

# Key Quotations on the New START Treaty

## General Treaty Support

### **President Obama**

“We’ve turned words into action. We’ve made progress that is clear and concrete. And we’ve demonstrated the importance of American leadership and American partnership on behalf of our own security and the world’s.”

*Remarks on New START, March 26, 2010*

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-announcement-new-start-treaty>

### **Secretary of Defense Robert Gates**

“The key question...has always been the same: Is the United States better off with an agreement or without it? The answer for each successive president has always been ‘with an agreement.’ The U.S. Senate has always agreed, approving each treaty by lopsided, bipartisan margins.

“The same answer holds true for the New START agreement: The U.S. is far better off with this treaty than without it. It strengthens the security of the U.S. and our allies and promotes strategic stability between the world’s two major nuclear powers.”

*The Case for the New START Treaty, The Wall Street Journal, May 13, 2010*

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ\\_Opinion\\_LEFTTopOpinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFTTopOpinion)

### **Admiral Michael Mullen, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff**

“I, the vice chairman and the Joint Chiefs, as well as our combatant commanders around the world, stand solidly behind this new treaty, having had the opportunity to provide our counsel, to make our recommendations and to help shape the final agreements.”

“[T]hrough 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. I am as confident in its success as I am in its safeguards.”

*White House Press Briefing on New START, March 26, 2010*

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/briefing-secretary-clinton-secretary-gates-admiral-mullen-announcement-new-start-tr>

### **George Shultz and Henry Kissinger, Former Secretaries of State; William Perry, Former Secretaries of Defense; and Sam Nunn, Former Senator, D-GA**

“We strongly endorse the goals of this Treaty, and we hope that after careful and expeditious review that both the United States Senate and the Russian Federal Assembly will be able to ratify the Treaty. We also urge the two governments to begin planning now for even more substantial reductions, including tactical nuclear weapons.”

*Statement on the New START Treaty, March 26, 2010*

[http://www.nti.org/c\\_press/Statement\\_by\\_Four\\_on\\_START\\_Follow\\_On\\_032610.pdf](http://www.nti.org/c_press/Statement_by_Four_on_START_Follow_On_032610.pdf)

**George Shultz, Former Secretary of State for President Ronald Reagan**

“President Barack Obama shares President Ronald Reagan's desire to rid the world of nuclear weapons. He also shares Reagan's conviction that as long as nuclear weapons exist, the United States must maintain its deterrent capability through a stockpile of nuclear weapons that are secure, safe and reliable.”

“The new treaty calls for modest but significant reductions in strategic weapons, accompanied by verification and transparency measures made necessary by the expiration of the original START last December.”

“The treaty helps move our relationship with Russia in a more constructive direction, and it sets the stage for work with other nations in getting the nuclear threat under control.”

*Debating Obama's New Nuclear Doctrine, The Wall Street Journal, April 13, 2010*  
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304222504575174200114028206.html>

**Brent Scowcroft, Lt. Gen. USAF, (Ret.), Former National Security Advisor to Presidents Ford and George H. W. Bush**

“There are detractors who will say New START goes too far or not far enough, but to me it's a necessary step to get us back on track toward the architecture of nuclear arms control that started back in the [Lyndon B.] Johnson administration”

“[New START] should not be controversial no matter how liberal or conservative you are.”

*Atlantic Council Event, April 21, 2010*  
<http://www.acus.org/event/road-prague-next-steps-new-start>

**Stephen Hadley, Former National Security Advisor for President George W. Bush**

"This is a dramatic reduction and a dramatic change that reflects the extent to which both Russia and the United States are relying much less on nuclear weapons for their national security. So that's a good development. The world should take some comfort in that development."

*Interview with Xinhua News Agency, April 8, 2010*  
<http://english.cri.cn/6966/2010/04/09/1781s562043.htm>

**Richard Burt, Chief START Negotiator during the George H.W. Bush Administration**

“[T]aken together, [New START and the NPR] could be transformational, spurring a shift in American nuclear strategy from an outmoded Cold War focus on deterring a Russian-American nuclear conflict to a 21st century emphasis on curbing nuclear proliferation and terrorism. Such a shift is long overdue, and opens the door to new opportunities for further international cooperation, with Russia, China and others to reduce nuclear risks.”

