

# Western States Legal Foundation

Commentary

December 2010

## **The START Treaty and Disarmament: a Dilemma in Search of a Debate**

*by Andrew Lichterman\**

For months now, what little public discussion there is in the United States about arms control and disarmament has been dominated by treaty negotiations between the Obama administration and a formidable adversary. The treaty in question is the new U.S.-- Russia strategic arms reduction treaty (START). The adversary is not Russia (those negotiations concluded last spring); it is the U.S. military-industrial complex and its representatives in the United States Senate. The U.S. Constitution requires Senate consent for treaty ratification, and those who advocate unfettered U.S. military power long have seen the ratification process as an opportunity to extract both policy and spending commitments in return.

The START treaty will have little effect on the material institutions of the arms race. It will have only minimal effects on current nuclear weapons deployments, and places no meaningful limit on the modernization of nuclear arsenals or the development of strategically significant weapons systems such as missile defenses and conventional “prompt global strike” weapons with global reach. The principal purported benefits of new START, given that it requires only marginal arms reductions over seven years, mainly fall into two areas: resumption of on-the-ground verification measures, and re-establishment of a negotiating framework for future arms reductions. The concessions extracted by the weapons establishment in anticipation of ratification, in contrast, will have immediate and tangible effects, beginning with increases in weapons budgets and accelerated construction of new nuclear weapons facilities. These increased commitments of resources are intended to sustain a nuclear arsenal of civilization-destroying size for decades to come, and will further entrench interests that constitute long-term structural impediments to disarmament.

One would think that the START deal, with a treaty constituting at best very small arms reductions coming at the cost of material and policy measures that are explicitly designed to push any irreversible commitment to disarmament off many years into the future, would spark considerable debate within the U.S. “arms control and disarmament community.” With the struggle over treaty ratification in its final stages, however, most U.S. arms control and disarmament organizations have obediently lined up behind the Obama administration, parroting its talking points and saying little or nothing about the budget increases and policy promises provided to the nuclear weapons establishment. The vast majority of the e-mail blasts I receive from disarmament groups ask me to tell my Senator to vote for ratification without mentioning these commitments at all. The occasional message that mentions them seldom mentions their significance, despite the fact that it is quite clear that without these commitments—which, furthermore, have constantly increased as the ratification battle has dragged on—the chances for approval by the Senate are nil.

From the disarmament perspective, do the vast concrete negatives of the START deal outweigh its considerably more intangible positives? The “arms control and disarmament community” has concluded that the answer is yes, but has done so without any visible debate.

### **The making of the START deal**

The new START treaty was designed to change nuclear weapons deployments little, and to limit the development and deployment of other strategically relevant weapons systems even less. Mainstream arms control groups admit that the new START limits mainly just changed the counting rules, allowing both the U.S. and Russia to continue to deploy about the same number of nuclear warheads as had been permissible under the Bush-era SORT treaty. As Hans Kristensen of the Federation of American Scientists pointed out, “while the treaty reduces the *legal limit* for deployed strategic warheads, it doesn’t actually reduce the *number* of warheads. Indeed, the treaty does not require destruction of a single nuclear warhead and actually permits the United States and Russia to deploy almost the same number of strategic warheads that were permitted by the 2002 Moscow Treaty.”<sup>1</sup> And as Deputy Under Secretary Of Defense James Miller told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, New START counting rules permit retention of enough “nondeployed” nuclear warheads and delivery systems to “allow the U.S. to minimize irreversible changes to nuclear force structure.”<sup>2</sup>

Regarding missile defense, as the Arms Control Association noted in a recent issue brief *supporting* START, “New START is a missile defense-friendly treaty. It does not constrain U.S. missile defense plans in any way.”<sup>3</sup> New START also leaves U.S. “global strike” programs for delivery of conventional weapons with global range untouched. The U.S. is researching a variety of new propulsion and delivery vehicle technologies intended to provide “the ability to hit a target anywhere on the earth in less than one hour using a non-nuclear warhead.”<sup>4</sup> If deployed on ballistic missiles, conventional global strike weapons would be counted as deployed warheads under START. The U.S. military has indicated it would deploy such weapons on ballistic missiles during the term of the START treaty only in numbers too small to “prevent the United States from maintaining a robust nuclear deterrent.”<sup>5</sup> The U.S. has taken the position that other “global strike” technologies under development, such as “boost glide” vehicles with global range and considerable maneuverability, will not be subject to START limits because they are not fly a “ballistic” trajectory.<sup>6</sup> The technologies being researched for global strike, which include highly accurate delivery vehicles and materials and design concepts applicable to a wide range of applications for hypersonic flight, constitute a significant form of arms racing. Some advances may be applicable to existing or next generation nuclear weapons systems (and START places no limits on their modernization). If developed successfully boost-glide delivery systems also could be used for nuclear weapons, and in fact the United States contemplated doing so as recently as the late 1990’s.<sup>7</sup>

The Treaty places no limitation on modernization of nuclear arms, providing explicitly that “modernization and replacement of strategic offensive arms may be carried out.”<sup>8</sup> This has left the nuclear weapons establishment and its political allies free to extract as much as they can in funding and program commitments. The Obama Administration, eager to attain something it can portray as a foreign policy “win” and to regain the ideological “high ground” for its

counterproliferation/nonproliferation efforts, attempted to preempt the inevitable demands of the party of war and weapons (which extends well beyond the ranks of the formal Republican opposition). The Administration's February 2010 budget request for the 2011 fiscal year proposed an increase of almost 10% for Department of Energy nuclear weapons programs, and continuing increases over five years.<sup>9</sup> Over the next several months, the Administration further elaborated its plans for sustained and increased nuclear weapons spending through budget documents and a Nuclear Posture Review, a study conducted every five to ten years. By May, the administration had committed to budgeting a total of \$180 billion over the next ten years for nuclear warheads and delivery systems, an amount that would assure significant increases over previously projected spending.<sup>10</sup> The increases were of sufficient size that Linton Brooks, head of the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration under President Bush, observed that "I'd have killed for that budget."<sup>11</sup>

Throughout this process, the nuclear weapons establishment played its usual double game, promoting the President's treaty package while raising doubts about whether the accompanying financial commitments were quite big enough. Los Alamos National Laboratory Director Michael Anastasio, for example, told the Senate Foreign Relations committee that while the proposed budget increases are "an important first step," he fears "that some may perceive that the FY11 budget request meets all of the necessary budget commitments for the program; however, there are still significant financial uncertainties, for example, the design of the UPF [Uranium Processing Facility] and CMRR [Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement facility] are not complete and the final costs remain uncertain."<sup>12</sup> These two projects at Oak Ridge, Tennessee and Los Alamos, New Mexico are central to the manufacturing of the nuclear explosives components for nuclear warheads. They are intended to sustain the U.S. the ability to manufacture significant numbers of nuclear weapons into the middle of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, including new-design weapons if desired.<sup>13</sup>

Having failed to obtain Senate approval for ratification during the brief window available for substantive decision making between the long, wild propaganda frenzies driven by unlimited money that are today's U.S. "elections," the START battle only could be fully joined again after the early November balloting. Facing significant Republican gains in the Senate, the Obama administration has become visibly desperate to obtain consent to START before the seating of an even more hostile Senate in 2011. In November the administration promised billions of dollars in additional increases for the weapons complex, while reiterating its "extraordinary commitment to ensure the modernization of our nuclear infrastructure."<sup>14</sup> Fully aware of gloomier fiscal times ahead, the Senate negotiators on behalf of the weapons complex, exploiting the ideological space created by half-hearted endorsement of Obama's budget by the Executive branch's own weapons complex functionaries, are seeking to accelerate spending on major projects like the UPF and the CMRR.<sup>15</sup> To the extent that they are successful these efforts also will reduce the chance for a future change in direction on nuclear complex modernization.

