# 1AC

## 1AC—Inherency

### U.S.-China Space cooperation is *extremely* tenuous now—*mistrust* is high.

Richburg 1/22/11 (Keith B, Washington Post, “Mistrust stalls U.S.-China space cooperation”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/21/AR2011012104480.html//sb>)

The Obama administration views space as ripe territory for cooperation with China. Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates has called it one of four potential areas of "strategic dialogue," along with cybersecurity, missile defense and nuclear weapons. And President Obama and Chinese President Hu Jintao vowed after their White House summit last week to "deepen dialogue and exchanges" in the field. But **as China ramps up its space initiatives, the diplomatic talk of cooperation has so far found little traction**. The Chinese leadership has shown scant interest in opening up the most sensitive details of its program, much of which is controlled by the People's Liberation Army (PLA). At the same time, Chinese scientists and space officials say that Washington's wariness of China's intentions in space, as well as U.S. bans on some high-technology exports, makes cooperation problematic. For now, **the U.S.-China relationship in space appears to mirror the one on Earth** - a still-dominant but fading superpower facing a new and ambitious rival, **with suspicion on both sides**. "What you have are two major powers, both of whom use space for military, civilian and commercial purposes," said Dean Cheng, a researcher with the Washington-based Heritage Foundation and an expert on the Chinese military and space program. NASA's human spaceflight program has been in flux in recent years, fueling particular concern among some U.S. observers about the challenge posed by China's initiatives in that area**. There is "a lot of very wary, careful, mutual watching**," Cheng said. Song Xiaojun, a military expert and commentator on China's CCTV, said that substantial cooperation in the space field is impossible without mutual trust. Achieving that, he said, "depends on whether the U.S. can put away its pride and treat China as a partner to cooperate on equal terms. **But I don't see that happening in the near future, since the U.S. is experiencing menopause while China is going through puberty."**

### And, China has already proposed the framework for space cooperation—it is only a question of *U.S. joining*.

Yan 6 (Yangtze, Xinhua News, “China offers 4-point proposal to boost Sino-US space co-op”, 9/25/06, http://www.gov.cn/english/2006-09/25/content\_398469.htm//sb)

China has offered a four-point proposal to boost Sino-U.S. space cooperation, said Sun Laiyan, administrator of China National Space Administration. Sun was speaking on Monday during an interview. He held formal talks with his U.S. counterpart Michael Griffin, administrator of National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), in Beijing on Sunday. "The two sides expressed willingness to jointly promote Sino-American space cooperation to further contribute to constructive and cooperative relations," Sun said. China's proposals, based on this consensus, were: -- to strengthen exchanges and communication, increase mutual trust, foster friendship and promote cooperation. -- to hold meetings every year to exchange views and concerns on certain issues in an effort to cement the stable development of bilateral space cooperation. -- to jointly explore fields where the two sides could cooperate. -- to eliminate obstacles and boost mutual trust to develop China-U.S. constructive and cooperative ties, Sun said. "Griffin's visit begins a new chapter in China-US space cooperation", Sun said, adding that the visit follows the implementation of the consensus reached between the two countries during Chinese president Hu Jintao's visit to the United States last April. China will boost bilateral collaboration in fields such as space and earth science, as well as the moon exploration program based on the principles of "equality, mutual benefit, peaceful utilization and joint development," Sun noted. "China is fully committed to cooperating with foreign countries, including the United States, on space exploration and to making its own contribution to the peaceful utilization of outer space and the well-being of the human race," Sun added.

## 1AC—Plan

### The United States federal government should join civilian-based cooperation in space beyond the Earth’s mesosphere with the People’s Republic of China.

## 1AC—China Space Race Advantage

### Advantage One: Space Race

### Current deterrence policy doesn’t work and fuels an arms race with China—makes space war *inevitable*.

Gargasz 10 (Michael Luke, Major, United States Air Force, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, “We’ve Rattled Our Sabers…Now What? The Future of US/China Space Relations”// -sb)

[Traditionally. US deterrent means have been largely based on technology. Those efforts involved developing advanced offensive and defensive capabilities and successfully demonstrating them. This, in theory, deters other nations from challenging our position of strength. Besides theoretically preventing war. another advantage of this strategy is preparedness. By developing advanced capabilities, the US would be prepared to defend its space interests should they be threatened. A major disadvantage of pursuing deterrence for space is cost because "[t]he quest for unassailable space technology, arguably an impossible goal, will certainly be obscenely expensive."1 Another disadvantage is that an aggressive deterrent strategy can be viewed as threatening and lead to an arms race and '"even great insecurity.""18 Another aspect of deterrence (that could be viewed as an advantage or disadvantage depending on your viewpoint) is that it does not require extensive engagement between the rival parties. It is apparent (rhetorically speaking) that **the US was on the deterrence path in recent years in regards to space war prevention**. Unfortunately, much of this rhetoric stepped far beyond what was technologically feasible and left the US vulnerable to countermeasures developed by an undeterred part)' (despite the futuristic capabilities being conveyed in US "vision" statements). China received the message of US power but was not fully deterred. They decided to counter US strength by quietly developing countermeasures to stop the US's march toward "space dominance"\*. During this period, there was very limited contact between the US and China on space matters. This lack of interaction has led to a very '"high level of suspicion.. .setting up an antagonistic if not adversarial relationship'" between the two space powers.'9 The 2007 Chinese ASAT demonstration was a clear indication that US deterrence efforts have not produced the intended results. Perhaps **a change in strategy is necessary to prevent space war** between the Chinese and the US and to avoid the crippling economic ramifications of such an endeavor.

### China is making strategic *long-term* moves towards ASAT development.

Adams 10 — Jonathan. "China is on path to 'militarization of space'." Christian Science Monitor 28 Oct. 2010: N.PAG. Academic Search Premier. EBSCO. Web.

China looks set to pull ahead in the Asian space race to the moon, putting a spacecraft into lunar orbit Oct. 6 in a preparatory mission for an unmanned moon landing in two or three years. Chinese engineers will maneuver the craft into an extremely low orbit, 9.5 miles above the moon's surface, so it can take high-resolution photos of a possible landing site. Basically, China is looking for a good "parking space" for a moon lander, in a less-known area of the moon known as the Bay of Rainbows. The mission, called Chang'e 2 after a heroine from Chinese folklore who goes to the moon with a rabbit, highlights China's rapidly growing technological prowess, as well as its keen desire for prestige on the world stage. If successful, **it will** put China a nose ahead of its Asian rivals with similar lunar ambitions – India and Japan – and signal a challenge to the American post-cold-war domination in space. The Asian space race Compared with the American and Soviet mad dashes into space in the late 1950s and '60s, Asia is taking its time – running a marathon, not a sprint. "All of these countries witnessed the cold war, and what led to the destruction of the USSR," says Ajey Lele, an expert on Asian space programs at the Institute for Defense Studies and Analysis in New Delhi, referring to the military and space spending that helped hasten the decline of the Soviet regime. "They understand the value of money and investment, and they are going as per the pace which they can go." But he acknowledged China's edge over India. "They started earlier, and they're ahead of us at this time," he says. India put the Chandrayaan 1 spacecraft into lunar orbit in 2008, a mission with a NASA payload that helped confirm the presence of water on the moon. It plans a moon landing in a few years' time, and a manned mission as early as 2020 – roughly the same timetable as China. Japan is also mulling a moonshot, and has branched out into other space exploration, such as the recent Hayabusa mission to an asteroid. Its last lunar orbiter shared the moon with China's first in 2007. Both Japan's and India's recent missions have been plagued by glitches and technical problems, however, while China's have gone relatively smoothly. Mr. Lele said the most significant aspect of the Chang'e 2 mission was the attempt at a 9.5-mile-high orbit, a difficult feat. India's own lunar orbiter descended to about 60 miles in 2008, he said, but was forced to return to a more stable, 125-mile-high orbit. A low orbit will allow for better scouting of future landing sites, said Lele. "They [the Chinese] will require huge amounts of data on landing grounds," said Lele. "A moon landing hasn't been attempted since the cold war." During the famed 1969 Apollo 11 manned mission to the moon, astronaut Neil Armstrong had to take control of the lander in the last moments of descent to avoid large moon boulders strewn around the landing site. China hopes to avoid any such last-minute surprises with better reconnaissance photos, which would allow them to see moon features such as rocks as small as one-meter across, according to Chinese media. Is China's space exploration a military strategy? Meanwhile, some have pointed out that China's moonshot, like all space programs, has valuable potential military offshoots. China's space program is controlled by the People's Liberation Army (PLA), which is steadily gaining experience in remote communication and measurement, missile technology, and antisatellite warfare through missions like Chang'e 2. The security implications of China's space program are not lost on India, Japan, or the United States. The Pentagon notes that China, through its space program, is exploring ways to exploit the US military's dependence on space in a conflict scenario – for example, knocking out US satellites in the opening hours of a crisis over Taiwan. "China is developing the ability to attack an adversary's space assets, accelerating the militarization of space," the Pentagon said in its latest annual report to Congress on China's military power. "PLA writings emphasize the necessity of 'destroying, damaging, and interfering with the enemy's reconnaissance … and communications satellites.' " More broadly, some in the US see China's moon program as evidence that it has a long-range strategic view that's lacking in Washington. The US has a reconnaissance satellite in lunar orbit now, but President Obama appears to have put off the notion of a manned return to the moon. With China slowly but surely laying the groundwork for a long-term lunar presence, some fear the US may one day find itself lapped –"like the tale of the tortoise and the hare," says Dean Cheng, an expert on China's space program at the Heritage Foundation in Washington. "I have to wonder whether the United States, concerned with far more terrestrial issues, and with its budget constraints, is going to decide to make similarly persistent investments to sustain its lead in space."

### Chinese space cooperation eliminates the incentive to develop ASATs in the future.

Ressler 9 (Aaron R, Major, USAF, under the direction of Edwina S. Campbell, Ph.D, “ADVANCING SINO-U.S. SPACE COOPERATION”, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA539619//sb)

After reviewing Chinese counterspace capabilities and possible motivations, the question at hand, again, is how can the U.S. make ASAT operations less attractive for China? To not do anything is an option since China broke no laws or treaties. 24 But what if China were to pursue continued and even more aggressive ASAT testing? Then there is always the option of multilateral treaties that could be designed to prevent or limit the weaponization of space. While this may appear to be an attractive option, a treaty of this sort could go against the 2006 U.S. National Space Policy which states that the U.S. intends to maintain its freedom to act in space. **25 U.S.-China space cooperation could be the ideal answer to deter Chinese counterspace testing and operations without significantly tying the hands of the U.S. with regard to maintaining freedom of action in space.** The idea here is gaining a partner versus a competitor. Despite improvement in diplomatic and economic relationships between the U.S. and China, there has been very little initiative from the U.S. in entering into cooperative efforts with China in space activities. In fact, it was reported by Michael Griffin, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s (NASA) current administrator, that the Bush administration failed to approve an “overture to China for a cooperative U.S.-China space mission” in late 2008. 26 Opening the doors toward increased cooperation with China in the space endeavor could present some attractive benefits. First and foremost, communication would improve between the two countries on space matters which would be essential in ultimately preventing further uncoordinated direct-ascent ASAT type activities. Currently, there is essentially no dialogue between the U.S. and China regarding military space issues. 27 Another advantage of space cooperation is cost. The U.S. and China share similar goals, like returning to the Moon and eventually pursuing a manned mission to Mars. Space is expensive, so why not share resources and capabilities in the pursuit of such activities

### Chinese weaponization is *only* a response to U.S. space unilateralism—this causes space debris and kills any chance of future space missions.

Gargasz 10 (Michael Luke, Major, United States Air Force, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, “We’ve Rattled Our Sabers…Now What? The Future of US/China Space Relations”//-sb)

Similar to the traditional US view of peaceful uses of space. China has longed advocated a weapons-free space. But faced with the US's hegemonic power and belligerent rhetoric. China clearly decided to take action to counter US space power. The country quietly built anti-space capabilities throughout the last decade such as ground-based lasers, satellite jammers, and anti-satellite (ASAT) weaponry and intensified its rhetoric.9 In January 2006. China released its 2006 Defense White Paper which no longer included language "preventing an arms race in outer space".10 Subtle as this change may have seemed, the rhetorical die was cast. The next two years saw laser dazzling of US spacecraft and a successful direct-ascent ASAT demonstration by the Chinese (the US responded in kind with a successful satellite shoot down of its own in 200S).11 With anti-space capability demonstrated, recent Chinese rhetoric has gotten more aggressive in its tone. For instance. China's air force commander Xn Qiliang recently said "[a]s far as the revolutions in military affairs in concerned, the competition between military forces is moving Towards outer space" and militarization of space is inevitable. " Is Xu Qiliang correct? Is militarization of space inevitable? Is it in the interest of Chinaor the US to engage in a space war? Perhaps **the answer to all these questions is an emphatic no**! The US and Chinese economies are symbiotically linked. For example. US and China trade in 2008 amounted to greater than 400 billion dollars.15 Outset of war between the US and China would have horrific economic ramifications to both parties. In addition, both countries have thriving space programs and rely heavily upon space platforms for military and economic purposes (albeit the US is far more reliant). So. the resulting acts in space would asymmetrically affect both nations. China and the US would be foolish to instigate a space shooting war because the "ensuing debris could quickly render Earth orbital space unusable for centuries."14 Also, there would be great pressure from other international space powers to avoid space war since they could eventually become collateral damage of a US China kinetic conflict in space. Given that space war is not advisable, what can the US do to prevent it?

### US-China space war escalates and goes nuclear.

Forden 8 (Geoffrey Forden, National Security research associate at MIT, "How China Loses the Coming Space War (Pt. 2)", 1/10/08, www.wired.com/dangerroom/2008/01/inside-the-ch-1/)

If China did decide to destroy these early warning satellites, it would greatly reduce the area covered by US missile defenses in Taiwan against SCUD and longer range missiles. This is because the area covered by a theater missile defense system is highly dependent on the warning time it has; the greater the warning time, the more effective the missile defense system’s radar is. Thus a Patriot battery, which might ordinarily cover the capital of Taiwan, could be reduced to just defending the military base it was stationed at. Some analysts believe that China would gain a tremendous propaganda coup by having a single missile make it through US defenses and thus might consider this use of its deep-space ASATs highly worthwhile even if it could not increase the probability of destroying military targets. On the other hand, China would run a tremendous risk of the US believing it was under a more general nuclear attack if China did destroy these early warning satellites. Throughout the history of the Cold War, the US has had a policy of only launching a “retaliatory” nuclear strike if an incoming attack is detected by both early warning satellites and radars. Without the space leg of the early warning system, the odds of the US misinterpreting some missile launch that it detected with radar as a nuclear attack would be greatly increased even if the US did not view the satellite destruction as a sufficiently threatening attack all by themselves. Such a misinterpretation is not without precedent. In 1995, Russia’s early warning radars viewed a NASA sounding rocket launch off the coast of Norway and flagged it as a possible Trident missile launch. Many analysts believe that Russia was able to not respond only because it had a constellation of functioning early warning satellites. Any Chinese attacks on US early warning satellites would risk both intentional and mistaken escalation of the conflict into a nuclear war without a clear military goal.

### **A space race also guts the Chinese economy.**

Johnson-Freese 4 (Dr. Joan Johnson-Freese Chair, Department of National Security Studies, Naval War College “Space Wei Qi: The Launch of Shenzhou V” <http://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/ba695c64-2c13-4913-a6f5-9ebcec9aa311/Space-Wei-Qi--The-Launch-of-Shenzhou-V---Johnson-F> //Donnie)

Apparently, since rumors of consideration of a reinvigorated U.S. manned space effort began within two months of the successful Chinese launch, Washington realized that “doing nothing” was not an option. If the United States ignored the Chinese launch, China would simply seek out and likely find other countries more favorably disposed to working with it. That would leave the United States in the seeming position of having been “caught,” if not overtaken, by the Chinese in a manned space race driven by public perceptions, as well as the very real likelihood of more unwanted partnerships, of the Galileo variety, between China and third nations or groups, with the United States increasingly the odd man out. Although the American public was apathetic about Yang Liwei’s flight, the fickle nature of the public meant that could change. If the Chinese continued with manned space activity and the United States continued on an ambivalent path, the latter would eventually have to decide if it were comfortable with an overall first place in space but gold medals for China in manned space exploration and development. China’s technology would not have outpaced that of the United States, but its sustained political commitment would have. With the status quo not being an option, the relevance of how the United States would reinvigorate its program becomes critical. Simply announcing intent says little, as the devil is always in the details. The United States can declare a space race, unilaterally developing a long-awaited manned program to return to the moon or a manned Mars mission, or some combination of the two. However, it is unlikely that the ISS partners would support a program developed without their input; in fact, their post–Shenzhou V congratulatory messages, especially those of Russia and Europe, suggest that they would support no program that excluded the Chinese. Further, the continuing financial and technical problems of the still-incomplete ISS make it unlikely that its sponsors will be anxious to commit themselves, even if invited, to an expanded manned program. ISS is struggling. Debate followed the 20 October 2003 arrival of the fresh crew at the station when it was disclosed that some NASA staff felt the station unsafe, because air, water, and radiation monitors, medical devices, and some other systems were ailing or broken. NASA management itself declared the overall station safe, at least temporarily. Clearly, however, ISS needs immediate attention and possibly additional funding. The benefits to the United States of a competitive approach are the same kinds it enjoyed earlier with Apollo—prestige, technology development, and jobs in aerospace. At the risk of losing face and allowing the technology gap to grow, China would be pushed to put more money into its manned program and at a faster rate than it would otherwise have, thereby diverting it from military programs. It would be the equivalent of forcing the Soviet Union to spend money to counter Strategic Defense Initiative (“Star Wars”) technology. There are three drawbacks to this approach: Can the United States afford this kind of a program and maintain the requisite political will to fund it through completion? Is this really the best long-term strategy for long-term U.S.-China relations? Does, finally, the United States want to reinforce the view that it prefers unilateralism to multilateralism?