*Debating Obama's New Nuclear Doctrine, The Wall Street Journal, April 13, 2010*  
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304222504575174200114028206.html>

## **Nuclear Posture under New START**

### **Secretary of Defense Robert Gates**

“[T]he treaty preserves the U.S. nuclear arsenal as a vital pillar of our nation's and our allies' security posture. Under this treaty, the U.S. will maintain our powerful nuclear triad—ICBMs, submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) and bombers—and we will retain the ability to change our force mix as we see fit. Based on recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we plan to meet the Treaty's limits by retaining a triad of up to 420 ICBMs, 14 submarines carrying up to 240 SLBMs, and up to 60 nuclear-capable heavy bombers.”

*The Case for the New START Treaty, The Wall Street Journal, May 13, 2010*

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ\\_Opinion\\_LEFTTopOpinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFTTopOpinion)

### **Jim Miller, Principal Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Policy**

“[D]uring the NPR, we looked at a very wide range of scenarios, possible nuclear scenarios, and found that the force structure and the numbers that had become part of the New START Treaty, provided a very robust capability across that wide range.”

*Testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee Hearing on “The Nuclear Posture Review,” April 22, 2010*

<http://armed-services.senate.gov/Transcripts/2010/04%20April/10-37%20-%204-22-10.pdf>

### **General James Cartwright, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff**

“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].”

“No, I don't feel constrained in the least, really. I think we have more than enough capacity and capability for any threat that we see today or might emerge in the foreseeable future.”

“We will retain, throughout the life of the treaty, the nuclear triad.”

*Pentagon briefing on the NPR, April 6, 2010*

<http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=4600>

### **General Kevin Chilton, Commander, U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM)**

“[T]he New START agreement warhead and platform numbers provide appropriate military flexibility....I am confident that the NPR and New START outline an approach that continues to enable the men and women of U.S. Strategic Command to deliver global security for America today and in the future.”

“With regard to New START, the nuclear enterprise remains, today and for the foreseeable future, the foundation of U.S. deterrence strategy and defense posture. As the combatant command responsible for executing strategic deterrence operations, planning for nuclear operations, and advocating for nuclear capabilities, at STRATCOM we are keenly aware of how force posture and readiness changes can affect deterrence, assurance, and overall strategic stability.”

“The New START agreement, in my view, retains the military flexibility necessary to ensure each of these for the period of the treaty.

“I’m confident that the NPR and New START outline an approach that continues to enable the men and women of U.S. Strategic Command to deliver global security for America today and in the future.”

*Testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee Hearing on “The Nuclear Posture Review,” April 22, 2010*

<http://armed-services.senate.gov/statemnt/2010/04%20April/Chilton%2004-22-10.pdf>

“The United States Strategic Command under the construct of both the Nuclear Posture Review and the START treaty is able to fully execute the missions assigned to this command to provide adequate strategic deterrence for the United States of America. Of that I’m absolutely convinced.”

“We looked very carefully and supported the negotiations for START as far as vehicle limitations...[A]nd I can tell you we’re very comfortable with the limits that have been set.”

*Testimony before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Hearing on Hearing on “U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy and Force Structure,” April 14, 2010*

**Richard Burt, Chief START Negotiator during the George H.W. Bush Administration**

“[T]he posture review represents a necessary de-emphasis in the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. defense and foreign policy.”

*Debating Obama’s New Nuclear Doctrine, The Wall Street Journal, April 13, 2010*

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304222504575174200114028206.html>

**George Shultz, Former Secretary of State for President Ronald Reagan**

“The nuclear posture review shows [President Obama] is being careful about American national security at every step.”

“One of the things in the nuclear posture review that has gotten zero attention—but deserves some attention—is the common sense notion that deterrence involves more than just nuclear weapons. There are all sorts of ways historically that you can deter an enemy. If you are an Al Qaeda fighter in the hills of Pakistan, you are much more worried about a drone than a nuclear missile.”

“We need to broaden our concept that deterrence is not just nuclear. That is part of the thinking that must go along with steep reductions in nuclear weapons.”

