



Updated February 26, 2026

U.S.-Russian Nuclear Arms Control: Overview and Potential Considerations for Congress

The United States has periodically sought to advance its national security interests through the negotiation and conclusion of nuclear arms control agreements with its adversaries. Throughout 2025 and in 2026, President Donald Trump has discussed potential talks with Russia and China concerning nuclear weapons reductions.

Congress plays an important role in arms control, which is implemented pursuant to treaties or agreements negotiated by the executive branch. The Senate considers providing advice and consent to the ratification of treaties and the confirmation of executive branch nominees for positions in the Department of State (DOS), Department of Defense (DOD), Department of Energy, and the intelligence community. Congress also authorizes and appropriates funds for, as well as provides oversight of, those U.S. government agencies that negotiate, implement, monitor, and verify compliance with treaties and agreements.

Background

During the Cold War and in its aftermath, the United States and the Soviet Union (which Russia and other Soviet republics dissolved in 1991) sought to minimize the costs and risks of nuclear competition and improve so-called strategic stability. Following the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, the United States and the Soviet Union created a “hotline” to communicate in a nuclear crisis, which, along with some later risk reduction agreements, sought to reduce dangers of an accidental or inadvertent nuclear war.

After the Soviet Union achieved rough parity in strategic nuclear forces with the United States, and began to deploy ballistic missile defenses, the two countries engaged in Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT). The 1972 SALT I Treaty and Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty negotiated by the Johnson and Nixon Administrations and the 1979 SALT II Treaty negotiated by the Nixon, Ford, and Carter Administrations resulted in some limits on strategic nuclear forces and ballistic missile defenses. Subsequently, the Reagan Administration concluded the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, which verifiably destroyed all ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles of intermediate ranges. The Reagan and George H. W. Bush Administrations negotiated the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I), which resulted in the “largest arms control reductions in history,” according to DOD. In 2002, the George W. Bush Administration concluded the Moscow Treaty reducing U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear forces.

The executive branch has also at times withdrawn from arms control, including in 2002 from the ABM Treaty and

in 2019 from the INF Treaty, when it deemed these accords to no longer be in the U.S. national security interest.

New START

Until February 5, 2026, the United States and Russia were parties to the 2010 New START treaty, under which the two countries verifiably reduced their strategic nuclear forces to 1,550 deployed warheads on 700 deployed strategic delivery vehicles (intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs); submarine-launched ballistic missiles; and strategic bombers). Between 2023 and 2026, Russia did not participate in parts of the treaty’s verification regime. This followed Russian President Vladimir Putin’s announcement that Russia would “suspend participation” in New START, citing concerns about UK and French nuclear weapons and also Western efforts to achieve Russia’s “strategic defeat” in the war in Ukraine. Russian officials stated that Russia would observe treaty central limits, but would suspend data exchanges and consultations. The DOS called Russia’s suspension “legally invalid” and announced countermeasures. The DOS had also expressed concerns about Russia’s compliance with New START in congressionally mandated public annual reports.

In September 2025, President Putin stated that Russia could continue to abide by New START limits after the treaty’s expiration date if the United States did so. On February 5, 2026, the day of New START’s expiration, President Trump posted on social media that “rather than extend” New START, the United States “should” negotiate a “new, improved, and modernized Treaty.” On February 11, Russian officials stated that Russia would abide by New START central limits as long as the United States did so.

New START Follow-on Negotiations

In 2020, during the first Trump Administration, U.S. and Russian officials held several meetings to discuss arms control issues, including potential limits on Russian nonstrategic nuclear weapons, which are nuclear weapons deployed on delivery vehicles with ranges shorter than strategic nuclear weapons. The United States also sought to include China, which declined to participate, in talks.

In 2021, the Biden Administration engaged with Russia in a Strategic Stability Dialogue (SSD) to “lay the groundwork for future arms control and risk reduction measures.” The United States advocated including all Russian nuclear weapons in a notional agreement. Russia, in turn, proposed discussing nuclear and nonnuclear weapons, missile defense, outer space, and other issues, which, Russia argued, affected strategic stability. The SSD process ended in 2022, following Russia’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine.

In February 2026, citing President Trump’s post arguing for a new nuclear weapons treaty, Administration officials called for “multilateral nuclear arms control and strategic stability talks” involving Russia and China.

Potential Considerations for Congress

Members of Congress have deliberated, including in 2025 and 2026 committee hearings, about the extent to which current and future U.S.-Russian nuclear arms control is in the U.S. national security interest. Some Members have argued that there is “continued value” in such arms control, and “urged” talks for a new treaty and mutual observance of New START limits. Other Members have expressed concerns about Russia’s noncompliance with arms control commitments, urged DOD to prepare for a future where Russian nuclear weapons are not bound by New START, and stressed the importance of U.S. nuclear modernization.

Arms control and U.S. nuclear modernization

Congress may consider how arms control, and the timelines for any potential limits on U.S. capabilities, interact with the progress of U.S. nuclear modernization. The United States is modernizing its nuclear forces, including procuring a new ICBM, a new strategic bomber, and a new ballistic missile submarine; updating its nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3) system and regional deterrence capabilities; and modernizing its nuclear weapons complex.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated in 2025 that the operation and modernization of U.S. nuclear forces could total over \$95 billion a year. DOD has continued to prioritize modernization, but President Trump has also stated that “tremendous amounts of money are being spent” on nuclear weapons and expressed hope that the United States, Russia, and China could decrease defense spending.

Russia’s nuclear capabilities of concern

Congress may consider whether Russian nuclear weapons present a threat to the United States that could be managed through arms control. Some Russian officials have suggested that new U.S. ballistic missile defense developments may affect Russia’s willingness to maintain treaty limits. According to open sources, Russia, like the United States, has reserve nuclear warheads that it could upload on strategic delivery vehicles.

Russia has nuclear weapons that did not fall under New START. The Obama, Trump, and Biden Administrations unsuccessfully sought to negotiate verifiable limits on nonstrategic nuclear weapons (NSNW), as per guidance in the Senate’s 2010 resolution of New START ratification. U.S. officials have considered the possibility of an agreement that would cover all types of nuclear warheads, including those for NSNW, though it would likely require intrusive verification measures. In 2023, President Putin stated that Russia had deployed NSNW to Belarus.

Russia also has novel nuclear and nuclear-capable delivery vehicles that President Putin has said are intended to counter U.S. ballistic missile defenses. Russia included some of these—a new heavy ICBM and an ICBM-mounted hypersonic glide vehicle—in New START. Others, such as a nuclear-powered cruise missile and an autonomous

underwater system, remained outside of an arms control framework. According to the U.S. intelligence community’s unclassified 2025 Annual Threat Assessment, Russia was also “developing a new satellite meant to carry a nuclear weapon.”

Arms control in a two-nuclear-peer environment

Congress may consider how U.S.-Russian nuclear arms control fits into an environment where China’s nuclear arsenal is expanding, with potential implications for U.S. deterrence requirements. According to a 2024 unclassified DOD assessment, China may have over 1,000 “operational nuclear warheads” by 2030. The Biden Administration’s 2024 nuclear employment strategy argued that “the types of limits that the United States will consider,” including in future negotiations with Russia, “will be influenced by the actions and trajectories of other nuclear-armed actors.”

The 2023 report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, which warned of an emergence of a “two-nuclear-peer” threat, argued that the United States needed to start with a strategy and appropriate nuclear force requirements prior to “developing U.S. nuclear arms control limits for the 2027-2035 timeframe.” The Commission also stressed the need for research into verification technologies to support future arms control efforts and highlighted the potential importance of formal and informal risk reduction measures with both Russia and China “to increase predictability and reduce uncertainty.”

In the absence of arms control, such measures, according to some experts, could range from data exchanges to operational constraints, such as political commitments to avoid interfering with NC3 or with monitoring by national technical means. Russia’s willingness to discuss risk reduction is uncertain.

Role of Congress in arms control and risk reduction

Congress may consider what its role may be in future efforts to manage the risks of nuclear competition. In past Congresses, Members have debated, assessed, and conducted oversight of U.S.-Russian arms control and risk reduction measures and their contributions to U.S. national security. Some Members have proposed risk reduction measures for potential executive branch enactment. Others have served as U.S. observers in arms control negotiations.

The Senate’s 2010 resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the New START Treaty states that “further arms reduction agreements . . . may be made only pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President as set forth in Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.” However, the executive branch may also pursue nonbinding or political commitments that may not require Senate action.

CRS Products

CRS In Focus IF12672, *Russia's Nuclear Weapons*
CRS Insight IN12640, *Extension of New START Central Limits: Overview of the Expert Debate*
CRS Insight IN12568, *Golden Dome: Potential Strategic Stability Considerations for Congress*
CRS Report RL33865, *Arms Control and Nonproliferation: A Catalog of Treaties and Agreements*

Anya L. Fink, Analyst in U.S. Defense Policy

IF12964

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.