

New START Dead or Revivable Under a Biden/Harris Administration?

By [Stephen Lendman](#)

Global Research, November 20, 2020

Region: [Russia and FSU, USA](#)

Theme: [History](#)

New START is the last remaining Russia/US agreement to prevent unconstrained expansion of nukes that can kill us all if detonated in enough numbers.

Under Trump, it's dead. Efforts by hardliners surrounding him to kill the deal succeeded by making unacceptable demands no responsible government would accept.

Is resuscitation possible if Biden/Harris succeed Trump in January?

Dems are notoriously more belligerent than Republicans.

Softening US relations with Russia, China, and other independent nations on the US target list for regime change is virtually off-the-table.

US relations with nations it doesn't control are more likely to be hardened, not eased.

As long as nuclear weapons and long-range delivery systems exist in the hands of a nation seeking unchallenged global dominance — imperial USA — possible mass annihilation threatens everyone everywhere.

The US dismissed proposals by Russia to extend New START short-term ahead of November 3 elections.

Despite good faith efforts by Moscow to bridge differences, Pompeo and other Trump regime hardliners consistently rejected its proposals.

New START expires on February 5. Biden earlier said if he succeeds Trump in January, he'll pursue extending the treaty without conditions.

Time and again, what US politicians say and do are worlds apart.

In relations between Washington and other nations, nothing is certain except militancy, belligerence, and rage to control planet earth, its resources and populations — wars by hot and/or other means its favored strategies.

In late October, Russia's Foreign Ministry offered to extend New START for one year, adding:

The Kremlin would commit to "freeze for the above-mentioned period the number of nuclear warheads that each side possesses."

The good faith offer would "be implemented only and exclusively on the premise that

‘freezing’ of warheads will not be accompanied by any additional demands on the part of the United States.”

“(T)ime gained (by extending the treaty for a year) “could be used to conduct comprehensive bilateral negotiations on the future nuclear and missile arms control that must address all factors affecting strategic stability.”

In mid-October, Vladimir Putin offered to extend New START “unconditionally for at least a year” in its present form.

Trump’s national security advisor Robert O’Brien called the offer a “non-starter.”

Following O’Brien’s rejection, Pompeo falsely claimed the landmark treaty “is not a good deal for the United States or our friends or allies.”

In late October, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister/chief New START negotiator with the US Sergey Ryabkov said the following:

“(T)he degree of our differences is rather significant. (He saw no) “reasons for strong optimism” that New START would be extended, warning:

Failure to reach agreement (because of unacceptable US demands) risks “destroy(ing)” it altogether.

While “Russia is open to continuing the dialogue,” chances for a breakthrough with Trump regime hardliners is virtually nil.

If New START expires and Biden/Harris succeed Trump on January 20, they’ll have barely more than two weeks to extend it.

On Thursday, Sergey Lavrov expressed little hope for extending the agreement, saying:

Russia’s “(c)onversations (with the US) are conducted in terms of the mentality of ‘who will win, who will lose’ ” by Trump regime negotiators.

“When talking about the START treaty, everyone can win if we extend it without any preconditions.”

An earlier unacceptable arrangement had US “inspectors...sitting at the gates of our military-industrial complex factories.”

This was during the Boris Yeltsin years “in the 1990s. (T)here will never be a return to this system,” Lavrov stressed, adding:

“Considering the hype that has developed in the United States as part of the ongoing vote counting, lawsuits, and other perturbations, it is probably not reasonable to expect any clear proposals from the Americans.”

“The ball is now in their court. If the answer is no – well, we will live without the agreement.”

Throughout his tenure, Trump proved he's a deal-breaker, not maker. New START may be the next to go.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Award-winning author Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG)

His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html>

Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com.

Featured image is from InfoRos

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Stephen Lendman](#), Global Research, 2020

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Stephen Lendman](#)

About the author:

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."
<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html> Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com. Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca