Negative: New Start

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

The AFF plan has the US drop out of the "New Start" nuclear weapons limitation treaty with Russia. Russia recently announced that they were "suspending participation" (so, not doing some things they are supposed to do) in the treaty, but not officially leaving it. NEG position in the round is that we would be better off to remain in the treaty and try to persuade Russia to come back to full participation, rather than be the ones to officially cancel the treaty.
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Negative: New Start

INHERENCY

1. Expires on its own in 2026

New Start Treaty expires in 2026 and will not be renewed

Eugene Rumer 2023. (former national intelligence officer for Russia and Eurasia at the U.S. National Intelligence Council, senior fellow and the director of Carnegie Endowment for Peace’s Russia and Eurasia Program) The Method Behind Putin’s New START Madness (accessed 13 Mar 2023) https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/02/28/method-behind-putin-s-new-start-madness-pub-89161

 New START will almost certainly have no successor when it expires in early 2026. The United States and Russia will then find themselves without any formal means of managing their nuclear standoff.

New Start treaty expires on its own Feb 4, 2026

US State Dept. 2023. "New START Treaty" last updated 16 Feb 2023 (accessed 13 Mar 2023) https://www.state.gov/new-start/

The Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, also known as the New START Treaty, enhances U.S. national security by placing verifiable limits on all Russian deployed intercontinental-range nuclear weapons. The United States and the Russian Federation have agreed to extend the treaty through February 4, 2026.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. A/T "Lack of accountability"

New Start Treaty enables US access to Russia's nuclear forces and increases our knowledge about their capabilities

US State Dept. 2023. "New START Treaty" last updated 16 Feb 2023 (accessed 13 Mar 2023) https://www.state.gov/new-start/

The New START Treaty’s verification provisions enable the United States to assess Russian compliance with the treaty and give us a vital window into Russian intercontinental-range nuclear forces and operations.  Without the New START Treaty’s verification measures, there would be a decrease in U.S. knowledge of Russian nuclear forces.  Over time we would have less confidence in our assessments of Russian forces and would have less information upon which to base decisions about U.S. nuclear forces.

2. A/T "Demonstrates resolve against Russia"

Irresponsible way to do it: Abandoning safeguards against nuclear war is the wrong way to oppose Russia's war in Ukraine. There are lots of more reasonable ways to do it

**Paul Ingram***2023 (Senior Research Associate at Cambridge University’s Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, and formerly an Executive Director of the British American Security Information) 24 Feb 2023 "*Response to Russia’s decision to suspend New START" (accessed 13 Mar 2023) *Council*https://natowatch.org/default/2023/response-russias-decision-suspend-new-start

Unfortunately, some complacency has crept in. Western leaderships now appear to have faith that Putin was never serious and that we can call his bluff. Equally, they seem willing to sacrifice critical global governance tools in their attempts to censure, isolate and punish Russia. This is irresponsible behaviour. There are plenty of UN and media arenas in which to condemn the Russians; plenty of tools such as sanctions, to apply pressure. But it is truly shocking to see the manner in which international arenas unrelated to the war have been used by diplomats to repeatedly condemn Russia and to risk or abandon engagements essential to managing global threats such as climate change or nuclear war. It is now critical that states relearn the lessons from the Cold War and find effective means to protect arms control, the climate change COP process, and other mechanisms to contain global catastrophic risks. Collaboration on these matters does not imply endorsement of unacceptable actions by states in other arenas, but is rather a matter of survival for all of us.

3. A/T "National security with more nuclear weapons"

Don't need any more nuclear weapons to have US security assured

*Rebecca Hersman and Joseph Rodgers 2021 (Hersman is director of Project on Nuclear Issues (PONI) and senior adviser with the International Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington. Rodgers is a program manager with CSIS PONI)* 14 June 2021 "Reading the Nuclear Tea Leaves: Policy and Posture in the Biden Administration" (accessed 14 Mar 2023) https://www.csis.org/analysis/reading-nuclear-tea-leaves-policy-and-posture-biden-administration-0

Even in the face of sustained nuclear expansion from Russia and China, a broad consensus remains that the overall parameters of the U.S. strategic nuclear stockpile, as delimited under New Start, are sufficient to meet our global deterrence needs, improve transparency and communication between the United States and Russia on strategic arms, and reduce anxieties about potential arms racing dynamics especially among European allies.

SOLVENCY

1. Overall net benefits to staying in New Start

"Not" dropping out of New Start and instead negotiating with Russia to return to compliance would be the best policy

Daryl Kimball, Tony Fleming, and Kathy Crandall Robinson 2023 (Kimball - Executive Director of the *Arms* Control Association. Fleming - Director for Communications and Operations at the *Arms* Control Association. Robinson - chief operating officer for the *Arms* Control Association) 9 March 2023 Nuclear Arms Control at High Risk (accessed 13 March 2023) https://www.armscontrol.org/blog/2023-03/inside-aca

Notably, the Biden administration "remains ready to talk about strategic arms limitations at any time with Russia irrespective of anything else going on in the world or in our relationship." Despite headwinds, there is still time, opportunity, and ample reason to prevent a bad situation from worsening. Continued U.S. presidential leadership, stronger congressional support for commonsense nuclear limits, and added international pressure, could still convince the Kremlin to resume New START inspections and data exchanges and secure an agreement that both sides will respect the central limits set by New START until the two governments can conclude a new, more comprehensive nuclear arms control framework.

2. A/T "Pullout of past treaties has worked successfully"

Nothing good came out of pulling out of the last 3 treaties we had with Russia

**Paul Ingram***2023 (Senior Research Associate at Cambridge University’s Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, and formerly an Executive Director of the British American Security Information) 24 Feb 2023 "*Response to Russia’s decision to suspend New START" (accessed 13 Mar 2023) *Council*https://natowatch.org/default/2023/response-russias-decision-suspend-new-start

Without New START and given the level of tension and distrust, we are likely to see a renewed arms race. We may well have already been in one, on a number of fronts, but now it feels like both sides are saying, ‘Game on!’. Equally, we must acknowledge shared responsibly. The United States has played a leading role in demolishing our arms control architecture, starting with major missed opportunities in the 1990s, followed by withdrawal from the ABM Treaty in 2002, INF Treaty in 2019 and Open Skies Treaty in 2020. This is in part because the United States and other states have been complacent in managing the global nuclear order, and many American leaders believed they no longer needed to be constrained by arms control.

Withdrawal from past treaties put the US and the entire world at increased risk of nuclear war

**Prof. Jonathan Alan King 2023 (professor emeritus of molecular biology at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he chairs the annual “Reducing the Threat of Nuclear War” conferences. He also serves as co-chair of the board of Massachusetts Peace Action and assistant chair of its Nuclear Disarmament Working Group) 14 Feb 2023 "** Is Withdrawing From Treaties the Nuclear Weapons Industry’s Business Plan?" (accessed 14 Mar 2023) https://masspeaceaction.org/is-withdrawing-from-treaties-the-nuclear-weapons-industrys-business-plan/

Withdrawing from nuclear weapons treaties puts our entire nation — and the world — at increased risk of nuclear war. Counter to recent Federal Emergency Management Agency educationals, going inside or underground will not protect those in the many miles-wide blast zone. They will be quickly incinerated by the intense heat and firestorms that accompany nuclear explosions. The ensuing nuclear winter caused by ash and debris thrown into the atmosphere by the blasts will block out the sunlight for years to come and lead to the death of billions more. It will be a great human tragedy if our society allows a tiny number of greedy individuals to put our entire population at grave risk of catastrophic damage and suffering. The first step is to start voting out those elected officials who support these suicidal policies.

3. No improvement in US national security

Reducing nuclear risks and threats requires - not "more weapons" - but efforts towards arms control

*Rebecca Hersman and Joseph Rodgers 2021 (Hersman is director of Project on Nuclear Issues (PONI) and senior adviser with the International Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington. Rodgers is a program manager with CSIS PONI)* 14 June 2021 "Reading the Nuclear Tea Leaves: Policy and Posture in the Biden Administration" (accessed 14 Mar 2023) https://www.csis.org/analysis/reading-nuclear-tea-leaves-policy-and-posture-biden-administration-0

 The Biden administration has set high goals for revitalizing arms control while also reducing nuclear risks and the role of nuclear weapons. Integrated deterrence requires not only a holistic approach to developing deterrence capabilities, but it also rests upon an integrated approach to limiting arms racing and reducing the risks and consequences of war. Integrated deterrence must go hand in hand with integrated arms control to be effective. Taking a comprehensive approach to security by advancing both arms control and deterrence will be vital for future conflict and cooperation with China and Russia.

