



Strong National Security Support for the New START Treaty

Information Pack

<http://www.securityconsensus.org/>

November 30, 2010

Contents:

P 3	National Security Can't Wait – Ratify New START Now
P 5	10 Things You Should Know about the New START Treaty
P 9	10 New U.S. Security Challenges if the Senate Fails to Pass START
P 19	New START and Missile Defense
P 26	National Security Experts Who Have Endorsed New START Ratification
P 30	Consensus Letter to Senate Leaders
P 34	US-Russia Business Council Letter to Senator Kyl
P 37	Strong, Nonpartisan Support for New START: Key Quotes
P 44	Letter from Former STRATCOM Commander to the SFRC
P 48	List of Senate Hearings Held on the New START Treaty
P 51	Notable Opinion Articles on New START

If you or your office would like any further information, or arrange a briefing with members of the Consensus for American Security - please contact Paul Hamill: phamill@americansecurityproject.org, 202 347 8999

***About the Consensus for American Security:** The Consensus for American Security is a non-partisan group of influential military and national security leaders who have come together to highlight growing support for a new and sustainable nuclear weapons policy. The Consensus is an initiative of the American Security Project. For more information, visit www.securityconsensus.org.*

National Security Can't Wait – Ratify New START Now.

For almost a year, American inspectors have been unable to monitor the Russian nuclear arsenal. The New START treaty will re-establish those inspections, provide a sound strategic framework, and improve our national security. That is why the entire U.S. military chain-of-command, seven former commanders of the U.S. Strategic Command, the head of the U.S. Missile Defense Agency and senior experts in both parties from each of the last seven presidential administrations support the New START treaty currently pending before the Senate.

"[T]he military leadership in this country believes that this treaty is essential to our future security. I hope the Senate will ratify it quickly."

**– Admiral Michael Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
November 12, 2010**

"If we don't get the treaty, they [the Russians] are not constrained in their development of force structure and we have no insight into what they're doing. So it's the worst of both possible worlds."

**– Gen. Kevin Chilton, Commander of U.S. Strategic Command
July 16, 2010**

"So both for myself, as a previous commander at STRATCOM, and also for General Chilton, we both feel very comfortable with these numbers [in New START]."

**– Gen. James Cartwright, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
April 6, 2010**

"The U.S. is better off with [the New START] treaty than without it... It increases stability and predictability, allows us to sustain a strong nuclear triad, and preserves our flexibility to deploy the nuclear and non-nuclear capabilities needed for effective deterrence and defense."

**– Robert Gates, Secretary of Defense
May 18, 2010**

"We strongly endorse its early ratification and entry into force."

**– 7 former commanders of U.S. Strategic Command and Strategic Air Command
July 14, 2010**

"Relative to the recently expired START Treaty, the New START Treaty actually reduces constraints on the development of the missile defense program."

**– Lt. Gen. Patrick O'Reilly, Director of the Missile Defense Agency
April 20, 2010**

"[Failure to ratify this treaty] would have a detrimental effect on our ability to influence others with regard to, particularly, the nonproliferation issue."

**– James Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense 1973-1975
April 29, 2010**

"I strongly believe that it is important for our country and Russia to maintain a vigorous commitment to arms control as part of our effort to create and maintain an effective non-proliferation regime."

**– James Baker, Secretary of State 1983-1992
May 19, 2010**

"Non-ratification would throw the whole nuclear negotiating situation into a state of chaos..."

**– Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft, National Security Advisor 1989-1993
June 10, 2010**



As members of The Consensus for American Security, we support the ratification of New START:

Brig. Gen. John Adams USA (Ret.)
Madeline Albright Secretary of State 1997-2001
Graham Allison Special Advisor to the Secretary of Defense 1995-1997
Mary Catherine Andrews Special Assistant to the President 2003-2006
Scott Bates Senior Advisor to the U.S. House of Representatives' Homeland Security Committee
Samuel Berger National Security Advisor 1997-2001
Colt Blacker Director and Senior Fellow, Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies
Barry Blechman Defense Policy Board 2002-2006
Mark Brominski Director of Russian/Eurasian Affairs, National Security Council 1999-2001
Amb. Richard Burt Chief Negotiator, Strategic Arms Reduction Talks with the Former Soviet Union
Lt. Gen. John Castellaw USMC (Ret.)
Brig. Gen. Stephen Chaney USMC (Ret.)
Nelson Cunningham Senior White House Foreign Policy Advisor
Sidney Drell Former Director of SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory
Maj. Gen. Paul Eaton USA (Ret.)
Lt. Gen. Robert Gard USA (Ret.)
Dennis Gormley Senior Research Fellow, Matthew B. Ridgway Center for International Security Studies
Vice Adm. Lee Gunn USN (Ret.)
Mort Halperin Director, Policy Planning Staff at the Department of State 1998-2001
Sen. Chuck Hagel US Senator (R-NE) 1997-2009

Maj. Gen. Marcolita Harris USAF (Ret.)
Sen. Gary Hart US Senator (D-CO) 1975-1987
Lt. Gen. Arden "Dink" Jameson USAF (Ret.)
Brig. Gen. John Johns USA (Ret.)
David Kay Former IAEA Chief Nuclear Weapons Inspector
Geoffrey Kemp Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs 1983-1985
Lt. Gen. Donald Kerrick USA (Ret.)
Col. Richard Klass USAF (Ret.)
Lawrence Korb Assistant Secretary of Defense 1981-1985
Rear Adm. Rosanne Levine USN (Ret.)
Gen. Merrill "Tony" McPeak USAF (Ret.)
James Nolan Director of Nuclear Security, ASP
Adm. William Owens USN (Ret.)
Amb. Steven Pifer Ambassador to Ukraine 1996-2000
Lt. Gen. Norman Seip USAF (Ret.)
Amb. Wendy Sherman Former Counselor to the Secretary of State 1997-2001
George Shultz Secretary of State 1982-1989
Strobe Talbott Deputy Secretary of State 1993-2001
Lt. Gen. James Thompson USA (Ret.)
Maj. Gen. Jasper Welch USAF (Ret.)

www.securityconsensus.org

Paid for by the American Security Action Fund

10 Things You Should Know about the New START Treaty

The New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) was signed in April 2010 by the United States and Russia. New START provides modest limits on U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons, and a verification system that allows for monitoring of each country's nuclear arsenal.

Critics of the treaty have attempted to create doubt about the usefulness of approving New START. However, there are ten key realities about the treaty that any nonpartisan assessment should include:

1. **New START provides the accurate, real time intelligence that the United States needs to protect its security.** Admiral Michael Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in March 2010 that, “[New START] features a much more effective, transparent verification method that demands quicker data exchanges and notifications... this treaty enhances our ability to do that which we have been charged to do: protect and defend the citizens of the United States. I am as confident in its success as I am in its safeguards.”
2. **The limits on strategic nuclear forces in the treaty allow the U.S. military to allocate resources to its most vital priorities,** instead of spending on weapons designed for the Cold War.
3. **New START provides for a strong American nuclear deterrent** in the context of a stable and predictable framework between the U.S. and Russia, ensuring the United States has what is needed to deter all potential adversaries.
4. **Under New START, the United States will have the benefit of highly trained, professional inspectors on the ground in Russia** to conduct frequent, routine inspections of Russian nuclear forces. The agreement allows the U.S. to count the number of actual warheads on Russian missiles and to track any movements of Russian strategic forces limited by the treaty.

5. **New START places no limits on American missile defense plans.** Unilateral statements by either side should not be confused for real treaty provisions. They are not legally binding.
6. **The New START agreement will make it easier to advance U.S. missile defense research.** General Patrick O'Reilly, head of the Missile Defense Agency, testified in a June 2010 Senate hearing that New START will reduce constraints on missile defense-related activities. He noted that once the treaty enters into force, "[W]e will have greater flexibility in conducting testing with regard to launch locations, telemetry collection, and processing, thus allowing more efficient test architectures."
7. **New START does not limit modernization of the U.S. nuclear stockpile.** This right is explicitly protected in the agreement. Without the treaty, however, funds for modernization priorities run the risk of being diverted back to spending on weapons that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said we don't need.
8. **Ratifying the New START Treaty is an essential step towards addressing other nuclear dangers,** including the Russian arsenal of tactical (short-range) nuclear weapons. Without New START, other important challenges will go unmet.
9. **New START has won overwhelming nonpartisan support from over 70 national security and military officials,** including former Secretaries of State and Defense, National Security Advisors, national laboratory directors and STRATCOM Commanders, spanning eight administrations and from both sides of the aisle.
10. **It has been over 300 days since New START's predecessor, START I, expired** and took with it the access to crucial intelligence that the United States requires for its security. Until the Senate votes to ratify New START, the United States is denied vital national security and intelligence benefits.

10 Challenges to US Security if the Senate Fails to Ratify New START

“I believe, and the rest of the military leadership in this country believes, that this treaty is essential to our future security...I hope the Senate will ratify it quickly.”
(November 12, 2010)

Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Key Findings

- If the Senate fails to ratify New START before the Congress goes out of session for the year, the United States will lose significant national security and intelligence benefits.
- The bipartisan resolution of ratification amended and passed by a clear majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is void if the full Senate fails to move forward with ratification this year.
- Delaying a vote until the next Congress means that New START risks never being taken up again. Other legislation that the new Congress must consider next year will compete for Senate time and could make it impossible to fully vet the agreement or put it to a vote.
- Even under the most optimistic scenarios, it will be months before the Senate can complete another review of the treaty and move the agreement to the floor.
- With a new Congress starting in January 2011 that will include newly elected members who have little familiarity with the treaty's provisions, the Senate would literally have to start from scratch.

Failure to ratify New START will create many new national security challenges for the United States.

Here are ten:

1. Undermining US Stature in the World

The United States will lose stature and credibility if a treaty that is vital to both global and national security cannot be ratified because of domestic politics.

American influence to promote nuclear restraint globally depends on the US honoring its commitments to other powers, including Russia. A failure to ratify START this year will damage the US-Russian relationship, could play to Russian opponents of US-Russian cooperation, and ultimately reverse the progress the US has made in unifying the large powers to act decisively against urgent security threats such as Iran.

Russian assistance in non-proliferation, counter-narcotics, counter-terrorism, and the quest for stability in Afghanistan will be compromised if there is a stalemate or decline in US-Russian relations stemming from a US failure to ratify START.

At the recent NATO summit in Lisbon, the allies urged the US to move without delay to ratify the START treaty, stressing the importance of START to their own security and as an essential part of the support the US has elicited among European states and Russia for missile defense.

"I have received overwhelming support from our allies here that START — the New START treaty — is a critical component to U.S. and European security...and they have urged both privately and publicly that this gets done." (November 21, 2010)

President Barack Obama

2. Uncertainty about the US-Russian Nuclear Balance

Without a formal and verifiable agreement, there will be no constraints on or predictability about the level and type of nuclear forces the Russians deploy, making it much more difficult – and expensive – for the United States to plan and size its forces. The US may be forced to revert to “worst case” predictions to plan its own forces instead of the more precise and cost effective criteria that come with the transparency provided under START.

