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Yes START

START will pass now – no substantive opposition in the Senate.

Joe Circione 6-30-10 “A Strong Majority for New START” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joe-cirincione/a-strong-majority-for-new\_b\_628936.html

With such overwhelming bipartisan support from America's top civilian and military officials and former national security leaders, it has been hard for the determined critics to scrape together experts beyond the fringe. Sen. Inhofe (R-OK) - the only U.S. Senator to publicly oppose the treaty - lamented this very situation, saying, "Seventeen witnesses so far, no witnesses in opposition to it." He added, "I don't know who thinks that can be reasonable." The opposition's problem is not that the Senate is being lead astray. In committee hearings, supporters of the treaty did not pull their punches. They noted areas where they wished the treaty had gone further. The far right is simply having trouble objecting to what is an extremely reasonable and widely supported treaty with clear benefits for American national security. It's down to politics. The only reason to oppose this treaty is political gamesmanship on the eve of elections--to deny the administration a victory. This would sacrifice our national security for narrow, partisan gain.

START will pass – Bipartisan support now.

Joe Circione 6-30-10 “A Strong Majority for New START” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joe-cirincione/a-strong-majority-for-new\_b\_628936.html

The New START treaty has passed its tipping point. The majority of living former secretaries of state, secretaries of defense, and national security advisors are now on record that New START strengthens U.S. national security. That is 13 out of 24. None has opposed the treaty. It is time for the Senate to approve this new security agreement. Last week, thirty national security luminaries - including Colin Powell, Madeleine Albright, George Shultz, Sam Nunn, Chuck Hagel, Bill Cohen, Lee Hamilton, Thomas Kean - enthusiastically gave their bipartisan support for the New START Treaty as a "necessary and appropriate step toward safeguarding our national security." These leaders emphasized the benefits of the treaty's prudent reductions in nuclear arms and its tough inspection regime. They made clear that the treaty does not inhibit America's ability to maintain an effective nuclear arsenal or deploy missile defense systems.

START will pass now – 80 votes.

USA Today 6/24 War in Senate brewing over U.S.-Russia arms deal http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2010-06-23-nuke-treaty\_N.htm

The White House views the treaty as a crucial step toward Obama's goal of stopping the global spread of nuclear weapons and an example that should be set by the two countries that hold 90% of the world's stockpile. The treaty demonstrates a commitment to non-proliferation, Rhodes says. If the Senate doesn't vote before the November elections and Obama's Democratic party loses control of the Senate, passage could get trickier. But most experts say the treaty likely will get through with 80 or more votes. "The American people want to see Congress accomplish something, and START is a made-to-order agreement," says Andy Johnson, head of the national security programs at the politically moderate think tank Third Way. "If the Republicans delay the process, they open themselves up to the charge of putting politics over national security." The Russian Parliament also is likely to vote on ratification this year.

Yes START

Obama can get START now – but his political capital is finite.

Global Security Newswire 6-25 “Obama Nuclear Agenda Faces Post-START Obstacles” http://gsn.nti.org/gsn/nw\_20100617\_8083.php

Skeptics have also expressed concerns that the New START pact could constrain U.S. options for deploying missile defenses and demanded that the treaty be accompanied by modernization of the nation's nuclear arsenal. Ratification of the arms control deal would require 67 Senate votes, eight of which would have to come from Republicans -- assuming the vote occurs before the next Congress takes over in January 2011. Observers believe the Senate is likely to sign off on the deal, but the same cannot be assured if the administration then pursues ratification of the test ban treaty, further cuts to the arsenal or other initiatives. Former President Bill Clinton signed the test ban but in 1999 could not collect sufficient support for the pact in the Senate, where Kyl and other lawmakers argued that testing could be necessary to ensure a reliable nuclear deterrent. The Obama administration has pledged to bring the pact back to the congressional body, though the New START comes first. The White House, though, is “already scarred from some heavy political fights,” said Matthew Rojansky, a Russia expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He compared Obama's challenges on nuclear weapons policy to Clinton’s failed attempt to court a Republican majority in a similarly “hyper partisan Congress.”