4. A/T "Taxpayer costs" - AFF Plan won't solve.

We should be reducing nuclear weapon systems, not increasing them, if you really want to save taxpayer cost

Andrew Lautz 2021 (master's degree in Political Management; Director of Federal Policy for National Taxpayers Union and National Taxpayers Union Foundation) 11 Feb 2021 " The Bipartisan Map For Congress and Biden to Trim the Defense Budget By $338 Billion" (accessed 14 Mar 2023) https://www.ntu.org/publications/detail/the-bipartisan-map-for-congress-and-biden-to-trim-the-defense-budget-by-338-billion

As CBO [Congressional Budget Office] [writes](https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/2019-06/54667-budgetoptions-2.pdf#page=150) in its 2018 report on this option (the less significant reduction of two options), “[t]he official Nuclear Weapons Employment Strategy of the United States, released in 2013, states that the United States could maintain a ‘strong and credible’ strategic nuclear deterrent with about one-third fewer weapons deployed than the number allowed under New START.” A December 2020 update from CBO found that retaining a nuclear triad with 10 submarines (down from 12 deployed), 300 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs; down from 400 deployed), and 1,550 warheads (same as currently allowed under the New START treaty) would save the U.S. [$3.7 billion](https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/2020-12/56783-budget-options.pdf#page=55) from FYs 2021 through 2025.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Propaganda victory for Russia

Link: It makes no sense to do the AFF plan because we would be handing Russia a propaganda victory and losing global public opinion

Eugene Rumer 2023. (former national intelligence officer for Russia and Eurasia at the U.S. National Intelligence Council, senior fellow and the director of Carnegie Endowment for Peace’s Russia and Eurasia Program) The Method Behind Putin’s New START Madness (accessed 13 Mar 2023) https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/02/28/method-behind-putin-s-new-start-madness-pub-89161

It makes no sense for the United States to abandon New START before its expiration and take the Russian bait. The treaty does not impede ongoing U.S. modernization programs, and there is no reason to hand Russia the opportunity to engage in public relations posturing and accuse the United States of giving up on arms control. To the contrary, it makes sense to hold Russia publicly to its pledge to stay within the treaty’s limits, to monitor its compliance with all remaining available means, and publicize its further noncompliance should there be any. It also makes sense to encourage global public opinion, especially Russia’s strategic partners China and India, to condemn the Russian move.

Link & Brink: Now is the critical time for the US to maintain world opinion against Russia to avoid giving up on Ukraine

Johan Hassel, Kate Donald, Laura Kilbury, Sarnata Reynolds 2023 (Hassel - Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress (CAP). Donald - Senior Director, Accountability and International Policy, CAP. Kilbury - Research Assistant, CAP. Reynolds - Senior Director, Human Security and International Policy, CAP) 22 Feb 2023 " Why the United States Must Stay the Course on Ukraine" (accessed 13 Mar 2023) https://www.americanprogress.org/article/why-the-united-states-must-stay-the-course-on-ukraine/

Now, after a series of humiliating retreats during the fall, Putin is launching a [new offensive](https://www.cnbc.com/2023/02/13/what-to-expect-from-russias-much-awaited-offensive-in-ukraine.html) and digging in for the long haul—seemingly with the hope to wear down the Ukrainians and force fissures in U.S. and European support. It is more critical than ever for the United States and its partners to stay the course.