Given its weak substantive limits on weapons development and deployment, START has been promoted by its advocates for its verification provisions and as a first step towards further rounds of reductions. The verification provisions such as on-site inspections, while not without value, are considerably less important than they were during the Cold War, with neither Russia

nor the United States currently engaged in large scale nuclear weapons production and frequent rollouts of new delivery systems. With satellite surveillance and other intelligence gathering means there is little reason to believe that any verification crisis or “yawning gap in the collection of strategic information”<sup>16</sup> exists. Increased Russian nuclear weapons deployments, furthermore, are unlikely to have a significant effect on the survivability of U.S. nuclear forces. Secretary of Defense Gates, in fact, assured the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that “Additional Russian warheads above the new START limits would have little or no effect on the assured second-strike capabilities that underwrite stable deterrence.”<sup>17</sup>

If the goal is greater stability in the U.S.-Russia armaments balance, the greater value of verification measures may be assuring confidence for Russia regarding the status of US forces, given greater U.S. hi-tech industrial capabilities and capacity to upload additional warheads on its strategic delivery systems. Some START verification measures also may help reduce the danger of ambiguity if prompt global strike systems are deployed—but in doing so they may make such systems more politically feasible, institutionalizing a new dimension in strategic arms racing.

Perhaps the strongest argument for new START is that it provides a first step and a framework for going forward with further U.S.-Russia bilateral reductions. If one goes beyond taking the disarmament rhetoric of the Obama administration at face value, however, prospects for significant U.S. reductions below proposed new START levels (which really means below current deployments) are at best highly debatable. Although U.S. officials use the language of “deterrence” in public arms control contexts, the actual policy of the U.S. government is to pursue escalation dominance at all levels of warfare, with the world’s most powerful conventional forces operating world-wide under the “umbrella” of nuclear forces of sufficient size and flexibility to threaten everything from credible use of small numbers of nuclear weapons up to societal annihilation.<sup>18</sup> Until this policy changes, “reductions” in the U.S. arsenal are likely to be of the new START variety—largely cosmetic, and leaving unaltered the fundamental danger that a nuclear arsenal of civilization-destroying size represents. Nor are other nuclear-armed states which see themselves as potential adversaries of the U.S. likely to give up their nuclear arsenals so long as the U.S., with by far the most powerful conventional forces, continues to pursue global military dominance.

A recent U.S. Congressional Research Service catalog of U.S. arms control agreements begins with this statement: “Arms control and nonproliferation efforts are two of the tools that have occasionally been used to implement U.S. national security strategy.”<sup>19</sup> This reflects a far more realistic view of what “arms control” is than seems to prevail among NGO disarmament professionals today. In the absence of significant movements for disarmament, most who work for disarmament seem to have lost sight of the fact that disarmament and arms control are not the same. At its extreme most opposed to disarmament, arms control is little more than the pursuit of military advantage by diplomatic means. Working for disarmament, in contrast, means opposing destructive weaponry in a way that leads to a world that is safer for all humanity, without favoring the concerns of elites whose power and privilege is in part sustained and extended through the threat and use of high-tech weapons, including nuclear weapons.

The available evidence suggests that the new START treaty lies much closer to the pole of pursuing U.S. geopolitical and military goals than to meaningful progress on disarmament. Some of the main Obama administration talking points for the treaty focus on the ways in which it will allow the United States to prosecute its continuing wars and to regain the diplomatic initiative in its counterproliferation efforts. As the President put it in a radio address pushing the treaty, “[w]ithout ratification, we put at risk the coalition that we have built to put pressure on Iran, and the transit route through Russia that we use to equip our troops in Afghanistan.”<sup>20</sup> These statements may indeed be goals of ruling U.S. elites, but should be considered more critically by those seeking disarmament and a more peaceful world—particularly when coming from the leader of a country still fighting a war of aggression and occupation begun under the rubric of preventing proliferation of nuclear weapons and other “weapons of mass destruction.”