Yes START – A2 Duma

The Duma will easily ratify START now – but only if the Senate does.

Sarah Bulley 6-11-10 “Progress on New START Ratification?”http://csis.org/blog/progress-new-start-ratification

Russia, for its part, seems to face a much less difficult road to ratification. United Russia, the party of Prime Minister Vladimir Putin, has an overwhelming majority in the Duma’s lower house. The hope of President Medvedev is that New START will be ratified simultaneously by the United States and Russia. Two weeks ago, President Medvedev introduced START to the Russian Duma and urged its passage; however, Medvedev does not want to run the risk of having Russia ratify the treaty if it cannot be guaranteed that the U.S. will do the same. As Defense News reported: Medvedev said the ratification in Russia and the United States should be simultaneous in order to avoid Russia repeating the fate of the Soviet Union, which the Kremlin chief said had been "cheated" before. "We will tolerate this no more," Medvedev said, without elaborating. The Kremlin has previously expressed unhappiness about arms treaties that were ratified by Russia's parliament but failed to pass the Senate.

Yes START – AT: Spies

Spy scandal won’t cause major disruptions – won’t have enough traction

**Harding 6/29** (Luke, Moscow Correspondent for the Guardian 6/29/10 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/jun/29/russian-spy-ring-claims-bilateral-ties>)

Despite the recent thaw in relations, the US and Russia continued to spy on each other, said Mark Urnov, dean at the political science department of Russia's Higher School of Economics. "This [spy scandal] is an issue dating from previous years," he said. "The security services can't stop their activities immediately. Until recently, there was a semi-cold war between US and Russia. So why not spy?" According to Urnov, Moscow was unlikely to drop its positive attitude to Washington. "Of course there are some groups inside the [Russian] political elite who would prefer to continue with more or less cold relations. But the dominant tendency now is to be friendly. "I don't see any forces on both sides who could be interested in intensifying this scandal, or in stirring up aggravation now between our countries."

No START

START won’t pass - vote won’t come until after the elections, Russian spy scandal, partisanship, and midterm

**The Hill 7/2**/10 (J. Taylor Rushing,, Staff Writer, <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/106903-russian-spy-ring-may-be-last-straw-for-obama-nuke-treaty>)

A U.S.-Russia arms treaty is teetering in the Senate, lacking support from Republicans and set back by an alleged spy ring. The White House was hoping that the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (**START**), signed three months ago by President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev, would move quickly through the Senate. But now it may not get a vote on the floor until after the November elections. The pact to reduce warheads, missiles and launchers in both countries could be cleared by the Foreign Relations Committee this month, but that timetable could also be pushed back. While a simple majority is enough to pass it through the panel, 67 votes will be needed for ratification by the full Senate. The House does not vote on treaties. Given the partisanship of the upper chamber and the midterm elections four months away, there is little chance of securing the vote of every Senate Democrat and the backing of least eight Republicans anytime soon.

No START – Duma

Communists in the Duma will block START passage.

Global Security Newswire 6-25 “Obama Nuclear Agenda Faces Post-START Obstacles” http://gsn.nti.org/gsn/nw\_20100617\_8083.php

Republicans in Congress are not the only roadblock to Obama’s agenda to phase out nuclear weapons. Communist Party politicians in Russia have also opposed strategic arsenal reduction under New START and, like Republicans, are concerned that language on missile defense in the agreement could degrade their nation's nuclear deterrent. Moscow has reserved the right to withdraw from the treaty if leaders there determine U.S. plans for a missile defense shield could render their strategic arsenal inferior.

No START – Russian Spies

Spy scandal means START won’t pass – eliminates republican votes.

National Post (Canada) 6-30-10 “Timing casts Obama in poor light: experts” http://www.nationalpost.com/news/canada/toronto/Timing+casts+Obama+poor+light+experts/3218437/story.html#ixzz0sex2kTNY

While it was unclear what impact the scandal would have on negotiations between the two countries, the spy expose could hinder the ratification of a historic deal between the U.S. and Russia to cut their nuclear stocks, experts said. The two countries' leaders signed a new START arms control treaty in April, setting new limits on the number of nuclear-capable missiles, but it has yet to be ratified by the U.S. Senate, and faces deep skepticism from Republicans. "There will not be ratification of START before the November [mid-term] elections and after the elections it is even more doubtful," Mr. Kremenyuk predicted. The most weighty achievement of the reset will be thwarted."