*Interview with Christian Science Monitor, April 14, 2010*

[http://news.yahoo.com/s/csm/20100414/cm\\_csm/294507](http://news.yahoo.com/s/csm/20100414/cm_csm/294507)

## **Maintaining a Strong Nuclear Deterrent under New START**

### **Secretary of Defense Robert Gates**

“[T]he treaty is buttressed by credible modernization plans and long-term funding for the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile and the infrastructure that supports it. This administration is proposing to spend \$80 billion over the next decade to rebuild and sustain America's aging nuclear infrastructure—especially our national weapons labs, and our science, technology and engineering base. This week the president is providing a report to the Congress on investments planned over the next 10 years to sustain and modernize our nuclear weapons, their delivery systems, and supporting infrastructure.”

*The Case for the New START Treaty, The Wall Street Journal, May 13, 2010*

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ\\_Opinion\\_LEFTTopOpinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFTTopOpinion)

“The NPR calls for making much-needed investments to rebuild America’s aging nuclear infrastructure. . . . These investments, and the NPR’s strategy for warhead life extension, represent a credible modernization plan necessary to sustain the nuclear infrastructure and support our nation’s deterrent.”

### **Nuclear Posture Review Report, April 2010**

<http://www.defense.gov/npr/>

### **Tom D’Agostino, Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration**

“[O]ur approach towards maintaining the stockpile described in the NPR is wholly consistent with, and was informed by, the Stockpile Management Program principles, passed into law through the 2010 National Defense Authorization Act. With the committee's endorsement, the nuclear security enterprise will have the science, technology and engineering expertise to manage the stockpile and to also carry out the full range of nuclear security missions, which include nuclear non-proliferation, nuclear counterterrorism and nuclear forensics, among other activities.”

*Testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee Hearing on “The Nuclear Posture Review,” April 22, 2010*

<http://armed-services.senate.gov/Transcripts/2010/04%20April/10-37%20-%204-22-10.pdf>

“[The NNSA] budget request is the president's signal that he cares about nuclear nonproliferation because of the increase there and the charge to secure material in four years, but he also knows that you cannot reduce the size of the stockpile without maintaining the stockpile and maintaining it in a way that's going to have some longevity and sustainability.”

*Testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development Hearing on “DOE, Weapons Activities, Naval Reactors,” March 4, 2010*

### **William Perry, Secretary of Defense for President Bill Clinton**

“The President’s FY11 budget submission proposes substantial increases to the nuclear weapons program for [improvement of the nuclear weapons complex]. . . . The administration has been consistent in its statements and proposals on this point, all of which support upgrade and improvement of the nuclear weapons complex.”

“This treaty does not limit America's ability to structure its offensive arsenal to meet current or future threats, nor does it prevent the future modernization of the American nuclear arsenal.”

*Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing on “The Historical and Modern Context for U.S.-Russian Arms Control,” April 29, 2010*

**Linton Brooks, Former Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration for President George W. Bush**

“I will say flatly, I ran [NNSA] for five years and I’d have killed for that budget and that much high-level attention in the administration... I think [the budget] does put us on a very firm, firm basis”

“I think that it is hard to come up with a definition of supporting modernization that the Nuclear Posture Review isn’t responsive too.”

*Arms Control Association Event, April 9, 2010*

<http://www.armscontrol.org/events/STARTandNPRBriefing>

## **Verification**

### **President Obama**

“[The new START treaty] puts in place a strong and effective verification regime.”

*Remarks on New START, March 26, 2010*

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-announcement-new-start-treaty>

### **Secretary of Defense Robert Gates**

“[New START] limits significantly U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear arsenals and establishes an extensive verification regime to ensure that Russia is complying with its treaty obligations. These include short-notice inspections of both deployed and nondeployed systems, verification of the numbers of warheads actually carried on Russian strategic missiles, and unique identifiers that will help us track—for the very first time—all accountable strategic nuclear delivery systems.

“Since the expiration of the old START Treaty in December 2009, the U.S. has had none of these safeguards. The new treaty will put them back in place, strengthen many of them, and create a verification regime that will provide for greater transparency and predictability between our two countries, to include substantial visibility into the development of Russian nuclear forces.”

*The Case for the New START Treaty, The Wall Street Journal, May 13, 2010*

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ\\_Opinion\\_LEFTTopOpinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFTTopOpinion)

### **Admiral Michael Mullen, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff**

New START “features a much more effective, transparent verification method that demands quicker data exchanges and notification.”

*White House Press Briefing on New START, March 26, 2010*

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/briefing-secretary-clinton-secretary-gates-admiral-mullen-announcement-new-start-tr>

### **General Kevin Chilton, Commander, U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM)**

“[I]n listening to the discussions along the way and what has been included in the current verification protocols in the proposed treaty, I think, will be adequate for us over the life of the treaty to ensure compliance.”