“If we don’t get the treaty, [the Russians] are not constrained in their development of force structure and ...we have no insight into what they’re doing. So it’s the worst of both possible worlds.” (June 6, 2010)

General Kevin Chilton, US STRATCOM Commander

3. An Uncertain Future for Modernization

The administration has proposed unprecedentedly large increases in funding for the modernization and refurbishment of the nuclear infrastructure over the next ten years, recently adding an additional \$4.1 billion to the \$80 billion the Senate had already approved.

The recognition of the need for augmented investment in nuclear facilities has prompted a former NNSA director, Linton Brooks, to quip: “this is a budget I would have killed for.”

No matter how strong the commitment to modernization currently, a failure to ratify the START treaty – in a climate of mounting pressures from both parties to cut the federal budget – will undercut the bipartisan consensus in favor of these large budgetary increases and could lead to a failure to make needed investments.

“Concerns about modernization ... are not an argument against the treaty. They are an argument for building a political consensus between the administration and Congress on what needs to be funded now and what can be deferred. In this respect, the treaty provides a vehicle whereby some Democrats not usually known for their support of strategic systems can

bring themselves to commit to modernization, while, at the same time, some Republicans not usually known for their support for arms control can bring themselves to vote for ratification. Conversely, rejecting the treaty may well break this consensus and result in no modernization of our forces.”
(September 22, 2010)

Lt. General Brent Scowcroft, USAF (Ret.), President George H.W. Bush's
National Security Advisor

4. Constraints on US Intelligence

Without New START, the US is deprived of the vital intelligence it receives from having trained inspectors on the ground to closely monitor Russian nuclear forces and facilities.

The US uses national technical means to augment intelligence from onsite inspections. Overhead surveillance and other such intelligence capabilities are much less precise and inevitably face constraints in light of the many other demands on intelligence assets, especially from the Middle East and Afghanistan.

“We need to get our inspectors back into Russia after a gap of nearly a year. As our intelligence and defense colleagues have repeatedly noted, we are much better off with New START than without it. Jim Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, said yesterday, the earlier, the sooner, the better. We need the stability, transparency, and predictability that New START will provide by giving us insight into Russia's strategic nuclear arsenal.”
(November 17, 2010)

Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State

5. Less Bang for the Buck

Without a formal agreement that sets reliable ceilings on Russian strategic weapons, the US will have to program funds for weapons it planned to retire and may need to redirect resources from other, more urgent defense priorities to hedge against unknown Russian developments.

At a time of severe budget cuts and accelerating demands for defense resources, a failure to ratify New START could force the Chiefs to make difficult sacrifices that impinge on critical priorities – from the war in Afghanistan to improvements in advanced conventional capabilities under Prompt Global Strike, to medical benefits for veterans.

“Without New START we will be compelled to waste military resources, not to mention tax dollars. A precise accounting of the Russian arsenal and predictability going forward informs our strategic force structure. Frankly, it is to our advantage to verifiably reduce the Russian deployment because it allows us to use our resources more effectively.” (November 15, 2010)

Lt. Gen John Castellaw, USMC (Ret.)

6. A Loss of Intelligence Assets

Without a treaty in place, the United States cannot count on getting the intelligence we need from the highly skilled on site inspectors who have developed the experience and technical expertise to effectively implement verification provisions and keep close tabs on Russia.

Each day the inspectors cannot be on the job, the individuals who have spent years training to understand and monitor Russian nuclear activities risk frustration from being unable to do their jobs and ultimately may opt to seek new opportunities for more productive employment.

The loss of experienced inspectors and their special expertise would have an incalculably adverse impact on US intelligence capabilities, chilling prospects for future agreements with Russia (or any other country) that need to be verified with confidence.

7. Stalled Progress in Nuclear Security: The Russian Tactical Nuclear Arsenal

If the Senate fails to complete the New START treaty, it will be impossible to move ahead to achieve new agreements with Russia, including to reduce and secure their large and dangerous arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons.

As long as Russia keeps thousands of tactical nuclear weapons without agreed constraints or a verification regime, they pose a risk to the security of our NATO allies and heighten the danger of terrorist compromise.

“The principal result of non-ratification would be to throw the whole nuclear negotiating situation into a state of chaos.” (June 10, 2010)

**Lt. General Brent Scowcroft, USAF (Ret.), President George H.W. Bush’s
National Security Advisor**

8. No Future for Nuclear Threat Reduction

The failure to implement the START agreement could make it impossible to sustain ongoing cooperative efforts to secure and dismantle the stockpiles of mass destruction weapons and materiel dispersed across the territory of the former Soviet Union.

The Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, also known as Nunn-Lugar, is the most successful counter proliferation agreement the world has ever seen. It has reduced and secured the stockpiles and facilities of dangerous technologies of many former Soviet republics and contained the most likely source of supply of unconventional weapons to terrorists.

The risk of terrorists gaining access to nuclear material – or even to a weapon – will increase without Russian willingness to continue and extend cooperative efforts under Nunn-Lugar. The US would lose the ability to monitor developments in the region with any confidence, a vital element of efforts to contain global proliferation.

“It is unlikely that Moscow would sustain cooperative efforts indefinitely without the New START treaty coming into force. The Nunn-Lugar Umbrella Agreement expires in 2013. The prospects for extending Nunn-Lugar work in Russia after that date would be especially complicated without New START’s transparency features that assure both countries about the nuclear capabilities of the other.” (November 8, 2010)

Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN)

9. Effects on the Global Non-Proliferation Regime

The viability of the global non-proliferation regime, including efforts to contain outlier states like Iran and North Korea, depends on Russian support and cooperation.

Russia aside, other countries may be less inclined to follow American leadership or join US-sponsored initiatives if they perceive that the US is too hobbled by domestic politics to honor its commitments or ratify a simple strategic arms treaty.

*Failure to ratify this treaty “would have a detrimental effect on our ability to influence others with regard to, particularly, the nonproliferation issue.”
(April 29, 2010)*

James Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense for Presidents Nixon and Ford

10. Unraveling the American Security Consensus

Military leaders from successive administrations have come forward to urge prompt ratification of New START in the highest interest of national security.

A failure to ratify – in defiance of our military’s best advice – will have severe effects on American political cohesion and the long-standing consensus among all Americans to subordinate politics when it comes to issues of national security.

“The New START Treaty has the unanimous support of America’s military leadership.” (April 3, 2010)

Robert Gates, US Secretary of Defense

The Bottom Line

“...We have to hold elected officials of either party to account for their behavior on a matter of consequence such as this and not just let them get by with a rubber stamped negative vote. They have to say why they’re doing that and it has to make sense.

“These are matters of ultimate consequence, survival perhaps, who knows, we owe it to our children, we owe it to future generations to do what’s right here and not calculate the politics.” (July 19, 2010)

Gary Hart former Senator (D-CO)

New START and Missile Defense

Setting the Record Straight

*“Relative to the recently expired START treaty, **the New START treaty actually reduces constraints on the development of the missile defense program...**[under New START] our targets will no longer be subject to START constraints.”¹*

- Lieutenant General Patrick O'Reilly, Director of the U.S. Missile Defense Agency

The New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) was signed on April 8, 2010 by the United States and Russia. The treaty seeks to stabilize each country's strategic offensive arms, much like the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) and the 2002 Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT). However, a very small group of individuals have criticized New START, saying that it constrains future U.S. ballistic missile defense programs. While New START does contain language pertaining to missile defense, the treaty in no way limits current U.S. missile defense plans, testing, or deployment.

New START Reduces Constraints and Helps Missile Defense

Lt. General Patrick O'Reilly, Director of the U.S. Missile Defense Agency, the agency within DOD responsible for developing ballistic missile defense, has testified before Congress numerous times² in support of New START, stating that it does not constrain U.S. missile defense plans.

¹ Senate Armed Services Committee. Hearing on *Fiscal Year 2011 Defense Authorization: Ballistic Missile Defense Programs*. 04/20/2010.

² Lt. Gen. O'Reilly testified before the House Armed Services Committee on April 15, 2010; before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 20, 2010; and before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 16, 2010.

Four main points support his statement.

Article III: This article states that “a missile of a type developed and tested solely to intercept and counter objects not located on the surface of the Earth shall not be considered to be a ballistic missile to which the provisions of this treaty apply.”³ Simply put, interceptor missiles (the core of current U.S. missile defense plans⁴) are excluded from this treaty. New START places no constraints on how the U.S. chooses to develop its interceptor force.

Trident I Missile: Trident I missiles are Submarine-launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMs) carried on Ohio-class submarines. Under START I, Trident I missiles were counted towards the U.S. limit. However, New START places no such restrictions on Trident I missiles. The U.S. State Department stated that “Trident I SLBMs...are no longer SLBMs of an existing type.”⁵ This means that the U.S. can now use Trident I missiles as missile defense test targets without counting them against its limits under New START.⁶

Telemetry: As opposed to START I,⁷ New START relaxes restrictions on telemetry (the technical information that a missile sends back about its operation) to only a few exchanges per year. Part II of the Annex on Telemetric Information states that “...the Party conducting launches...may use any method of denying access to telemetric information.”⁸ This means

³ “Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms.” 04/08/2010.

<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/140035.pdf>.

⁴ Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Hearing on *The New START Treaty: Views from the Pentagon*. 06/16/2010.

⁵ “Statement of the United States of America: Trident I SLBMs.” U.S. Department of State: Bureau of Verification, Compliance, and Implementation. 04/07/2010. <http://www.state.gov/t/avc/rls/140186.htm>.

⁶ “Senate Foreign Relations Committee Request for Information.” 05/17/2010.

<http://lugar.senate.gov/issues/start/pdf/SFRCrequest.pdf>.

⁷ START I relied heavily on telemetric information for verification purposes, since the treaty did not count the actual number of warheads:

http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear_weapons_and_global_security/nuclear_weapons/technical_issues/verification-of-new-start.html.

⁸ “Annex on Telemetric Information to the Protocol to the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms.” 04/08/2010. <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/141292.pdf>.

that the U.S. can conduct flight testing for missile defense without giving Russia access to the telemetric data.⁹

Long-range Testing: Under START I, the U.S. was restricted from launching missiles from airborne targets, aircraft, or waterborne targets, making long-range testing difficult. These constraints no longer apply under New START, giving the U.S. greater flexibility in conducting long-range testing in the Pacific. It will also give the U.S. the ability to expand tests from 1,000 kilometers up to 4,000 kilometers without any restrictions.¹⁰

New START and Missile Defense – Allegations and Truths

Allegation: The language in the Preamble to New START links Russian compliance under New START to limits on U.S. missile defense capabilities.

Truth: The Preamble to New START simply states that there is a relationship between strategic offensive arms and strategic defensive arms, and that this relationship will become more important as offensive arms reductions occur. This is simply stating a fact. Offensive and defensive capabilities are inherently related; without an offense, there would be no need for a defense. The preamble also makes clear that currently deployed strategic defensive arms *do not undermine* the strategic offensive arms of either Russia or the United States. Most importantly, the preamble is not legally binding.

⁹ Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Hearing on *The New START Treaty: Views from the Pentagon*. 06/16/2010.

