

The 111th Congress needs to do its job and finish the job it started.

“We have one-hundred-and-fifty-thousand US warriors doing their job over Christmas and the New Year, the US Senate should do its job – and ratify this treaty.”

***Brig. Gen. John Adams
December 13, 2010***

If we **fail to pass New START now...**

....we will not be able to get US inspectors on the ground inside Russian nuclear facilities.

...we will not be able to monitor Russian strategic nuclear forces with any safety or transparency.

...the bipartisan resolution of ratification amended and passed by a clear majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will be void.

...the Senate would literally have to start from scratch, with a new Congress starting in January 2011, which will include newly elected members who have little familiarity with the treaty's provisions.

...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 for a vote.

...New START runs the risk of never being taken up again.

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

These include:

1. [Blindfolding US Intelligence](#)
2. [Uncertainty about the US-Russian Nuclear Balance](#)
3. [An Uncertain Future for Modernization](#)
4. [Wasting Resources](#)
5. [Losing Professional Intelligence Assets](#)
6. [Stalled Progress on the Russian Tactical Nuclear Arsenal](#)
7. [No Future for Nuclear Threat Reduction](#)
8. [Uncertain US-Russian Security Cooperation](#)
9. [Negative Effects on the Global Non-Proliferation Regime](#)
10. [Undermining US Leadership in the World](#)

[Unraveling the American Security Consensus](#)

1. Blindfolding US Intelligence

Without New START, the US will not get the vital intelligence from trained inspectors on the ground –inside Russian nuclear facilities – who closely monitor Russian nuclear weapons, forces and structure.

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 the US has for intelligence support, including in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Dr. David Kay, former weapons inspector:

“When you have inspectors on the ground in a place like Russia, you get an insight into what’s happening in their system, their military developments, what’s coming around. And, it gives you far better intelligence. I’ve spent a lot of my career staring at satellite photos and listening to communications intercepts. They provide data points. They don’t provide context. They don’t tell you what is the human element and what people are thinking and how they’re going. We’ve lost that. We’re blind right now with regard to Russian strategic nuclear weapons.” (Dec 02, 2010)

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 from transparency under START.

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 it's the worst of both possible worlds."
(June 6, 2010)*

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, totaling \$84 Billion.

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

Failure to ratify the START treaty will undercut the bipartisan consensus in favor of these large budgetary increases and could lead to a failure to make needed investments.

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

“rejecting the treaty may well break this consensus and result in no modernization of our forces.” (September 22, 2010)

4. Wasting Resources

Without a treaty 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 Joint 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.

Lt. Gen. John Castellaw, USMC (Ret.):

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)

5. A Loss of Professional 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 arms restraint agreements with Russia (or any other country) that need to be verified with confidence.

Dr. David Kay, former weapons inspector:

“The New START treaty, in fact, for an inspector is a lot better than the old one. It provides almost instantaneous transmission of information about movement of warheads. It provides short notice, 18 short notice inspections. This is a cadre of expertise that we’ve developed over the years,[that] have provided the development of a cadre of people who know how to do this who have the language and technical expertise. We’re not using those people now, for a year, and if this treaty is not ratified very, very soon, you’re going to start to see those people disappear into other jobs. You cannot imagine how expensive it would be to rebuild that cadre.” (Dec 02, 2010)

6. Stalled Progress on 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.

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." (June 10, 2010)

7. No Future for Nuclear Threat Reduction

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

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.

Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN):

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)

8. Uncertain US-Russian Security Cooperation

Russia will be unlikely to agree to negotiate new agreements with the US if the START treaty is not ratified.

Russian assistance in non-proliferation, counternarcotics, 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.

Russia is unlikely to have confidence in any existing or future agreement with the US if they perceive that the Senate will not ratify treaties even when they serve the interests of US national security

Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State:

“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.” (June 17, 2010)

9. Negative 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 internal politics to honor its commitments or ratify a simple strategic arms treaty

James Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense for Presidents Nixon and Ford:

“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)

10. Undermining US Leadership 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, even when it is clearly in the national interest.

American influence to promote nuclear restraint globally depends on the US honoring its commitments to other powers, including Russia.

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.

Amb. Linton Brooks:

“Anytime the United States makes a major commitment and is unable to deliver, then the US overall ability to influence the international system is weakened.” (November 21, 2010)

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.

Admiral Mike 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." (November 12, 2010)

Gary Hart, former Senator (D-CO):

"...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)

The Senate cannot fail to ratify New START now, because our national security depends on it.

For more information, please visit:

<http://www.securityconsensus.org> and <http://www.securityconsensus.org/new-start/>