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# \*\*Uniqueness\*\*

## Uniqueness General – Cooperation Now

### Cooperative space strategy cornerstone of Obama’s NSP

Fukushima – National Institute for Defense Studies, Ministry of Defense, Japan – 10

Yasuhito, An Asian perspective on the new US space policy: The emphasis on international cooperation and its relevance to Asia, December

This paper aims to analyze the new US National Space Policy (NSP) and examine its relevance to Asia. President Barack Obama announced the new NSP in June 2010, after inviting wide speculation on how the new administration wanted to define its NSP. The NSP is a comprehensive document which stipulates principles, goals and inter-sectoral and sectoral guidelines for space activities; it can be analyzed from various perspectives. Above all, the NSP’s great emphasis on the importance of international cooperation has significant meaning for Asia. The USA has a long history of international space cooperation, especially in the field of civil space, and past administrations also pledged the promotion of international cooperation in their NSPs. Even the former Bush administration’s NSP, which was sometimes regarded as a product of unilateralism, included “cooperation with other nations” as one of the principles of US space programs and activities.1 Obama’s NSP is, however, rooted in cooperation and incorporates the concept throughout, instead of just mentioning it in one section. The introduction states that “the United States hereby renews its pledge of cooperation,” whereas for the principles of space activities, the USA will adhere to its principles “in this spirit of cooperation” and proposes that other nations follow suit. Also, as one of the goals of its national space programs, emphasis is placed on the expansion of international cooperation. In the inter-sectoral guidelines there is a special section on international cooperation, which stipulates the need to strengthen US space leadership, identify areas for potential international cooperation, and develop transparency and confidence-building measures (TCBMs). According to a senior administration official, who played a central role in shaping the document, enhancing international cooperation and collaboration in space is positioned as a “key cornerstone” in Obama’s NSP.2

## Uniqueness General – Cooperation Inevitable 1/2

### Global cooperation over space is inevitable

Moltz – Prof @ Naval Postgraduate School – 10

James, China, the United States, and Prospects for Asian Space Cooperation, December, Journal of Contemporary China (2011), 20(68), January, 69–87

But the increasing crowding of space itself, the need for improved control over debris, and expanded efforts to avoid collisions are providing top-down pressures on all countries—regardless of region—to cooperate more closely in ‘managing’ space. While relatively autonomous policies were possible in the early decades of space activity, recent events (such as the 2007 Chinese ASAT test and the 2009 Iridium–Cosmos collision) and the resultant increase in orbital debris have forced countries and their militaries to begin thinking more collectively about space. The recent willingness of the US Air Force to expand its international data sharing on conjunction analysis regarding space debris and satellite collisions marks a significant evolution in American thinking. China’s restraint from conducting additional kinetic ASAT tests since 2007 may be part of the same learning curve. These factors suggest that increasing cooperation and transparency may yet emerge in the coming years, since states recognize that the alternative is the possible loss of safe access to low-Earth orbital space.
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### Space cooperation inevitable

Fukushima – National Institute for Defense Studies, Ministry of Defense, Japan – 10

Yasuhito, An Asian perspective on the new US space policy: The emphasis on international cooperation and its relevance to Asia, December

The Obama NSP clearly recognizes that international cooperation is vital in addressing these challenges. It states that not only the USA but other countries also share the responsibility and “calls on all nations to work together to adopt approaches for responsible activity in space.” Also, the section on international cooperation in the inter-sectoral guidelines specifies that the USA will pursue bilateral and multilateral TCBMs “to encourage responsible actions in, and the peaceful use of, space.” Now it is increasingly important for the USA to go beyond its traditional cooperation with allies and partners, and to expand cooperation with virtually all nations. Thus, the Obama administration sees international cooperation as a “key cornerstone” of its NSP not only to take advantage of growing opportunities, but also to maintain both US primacy in space, and the safety and security of space. For the USA now, international cooperation has been evolving from “nice to do” to “must do” status.

## Uniqueness General – No Asia Cooperation

### (\_\_) Lack of inter-Asian cooperation on space now

Moltz – Prof @ Naval Postgraduate School – 10

James, China, the United States, and Prospects for Asian Space Cooperation, December, Journal of Contemporary China (2011), 20(68), January, 69–87