For disarmament advocates, the arguments for new START may have some merit, but certainly are not so decisive as to foreclose debate. There are a number of questions that might have been considered on the way to one or another conclusion, but no sign that they were. Is there any threshold of weapons budget increases and policy commitments to the military-industrial complex that would, in the view of NGO disarmament professionals, outweigh the value of the treaty? If one believes the treaty is more good than bad, is the best political strategy for disarmament groups, consistent with their long-term goals, simply to endorse it while remaining largely silent about the anti-disarmament character of the ever-expanding “deal” on offer from the Obama administration to obtain Senate approval? Even if one concludes that START is an incremental step forward, is it sufficiently valuable to warrant the expenditure of time and resources for a disarmament movement whose social base has largely disappeared, and that might better spend its time developing a broadly persuasive vision for the role of disarmament in the current conjuncture? Such questions, it seems, are doomed to echo unanswered in the vast political vacuum that surrounds the dense and ever-narrowing concentration of wealthy and powerful interests in the United States that delimit what “reasonable” policy professionals are allowed to say.

All of these questions might come under the more general theme of whether an “inside outside” strategy for disarmament work might be preferable, with mobilized social movements asking for what they really want, creating the broader political conditions for allies in centers of power to make progress, and eventually for there to be more political allies in centers of power. This means something quite different from conventional top-down, single issue pressure group campaigning, with the issues defined by what can fit within the official agenda of ruling elites, and the arguments to be employed largely limited to what “policy professionals” deem to be credible in the Capitol halls.

In the case of nuclear disarmament, it means *demanding disarmament*—and educating both ourselves and broader publics about why world-destroying nuclear arsenals persist two decades after the end of the Cold War. It also means opposing the concrete institutions of the nuclear weapons establishment, and the expansion of their economic and political power by increasing their budgets and modernizing their facilities in preparation for another half century of high-tech nuclear militarism. Disarmament groups could loudly and clearly call for nuclear disarmament, oppose all nuclear weapons modernization funding, demand significant cuts in the

broader military budget, and begin to educate the public about the role the U.S. military and the military-industrial complex play in sustaining a highly inequitable political and economic order both at home and abroad. Massive pay-offs in exchange for even a tentative step in the direction of arms control such as START could then be understood as manifesting the political power of a powerful, entrenched, and largely unaccountable military-industrial complex. This approach also could contribute to building broader coalitions for a more equitable economy and for redirecting spending from war and repression to human needs. For those who are convinced that new START constitutes disarmament progress, this kind of approach at worst would have helped deal-cutting politicians to portray a modest arms control treaty as a “moderate” middle position.

Instead, the prevalent approach to new START turns disarmament politics on its head, with many disarmament NGO’s uncritically supporting the official position of the administration that leads the world’s most heavily armed state. This kind of approach can result at best in modest gains, while risking devastating double defeats. It does nothing to advance understanding of the real obstacles to disarmament or to build movements to change the political conditions that make disarmament progress unlikely. And if the ideological and material concessions to the military-industrial complex fail to garner Senate support for ratification, the damage has been done. This was the result in the late 1990’s where the mainstream arms control and disarmament groups acceded to a similar package of “safeguards” for the U.S. nuclear arsenal offered by the Clinton administration in a vain attempt to garner support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.<sup>21</sup> Today, the U.S. still has not ratified the CTBT, but billions of dollars of new nuclear weapons research facilities have been built with the money extracted by the nuclear weapons establishment in the bargaining over that failed “deal.” Once the administration—backed by the most prominent arms control and disarmament NGO’s—have actively or passively agreed that a new round of spending for nuclear weapons is “necessary” for “national security,” it is extremely difficult to reverse field whether the “deal” succeeds or not. Further, the mainstream “arms control and disarmament” groups soon fall back into habitual, purportedly “pragmatic” patterns of behavior, mainly challenging only marginal, luridly excessive elements of the new, higher budget “normal.”