Russian spies have complicated passage –

**The Hill 7/2**/10 (J. Taylor Rushing,, Staff Writer, <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/106903-russian-spy-ring-may-be-last-straw-for-obama-nuke-treaty>

This week’s arrest of 11 alleged Russian spies in the U.S. has made the passage of the treaty an even steeper uphill climb. According to court documents, two of the alleged Russian agents were asked by Moscow to collect information about the treaty.

Spy scandal gives conservatives ammunition to hold up START

**Harding 6/29** (Luke, Moscow Correspondent for the Guardian 6/29/10 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/jun/29/russian-spy-ring-claims-bilateral-ties>)

Hardliners on both sides will welcome the scandal as an opportunity to sabotage improving US-Russian ties – and to put the boot into Obama and Medvedev. Russia intimated it believes Obama's enemies are behind the arrests.

"I don't think this is a very big scandal," said Fyodor Lukyanov, editor-in-chief of Russia in Global Affairs. "The main concern is that it will give ammunition to US politicians in the Senate who are against ratification of the Start treaty and the one-on-one agreement on nuclear co-operation."

No START – Delay

Kyl opposition will hold START until October at the earliest

**The Hill 7/2**/10 (J. Taylor Rushing,, Staff Writer, <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/106903-russian-spy-ring-may-be-last-straw-for-obama-nuke-treaty> )

Much of the push-and-pull in the Senate on START has centered on a struggle between Kerry and GOP Whip Jon Kyl (Ariz.), a skeptic of the treaty. Kyl has cited missle defense issues when expressing opposition to START.

Majority Whip Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) said the treaty “is not likely to come up before October” and perhaps not until after the election. He said there has been no Democratic whipping so far, but acknowledged the treaty will be a challenge to ratify.

“Kyl is leading the charge against it,” Durbin said.

No START – AT: Moderate GOP

GOP is lining up behind far-right conservatives on START – no pass.

**The Hill 7/2**/10 (J. Taylor Rushing,, Staff Writer, <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/106903-russian-spy-ring-may-be-last-straw-for-obama-nuke-treaty>)

Republicans seem to be following Kyl’s lead more than Lugar’s. The Senate GOP whip emphasizes that he has not ruled out voting for the treaty. “We’ve just barely begun that process,” Kyl said. “There are a whole series of things that I’m going to be looking for to demonstrate the administration’s ability to begin carrying a robust modernization before I think it’s wise to take up the START treaty.” Lugar called the treaty “critically important.” He also said the treaty was “modest” in the number of warheads it would reduce on both sides. “Having spent 19 years of my life attempting to work with Russians to take warheads off missiles and destroy missiles, it’s critical to have American and Russian contractors working together eyeball to eyeball with boots on the ground,” Lugar said. “It was a real blow that we came to the end in December and there was no treaty. Now we have an opportunity to renew that and set the stage in our relations with Russia for a longer-term treaty.” Kerry said the White House has been very supportive, with Vice President Joe Biden — Kerry’s predecessor as Foreign Relations chairman — taking a leading role along with others such as Gates. Democrats also appear likely to have the support of their more conservative members, such as Evan Bayh of Indiana and Ben Nelson of Nebraska; both say they are likely yes votes. However, Nelson isn’t optimistic about the treaty’s chances, suggesting that Republicans seem more interested in politics than answering their concerns. “Most of the criticism that’s being registered against it right now was — oddly enough — was not registered against previous treaties,” Nelson said. “Why? The conclusion is that it may not pass. If they’re using these arguments today to be against this treaty, and they didn’t raise them back then, and that’s going to be the basis for voting against it, there may not be enough votes.” Sen. Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.) said, “I’d like to be in a position to vote for it, but I’d like to be assured that we’re investing enough money in modernization. “In a world in which there will be nuclear weapons for a good long time, Sen. Kyl and I want to make sure that the smaller number of weapons we’re left with in our stockpile work.”