But meaningful integration of space programs within Asia—and particularly between the major players involved—has not occurred. This highly nationalistic trend among Asia’s leading space powers is more consistent with the jealous tendencies of US–Soviet space competition, yet is sharply at odds with the close collaboration and deep industrial interpenetration seen today among advanced European countries in space. Notably, bilateral dynamics in the US–Soviet space competition eventually fostered mutual learning, restraint, and the formation of a number of arms control agreements affecting space, thus providing surprising stability in an otherwise competitive space relationship.3 Such developments—partly because of the absence of multilateral security talks in regard to space—have not emerged among Asia’s space powers. Today, the United States and the Russian Federation—which arguably still possess the world’s two most advanced space programs—now cooperate extensively in the area of space technology. Russian engines power American Atlas rockets for launching US military payloads, and Russian Soyuz spacecraft routinely deliver American astronauts to the International Space Station (ISS). No cooperation to this degree exists among Asia’s major space-faring nations. Ironically, current trends in Asia go against predictions by earlier theorists of political economy who argued that space might be an area uniquely suited to cooperation among advanced countries. As Victor Basiuk argued in 1977: ‘Advanced technologies, because of their huge costs, large scale, and, in the case of nuclear weapons, immense destructive power, provide an important impetus to international cooperation’.4 While we do see such trends today in Europe and in the US–Russian civil space context, this predicted integration has not taken place to date among the most developed space powers in Asia. It is therefore worth investigating why this is the case, why it matters, and what (if anything) the United States might be able to do about it.

## Uniqueness General – No Asia Coop

### (\_\_) Asian space programs primarily competitive in orientation

Moltz – Prof @ Naval Postgraduate School – 10

James, China, the United States, and Prospects for Asian Space Cooperation, December, Journal of Contemporary China (2011), 20(68), January, 69–87

The multipolar nature of space competition in Asia and the lack of regional security organizations have also played a role in impeding cooperation. There are no bodies currently—outside of the United Nations—that bring together all of the key players for space security discussions. Moreover, relatively hostile political relationships still exist between many capitals in Asia (New Delhi–Beijing, New Delhi–Islamabad, Seoul–Tokyo, Pyongyang–Seoul, and Tokyo–Beijing), which have lowered receptivity to possible cooperation in space. Finally, the relative availability of alternative partners (Russia, Ukraine, France, the United Kingdom, and, for some, the United States) with more advanced capabilities has made regional cooperation within Asia seem unnecessary and even undesirable, if a rival might thereby gain a comparative advantage. Another critical factor has been the relatively closed nature of major Asian economies, which have traditionally resisted cooperative projects with potential rivals, particularly in an area of technology deemed critical to the nation’s economic infrastructure. Mercantilist strategies have therefore prevailed in space, with countries seeking independent capabilities, shunning offers of cooperation, and blocking access to their domestic markets. For these reasons, market forces, interdependence, and practices based on national divisions of labor in different aspects of space activity have not been able to emerge, as they have in other areas of the Asian marketplace. Instead, countries have behaved in a highly ‘un-economic’ manner in regard to space, pouring large investments into redundant national programs for reasons of security and prestige, which often have not made sense from a purely economic perspective. Timing has also played a role in inhibiting space cooperation, as countries have sought to avoid revealing weaknesses and potentially being ‘locked into’ inferior positions relative to rivals. Asian countries have been relative late-comers in space, and the high cost of space programs, the sophistication of the technologies involved, and the need for specially trained personnel and an expensive infrastructure have increased the role of nationalism and limited the perceived value of cooperation with neighbors, particularly those with the potential to harm them. Indeed, it is hard to underestimate how much the interplay between developmental and security needs has affected (and limited) space cooperation within Asia.

# \*\*Cooperation Good\*\*

## Cooperation Good – Conflict Escalation 1/2

### Space cooperation prevents conflict escalation

Col Rendleman and Faulconer – 10

James and J. Walter, Improving international space cooperation: Considerations for the USA, Space Policy 26 (2010) 143-151