This approach, in which both the less militarist elements in the U.S. Congress and most disarmament NGO’s fail to oppose massive expenditures for modernization of nuclear weapons research and production facilities at one of the few times when *U.S.* nuclear weapons facilities are publicly discussed, also makes it more difficult to create effective opposition to the nuclear weapons establishment “on the ground,” in the regions where these immense and politically powerful institutions exist. Where local opposition has played an effective role in stopping nuclear weapons facilities or deployments it typically has done so by creating multi-issue coalitions that also gained the support of some local elected federal officials. Episodes like the failed CTBT deal and the new START bargain capture legislators in commitments to the weapons complex, including for weapons projects being fought locally. Furthermore, the public is presented with a contradictory picture, with local disarmament groups attempting to block new or modernized weapons facilities, pro-treaty politicians and the mass media portraying nuclear weapons “modernization” as essential to obtaining Senate consent to ratification, and most national disarmament NGO’s telling local activists that the treaty is an urgent priority.

Top-down strategies stressing support for purportedly “winnable” legislative packages like the START bargain are incompatible with building coalitions by educating people about the impacts of nuclear weapons research and production and the role of the military-industrial complex and the interests it serves in an increasingly inequitable and undemocratic national and global society. This is so because such bargains make neither moral nor policy sense. They are “political” in the narrowest sense, the outcome of interest-driven bargaining manifesting the balance of forces among powerful factions in a fractious oligarchy. It is the work of the propagandists for the powerful to dress up such deals as serving the “national interest” and to sell them to the rest of us. The tasks of those who represent the cause of disarmament in capitol cities should be to help us understand the workings of those in power and their implications for our efforts, and to faithfully carry our message into forums where we have decided it is useful to do so. There are more than enough politicians to cut deals that benefit the powerful, and more than enough propagandists to convince us that such deals represent the entire universe of political possibility.

Inside-outside strategies require an “outside”—a movement that is a visible force taking oppositional action across the country. No disarmament movements capable of having even the kind of modest effects of the very large, visible Cold War-era anti-nuclear movements exist today. The absence of disarmament movements, to be sure, is only one aspect of a far deeper and broader erosion of “civil society” and hence of democracy in the United States and throughout much of the world.<sup>22</sup> The kind of professionalized interest group campaigning and advocacy prevalent in disarmament work dominates most other areas of “progressive” politics in the U.S. as well. Most who do disarmament work act as if this decline of civil society and the rise of an oligarchic politics that starkly limits the horizons not only of political possibility but of political imagination is inevitable, something to be adapted to rather than struggled against. Most also seem to see these developments as unrelated to the persistence of nuclear weapons and to the difficulty of eliminating them. I believe such views—or, as is more often the case, failure even to reflect on the nature of these problems—to be a mistake.

In those instances where pressure from disarmament movements may have played a significant role in obtaining arms control treaties, there was far more going on than lobbying campaigns backing the treaties. Instead, there were large movements with far more sweeping demands, from those who calling for Banning the Bomb (in the era of the Limited Test Ban Treaty) to the international peace and disarmament movements of the 1980’s, which formed the background for the treaties that spanned the end of the Cold War (the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and START I. The latter movements also were intertwined in complex and for the most part productive ways with other social movements of that time seeking fairness and democracy at every level of social practice, from the workplace to race and gender relations to the organization of the economy, as well as an ecologically sustainable way of life.

Rebuilding such movements will require far more than convincing a few NGO’s who work on other issues to e-mail blasts to their lists supporting one or another disarmament initiative hatched inside the Beltway. It will require a redirection of resources away from centers of corporate, political, and military power down to where the rest of us live, starting over again

in the long hard task of building movements that can give us power and voice. And it requires a vision of a better future conjoined with an understanding of how cause and effect works in society today—of why things are as they are, and how they might be changed—that demonstrates why the disparate problems and injustices people are working to eliminate have common causes. These two tasks are intertwined. The requisite vision and analysis of cause and effect will not be developed in conversations among ambitious policy professionals with an eye to what moves them up the career ladder in Washington D.C., where any vision that departs from the status quo is derided as impractical and any analysis that links economic to political power is denounced as heretical.