TNW Politics Link- 1NC

Plan causes partisanship and costs political capital-

 even if there IS support for withdrawing tactical – it’s a question of HOW we do it

Withington 2k8 (Thomas, independent defense consultant, writer and analyst. He is a Research Associate at the Centre for Defence Studies, King's College, London and an Associate Member of the Royal Aeronautical Society. “The tactical nuclear weapons game,” [www.isn.ethz.ch](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/), August 13, 2008)

Cold War notions of nuclear deterrence come into play here for as long as a nuclear threat remains to NATO in the form of Russia's tactical nuclear weapons. It could be politically difficult for the alliance to unilaterally withdraw the weapons and alter the nuclear power balance on the continent, even though Britain and France both maintain their strategic nuclear arsenals.

Antagonism between the Bush administration and the new government of Russian President Dmitry Medvedev could make the mutual removal of tactical nuclear weapons from European Russia and from the NATO states difficult.

In July, the London-based Times newspaper reported that Russian parliamentary officials had visited the Russian enclave of Kaliningrad on the Baltic to assess the feasibility of basing nuclear weapons there. Moscow's motivations for deploying such weapons to Kaliningrad were reported by the paper as a possible response "to American plans to develop a defence shield against missiles from Iran and other countries."

Russia's previous president and current prime minister, Vladimir Putin, had made little secret of his displeasure at the Bush administration's plans for a European-based ballistic missile defense system. However, should either John McCain or the presumptive Democrat party presidential nominee Barack Obama reverse course and cancel the missile defense initiative, there could be room for negotiation over the future of Russia and NATO's tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

For NATO to withdraw the US nuclear weapons from Europe, it would almost certainly have to be done as an alliance-wide decision and could not be at the behest of one country lest this is perceived as disunity within the multinational body.

Moreover, the two main parties in the US have indicated that they want to revisit the European tactical nuclear weapons issue. McCain made his statement to that effect in May, and, according Ingram; "there's some form of debate [in the Democratic Party] between those who say that they should be withdrawn unilaterally, and those who say they should be used as a negotiating tool" by which the US and Russian governments could negotiate a bilateral agreement to eliminate tactical nuclear weapons from the European continent.

Whichever way one looks at the debate, it seems that both political parties would like to see the removal of US nuclear weapons from Europe, but that differences exist on the conditions under which this could happen.
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Politically divisive issue- public popularity divides support ensuring controversy

Sokov 2009 (Dr. Nikolai N. Sokov is a Senior Research Associate at CNS. He graduated from Moscow State University in 1981 and subsequently worked at the Institute of US and Canadian Studies and the Institute of World Economy and International Relations in Moscow. From 1987-92 he worked at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and later Russia, and participated in START I and START II negotiations. Dr. Sokov has a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan (1996) and (the Soviet equivalent of a Ph.D.) Candidate of Historical Sciences degree from the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (1986). He has published extensively on international security and arms control.Four Emerging Issues in Arms Control, Disarmament, and Nonproliferation: Opportunities for German Leadership, “Tactical (Substrategic) Nuclear Weapons” The James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, July 2009)

The U.S. public is also likely to be divided on the issue. Indeed, a recent public opinion poll indicates that Obama’s call for eliminating nuclear weapons has been greeted skeptically by the American public; on the other hand, keeping nuclear weapons away from terrorists registers as a top security concern.37

Thus, when the issue becomes ripe for decision, it is likely to provoke considerable controversy in Washington. Given such political constraints, it is likely that the Obama administration will not want to act unilaterally, but rather will seek to take action in the context of the upcoming decisions on a new NATO Strategic Concept— the first such document in a decade. Indeed, NATO has been preparing for this task for some time having authorized in 2007 an internal review of nuclear deterrence requirements for the twenty-first century.38 Working through this process would allow the United States and selected other allies (most likely the United Kingdom and, to a lesser extent France) to find means for reassuring the most concerned states that their Article V protections will remain intact without the forward deployment of TNW. Some European sources indicate that the United Kingdom in fact has been pushing for such discussions to take place, but has been held back by Germany, which wants to postpone any discussion until after its September 2009 national elections.

