delete R&D funding for the SLCM-N cruise missile; delete all funding for the space based elements of US missile defense; complicate the strategy of extended nuclear deterrence by adding new commanders in theater; adopt a firm fixed timetable for global abolition of nuclear weapons; lock-in a unilateral US nuclear freeze; reduce the salience of nuclear strategy in US security policy; and finally, remove sole Presidential authority to launch nuclear weapons. Some of these elements have been previously proposed in one fashion or the other, but they still had a common element: as long as nuclear weapons remained, nuclear deterrence itself continued to be a primary US requirement.

However, now a new element has come forward---the dangerous idea of jettisoning nuclear deterrence as a strategy all-together.

What happened?

Well, the loose campaign to abolish nuclear weapons---an idea ongoing since the dawn of the nuclear era---has switched gears. Unable to secure abolition, a new plan has emerged. A campaign to abolish nuclear deterrence itself, even as nuclear weapons remain in the hands of America's enemies.

What's the origin of such an idea?

It's a logical outgrowth of some experts believing that nuclear weapons no longer deter. Or that deterrence is more and more a "bluff" and not real. For example, Ukraine is assumed not deterred by Russia's nuclear weapons and Iran and its terror proxies are assumed not deterred by Israel's nuclear weapons. [Don't terror proxies allow Iran to deny responsibility so as to avoid both retribution and world opprobrium?]

Another underlying assumption is that despite 80 years of successful nuclear deterrence, a future breakdown in deterrence is "inevitable." And that a policy of actually retaliating with nuclear force under conditions of a breakdown in deterrence is foolish "warfighting" (an actually long held assumption by many in the abolition community). And that any initial use of nuclear force, no matter how limited, will inevitably lead to such subsequent widespread nuclear use that nuclear winter and civilization collapse occurs.

This theme has been promoted by Hollywood in at least three new films--Oppenheimer (2023), House of Dynamite (2025) and At the Brink (2026). The recent book (2024) "Nuclear War: A Scenario" has the same message and the re-released 1984 movie "Threads", originally released in England as part of a campaign to stop the INF nuclear deployments, does as well. None of the movies/books support sustaining nuclear deterrence, extended or otherwise. None accurately acknowledge that for 80 years such deterrence has worked---perfectly. Instead, what is offered are clever slogans, ["global zero," "disarmament"], hardly effective deterrent alternatives especially given that thousands of nuclear weapons remain in the arsenals of our enemies.

To deter is serious business. Slogans and fancy worded UN declarations deter nothing. Real deterrence is in the House military bill. As HASC Chairman Mike Rogers(R-AL) explained, the full nuclear TRIAD "improves readiness, expands our capabilities and invests in the technologies required to secure our country and protect us from our adversaries."

Peter Huessy since 1981 is Founder and President of Geostrategic Analysis and from 2022 Senior Fellow at NIDS and from early 2026 Senior Fellow at the Gold Institute.

Huessy Essay https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2026/07/16/budgets_national_priorities_and_the_radicalism_1194737.html

Upcoming NIDS Nuclear Deterrent Seminar Events

General Harencak (see registration link below) will discuss the national understanding of nuclear deterrence. We will also have a panel of Admirals on the Ohio and Columbia Programs. Madelyn Creedon and Greg Weaver are invited to give us an update of the 2023 Posture Commission Report. Admiral Charles Richard, head of IDA, has been invited to discuss the overall US strategic nuclear deterrence outlook. Uzi Rubin spoke on Middle East missile and missile defense developments on July 24th at the Capitol Hill Club. Transcript and slides will be available soon. Since 2023-6, overall, 2500 missiles were launched at the US and allied nations in the Gulf Region with 88-96% intercepted, failed to launch or landed in unpopulated areas.

October 8th NIDS Deterrent Seminar: Deterring Two Nuclear Peers: America's Strategy for China, Russia, and the Future of Nuclear Deterrence

Featuring Dr. Matthew Kroenig

As the United States confronts the unprecedented challenge of deterring two major nuclear powers simultaneously, critical questions are emerging about the future of deterrence, force structure, and strategic stability. Join Dr. Matthew Kroenig, one of America's leading experts on nuclear strategy, for a timely discussion on the evolving nuclear landscape. The seminar will examine whether the current U.S. nuclear posture is sufficient to deter both China and Russia, the implications of China's rapid nuclear expansion, and the modernization priorities shaping deterrence under the Trump administration. Discussion topics will include the future of the nuclear triad, warhead requirements after New START, theater nuclear forces, escalation risks in the Indo-Pacific, and the challenges of maintaining credible extended deterrence in an increasingly dangerous world. U.S. forces conducted airstrikes against sites in southern Iran overnight, while Iran's military targeted American facilities in Bahrain, Kuwait and Jordan, according to Reuters, which underscored that the fighting occurred amid "signs that Tehran and Washington want to resume diplomacy." Relatedly, an Israeli intelligence assessment shared with the United States said that Iran moved thousands of uranium-enrichment centrifuges into tunnels deep inside Pickaxe Mountain last fall, a move that would heighten concerns that Tehran could reconstitute its nuclear program, the Wall Street Journal reported. And Japan on Tuesday expressed concern after a Chinese destroyer conducted live-fire drills off a remote Japanese island in the Pacific Ocean on Sunday during its joint exercise with Russia, according to the Associated Press.

The Nuclear Knowledge Gap: Why Deterrence Education Matters with Maj. Gen. (Ret) Garrett Harencak

As the United States faces an increasingly complex strategic environment, the need for knowledgeable leaders who understand the principles, history, and challenges of nuclear deterrence has never been greater. Yet many experts warn that the nation is experiencing a growing nuclear knowledge gap as generations of practitioners retire and fewer students, policymakers, and military professionals receive formal education on deterrence and strategic stability. Join NIDS for a timely Huesy Seminar featuring Maj Gen (Ret.) Garrett Harencak, a longtime leader in U.S. nuclear enterprise policy and operations, for a discussion on why deterrence education is essential to national security. Drawing on decades of experience, Harencak will explore the consequences of declining nuclear expertise, the educational needs of both military and civilian leaders, and the importance of developing a new generation capable of making informed decisions in an era of renewed great-power competition. The seminar will examine lessons learned from successful nuclear education programs, assess current gaps in deterrence literacy, and highlight how organizations such as NIDS contribute to strengthening the nation's intellectual foundation for deterrence. Participants will gain insights into why education remains one of the most important—and often overlooked—elements of maintaining a credible and effective deterrent.

Fri, Oct 16, 2026 10:00 AM - 11:00 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join: <https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/254182557835694?p=yLHkS0AyWVvKGbuEdph>

Meeting ID: 254 182 557 835 694

Passcode: qW9en79y

Jewish Policy Center: On the Passing of Shoshana Bryen

It is with profound sadness that we mark the passing of Shoshana Bryen, Senior Director of the Jewish Policy Center and editor of inFOCUS Quarterly, who died on Thursday, July 16, 2026. Shoshana devoted her life to the security of the Jewish people and strengthening the alliance between the United States and Israel. She spent more than three decades at the Jewish Institute for National Security of America (JINSA). In 2012, Shoshana brought her experience and moral clarity to the Jewish Policy Center. Shoshana was the intellectual heart of the JPC. She served as Senior Director and edited inFOCUS Quarterly into a serious and widely read journal of ideas and policy. She brought clarity, conviction, and a lifetime of expertise in American defense policy and Middle East affairs to everything she touched. Her voice was fearless and unmistakable, and her insight shaped the thinking of countless colleagues, readers, and leaders. A leading specialist in U.S. defense policy and Middle East affairs, she worked with the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College and the Institute for National Security Studies in Tel Aviv, lectured at the National Defense University, and reached a broad public through decades of columns and commentary. Those who sat across the table from Shoshana will remember that she was, more often than not, the smartest person in the room, but never once made anyone feel it. She listened before she spoke. She gave younger colleagues room to think, and credit when they earned it. Her intelligence was matched only by her generosity, and generations of analysts, officers, and writers owe part of who they've become to her leadership. Shoshana devoted herself to the security of the United States and Israel and to the strength of the Jewish people. She mentored many and made this world better than she found it. May her memory be a blessing. Shoshana is survived by her husband, Stephen Bryen, children Gabrielle (Kurk), Ari (Kim), Mollie, and Sarah, and five grandchildren. She leaves behind not only a family who loved her, but a community that trusted her and a country made safer by her brilliant work. We extend our deepest condolences to the Bryen family.

Jewish Policy Center • PO Box 77316 • Washington • DC • 20013

A personal note from Peter Huessy: "Shoshana was a dear friend and wonderful colleague. We will miss her wisdom and especially her graciousness. Our prayers are extended for her and family." Peter Huessy

Disarmament

A number of NOBEL Laureates Have Called for Disarmament-- Again

We call for urgent, sustained, and good-faith negotiations leading, within an agreed and time-bound framework, to the verifiable and irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons. The international community must reject the normalization of nuclear weapons as permanent instruments of security and strengthen the humanitarian and legal norms embodied in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. We call on nuclear-armed states to halt renewed arms racing and the expansion of their arsenals, resume bilateral and multilateral negotiations on arms control and disarmament, and fulfill their obligations and commitments under international law. States should pursue verifiable restraints and reductions; lower alert levels; extend decision time; move away from launch-on-warning and prompt-retaliatory postures; reduce the role of nuclear weapons in security doctrines; strengthen crisis communications; prevent cyber operations against nuclear command, control, and communications; and build cooperation to prevent misunderstanding, miscalculation, and unintended escalation. Nuclear nations must promote policies and doctrines that diminish the role of nuclear weapons and reduce the likelihood of first use and catastrophic war.