For those who work on disarmament, we need a new conversation, one that starts by asking how, if at all, single-issue disarmament work—in the sense of movements that focus mainly on controlling and eliminating classes of weapons—can be effective. We must step back and think once again about the proper scope and context of our work. It may well be the right thing to support particular arms control treaties and to oppose particular military programs and budget appropriations—but those are tactics, not strategies. Strategies must have goals, and an understanding of how cause and effect works in the arenas of action. Single issue campaigning employing arguments that can be effective without a new vision of a genuinely different alternative future only can change small things. They cannot make change that requires significant alteration of the distribution of power and wealth. If significant disarmament progress requires deeper change, a different approach will be necessary.

If more fundamental change is needed for disarmament progress, it likely must include not only reining in the economic and political power of military-industrial complexes but addressing the fundamental inequities, both within and between states, that long have been significant causes of wars. This will require the development of both broader analyses and broader movements. Unfortunately, the kind of discussion and reflection needed to address these questions is largely absent today within the “arms control and disarmament community.”

I am not arguing for halting action until we can develop the perfect analysis of global political economy and social change. I am arguing for turning disarmament work right side up. The criteria for choosing and judging actions cannot be what is possible in the short term in the halls of government in corrupt, bellicose, and heavily armed states. We can go there when useful to demand what we really want—and learn from the response we get who has power, and what they really want to do with it. We can confront the institutions of the nuclear-military-industrial complex where we find them—and learn by doing so about the effects of a half-century concentrated, unaccountable power on our communities and the natural world, and about how great power is deployed at every level of society. It is within this kind of context, and broader strategies that we develop from this perspective, that particular arms control measures like new START and the usefulness of campaigning for them should be debated and judged.

---

*\*Andrew Lichterman is a lawyer and peace activist living in Pleasant Hill, California. He is a member of the boards of the Oakland, California based Western States Legal Foundation and the Albuquerque, New Mexico based Los Alamos Study Group. The opinions expressed here are his own. A shorter version of this piece is forthcoming in the January, 2011 edition of Wissenschaft und Frieden.*



- 
- <sup>1</sup> Hans Kristensen, “New START Treaty Has New Counting,” *FAS Strategic Security Blog*, March 29, 2010, <http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2010/03/newstart.php> (emphasis original).
- <sup>2</sup> Statement of Dr. James N. Miller, Principal Deputy Under Secretary Of Defense For Policy Before The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, June 16, 2010, p.2
- <sup>3</sup> Tom Z. Collina And Greg Thielmann, “New START Clears the Path for Missile Defense,” *Arms Control Association Issue Brief*, Volume 1, Number 39, December 1, 2010 <http://www.armscontrol.org/issuebriefs/NewSTARTClearsPathforBMD>
- <sup>4</sup> Statement of Dr. James N. Miller, Principal Deputy Under Secretary Of Defense For Policy Before The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, June 16, 2010, p.3.
- <sup>5</sup> Statement for the record of Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, Report of the Senate Foreign Relation Committee, “Treaty With Russia On Measures For Further Reduction And Limitation Of Strategic Offensive Arms (The New Start Treaty),” 111th Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, Exec. Rept. 111–6 To Accompany Treaty Doc. 111–5], p.54.
- <sup>6</sup> Statement of Dr. James N. Miller, Principal Deputy Under Secretary Of Defense For Policy Before The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, June 16, 2010, pp.3-4; see also Report of the Senate Foreign Relation Committee, “Treaty With Russia On Measures For Further Reduction And Limitation Of Strategic Offensive Arms (The New Start Treaty),” 111th Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, Exec. Rept. 111–6 To Accompany Treaty Doc. 111–5], pp.50-57.
- <sup>7</sup> See discussion and references in Andrew Lichterman, “Missiles of Empire: America’s 21st Century Global Legions,” *Western States Legal Foundation Information Bulletin*, Fall 2003, pp.5-6 <http://wslfweb.org/docs/missiles03.pdf>
- <sup>8</sup> Treaty Between The United States of America and The Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, Article V paragraph 1.
- <sup>9</sup> U.S. Department of Energy, FY 2011 Congressional Budget Request, V.I, National Nuclear Security Administration, pp.47-48.
- <sup>10</sup> See U.S. Department of State, Fact Sheet, “The New START Treaty – Maintaining a Strong Nuclear Deterrent,” may 13, 2010. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/New%20START%20section%201251%20fact%20sheet.pdf>
- <sup>11</sup> Arms Control Association and the Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation Briefing on START and the Nuclear Posture Review, April 7, 2010, Transcript available at <http://www.armscontrol.org/events/STARTandNPRBriefing>
- <sup>12</sup> Testimony of Dr. Michael R. Anastasio, Laboratory Director, Los Alamos National Laboratory, on the New START Treaty before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, July 15, 2010, pp.6, 10. <http://foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Anastasio.pdf>
- <sup>13</sup> Greg Mello and Trish Williams-Mello, see generally “Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Project (CMRR) Primer: Introduction, Overview, and Some Key Issues,” Los Alamos Study Group, September 2009 (updated 2009) [http://www.lasg.org/CMRR\\_Dec\\_09.pdf](http://www.lasg.org/CMRR_Dec_09.pdf)