Impact: Grave consequences for global human rights and democracy

Johan Hassel, Kate Donald, Laura Kilbury, Sarnata Reynolds 2023 (Hassel - Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress (CAP). Donald - Senior Director, Accountability and International Policy, CAP. Kilbury - Research Assistant, CAP. Reynolds - Senior Director, Human Security and International Policy, CAP) 22 Feb 2023 " Why the United States Must Stay the Course on Ukraine" (accessed 13 Mar 2023) https://www.americanprogress.org/article/why-the-united-states-must-stay-the-course-on-ukraine/

Deterring Russian aggression has critical implications for peace and stability around the world. Ceding ground to Russia’s blatant and illegal aggression against a nonviolent neighbor—as well as Russia’s alleged perpetration of [crimes against humanity](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2023/02/18/remarks-by-vice-president-harris-at-the-munich-security-conference-2/)—would be an affront for democracies and universal principles of self-determination and human rights. A failure of resolve would also undermine U.S. credibility with key allies and potentially embolden competitors—such as China—to act further against U.S. interests, with possible grave consequences.

2. Catastrophic arms race

Link: Abandoning US/Russia arms control risks catastrophic escalation

Eugene Rumer 2023. (former national intelligence officer for Russia and Eurasia at the U.S. National Intelligence Council, senior fellow and the director of Carnegie Endowment for Peace’s Russia and Eurasia Program) The Method Behind Putin’s New START Madness (accessed 13 Mar 2023) https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/02/28/method-behind-putin-s-new-start-madness-pub-89161

The end of bilateral U.S.-Russia arms control will not benefit anyone. A new arms race is fraught with unnecessary military expenditures and increased risks of a catastrophic escalation. Moreover, with China reportedly well on the way to building up its nuclear arsenal, the bilateral arms race could well become trilateral, with many additional risks and complications, most of them not immediately apparent but likely to manifest themselves over time.

Link: AFF explicitly says they wish we could build more nuclear weapons

It's supposedly one of their advantages - that we get to build more nuclear weapons if we drop out of New Start.

Link: Even though Russia has suspended participation in the treaty, they are still complying with the arms limits

Alexander Gabuev 2023 (senior fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace) 24 Feb 2023 "Is Russia Shooting Itself in the Foot by Suspending the New START Treaty?" (accessed 13 Mar 2023) https://carnegieendowment.org/politika/89131

At the same time, Moscow is making it clear that it’s not yet withdrawing from the treaty altogether. The Russian Foreign Ministry [clarified](http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/70565) that Moscow will “continue to strictly comply with the quantitative restrictions stipulated in the treaty” and exchange notifications of ballistic missile launches with the United States.

Link: The Treaty could be salvaged [if we don't walk away], since Russia has not officially withdrawn yet

Zachary B. Wolf 2023 (journalist for CNN) 21 Feb 2023 " What to know about Russia’s latest move on nuclear weapons" (accessed 13 Mar 2023) https://www.cnn.com/2023/02/21/politics/nuclear-weapons-new-start-treaty-what-matters/index.html

The treaty was already essentially paused since Russia had recently refused to open up its arsenal to inspectors. [CNN’s report](https://www.cnn.com/2023/02/21/europe/putin-russia-new-start-nuclear-pact-intl/index.html) notes that Putin is not technically withdrawing from the treaty, so his declaration “appears to be formalizing its current position.” Russia’s Foreign Ministry later clarified that Moscow will continue to respect the caps established in the treaty and that Putin’s suspension of the treaty is “reversible.”

Brink & Impact: Abandoning New Start = Higher risk of nuclear war, and now is the critical time not to escalate

Scott Ritter 2022 (former US Marine Corps intelligence officer whose service over a 20-plus-year career included tours of duty in the former Soviet Union implementing arms control agreements, serving on the staff of US Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf during the Gulf War and later as a chief weapons inspector with the UN in Iraq from 1991-98) 20 Dec 2022 " The Death of Arms Control" (accessed 13 Mar 2023) https://www.energyintel.com/00000185-3010-d582-a9ef-7ed7c8b20000

Failure to renew New Start would open the door to a world where both the US and Russian strategic arsenals are untethered from the constraints of arms control, while at the same time are being reconfigured for the most destabilizing nuclear postures imaginable — preemptive nuclear first strikes designed to neutralize an opponent’s nuclear retaliatory capability. The risk of nuclear conflict between Russia and the US is greater than any time since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, and — with relations inflamed by the Ukraine crisis — neither side appears to be in a rush to engage in the processes intended to forestall such an outcome.