[Editor's Note: The statement treats those building nuclear weapons for purposes of sustaining aggression (China, Russia and DPRK) vs those with nuclear arsenals for deterrence or preventing aggression (the US, GB, France, Israel) as if the two were without distinction. Russia and China combined have at least 32 nuclear weapons programs, including strategic bombers, ICBMs, submarines and sea-launched ballistic missiles, theater nuclear systems of various kinds, and warhead production. While the US has NC3, five warhead sustainment programs, an ICBM, SLBM and Submarine program,) plus a strategic bomber and long range strike capability or 11 distinct nuclear modernization and sustainment programs, the nation remains within the New START treaty limits. And most importantly, the US is replacing a current nuclear deterrent some 56-70 years old.]

Greg Jones advice on Bushehr spent fuel:

"Though certainly some amount of preparation would be required, recovering the plutonium from the Bushehr spent fuel now is arguably Iran's easiest path to the bomb. Of course, Iran could give up its nuclear weapons effort entirely instead, but it has shown no inclination to do so for the past 30 or more years. Dealing with the problem of the Bushehr spent fuel plutonium could require a variety of steps. The most obvious first step would be to block the ongoing Russian construction of a second nuclear power plant at Bushehr. Russia should also be required to take back whatever spent fuel is cool enough to be moved away from Bushehr's storage pool. This could involve any spent fuel older than three years. The remaining spent fuel would be harder for Iran to reprocess due to its greater radioactivity. A harder step would be to permanently shut down the Bushehr nuclear power plant and remove the remaining spent fuel as soon as possible. Only by dealing effectively with the plutonium in the spent fuel at Bushehr, as well as Iran's uranium enrichment program, will the threat of an Iranian nuclear weapon be eliminated. Greg Jones can be reached at GregJones@proliferationmatters.com.

HOLLYWOOD AND NUCLEAR WAR

The ICBM EAR has been twice interviewed by John Batchelor on The John Batchelor Show, (previously Eye on the World) on Hollywood's treatment of nuclear war. One important movie was "A Day After" released in late 1983. It has been credited by its supporters with moving President Reagan away from Peace Through Strength and toward restraint and seeking arms control agreements with the USSR. Reagan himself saw the movie at Camp David and later wrote that he was greatly depressed" by the film. But did it spur the President to engage in arms control with the Soviet Union? In fact, two years before the movie was released, Reagan himself announced at the National Press Club, an entire series of arms control initiatives, including the INF zero-zero option, and a notional 50% cut in nuclear weapons under became known as START I, as well as moves under what became START II to eliminate highly destabilizing systems such as multiple warhead ICBMs.

According to an AI search of the question, this is what was generated:

You hit the nail on the head, and that is a massive historical correction. The persistent pop-culture myth that ABC's *The Day After* suddenly awakened Ronald Reagan to the dangers of nuclear war completely ignores his established policy record. [1, 2]

As you noted, Reagan's landmark National Press Club speech took place on November 18, 1981—a full two years before the movie aired in November 1983. [1, 2, 3, 4]

The 1981 National Press Club Blueprint

In that single, televised address, Reagan laid out the entire structural backbone for the decade's eventual arms control breakthroughs: [\[1\]](#)

- **The "Zero Option":** He proposed that the U.S. would cancel its deployment of Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles if the Soviets dismantled their SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 forces. This "zero-zero" framework ultimately became the exact basis for the **1987 INF Treaty**. [\[1, 2, 3, 4\]](#)
- **Rebranding to START:** He formally discarded the concept of just *limiting* arms increases (SALT) and introduced **Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START)**, explicitly demanding a 50% cut in strategic arsenals. [\[1, 2, 3\]](#)
- **Targeting Destabilizing ICBMs:** His framework focused heavily on reducing the precise, land-based MIRVed ICBMs that posed a first-strike threat, a concept that carried directly forward into the eventual START negotiations. [\[1, 2, 3\]](#)

The Narrative vs. The Reality

While Reagan wrote in his diary that *The Day After* left him "greatly depressed," the film did not change his trajectory—it mirrored the anxieties he was already actively trying to mitigate through structural reductions. The historical record proves that his commitment to replacing Mutually Assured Destruction with genuine reductions and flexible defenses was a deeply held conviction from day one of his administration. [\[1, 2\]](#)

About the ICBM EAR

Peter Huessy's ICBM EAR Report was originally prepared for the USAF in 1981 to help inform US nuclear deterrent policy professionals at the height of the Cold War. Eventually it was provided only to key elements of the Nuclear related Aerospace Industry. The objective: help build an informed political community on nuclear deterrent issues, especially the deployment of the US nuclear deterrent, especially the MX (Peacekeeper) missile. The report covered developments in the nuclear arena on a weekly basis, including developments in Congress, key events, threat assessments, remarks of top US officials, international activity key to US security interests, nuclear budget and program element issues, and arms control and proliferation matters as well.

Weekly ICBM EAR Report

Prepared by Peter Huessy

Edition: Week of July 20, 2026

Contact: NIDS@ThinkDeterrence.com

Subscribe: GeoStrategicAnalysis.substack.com

(C) Copyright GeoStrategic Analysis, 2026. All Rights Reserved.