*Testimony before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Hearing on Hearing on “U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy and Force Structure”, April 14, 2010*

### **William Perry, Secretary of Defense for President Bill Clinton**

“The transparency and verification regime in this treaty builds upon the successful procedures and methods from the prior START treaty.”

“I think the inspection provisions considerably enhance our ability to verify the treaty. But you should understand that they are supplementary to our national technical means, which are quite considerable.”

*Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing on “The Historical and Modern Context for U.S.-Russian Arms Control,” April 29, 2010*

**Stephen Hadley, Former National Security Advisor for President George W. Bush**

“[New START] will revive and institutionalize some of the verification measures from the START I agreement....These measures are important because they ensure transparency and give each side the reassurance that the other side is complying with the agreement, and that's of course a very important confidence building effort.”

*Interview with Xinhua News Agency, April 8, 2010*

<http://english.cri.cn/6966/2010/04/09/1781s562043.htm>

## **Senate Advice and Consent and Treaty Ratification**

### **Secretary of State Hillary Clinton**

“I believe that a vast majority of the Senate at the end of the day will see that this is in America's interest and it goes way beyond politics.”

“In fact, I think if you look at the last three major nuclear arms treaties, the SORT treaty of 2003, 95-0; START I treaty, 1992, 93-6; the INF treaty, 1988, 93-5.”

#### ***White House Press Briefing on New START, March 26, 2010***

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/briefing-secretary-clinton-secretary-gates-admiral-mullen-announcement-new-start-tr>

### **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.”

#### ***The Case for the New START Treaty, The Wall Street Journal, May 13, 2010***

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ\\_Opinion\\_LEFTTopOpinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFTTopOpinion)

“Let me first say a word about ratification from my perspective. There has been a very intense continuing consultation on the Hill as the negotiations have proceeded. Two of the areas that have been of concern in the Senate, among senators: Are we protecting our ability to go forward with missile defense? And are we going to make the investment in our nuclear infrastructure so that the stockpile will remain reliable and safe? ... We have addressed both of those.”

#### ***White House Press Briefing on New START, March 26, 2010***

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/briefing-secretary-clinton-secretary-gates-admiral-mullen-announcement-new-start-tr>

### **James Schlesinger, Former Secretary of Defense for Presidents Nixon and Ford**

“I think that it is obligatory for the United States to ratify [New START].”

“For the United States at this juncture to fail to ratify the treaty in the due course of the Senate's deliberation would have a detrimental effect on our ability to influence others with regard to particularly the nonproliferation issue.”

#### ***Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing on “The Historical and Modern Context for U.S.-Russian Arms Control,” April 29, 2010***

**Charles Hagel, Former Senator, R-NE**

“I don't think [the Treaty] needs to be divisive at all. This is clearly in the interest of both countries and the world.”

*Atlantic Council Event, April 21, 2010*

<http://www.acus.org/event/road-prague-next-steps-new-start>

**Linton Brooks, Former Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration for President George W. Bush**

“I don't think there's any question this [treaty] is in our interest and should be ratified.”

*Arms Control Association Event, April 9, 2010*

<http://www.armscontrol.org/events/STARTandNPRBriefing>

**Richard Burt, Chief START Negotiator during the George H.W. Bush Administration**

“I can say as a former political appointee of two Republican administrations, it will be very difficult for anybody to come up with a strong set of coherent arguments against this treaty. This treaty itself does not take sweeping steps to reduce either the United States or Russian deployed arsenal...It's a very small step toward further reductions...Anyone who would vote against [the treaty] needs to think about the consequences of the signals we would send to the rest of the world...What would be the impact on proliferation?...What would it do to US leadership...on a whole range of international order issues?”

*Global Zero Press Conference on New START, April 9, 2010*

<http://motherjones.com/mojo/2010/04/reaganbush-i-appointee-gopers-dont-mess-start-treaty>

## **Missile Defense and Extended Deterrence**

### **President Obama**

“[New START] maintains the flexibility that we need to protect and advance our national security and to guarantee our unwavering commitment to the security of our allies.”