Strong political powerful opposition to the plan- Congressional Commission and Republicans all oppose

Sokov 2009 (Dr. Nikolai N. Sokov is a Senior Research Associate at CNS. He graduated from Moscow State University in 1981 and subsequently worked at the Institute of US and Canadian Studies and the Institute of World Economy and International Relations in Moscow. From 1987-92 he worked at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and later Russia, and participated in START I and START II negotiations. Dr. Sokov has a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan (1996) and (the Soviet equivalent of a Ph.D.) Candidate of Historical Sciences degree from the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (1986). He has published extensively on international security and arms control.Four Emerging Issues in Arms Control, Disarmament, and Nonproliferation: Opportunities for German Leadership, “Tactical (Substrategic) Nuclear Weapons” The James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, July 2009)

If some in the Obama administration support withdrawal of the weapons once the arms control agenda allows the issue to come forward, some **politically powerful** figures outside the administration are taking the opposite point of view. The bipartisan congressional commission on the U.S. strategic posture in its report referenced above stressed the value of “extended deterrence” and said that this mission could force the United States to retain weapons it does not need for its own security. The report gave considerable weight to the opinion of those allies in Europe who consider these weapons essential to prevent coercion by Russia and Iran. It should be noted that recent studies and interviews with representatives of these countries challenge the accuracy of this representation of their countries’ views by the commission. 35 The strong emphasis on the argument that some European countries are staunchly opposed to the withdrawal of TNW is widely attributed to commission co-chairman James Schlesinger, who has been championing this theme of late.36 Still, the political salience of this message, particularly among congressional Republicans is undeniable.

Congressional Commission shapes Congressional opinion

McCain, 09 (Title: Hearing Of The Senate Committee On Armed Services - The Report Of The Congressional Commission On The Strategic Posture Of The United States, : 05/07/2009 http://www.votesmart.org/speech\_detail.php?sc\_id=458591&keyword=&phrase=&contain=)

This congressional commission's strategic posture report both addresses many of the complexities we face in the world today and plays an important role in fostering a national **bipartisan** discussion on the current state and path forward of our strategic deterrent. This report takes an important look at the steps needed to make sure that our deterrent remains credible and that our nuclear infrastructure remains viable, addresses missile defense as well as the path forward for re-energizing our non-proliferation efforts.
The work of this commission will likely influence the upcoming **N**uclear **P**osture **R**eview, as well as congressional consideration of strategic issues over the next few years.
It will also play an important role as the United States formulates its approach to discussions about the future of the START Treaty, which will expire at the end of this year.
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Hold strong powerful symbol and strong political clout- even if other reductions are popular TNWs are not

Wood, 2009 (David, won the Gerald Ford Prize for Distinguished Reporting on National Defense in 2008. July 8. www.politicsdaily.com)

On the U.S. side, the arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe serves as a powerful symbol of America's guarantee of protection to its European allies, including former Soviet satellites such as Poland and the Czech Republic. Small wonder, given the military and political clout of these armaments, that [the summit agreement](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/FACT-SHEET-The-Joint-Understanding-for-the-START-Follow-on-Treaty/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) to reduce nuclear weapons never **mentioned** tactical nukes.
"I'm not surprised -- tactical nuclear weapons is a much tougher issue,'' said [Hans Kristensen](http://www.fas.org/press/experts/kristensen.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank), director of the Nuclear Information Project at the nonpartisan Federation of American Scientists.