¹⁰ House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces. Hearing on *The Ballistic Missile Defense Review and the FY 2011 National Defense Authorization Budget Request Programs*. 04/15/2010.

Allegation: Article V, Section 3 of New START does not allow for silo conversion and therefore limits U.S. missile defense options.

Truth: Article V, Section 3 discusses the conversion of Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) and SLBM launchers for use in missile defense programs. According to Article V, the U.S. and Russia may not convert existing ICBM or SLBM launchers into missile defense interceptors, and they may not convert existing missile defense interceptors into ICBM or SLBM launchers. This provision does not apply to the ICBM launchers converted at Vandenberg Air Force Base prior to the signing of New START. However, the U.S. does not plan to convert any more silos or launchers for use in missile defense. Converting launchers is technically and financially unattractive. According to Lt. General O'Reilly, the U.S. has developed an interceptor silo that "costs \$20 million less than converting ICBM silos and is easier to protect and maintain."¹¹

Allegation: The withdrawal clause in Article XIV links Russian withdrawal from the treaty with development of U.S. missile defenses.

Truth: The New START treaty, like every treaty, contains a withdrawal clause which states that the U.S. or Russia may withdraw from the treaty for "extraordinary events." In its unilateral statement, Russia declared that the development of U.S. missile defenses *may* be considered such an event. It should be noted, however, that this clause is nearly identical to the withdrawal clause contained in other arms-control agreements, such as START I and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Furthermore, the clause applies to the United States as well. If the Russians develop a capability we believe upsets the strategic balance, then the United States may withdraw from New START.

¹¹ Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Hearing on *The New START Treaty: Views from the Pentagon*. 06/16/2010.

Allegation: Russia will withdraw from the treaty if the U.S. increases its missile defense capabilities, as they declared in their unilateral statement. Therefore, New START limits U.S. missile defense.

Truth: Prior to the signing of New START, the U.S. and Russia released unilateral statements pertaining to missile defense.¹² Russia stated that “a build-up in [U.S.] missile defense system capabilities” may be grounds for Russian withdrawal from the treaty. The U.S. stated that, regardless, it will “continue improving and deploying its missile defense systems.” Defense Secretary Robert Gates affirmed this U.S. position when he testified that “the United States will continue to improve our capability to defend ourselves, our deployed forces, and our allies and partners against ballistic missile threats...We have made all this clear to the Russians.”¹³ These unilateral statements are just that – independent opinions that reflect each country’s view on the subject. They are *not legally binding* nor are they part of the treaty itself. The Soviet Union made a similar unilateral statement when signing START I, threatening to withdraw from START I if the U.S. pulled out of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Although the U.S. announced its withdrawal from the ABM Treaty in 2001, Russia remained a Party to START I. Clearly, unilateral statements cannot be counted on as reliable predictors of behavior or future obligations.

¹² “New START: Unilateral Statements.” U.S. Department of State. 04/07/2010.
<http://www.state.gov/t/avc/newstart/c39904.htm>.

¹³ Senate Armed Services Committee. Hearing on *New START and Its Implications for National Security*. 06/17/2010.

Allegation: The Bilateral Consultative Commission (BCC) created by the treaty may modify the treaty without the Senate's advice and consent and could limit U.S. missile defenses.

Truth: According to the treaty, the BCC may approve "additional measures as may be necessary to improve the viability and effectiveness of the treaty."¹⁴ However, Article XV, Section 2 of the treaty states the BCC may in no way make changes that would "affect substantive rights or obligations under this treaty." The BCC cannot, therefore, make any changes to the treaty that would limit or constrain U.S. missile defense.

Reality

Despite critics' claims to the contrary, New START does nothing to prohibit or constrain U.S. missile defense plans. In fact, it *reduces* previous constraints on missile defense.

New START has the support of top military officers and national security officials, including Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Michael Mullen, the head of the U.S. Strategic Command General Kevin Chilton, Commander of Air Force Global Strike Command Lt. Gen. Frank G. Klotz, and Secretary of Defense Robert Gates.

Dr. Janne Nolan, Director for Nuclear Security at ASP said: "If New START was truly a detriment to missile defense, it would not have such broad support among those entrusted with our nation's security."

¹⁴ "Protocol to the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction of Strategic Offensive Arms." Part Six, Section I (b). 04/08/2010. <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/140047.pdf>.

National Security Experts Who Have Endorsed New START Ratification:

Madeleine Albright, Secretary of State, 1997-2001

Howard Baker, U.S. Senator (R-TN), 1967-85

Samuel Berger, National Security Advisor, 1997-2001

Dr. Barry Blechman, Assistant Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, 1977-80; Commissioner, Commission to Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States, 1998-99

Linton Brooks, Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration, 2002-07

Harold Brown, Secretary of Defense, 1977-81

Mark Brzezinski, Director of Southeast European Affairs, National Security Council, 1999-2001

Richard Burt, Chief START Negotiator, 1989-91

Frank Carlucci, Secretary of Defense, 1987-89

Warren Christopher, Secretary of State, 1993-97

William Cohen, Secretary of Defense, 1997-2001

John C. Danforth, U.S. Senator (R-MO), 1977-95

Kenneth M. Duberstein, White House Chief of Staff, 1988-89

Lieutenant General Robert Gard, U.S. Army (Ret), President of the National Defense University, 1977-81

Vice Admiral Lee Gunn, U.S. Navy (Ret), Inspector General of the

Department of the Navy, 1997-2000

Chuck Hagel, U.S. Senator (R-NE), 1997-2009

Lee Hamilton, U.S. Congressman (D-IN), 1965-99

Gary Hart, U.S. Senator (D-CO), 1975-87

Rita E. Hauser, Chair, International Peace Institute

Carla Hills, U.S. Trade Representative, 1989-93

Lieutenant General Dirk Jameson, U.S. Air Force (Ret), Commander of U.S. ICBM forces 1992-94; Deputy Commander-In-Chief of U.S. Strategic Command, 1994-96

Nancy Kassebaum-Baker, U.S. Senator (R-KS), 1978-97

Thomas Kean, Governor (R-NJ), 1982-90; 9/11 Commission Chair

Lawrence Korb, Assistant Secretary of Defense, 1981-85

Richard Leone, President, The Century Foundation

Donald McHenry, U.S. Ambassador to the UN, 1979-81

Sam Nunn, U.S. Senator (D-GA), 1972-96

William Perry, Secretary of Defense, 1994-97

Thomas Pickering, Under Secretary of State, 1997-2000

Steven Pifer, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, 2001-04

Colin L. Powell, Secretary of State, 2001-05

Warren Rudman, U.S. Senator (R-NH), 1980-92

Wendy Sherman, Commissioner, Commission for the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction, Proliferation and Terrorism; Special Advisor and Policy Coordinator on U.S. policy toward North Korea, 1997-2001

Alan Simpson, U.S. Senator (R-WY), 1979-97

George Shultz, Secretary of State, 1982-89

Theodore Sorensen, White House Special Counsel, 1961-63

John Whitehead, Deputy Secretary of State, 1985-88

Timothy E. Wirth, U.S. Senator (D-CO), 1987-93

Frank Wisner, Under Secretary of State, 1992-93

Testimony from Former Republican Officials in Favor of New START Ratification:

- Former Secretaries of Defense James Schlesinger and William Perry – Senate Foreign Relations Committee, April 29, 2010.
- Former Secretary Henry Kissinger – Senate Foreign Relations Committee, May 25, 2010.
- Former Secretary of State James Baker – Senate Foreign Relations Committee, May 19, 2010.
- Former National Security Advisors Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft and Stephen Hadley – Senate Foreign Relations Committee, June 10, 2010.

Consensus Letter to Senate Leaders

November 17, 2010

Dear Senator Reid and Senator McConnell:

As retired military officers and national security experts who have spent our careers dedicated to protecting the security of the United States, we respectfully request you commit to a full Senate vote on ratification of the New START Treaty as soon as possible.

We ask the Senate to consider the consequences to our national security in delaying ratification of this vital treaty.

It has been 347 days since American inspectors left Russia, and every day uncertainty grows. Without New START in place, we have no on-site verification mechanisms in place to monitor Russian strategic forces.

Further delay will only risk misunderstanding and destabilization of the U.S. and Russian nuclear balance; set back other important non-proliferation priorities; and, put America needlessly at risk.

We urge all Senators to heed the words of our military leaders, including Admiral Mike Mullen, who said: *"The military leadership in this country believes that this treaty is essential to our future security....I hope the Senate will ratify it quickly."*

As part of the vast consensus of national security professionals who have endorsed New START, we respectfully call on the Senate to ratify the New START Treaty.

Sincerely,

The Consensus for American Security

Brigadier General John Adams (U.S. Army, Ret.)
Madeleine Albright, former U.S. Secretary of State
Dr. Graham Allison, former Special Advisor to the Secretary of Defense
Mary Catherine Andrews, former Special Assistant to the President
Scott Bates, former Senior Policy Advisor to the U.S. House Homeland Security Committee
Samuel Berger, former National Security Advisor
Dr. Barry Blechman, Assistant Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Mark Brzezinski, former Director for Russian/Eurasian affairs at the National Security Council
Ambassador Richard Burt, U.S. Chief Negotiator in the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks
Lieutenant General John G. Castellaw (U.S. Marine Corps, Ret.)
Brigadier General Stephen A. Cheney (U.S. Marine Corps, Ret.)
Joe Cirincione, President of the Ploughshares Fund
Nelson Cunningham, former Special Advisor to the President for Western Hemisphere Affairs
Dr. Sidney Drell, former Deputy Director of the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory
Major General Paul Eaton (U.S. Army, Ret.)
Lieutenant General Robert Gard Jr. (U.S. Army, Ret.)
Dennis Gormley, Senior Research Fellow at the Matthew B. Ridgway Center for International Security Studies
Vice Admiral Lee Gunn (U.S. Navy, Ret.)
Chuck Hagel, former Senator (R-NE)
Dr. Morton Halperin, former Special Assistant to the President
Major General Marcelite Harris (U.S. Air Force, Ret.)
Gary Hart, former Senator (D-CO)
Lieutenant General Arlen "Dirk" Jameson (U.S. Air Force, Ret.)
Brigadier General John H. Johns, PhD (U.S. Army, Ret.)
Dr. David Kay, former IAEA/UNSCOM Chief Nuclear Weapons Inspector
Dr. Geoffrey Kemp, former Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

Lieutenant General Donald Kerrick (U.S. Army, Ret.)
Colonel Richard L. Klass (U.S. Air Force, Ret.)
Dr. Lawrence Korb, former Assistant Secretary of Defense
Rear Admiral Rosanne M. LeVitre (U.S. Navy, Ret.)
General Merrill “Tony” McPeak (U.S. Air Force, Ret.)
Dr. Janne E. Nolan, Director of Nuclear Security for the American
Security Project
Admiral William Owens (U.S. Navy, Ret.), former Vice Chairman of
the Joint Chiefs of Staff
Ambassador Steven Pifer, former Senior Director for Russia, Ukraine
and Eurasia of the NSC Lieutenant General Norman Seip (U.S. Air
Force, Ret.)
Lieutenant General Harry E. Soyster (U.S. Army, Ret.)
George P. Shultz, former U.S. Secretary of State
Ambassador Wendy R. Sherman, former Counselor for the State
Department and Special Advisor to President Clinton
Ambassador Nancy Soderberg, former Deputy Assistant to the
President for National Security Affairs
Strobe Talbott, former Deputy Secretary of State
Lieutenant General James M. Thompson (U.S. Army, Ret.)
Major General Jasper Welch (U.S. Air Force, Ret.)