4. Global engagement For thousands of years, tribes, then cities, states, and nations, have formed cooperative agreements, partnerships and relationships with others to promote matters of mutual interest, such as security and self defense, commerce, and humanitarian assistance. Cooperation presents an opportunity to develop dependencies among nations that may obviate conflict**.** Such sharing also gives a nation an opportunity to gain what may be a rare insight into what a competitor or adversary knows about space technologies and how they can be employed. This understanding can help reduce the need to prepare for doomsday scenarios where one imagines or projects the technologies that an adversary could develop, regardless of the technical merit or reality. Today, international cooperation extends to a whole host of scientific endeavors, reflecting the best spirit and intentions of the Outer Space Treaty, whose preamble calls for space to be used for “peaceful purposes.”19 This has been the hope since the beginnings of the space era. In 1955, before the very first successful space launches, cooperation was declared a centerpiece of US foreign policy strategy when the White House announced: The President has approved plans by this country for going ahead with launching of small unmanned earth-circling satellites as part of the United States participation in the International Geophysical .This program will for the first time in history enable scientists throughout the world to make sustained observations in the regions beyond the earth’s atmosphere.20 The full realization of cooperation’s promise occurred nearly four decades later with the end of the ColdWar. Space and Earth science research and space exploration were no longer constrained by an overarching competition between two superpowers. Capitalizing on opportunities and leveraging the expertise of other nations, those seeking to jumpstart or advance their scientific initiatives rushed into the new multi-polar world creating a surplus of international space alliances and partnerships.21 The USA is continuing this trend by reaching out more constructively to large nuclear global powers like India and China, in the hope that such engagement shapes their future space and engineering activities in positive directions. Of course, a nation’s decision to engage in space cooperation is very much a political decision. Nations pick and choose if, when, where, and how they expend their national treasure. They choose the manner and extent of their foreign investments for reasons both known and unknownto other nations. The only constant is that a decision to “join in” cooperation is, in every case, a calculated political decision by each potential member of a commercial partnership or alliance, or inter- or quasi-governmental structure. Private commercial investments are nearly always controlled at a national level, usually by the force of domestic (municipal) law, regulation, or licensing.22 National decision-making influences commercial and government entity governing structures. Accordingly, some space capabilities will be funded, developed, and offered if and only if they are strictly operated and controlled under specific national direction and within strategic national guidelines. Thus, military space cooperation tends to occur only when overarching national security military and intelligence community interests are satisfied. In contrast, international civil cooperation generally wins internal national political support for a different set of reasons: that is, if the cooperation generates national diplomatic prestige, provides for political sustainability, or enables workforce stability.23 Cooperation provides opportunities for a nation to demonstrate its international leadership and technical prowess. For example, India has used its recent launches to host payloads from a number of international partners. South Korea is leveraging Russian launch technology to attempt space launches of satellites in support of its dream to become a “top ten” space fairing nation. Russia and China launch satellites for much of the global space faring community. Ultimately, support for cooperation and collaboration increases when the perceived utility and diplomatic prestige derived from cooperation increases. A demonstration of the utility of diplomatic prestige gained from space cooperative endeavors can be seen in the Apolloe Soyuz space link-up (1975) and Space Shuttlee Mir docking (1995) missions, though not for reasons contained in the public pronouncements by the participants Their true and complex diplomatic utility was not made apparent for many years. As described by James Oberg: Only with the Soviet program at a standstill did Moscow agree to fly a joint orbital mission. Its fallback position was that if it couldn’t be Number One in space, it could at least pose as the equal partner of the new Number One, the United States. It was better than letting on how far behind its space program had fallen.24 4.2. Political sustainability International cooperation has the wonderful, if sometimes wasteful, capacity to increase the political will to sustain and fund space programs and associated budgets. As noted, cooperation provides a spacefaring state the basis to draw on additional resources. It also enables a program to weather attempts to rein it in even when faced with contentious and devastating cost-growth or budget realities (which most space programs invariably face). Thus, within the USA, a program often wins some sanctuary from cancellation threats or significant budget reductions to the extent that Congress and the administration feel compelled not to break, stretch, or withdraw from international agreements. Political good will is generated by funding these programs. As an example of the power of this good will, one only need look at the politics surrounding NASA’s manned program. Money has been allocated to the program even when the perceived justification has collapsed. Now the new internationalist US president doesn’t care much for the NASA manned mission, and has even less understanding of its science mission. But critics concede that the president sees value in the votes its engineering and contractor community represents, key especially in vote rich states such as Florida which serve as a nexus for manned US launches.

<continues>
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<continued>

Similarly, some reason the political and diplomatic integration of Russia into the ISS program may well have saved it and Space Shuttle programs from cancellation.25 Once cooperation has commenced, canceling a program becomes inconsistent with political sustainability as long as the utility cost associated with the loss of diplomatic benefits and the negative effects on reputation of terminating an international agreement is larger in magnitude than the utility cost that must be paid to maintain the system. In general, any unilateral action sends a signal that the actor is an unpredictable and therefore an unreliable and possibly disrespectful partner. This tends to sabotage the possibility of future cooperation.26 If significant cooperation has never previously occurred, its commencement is thought to be a defining event, delivering specific political rewards and diplomatic utility. This is why the recent pronouncements on space cooperation made by President Obama and Chinese officials during his November 2009 visits are being watched with special interest. The same attention is being paid to the discussions held with the Indian government and its space community. During the height of the Cold War the USA and the USS Rwere able to find common ground to press on with the Apolloe Soyuz mission despite longstanding security concerns. Perhaps similar common ground can be found with the Chinese. Lamentably, space cooperation between the two countries has thus far been only marginal given the strict security controls that needed to be imposed. The Chinese, like many others, are exploiting space technologies to improve missile systems that can deliver weapons of mass destruction and they are stealing every technology they can get their hands on. China has now tested a kinetic-kill anti-satellite weapon system.

