

New START / Treaty should be ratified

< New START

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

Position: Treaty should be ratified

This position addresses the topic New START.

For this position

“The dread consequences of this treaty failure are described by the commentariat in relation to discrete problems with Russia (no inspections, no reset), Iran (an affronted Russia won't help pressure Tehran), or Obama's broader foreign policy (mortally wounded), but the true stakes are far higher — a final defeat of the hard-won international consensus that nuclear weapons are in a category apart, requiring a steady movement, however incremental, from limitation to reduction to an ultimate abolition.”

From *Fallout from a US treaty failure*, by James Carroll (*The Boston Globe*, November 29, 2010) ([view](#))

“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.”

From *The Case for Ratifying New Start*, by Joe Biden (*The Wall Street Journal*, November 25, 2010) ([view](#))

“To see what's at stake, consider the Russian missile base at Teykovo. The Russians have upgraded at least one of the four garrisons there this year, replacing the single-warhead SS-25 ICBMs with new SS-27s capable of carrying multiple warheads, according to Hans M. Kristensen, director of the Nuclear Information Project at the Federation of American Scientists. All without any oversight by American inspectors. So it's clear why the New START treaty is strongly supported by our military and national security establishment, including Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates, Joint Chiefs Chairman Adm. Michael G. Mullen and numerous current and former commanders of U.S. Strategic Command and its predecessor, the Strategic Air Command.”

From *Indefensible*, by Dianne Feinstein (*Los Angeles Times*, November 21, 2010) ([view](#))

“ "The pact comes with side benefits just as critical as cutting back on nuclear hardware. It reels in an increasingly feisty and unpredictable Russia on a key issue. It could lead to further weapons treaties. It could win Moscow's cooperation in confronting Iran and its bomb-making ambitions. Drawing down the numbers of nukes would make it easier to persuade other nuclear nations to do the same." ”

From Don't delay START, by San Francisco Chronicle editorial board (*San Francisco Chronicle*, November 18, 2010) (view)

“ "First, the agreement emphasizes verification, providing a valuable window into Russia's nuclear arsenal. Since the original START expired last December, Russia has not been required to provide notifications about changes in its strategic nuclear arsenal, and the United States has been unable to conduct on-site inspections. Each day, America's understanding of Russia's arsenal has been degraded, and resources have been diverted from national security tasks to try to fill the gaps." ”

From The Republican case for ratifying New START, by Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, James Baker, Lawrence Eagleburger, Colin Powell (*The Washington Post*, December 2, 2010) (view)

Against this position

“ "But in West Germany, and especially in Britain, the major opposition parties were practically — if not actually — in favor of unilateral nuclear disarmament. European democracies have a notorious history of being susceptible to the seduction of appeasement, and nearly succumbed during the Reagan-Thatcher era. A nuclear arms control pact cannot be passed blindly under the rationale that "it is in everybody's interests to work on reducing our nuclear arsenals." GOP senators want it made clear what New START really does, and what Moscow believes it does." ”

From New START, Old Whine, by Investor's Business Daily editorial board (*Investor's Business Daily*, November 24, 2010) (view)

“ "Here's the catch: The Russians are already beneath 700 launchers. The aging of their arsenal, coupled with economic constraints, means that they aren't going higher regardless. Effectively, New START only mandates cuts on us, and we make concessions to the Russians for the privilege. This is classic Obama chump diplomacy." ”

From A Poor START, by Rich Lowry (*National Review*, November 23, 2010) (view)

“ "At stake is something far beyond compliance procedures and bean-counting of warheads — the future of America and other free countries having a credible missile defense against nuclear attack. As pointed out by Frank Gaffney, president of the Center for Security Policy, New START could end up resuscitating the corpse of the lopsided 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty from which President George W. Bush withdrew in 2001. Gaffney notes that some senators worry the treaty "will effectively hobble once again America's ability to protect its people and allies" using anti-nuclear missile defense, "even from threats emerging from North Korea and Iran — and that Russia will withdraw from the treaty if that proves not to be the case." ”

From A New START Treaty? No Deal, by Investor's Business Daily editorial board (*Investor's Business Daily*, November 17, 2010) (view)

“ “While the on-site visits and data exchanges allowed under the treaty are valuable, New START abandons on-the-ground monitoring of Russia's missile-manufacturing facility and permits Russia to withhold telemetry of some of its missile tests, undermining our ability to know both what is being produced and what is being developed.” ”

From New START is a bad deal at any time, by Conn Carroll (*The Orange County Register*, December 7, 2010) (view)

“ “Messrs. Perle and Holmes, writing in National Review Online, say the treaty would: Encumber our freedom to deploy ballistic-missile defense; Squander the negotiating leverage needed to bring Russian shorter-range missiles under control; Reduce verification standards in this and perhaps future arms deals. Thus, New START is not a nuclear arms reduction treaty but an Rx for America's suicide.” ”

From Deal or no deal?: No New START, by Pittsburgh Tribune-Review editorial board (*Pittsburgh Tribune-Review*, December 21, 2010) (view)

Mixed on this position

“ “At Russia's insistence, the treaty contains language that some Republicans think does - and the Obama administration insists does not - couple limits on offensive and defensive systems. If it does, Republicans should oppose New START; if the language is, as the administration says, without force, it should be deleted. The Senate made ratification of the Jay Treaty (1795) and the Panama Canal Treaty (1978) contingent on modifying some language.” ”

From Obama's time-warp focus on the New START treaty, by George F. Will (*The Washington Post*, December 2, 2010) (view)

Retrieved from

"https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=New_START/_Treaty_should_be_ratified&oldid=13446"

This page was last edited on November 22, 2010, at 20:42.

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.