№ 2010-211

November 18, 2010

Klaus Kleinfeld *Chairman of the Board*
Edward S. Vernon *President and Chief Executive Officer*

Chairmen Emeritus

Robert S. Strauss
E. Neville Isidore

Board of Directors

Theodore Austell, III *The Boeing Company*
Oscar Bayraktar *Pfizer Inc.*
Stephen E. Biegun *Ford Motor Company*
James P. Bevens *General Motors Corporation*
Laura M. Brink *Dechert LLP*
Carolyn L. Brehm *Procter & Gamble*
Peter A. Charow *BP America Inc.*
James F. Collins *U.S. Russia Foundation for Economic Advancement and Rule of Law*
Jeffrey R. Costello *JPMorgan Chase Bank*
Andrew Cranston *KPMG*
Richard N. Dean *Boyer & McKenzie*
Marthin De Beer *Cisco Systems, Inc.*
Neil W. Duffin *Axon Mobile Corporation*
Dorothy Dweckin *Microsoft Corporation*
C. Cato Ealy *International Paper*
Terrence J. English *Baring Vostok Capital Partners*
Mark B. Fuller *Monitor Group*
Toby T. Gati *Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, LLP*
Peter Gerendasi *PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP*
Herman O. Gref *Sberbank*
Drew J. Guff *Stigler Guff & Company, LLC*
Trevor Gunn *Medtronic, Inc.*
Jay M. Haft *Renova Group*
Greg Hill *Hess Corporation*
D. Jeffrey Hirschberg *Kalorama Partners, LLC*
Kamil S. Isner *Intel Corporation*
Karl Johansen *Ernst & Young LLP*
Alexey Klim *Philip Morris Sales and Marketing Ltd.*
Klaus Kleinfeld *Alcoa, Inc.*
Sergei A. Kuznetsov *Severstal North America*
Ramon Laguarda *PepsiCo, Inc.*
William C. Lane *Caterpillar Inc.*
Eugene K. Lawson *Lawson International, Inc.*
James J. Mulva *ConocoPhillips*
Peter B. Necasulmer *The PBN Company*
Thomas R. Pickering *The Eurasia Foundation*
Jay R. Pryer *Chevron Corporation*
David W. Rierdan *Zurich-American Insurance Company*
Paul Rodzianko *Hermitage Museum Foundation*
Charles E. Ryan *UFG Asset Management*
Claudi Santiago *General Electric Company*
William M. Shedy *Visa Inc.*
Maurice Tempelman *Laure Kaplan International Inc.*
Peter L. Thoren *Accora Industries, Inc.*
Clyde C. Tuggle *The Coca-Cola Company*
Alberto Verme *Citi*
Mark von Pentz *Deere & Company*
Daniel H. Yergin *Cambridge Energy Research Associates*

Honorary Director

Peter J. Pettibone *Hogan Lovells U.S. LLP*

The Honorable Jon Kyl
730 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-0304

Dear Senator Kyl,

As the Senate considers the merits of the New START Treaty, I write to you on behalf of the members of the U.S.-Russia Business Council to underscore the importance of the Treaty's ratification in the nearest future, not only as a means of building on past cooperation with Russia in the area of arms control, but also as a way of setting the stage for a stronger bilateral partnership that supports the U.S. national interest across the broad spectrum of geopolitical and economic issues.

Through such official channels as the U.S.-Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission, the U.S. Senate-Russian Federation Council dialogues, and Russia's ongoing WTO accession talks, recent dialogue with Russia has presented U.S. officials with opportunities to address concerns and encourage Russia to adopt and adhere to established international rules for trade and investment. We support these initiatives as a means to integrate Russia into the global community as a committed partner with demonstrated respect for the rule of law on a wide array of issues, from non-proliferation to international trade and investment. We recognize that improved bilateral commercial relations with Russia will only serve to strengthen the broader relationship, including those nascent areas of cooperation that are critical to U.S. strategic interests.

Numerous U.S. companies have experienced considerable growth and success in the Russian market in recent years, including businesses in your home state of Arizona. Leading U.S. companies such as Boeing, Intel and Caterpillar, which have major facilities in your state, have a strong presence in the Russian market. Other Arizona companies active in Russia include Evergreen International Aviation, whose facility in Marana has exported refurbished passenger jets to Russia, and Phoenix-based Indigo Partners, which has investments in the Russian airline industry. U.S. companies such as these have benefitted from doing business in the emerging Russian market, but many have also experienced notable difficulties in dealing with issues such as corruption and limited rule of law. The ability of the U.S. to address these problems and to enhance conditions in Russia for U.S. companies is contingent on an atmosphere that fosters constructive engagement.

As a U.S.-based organization representing more than 170 U.S. member companies, USRBC shares your commitment to protecting and preserving our

1110 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 350, Washington, DC 20005 (202) 739-9180 Fax: (202) 659-5920
Novinskiy Boulevard 8, Office 907, Business Center Lotte Plaza, 121099 Moscow, Russian Federation [7] 495-228-5896 Fax: [7] 495-228-5897

www.usrbc.org info@usrbc.org



national security. As a business association, USRBC recognizes the critical importance of supporting those steps that both protect our national interest and at the same time foster the efforts of government and industry to achieve a stable trade and investment climate with Russia, which I see as the key to improving bilateral relations across the board while supporting long-term U.S. national security interests.

I therefore strongly urge you to consider ratification in the nearest future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "E. Verona", with a long, wavy horizontal line extending to the right.

Edward S. Verona
President and CEO
U.S.-Russia Business Council

CC: The Honorable John Kerry
Chairman
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

The Honorable Richard Lugar
Ranking Republican Member
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

Strong, Nonpartisan Support for New START:

Key Quotes

SUPPORT FOR RATIFICATION

Admiral Michael Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "I believe, and the rest of the military leadership in this country believes, that this treaty is essential to our future security....I hope the Senate will ratify it quickly." [Admiral Mullen, 11/12 2010]

Secretary of Defense Robert Gates: "The New START Treaty has the unanimous support of America's military leadership—to include the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all of the service chiefs, and the commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, the organization responsible for our strategic nuclear deterrent. For nearly 40 years, treaties to limit or reduce nuclear weapons have been approved by the U.S. Senate by strong bipartisan majorities. This treaty deserves a similar reception and result-on account of the dangerous weapons it reduces, the critical defense capabilities it preserves, the strategic stability it maintains, and, above all, the security it provides to the American people." [Secretary Gates, 5/13/10]

James Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense for Presidents Nixon and Ford: "It is obligatory for the United States to ratify." [James Schlesinger, 4/29/10]

Admiral Michael Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "I am pleased to add my voice in support of ratification of the New START treaty and to do so as soon as possible. We are in our seventh month without a treaty with Russia." [Admiral Mullen, 6/17/10]

Dr. James Miller, Principal Deputy Defense Undersecretary for Policy: "The New START Treaty is strongly in the national security interest of the United States. The Department of Defense fully supports the treaty." [James Miller, 6/16/10]

Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN): “I support the New START treaty and believe that it will enhance United States national security.” [Senator Lugar, 4/29/10]

Henry Kissinger, National Security Advisor to President Nixon and Secretary of State to Presidents Nixon and Ford: “In deciding on ratification, the concerns need to be measured against the consequences of nonratification, particularly interrupting a [bilateral arms control] process that has been going on for decades, the relationship to the NPT, and to the attempt to achieve a strategic coherence. And so, for all these reasons, I recommend ratification of this treaty...In short, this committee's decision will affect the prospects for peace for a decade or more. It is, by definition, not a bipartisan, but a nonpartisan, challenge.” [Henry Kissinger, 5/25/10]

Colin Powell, Madeleine Albright, Samuel Berger, Frank Carlucci, Chuck Hagel, John Danforth and many other prominent national security experts: “We, the undersigned Republicans and Democrats, support the New START treaty.” [30 Bipartisan Leaders via Partnership for a Secure America, 6/24/10]

BENEFITS OF THE NEW START AGREEMENT

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Michael Mullen: “The New START deals directly with some of the most lethal of those common challenges - our stockpiles of strategic nuclear weapons. By dramatically reducing these stockpiles, this treaty achieves a proper balance more in keeping with today's security environment, reducing tensions even as it bolsters nonproliferation efforts. It features a much more effective, transparent verification method that demands quicker data exchanges and notifications... In other words, through the trust it engenders, the cuts it requires, and the flexibility it preserves, this treaty enhances our ability to do that which we have been charged to do: protect and defend the citizens of the United States.” [Admiral Michael Mullen, 3/27/10]

Stephen Hadley, National Security Advisor to President George W. Bush: “The New START Treaty makes its modest but nonetheless useful

contribution to the national security of the United States and to international stability.” [Stephen Hadley, 6/10/10]

Secretary of Energy Steven Chu: “New START is an important part of President Obama's nuclear security agenda. If ratified and entered into force, the treaty will commit the United States and the Russian Federation to lower levels of deployed strategic nuclear weapons in a transparent and verifiable way. This will increase stability between our countries, while demonstrating our joint commitment to a nuclear nonproliferation treaty.” [Secretary Chu, 6/17/10]

Former Secretary of State James Baker: “Although I am not an expert on the nuances of the proposed New START treaty, it appears to take our country in a direction that can enhance our national security while at the same time reducing the number of nuclear warheads on the planet. It can also improve Washington's relationship with Moscow regarding nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, a relationship that will be vital if the two countries are to cooperate in order to stem nuclear proliferation in countries such as Iran and North Korea.” [James Baker, 5/19/10]

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton: “This is a treaty that if ratified will provide stability, transparency and predictability for the two countries with more than 90 percent of the world's nuclear weapons. It is a treaty that will reduce the permissible number of Russian- and U.S.-deployed strategic warheads to 1,550, a level not seen since the 1950s.” [Secretary Clinton, 6/17/10]

General Kevin Chilton, STRATCOM Commander: “I believe that there are three reasons why the New START agreement represents a positive step forward. First, New START limits the number of Russian ballistic missile warheads and strategic delivery vehicles that can target the United States. Second, New START retains efficient flexibility in managing our deterrent forces to hedge against technical or geopolitical surprise. And third, New START will re-establish a strategic nuclear arms control verification regime that provides access to Russian nuclear forces and a measure of predictability in Russian force deployments over the life of the treaty.” [General Chilton, 6/16/10]

Admiral Michael Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: “The chiefs and I believe the New START treaty achieves an important and necessary balance between three critical aims. It allows us to retain a strong and flexible American nuclear deterrent. It helps strengthen openness and transparency in our relationship with Russia. It also demonstrates our national commitment to reducing the worldwide risk of a nuclear incident resulting from the continuing proliferation of nuclear weapons.” [Admiral Mullen, 6/17/10]