## Cooperation Good – Space Leadership (1/2)

### International cooperation is critical to U.S. space leadership

Newton 11 (Elizabeth K., Professor of Physics – University of Alabama, Huntsville and Michael D. Griffin, Former Administrator – NASA and Eminent Scholar and Professor – University of Alabama, Huntsville, “United States Space Policy and International Partnership”, Space Policy, 27(1), February, p. 8)

 1. Will the USA be more secure? As stated in the White House’s space policy and Lynn’s preview of the National Security Space Strategy, US security hinges on fostering a cooperative, predictable space environment where countries can operate in a stable, sustainable way. Planned debris tracking standards, considerations of international ‘rules of the road’, and shared data sets for collision avoidance and debris mitigation are measures that undoubtedly will contribute to the security of space as a shared venue for national activities. The stated desire to develop a Combined Space Operations Center for coalition operations could expand access to information, awareness, and services. Leveraging partner capabilities, integrating them into system architectures, and increasing the interoperability of systems are important planned steps as well. These new strategies do not diminish the USA’s current strengths in the national security space realm and quite likely stand to capitalize on international interest in multilateral solutions. Further information will doubtless be forthcoming in the Space Posture Review. One might also mention, under the theme of security, the USA’s ability to access its strategic assets in space. On the civil space side, the ‘gap’ in the government’s ability to access the International Space Station (ISS), a >$70 billion asset, after the Shuttle’s retirement is certainly detrimental from a strategic point of view. The USA will be dependent on the goodwill of international partners until an as-yet-unrealized commercial capability becomes available. However even then, the policy’s lack of support for having an independent federal capability is worrying, for it is tantamount to relying on FedEx without the back-up of a US postal service; or on commercial airlines without alternative military air transport; or on commercial weather forecasting without a National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA).

Cooperation Good – Space Leadership (2/2)

### Space leadership is rapidly eroding --- risks collapsing warfighting and overall hegemony

Young 8 (A. Thomas, Chair – Institute for Defense Analyses Research Group, et al., “Leadership, Management, and Organization for National Security Space”, July, [http://www.armyspace.army.mil/ASJ/Images/National\_Security\_S pace\_Study\_Final\_Sept\_16.pdf](http://www.armyspace.army.mil/ASJ/Images/National_Security_Space_Study_Final_Sept_16.pdf))

Today, U.S. leadership in space provides a vital national advantage across the scientific, commercial, and national security realms. In particular, space is of critical importance to our national intelligence and warfighting capabilities. The panel members nevertheless are unanimous in our conviction that, without significant improvements in the leadership and management of NSS programs, U.S. space preeminence will erode to the extent that space ceases to provide a competitive national security advantage. Space technology is rapidly proliferating across the globe, and many of our most important capabilities and successes were developed and fielded with a government technical workforce and a management structure that no longer exist. [CONTINUES] U.S. Leadership in Space is a Vital National AdvantageSpace capabilities underpin U.S. economic, scientific, and military leadership. The space enterprise is embedded in the fabric of our nation’s economy, providing technological leadership and sustainment of the industrial base. To cite but one example, the Global Positioning System (GPS) is the world standard for precision navigation and timing. Global awareness provided from space provides the ability to effectively plan for and respond to such critical national security requirements as intelligence on the military capabilities of potential adversaries, intelligence on Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) program proliferation, homeland security, and missile warning and defense. Military strategy, operations, and tactics are predicated upon the availability of space capabilities. The military use of space-based capabilities is becoming increasingly sophisticated, and their use in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom is pervasive.

### Global nuclear war

Arbatov 7 (Alexei, Member – Russian Academy of Sciences and Editor – Russia in Global Affairs, “Is a New Cold War Imminent?”, Russia in Global Affairs, 5(3), July / September, <http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1130.html>)