---

<sup>14</sup> The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, “Fact Sheet: An Enduring Commitment to the U.S. Nuclear Deterrent,” November 17, 2010 <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2010/11/17/fact-sheet-enduring-commitment-us-nuclear-deterrent>

<sup>15</sup> Peter Baker, “G.O.P. Senators Detail Objections to Arms Treaty,” *The New York Times*, November 24, 2010 <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/25/world/europe/25start.html>; see also “Memo, Sen. Jon Kyl, Sen. Bob Corker to Republican Members, November 24, 2010, re: Progress in Defining Nuclear Modernization Requirements,” obtained by the Arms Control Association, available at <http://www.armscontrol.org/system/files/20101124%20-%20Kyl-Corker%20Memo%20On%20Modernization%20for%20Republican%20Colleagues.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> Greg Thielmann, “Close the Verification Gap: Ratify New START,” Arms Control Association Issue Brief Volume 1, Number 35, November 19, 2010 <http://www.armscontrol.org/node/4559>

<sup>17</sup> Letter From The Honorable Robert M. Gates, Secretary Of Defense, July 30, 2010, Report of the Senate Foreign Relation Committee, “Treaty With Russia On Measures For Further Reduction And Limitation Of Strategic Offensive Arms (The New Start Treaty),” 111th Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, Exec. Rept. 111–6 To Accompany Treaty Doc. 111–5], p.126.

<sup>18</sup> See Andrew Lichterman and Jacqueline Cabasso, “War is Peace, Arms Racing is Disarmament: The Non-Proliferation Treaty and the U.S. Quest for Global Military Dominance,” Western States Legal Foundation Special Report, May 2005, pp.7-8 and sources cited therein. <http://wslfweb.org/docs/warispeace.pdf>

<sup>19</sup> Amy F. Woolf, Mary Beth Nikitin, and Paul K. Kerr, *Arms Control and Nonproliferation: A Catalog of Treaties and Agreements*, Congressional Research Service, February 2, 2010, Summary.

<sup>20</sup> Remarks of President Barack Obama, Weekly Address: “Senators Opposing New START ‘Want to Trust But Not Verify,’” The White House, November 20, 2010, Transcript at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2010/11/20/weekly-address-senators-opposing-new-start-want-trust-not-verify>

<sup>21</sup> On this point see See Jacqueline Cabasso, “Nuclear Weapons Research and Development,” in Michael Spies and John Burroughs, eds., *Nuclear Disorder or Cooperative Security? U.S. Weapons of Terror, the Global Proliferation Crisis, and Paths to Peace*, New York, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, Western States Legal Foundation, and Reaching Critical Will project of the Womens’ International League for Peace and Freedom, 2007, pp.93 et seq.

<sup>22</sup> For an in-depth discussion of the erosion of civil society and its effect on disarmament work see Andrew Lichterman, “Nuclear Disarmament, Civil society, and Democracy,” forthcoming in *Disarmament Forum*, 2011.

Western States Legal Foundation · 655 13th Street, Suite 201 · Oakland, California USA 94612

Tel: +1 510 839-5877 · Fax: +1 510 839-5397 · [wslfweb.org](http://wslfweb.org)