CONSEQUENCES OF NON-RATIFICATION

General Kevin Chilton, STRATCOM Commander:

"If we don't get the treaty, [the Russians] are not constrained in their development of force structure and...we have no insight into what they're doing. So its the worst of both possible worlds." [General Chilton, 6/16/10]

General Brent Scowcroft (Ret.), President George H.W. Bush's National Security Advisor: “The principal result of non-ratification would be to throw the whole nuclear negotiating situation into a state of chaos.” [Brent Scowcroft, 6/10/10]

James Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense for Presidents Nixon and Ford and the Secretary of Energy for President Carter: Failure to ratify this treaty “would have a detrimental effect on our ability to influence others with regard to, particularly, the nonproliferation issue.” [James Schlesinger, 4/29/10]

Former Defense Secretary William Perry “If we fail to ratify this treaty, the U.S. forfeits any right to leadership on nonproliferation policies.” [William Perry, 4/29/10]

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton: “The consequences of not ratifying this treaty would have very serious impacts on our relationship with Russia, and would frankly give aid and comfort to a lot of the adversaries we face

around the world.” [Hillary Clinton, 6/17/10]

Henry Kissinger, National Security Advisor to President Nixon and Secretary of State to Presidents Nixon and Ford: “This START treaty is an evolution of treaties that have been negotiated in previous administrations of both parties. And its principal provisions are an elaboration or a continuation of existing agreements. Therefore, a rejection of them would indicate that a new period of American policy had started that might rely largely on the unilateral reliance of its nuclear weapons, and would therefore create an element of uncertainty in the calculations of both adversaries and allies. And therefore, I think it would have an unsettling impact on the international environment.” [Henry Kissinger, 5/25/10]

MISSILE DEFENSE

Director of the U.S. Missile Defense Agency, Lieutenant General Patrick O'Reilly: “The New START Treaty actually reduces previous START treaty's constraints on developing missile defense programs in several areas.” [General O'Reilly, 6/16/10]

Secretary of Defense Robert Gates: “The treaty will not constrain the United States from deploying the most effective missile defenses possible nor impose additional costs or barriers on those defenses.” [Sec. Gates, 6/17/10]

Commander of U.S. Strategic Command General Chilton: “As the combatant command also responsible for synchronizing global missile defense plans, operations, and advocacy, this treaty does not constrain any current missile defense plans.” [General Chilton, 6/16/10]

Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Michele Flournoy and Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology & Logistics Ash Carter: “Missile defenses have become a topic of some discussion in the context of the Senate's consideration of the New START Treaty with Russia. The fact is that the treaty does not constrain the U.S. from testing, developing and deploying missile defenses. Nor does it prevent us from improving or expanding them. Nor does it raise the costs of doing so. We have made

clear to our Russian counterparts that missile defense cooperation between us is in our mutual interest, and is not inconsistent with the need to deploy and improve our missile defense capabilities as threats arise.” [Flournoy and Carter via WSJ, 6/17/10]

Letter from Former STRATCOM Commanders

Senator Carl Levin, Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee
Senator John F. Kerry, Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Senator John McCain, Ranking Member, Senate Armed Services Committee
Senator Richard G. Lugar, Ranking Member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee

July 14, 2010

Gentlemen:

As former commanders of Strategic Air Command and U.S. Strategic Command, we collectively spent many years providing oversight, direction and maintenance of U.S. strategic nuclear forces and advising presidents from Ronald Reagan to George W. Bush on strategic nuclear policy. We are writing to express our support for ratification of the New START Treaty. The treaty will enhance American national security in several important ways.

First, while it was not possible at this time to address the important issues of non-strategic weapons and total strategic nuclear stockpiles, the New START Treaty sustains limits on deployed Russian strategic nuclear weapons that will allow the United States to continue to reduce its own deployed strategic nuclear weapons. Given the end of the Cold War, there is little concern today about the probability of a Russian nuclear attack. But continuing the formal strategic arms reduction process will contribute to a more productive and safer relationship with Russia.

Second, the New START Treaty contains verification and transparency measures—such as data exchanges, periodic data updates, notifications, unique identifiers on strategic systems, some access to telemetry and on-site inspections—that will give us important insights into Russian strategic nuclear forces and how they operate those forces. We will understand Russian strategic forces much better with the treaty than would be the case without it. For example, the treaty permits on-site inspections that will allow us to observe and confirm the number of warheads on individual

Russian missiles; we cannot do that with just national technical means of verification. That kind of transparency will contribute to a more stable relationship between our two countries. It will also give us greater predictability about Russian strategic forces, so that we can make better-informed decisions about how we shape and operate our own forces.

Third, although the New START Treaty will require U.S. reductions, we believe that the post-treaty force will represent a survivable, robust and effective deterrent, one fully capable of deterring attack on both the United States and America's allies and partners. The Department of Defense has said that it will, under the treaty, maintain 14 Trident ballistic missile submarines, each equipped to carry 20 Trident D-5 submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs). As two of the 14 submarines are normally in long-term maintenance without missiles on board, the U.S. Navy will deploy 240 Trident SLBMs. Under the treaty's terms, the United States will also be able to deploy up to 420 Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and up to 60 heavy bombers equipped for nuclear armaments. That will continue to be a formidable force that will ensure deterrence and give the President, should it be necessary, a broad range of military options.

We understand that one major concern about the treaty is whether or not it will affect U.S. missile defense plans. The treaty preamble notes the interrelationship between offense and defense; this is a simple and long-accepted reality. The size of one side's missile defenses can affect the strategic offensive forces of the other. But the treaty provides no meaningful constraint on U.S. missile defense plans. The prohibition on placing missile defense interceptors in ICBM or SLBM launchers does not constrain us from planned deployments.

The New START Treaty will contribute to a more stable U.S.-Russian relationship. We strongly endorse its early ratification and entry into force.

Sincerely,

General Larry Welch USAF, Ret

Admiral Henry Chiles USN, Ret
General John Chain USAF, Ret
General Eugene Habiger USAF, Ret
General Bennie Davis USAF, Ret
General Lee Butler USAF, Ret
Admiral James Ellis USN, Ret

Senate Hearings on the New START Treaty

Senate Foreign Relations Committee

July 15, 2010 - The New START Treaty: Maintaining a Safe, Secure and Effective Nuclear Arsenal - Witnesses: Dr. Michael R. Anastasio, Director, Los Alamos National Laboratory; Dr. George H. Miller, Director, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; Dr. Paul J. Himmert, Sandia National Laboratories.

July 14, 2010 - The New START Treaty: Maintaining a Safe, Secure and Effective Nuclear Arsenal (Closed) – Witnesses: The Honorable Rose Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary for Verification and Compliance, Department of State.

June 24, 2010 – The New START Treaty: Implementation – Inspections and Assistance – Witnesses: The Honorable James N. Miller, Jr., Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense; Kenneth A. Myers III, Director, Defense Threat Reduction Agency and U.S. Strategic Command Center for Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction.

June 24, 2010 – The New START Treaty: Benefits and Risks – Witnesses: The Honorable Robert G. Joseph, Senior Scholar, National Institute for Public Policy; The Honorable Eric S. Edelman, Distinguished Fellow Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, Visiting Scholar Philip Merrill Center for Strategic Studies Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced and International Studies (SAIS); Dr. Morton H. Halperin, Senior Advisor, Open Society Institute.

June 16, 2010 – The New START Treaty: Views from the Pentagon – Witnesses:
The Honorable James N. Miller, Jr., Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense; General Kevin P. Chilton, USAF, Commander, United States Strategic Command; Lieutenant General Patrick J. O'Reilly, USA, Director, Missile Defense Agency.

*June 15, 2010 – **The New START Treaty: The Negotiations*** – Witnesses: The Honorable Rose Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary of State for Verification and Compliance Chief U.S. Negotiator in Post-START Negotiations, Department of State; The Honorable Edward L. Warner, III, Secretary of Defense Representative to Post- START Negotiations, Department of Defense.

*June 10, 2010 – **Strategic Arms Control and National Security*** – Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft, USAF (Ret.), President, The Scowcroft Group; The Honorable Stephen J. Hadley, Senior Adviser for International Affairs, United States Institute of Peace.

*June 8, 2010 – **The New START Treaty: The Negotiations** (Closed)* – Witnesses: The Honorable Rose Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary of State for Verification and Compliance Chief U.S. Negotiator in Post-START Negotiations, Department of State; The Honorable Edward L. Warner, III, Secretary of Defense Representative to Post- START Negotiations, Department of Defense.

*May 25, 2010 – **The New START Treaty: The Role of Strategic Arms Control in a Post-Cold War World*** – Witnesses: The Honorable Henry A. Kissinger, Former Secretary of State / Chairman, Kissinger McLarty Associates.

*May 19, 2010 – **The History and Lessons of START*** – Witnesses: The Honorable James A. Baker, Former Secretary of State / Former Secretary of the Treasury, Senior Partner, Baker Botts L.L.P.

*May 18, 2010 – **The New START Treaty*** – Witnesses: The Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State, Department of State; The Honorable Robert Gates, Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense; The Honorable Admiral Michael Mullen, USN, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

*April 29, 2010 – **The History and Modern Context for U.S.-Russian Arms***

Control – Witnesses: The Honorable James R. Schlesinger, Chairman of the Board MITRE Corporation / Former Secretary of Defense, Former Secretary of Energy, Former Director of Central Intelligence; The Honorable William J. Perry, Michael and Barbar Berberian Professor, Center for International Security & Cooperation, Stanford University / Former Secretary of Defense.

Senate Armed Services Committee

July 15, 2010 – **To receive testimony on sustaining nuclear weapons under the New START** (Open/Closed) – Witnesses: Dr. Michael R. Anastasio, Director, Los Alamos National Laboratory; Dr. George H. Miller, Director, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; Dr. Paul J. Himmert, Sandia National Laboratories; Dr. Roy F. Schwitters, Chairman, JASON Defense Advisory Group, S.W. Richardson Foundation Regental Professor of Physics, The University of Texas at Austin.

July 14, 2010 – **Briefing on the National Intelligence Estimate on the verifiability of the New START** (Closed) – Witnesses: Andrew M. Gibb, National Intelligence Officer for Weapons of Mass Destruction, National Intelligence Council.

June 17, 2010 – **To receive testimony on the New START and implications for national security programs** – Witnesses: The Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State, Department of State; The Honorable Robert Gates, Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense; The Honorable Admiral Michael Mullen, USN, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; The Honorable Steven Chu, Secretary of Energy, Department of Energy.

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

Week of July 12, 2010 – **Briefing on the intelligence community's National Intelligence Estimate on the New START Treaty** (Closed) – Witnesses: TBA.

Notable Opinion Articles on New START

[The Case for Ratifying New Start](#)

By Joseph R. Biden Jr.

Wall Street Journal

November 24, 2010

President Obama has shown that missile defense and arms control can proceed hand-in-hand.

In September 2009, when President Obama decided to alter his predecessor's plans for missile defense in Europe, some critics claimed that we had sacrificed our allies in the interest of the "reset" with Russia. Others thought that we would derail the reset by proceeding with the new plan. The skeptics were wrong on both counts.