However, the low probability of a new Cold War and the collapse of American unipolarity (as a political doctrine, if not in reality) cannot be a cause for complacency. Multipolarity, existing objectively at various levels and interdependently, holds many difficulties and threats. For example, if the Russia-NATO confrontation persists, it can do much damage to both parties and international security. Or, alternatively, if Kosovo secedes from Serbia, this may provoke similar processes in Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Transdniestria, and involve Russia in armed conflicts with Georgia and Moldova, two countries that are supported by NATO. Another flash point involves Ukraine. In the event of Kiev’s sudden admission into the North Atlantic Alliance (recently sanctioned by the U.S. Congress), such a move may divide Ukraine and provoke mass disorders there, thus making it difficult for Russia and the West to refrain from interfering. Meanwhile, U.S. plans to build a missile defense system in Central and Eastern Europe may cause Russia to withdraw from the INF Treaty and resume programs for producing intermediate-range missiles. Washington may respond by deploying similar missiles in Europe, which would dramatically increase the vulnerability of Russia’s strategic forces and their control and warning systems. This could make the stage for nuclear confrontation even tenser. Other “centers of power” would immediately derive benefit from the growing Russia-West standoff, using it in their own interests. China would receive an opportunity to occupy even more advantageous positions in its economic and political relations with Russia, the U.S. and Japan, and would consolidate its influence in Central and South Asia and the Persian Gulf region. India, Pakistan, member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and some exalted regimes in Latin America would hardly miss their chance, either. A multipolar world that is not moving toward nuclear disarmament is a world of an expanding Nuclear Club. While Russia and the West continue to argue with each other, states that are capable of developing nuclear weapons of their own will jump at the opportunity. The probability of nuclear weapons being used in a regional conflict will increase significantly. International Islamic extremism and terrorism will increase dramatically; this threat represents the reverse side of globalization. The situation in Afghanistan, Central Asia, the Middle East, and North and East Africa will further destabilize. The wave of militant separatism, trans-border crime and terrorism will also infiltrate Western Europe, Russia, the U.S., and other countries. The surviving disarmament treaties (the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty, and the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty) will collapse. In a worst-case scenario, there is the chance that an adventuresome regime will initiate a missile launch against territories or space satellites of one or several great powers with a view to triggering an exchange of nuclear strikes between them. Another high probability is the threat of a terrorist act with the use of a nuclear device in one or several major capitals of the world.

## Cooperation Good – Space Leadership Ext

### UQ/IL – Cooperation key to maintaining space primacy and commercial competitiveness

Fukushima – National Institute for Defense Studies, Ministry of Defense, Japan – 10

Yasuhito, An Asian perspective on the new US space policy: The emphasis on international cooperation and its relevance to Asia, December

Leveraging the increasing opportunities to work together with other countries is not the only aim of the NSP. The changing environment of space activities has pressured the USA into undertaking a more intensified policy of international cooperation. One reason the USA needs cooperation is closely connected to the fear of weakening US primacy in space. Along with the USSR (Russia), the USA has been the leading space power and, especially after the Soviet breakup, it has enjoyed a huge advantage in this field. In 2009 it is estimated that the US government space budget ($64.42 billion) accounted for a quarter of the global space economy ($261.61 billion) and about three-quarters of aggregate world government space budgets ($86.17 billion).5 The current US primacy in space is, however, no longer secure and is challenged by budget pressures and growing competition. The push for more budget cuts is especially apparent in the national security space sector. In June 2010 Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates announced his intention to save over $100 billion of the defense budget over a five-year period starting from fiscal year 2012 and this is where the space-related budget is expected to suffer.6 In addition, the proliferation of space activities has intensified heated competition in space. For example, the US Global Positioning System (GPS) has been widely used as the “gold standard” for space-based positioning, navigation and timing (PNT) and generated huge positive economic effects.7 Nevertheless, other countries have recently been preparing their own global navigation satellite systems (GNSS). Russia is rebuilding its Glonass constellation, which aims to be fully operational by the end of 2010.8 European countries are funding the Galileo system, which is scheduled to be partially operational in 2014.9 China is also constructing the Beidou/Compass system, which is intended to achieve global coverage by around 2020.10 These systems are designed to be dual-use and are sure to have great impact on related markets. Under these circumstances the USA is attempting to maintain its primacy in space by utilizing increased international cooperation and collaboration. Michael Nacht, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Affairs, stated in May 2010 that expectations of flat to declining military space budgets in the next couple of years is the motivation for enhancing international cooperation.11Furthermore, while space is becoming a more competitive domain where other nations are increasing their presence, the USA seems to be aiming to shape the direction of global space activities in its favor and to expand its market opportunities through cooperation with other nations. In the case of space-based PNT, the new NSP stipulates that, for the purpose of maintaining US leadership in this area, the country shall “engage with foreign GNSS providers to encourage compatibility and interoperability, promote transparency in civil service provision, and enable market access for US industry.”