*Remarks on New START, March 26, 2010*

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-announcement-new-start-treaty>

### **Secretary of State Hillary Clinton**

“We, we have consistently conveyed to our European friends and allies America's absolute commitment to our NATO partners and to their defense. The phase adaptive approach that the president concluded was the best way forward on missile defense, we think, actually makes Europe safer from what are the real threats that are out there.”

“One of the reasons why it's so significant that the presidents will meet in Prague is because we want to send exactly that signal, that this is good for Europe, as well as for the United States and Russia.”

*White House Press Briefing on New START, March 26, 2010*

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/briefing-secretary-clinton-secretary-gates-admiral-mullen-announcement-new-start-tr>

### **Secretary of Defense Robert Gates**

“[T]he treaty will not constrain the U.S. from developing and deploying defenses against ballistic missiles, as we have made clear to the Russian government. The U.S. will continue to deploy and improve the interceptors that defend our homeland—those based in California and Alaska. We are also moving forward with plans to field missile defense systems to protect our troops and partners in Europe, the Middle East, and Northeast Asia against the dangerous threats posed by rogue nations like North Korea and Iran.”

*The Case for the New START Treaty, The Wall Street Journal, May 13, 2010*

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ\\_Opinion\\_LEFTTopOpinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703339304575240164048611360.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFTTopOpinion)

“There are no constraints [in the treaty] on missile defense.”

“America's nuclear arsenal remains an important pillar of the U.S. defense posture, both to deter potential adversaries and to reassure more than a dozen allies and partners who rely on our nuclear umbrella for their security.”

“The reductions in this treaty will not affect the strength of our nuclear triad. Nor does this treaty limit plans to protect the United States and our allies by improving and deploying missile defense systems.”

*White House Press Briefing on New START, March 26, 2010*

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/briefing-secretary-clinton-secretary-gates-admiral-mullen-announcement-new-start-tr>

**General James Cartwright, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff**

“There are no constraints in this treaty associated with our missile defenses or our prompt global strike capabilities, read conventional.”

*Pentagon Briefing on the NPR, April 6, 2010*

<http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=4600>

**General Kevin Chilton, Commander, STRATCOM**

“There [are] no restrictions in START with regard to our missile defense capability.”

*Testimony before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Hearing on “Strategic Forces Programs”, April 14, 2010*

[http://www.senate.gov/~armed\\_services/Transcripts/2010/04%20April/10-30%20-%204-14-10.pdf](http://www.senate.gov/~armed_services/Transcripts/2010/04%20April/10-30%20-%204-14-10.pdf)

**Lieutenant General Patrick O’Reilly, Director, Missile Defense Agency**

“Relative to the recently expired START Treaty, the new START Treaty actually reduces constraints on the development of the missile defense program.”

*Testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee Hearing on “Fiscal Year 2011 Defense Authorization – Ballistic Missile Defense Programs”, April 20, 2010*

<http://armed-services.senate.gov/statemnt/2010/04%20April/O'Reilly%2004-20-10.pdf>

**William Perry, Secretary of Defense for President Bill Clinton**

“The development of Ballistic Missile Defense is similarly unconstrained by this treaty.”

“[T]he treaty puts no meaningful limits our Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense program, and in fact it reduces restrictions that existed under the previous START treaty. I recommend ratification.”

*Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing on “The Historical and Modern Context for U.S.-Russian Arms Control”, April 29, 2010*

**James Schlesinger, Former Secretary of Defense for Presidents Nixon and Ford**

“The treaty does not limit U.S. missile defense in a serious way.”

*Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing on “The Historical and Modern Context for U.S.-Russian Arms Control”, April 29, 2010*

**Linton Brooks, Former Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration for President George W. Bush**

“The treaty does not limit missile defense at all.”

*Arms Control Association Event, April 9, 2010*

<http://www.armscontrol.org/events/STARTandNPRBriefing>

**Brent Scowcroft, Lt. Gen. USAF, (Ret.), Former National Security Advisor to Presidents Ford and George H. W. Bush**

"I strongly approve of President Obama's decision regarding missile defense deployments in Europe. I believe it advances U.S. national security interests, supports our allies, and better meets the threats we face."

*Atlantic Council Press Statement, September 18, 2009*

[http://www.acus.org/new\\_atlanticist/brent-scowcroft-supports-obamas-missile-defense-decision](http://www.acus.org/new_atlanticist/brent-scowcroft-supports-obamas-missile-defense-decision)