At NATO's summit in Lisbon last weekend, President Obama united Europe behind our missile-defense plans and received strong support for the New Start Treaty that is currently before the Senate. In doing so, he proved that missile defense and arms control can proceed hand-in-hand.

It's hard to remember how much relations between the United States and our European allies had frayed before this administration took office. U.S. leadership was viewed negatively by many foreign publics, and U.S. policies often met with opposition from our traditional partners. The positive atmosphere in Lisbon—and the substantial progress on priorities like missile defense, arms control and the Russia reset—simply would not have been possible without nearly two years of intensive diplomacy.

NATO's adoption of territorial missile defense as a new mission shows that President Obama has rebuilt the alliance's underlying consensus about the threats we face and how to meet them. Once considered an insurmountable political, technical and financial challenge, NATO's decision to embrace territorial missile defense demonstrates the alliance's determination to meet 21st-century threats.

The ballistic missile threat to our allies, partners and deployed forces is real and growing, particularly from Iran. Unlike previous approaches, this NATO missile-defense system will protect all NATO allies in Europe, not just some. And it will protect more European territory sooner than the system it replaced. The capability will improve over time, addressing existing and near-term threats first, then expanding to provide greater coverage and protection as the threat and technology evolve.

The U.S. contribution to this effort will be the European Phased Adaptive Approach, which will include Aegis ships capable of ballistic missile defense, a forward-based radar,

and land-based SM-3 interceptor sites in Romania and Poland. Our European missile-defense system will employ cost-effective and proven technologies, using a distributed network of sensors and shooters, making it far more flexible, adaptable and survivable than earlier proposals. This system demonstrates America's enduring commitment to Article 5 of the Washington Treaty—that an attack on one is an attack on all.

NATO missile defense also provides the opportunity for further improvements in both NATO-Russian and U.S.-Russian relations. NATO and Russia agreed at Lisbon to carry out a joint ballistic missile threat assessment, to resume theater missile-defense exercises, and to explore further cooperation on territorial missile defense—things that were nearly unimaginable two years ago.

These agreements underscore the strategic importance the alliance attaches to improving its relationship with Russia. But trust and confidence in our relationship with Russia would be undermined without Senate approval of the New Start Treaty, which reduces strategic nuclear forces to levels not seen since the 1950s, and restores important verification mechanisms that ceased when the first Start Treaty expired last December.

The U.S. has been conducting on-site inspections in Europe since the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty of 1987, which banned medium-range missiles. That treaty showed how U.S.-Russian arms control can make Europe more secure, and New Start continues that tradition.

European leaders understand that New Start advances their security as well as America's, and that is an important foundation for future negotiations on conventional forces and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. That is why all 27 of our NATO allies expressed their desire to see the treaty's early ratification.

NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen, for instance, cautioned that delay in ratification would be damaging to security in Europe. And leaders from nations that border Russia (including Poland, Latvia and Lithuania) spoke out strongly in support of the treaty.

New Start is also a cornerstone of our efforts to reset relations with Russia, which have improved significantly in the last two years. This has led to real benefits for U.S. and global security. Russian cooperation made it possible to secure strong sanctions against Iran over its nuclear ambitions, and Russia canceled a sale to Iran of an advanced anti-aircraft missile system that would have been dangerously destabilizing. Russia has permitted the flow of materiel through its territory for our troops in Afghanistan. And—as the NATO-Russia Council in Lisbon demonstrated—European security has been advanced by the pursuit of a more cooperative relationship with Russia. We should not jeopardize this progress.

The Lisbon summit showed that American leadership in Europe remains essential. It also reminded us why the stakes of the New Start Treaty are so high. Our uniformed military supports it. Our European allies support it. Our national security interests are at stake. It is time for the Senate to approve *New Start*.

Mr. Biden is vice president of the United States.

Clinton and Gates: Why the Senate should ratify New START

By Hillary Rodham Clinton and Robert M. Gates

The Washington Post

November 15, 2010

For decades, American inspectors have monitored Russian nuclear forces, putting into practice President Ronald Reagan's favorite maxim, "Trust, but verify." But since the old START Treaty expired last December, we have relied on trust alone. Until a new treaty comes into force, our inspectors will not have access to Russian missile silos and the world's two largest nuclear arsenals will lack the stability that comes with a rigorous inspection regime.

Before this session of Congress ends, we urge senators to approve an arms control treaty that would again allow U.S. inspectors access to Russian strategic sites and reduce the number of nuclear weapons held by both nations to a level not seen since the 1950s.

The New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), [signed by President Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev in April](#), builds on foundations laid by American leaders from both political parties over the past four decades. It has broad bipartisan backing. Six former secretaries of state, five former secretaries of defense and three former national security advisers have endorsed ratification, along with seven former commanders of U.S. Strategic Command and the entire current U.S. military leadership. They understand that nuclear dangers did not disappear with the Soviet Union and that we have a responsibility – to Americans and our allies – to keep our eyes on the world's other major strategic nuclear arsenal.

Time is running out for this Congress. Here is what's at stake:

New START will advance critical national security objectives: Reducing the number of deployed nuclear weapons while retaining a safe and effective deterrent; providing direct insight into Russia's nuclear arsenal; and creating a more stable, predictable and cooperative relationship between the world's two leading nuclear powers.

It will put in place an effective verification regime to track each side's progress in reducing its arsenal to 1,550 strategic warheads. We will be able to count the number of deployed strategic weapons more accurately, because we will exchange more data on weapons and their movement than in the past. We will also conduct 18 short-notice inspections of Russian nuclear forces each year, including checking warheads on individual missiles.

New START will also set the stage for future arms reductions, including negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons. It will help solidify the "reset" of U.S. relations with Russia, which has allowed us to cooperate in pursuit of our strategic interests.

That's what the treaty will do. Here's what it will not do:

It will not limit our ability to develop and deploy the most effective missile defenses to protect America's forces and territory, and to enhance the security of our allies and partners. This administration is committed to sustaining and improving our missile defense capabilities and has proposed spending nearly \$10 billion in fiscal 2011 to do so. It will not restrict our ability to modernize our nuclear forces. On the contrary, the United States will continue to maintain a robust nuclear deterrent based on our "triad" of delivery systems: intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and heavy bombers for nuclear armaments. To sustain and modernize these systems, the administration has proposed spending well over \$100 billion during the next decade.

Furthermore, the treaty permits us to make investments as needed to maintain a secure and effective nuclear stockpile. The [administration has proposed](#) spending \$7 billion for this purpose in the current fiscal year – a nearly 10 percent increase – and more than \$80 billion to modernize our nuclear weapons complex over the next decade, including a major life-extension program for current warheads. In all, the administration proposes spending more than \$180 billion on the infrastructure that sustains our nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them – a substantial investment in the credibility and efficacy of America's nuclear deterrent.

Finally, New START will not constrain our ability to develop and deploy the most effective conventional capabilities possible, including strike systems that could potentially hit a target anywhere on the globe in less than an hour.

Every president since the beginning of the Cold War has opted for verifiable arms control deals. Each time, [the Senate has backed these treaties by overwhelming margins](#). The START Treaty, negotiated by Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush, was approved in 1992 by 93 votes to 6. The Moscow Treaty, negotiated by President George W. Bush, was approved 95 to 0 in 2003.

The New START Treaty also deserves prompt ratification. Our national security depends on it.

The writers are, respectively, the U.S. secretary of state and secretary of defense

It's time for the Senate to vote on New START

By George P. Shultz, Madeleine K. Albright, Gary Hart and Chuck Hagel

The Washington Post

September 10, 2010

The Senate should promptly vote to approve the New Strategic Arms Reductions Treaty (New START) with Russia for one reason: It increases U.S. national security. This is precisely why Defense Secretary Robert Gates declared at the outset of Senate consideration of the treaty that it has “the unanimous support of America’s military leadership.”

The treaty reduces and caps the Russian nuclear arsenal. It reestablishes and makes stronger the verification procedures that allow U.S. inspectors to conduct on-site inspections and surveillance of Russian nuclear weapons and facilities. It strengthens international efforts to prevent nuclear terrorism, and it opens the door to progress on further critical nonproliferation efforts, such as reducing Russian tactical nuclear weapons.

Adm. Mike Mullen, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has urged the Senate to ratify the treaty, and seven former Strategic Command (STRATCOM) chiefs have called on Senate leaders to move quickly.

In addition to our military leadership, there is overwhelming bipartisan support for the treaty among national security experts. Also, officials from the past seven administrations, Republican and Democrat alike, testified before Senate committees in support of the treaty. In fact, the number of Republican former officials testifying outnumbered the number of Democrats.

We were part of a group of 30 former national security leaders from both political parties — including former secretary of state Colin Powell, former defense secretary Frank Carlucci and former national security adviser Sandy Berger — who published an open letter in support of the treaty.

The Senate has done its due diligence: Over the course of 21 hearings and briefings during the last five months, senators have had the opportunity to ask questions and put to rest concerns. From the director of the Missile Defense Agency, Lt. Gen. Patrick O’Reilly, senators learned that the treaty in no way limits the ability of our military to

deploy the missile defenses it needs or wants. From STRATCOM Commander Kevin Chilton, they learned that with the treaty in place, the United States will retain a strong and reliable deterrent. Sen. John Kerry, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, even delayed the committee vote on the treaty to give senators an extra month to review background materials and seek answers to their questions. Now it is time to act.

While substantive questions about the treaty have been put to rest, some senators are trying to delay consideration of it based on an unrelated funding issue, namely, claims that future funding for the U.S. nuclear arsenal might be insufficient.

This is wrong for two reasons.

First, these claims fly in the face of the considered opinions of Chilton and National Nuclear Security Administration head Thomas D'Agostino, the men charged with overseeing our nuclear weapons and weapons laboratories. They, along with Gates and Mullen, have made clear that the administration's 10-year, \$80 billion plan to modernize our nuclear infrastructure, which would result in a 15 percent increase over current spending levels, represents the funding level that is needed and can be executed in a timely manner.

More important, delaying this treaty over an unrelated matter undermines our national security.

By the time the Senate Foreign Relations Committee votes Sept. 16 on whether to send the treaty to the Senate floor for ratification, it will have been more than 280 days and counting since the United States lost the ability to conduct on-site inspections, monitoring and verification of Russia's nuclear arsenal. This ability will not begin again until the treaty is ratified.

As Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) told the committee, "The problem of the breakdown of our verification, which lapsed Dec. 5, is very serious and impacts our national security."

Given the national security stakes and the overwhelming support from the military and national security community, we hope that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will send the treaty to the floor with robust bipartisan backing and that senators will promptly ratify it with the kind of resounding margin such measures have historically enjoyed.

Senate approval of New START would send a strong message to the world that the United States can overcome partisan differences and take concrete, practical action to reduce the nuclear threat and enhance our nation's security.

George P. Shultz was U.S. secretary of state from 1982 to 1989. Madeleine K. Albright was secretary of state from 1997 to 2001. Gary Hart (D-Col.) and Chuck Hagel (R-Neb.) are former members of the U.S. Senate.

Cutting back nukes

Fewer arms would make us more secure.

Chicago Tribune

November 29, 2010

The world has many problems, but too few nuclear weapons is not one of them. We would all be safer if North Korea surrendered its nukes and Iran gave up its quest for them. But one longtime U.S. adversary, Russia, has agreed to reduce the size of its stockpile. And here's the surprise: some Republicans won't take "yes" for an answer.

Earlier this year, President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev signed the New START accord, which requires both sides to dismantle weapons. The Russians, who now have some 2,700 long-range warheads capable of reaching U.S. soil, would have to make do with 1,550. The U.S. would cut back to the same level. But the Russian cuts would be bigger than ours.

The treaty also restores the right of the U.S. government to inspect Russian nuclear facilities — something we lost with the expiration of the previous Start agreement last year. It facilitates transparency and cooperation between the two countries on these supremely destructive weapons. It fosters better relations between two governments with a history of mutual distrust.

It has broad support among current and former U.S. military leaders, including seven out of eight former commanders of American nuclear forces. Gen. Colin Powell, who served as secretary of state under President George W. Bush, has endorsed the deal, as has Bush's former national security adviser, Stephen Hadley.

But it faces resistance among some Senate Republicans. Arizona Sen. Jon Kyl demands big increases in outlays to modernize our nuclear arsenal. Other critics claim the agreement would impede U.S. efforts to deploy missile defense systems, while leaving us with less firepower to protect our allies.

In fact, the Obama administration has committed to boost modernization funding by more than \$85 billion over the next decade. The text of the treaty does not restrict American missile defense in the slightest. The Russians would have liked to get such limits, but they had to settle for a fig leaf — a vague, nonbinding passage in the preamble acknowledging an "interrelationship between strategic offensive arms and strategic defensive arms."

If the government in Moscow doesn't like what we do on missile defense, its only option is to withdraw from the treaty — as the Bush administration withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in 2002. But that option exists in every arms control agreement. Nor is there any danger that the United States will have too few nukes to deter our enemies from attacking us or our friends. Can anyone seriously argue that 1,550 warheads are insufficient to cover every possible military need in a confrontation with Iran, North Korea or Russia?

Some Republicans accuse the administration of trying to rush ratification. But the Senate has already put off the vote and held some 20 hearings on the issues. There is nothing new to be learned by waiting.

This treaty clearly would enhance the national security of the United States. Any time the Senate has a chance to do that, it should not delay.

Ratify US-Russia nuclear accord

The Financial Times

November 26, 2010

After the Thanksgiving holiday, the US Senate should ratify the US-Russia strategic arms reduction treaty without further delay. Senate Republicans are blocking this important measure, which would reduce the two powers' nuclear stockpiles and restore the verification system that lapsed when the previous treaty expired. The GOP calls constantly for the White House to extend its hand in co-operation over measures that command bipartisan support. There is no better instance than Start.

Senator John Kyl is the Republicans' spokesman on the issue. He complains that the lame-duck session of Congress is too short – and too crowded with other business – to allow proper consideration of the treaty. He says newly elected senators should be allowed to have their say when they take their seats in January. He asks for assurances that the treaty will not interfere with US missile-defence plans and that funds to modernise the reduced US nuclear arsenal will be forthcoming.

Each of these arguments is so weak as to call into question Mr Kyl's good faith. The Start treaty has received the fullest consideration and Mr Kyl and his colleagues have been engaged on the issue for months. Any suggestion that this is a White House ambush – sneak the treaty through the Senate while nobody is looking – is absurd. The measure has the broadest support, not just in the US military, but also from top officials of previous Republican administrations, including Henry Kissinger and James Baker.

The notion that the treaty must wait for the new senators would be a stretch even if it had been a point of contention in the midterm elections, which it was not. The current Senate has all its powers and responsibilities until the new one takes over. The treaty has no bearing on missile-defence plans, and sufficient funds – extra funds, in fact, at the Republicans' previous urging – have been promised for weapons modernisation.

Consider, on the other hand, the costs of further delay. Aside from the financial and security benefits of smaller nuclear stockpiles, much else is at stake: the “reset” of relations with Russia, the resumption of the verification regime and the credibility of the US administration in international negotiations of every sort. Richard Lugar, the senior Republican on the Senate foreign relations committee, has rebuked his party’s leaders over the delay and calls for an immediate vote to ratify. Mr Kyl should drop his objections at once.

Copyright <<http://www.ft.com/servicetools/help/copyright>> The Financial Times Limited 2010.

Failing to ratify New START has real consequences

By John Castellaw

The Hill

November 15, 2010

When the Senate returns to complete their work for this session, they will undoubtedly have a lot on their plate. America's military leadership, however, has made clear that for them, scheduling a vote on the ratification of the New START arms reduction treaty with Russia should be a top priority.

The Secretary of Defense has written that New START has the "unanimous support" of the US military. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Mullen, testified in support of the treaty, as did the Director of the US Missile Defense Agency, Lt. Gen Patrick O'Reilly. The Commander of US nuclear forces (STRATCOM), General Kevin Chilton advised the Senate to ratify New START. He was joined by seven of the last eight commanders of STRATCOM who jointly wrote the Senate urging ratification.

As recently as November 4, Pentagon spokesman Geoff Morrell told reporters, "This treaty is absolutely critical to the effectiveness of our nuclear arsenal, our knowledge of Russian nuclear capabilities and U.S. national security overall. We're advancing it at this time and pushing for ratification because we need this. And we need it sooner, rather than later."

Despite all of this, there are some in Washington who would urge the Senate to flatly ignore America's military and, in direct contradiction to their advice, postpone consideration of New START until some unspecified time in the future. But those who make this argument have failed to take responsibility for the likely consequences of that course of action, just as they typically fail to acknowledge that their recommendation enjoys no support at the Pentagon.

So let us consider what failure to ratify the treaty would mean.

First, it means that the US ability to conduct on-site inspections will continue to be suspended. For more than twenty years, the US military has had boots on the ground, inspecting and monitoring the Russian nuclear arsenal. These inspections, negotiated by the Reagan administration and guided by the principle of "trust, but verify" have provided critical intelligence. Unfortunately, they were suspended when the prior START I treaty expired in December of last year. The New START Treaty would both resume and improve those on-site inspections. For almost a full year, we've been in the dark. At a minimum, postponing a ratification vote would prolong this disadvantageous situation. At worse, inspections would be postponed indefinitely. As General Chilton testified: "If we don't get the treaty, [the Russians] are not constrained in their development of force structure and ... we have no insight into what they're doing. So it's the worst of both possible worlds."

Second, it means that the US is obliged to plan on worst-case scenarios with regard to our own deployments. This means that we will be compelled to waste military resources, not to mention tax dollars. A precise accounting of the Russian arsenal and predictability going forward informs our strategic force structure. Frankly, it is to our advantage to verifiably reduce the Russian deployment because it allows us to use our resources more effectively. The greater predictability we have, the better.

And contrary to the erroneous claim that New START interferes with missile defense, Lt. General O'Reilly testified that "the New START Treaty actually reduces previous START treaty's constraints on developing missile defense programs in several areas."

There are broader issues at stake as well. While some may still view these issues through a Cold War lens, the fact is that world has changed. Our 21st century concerns are nuclear proliferation and the terrible possibility of nuclear terrorism. To successfully address these issues we need to build and expand our cooperation with Russia and other states. Whether it is countering Iran's nuclear ambitions or securing nuclear material around the globe we need to persuade the other major powers to advance a shared security agenda. To argue that we can address these issues unilaterally is simply not credible.

Engaging Russia isn't about "being nice" it is about advancing our national security interest. Failing to ratify New START will both destabilize relations with Russia and seriously weaken US leadership on these issues internationally.

The New START Treaty enjoys very strong support from the US military for one simple reason - it improves our national security. While some may see a political opportunity in delaying a vote, the national security disadvantages are far more serious and more immediate.

In our system of government, civilians control the military to ensure that the military does not acquire too much power. This is a principle that has served us well, but it does not mean that elected officials should ignore the advice of the military for solely political reasons.

John Castellaw, retired as a lieutenant general after a 36-year career in the United States Marine Corps and most recently served as the deputy commandant for programs and resources at the Pentagon in Washington, D.C.

Treaty critics can't explain away military support for New START

By Lt. General Dirk Jameson

The Hill

October 21, 2010

Critics of the New START Treaty have recently taken to the pages of the Washington Times in an attempt to raise doubts about the treaty. Despite their best efforts to muddy the waters, however, they have been unable to explain away the overwhelming support that the treaty has among both U.S. military leadership and the national security establishment.

The reason for that support is simple. The treaty makes us safer. That's why Defense Secretary Robert Gates made it clear that the treaty had the "unanimous support of America's military leadership." Senate committees heard testimony in support of the treaty from former Republican and Democratic officials alike, including Secretaries of Defense James Schlesinger and William Perry, former Secretaries of State James Baker and Henry Kissinger and former National Security Advisors Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft and Stephen Hadley.

Thirty former national security officials from both political parties – including Colin Powell, Frank Carlucci, Madeleine Albright, Chuck Hagel and John Danforth – recently published an open letter in support of the treaty. Seven former commanders of U.S. Strategic Command wrote to senators, calling for the treaty's prompt ratification.

It's a straightforward treaty. The New START Treaty replaces a treaty negotiated under the Reagan administration and signed by President George H. W. Bush, which expired last December. It will provide stability and predictability between the world's two leading nuclear powers as well as modest reductions in U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals. Most importantly it will replace the previous treaty's lapsed verification regime with a state of the art system that builds on twenty years of verification experience and will put U.S. inspectors back on the ground to monitor Russia's nuclear weapons.

As the commander of the U.S. 20th Air Force, it was my job to make sure that our ICBMs launched in the event of a nuclear war. Being at the sharp end of the nuclear spear made me a strong believer in President Reagan's admonition that we should "trust, but verify."

Unfortunately, if the Senate fails to ratify the New START Treaty, we will be reducing that to simply "trust."

By December 5th, an entire year will have passed since the U.S. lost the ability to conduct on-site inspections, monitoring and verification of Russia's nuclear arsenal. Every day that we delay is another day we aren't on the ground keeping tabs on Russian nuclear weapons and facilities.

All the dust kicked up by treaty critics can't hide the fact that they are asking senators to take their word over the word of the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the men in charge of our nuclear weapons and missile defense, as well as security experts from both parties, all of whom stand squarely behind the treaty. The Senate has done its due diligence, and as our former STRATCOM commanders urge, when the Senate reconvenes after the elections, it is time to ratify the treaty.

Lt. General Dirk Jameson served as Deputy Commander in Chief and Chief of Staff of U.S. Strategic Command before retiring from the U.S. Air Force in 1996 after more than three decades of active service. Prior to his STRATCOM assignment, Gen. Jameson commanded the 14,500 men and women of the U.S. 20th Air Force, and was responsible for all U.S. Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles, seven major subordinate units, operational training, testing, security and readiness. He is a member of the Consensus for American Security <http://www.securityconsensus.org/>

GENERALS: Military gung-ho for New START

Treaty endorsed by thinkers from across the political spectrum

By Lt. Gens. John Castellaw, Arlen Jameson, Donald Kerrick and Brig. Gen. John Adams

The Washington Times

October 24, 2010

Over the course of six months of hearings and briefings, one by one, the secretary of defense, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the heads of STRATCOM and the Missile Defense Agency and former officials from the last seven administrations, Republican and Democrat alike, all told senators the same thing – the New START treaty makes us safer and should be ratified by the Senate.