## Cooperation Good – Competitiveness (1/2)

### (\_\_) Cooperation key to competitiveness

Col Rendleman and Faulconer – 10

James and J. Walter, Improving international space cooperation: Considerations for the USA, Space Policy 26 (2010) 143-151

Scientific research, engineering, and innovation are at the heart of the success of the US economy and world leadership. Some argue that the Apollo Moon landing program laid the technical foundations and infrastructure underpinning advances by the USA for the next 40 years. It inspired hundreds of thousands to become engineers and live on the innovation frontlines. Its communications, weather, precision navigation and timing, surveillance and warning satellites systems became part of a revolution that connected the USA and the rest of the world. Even when interest in manned space programs waned, the engineers it generated drove a technological innovation engine that sparked many years of advances a cross many other arenas. These successes rightly led to the 20th century being called the American Century. Over the past 50 years, 50-85% of the growth in America’s gross national product (GNP) can be attributed to its science and engineering strengths. As noted in a recent report published by the National Academy of Sciences, “scientists and engineers tend, through innovation, to create new jobs not only for themselves but also for workers throughout the economy.”27 They generate economic growth for others unlike many other elements of society, and this success is highly leveraged; only 4% of the US workforce is involved in engineering and science.28 Many other nations are eager to duplicate this success. They are working diligently to grow indigenous capabilities to exploit orbital space for their own commercial or military gain, or for national pride. This has all had the effect of generating considerable interest from other nations and commercial entities to seek space cooperation with USA and other potential partners. Initially such space cooperation might be perceived as inimical to the US aerospace industrial base: cooperation could cause decreased domestic employment because foreign nations could then build space systems and components that might otherwise have been constructed in the USA. India and China are producing huge numbers of science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) qualified manpower in their rush to become first-tier superpowers. This is problematic for the USA, as cooperation with such states could allow them eventually to better engineer and then undercut US markets. While international space programs often survive the US Congress’ budget knife for the prestige and political reasons described above, spending on cooperative programs also generates large numbers of jobs. In turn, these can serve as key sources of revenue in local communities or among leading edge and educated engineering constituencies. Those who are employed in such programs benefit from the government largess that arises out of the cooperative space effort’s prestige and political support. On the other hand, the prospective loss of aerospace community jobs and revenue can easily pose a serious political problem for both the administration and Congress. Given this, political appointee and elected official perceptions of ongoing international cooperation programs is a matter of great importance.

Cooperation Good – Competitiveness (2/2)

### Economic decline causes global war

Royal 10 (Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction – U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises”, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflictat systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

## Cooperation Good – Accidents/ Debris

### (\_\_) Cooperation key to reducing risk of accidents and space debris

Fukushima – National Institute for Defense Studies, Ministry of Defense, Japan – 10

Yasuhito, An Asian perspective on the new US space policy: The emphasis on international cooperation and its relevance to Asia, December

Another reason the USA is in need of cooperation has something to do with the fact that outer space is a highly interdependent domain. Just as the maritime domain has several major routes for transportation called the sea lines of communication, highways for satellites (e.g. LEO and GEO) exist in outer space.12 These are shared by all spacefaring nations and non-state actors, and are becoming increasingly congested as satellites and space debris increase. In this context, the NSP states “the now-ubiquitous and interconnected nature of space capabilities and the world’s growing dependence on them mean that irresponsible acts in space can have damaging consequences for all of us.” The NSP also names the increase in the amount of space debris and the risks of satellite collisions as examples of challenges for the sustainable use of space. These descriptions are no doubt influenced by the results of two incidents China’s 2007 ASAT test and the 2009 US-Russia satellite collision which have occurred since the last NSP was released in 2006. These two incidents have made the challenges to the sustainability of the space environment more imminent, multiplying the number of catalogued LEO space objects by more than 60%.13

## Cooperation Good – Asia

### US-Asian space cooperation now – reducing risks of accidents and miscalculation

Fukushima – National Institute for Defense Studies, Ministry of Defense, Japan – 10

Yasuhito, An Asian perspective on the new US space policy: The emphasis on international cooperation and its relevance to Asia, December

The Obama administration is thus indicating its willingness to cooperate and collaborate with Asian countries in space. In the case of Japan, which is a key US ally in Asia and has already collaborated with it on civil space projects like the ISS program, the USA is now interested in pursuing national security space cooperation. In November 2009 President Obama and the then Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama agreed to open discussions on this issue as part of the process to deepen the USeJapan alliance.14 The USA is also advancing ties in space with another regional ally, Australia. The two countries are having consultations to develop a Civil Space Cooperation Framework Agreement. In addition, military space collaborations between these two countries are progressing. In April 2010 the two forces signed a Memorandum of Understanding to share UHF-frequency satellite capacity.15 In November 2010, the foreign and defense ministers of both countries endorsed a Joint Statement on Space Security and signed a Space Situational Awareness Partnership Statement of Principles.16 Under this partnership, both countries are to consider the possibility of establishing and operating sensors in Australia to complement US space surveillance capabilities in this region. Besides collaboration with its allies in the region, the Obama administration is seeking to expand cooperation with an emerging space power, India. In July 2009 both governments signed a Technology Safeguards Agreement which was intended to “permit the launch of civil or non-commercial satellites containing US components on Indian space launch vehicles.”17 In November 2009 President Obama and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh agreed to “collaborate in the application of their space technology and related scientific capabilities in outer space and for development purposes.”18 Furthermore, in November 2010, both leaders agreed to expand their collaboration in space.19 According to the agreement, the two countries are to hold a Joint Civil Space Working Group in 2011 to develop closer ties in space cooperation and Earth observation. The leaders also agreed to cooperate on the safety and security of space activities. Of special note is the US decision to remove all Indian civil space and defense-related entities from the Department of Commerce “Entity List”, which involves export license requirements. Accordingly, subordinates of the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) and the Defense Research and Development Organization (DRDO) were removed from the list in order to “facilitate trade and cooperation in civil space and defense.”20 In his remarks to the Indian parliament President Obama stated that the removal, along with the ongoing reform of the export control system, “will ensure that Indian companies seeking high-tech trade and technologies from America are treated the same as our very closest allies and partners.”21 The Obama administration is now trying to promote space cooperation with China. In November 2009 President Obama and China’s President, Hu Jintao, agreed to seek further discussions on space science cooperation and to initiate a dialogue on human spaceflight and space exploration.22 The two leaders also welcomed reciprocal visits of the NASA administrator and his Chinese counterpart in 2010. This led to an official visit to China by NASA Administrator Charles Bolden in October 2010.23 Bolden met his counterpart, Chen Qiufa, head of the China National Space Administration and visited Chinese human spaceflight related facilities.24 In addition, both presidents shared the view that the two countries have common interests in the promotion of the peaceful use of space and agreed to take steps to enhance security in space. In pursuance of this the administration is seeking bilateral TCBMs with China. In October 2010 Defense Secretary Gates mentioned the need for strategic dialogue, which includes the issue of space security, in a meeting with China’s Defense Minister Liang Guanglie.25 Thus, in Asia the USA is deepening collaboration with its allies (Japan and Australia), expanding cooperation with India, and developing bilateral TCBMs with China. These are welcome indications for Asia. As Asian countries increasingly depend on the use of space, it is becoming indispensable for them, too, to cooperate. By collaborating with the leading spacefaring nation, Asian countries will be able to access cutting-edge technology and know-how, at least to some extent. Asian countries will also benefit from the bilateral TCBMs between the USA and China, contributing to the overall safety and security of outer space.

## Cooperation Good – China

### (\_\_) Lack of cooperation between the US and China risks instability, increased debris, and attacks on space assets

Moltz – Prof @ Naval Postgraduate School – 10

James, China, the United States, and Prospects for Asian Space Cooperation, December, Journal of Contemporary China (2011), 20(68), January, 69–87

An important missing link is the virtual absence of space cooperation between China and the United States since the late 1990s. Indeed, conservative military analysts on both sides of the Pacific are now calling for increased offensive and defensive military space capabilities, fomenting tensions and risking a US–Chinese space arms race. Such trends could lead to instability, increased orbital space debris, and possibly interference with or even attacks on each other’s space assets. In the commercial realm, meanwhile, strict US export controls have caused China to shift its space outreach to new partners. British Surrey Satellites, Ltd, has built and sold small spacecraft to China. French Alcatel has begun to manufacture advanced satellites (without US components) specifically for sale to the growing Chinese market. For these and other reasons, US–Chinese space cooperation is now being actively reassessed in Washington by the Obama administration, but can these efforts succeed?

## Cooperation Good – Space Program – Cost Reduction

### Cooperation key to cost reduction

Col Rendleman and Faulconer – 10

James and J. Walter, Improving international space cooperation: Considerations for the USA, Space Policy 26 (2010) 143-151