Chinese economic collapse causes global war.

Friedberg 11 (July/August, Aaron L., professor of politics and international affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University, Hegemony with Chinese Characteristics, The National Interest, lexis)

Such fears of aggression are heightened by an awareness that anxiety over a lack of legitimacy at home can cause nondemocratic governments to try to deflect popular frustration and discontent toward external enemies. Some Western observers worry, for example, that if China’s economy falters its rulers will try to blame foreigners and even manufacture crises with Taiwan, Japan or the United States in order to rally their people and redirect the population’s anger. Whatever Beijing’s intent, such confrontations could easily spiral out of control. Democratic leaders are hardly immune to the temptation of foreign adventures. However, because the stakes for them are so much lower (being voted out of office rather than being overthrown and imprisoned, or worse), they are less likely to take extreme risks to retain their hold on power.

### And, no disads—cooperation *doesn’t sacrifice U.S. leadership*.

Pollpeter 8 (Kevin, China Program Manager at Defense Group Inc.’s Center for Intelligence Research and Analysis. Previously, he was a researcher at the RAND Corporation. Mr. Pollpeter is widely published on China national security issues and focuses on the Chinese space program, RAND corporation, “BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE: CHINA’S PROGRESS IN SPACE TECHNOLOGY DURING THE TENTH 5-YEAR PLAN AND THE U.S. RESPONSE”, <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub852.pdf//sb>)

While relative decline for the United States in space technologies is unavoidable, it need not lead to a loss of leadership. The rise of a new space power requires two responses from the United States: domestic and international. Domestically, the reliance of the space 52 industry on government clients requires a broad-based response by both the U.S. Government and industry. Without a stable, adequately funded, organized, and staffed space industry, it will be difficult to master the technologies needed to meet the military, commercial, and political challenges of a Chinese space program. This will not only require better program management on the part of industry and government, but will also require both actors to think innovatively about how to attract and maintain a competent workforce. As China’s space power grows, space diplomacy will also have a role in meeting the challenges of China’s space program. This monograph argues that a program of limited cooperation with China that focuses on tangible benefits for both countries is best suited to meet those challenges. Space activities are multifaceted, and the U.S.-China space relationship need not be solely defined by military considerations. Nevertheless, the inherently military nature of the Chinese space program and its lack of transparency and tendency towards disinformation preclude most forms of cooperation. By focusing cooperation on the safety of space travel and improving science, however, NASA can contribute to its mission while meeting the challenges of a growing space power.

### Finally, cooperation prevents the rise of an *independent* Chinese space program—*turns their disads*.

Zhou 8 (Yi Zhou, Center for Space Science and Applied Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, George Washington University, "Perspectives on Sino-US cooperation in civil space programs", 7/14/08, [www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964608000404//avi](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964608000404//avi))

Over recent years political relations between China and the USA have swayed, with a stable and acceptable position for both sides being sought. This suggests a bright future in political relations for China and the USA, since all these recent moves imply that there exists a possibility for the two countries to open doors in civilian space cooperation. In this article the current relations between China and USA in space cooperation are summarized. The possibilities for cooperation are discussed, with an analysis of the positive and negative postures of both countries. Finally, a step-by-step approach to cooperation in civil space areas, particularly space science and exploration programs, is suggested. This article does not address issues of security space and how they might influence the evolution of civilian space cooperation. Clearly one impact of the January 2007 Chinese ASAT test was to put at least a temporary halt to US–Chinese discussions on possible cooperation. China is concerned with the implications of US military space capabilities for its security interests, and the USA reciprocally is concerned with the potential build-up of Chinese capabilities to counter US military space capabilities. These considerations form the background of this paper's discussion, but are not treated in detail here. 2. The mutual benefits of space cooperation Both China and the USA are important countries in global politics, economics and space activity. Both countries’ national space policies are supportive of international cooperation on space activities. They have also made progress and benefited from space cooperation with their partners in past years. However, there is only a limited number of individuals from the two countries visiting each other on a non-official basis and sparse information exchange on space. China and the USA have no government space cooperation agreement. China does not have any cooperative space projects with NASA either, although both countries have joined other multilateral government agreements, such as the International Living with a Star (ILWS), Committee on Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS), the Global Exploration Strategy, the Outer Space Treaty and other related international space law treaties. Can China become a new partner of the USA in the near future after Europe, Japan and even Russia, and directly collaborate on space with it? Would both countries benefit from bilateral space collaboration? On the one hand, there are many obvious potential benefits that could emerge for China's space program. According to China's official space policy, the country will develop programs balanced between space science, space technology and space applications. The objective is grand, but it is difficult to attain these goals because of China's present limited space capability, budget and experience. Cooperation with developed space countries, including Russia, Europe and the USA will be a short cut for China to obtain these objectives. For example: • Bilateral cooperation on space science missions will improve China's scientific instrument development and data analysis capability, as well as its research system capability. • Bilateral cooperation on human spaceflight will quicken China's breakthrough in the key technology problems of human spaceflight and related areas. • By developing its space technology, China will improve the competitive ability of its space products in the global market. • Bilateral space cooperation will improve the level of professionalism and project management in the field. • Civil space cooperation will potentially promote China's military modernization via dual use space technology in some limited areas, although cooperation with the USA could weaken the independence of current Chinese space technology efforts in general. Indeed, one of the main reasons why China has used cooperation with other countries is to speed up its indigenous space effort by participating in and learning from the experience of different programs, rather than focusing on attempting to acquire knowledge of key technologies. On the other hand, some commentators in the USA worry that cooperation with China will somehow compromise US economic and political progress and even US national security [7]. However, there are several potential benefits for the USA which should be given greater consideration: •

## 1AC—China Cooperation Advantage

### Advantage Two: China Cooperation

### Lack of cooperation over space is spilling over to undermine broader cooperation over *keystone issues* like climate change and nuclear security.

Kulacki 6/23/11 (Gregory, a senior analyst and the China Project manager for the Union of Concerned Scientists, Volume 474, Nature, “US and China need contact, not cold war”, <http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nwgs/Kulacki_US-China-coop_Nature_6-23-11.pdf//sb>)

This April, a US congressman used budget negotiations to ram through a potentially unconstitutional assault on the president’s ability to conduct scientific diplomacy. A bill was passed stipulating that, until September 2011 at least, no appropriated funds may be used by NASA or the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) “to develop, design, plan, promulgate, implement, or execute a bilateral policy, program, order, or contract of any kind to participate, collaborate, or coordinate bilaterally in any way with China”. The move, instigated by Representative Frank Wolf (Republican, Virginia), chair of the commerce, justice and science subcommittee of the House appropriations committee, which funds NASA and the OSTP, is part of a decades-old congressional tradition of concerns about China’s space programme. Nevertheless, this latest shot has wideranging implications. It has already led to the suspension of a geodynamics research project between the Chinese Academy of Sciences and NASA, for example. And it will impede ongoing bilateral negotiations on climate change and nuclear security that are part of the US–China Strategic and Economic Dialogue, a high-level forum established by presidents Barack Obama and Hu Jintao in 2009. My experience working in China for the Union of Concerned Scientists suggests that the ban will have a chilling effect on both government-funded scientific cooperation and on non-governmental activities. The ban should be lifted. The progress of Chinese space activity during the previous US administration suggests that **the prohibitions that have stifled Sino–American scientific cooperation** for decades **have not achieved their aims, and have** arguably **been counterproductive**. China has shown that it has the talent and resources to go it alone. The sanctions have only severed links between the countries and made a new generation of Chinese intellectuals resentful and suspicious of the United States. And they stand in contrast to the tradition of scientists strengthening diplomatic relations

### Space is key—it *spills over* to broader cooperation.

Zhou 8 (Yi Zhou, Center for Space Science and Applied Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, George Washington University, "Perspectives on Sino-US cooperation in civil space programs", 7/14/08, [www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964608000404//avi](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964608000404//avi))

 Benefits for geopolitical issues and global stability. A country's strategic interests may provide the primary motivation for engaging partner nations in cooperative space ventures. The International Space Station (ISS) is a good example of this. China and the USA are both important countries and a stable relationship between them is a key factor in global stability. Space could be a focal point for promoting this kind of stability. Several European countries and Russia have undertaken cooperative activities in space with China to satisfy their geopolitical demands and other interests. Chinese participation in US-led space exploration would send a strong signal to the world of good US–China relations [8], which would be good for US international relations and would provide geopolitical benefits. • The United States will be able to understand more about China's space development and direction through actual cooperation. At the moment the USA observes China's space policy and capabilities through statements in China's white papers. But studying one paper every five years is too limited and does not provide sufficient detail. Some American consulting and research institutions may simply rely on graduate students’ superficial papers to try to gain insight into the direction of China's space development. These are not full-scale or always entirely accurate, and may sometimes result in misunderstandings. If NASA signed an agreement with CNSA and began joint space projects, they would more easily and directly understand China's space activities and directions. They may even be able to make some good suggestions for China's space projects and policies. These win–win suggestions should be readily adopted by China's policy makers to extend the two countries’ space and national benefits.

### In particular, cooperation over space is *vital* to spur cooperation on climate change, nuclear terrorism, and space debris.

Kulacki 6/23/11 (Gregory, a senior analyst and the China Project manager for the Union of Concerned Scientists, Volume 474, Nature, “US and China need contact, not cold war”, <http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nwgs/Kulacki_US-China-coop_Nature_6-23-11.pdf//sb>)

Some see a moral argument behind the bans on US–China collaboration, arguing that China’s human-rights record necessitates a certain distance. Wolf is one such person. He challenged Holdren to justify cooperation with a regime still guilty of the same human-rights abuses that precipitated the Tiananmen sanctions. Holdren explained that the administration’s pursuit of scientific and technological cooperation was not an endorsement of the Chinese government or a reward for good behaviour, but was necessary to address complicated threats to US interests, including climate change, nuclear terrorism and space debris. These are problems that require international solutions, and if China fails to address them it will harm the US public.

### That’s fosters *dialogue* and *information exchange*—key to mitigating global warming.

Davidson 10 (Michael, Michael Davidson is a visiting fellow at Asia Policy Point., “US, China: A green security blanket?”, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China/LE14Ad01.html//SB)

To meet the new transnational threat of climate change, the QDR calls for collaborations with "both traditional allies and new partners". The US and China are natural new partners. Neither can confront alone the human dislocation and resource competition caused by environmental degradation. Furthermore, of all the governmental agencies examining climate change, only militaries have the necessary logistical structures to react cooperatively and quickly. A new US-China security partnership would complement the 2009 inter-governmental memorandum of understanding to Enhance Cooperation on Climate Change, Energy and the Environment that established a regular policy dialogue on these topics. It could also build on the Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED). The S&ED was designed to address a large range of shared concerns, including regional security and global issues such as climate change. A new track on climate security cooperation can strengthen ties in both dialogues. Cooperation has already begun. For example, last May, China and the US participated multilaterally in the ASEAN Regional Forum's First Voluntary Demonstration of Response on Disaster Relief. The US and China should go the next step to initiate a joint exercise focusing specifically on climate change-induced disasters. In addition, climate security extends beyond traditional disaster preparedness, into climate change mitigation and scientific research. The Office of Naval Research wants to establish scientific exchanges with the Chinese on alternative energy and other basic science through its proposed joint forces Hong Kong office. The Office of Naval Research, the Air Force Office of Scientific Research and the US Army Research, Development and Engineering Command already support basic science research projects with other Asian countries on superconductors and biofuels. By focusing on scientific research and disaster preparedness, the US and China can reframe existing military exchanges to focus on areas of critical cooperation: energy security concerns as well as human security needs such as cheap energy, food shortages and refugee relief. Instead of bickering over borders and air space, it is first better to establish a working day-to-day relationship over matters of mutual concern and interests. A US-China climate security partnership can draw on the best instincts and science of both countries, both of which are firm ground to build trust and understanding.

### Cooperation with China is the *only* way to solve global warming—top two emitters in the world.

Brookings 9 (Brookings Institute, A FOREIGN POLICY AND JOHN L. THORNTON CHINA CENTER EVENT, “U.S.-China Climate Change Cooperation: Overcoming Obstacles”, http://www.brookings.edu/events/2009/0205\_climate\_change.aspx//sb)

Any solution to global warming will require substantial activity in the United States and China, the world’s top two emitters of greenhouse gases. Working together, the two countries could make important progress in addressing this challenge. Recent developments—including new leadership in the U.S., dire scientific warnings and an aggressive international negotiating schedule—are dramatically raising the profile of this issue on the U.S.-China bilateral agenda. Yet different histories, cultures and national circumstances create substantial barriers to large-scale cooperation.

### Global warming leads to extinction

Oliver Tickell, Climate Researcher, 8/11/2008, On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction, The Guardian, Proquest

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

### U.S.-China cooperation is also essential for resolving the North Korean issue.

Cossa 6 (Ralph A, Dr. Ralph A. Cossa is president of the Paciﬁc Forum CSIS (www.csis.org/pacfor), a Honolulu-based non-proﬁt research institute afﬁliated with the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington. He is also senior editor of Comparative Connections, a quarterly electronic journal., “The North Korean Crisis and U.S.-Sino Relations”, <http://www.amcham-shanghai.org/NR/rdonlyres/14AFAA53-14A6-44D2-97CA-1B6499CE92AC/2447/09_Policy_Insight.pdf//sb>)

Although China remains caught in the middle, there are a number of areas where future U.S.-Sino cooperation can be expected. The ﬁrst addresses Washington’s main concern: namely, keeping North Korea’s nuclear capability in North Korea. Formal Chinese support for the U.S.-led Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI, aimed at countering proliferation on land, in the air, and especially at sea) may be a bridge too far, but Beijing has already made it clear that it supports PSI objectives and is apparently taking steps to enforce U.N. sanctions prohibiting North Korea from exporting or importing nuclear, missile or other prohibited military hardware. North Korea has said sanctions are an “act of war” and threatened to “deal merciless blows” against anyone attempting to enforce them. China, perhaps more so than Washington, Seoul, or especially Tokyo, is best suited to call this bluﬀ. The reported clamping down of transactions with North Korea by Chinese banks sends a useful message, both of Beijing’s seriousness and of Washington’s commitment to maintain its ﬁnancial crackdown. While Washington must respect Beijing’s concerns for the integrity of the North Korean state, China must make it clear both that a change of heart by North Korea’s leaders is the only alternative to a change of regime, and that it can envision a more responsible and accommodating leader than Kim Jong-il has proven to be. **There is a lot at stake in successfully resolving this crisis**. But, no doubt unintentionally, Kim Jong-il has provided Washington and Beijing with a golden opportunity to develop a truly strategic cooperative relationship, if they can continue to ﬁrmly and jointly speak with one voice in dealing with this nuclear challenge

North Korean nuclear instability causes extinction!