Here's what it does. The New START treaty replaces a treaty negotiated under the Reagan administration and signed by President George H.W. Bush, which expired in

December. It provides stability and predictability between the world's two leading nuclear powers as well as modest reductions in U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals. Most important, it replaces the previous treaty's lapsed verification regime with a state-of-the-art system that builds on 20 years of verification experience and puts U.S. inspectors back on the ground to monitor Russia's nuclear weapons.

On Sept. 16, satisfied with the overwhelming consensus in support of the treaty among the military and national security experts, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee – in a moment of nonpartisanship rare in this era – voted 14-4 to send the treaty to the full Senate for ratification.

In recent days, however, critics have resumed making spurious claims designed to raise doubts about the treaty. A quick review of the record ought to be enough to put these claims to rest once and for all.

The treaty compromises missile defense, critics claim. Not so, according to Lt. Gen. Patrick J. O'Reilly, director of the Missile Defense Agency, who, along with Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates, has repeatedly made clear that the new treaty has no implications for our missile-defense plans. On the contrary, Gen. O'Reilly told senators, the treaty "actually reduces constraints on the development of the missile defense program."

Russia can't be trusted to comply with the terms of the treaty, critics say. This claim turns President Reagan's admonishment that we should "trust, but verify" on its head. By opposing the treaty, critics are arguing in favor of eliminating on-site surveillance and inspections of the Russian nuclear arsenal that are the only checks we have against Russian untrustworthiness.

Here's what the current commander of STRATCOM, Gen. Kevin P. Chilton, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about the danger involved in rejecting the treaty: "If we don't get the treaty, [the Russians] are not constrained in their development-of-force structure and ... we have no insight into what they're doing, so it's the worst of both possible worlds."

It's worth stepping back for a moment to ask the question why, if any of the things critics claim were remotely true, the treaty would have such overwhelming support among the military?

And it's not just the military that supports the treaty. The Senate heard testimony in favor of the treaty from Republican national security heavyweights like James R. Schlesinger, George Shultz, James A. Baker III, Henry Kissinger and Brent Scowcroft. An open letter in support of the treaty was published recently from 30 former national security officials from both political parties – including Colin L. Powell, Frank C. Carlucci, Madeleine K. Albright, Chuck Hagel and John C. Danforth.

The bottom line is this – critics have no answer to the overwhelming support for this treaty among the military and national security experts, so they must resort to confusing the issue. There is real risk here, though.

For 20 years, we have had American inspectors on the ground keeping tabs on Russian nuclear weapons. On Dec. 5, it will have been an entire year since we lost that ability to conduct on-site inspections and monitoring. If the Senate fails to ratify the New START treaty, those inspections will stop forever.

Every day we wait is a day we lose insight into Russia's arsenal, and that makes us less safe.

When the Senate reconvenes after the elections, its top priority should be taking the advice of our military leadership and ratifying the treaty.

Lt. Gens. John Castellaw, Arlen Jameson, Donald Kerrick and Brig. Gen. John Adams, all retired, are members of Consensus for American Security, a nonpartisan group of security experts.

Republicans Need to Support DISCLOSE and START

By Norman J. Ornstein

Roll Call

November 22, 2010

In an era of such sharp partisanship and polarization, it is easy to be jaded about Congressional policy and politics, and hard to be surprised by anything. But I have found two things of late in the Senate to be particularly unsettling and depressing--because they involve in a bad light some of the lawmakers I respect and like the most.

The first is the failure of any Republican Senator to step up and support the DISCLOSE Act, to bring sunlight to the outrageous, anonymous huge funders who played a major role in the 2010 campaigns, hiding behind the cloak of 501(c)(4)s run by groups cynically manipulating weak IRS enforcement of the law.

Voters support disclosure by overwhelming margins. So do Supreme Court justices--by 8-to-1. The only chance to provide it is in the lame-duck session; the bill passed the House in the 111th Congress and has zero chance of making through the 112th House. If the Senate does not act now, disclosure is dead.

The Senate does not have to pass the same bill the House did; if there are problems with DISCLOSE, if it goes too far or has cumbersome provisions, those can be easily excised--and the sponsors have made it clear that they will do so to get at least a streamlined

disclosure provision to ameliorate the worst abuses of the post-Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission world.

So where are the previous champions of campaign finance reform? Where is Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), whose greatest legislative accomplishment was given a sharp stick in the eye by a 5-4 decision on the Supreme Court? Where are previous supporters of reform--and professed supporters of disclosure--such as Republican Sens. Susan Collins (Maine) and Scott Brown (Mass.)? And most important, where is Sen. Olympia Snowe (R-Maine), who has always been an independent voice, whose Snowe-Jeffords amendment to the campaign reform law was the provision most assaulted by the Citizens United case, who stood up to immense pressure from Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) and Republican leaders in 2002 to do the right thing?

The urgent need to raise more and more money will lead inevitably to more and more corruption, trading votes or other favors for campaign cash, or shaking down prospective donors.

Disclosure alone will not stop the arms race that is going to escalate even more in 2012 and motivate every Member up for re-election that year to put pedal to metal in the next two years to raise money every spare minute to counter the likely assault on them over the airwaves by hit groups funded by corporations, unions and billionaires.

The urgent need to raise more and more money will lead inevitably to more and more corruption, trading votes or other favors for campaign cash, or shaking down prospective donors. But disclosure at least can provide some counterweight. It will be beyond disappointing if somehow McConnell can mesmerize or intimidate every one of the erstwhile reformers above to ignore their principles.

As important as campaign reform may be, it still takes a back seat to national security. And nothing is more puzzling, or infuriating, than what is happening to the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. This treaty is supported enthusiastically by Henry Kissinger, James Baker, George Schultz, Sen. Dick Lugar (R-Ind.), Adm. Mike Mullen, virtually every significant military leader active and retired, and all our NATO allies.

The reasons go beyond the arms control provisions. Reaching agreement on this treaty was a key step in a new and broader relationship with Russia, and with President Dmitry Medvedev. Of course, Russia and the U.S. remain rivals and adversaries in many ways. But the cooperation we have received on sanctions toward Iran--including especially the Russian refusal to send potent S-300 missile systems to Tehran--and on the drug trade in Afghanistan, among other things, has been a major plus. The failure of START in the Senate would endanger future cooperation and be a major embarrassment to Medvedev and a big boost to Prime Minister Vladimir Putin. It would also devastate the existing regime of inspection over nuclear arms, ramping up the danger of nukes getting into the hands of highly undesirable people and groups.

Of course, the treaty left some gaps and ambiguities. These were recognized and pointed out by Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.), the conservatives' point man in the Senate on START. The administration, Lugar and Senate Foreign Relations Chairman John Kerry (D-Mass.) have bent over backward to accommodate Kyl's concerns, with flat assurances that they will provide the resources to modernize our weapons and will not use the treaty to erase missile defense systems. The Russian willingness to work with us and the Europeans on a missile defense system will melt away if START falters.

But in this corrosive political environment, where even key national security issues get caught up in partisan warfare, where the goal of making the president a one-term can trump any issue, and where too many lawmakers are afraid that they will be the next Sen. Bob Bennett (R-Utah), the fact is that START needs to get through in the lame duck, where only eight Republicans are required to make the 67 votes needed for ratification. In January, the numbers shift in a dangerous direction, as a group of incoming Senators led by Roy Blunt (R-Mo.) have already suggested some antipathy toward the treaty.

Unfortunately, Kyl and other Republican opinion leaders such as Sen. Bob Corker (Tenn.) have made clear they do not want a vote on the treaty in the lame duck. Kyl has long been a Senator I admire for his seriousness of purpose, his intellect, and his decency. Corker is a thoughtful, solid and independent conservative, a rising star in the Senate, who voted for the treaty in the Foreign Relations Committee. Blunt brings real depth and experience from his position of leadership in the House; I always found him to be one who put national interest ahead of cheap shots, at least on the international front.

I cannot fathom why they are doing what they are doing. Schultz is not exactly a wimp when it comes to dealing with Russia or threats in the world. No one understands the dynamics of global relations and America's role in the world--much less the dangers of nuclear proliferation--more than Lugar.

Our military leaders are not prone to wishful thinking or peace-at-any-price thinking. The stakes for America's national interest, including Iran and Afghanistan, are immense here. Please, guys, suck it up and find a way to make this work.

Norman J. Ornstein is a resident scholar at AEI.

Other editorials include:

The Sacramento Bee, 11/29

<http://www.sacbee.com/2010/11/28/3214067/one-senator-delaying-new-start.html>

Rocky Mountain Telegram, 11/27

<http://www.rockymounttelegram.com/opinion/our-views/us-senate-should-ratify-new-start-treaty-183452>

The Houston Chronicle, 11/27

<http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/editorial/7313678.html>

Citizen-Times, 11/27

<http://www.citizen-times.com/article/20101127/OPINION01/311270021/1007/COLUMNISTS>

Tulsa World, 11/26

http://www.tulsaworld.com/opinion/article.aspx?subjectid=61&articleid=20101126_61_A18_Thepar964959

Sheboyganpress, 11/26

<http://www.sheboyganpress.com/article/20101126/SHE06/11260384/Editorial-Senate-should-pass-nuke-weapons-treaty>

The Vindicator, 11/26

<http://www.vindy.com/news/2010/nov/26/arms-reduction-is-a-matter-of-national-s/>

The Register Guard, 11/24

<http://www.registerguard.com/csp/cms/sites/web/opinion/25580421-47/treaty-arms-military-nuclear-control.csp>

The Salt Lake Tribune, 11/24

<http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/opinion/50736701-82/treaty-ratification-senate-delay.html.csp>

The Philadelphia Inquirer, 11/23

http://www.philly.com/inquirer/opinion/20101123_Inquirer_Editorial_Politics_over_safety.html

Baltimore Sun, 11/23

http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2010-11-23/news/bs-ed-start-letter-20101123_1_nuclear-arms-gop-strategic-arms-reduction-treaty

Seattle Times, 11/22

http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/editorialsopinion/2013496924_editorial_23start.html

The Bemidji Pioneer, 11/21

<http://www.bemidjipioneer.com/event/article/id/100023824/group/Opinion/>

The Times of Trenton, 11/21

<http://www.nj.com/opinion/times/editorials/index.ssf?/base/news-1/1290235567265200.xml&coll=5>

Knox News, 11/21

<http://www.knoxnews.com/news/2010/nov/21/senators-should-vote-on-new-start/>

News Observer

<http://www.newsobserver.com/2010/11/28/827985/in-our-interest.html>

The Palm Beach Post

http://www.palmbeachpost.com/opinion/editorials/gop-senators-going-rogue-with-north-korea-acting-1070373.html?cxttype=rss_editorials