Even if the plans popular it still causes fights

CNS, 2009 (Center for Nonproliferation Studies. July 10. http://cns.miis.edu/stories/090710\_obama\_moscow.htm)

The new treaty is not expected to cover tactical nuclear weapons, which may become an issue when it is considered in the U.S. Congress. Recently, for example, a report issued by a panel of experts sponsored by the conservative Center for Security Policy argued that it would be "[i]ll advised" to consider cuts below 1,700 warheads because of the "immense advantage the Kremlin enjoys in nonstrategic weapons and the threat they pose to the former Soviet republics and American allies on Russia's littoral."[[13]](http://cns.miis.edu/stories/090710_obama_moscow.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22fn13#fn13)

NATO politically charges our link

Kelleher and Warren 09

[Catherine M. Kelleher and Scott L. Warren, Catherine M. Kelleher is a College Park Professor at the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland and a senior fellow at the Watson Institute at Brown University. Scott L. Warren is a recent graduate of Brown University, currently serving as executive director of the nonprofit Generation Citizen. “Getting to Zero Starts Here: Tactical Nuclear Weapons”, Arms Control Association, October 2009]

NATO also continues to present a political problem. The process leading up to the new strategic concept is more open and transparent than ever before. There will be national forums; the one in the United States will involve multiple meetings led by former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. Concerns about tactical nuclear weapons have already been raised on all sides of the argument about NATO’s strategic future. The idea of a nuclear umbrella is still alive and well, despite a number of allies declaring its seeming irrelevance in current times. U.S. officials, in turn, have noted their continued commitment to extended deterrence throughout Europe. It will be interesting to see how this argument develops, particularly in light of the recent decision to alter the Bush administration’s plans for a missile defense system. Tactical nuclear weapons may experience revitalization if they are seen as a way to re-emphasize the U.S. commitment to the defense of Europe.

White House supports TNWS- Pentagon and Department of State would backlash

Kelleher and Warren 09

[Catherine M. Kelleher and Scott L. Warren, “Getting to Zero Starts Here: Tactical Nuclear Weapons”, Arms Control Association, October 2009]

The principal issues with the elimination of tactical nuclear weapons are political and conceptual, rather than straightforwardly military, with the single but critical exception of the risk of terrorist seizure. The notion of the U.S. nuclear umbrella, with tactical weapons serving as a real or potential down payment on a security commitment, particularly in Europe, still has significant traction within the Obama administration. Key factions in the Pentagon and perhaps in the Department of State argue that the United States must still provide allies substantial security support, especially with Iran and North Korea deeply engaged in nuclear programs. This is the case despite the indifference of many NATO allies toward technical weapons or, in some cases, direct demands for elimination. Some European countries, especially elites in the newer central and eastern European member states, attach a high symbolic importance to the deployment of tactical nuclear weapons on European soil as evidence of U.S. security guarantees. Turkey also is thought to be particularly concerned about any withdrawal because it faces a more direct threat from Iranian missiles, although it is now included in the new U.S. plans for a European missile defense system.[[3](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2009_10/Kelleher#3)]
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Right-wing backlash- seen as soft on Russians and weak on defense

Kelleher and Warren 09

[Catherine M. Kelleher and Scott L. Warren, Catherine M. Kelleher is a College Park Professor at the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland and a senior fellow at the Watson Institute at Brown University. Scott L. Warren is a recent graduate of Brown University, currently serving as executive director of the nonprofit Generation Citizen. “Getting to Zero Starts Here: Tactical Nuclear Weapons”, Arms Control Association, October 2009]

Even proportionate reductions would leave the Russians with a larger arsenal, but such cuts could be an effective component of a larger bargain involving tactical and strategic weapons. Such cuts could mark a crucial icebreaker, demonstrating the overall U.S. commitment to making real progress toward a world without nuclear weapons. Some officials within the Obama administration seem to recognize this point. It will remain challenging to sell this argument to congressional opponents and domestic critics on the right who accuse the Obama administration of being soft on the Russians, weak on defense, and generally having an overall naïve worldview. The military establishment will likely present a less difficult sell, given its fundamental dislike of these weapons and the taxing formal and informal requirements for their deployment.[[10](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2009_10/Kelleher#10)]

Verification of TNWs sparks political controversy

Gormley et. al 2009 (Dennis M, Senior Fellow at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation

Studies, Patricia M. Lewis, the Deputy Director and Scientist-in-Residence at CNS. Dr. Lewis

served for ten years as the Director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in Geneva, Switzerland. Miles A. Pomper, Senior Research Associate in the Washington, DC office of CNS. Mr. Pomper joined the Center after serving as Editor-in-Chief of Arms Control Today, Lawrence Scheinman, Distinguished Professor at CNS, based in Washington, D.C., Four Emerging Issues in Arms Control, Disarmament, and Nonproliferation: Opportunities for German Leadership, The James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, July 2009)

Verification of TNW stockpiles is a non-trivial task that is likely to prove controversial both politically and technically. Some interested parties within each state are likely to be reluctant to accept a radical expansion of inspection rights (e.g., for storage facilities). Even if negotiations are conducted in earnest, the scale of the technical issues that have to be resolved will probably require considerable time and effort.

No offense- secrecy ensures no credit or political benefit

Sokov 2009 (Dr. Nikolai N. Sokov is a Senior Research Associate at CNS. He graduated from Moscow State University in 1981 and subsequently worked at the Institute of US and Canadian Studies and the Institute of World Economy and International Relations in Moscow. From 1987-92 he worked at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and later Russia, and participated in START I and START II negotiations. Dr. Sokov has a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan (1996) and (the Soviet equivalent of a Ph.D.) Candidate of Historical Sciences degree from the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (1986). He has published extensively on international security and arms control.Four Emerging Issues in Arms Control, Disarmament, and Nonproliferation: Opportunities for German Leadership, “Tactical (Substrategic) Nuclear Weapons” The James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, July 2009)

When the Cold War ended, American TNW in Europe were drastically reduced from an estimated 1,600 to around 500 by the early 2000s, and further to about 200-240 today. Reductions continue—see above—but these occur in secret, without public announcement, and consequently without garnering any credit or political benefit.
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Specifically now would be more politically contentious

CACN, 2009. (Center for Arms Control and Non-proliferation. June 16. http://www.armscontrolcenter.org)

The START treaty does not cover non-strategic weapons systems, limits on which were discussed by Presidents Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin in a START III framework that was never completed. However, as levels of strategic nuclear weapons decline, Russia’s superior tactical arsenal could develop into a security (or political) concern for the United States (just as U.S. conventional superiority is of concern for Russia). Experts agree that while this is an important and contentious issue, there is not sufficient time in 2009 to reach an agreement, and the issue should be put off until a later round of nuclear reduction talks. Another option is to seek an agreement on tactical nuclear weapons in separate negotiations.

The closer to START the stronger the link- Congressional Commission opposes

Wood, 2009 (David, won the Gerald Ford Prize for Distinguished Reporting on National Defense in 2008. July 8. www.politicsdaily.com)

"Russia enjoys a sizable numerical advantage,'' the [Congressional Commission](http://www.usip.org/strategic-posture-commission/the-commissioners%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) on the Strategic Posture of the United States, a blue-ribbon panel headed by former Defense Secretary William Perry, reported this spring. Russia "stores thousands of these weapons in apparent support of possible military operations west of the Urals,'' the report said. Whatever the number, strategists are coming to consider these weapons as an increasingly destabilizing factor in Europe.

Ultimately, of course, there is concern about miscalculation in an escalating confrontation over, say, [Georgia](http://www.cfr.org/publication/16930/georgiarussia_clash.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank). Many conflicts start unintentionally, and the tactical nuclear weapons are close at hand for saber-rattling purposes.

A more immediate problem looms, however. As Russia and the United States reduce their strategic nuclear weapons, **the relative clout of tactical nukes rises**. The existing imbalance in tactical nukes "will become more apparent" and U.S. allies will be "less assured,'' the commission said.

Specifically B-61- experts agree

National Journal, 10-9 (James Kitfield, Wars, Political Battles Complicate Obama Effort to Prevent Spread of Nuclear Weapons, http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20091009\_8675.php)

U.S. B-61 gravity bombs. President Barack Obama faces numerous political challenges that could complicate his efforts to curb nuclear weapons proliferation, according to experts (U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration photo).