Hayes and Hamel Green 10 (Peter, Professor, RMIT University and Michale Hamel-Green, Victory University, "The Path Not Taken, the Way Still Open: Denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia," SPECIAL REPORT 10-001, Nautilus Institute, 1-5-10, [www.nautilus.org/fora/security/10001HayesHamalGreen.pdf](http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/10001HayesHamalGreen.pdf))

The international community is increasingly aware that cooperative diplomacy is the most productive way to tackle the multiple, interconnected global challenges facing humanity, not least of which is the increasing proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Korea and Northeast Asia are instances where risks of nuclear proliferation and actual nuclear use arguably have increased in recent years. This negative trend is a product of continued US nuclear threat projection against the DPRK as part of a general program of coercive diplomacy in this region, North Korea’s nuclear weapons programme, the breakdown in the Chinese-hosted Six Party Talks towards the end of the Bush Administration, regional concerns over China’s increasing military power, and concerns within some quarters in regional states (Japan, South Korea, Taiwan) about whether US extended deterrence (“nuclear umbrella”)A afforded under bilateral security treaties can be relied upon for protection. The consequences of failing to address the proliferation threat posed by the North Korea developments, and related political and economic issues, are serious, not only for the Northeast Asian region but for the whole international community. At worst, **there is the possibility of nuclear attack1**, **whether by intention, miscalculation, or merely accident, leading to the resumption of Korean War hostilities**. On the Korean Peninsula itself, key population centres are well within short or medium range missiles. The whole of Japan is likely to come within North Korean missile range. Pyongyang has a population of over 2 million, Seoul (close to the North Korean border) 11 million, and Tokyo over 20 million. **Even a limited nuclear exchange would result in a holocaust of unprecedented proportions. But the catastrophe within the region would not be the only outcome**. **New research indicates that even a limited nuclear war in the region would rearrange our global climate far more quickly than global warming**. Westberg draws attention to new studies modelling the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange involving approximately 100 Hiroshima-sized 15 kt bombs2 (by comparison it should be noted that the United States currently deploys warheads in the range 100 to 477 kt, that is, individual warheads equivalent in yield to a range of 6 to 32 Hiroshimas).The studies **indicate** that the soot from the fires produced would lead to a decrease in global temperature by 1.25 degrees Celsius for a period of 6-8 years.3 In Westberg’s view: **That is not global winter, but the nuclear darkness will cause a deeper drop in temperature than at any time during the last 1000 years**. The temperature over the continents would decrease substantially more than the global average. A decrease in rainfall over the continents would also follow…The period of nuclear darkness will cause much greater decrease in grain production than 5% and it will continue for many years...hundreds of millions of people will die from hunger…To make matters even worse, such amounts of smoke injected into the stratosphere would cause a huge reduction in the Earth’s protective ozone.4 These, of course, are not the only consequences. Reactors might also be targeted, causing further mayhem and downwind radiation effects, superimposed on a smoking, radiating ruin left by nuclear next-use. Millions of refugees would flee the affected regions. The direct impacts, and the follow-on impacts on the global economy via ecological and food insecurity, could make the present global financial crisis **pale by comparison**. How the great powers, especially the nuclear weapons states respond to such a crisis, and in particular, whether nuclear weapons are used in response to nuclear first-use, could make or break the global non proliferation and disarmament regimes. There could be many unanticipated impacts on regional and global security relationships5, with subsequent nuclear breakout and geopolitical turbulence, including possible loss-of-control over fissile material or warheads in the chaos of nuclear war, and aftermath chain-reaction affects involving other potential proliferant states. The Korean nuclear proliferation issue is not just a regional threat but a global one that warrants priority consideration from the international community. North Korea is currently believed to have sufficient plutonium stocks to produce up to 12 nuclear weapons.6 If and when it is successful in implementing a uranium enrichment program - having announced publicly that it is experimenting with enrichment technology on September 4, 20097 in a communication with the UN Security Council - it would likely acquire the capacity to produce over 100 such weapons. Although some may dismiss Korean Peninsula proliferation risks on the assumption that the North Korean regime will implode as a result of its own economic problems, food problems, and treatment of its own populace, **there is little to suggest that this is imminent**. If this were to happen, there would be the risk of nuclear weapons falling into hands of non-state actors in the disorder and chaos that would ensue. Even without the outbreak of nuclear hostilities on the Korean Peninsula in either the near or longer term, North Korea has every financial incentive under current economic sanctions and the needs of its military command economy to export its nuclear and missile technologies to other states. Indeed, it has already been doing this for some time. The Proliferation Security Initiative may conceivably prove effective in intercepting ship-borne nuclear exports, but it is by no means clear how air-transported materials could similarly be intercepted. Given the high stakes involved, North Korean proliferation, if unaddressed and unreversed, **has the potential to destabilize the whole East Asian region and beyond**. Even if a nuclear exchange does not occur in the short term, the acute sense of nuclear threat that has been experienced for over five decades by North Koreans as a result of US strategic deterrence is now likely to be keenly felt by fellow Koreans south of the 38th Parallel and Japanese across the waters of the Sea of Japan. China, too, must surely feel itself to be at risk from North Korean nuclear weapons, or from escalation that might ensue from next-use in the Korean Peninsula resulting not only in the environmental consequences noted above, but in regime collapse and massive refugee flows. South Korea and Japan appear willing to rely on their respective bilateral security pacts with the United States to deter North Korean nuclear attack for the time being. However, should South Korea and/or Japan acquire nuclear weapons, the outcome would be destabilizing, especially if this resulted from rupture of their alliance relationships with the United States. Both have the technical capability to do so very rapidly. South Korea has previously engaged in nuclear weapons research but desisted after US pressure. Japan still proclaims its adherence to the three Non-Nuclear Principles although recent confirmation that the United States routinely transited nuclear weapons through Japan and retains the right of emergency reintroduction of nuclear weapons has tarnished Japan’s non-nuclear image. Moreover, it has large stockpiles of plutonium that could rapidly be used to produce nuclear warheads. Such responses, already advocated by conservative and nationalist groups within South Korea and Japan, could trigger a regional nuclear arms race involving the Koreas, Japan, Taiwan, and China, with incalculable wider consequences for Southeast Asia, South Asia and the whole Pacific and beyond. These developments would spell the demise of the current global non-proliferation regime as underpinned by the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Failure to reverse the DPRK’s nuclear breakout is also an important factor driving a general malaise in the exercise of American power which one of the authors has characterized elsewhere as “the end of American nuclear hegemony.”8

### And, U.S.-China space cooperation is critical to future space exploration—*cost savings* and *tech*.

Rutkowski 8 (Ryan, M.A. in International Relations from Johns Hopkins, “The Prospect of US – China Collaboration for Manned-Space Exploration”, http://mysite.verizon.net/ryan.rutkowski/Blog/US-China%20Space%20cooperation.pdf//sb)

Despite the U.S. efforts to engage with the international community more in manned-space exploration, U.S. and China collaboration remains limited. Indeed, U.S.-China space cooperation has been poor since the mid-1990s when several U.S. companies were accused of transferring potentially sensitive military information to China. The primary problem with U.S-China space cooperation continues to be concerns about inadvertent technology transfers. Certain U.S. officials fear that dual-use space technology could easily be transferred to China. This is encompassed in the U.S ban on sale of military technology and export restrictions of certain “sensitive” technologies to China. Nonetheless, in 2006, NASA Administrator Michael Griffin visited China to begun a limited dialogue on cooperation. However, any progress towards cooperation on space technology was halted when China tested its first successful anti-Satellite weapons technology heightening security tensions between the U.S and China. However, the continued reluctance to pursue U.S. and China space cooperation, ignores the benefits of such cooperation, namely promote mutual understanding, cost savings, improved transparency, and ensuring long-term gains in human space exploration. Similar with US-Russian cooperation, US-Chinese space cooperation will allow for a cultural exchange through collaboration with US and Chinese astronauts and scientists. **China could be a vital source of funding to reduce the rising costs for an expanding U.S. space program**. Indeed, China and the US could collaborate on joint-projects, such as ISS or even a lunar base that could help reduce the cost of investment in space exploration for both countries. US-China space collaboration would also reduce security tensions, especially in space-based weapons, by increasing transparency of the long-term intentions of both countries in space technology. Finally, U.S. and Chinese civilian space programs could recognize a common purpose and commitment to the development of space technology to promote progress in human space exploration to the moon, mars, and beyond. U.S-China space cooperation is vital to future progress in space technology and space exploration. The U.S. and China could engage in non-sensitive data and information sharing from satellites, such as debris management, environmental and meteorological conditions, and navigation. The two countries could also engage in a space policy dialogue similar to the annual strategic economic dialogue to build a better understanding of civilian and military space objectives and a common vision for space exploration initiatives. Finally, the U.S. and China could launch bi-lateral and multi-lateral joint-projects with ISS, lunar expeditions, and eventual mars exploration. Ultimately, the future of U.S.-China space cooperation is a necessity for continuation of human progress in exploring our planet, solar system, and worlds beyond

### Cooperation with China is also critical to mitigate the risk of exploration—solves their space DAs.

Zhou 8 (Yi Zhou, Center for Space Science and Applied Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, George Washington University, "Perspectives on Sino-US cooperation in civil space programs", 7/14/08, [www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964608000404//avi](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964608000404//avi))

• More choices and back-up for the USA. Space exploration is an inherently risky activity in which the element of risk can be managed and mitigated but never eliminated. It is necessary for any country to spread and manage risk. More back-up means greater safety. International cooperation can be used to duplicate capabilities which ensure that failure in one area is unlikely to jeopardize the entire mission or project. The most obvious example of this point today is the ISS's reliance on the Space Shuttle and the Soyuz for transporting humans to the station. In the next 20 years the USA and China will be realizing ambitions to fly to the Moon. By cooperating with China, this additional back-up would lower the risks involved in human spaceflight. For example, if Americans return to the Moon and meet with an accident, the Chinese lunar project or crew could supply assistance as a back-up. Usually, such arrangements are discussed and integrated from the very beginning, in the design phase. Unfortunately that does not seem very likely under current circumstances.

### Exploration of the solar system helps us find other civilizations—solves *all modern problems*.

Mitchell et al 10 (October-November, 2010, Edgar D. Mitchell, Sc.D., Apollo 14 Lunar module pilot, Sixth person to walk on the Moon, Robert Staretz, M.S., Journal of Cosmology, Vol 12, “Our Destiny – A Space Faring Civilization?” <http://journalofcosmology.com/Mars104.html>, ngoetz)

Interplanetary exploration aside, there is no certainty that we will survive the gathering storm on Earth of the man made challenges to our survival. If we do endure, it is likely that we will eventually meet other intelligent technological civilizations in this increasingly apparent life friendly universe that we live in if we haven’t already done so. Hopefully these civilizations will have solved once and for all many of the dilemmas currently facing humanity. Clearly any civilization that mastered the technological challenges of interstellar travel will most likely be much older and far more advanced than us in many ways that we cannot even conceive. They will also likely be much wiser in how they utilize their technologies. When we begin a dialogue with them, perhaps our first order of business should be to find out how they managed to get beyond the civilization threatening technological adolescent stage in which we on Earth are now engaged.

### Colonization solves extinction—*unexpected calamities*.

Ragheb 11 (5/5/2011, Magdi Ragheb, Associate Professor of nuclear, plasma, and radiological engineering, Ph.D. Nuclear Engineering, “Nuclear And Plasma Space Propulsion,” https://netfiles.uiuc.edu/mragheb/www/NPRE%20402%20ME%20405%20Nuclear%20Power%20Engineering/Nuclear%20and%20Plasma%20Space%20Propulsion.pdf, ngoetz)

In their role as stewards of life on Earth and perhaps in the whole known universe, humans have a duty to preserve and spread life. With their acquired intelligence, science and technology, it is their sacred destiny to preserve life with the equivalent of Noah’s Arks on both the moon and Mars. Life can be subject to extinction on Earth either from within through volcanic eruptions or viral epidemics or from astral assailants as asteroid or comets impacts from space, as we know has happened in the past. It is urgent to keep backup copies of life, like we keep for files on computers, on the moon and Mars protected from the possible unexpected calamities that could extinguish life on Earth.

# Uniqueness

## China Cooperation On the Brink

### U.S. China cooperation is shaky, but incremental progress is visible.

New York Times 1/19/11 (Micheal Wines, “Subtle Signs of Progress in U.S.-China Relations”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/20/world/asia/20assess.html//sb>)

So, in a sense, were the events of Wednesday. Neither side made any significant progress, much less any breakthrough, on the larger problems that have bedeviled relations ever since Mr. Obama made his state visit to Beijing in November 2009. On the American side, that includes revaluing China’s currency, leveling the playing field for American investors in China and establishing a serious discourse between the nations’ militaries. For the Chinese, the biggest thorns include American arms sales to Taiwan, its continued support of the Dalai Lama and what a Chinese journalist at Wednesday’s news conference called “strategic mistrust” — the fear that the United States is seeking to encircle China and suppress its rise. Still, each side came away from the meeting with something it could point to as an accomplishment, however modest. The White House had set out to keep relations from sliding even further downhill, and to establish a more personal relationship with Mr. Hu that could sustain ties during the next two years, when the political realities of choosing leaders in both countries will work against any significant improvement. Mr. Obama appears to have gotten that. For his part, Mr. Hu was, by American accounts, fixated on engineering a state visit that would portray China as an equal partner with the United States, and China’s president as a successful, internationally recognized statesman. He got that, too. Both leaders should also reap domestic political benefits from their meeting. Mr. Hu’s enhanced stature, American analysts say, should help him tamp down political forces that have driven a more aggressive foreign policy and hamstrung relations with the United States and China’s Pacific neighbors in the last year. Mr. Hu and China’s prime minister, Wen Jiabao, “realize this assertiveness based in the last year on nationalism and the belief that the U.S. is declining has gotten them into deep trouble,” said Joseph S. Nye Jr., the former dean at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard and a State Department and Pentagon official in the Carter and Clinton administrations. Mr. Nye was in Washington for a luncheon with Mr. Hu at the State Department. “They think a summit which could be played as a success can give them ammunition to quiet down this rumbling below in the ranks.” For his part, Mr. Obama comes away from the visit with a new reputation for toughness in his China policy, something that is likely to please conservatives and some liberals alike. In the past week, the president’s cabinet members loosed a fusillade of speeches intended to lay out the administration’s differences with Beijing for all to see. And at Wednesday’s public sessions with Mr. Hu, Mr. Obama repeatedly raised concerns about China’s currency, its foot-dragging in stopping the pirating of American software and other intellectual property, its poor human rights record and, boldest of all, China’s refusal to talk to the Dalai Lama. Critics on Mr. Obama’s left have accused him of soft-pedaling human rights since the start of his presidency, when Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton played down the need to raise rights concerns in public during a visit to Beijing. This time, Mr. Obama invited human rights advocates to the White House for a meeting on China in the days before Mr. Hu’s arrival, and raised the issue from the beginning on Wednesday, in his remarks welcoming Mr. Hu to the White House. Mr. Obama also had a “very serious” discussion on human rights with Mr. Hu during a private dinner in the White House on Tuesday, Mr. Lieberthal said. “The administration feels this is about managing a very complicated and very important relationship — and I stress ‘managing,’ ” he said. “This is not a relationship where everything is going to come out right.” Whether baby steps on human-rights language and other issues will show staying power after Mr. Hu returns to Beijing and the cauldron of domestic politics is an open question, Mr. Lieberthal and other experts said. But for now, “progress is progress,” said Nina Hachigian, a veteran analyst on United States-China relations at the Center for American Progress, a Democratic-leaning research group. “And **even if it’s incremental progress, it’s better than no progress at all”.**

## No Space Cooperation Now

### U.S.-China space cooperation efforts are not going anywhere.

Reuters 1/3/11 (“US-China space cooperation fades”, http://www.royalsociety.org.nz/2011/01/03/china-usa-space-2//sb)

The prospects for cooperation between the United States and China in space are fading even as proponents say working together in the heavens could help build bridges in often-testy relations on Earth. The idea of joint ventures in space, including spacewalks, explorations and symbolic “feel good” projects, have been floated from time to time by leaders on both sides. **Efforts have gone nowhere** over the past decade, swamped by economic, diplomatic and security tensions, despite a 2009 attempt by President Barack Obama and his Chinese counterpart, Hu Jintao, to kick-start the bureaucracies. US domestic politics make the issue unlikely to advance when Obama hosts Hu at the White House on Jan. 19. Washington is at odds with Beijing over its currency policies and huge trade surplus but needs China’s help to deter North Korea and Iran’s nuclear ambitions and advance global climate and trade talks, among other matters. Hu’s state visit will highlight the importance of expanding cooperation on “bilateral, regional and global issues,” the White House said. But space appears to be a frontier too far for now, partly due to US fears of an inadvertent technology transfer. China may no longer be much interested in any event, reckoning it does not need US expertise for its space program.

## A2: U.S.-China Cooperating Now

### There is a difference between rhetoric and actions—the U.S. is *not* engaged in cooperation with China.

Johnson-Freese 6 (Joan, Chair of the National Security Decision Making Department at the United States Naval War College., Yale Center for the Study of Globalization, “Strategic Communication with China: What message about space?”, http://www.wsichina.org/attach/cs2\_4.pdf//sb)

The United States says it is interested in working with China “as a global partner.” **Yet actions don’t match words when in functional areas such as space,** it maintains a strategy that the United States might characterize as hedging, but many see as containment, 38 trying to ignore the Chinese regarding cooperation in space while the other nations of the world are falling all over themselves to engage China. **China**, **on the other hand, is making it clear it is open to cooperation.** In fact, at the first International Association for the Advancement of Space Safety (IAASS) conference, held in Nice, France, in October 2005, an official from the government-run China Aerospace & Science Corporation (CASC) offered an open invitation to international cooperation on Chinese programs during a presentation. So, while engaging in a dialogue of ideas between people and institutions is one of the four fundamental premises of strategic communication, the United States has summarily rejected that premise regarding China and space. The message from the United States is clear in that regard. Whether it is the right message, however, is increasingly doubtful.

# Arms Race Advantage

## China Space Cooperation Checks Military Rise

### No national security risk to space coop—Chinese plans are inevitable—might as well make it *cooperative*.

David 6 (Leonard, Senior Space Writer, “U.S.-China Cooperation: The Great Space Debate”, http://i.space.com/2284-china-cooperation-great-space-debate.html//sb)

"China civil space plans are ambitious and inevitable," said Joseph Fuller, Jr., President and Chief Executive Officer of the Futron Corporation based in Bethesda, Maryland. "It is not a question of if, but when. For the U.S. exploration vision to succeed on a grand scale, it must include China, India, Russia and other space faring nations," he said. "Substantial collaboration already exists in business and economics," Fuller said, "why not civil space?" As China expands its automated and human spaceflight abilities, how best should the United States look upon this blossoming work--from a military/civilian perspective? Denying NASA and U.S. space commercial vendors the right to work with China is a political, not a security issue, said James Clay Moltz, Deputy Director, Center for Nonproliferation Studies and Professor of International Policy Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies in Monterey, California. "Space station technologies are available from other suppliers and are unlikely to lead to any meaningful military advantages," Moltz explained. "On the other hand, forcing China to develop its own space station with Russian or other partners simply sets up a possible competitor where there doesn't need to be one." Moltz told SPACE.com that **cooperating with China would defuse possible tensions, promote cost-savings for NASA, and level the playing field for U.S. companies**. The United States should continue to hold China to account for human rights violations and other problems, but not hold space hostage. "It's simply not in U.S. interests," he said.

### Chinese space coop will effectively check China’s space militarization, prevent an arms race, and boost leadership.

Johnson-Freese 04 (Joan, Chair of the National Security Decision Making Department at the United States Naval War College., Yale Center for the Study of Globalization, “Chinese Chess in Space”, http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/chinese-chess-space//sb)

The third alternative focuses on cooperation. The US has a long and successful tradition of international cooperation in space. Especially in the areas of space science and environmental monitoring, the US has historically viewed space as an opportunity to build bridges with countries while simultaneously co-opting them into working on areas of our choice, rather than areas not to our liking. **Cooperation is clearly the better option with China**, too. The US could start slowly, rewarding Beijing for reciprocity and transparency by granting China an increasingly larger role in a joint program of manned exploration and development. Specifically, a US proposal to multilaterally review and expand the future of manned space exploration - from the ISS to another lunar voyage or even a Mars mission - on an incremental, inclusive basis would allow Washington to revitalize American space leadership. **Crucially, it would also give the US a means to influence the future direction of the Chinese space program.** This option would counter the prevailing view of the US as a unilateralist hegemon and allow for a focus on infrastructure development that does not require unrealistic budget burdens. While there is the risk of international politics intruding into the process over time, that is counterbalanced by the vested interest such a program would give participants in system stability. To be sure, there would be resistance to working with China. Washington is replete with individuals adamantly objecting to cooperation with China on grounds from human rights to its status as the largest remaining communist country. Isolating China, however, is increasingly a stance counterproductive to US interests, as a world without China is simply not possible. US and Chinese interests frequently overlap, on North Korea and the Global War on Terror, for example, not to mention economics. The United States has a window of opportunity to step in and use space cooperation to its advantage. Because space is considered so critical to the futures of both the US and China, any activity by one has been considered zero-sum by the other, triggering an action-reaction cycle and threatening escalation into an arms race of technology and countermeasure development. **That direction can be changed**. A inclusive vision will give the US an opportunity to assume the mantle of leadership on a mission that could inspire the world and shift Chinese activities into areas more compatible with US interests. On the geostrategic Wei Qi board, **cooperation is the best "next move" for the US.**

### Cooperation in staffed space flights is crucial.

Gargasz 10 (Michael Luke, Major, United States Air Force, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, “We’ve Rattled Our Sabers…Now What? The Future of US/China Space Relations”//greenhill-sb)

So. if the US were to change course and undertake a cooperative strategy, would the Chinese participate'1 I contend that **they would**, albeit very slowly and very cautiously. US and Chinese economies are mutually dependant and war between them would be mutually devastating. To be successful, the US would need to dedicate itself to a decades-long strategy as it will take thousands of interactions to lower the walls created from years of belligerent rhetoric and saber-rattling tests. A good first step toward a successful cooperative strategy would begin in international fonirns. By negotiating limitations and norms along with many other participants. US China relations could begin to thaw. Cooperative programs and exchanges could follow to build a solid foundation for the future. Clearly a change of direction is needed. The deterrent strategy pursued over the last couple decades has produced the exact opposite of what was intended. Rather than space dominance, the US space capabilities are clearly threatened and vulnerable in future conflicts. As stated in a joint statement after President Obama's meeting with Chinese President Hu Jintao in November 2009. the US and China "nave common interests in promoting the peaceful use of outer space;'" Maybe this is the first step away from the unilateral, deterrent path that has created so much angst in the space community.

### Space coop with China ensures transparency and trust.

Ressler 9 (Aaron R, Major, USAF, under the direction of Edwina S. Campbell, Ph.D, “ADVANCING SINO-U.S. SPACE COOPERATION”, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA539619//sb)

While possibly deterring Chinese ASAT operations, this deterrence would be a secondary effect (or benefit for that matter) of successful U.S.-China space cooperation. In order for this cooperation to take place, the benefits will have to outweigh the challenges (some which will likely be viewed as risks) for both nations. The first benefit of cooperation would be improved transparency. 82 Secrecy of China’s space program has led to a suspicious outlook by many critics of this program. **Space cooperation between the two countries could be based on regular meetings which “could help the two nations understand each other’s intentions more clearly**.” 83 With China as a partner, the U.S. would have better visibility and communication with the CNSA concerning China’s space activities, and the same would hold true for China. Reviewing China’s White Paper on its space policy and trying to make sense of its counterspace capabilities after the fact is the wrong approach. “If NASA signed an agreement with CNSA and began joint space projects, they would more easily and directly understand China’s space activities and directions.” 84

Nationalism makes Chinese attack on the US extremely likely—space cooperation solves.

Hitchens and Chen 8 (Theresa, Center for Defense Information, World Security Institute, and David, CENTRA Technology, “Forging a Sino-US ‘‘grand bargain’’ in space” Space Policy, vol 24 2008)

Nevertheless, without an agreed upon understanding, the incentive to strike at what many Chinese strategists consider the Achilles’ heel of the US military machine is likely to remain a dominant consideration in China’s space strategy. Clearly, China’s leaders are driven by the strategic imperative to protect and project national sovereignty. This motivation has resulted in the Shenzhou manned spaceﬂight program and the Chang-e lunar probe mission, as well as the formation of cooperative associations such as the Asia–Paciﬁc Space Cooperation Organization. An important dividend of these programs is the promotion of China’s national prestige, both domestically and abroad. As the defenders of China’s sovereignty and international image, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) relies on such programs as a bulwark for the regime’s claim to legitimacy. Yet, even as the CCP stokes nationalistic zeal, it fears losing control of its citizens, making constructive outlets for nationalism, such as can be offered through international space cooperation, of vital importance. The next US president must recognize these incentives in the regime’s calculus, and leverage them as key points for agreeing on limits to the nascent space arms race.

## Unilateral Policies Bad

### Unilateral policies fail with China.

Mastalir 8 (Anthony J, SCHOOL OF ADVANCED AIR AND SPACE STUDIES, MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA, “THE US RESPONSE TO CHINA’S ASAT: AN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY SPACE ALLIANCE FOR THE FUTURE”//sb)

China’s ASAT test on 11 January 2007 was not nearly as “strategically dislocating” as was the subsequent realization that US national security space is ill-prepared to meet the attendant challenges of the contested environment, space. **Strategies to contain, coerce, or deter China are futile**, as Beijing’s decision to develop space weapons was one toward greater prestige, relevance, and influence as a major space power. A new paradigm has emerged. The best response for the United States is to prepare for a very different future in space, not with weapons in kind, but with enduring solutions to preserve the utility of space exploitation for all nations. These solutions require a vertically and horizontally integrated effort across all four instruments of national power. Drawing on the inherent soft power element of space, politicians and diplomats must craft the instruments necessary to form a national security space alliance. T**he unilateral approach to national security space is a broken promise for the future**, and space warriors need to adopt the coalition mindset their land, sea, and air counterparts have employed for decades. A multilateral space surveillance fusion center must be their highest priority. All stakeholders should apply a horizontally integrated approach to difficult problems such as export control, transparency, and engagement. Space superiority can be America’s destiny, if pursued with the cooperation of like-minded space-faring nations around the world.

## Space War Causes Extinction

### US-China space war escalates and causes extinction.

Hitchens 7 (Theresa Hitchens is Director of World Security Institute’s Center for Defense Information and the author of “Future Security In Space: Charting a Cooperative Course,”. She serves on the editorial board of The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, and is a member of Women in International Security and the International Institute for Strategic Studies, "200712 U.S.-Sino Relations in Space: From “War of Words” to Cold War in Space?", Winter 2007, [www.wsichina.org/cs5\_2.pdf](http://www.wsichina.org/cs5_2.pdf)) AK

Given that the United States and China now seem poised at the precipice of a dangerous competition to develop and deploy ASATs and other counter-space capabilities – a competition that threatens to draw in other players are well – what are the options for the wider international community in attempting to prevent Washington and Beijing from falling over the edge? The unfortunate truth is that there are not many, beyond continued diplomatic efforts to encourage both sides to tread more carefully. That said, those nations and international institutions committed to a weapons-free space environment should not throw up their hands in despair, but rather work together to reconsider how to push forward a collective space security agenda that can serve mutual interests rather than fan competition. If there is a silver lining to the current situation, it has raised the issue of space debris to a higher political level than ever before – and elicited anew commitment on the part of the U.S. government to refrain from testing debris-creating ASATs. “We don’t believe anyone should be doing these kinds of activities,” U.S. State Department deputy spokesman Tom Casey said Jan.19.50It is hoped that the planned meeting of the UN Committee for Peaceful Uses of Outer Space in February in Vienna (the discussions on debris are currently slated for Feb. 19-20 although the schedule may change),51 where delegates (including Chinese representatives, which up to now have been active proponents of the effort) were to discuss and hopefully approve a set of debris mitigation guidelines, is not derailed, but instead is given more impetus towards an agreement. One of the tenets of that agreement, according to U.S.-Sino diplomats involved, is that signatories pledge not to deliberately create space debris. While the accord would be voluntary, it would certainly make future destructive ASAT weapons tests by any of the signatories much more difficult to justify. It may also be that both the Committee for Peaceful Uses of Outer Spaceand the Conference on Disarmament will now be willing to consider a morespecific, legally binding, accord that wouldbar the testing and use of weaponry thatwould create significant persistent debris.Certainly, it is in the interest of no space-faring power for near-Earth orbit to be-come so polluted as to become unusable– an outcome that cannot be ruled outover the long-term in a weaponized space environment. But even in the short-term,an increase in the threat from space debris could have negative consequences for space-faring nations and space opera-tors. A report on the potential market impacts of the Chinese ASAT test by U.S. market consulting firm Teal Group found:“About the last thing that the satellite market needs now is the uncertainty that will accompany any moves to start blowing up objects in space or arming military satellites with protective countermeasures. The added debris problem is bad enough. An ASAT weapons race will have the effect of increasing the financial risk of any satellite program, and this will undoubtedly be felt most within the commercial market through decreased investor confidence and(or)higher insurance rates.”52Further, the fact that it will take months for a clear picture of the debris impact of the Chinese test to emerge should encourage all space-faring na-tions to invest more in capabilities to survey the space environment, and to consider how they can work together to improve debris monitoring. While the United States has the world’s most comprehensive space surveillancesystem, it is widely acknowledged that it has gaps and process problems that need to be addressed. Other nations have spot-check capabilities that could be used to provide additional data and augment U.S. capabilities – providedthat nations were willing to work out data-sharing protocols. In particular, the European Union should now move forward with its nascent plan to develop China and the United States should take heed, and seek to shape rules of the road that can help ensure mutual security in space for all. Theresa Hitchens a European space surveillance network and work with the United States to ensure compatibility. Finally, the United States and China need to recognize that they must makean effort to manage their emerging competition in military space in a manner that does not undercut their own national security, as well as the security of others. Breaking off nascent discussions about space cooperation in fa-vor of launching a kind of Cold War in space is bound to backfire on both Washington and Beijing in the long run. Instead, a frank and open dialogueabout each side’s national security concerns in space is called for – along withserious consideration of how a new code of conduct for behavior in spacemight be drafted to clearly demark the boundaries of acceptable and unac-ceptable behavior in space. A code of conduct for space is not a radical, oreven new, idea. Indeed, the administration of Ronald Reagan, while pursuingspace-based missile defenses and an ASAT program, also was consideringthe value of pursuing a code of conduct that might include measures suchas barring attacks on early warning satellites.53 Pursuit of a space code morerecently has been endorsed by a number of international media outlets, in-cluding The Economist, a libertarian-oriented British magazine, and U.S. tradejournal Aviation Week & Space Technology.54 China and the United States shouldtake heed, and seek to shape rules of the road that can help ensure mutual se-curity in space for all. Failure to act to restrain unfettered military competitionin space is bound to result in a “Wild West” environment that raises the risks not only to Chinese and U.S. uses of space, but to the peace and prosperity of the entire world.

# Chinese Cooperation Advantage

## Space Cooperation Key To Overall Cooperation

### Cooperation on space allows U.S. leverage in the relationship, decreases cost, and builds trust.

Logan 8 (Jefferey, Specialist in Energy Policy, Resources, Science, and Industry Division, CRS, “China’s Space Program: Options for U.S.-China Cooperation”, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22777.pdf//sb>)

Benefits of Cooperating with China. The potential benefits of expanded cooperation and dialogue with China include: ! Improved transparency. Regular meetings could help the two nations understand each others’ intentions more clearly. Currently, there is mutual uncertainty and mistrust over space goals, resulting in the need for worst-case planning. ! Offsetting the need for China’s unilateral development. Collaborating with China — instead of isolating it — may keep the country dependent on U.S. technology rather than forcing it to develop technologies alone. This can give the United States leverage in other areas of the relationship. ! Cost savings. China now has the economic standing to support joint space cooperation. Cost-sharing of joint projects could help NASA achieve its challenging work load in the near future. Some have argued that U.S. space commerce has suffered from the attempt to isolate China while doing little to keep sensitive technology out of China. Options for Possible Cooperation. ! Information and data sharing. Confidence building measures (CBMs) such as information exchange on debris management, environmental and meteorological conditions, and navigation, are widely considered an effective first step in building trust in a sensitive relationship. NASA has done some of this with CNSA in the past, but more is possible

### Space cooperation with China allows for Russian backup and spills over to overall Chinese relations.

Ressler 9 (Aaron R, Major, USAF, under the direction of Edwina S. Campbell, Ph.D, “ADVANCING SINO-U.S. SPACE COOPERATION”, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA539619//sb)

Increasing U.S. options with regard to manned spacelift could be a benefit in U.S. cooperation with China and is something the U.S. should consider for increased safety and logistics. History has shown that the U.S. was fortunate to have the cooperative programs it had with Russia when the shuttle fleet was grounded following the Columbia accident of 2003. If China were to become both a U.S. and ISS partner, the U.S. would eventually (assuming continued Shenzhou success) have another option besides Russia as a backup to deliver astronauts and supplies to the ISS. 88 **Global stability is another possible benefit stemming from U.S.-China space cooperation**. 89 “Both China and the USA are important countries in global politics, economics, AU/ACSC/RESSLER/AY09 16 and space activity.” 90 Maintaining a healthy relationship between these two countries has positive global impacts.

## China Space Cooperation Key To Exploration

### Chinese space cooperation is critical to future Mars exploration—cost sharing.

Svitak 5/4/11 (Amy, Space News, “China Viewed as Potential U.S. Partner in Future Mars Exploration”, http://www.spacenews.com/policy/110504-china-partner-mars-exploration.html//sb)

U.S. President Barack Obama views China as a potential partner for an eventual human mission to Mars that would be difficult for any single nation to undertake, a senior White House official told lawmakers. Testifying May 4 before the House Appropriations commerce, justice, science subcommittee, White House science adviser John Holdren said **near-term engagement with China in civil space will help lay the groundwork for any such future endeavor**. He prefaced his remarks with the assertion that human exploration of Mars is a long-term proposition and that any discussion of cooperating with Beijing on such an effort is speculative. “[What] the president has deemed worth discussing with the Chinese and others is that when the time comes for humans to visit Mars, it’s going to be an extremely expensive proposition and the question is whether it will really make sense — at the time that we’re ready to do that — to do it as one nation rather than to do it in concert,” Holdren said in response to a question from Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va.), a staunch China critic who chairs the powerful subcommittee that oversees NASA spending. Holdren, who said NASA could also benefit from cooperating with China on detection and tracking of orbital debris, stressed that any U.S. collaboration with Beijing in manned spaceflight would depend on future Sino-U.S. relations.

### Space cooperation with China will save costs for critical space exploration missions.

Ressler 9 (Aaron R, Major, USAF, under the direction of Edwina S. Campbell, Ph.D, “ADVANCING SINO-U.S. SPACE COOPERATION”, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA539619//sb)

Another benefit mentioned earlier is cost savings, which would be attractive for both nations. For most countries, budgets for space are insufficient or limited to the point where they depend on international space cooperation to meet their goals. 85 Exceptions to this in some degree are Russia, the U.S. and China, as all have achieved their own manned space programs. President Bush’s “Vision for Space Exploration” announcement in 2004 called for “redirecting NASA’s human exploration program from low Earth orbit to the Moon, Mars, and worlds beyond.” 86 The timeframe specified in this announcement for the return to the moon was between 2015-2020, carrying a price tag of $104 billion. 87 China too has ambitions for manned missions to moon, so spreading the cost could prove beneficial to both nations. Increasing U.S. options with regard to manned spacelift could be a benefit in U.S. cooperation with China and is something the U.S. should consider for increased safety and logistics. History has shown that the U.S. was fortunate to have the cooperative programs it had with Russia when the shuttle fleet was grounded following the Columbia accident of 2003. If China were to become both a U.S. and ISS partner, the U.S. would eventually (assuming continued Shenzhou success) have another option besides Russia as a backup to deliver astronauts and supplies to the ISS. 88

.

## Space Is Key

### Space is a *key issue*—mistrust of China in space makes in-depth cooperation impossible.

Washington Post 11 ("Mistrust stalls U.S.-China space cooperation", 1/22/11, [www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/21/AR2011012104480.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/21/AR2011012104480.html)) AK

The Obama administration views space as ripe territory for cooperation with China. Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates has called it one of four potential areas of "strategic dialogue," along with cybersecurity, missile defense and nuclear weapons. And President Obama and Chinese President Hu Jintao vowed after their White House summit last week to "deepen dialogue and exchanges" in the field. But as China ramps up its space initiatives, the diplomatic talk of cooperation has so far found little traction. The Chinese leadership has shown scant interest in opening up the most sensitive details of its program, much of which is controlled by the People's Liberation Army (PLA). At the same time, Chinese scientists and space officials say that Washington's wariness of China's intentions in space, as well as U.S. bans on some high-technology exports, makes cooperation problematic. For now, the U.S.-China relationship in space appears to mirror the one on Earth - a still-dominant but fading superpower facing a new and ambitious rival, with suspicion on both sides. "What you have are two major powers, both of whom use space for military, civilian and commercial purposes," said Dean Cheng, a researcher with the Washington-based Heritage Foundation and an expert on the Chinese military and space program. NASA's human spaceflight program has been in flux in recent years, fueling particular concern among some U.S. observers about the challenge posed by China's initiatives in that area. There is "a lot of very wary, careful, mutual watching," Cheng said. Song Xiaojun, a military expert and commentator on China's CCTV, said that substantial cooperation in the space field is impossible without mutual trust. Achieving that, he said, "depends on whether the U.S. can put away its pride and treat China as a partner to cooperate on equal terms. But I don't see that happening in the near future, since the U.S. is experiencing menopause while China is going through puberty."

### Banning all defense and technology contracts with China gut broader relations—the plan is key.

Xinhua 11 ("U.S. ban on China's bids for Pentagon contracts reflects 'cold war mentality'", 6/3/11, [www.china.org.cn/opinion/2011-06/03/content\_22713377.htm](http://www.china.org.cn/opinion/2011-06/03/content_22713377.htm)) AK

However, Chinese analysts said the ban shows America's growing unease over China's expanding national strength and concerns over the loss of its predominant status in the world. Gu Guoliang, director of the Arms Control and Non-proliferation Center of the Institute of American Studies under the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, said that the U.S. move to prohibit Chinese companies from receiving Pentagon contracts is the latest demonstration of its "cold war mentality" and is not beneficial to the development of bilateral relations. "The global financial crisis has made the U.S. too politically sensitive," said Zhang Yansheng, director of the Research Institute of Foreign Economic Relations of the National Development and Reform Commission, China's top economic planning agency. Zhang said the U.S. should separate critical deals from its numerous defense contracts and ban other countries' companies from receiving them, while allowing less important projects to be opened to bids from other nations. "Barring Chinese state-owned firms from providing defense-related goods to the U.S. amounts to protectionism," he said. In recent years, the U.S. has blocked several Chinese investments on national security grounds. In 2008, Huawei Technologies's 2.2-billion-U.S. dollar offer to network equipment manufacturer 3Com collapsed because of "national security risks." Its proposed acquisition of the technology company 3Leaf was thwarted in 2010 amid concerns over claims that 3Leaf's assets would be diverted. Also last year, the U.S. blocked Huawei's bid to supply telecommunications equipment to wireless carrier Sprint Nextel. All of these bids were complicated by so-called "national security considerations." The crackdown on Chinese investments is not in the best interests of China or of the U.S., Gu said. The U.S. promised to lift its ban on high-tech exports to China during the China-U.S. Strategic and Economic Dialogue held in May, and agreed to speed up the process of recognizing China's market economy status. However, the amendment was still welcomed by some representatives. Frank Wolf, a sponsor of the amendment, said Chinese companies, which have sought to compete for defense deals in the past, are "very much arms of Beijing and the PLA." "His claim is groundless and a frame-up," said Li Shuisheng, an analyst from the Chinese Academy of Military Science. "The U.S. should remove politics from economic issues. Otherwise, bilateral political mutual trust and cooperation will be undermined," Li noted, adding that the amendment signals America's reluctance to strengthening bilateral military exchanges.

### Issues in US-China relations are interconnected—tensions in space *spill over* to other areas.

Foust 6 (Jeff Foust is the editor and publisher of The Space Review, "US-China space cooperation: the Congressional view", 7/17/06, [www.thespacereview.com/article/661/1](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/661/1)) AK

Inevitably, any China-US space cooperation will get tangled up in bigger issues between the two countries, like economic policy and human rights, something that the congressmen said shouldn’t be avoided. “The fact is when you talk to the United States you have to talk democracy and human rights; it’s just part of who we are. We’re going to talk jobs, and we’re going to talk about the economy. We’re going to talk about military issues,” said Larsen. “They may be uncomfortable to talk about, but we’re going to have to address these issues if we’re going to even get to a point where we can talk about moving forward.” This gets back to the question of what each country has to gain by cooperating with one another in space exploration, an issue that arguably has not yet been convincingly answered in either country. Larsen, looking at the big picture, notes that China is working hard on a number of fronts to become more technologically advanced. “The space program is part of that economic development goal,” he said. “US policy needs to understand that, address it, and find ways to engage China on any number of issues because that country is thinking more strategically in terms of goal of competitiveness than I think we are.” How space fits into that big picture—or even if it does—has yet to be determined.

The US is deciding whether to engage or contain China – cooperation in space is key to foster an amicable relationship – the alternative is arms racing.

Hitchens and Chen 8 (Theresa, Center for Defense Information, World Security Institute, and David, CENTRA Technology, “Forging a Sino-US ‘‘grand bargain’’ in space” Space Policy, vol 24 2008)

Nearly 40 years later, China ﬁnds itself again dealing with a restive and nationalistic populace, struggling to maintain economic growth, and restrained by technological embargo. On the sidelines, the American superpower is again weighing the mandates of confrontation versus engagement, except this time the mandate lies in the heavens. In Washington’s space security community the debate has coalesced around the question of whether the future of Sino-US relations in space should more closely resemble arms control or an arms race—illustrated by the intercepts and destruction of satellites by both nations a year apart. Whatever direction Washington and Beijing take in their nascent military space competition is certain to be followed by other major and emerging space powers. Unfortunately, the existing trend in both nations is for promoting an offensive space strategy aimed primarily at one another. With a new US administration, whichever candidate enters ofﬁce will face the challenge of ﬁnding viable alternatives to the anti-satellite arms race that lies at the end of the present course, an outcome that would be in neither party’s interest. The incoming president might avoid such a security dilemma with China by utilizing the full range of US soft power, backed by realistic hard power consequences. This will require the incoming administration to expand its understanding of what constitutes a space issue, and to develop a deeper knowledge of what motivates China’s leadership. Using both persuasion and dissuasion to craft a kind of ‘‘grand bargain’’ with China regarding space, the next president may be able to steer Sino-US competition toward trade, economics and sport, rather than military oneupmanship. Accomplishing this would strengthen US national security and international stability in the Paciﬁc region.

Space cooperation spills over – it fosters an image of good relations and encourages more cooperation.

Zhou 8 (Yi Zhou, Center for Space Science and Applied Research, “Perspectives on Sino-US cooperation in civil space programs” Space Policy Vol 24 2008)

Beneﬁts for geopolitical issues and global stability. A country’s strategic interests may provide the primary motivation for engaging partner nations in cooperative space ventures. The International Space Station (ISS) is a good example of this. China and the USA are both important countries and a stable relationship between them is a key factor in global stability. Space could be a focal point for promoting this kind of stability. Several European countries and Russia have undertaken cooperative activities in space with China to satisfy their geopolitical demands and other interests. Chinese participation in US-led space exploration would send a strong signal to the world of good US–China relations [8], which would be good for US international relations and would provide geopolitical beneﬁts. The United States will be able to understand more about China’s space development and direction through actual cooperation. At the moment the USA observes China’s space policy and capabilities through statements in China’s white papers. But studying one paper every ﬁve years is too limited and does not provide sufﬁcient detail. Some American consulting and research institutions may simply rely on graduate students’ superﬁcial papers to try to gain insight into the direction of China’s space development. These are not full-scale or always entirely accurate, and may sometimes result in misunderstandings. If NASA signed an agreement with CNSA and began joint space projects, they would more easily and directly understand China’s space activities and directions. They may even be able to make some good suggestions for China’s space projects and policies. These win–win suggestions should be readily adopted by China’s policy makers to extend the two countries’ space and national beneﬁts.

Cooperation engages in trust building that spills over to the rest of the relationship – the alternative to space coop is China threat mongering in the US which destroys the potential for cooperation.

Zhou 8 (Yi Zhou, Center for Space Science and Applied Research, “Perspectives on Sino-US cooperation in civil space programs” Space Policy Vol 24 2008)

Management and cultural differences: Compared to the geopolitical and space policy problems, this is not a major obstacle. Because of cultural differences, Americans sometimes ﬁnd it difﬁcult to understand Chinese thinking. The same problem arose with cooperation between the USA and the USSR/Russia, and with Europe. There are many tools for resolving this. Detailed negotiating and trust building will be very helpful. In some cases the two countries should seek common points while putting aside differences for the sake of cooperation. Sino-US economic and political relations provide good examples of this. China does not yet have a completely modern management system, but management efﬁciency has improved in the past 20 years since China’s reform and opening. China’s management level will be enhanced in the near future. The above negative factors regarding Sino-US space cooperation appear difﬁcult to remove right now. Any international relationship should be based on understanding and trust. That is a key for the two countries to begin space cooperation. The Chinese have an old story: thousands of years ago, China often had disastrous ﬂoods. The government did not know how to solve the problem, and paid huge sums of money for people to build levees to stop the water. A man named Dayu was appointed to control it. He thought of a completely novel way to control the water. Instead of building levees, he dug canals and offshoot streams to divert some of the ﬂow. After that, the area no longer ﬂooded, and it became rich. This story is perhaps relevant to space relations between China and the USA. The USA continues to wall up the route to cooperation with China or places strict limitations on cooperative space activities. But, regardless, China will continue to develop its own space technology and other capabilities, and will undoubtedly achieve its goals in this ﬁeld. Lacking the channels to understand and talk to it, the USA will over-emphasize the ‘‘China threat’’ and pay an unnecessary price for it. Negative attitudes toward space cooperation will also affect other relations between the two countries, potentially including the realms of global space security, economics and politics.

Cooperation spills over.

Jinette 9 (Lieutenant Colonel James, US Air Force, “US CHINA POLICY: TIME FOR ROBUST ENGAGEMENT” 2009)

Space is another critical shared arena of potential interest-based engagement which must be addressed immediately because of its perceived strategic importance to both China and the US. As America sees its preeminence in space erode with ever increasing Chinese efforts to dominate space in its own way, China recognizes that space offers it an asymmetric advantage which may help it counter the US during any eventual conflict. Because China depends on access to resources from sea lanes, its primary geopolitical dilemma is maritime power. Quite simply, China views the US Navy as its primary threat. But China well knows how much America’s Navy utilizes space assets to perform its mission, and sees unique opportunities in space to counter the threat to its economic stability. 46 As George Friedman observes, “from the Chinese point of view, the denial of space to the United States would undermine American denial of the seas to China.” 47 For this reason, China has accelerated its efforts in space; it has destroyed a satellite, conducted a manned spacewalk, and has plans to send an unmanned rover to the surface of the Moon with manned mission to follow years later. 48 Reacting to these developments, experts within the Obama team have considered removing some barriers which exist between NASA and the US Military’s space program to find economies and accelerate NASA’s manned space flight timetable. 49 On both sides of the Pacific, space is viewed as a key strategic arena, and both China and he US are taking aggressive steps to gain and or maintain dominance of space to protect their individual national interests. Faced with these developments, avoidance of a cold-war style standoff in space may become impossible unless US policy makers immediately undertake assertive efforts to find an interest-based approach towards cooperative engagement with China in the space arena. If the United States misses the opportunity to cooperate with China in a growing international space competition, it could suffer an erosion of its leadership over the long term. 50 Although such collaboration would be difficult, it would certainly be possible. Future cooperation with China in space, particularly on manned missions, could reduce the costs of lunar and planetary missions, although care would need to be taken to reduce the potential for China to gain militarily from the exchange. 51 Most importantly, the benefits of an assertive effort to pair bilateral gains with China in space could enhance cooperative understanding, become a source of shared pride, and demonstrate to the world a positive partnership between two giants. Choosing an interest-based strategy of vigorous space engagement, US policy makers could shape decades of productive cooperation and dialogue with a developing space partner, and potentially defuse military flashpoints in the process.

## Cooperation Key To NASA Missions

### Space cooperation with China is critical to NASA missions—lunar and human flight.

Pollpeter 8 (Kevin, China Program Manager at Defense Group Inc.’s Center for Intelligence Research and Analysis. Previously, he was a researcher at the RAND Corporation. Mr. Pollpeter is widely published on China national security issues and focuses on the Chinese space program, RAND corporation, “BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE: CHINA’S PROGRESS IN SPACE TECHNOLOGY DURING THE TENTH 5-YEAR PLAN AND THE U.S. RESPONSE”, <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub852.pdf//sb>)

NASA is currently involved with scientific missions that could benefit from international cooperation with China. The most notable scientific missions are the two countries’ lunar programs. Both the United States and China are planning robotic missions to the moon involving surveying by orbiting satellites and landings on the moon surface. Another possible opportunity for cooperation could be planned missions to study black holes. The United States is teaming with other countries to launch in 2008 the Gamma-ray Large Area Telescope to study how black holes eject jets of gas at extreme speeds. China is also planning to launch in 2010 an X-ray telescope to research black holes. Similarly, the United States and Canada are cooperating on a new Mars lander to study the habitability of the red planet. Such exploration could be done in conjunction with the Russian-Chinese effort to send a Mars rover-type vehicle to Mars. Cooperation could also have benefits in the realm of human space flight by increasing safety in space. 105 The United States and China already have an agreement to assist stranded astronauts on the earth; this agreement could be extended to space. Having the option to use 50 Chinese spacecraft to rescue astronauts or cosmonauts manning the Space Shuttle, International Space Station, or the future Orion spacecraft seems to be a pragmatic goal. 106 In these situations, only the Russians could provide rescue, and even that could be threatened if political unrest in Kazakhstan were to prevent launches from Baikonur. Developing a code of conduct for space travel, similar to those governing travel on the high seas obligating assistance to crews in peril, would increase the safety of one of the most dangerous occupations. Such a code of conduct would require the Chinese to practice docking with the International Space Station and U.S. spacecraft to ensure safety and reliability. It would also require U.S. spacecraft to dock with the planned Chinese space station. A side benefit of a code of conduct to assist endangered astronauts in space may be an increase in the transparency of the Chinese space program. Cooperation would necessarily entail discussions over technology, policies, and intent that would otherwise be difficult to obtain.

## A2: China Space Coop Impossible—Tech Transfers

### Even with China’s military capabilities, cooperation in space is still possible

Pollpeter 8 (Kevin, China Program Manager at Defense Group Inc.’s Center for Intelligence Research and Analysis. Previously, he was a researcher at the RAND Corporation. Mr. Pollpeter is widely published on China national security issues and focuses on the Chinese space program, RAND corporation, “BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE: CHINA’S PROGRESS IN SPACE TECHNOLOGY DURING THE TENTH 5-YEAR PLAN AND THE U.S. RESPONSE”, <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub852.pdf//sb>)

While the inherent military nature of China’s space program and its lack of transparency preclude most forms of cooperation, the United States can cooperate with China in beneficial ways that do not transfer technology or expertise. These include coordinating scientific research and increasing the safety of human spaceflight by establishing a code of conduct to rescue imperiled astronauts. Consequently, the challenge for the United States is to manage the positive-sum and negative-sum consequences of China’s ascendant space program by improving its space industry, better enabling its military to counter space-based threats, and engaging in cooperative activities that improve science and increase the safety of human space flight.

## Earth Observation With China Is Key

### Earth Observation satellite systems are the best place to initiate cooperation

Brown 10 (Peter J, Asia Times Online, “China's space program poised to surge”, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China/LA06Ad02.html//sb)

The fact that the Obama administration is placing considerable emphasis on the need to initiate a formal program with China in the area of space science in particular is adding to the sense that longstanding barriers might be overcome. "This will give the US an opportunity to learn the mechanics of working with the Chinese and them with us, before progressing to areas like human spaceflight. This is a very smart move," said Johnson-Freese. "It keeps expectations low, and minimizes the impact of those who employ inflated fears of 'technology transfer' as a reason not to work with China. But, inflating risks for political reasons will always occur." Hagt sees the establishment of some form of joint relationship in space as inevitable. "China has always been receptive to the idea, and perhaps currently the US has increasingly warmed to the idea," said Hagt. "So perhaps Obama will be the [former US president Richard] Nixon of space relations and finally end the impasse." After the recent climate summit in Copenhagen, where China objected so strenuously to any form of satellite-based environmental monitoring, experts are being compelled to rethink China's degree of receptivity in this regard. "Scientific exchange, perhaps deep-space exploration are possibilities. **But sharing of environmental monitoring** data for disaster and humanitarian relief purposes is more pressing **and a logical place to begin,"** said Hagt. "Still, space remains dominated in both countries by a strategic perspective, and suspicion between the two dominates the view of one another in space. There has not been much change here of late. I suspect the two are moving inexorably toward some form of accommodation in space, something that will offer symbolic and political points, but not much beyond that." In other words, until overall relations improve and until specifically military-to-military relations warm considerably, there is little if any hope that relations in space specifically will improve.

## Space Cooperation Solves War

### Space cooperation is key to avoid tensions and an inevitable conflict.

David 6 (Leonard David, Senior Space Writer, Space.com "U.S.-China Space Ties Weighed", 4/20/06, [www.space.com/2318-china-space-ties-weighed.html](http://www.space.com/2318-china-space-ties-weighed.html)) AK

\* Joan Johnson-Freese is a Professor of National Security Affairs at the U.S. Naval War College

U.S.-China space relations are a classic security dilemma, where two states are drawn toward conflict though neither really wants that, Johnson-Freese explained. The reasons are fairly straightforward and strongly influenced by the technology involved, Johnson-Freese suggested. "Specifically, there is no distinction between space technology for civil or military use, since 95 percent of space technology is dual-use, and further--and really problematic--there is often little or no distinction between military technology that is offensive or defensive in nature," Johnson-Freese explained. "So, fear of being exploited drives countries to view actions of others in zero-sum terms." All this is further exacerbated when there is a predisposition by one state to view the other as an adversary ... or even a "potential" adversary. While strategically the U.S. talks about working with China, there are still other voices that talk about China as a potential near-peer competitor, due to Taiwan, the growth of their military, resource competition, and other issues of alarm, Johnson-Freese explained. All that said, she added: "It is very likely that the lens through which the U.S.--as the currently dominate space power--will view any expansion of Chinese space power will be a military one." Security dilemmas, Johnson-Freese remarked, are by their nature difficult to deal with, but not impossible. A recent visit of the bi-partisan Congressional delegation to China and talks about potential space cooperation in areas like astronaut rescue and environmental monitoring, was a good sign, she said. However, a change of policy to include cooperative space activities is still a White House call, Johnson-Freese said. A first step on this path, she counseled, is simply understanding the Chinese better and allowing them to know us better through dialogue.

# Critique Answers

## Security K Slayer

### Current American views towards China are *militaristic*—cooperative space activities break free of this security dilemma.

David 6 (Leonard, Senior Space Writer, “U.S.-China Space Ties Weighed”, http://www.space.com/2318-china-space-ties-weighed.html//sb)

**U.S.-China space relations are a classic security dilemma, where two states are drawn toward conflict though neither really wants that,** Johnson-Freese explained. The reasons are fairly straightforward and strongly influenced by the technology involved, Johnson-Freese suggested. "Specifically, there is no distinction between space technology for civil or military use, since 95 percent of space technology is dual-use, and further--and really problematic--there is often little or no distinction between military technology that is offensive or defensive in nature," Johnson-Freese explained. "So, fear of being exploited drives countries to view actions of others in zero-sum terms." All this is further exacerbated when there is a predisposition by one state to view the other as an adversary ... or even a "potential" adversary. While strategically the U.S. talks about working with China, there are still other voices that talk about China as a potential near-peer competitor, due to Taiwan, the growth of their military, resource competition, and other issues of alarm, Johnson-Freese explained. All that said, she added: "**It is very likely that the lens through which the U.S.--as the currently dominate space power--will view any expansion of Chinese space power will be a military one."** **Security dilemmas,** Johnson-Freese remarked, **are by their nature difficult to deal with, but not impossible**. A recent visit of the bi-partisan Congressional delegation to China and talks about potential space cooperation in areas like astronaut rescue and environmental monitoring, was a good sign, she said. However, a change of policy to include cooperative space activities is still a White House call, Johnson-Freese said. **A first step on this path**, she counseled, **is** simply **understanding the Chinese better and allowing them to know us better through dialogue**.

## A2: Threat Constructed

### China views deterrence differently than the U.S.—makes space conflict likely—this threat is not constructed.

NSF 9 (National Space Forum, Einsenhower Center for Space and Defense Studies, “Space and Defense”, Scholarly Journal of the United States Air Force Academy, Volume 3 No. 2, http://web.mac.com/rharrison5/Eisenhower\_Center\_for\_Space\_and\_Defense\_Studies/Journal\_Vol\_3\_No\_2\_files/Space\_and\_Defense\_3\_2.pdf//sb)

There is the potential of conflict involving China in space. This potential is supported by several key developments. One, the overall policy climate with regard to space and defense has not changed since the export controls issues and violations in relation to commercial space cooperation between the U.S. and China in the early 1990s. Two, there exist lexicon and language issues between the U.S. and China. For example, the concept of deterrence in China is different than it is in the U.S. Space deterrence for the Chinese refers to the idea of signaling an opponent of the likely actual use of space power and the attendant consequences in the hopes that this will persuade an opponent to undertake a costbenefit analysis, affect their psychology, and compel them to abandon their original aims. Within this context, there is an emphasis on space deterrent capability and the need to demonstrate that capability. This accounts for the laser blinding and ASAT tests conducted by China A third area of conflict lies with space surveillance. Surveillance is seen as hostile by China as there is no shared understanding of the importance of NTMV as there was with Russia. Chinese writings also suggest that space is not necessarily a global commons – suggesting an interest in extending sovereignty there – and that space is a possible contested battlefield, alongside land, sea, air, and cyberspace.

# Counterplan Answers

## A2: Negotiated Space Treaty CP

### International treaties fail for China.

Mastalir 8 (Anthony J, SCHOOL OF ADVANCED AIR AND SPACE STUDIES, MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA, “THE US RESPONSE TO CHINA’S ASAT: AN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY SPACE ALLIANCE FOR THE FUTURE”//sb)

The assertion that China designed its ASAT test to cajole the United States to the negotiating table, while plausible, is not well supported. In 2005. while Chinese diplomats harangued their foreign counterparts in meetings at the United Nations (UN), senior level PLA officers convened a task force on military space issues. In concluding that the weaponization of space is inevitable, they argued. "China must prepare itself and should not tie its hands through overly restrictive international legal treaties." In other words, while it is in China's interest to work diplomatically to the extent it can. "it should not limit its options if the United States proceeds with missile defense and space weapons.

## A2: Code of Conduct

### Code of Conduct can’t solve for ASAT – Chinese and Russians *cheat*.

Omri Ceren, PhD candidate studying Rhetoric USC, 11 [“Obama Administration Unilaterally Limiting U.S. Space Development, Ceding to China”, March 3, Commentary Magazine, http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2011/03/03/obama-administration-unilaterally-limiting-u-s-space-development-ceding-to-china/]

Secretary of Defense Robert Gates​ just finished explaining how the U.S. needs to suit up for future space wars, so naturally the Russians are pushing for us to forgo developing our space assets, promising they’ll follow along. Now the problem with striking arms deals with the Russians is that they cheat. They cheat a lot. Paula DeSutter, former assistant secretary of state for Verification, Compliance, and Implementation, has gone so far as to categorically state that they cheat so much that they’ve “violated every agreement we have ever had with them.” Arms agreements are win-wins for the Russians. Either they get a treaty, locking us down while keeping themselves free to proliferate, or they get to say that the U.S. is apparently uninterested in arms control — which they then use as a pretext to proliferate. The only difference is in how our arms-control community responds. In the latter case, they pen articles agreeing with the Kremlin and explaining that, were we only to establish global norms, the Russians would inexorably join in. In the former case, having promised that the Russians would follow, they spend their time explaining why Russia’s violations don’t really prove arms-control skeptics correct (so, you see, there is a difference between bad treaties and no treaties, just like arms-control experts always say!). Not that it matters, since the Russians aren’t the ones trying to get ahead of us in space militarization. The Chinese are, and they have no interest in even pretending to reciprocate limitations on space development. But as Eli Lake points out in a follow-up article to his initial backgrounder — which we covered here — the Obama administration is looking to impose those limitations anyway: The administration has signaled that it is preparing to accept the European Union’s draft Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities with minimal changes to the document. An administration interagency review concluded last month that the code of conduct … would not damage U.S. national interests in space or limit research and development into classified programs. … Rick Fisher, a senior fellow at the International Assessment and Strategy Center, said the strategy fails because it does not adequately account for the Chinese threat to U.S. satellites. “One gets the impression from this document that the Obama administration simply wants to ignore the Chinese threat in hopes it will just go away.”

### Only the U.S. will be pressured to follow norms—no check on China and Russia.

Baker Spring, F.M. Kirby Research Fellow in National Security Policy at The Heritage Foundation, 11 [“The Senate’s Letter to Prevent the Space Code of Conduct: Issues Remain”, Heritage Foundation, Feb 10, http://blog.heritage.org/2011/02/10/the-senates-letter-to-prevent-the-space-code-of-conduct-issues-remain/]

On February 2, 37 U.S. Senators signed a letter to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton seeking information about the Obama Administration’s reported plans to join the European Union Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities. The letter is a step in the right direction for the Senate, which needs to guard against international agreements that could undermine U.S. national security. Specifically, the letter reminds the Secretary that Section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal 2010 expresses concern about the possible negative consequences for U.S. security resulting from space arms control initiatives by keeping limits on space capabilities out of the U.S.–Russian New START arms control treaty. The letter poses a series of important questions about the possible effects of the Code of Conduct, as an arms control agreement. However, interested Senators need to focus on an additional procedural issue and two substantive issues that are not directly addressed in the letter. First, if the Obama Administration joins the Code of Conduct, as a non-treaty agreement it will violate the law. Section 2573 of Title 22 of the U.S. Code prohibits the Administration from taking any action, including entering into non-treaty agreements, that limit the armed forces of the U.S. in a militarily significant manner. Accordingly, any agreement that limits U.S. military operations—such as will reportedly be the case with the Code of Conduct—is an arms control agreement and is subject to the relevant provision in the law requiring that the agreement be drafted as a treaty and made subject to the Senate’s advice and consent process prior to ratification and entry into force. Second, there is a substantive question about how the negotiations on the code of conduct are structured. By focusing on limiting military operations, the Code of Conduct blurs the distinction between arms control agreements on the one hand and law of war agreements on the other. Arms control agreements are about limiting the quality or quantity of arms in peace time. Law of war treaties are about defining permitted and prohibited actions in the conduct of war. This is not a trifling distinction for military commanders. They can be put in jeopardy of prosecution for violating the laws of war. Accordingly, a future military commander who has to make a split-second decision in the conduct of a space operation that could generate space debris may face a war crime charge if the Code of Conduct, following its entry into force, is deemed to be a law of war agreement. Third, the European nations that are party to the Code of Conduct are allies and friends of the U.S. It is axiomatic that there is no need to negotiate arms limitation agreements with allies and friends. The chief threats to the U.S. regarding space are China and Russia. It is clear that in negotiating with the European Union, the Obama Administration will make the Europeans surrogates for China and Russia precisely because the Europeans are not seen as a threat to U.S. interests. As a practical matter, a code of conduct with European nations that limits U.S. military space operations will do so across the board. Neither China nor Russia will be bound by the Code of Conduct, but the U.S. will be by its obligations to the Europeans. In this context, the Code of Conduct will be a one-sided agreement that provides a direct advantage to China and Russia.

### Code of Conduct doesn’t solve anything and kills readiness – space capabilities key to our military.

Turner Brinton, Defense Business Reporter of Space News, 11 [“Sessions, Schulte Spar Over Proposed Space Accord”, May 13, Space News, http://www.spacenews.com/policy/110513-sessions-schulte-spar-accord.html]

WASHINGTON — The United States would not be prohibited from deploying any type of space system by adopting a code of conduct for space activities that has been proposed by the European Union (EU), the U.S. Defense Department’s top space policy official told lawmakers May 11. The Pentagon is still reviewing the code of conduct but believes it is well aligned with the new U.S. National Space Policy and would help ensure new spacefaring nations act responsibly in space, Gregory L. Schulte, U.S. deputy assistant secretary of defense for space policy, said during a hearing of the Senate Armed Services strategic forces subcommittee. Schulte was responding to the subcommittee’s ranking member, Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.), who raised concerns that the draft Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities proposed by the EU in October would prevent the United States from deploying certain systems or conducting certain activities in space related to national security. “We have the most capable [space] program in the world by far, I think,” Sessions said. “We’ve advanced further technologically in development and actual deployment of these systems than anyone else, and agreements [and] codes of conduct tend to … constrain our military. “Our military’s fundamentally configured so it depends on space capabilities. So I would be a bit nervous and am a bit nervous and want to examine carefully whether or not through some agreement we’ve constricted our ability to effectively defend our interests.” Schulte sought to distinguish the code of conduct, which he said is voluntary and nonbinding, from an arms control agreement. The National Space Policy issued by U.S. President Barack Obama in June 2010 states that the nation will consider arms control agreements that are equitable, verifiable and enhance the national security of the United States and its allies. “So far we haven’t found an arms control agreement that does that,” Schulte said. “There’s one on the table that has been proposed by Russia and China. We have declared it … fundamentally flawed because it’s not verifiable and it doesn’t capture many of the Chinese counterspace systems that worry us.” Schulte was referring to a ban on space weapons that has been proposed numerous times by Russia and China at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. The Obama administration — like the administration of George W. Bush before it — has rejected the proposal. Rather, the EU code of conduct is a series of so-called transparency and confidence- building measures by which the United States already generally abides, Schulte said. “Our goal isn’t to constrain ourselves — we think we act pretty responsibly in space — the goal is to try to constrain new and emerging space powers to ensure they adopt procedures that would, for example, mitigate the creation of debris and avoid mishaps and instability in space,” Schulte said. Sessions asked specifically about whether the code of conduct would prevent the United States from developing or deploying kinetic anti-satellite weapons or space-based missile interceptors. “It would not do that,” Schulte responded. “It doesn’t constrain capabilities, it constrains behaviors. “It would discourage any activities that would create a lot of debris.” Sessions pointed out that anti-satellite weapons that the United States may want to deploy would necessarily create debris, and thus the code of conduct would in effect prohibit their use. Schulte responded that “you can necessarily impact all satellites without creating debris,” an assertion that was met with skepticism by Sessions. Sessions also sought a guarantee that the Pentagon would consult with Congress in advance of agreeing to any multination agreement such as the EU code of conduct. Schulte responded that decision would be up to the State Department. “We have briefed the Armed Services Committee, Foreign Relations and Intelligence committee staffs on the code, and we intend continue to consult with Congress as we move forward,” a State Department official said May 13. “The Department of State, along with representatives from other appropriate departments and agencies, will continue our briefings to the relevant congressional committees on the code.”

Readiness is key to deterring war

Spencer 9/15/2000 (Jack - policy analyst for defense and national security at the Heritage Foundation, The Facts About Military Readiness, p. [http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2000/09/BG1394-The-Facts-About-Military-Readiness](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2000/09/BG1394-The-Facts-About-Military-Readiness%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

U.S. military readiness cannot be gauged by comparing America's armed forces with other nations' militaries. Instead, the capability of U.S. forces to support America's national security requirements should be the measure of U.S. military readiness. Such a standard is necessary because America may confront threats from many different nations at once. America's national security requirements dictate that the armed forces must be prepared to defeat groups of adversaries in a given war. America, as the sole remaining superpower, has many enemies. Because attacking America or its interests alone would surely end in defeat for a single nation, these enemies are likely to form alliances. Therefore, basing readiness on American military superiority over any single nation has little saliency. The evidence indicates that the U.S. armed forces are not ready to support America's national security requirements. Moreover, regarding the broader capability to defeat groups of enemies, military readiness has been declining. The National Security Strategy, the U.S. official statement of national security objectives,3 concludes that the United States "must have the capability to deter and, if deterrence fails, defeat large-scale, cross-border aggression in two distant theaters in overlapping time frames."4 According to some of the military's highest-ranking officials, however, the United States cannot achieve this goal. Commandant of the Marine Corps General James Jones, former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jay Johnson, and Air Force Chief of Staff General Michael Ryan have all expressed serious concerns about their respective services' ability to carry out a two major theater war strategy.5 Recently retired Generals Anthony Zinni of the U.S. Marine Corps and George Joulwan of the U.S. Army have even questioned America's ability to conduct one major theater war the size of the 1991 Gulf War.6 Military readiness is vital because declines in America's military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

### Code of Conduct can’t solve the aff – only deals with small countries with developing space programs

Dr Jeff Foust, aerospace analyst, journalist and publisher, editor and publisher of The Space Review, 11 [“Debating a code of conduct for space”, march 7, The space review, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1794/1]

“Even if the administration decides that it wants to sign the EU Code, I think it would be a significant mistake for it do so anytime soon,” DeSutter said. Instead, she said the US should wait until it’s clear that the document is in its final form, with no additional significant changes planned, before signing on. In the interim the administration could issue a statement supporting the Code while working to finalize the document’s text before signing. “Our leverage to make sure that this is an okay agreement ends the moment the United States puts its signature on it.” “I would say the US should never sign an EU Code of Conduct,” said Pace. Instead, the US should be consulting with a wide range of countries, including emerging space powers in Latin America, Asia, and Africa, to get their buy-in to the document. “For a code of conduct to really be useful, it needs to represent an emerging international consensus.” “We are looking with great interest at this code of conduct and working with the Europeans,” said Deputy Secretary of Defense Lynn. Even if the US was to sign on some version of the EU Code, both DeSutter and Pace believe it would desirable, if not necessary, to get the approval of the US Senate. DeSutter said it wasn’t clear if Senate “advise and consent” was strictly required for a document with less standing than a treaty, but that it would still be useful. “For me, it doesn’t matter if it’s required,” she said. “My general approach is, on something that is very significant, like this, for national security, go ahead and seek advise and consent. Go ahead and put it through those tests.” A benefit of getting Senate support for the document is that it would make it clear to other countries that the US backed it. Other countries “look to see if the two ends [of Pennsylvania Avenue] are in sync,” Pace said. “And where they are in sync, in things like remote sensing and GPS, they know there’s policy stability and they can rely on it.” It may take some time before there is a version of the Code of Conduct ready for the Senate to formally consider. “Basically, this document is more like an internal memo for us,” said László Deák, political counselor with the EU’s delegation in Washington, referring to the current draft of the EU Code. “This is not intended to be an international legal document. Debating the merits of the document is very important, but at the same time, we are just inviting you to talk about it. We are not inviting you to sign on to it.” In that respect, then, it’s not surprising that the new National Security Space Strategy doesn’t explicitly mention the EU Code, even though some of its provisions, such as “promoting responsible, peaceful, and safe use of space” are broadly consistent with the goals of the EU document. Late last year administration officials noted that consistency while suggesting that a US decision on supporting the EU Code would come in the near future (see “Securing space security”, The Space Review, December 20, 2010). At a forum on the new space strategy convened last month by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Deputy Secretary of Defense William J. Lynn III confirmed continued US interest in the EU Code, without explicitly endorsing the current draft. “We think it promotes transparency and responsible use of space. So we think it’s a positive. It has a very strong potential of being a positive step,” he said. He added that he expected a “final” draft of the code from the EU in the next 12–18 months. “We are looking with great interest at this code of conduct and working with the Europeans.” Given that the EU Code carries less standing than a treaty, and lacks any effective enforcement mechanisms, just what benefit does it provide? Pace suggested at the Marshall event that its strength is in dealing with new spacefaring nations rather than established powers like Europe, Russia, and China. “I am concerned about some of the new entrants, some of the new drivers on the road,” he said, who launch satellites with little means of tracking them to ensure they don’t pose a hazard to themselves or other spacecraft. “They don’t really necessarily know where these things are and what they’re doing and where’s they’re going.”

### Only the plan accesses peaceful uses military operations in space – Code of Conduct fails and encourages rogue states to break it

Leonard David, Columnist, 11 [“Do we need a code of conduct for space?”, Christian Science Monitor, Jan 10, http://www.csmonitor.com/Science/2011/0110/Do-we-need-a-code-of-conduct-for-space]

A "rules of the road" approach for outer space could a worthy effort, but only if it is championed by genuinely well-meaning advocates, space analysts said. Unfortunately, the vast bulk of these advocates are pushing for a Code of Conduct as a means of keeping the U.S. military out of space activities as a palatable substitute for an "anti-weaponization cause célèbre," said Everett Dolman, professor of military strategy at the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama. Among a host of issues that Dolman spotlights is that the code should state that weapons in space should not create or increase debris or in any manner impinge on the peaceful use of space. "Indeed, I can imagine a use for lasers or other directed-energy weapons that would clean up debris and make operations there safer than they currently are," Dolman told SPACE.com. What the proponents of current code proposals generally fail to recognize, Dolman said, is the positive contribution of military operations in the global commons during routine or peaceful operations. "The U.S. Navy and Air Force are the two most important critical enablers of both, ensuring adherence to properly enacted rules of conduct in the oceans and international air space … be it policing Somali pirates, clearing lanes of commerce of obstructions and impediments, or tracking criminal trafficking in and through these commons," Dolman said. Dolman said that, if the proponents of a space commons Code of Conduct are successful in essentially ending the ability of the U.S. to ensure access and protect space commerce and support in times of peace — and deny access to an adversary or rogue state in times of conflict — "the likelihood of an effective and enforceable Code of Conduct actually working is slim to none." For Dolman, there's a bottom line to a Code of Conduct for space. That is, if it does not embrace military support of the code, "it is likely to create a more dangerous and inefficient operating environment," Dolman concluded.

### Perm do both: Plan is only way to make CoC effective

Jeffery Logan, Specialist in Energy Policy Resources, Science, and Industry Division, 07 [“China’s Space Program: Options for U.S.-China Cooperation”, CRS, December 14, pdf]

Benefits of Cooperating with China. The potential benefits of expanded cooperation and dialogue with China include: Improved transparency. Regular meetings could help the two nations understand each others’ intentions more clearly. Currently, there is mutual uncertainty and mistrust over space goals, resulting in the need for worst-case planning. Regular dialogue would need high-level political support to succeed, but could help address national security concerns. Offsetting the need for China’s unilateral development. Collaborating with China — instead of isolating it — may keep the country dependent on U.S. technology rather than forcing it to develop technologies alone. This can give the United States leverage in other areas of the relationship. Cost savings. China now has the economic standing to support joint space cooperation. Cost-sharing of joint projects could help NASA achieve its challenging work load in the near future. Some have argued that U.S. space commerce has suffered from the attempt to isolate China while doing little to keep sensitive technology out of China. Options for Possible Cooperation. Information and data sharing. Confidence building measures (CBMs) such as information exchange on debris management, environmental and meteorological conditions, and navigation, are widely considered an effective first step in building trust in a sensitive relationship. NASA has done some of this with CNSA in the past, but more is possible. Space policy dialogue. Another area of potential exchange could begin with “strategic communication,”23 an attempt for each side to more accurately understand the other’s views, concerns, and intentions. Dialogue on “rules of the road,” a “code of conduct,” or even select military issues could be included.

### Transparency requires thorough cooperation—not just treaties.

Mastalir 8 (Anthony J, SCHOOL OF ADVANCED AIR AND SPACE STUDIES, MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA, “THE US RESPONSE TO CHINA’S ASAT: AN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY SPACE ALLIANCE FOR THE FUTURE”//sb)

Through information, as an instrument of national power, the United States must pursue a more nuanced understanding of the Chinese military space culture. Transparency cannot be achieved by sending an envoy to Beijing requesting access to China’s military budgets. **True transparency must be achieved through routine, sustained engagement.** Military-to-military engagement at the senior officer level must serve as a model for continued engagement throughout the chain of command. At the same time, the United States must increase the prominence of its commitment to strategic and tactical space intelligence. At the strategic level, the intelligence community must provide a workforce with the requisite skill sets to interpret the newly contested 12 environment. Tactically, commanders and collectors must optimize the flow of information and integrate processes and capabilities to ensure timely military response options are available.

## Transparency is Critical

### Transparency is critical to detract from ASAT development but cooperation efforts are critical.

Mastalir 8 (Anthony J, SCHOOL OF ADVANCED AIR AND SPACE STUDIES, MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA, “THE US RESPONSE TO CHINA’S ASAT: AN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY SPACE ALLIANCE FOR THE FUTURE”//sb)

China’s space weapon test revealed significant vertical disharmony within the information dimension as well. Space operators got a first glimpse at the dynamic environment in which future space conflicts may unfold. Only strong organizational relationships between the Air Force, Strategic Command, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the National Reconnaissance Office, along with mature internal and external processes, will ensure the timely flow of critical information during space warfare. The irony of the 11 January test is that it may have strengthened America’s space-warfighting posture by revealing the strengths and weaknesses of existing organizational relationships, machine-to-machine interfaces, and system processors. That China’s nefarious activities might be considered a net-loss, both diplomatically and militarily, serves as an important consideration for future US plans regarding space weaponry.US efforts to gain transparency regarding China’s intentions will benefit from horizontal integration across the other instruments of national power. Increased military engagement, at the operator, staff, and general officer levels is necessary to build the enduring relationships that can yield greater transparency over time. Diplomatically, the United States must remain engaged, exploring confidence-building measures to 1) further limit the creation of debris in space, 2) establish mechanisms of escalation control, and 3) proliferate well-established norms to new, space-faring nations. The **decision to suspend plans to develop space ventures with China, including joint exploration of the moon, in the aftermath of the ASAT test, only exacerbated the distrust between the two nations and moved the United States further from its goals toward transparency**.16 To this end, **it is critical that China’s participation in the space alliance is not repressively conditional**. Like new weapon systems, new alliances risk the paradoxical consequence of triggering a security dilemma. Restricting membership in the new “space club” will likely create disharmonies that could undermine its utility. The United States must remain engaged and earn the trust of other space-faring nations before it can expect to gain significant transparency.

# DA Answers

## A2: Soft Power/Leadership DA

### Cooperation doesn’t sacrifice U.S. leadership

Pollpeter 8 (Kevin, China Program Manager at Defense Group Inc.’s Center for Intelligence Research and Analysis. Previously, he was a researcher at the RAND Corporation. Mr. Pollpeter is widely published on China national security issues and focuses on the Chinese space program, RAND corporation, “BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE: CHINA’S PROGRESS IN SPACE TECHNOLOGY DURING THE TENTH 5-YEAR PLAN AND THE U.S. RESPONSE”, <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub852.pdf//sb>)

While relative decline for the United States in space technologies is unavoidable, it need not lead to a loss of leadership. The rise of a new space power requires two responses from the United States: domestic and international. Domestically, the reliance of the space 52 industry on government clients requires a broad-based response by both the U.S. Government and industry. Without a stable, adequately funded, organized, and staffed space industry, it will be difficult to master the technologies needed to meet the military, commercial, and political challenges of a Chinese space program. This will not only require better program management on the part of industry and government, but will also require both actors to think innovatively about how to attract and maintain a competent workforce. As China’s space power grows, space diplomacy will also have a role in meeting the challenges of China’s space program. This monograph argues that a program of limited cooperation with China that focuses on tangible benefits for both countries is best suited to meet those challenges. Space activities are multifaceted, and the U.S.-China space relationship need not be solely defined by military considerations. Nevertheless, the inherently military nature of the Chinese space program and its lack of transparency and tendency towards disinformation preclude most forms of cooperation. By focusing cooperation on the safety of space travel and improving science, however, NASA can contribute to its mission while meeting the challenges of a growing space power.

### Turn—Chinese space coop will effectively check China’s space militarization, prevent an arms race, and boost US Space leadership.

Johnson-Freese 4 (Joan, Chair of the National Security Decision Making Department at the United States Naval War College., Yale Center for the Study of Globalization, “Chinese Chess in Space”, http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/chinese-chess-space//sb)

The third alternative focuses on cooperation. The US has a long and successful tradition of international cooperation in space. Especially in the areas of space science and environmental monitoring, the US has historically viewed space as an opportunity to build bridges with countries while simultaneously co-opting them into working on areas of our choice, rather than areas not to our liking. **Cooperation is clearly the better option with China**, too. The US could start slowly, rewarding Beijing for reciprocity and transparency by granting China an increasingly larger role in a joint program of manned exploration and development. Specifically, a US proposal to multilaterally review and expand the future of manned space exploration - from the ISS to another lunar voyage or even a Mars mission - on an incremental, inclusive basis would allow Washington to revitalize American space leadership. **Crucially, it would also give the US a means to influence the future direction of the Chinese space program.** This option would counter the prevailing view of the US as a unilateralist hegemon and allow for a focus on infrastructure development that does not require unrealistic budget burdens. While there is the risk of international politics intruding into the process over time, that is counterbalanced by the vested interest such a program would give participants in system stability. To be sure, there would be resistance to working with China. Washington is replete with individuals adamantly objecting to cooperation with China on grounds from human rights to its status as the largest remaining communist country. Isolating China, however, is increasingly a stance counterproductive to US interests, as a world without China is simply not possible. US and Chinese interests frequently overlap, on North Korea and the Global War on Terror, for example, not to mention economics. The United States has a window of opportunity to step in and use space cooperation to its advantage. Because space is considered so critical to the futures of both the US and China, any activity by one has been considered zero-sum by the other, triggering an action-reaction cycle and threatening escalation into an arms race of technology and countermeasure development. **That direction can be changed**. A inclusive vision will give the US an opportunity to assume the mantle of leadership on a mission that could inspire the world and shift Chinese activities into areas more compatible with US interests. On the geostrategic Wei Qi board, **cooperation is the best "next move" for the US.**

### Technical barriers prove US-China space cooperation is key to US space leadership

Baker and Pollpeter 4 (John C. Baker and Kevin Pollpeter are researchers with the RAND Corporation, "A Future for U.S.-China Space Cooperation?", 12/13/04, [www.rand.org/commentary/2004/12/13/SN.html](http://www.rand.org/commentary/2004/12/13/SN.html)) AK

During the post-Apollo era, U.S. space exploration programs have been burdened by unrealistic expectations and inadequate funding that sometimes led to canceled or scaled-back programs. Transporting humans into space for extended periods remains expensive, risky and technically demanding. Cooperation with China on human space flight provides opportunities for collaboration that could reduce the cost of major missions such as returning to the moon and long-duration flights to Mars. The Chinese would expect to benefit from cooperation with the more advanced U.S. space program, gaining increased prestige and taking a great leap forward by getting access to U.S. knowledge, experience and technology. However, because most space technologies and skills are dual-use in nature — meaning they also can be used to develop space systems for military use — America wants to be sure China doesn't use space cooperation as a tool to strengthen its military might. China has strong military reasons to become a major space power and many Chinese writings on space argue that China should develop space weapons in addition to militarizing space. These technologies could be used against U.S. forces if an armed conflict arises over Taiwan. China could go a long way in addressing American concerns by increasing the transparency of its space program to reduce uncertainties over its intentions in space. A big step in this direction would be for China to remove its human space flight program from military control and establish a civil organization with direct responsibility for human space flight that would be better suited to working with NASA. The U.S. experience with the Soviet Union, and later with Russia, offer some insights on the promise and challenges of international space cooperation. Nearly three decades ago the two countries proceeded with the Apollo-Soyuz docking mission despite Cold War tensions. In recent years, the United States has benefited from its cooperation with Russia in preparing for, constructing and operating the international space station. Cooperation has not been easy, but it has been essential for making progress in human space activities, particularly since the Columbia shuttle accident. While the United States may have apprehensions about partnering with China in space, other nations do not. China is becoming an attractive partner for Europe and Russia, which are less inhibited in selling dual-use technologies to China. European nations are already partnering with China on significant space ventures, including the Galileo satellite navigation project. Cooperation with Russia or Europe could provide China with much of the same technologies that the U.S. hopes to prevent China from obtaining. Chinese cooperation on major space efforts without U.S. involvement could threaten to erode the U.S. leadership position as the world's top space power. As with all areas of international relations, the United States must decide the extent it wants to proceed on its own path or collaborate with other countries to achieve common goals. The financial and technical challenges of returning to the moon make a compelling argument for U.S.-Chinese cooperation. But if Washington sees benefits in exploring the opportunities for collaboration with Beijing, it must also identify ways of minimizing potential risks to U.S. national security. Beginning a dialogue that emphasizes greater transparency in U.S.-China civil space activities would be a good start.

## A2: Tech Transfer DA

### Space coop with China ensures we keep an eye on their transactions.

Ressler 9 (Aaron R, Major, USAF, under the direction of Edwina S. Campbell, Ph.D, “ADVANCING SINO-U.S. SPACE COOPERATION”, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA539619//sb)

While possibly deterring Chinese ASAT operations, this deterrence would be a secondary effect (or benefit for that matter) of successful U.S.-China space cooperation. In order for this cooperation to take place, the benefits will have to outweigh the challenges (some which will likely be viewed as risks) for both nations. The first benefit of cooperation would be improved transparency. 82 Secrecy of China’s space program has led to a suspicious outlook by many critics of this program. **Space cooperation between the two countries could be based on regular meetings which “could help the two nations understand each other’s intentions more clearly**.” 83 With China as a partner, the U.S. would have better visibility and communication with the CNSA concerning China’s space activities, and the same would hold true for China. Reviewing China’s White Paper on its space policy and trying to make sense of its counterspace capabilities after the fact is the wrong approach. “If NASA signed an agreement with CNSA and began joint space projects, they would more easily and directly understand China’s space activities and directions.” 84

### Isolation doesn’t work—China will just get tech from Europe and other countries—US safeguarding of tech is USELESS, and only kills the Aerospace Industry and EU cooperation with US

Johnson-Freese 6 (Joan, Chair of the National Security Decision Making Department at the United States Naval War College., Yale Center for the Study of Globalization, “Strategic Communication with China: What message about space?”, http://www.wsichina.org/attach/cs2\_4.pdf//sb)

But **trying to isolate China**, however ideologically satisfying that might be, **has proven impossible**. While it may be convenient to assume that Chinese space technology has been acquired through ‘beg, borrow and steal’ methods, more accurately, the Chinese have developed space capabilities by a combination of ‘borrowing’ generic designs from others, cooperative programs, indigenously developing technology, and buying what they needed and could afford from that which others would sell them. In a globalized world with a globalized economy, actions on the part of the United States to try to isolate China (or any other actor) into activity or nonactivity by denying it something else can only be effective if the United States has full control of whatever it is denying – and there are few remaining areas where the United States holds a monopoly. In fact, space is one of the most globalized aspects of world commerce. Even with the U.S. military’s ‘dominance’ of military space power, it is highly unlikely that the United States will ever be able to monopolize the space arena. For example, among the countries that China has worked on space efforts are: European countries collectively and individually; Canada; Russia; and Brazil, on the China-Brazil Earth Resource Satellite, touted as the largest space venture by two developing countries and potentially indicative of China posturing toward ‘leading’ other developing countries into space. China’s 2005 satellite sale to Nigeria, and its work with the Asia-Pacific Space Cooperation Organization – an international governmental organization headquartered in Beijing that aims to promote regional multilateral cooperation in space technology and its application – provide further evidence of China’s desire to cooperate on space activities. So, although U.S. engagement with China on space issues has been strictly limited, China has nevertheless advanced technologically and formed significant strategic space partnerships. Since the supposedly bipartisan, but in fact politically charged, Cox Commission report in 1999 dealing with espionage at national laboratories and technology theft in conjunction with commercial satellite launches in China, the United States has restricted the transfer of satellite technology to China – to the detriment of the U.S. aerospace industry on which the U.S military is increasingly reliant. 15 Ostensibly, the restrictions were intended to hinder development of Chinese military space capabilities. The breadth and development of Chinese military space capabilities, however, suggest that the U.S. policy has been ineffective. U.S. restrictions apply to commercial communications satellites and their launch, largely unrelated to the sensor technology China particularly needs for development of its military space program. Additionally, restrictive U.S. policy has pushed European companies toward cooperation with China and away from working with the United States. It might be argued that the Chinese would be even further ahead if the United States had not closed the door on the Chinese market. The fact of the matter is, however, that **although the technology China has acquired elsewhere may not be as good as that available from the United States, it’s good enough.** And if U.S. restrictions slowed Chinese advancement, it has also perhaps made China more determined to develop its own capabilities rather than being dependent on others. U.S. technology restrictions certainly prodded European satellite companies into moving from being niche component providers to U.S. prime contractors to becoming prime contractors themselves.

### Aerospace industry collapse spills over to kill Air Power.

Thompson President – American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics 2009 David, , “The Aerospace Workforce”, Federal News Service, 12-10, Lexis

Aerospace systems are of considerable importance to U.S. national security, economic prosperity, technological vitality, and global leadership. Aeronautical and space systems protect our citizens, armed forces, and allies abroad. They connect the farthest corners of the world with safe and efficient air transportation and satellite communications, and they monitor the Earth, explore the solar system, and study the wider universe. The U.S. aerospace sector also contributes in major ways to America's economic output and high- technology employment. Aerospace research and development and manufacturing companies generated approximately $240 billion in sales in 2008, or nearly 1.75 percent of our country's gross national product. They currently employ about 650,000 people throughout our country. U.S. government agencies and departments engaged in aerospace research and operations add another 125,000 employees to the sector's workforce, bringing the total to over 775,000 people. Included in this number are more than 200,000 engineers and scientists -- one of the largest concentrations of technical brainpower on Earth. However, the U.S. aerospace workforce is now facing the most serious demographic challenge in his 100-year history. Simply put, today, many more older, experienced professionals are retiring from or otherwise leaving our industrial and governmental aerospace workforce than early career professionals are entering it. This imbalance is expected to become even more severe over the next five years as the final members of the Apollo-era generation of engineers and scientists complete 40- or 45-year careers and transition to well-deserved retirements. In fact, around 50 percent of the current aerospace workforce will be eligible for retirement within just the next five years. Meanwhile, the supply of younger aerospace engineers and scientists entering the industry is woefully insufficient to replace the mounting wave of retirements and other departures that we see in the near future. In part, this is the result of broader technical career trends as engineering and science graduates from our country's universities continue a multi-decade decline, even as the demand for their knowledge and skills in aerospace and other industries keeps increasing. Today, only about 15 percent of U.S. students earn their first college degree in engineering or science, well behind the 40 or 50 percent levels seen in many European and Asian countries. Due to the dual-use nature of aerospace technology and the limited supply of visas available to highly-qualified non-U.S. citizens, our industry's ability to hire the best and brightest graduates from overseas is also severely constrained. As a result, unless effective action is taken to reverse current trends, the U.S. aerospace sector is expected to experience a dramatic decrease in its technical workforce over the next decade. Your second question concerns the implications of a cutback in human spaceflight programs. AIAA's view on this is as follows. While U.S. human spaceflight programs directly employ somewhat less than 10 percent of our country's aerospace workers, its influence on attracting and motivating tomorrow's aerospace professionals is much greater than its immediate employment contribution. For nearly 50 years the excitement and challenge of human spaceflight have been tremendously important factors in the decisions of generations of young people to prepare for and to pursue careers in the aerospace sector. This remains true today, as indicated by hundreds of testimonies AIAA members have recorded over the past two years, a few of which I'll show in brief video interviews at the end of my statement. Further evidence of the catalytic role of human space missions is found in a recent study conducted earlier this year by MIT which found that 40 percent of current aerospace engineering undergraduates cited human space programs as the main reason they chose this field of study. Therefore, I think it can be predicted with high confidence that a major cutback in U.S. human space programs would be substantially detrimental to the future of the aerospace workforce. Such a cutback would put even greater stress on an already weakened strategic sector of our domestic high-technology workforce. Your final question centers on other issues that should be considered as decisions are made on the funding and direction for NASA, particularly in the human spaceflight area. In conclusion, AIAA offers the following suggestions in this regard. Beyond the previously noted critical influence on the future supply of aerospace professionals, administration and congressional leaders should also consider the collateral damage to the space industrial base if human space programs were substantially curtailed. Due to low annual production rates and highly-specialized product requirements, the domestic supply chain for space systems is relatively fragile. Many second- and third-tier suppliers in particular operate at marginal volumes today, so even a small reduction in their business could force some critical suppliers to exit this sector. Human space programs represent around 20 percent of the $47 billion in total U.S. space and missile systems sales from 2008. Accordingly, a major cutback in human space spending could have large and highly adverse ripple effects throughout commercial, defense, and scientific space programs as well, potentially triggering a series of disruptive changes in the common industrial supply base that our entire space sector relies on.

### US airpower is key to deter WMD conflict.

Tellis Senior Political Scientist – RAND 1998 Ashley, “Sources of Conflict in the 21st Century”, http://www.rand. org/publications/MR/MR897/MR897.chap3.pdf

This subsection attempts to synthesize some of the key operational implications distilled from the analyses relating to the rise of Asia and the potential for conflict in each of its constituent regions. The first key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that American air and space power will continue to remain critical for conventional and unconventional deterrence in Asia. This argument is justified by the fact that several subregions of the continent still harbor the potential for full-scale conventional war. This potential is most conspicuous on the Korean peninsula and, to a lesser degree, in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea. In some of these areas, such as Korea and the Persian Gulf, the United States has clear treaty obligations and, therefore, has preplanned the use of air power should contingencies arise. U.S. Air Force assets could also be called upon for operations in some of these other areas. In almost all these cases, U.S. air power would be at the forefront of an American politico-military response because (a) of the vast distances on the Asian continent; (b) the diverse range of operational platforms available to the U.S. Air Force, a capability unmatched by any other country or service; (c) the possible unavailability of naval assets in close proximity, particularly in the context of surprise contingencies; and (d) the heavy payload that can be carried by U.S. Air Force platforms. These platforms can exploit speed, reach, and high operating tempos to sustain continual operations until the political objectives are secured. The entire range of warfighting capability—fighters, bombers, electronic warfare (EW), suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD), combat support platforms such as AWACS and J-STARS, and tankers—are relevant in the Asia-Pacific region, because many of the regional contingencies will involve armed operations against large, fairly modern, conventional forces, most of which are built around large land armies, as is the case in Korea, China-Taiwan, India-Pakistan, and the Persian Gulf. In addition to conventional combat, the demands of unconventional deterrence will increasingly confront the U.S. Air Force in Asia. The Korean peninsula, China, and the Indian subcontinent are already arenas of WMD proliferation. While emergent nuclear capabilities continue to receive the most public attention, chemical and biological warfare threats will progressively become future problems. The delivery systems in the region are increasing in range and diversity. China already targets the continental United States with ballistic missiles. North Korea can threaten northeast Asia with existing Scud-class theater ballistic missiles. India will acquire the capability to produce ICBM-class delivery vehicles, and both China and India will acquire long-range cruise missiles during the time frames examined in this report.

### Plan solves the impact best- cooperation allows U.S. insight into Chinese tech and allows more *leverage*.

Johnson-Freese 6 (Joan, Chair of the National Security Decision Making Department at the United States Naval War College., Yale Center for the Study of Globalization, “Strategic Communication with China: What message about space?”, http://www.wsichina.org/attach/cs2\_4.pdf//sb)

 “I think that if we use the right public information we can make sure that we have the Chinese understanding really what we’re about. We can also try to get a better understanding of what they’re about. They’re non-transparent, I think, would be a kind word. And we have sometimes tried to get really reciprocal visits. We have not achieved reciprocal visits. But I think we can nonetheless get some good in- sights by going there and talking to their people and getting as much as we can. As Kramer states, engaging with the Chinese allows information to be gathered from a still largely-closed society. Further, creating a Chinese dependence on U.S. technology offers the United States more leverage than pushing Beijing closer to others. Including China in cooperative manned programs also utilizes Chinese funds that might otherwise go into military programs, makes the tortoise and the hare space race plaguing the United States vanish, and emphasizes U.S. leadership in a positive manner.

## A2: Iran Export DA

### Iran exports are no longer an issue- Iran couldn’t pay China and moved towards Russia

Kan 9 (Shirley A., Specialist in Asian Security Affairs, 10/23/09, “China and Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Missiles: Policy Issues”, http://www.nti.org/e\_research/source\_docs/us/congress/congressional\_research\_service/24.pdf//sb)

However, there were other controversial PRC nuclear deals with Iran pointing to an Iranian nuclear weapon program. PRC technicians built a calutron, or electromagnetic isotope separation system, for enriching uranium at the Karaj nuclear research facility, according to “confidential reports” submitted to Iranian President Rafsanjani by his senior aides, according to the London Sunday Telegraph (as reported in the September 25, 1995, Washington Times). As reported, the PRC system was similar to the one used in Iraq’s secret uranium enrichment program. Secretary of Defense William Perry confirmed in an April 1996 report that “the Iranians have purchased an electromagnetic isotope separation unit from China.” 17 The China Nuclear Energy Industry Corporation had plans to sell Iran a facility to convert uranium ore into uranium hexafluoride gas, which could be enriched to weapons-grade material, according to the Washington Post (April 17, 1995; June 20, 1996). Intelligence reports said that the deal proceeded with PRC nuclear experts going to Iran to build the new uranium conversion plant near Isfahan, reported the Washington Times (April 17, 1996). However, PRC civilian nuclear officials later indicated to the IAEA and U.S. officials that China would not transfer the uranium conversion facility, ostensibly because of Iran’s inability to pay, reported the Washington Post (November 6, 1996). However, China’s role as nuclear supplier appeared to have been affected by Iran’s turn to Russia to build a nuclear reactor at Bushehr. Also, China seemed to respond to concerns of Israel (after Russia, the secondary supplier to China’s military).

## Any China Cooperation Links To Politics

### Any China cooperation proposal is a political football in Congress.

Paal 10 (Douglas H, Douglas H. Paal is vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He previously served as vice chairman of JPMorgan Chase International (2006–2008), and as unofficial U.S. representative to Taiwan as director of the American Institute in Taiwan (2002–2006). He was on the National Security Council staffs of Presidents Reagan and George H. W. Bush between 1986 and 1993 as director of Asian Affairs, and then as senior director and special assistant to the President., “Frenemies? U.S.-China Relations”, http://www.carnegie.ru/publications/?fa=41907//sb)

We’re in a period where people are opening newspapers every day and reading new superlatives about China, whether it’s the world’s fastest super computer, the second largest economy, the first to launch this, preparing for a moon mission—which will get a lot of people going. But the positive luster that had accompanied the Olympics in 2008 has been covered over with a bit of a tarnish because of China’s pushiness on a number of issues—whether its China’s maritime claims around its periphery, its position on human rights, or its pushback on the Western model of economic development where China is saying it doesn’t need the Western model and we’re going to go our own way. And, obviously, there is also the currency issue, which is a big political issue for Washington. It’s probably not the right place for Washington to focus, but it is an important part of **our trading and economic relationship** and **has** **become the political football in U.S.-China relations**. China, as far as I can tell, is responding to U.S. pressure to revalue its currency. But it will do so slowly, because when it does, China can lose jobs on production lines and they want to keep their jobs too. But more importantly, China is rebalancing investment and consumption in its domestic economy. We’re looking for evidence of that, and while the Chinese are talking a pretty good game right now, the question is whether they will follow through.

### The CP links to ptix - any economic or climate issue saps Obama’s political capital.

IAS 9 (Institute of American Studies and Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, “China-US Relations, Tending Towards Maturity”, Huang Ping, Tao Wenzhao, Wang Rongjun, Yuan Zheng, Zhao Xingshu\* Huang Ping, Tao Wenzhao, Wang Rongjun, Yuan Zheng, Zhao Xingshu\*, http://ias.cass.cn/en/show\_project\_ls.asp?id=1012//sb)

Although the leaders of both China and the US have emphasized the need to cooperate in dealing with the current world financial crisis, **it will take a lot of political wisdom and will for** the **Obama** administration to fend off the temptation of and pressure for economic nationalism and to ensure the stability of the bilateral economic relationship. Climate policy, yes, but ... President Obama has explicitly stated that he intends to pursue a new role for the United States in global climate efforts. The recent global financial crisis and economic downturn would seem to have made it more difficult for the US to take any action on the climate issue. Instead, it has triggered further contributions from the US, linking efforts to address climate change to the national recovery strategy. This was clearly seen in the recent American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), which comprehensively integrates goals of developing clean energy technologies, with enhancing energy efficiency, infrastructure construction, and employment promotion. The Obama administration’s adjustment of US climate policy has a fundamental strategic goal, namely to reverse its deteriorating international image and restore American leadership globally by playing a leading role in global climate efforts. But with the excuse of slowing down climate change, it will be more likely to make full use of its power as a trade giant and various trade measures to set up either traditional tariff barriers or more obstacles to export-oriented developing countries. Out of 12 market-based climate change bills introduced in the 110th Congress, almost half called for some border adjustment, either a tax to be applied to fossil fuel imports or a requirement for energy-intensive imports to gain permits corresponding to the carbon emissions embodied in them. In addition, environmental protection laws and regulations or other technological standards might also be applied as a sort of trade barrier targeting carbon-intensive goods from developing countries. Such explicit or implicit trade barriers will definitely weaken the competitiveness in the international market of commodities from developing countries. Thus, either they take part in green house gas (GHG) emission reduction or they will have to suffer losses from tariff and non-tariff barriers applied by developed counterparts. The stance of the United States with regard to China’s role in climate mitigation has not changed. In fact, both Democrats and Republicans have always agreed on getting China to make commitments to controlling its GHG emissions. Secretary of State Hilary Clinton has clearly stated that China is expected to collaborate with the United States and play a bigger role to mitigate global warming, overlooking its status as a developing country. Only the way in which the United States tries to achieve its goals may change, if there is any change at all. The Obama administration has begun to make tactical adjustments, trying to weaken and blur the difference between ‘responsibility’ and ‘capability’ between developed and developing countries. Dealing with this issue will also take political wisdom and cooperation

### China cooperation has generally been a political football.

IAS 9 (Institute of American Studies and Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, “China-US Relations, Tending Towards Maturity”, Huang Ping, Tao Wenzhao, Wang Rongjun, Yuan Zheng, Zhao Xingshu\* Huang Ping, Tao Wenzhao, Wang Rongjun, Yuan Zheng, Zhao Xingshu\*, http://ias.cass.cn/en/show\_project\_ls.asp?id=1012//sb)

China and the United States have developed more than sixty different platforms of dialogue and cooperation, including the Strategic Economic Dialogue (SED). Both sides have gone well beyond a simple concern for short-term hotspots in economic and trade issues, and are comprehensively considering the long-term development of the economic and trade relationship. China and the US have reached extensive consensus on many economic issues, and produced a number of visible and tangible achievements, such as the Ten-year Plan of Energy and Environmental Cooperation. In the past, **China-US relations often served as a ‘political football’ in partisan struggles** during the US presidential campaign, and bilateral relations sometimes suffered from changes in the US administration. Only after a period of adaptation to each other can China-US relations come back onto the normal track. This was the case during the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush administrations. Because more than 60 mechanisms (including the Senior Dialogue and the SED) have been established to manage the bilateral relations thus far, the relationship is now less subject to the influence of this ‘cyclicity’.