Cost motivations are the most important rationale given for cooperation. Space endeavors are very expensive and are thus highly debated, especially the returns on investment. International cooperation offers the potential to reduce the burden of gaining access to space by even the poorest of nations. It does this by spreading the resource investments and expenditures among cooperating nations. Observers have concluded that as per-partner costs decrease, the per-partner utility of international cooperation increases.15 Cooperation reduces exposure by spreading the risk of failure and allows a spacefaring state to draw in outside resources. This is especially compelling for nations whose resources are insufficient to attain any substantial space operational and technical goals. Even the well-endowed ESA has engaged the USA and Japan to join what were previously traditional European science missions as a way to rescue its mission portfolio from increased cost-growth.16 Similarly, Chandraayan, India’s first satellite to the Moon, was launched in 2008 carrying two primary instruments to help locate water and other resources. The USA contributed these to the mission. They cost more than the amount India spent building and integrating the balance of the spacecraft and the launch vehicle. International cooperation offers the opportunity to improve the efficacy of the expenditures. Resources can be rationalized, standardized, and made interoperable to bring about the best and most efficient use of research, development, procurement, support, and production resources. This fosters effective operations. So if a hypothetical space partnership involves two nations, one with sophisticated remote sensing engineering capabilities, and the other, spacelift, a rational approach would allocate program activities in accord with these strengths. International cooperation can provide a strong and essential benefit by providing programmatic redundancy, as happened when Russian Soyuz craft were able to provide transportation to the ISS following the loss of the Shuttle Challenger. Standardization of hardware, software, procedures, and the like helps to achieve a closer practical cooperation among partners. It does this through an efficient use of resources and reduction of operational, logistic, communications, technical, and procedural obstacles. It is telling that international partnerships usually begin their efforts by standardizing administrative, logistic, and operational procedures. Originators of standardizing systems and procedures often become the de facto leaders of collaborative efforts. Finally and closely related to standardization, interoperability is essential. “Designing for programmatic redundancy provides a strong argument for interoperability between nations’ space exploration assets, as this would allow nations to substitute each other’s critical capabilities with relative ease.”17 Nations whose space systems are interoperable can operate together more effectively. Designing for interoperability enables them to substitute each other’s critical capabilities with relative ease,18 and provides much needed redundancy in the event one nation cannot supply a key service or component for any number of reasons. Space programs can use the important capabilities provided by rationalization, standardization and interoperability to: communicate; efficiently integrate and synchronize operations; enable data and information exchanges; share consumables and resources; enhance effectiveness by optimizing individual and combined capabilities of equipment; increase efficiency through common or compatible support and systems; and assure technical compatibility by developing standards for equipment design, employment, maintenance, and updating them. With rationalization, standardization, and interoperability, nations that are likely to join a partnership can properly prepare to perform their responsibilities.

# \*\*Cooperation Bad\*\*

## Cooperation Bad – China – Space Primacy

### (\_\_) Cooperation with China over space facilitates espionage – threatens the US space program and space primacy

Sterner – Fellow @ the George C. Marshall Institute, held senior staff positions with the House Armed Services and Science Committee – 9

Eric, US-China space relations: maintaining an arm’s length’, Space News, (2 March 2009), p. 19**.**

It is tempting to hold out space partnership as a tool to influence the broader U.S.-PRC relationship. In particular, those who view space as a means of influencing terrestrial politics will push for a partnership. By learning to live and work together in space, we can better live and work together on Earth, or so the theory goes. But, such an approach fails to grasp the nature of international politics, in which space poli- cy is a tool of broader goals, and not the other way around. As a result, the broad U.S.-PRC relationship will affect how the two countries interact with one another in space, and not vice versa.

In that context, it makes little sense to seek a space partnership with China. The bilateral relationship is simply too unsettled with too many potential flashpoints, ranging from Taiwan and human rights to labor practices and currency manipulation. Thus, a space partnership would only import all of the burdens of the broader geopolitical relationship into the space program, without necessarily benefiting the program in a meaningful way. In- stead, sophisticated, multiyear cooperative projects would be at risk when Chinese behavior on human rights, toward its neighbors, in currency manipulation, or in proliferating dangerous technologies clash with American values, ideals or interests. Similarly, Beijing may counter U.S. moves to preserve a strategic balance in Asia by imposing consequences on any bilateral space project, essentially holding American space interests hostage to broader issues.

Any potential partnership with China also raises more specific concerns. Chinese espionage activities against hightech American targets are well documented.

Michelle Van Cleave, the nation's first national coordinator for counterintelligence, recently noted: "The Chinese stole the design secrets to all — repeat, all — U.S. nuclear weapons, enabling them to leapfrog generations of technology development and put our nuclear arsenal, the country's last line of defense, at risk. To this day, we don't know quite when or how they did it, but we do know that Chinese intelligence operatives are still at work, systematically targeting not only America's defense secrets but our industries' valuable proprietary information."

Unfortunately, NASA is a soft target compared with the nation's nuclear labs. The U.S. China Economic and Security Review Commission's most recent report noted that in 2005 Chinese hackers targeted NASA and stole files on spacecraft propulsion, solar panels and fuel tanks — all useful for military systems. More recently, a contract engineer was indicted last year for stealing technologies associated with the space shuttle and Delta 4 launch vehicle on behalf of the People's Republic of China. A close partnership would only increase the potential for greater technology transfer, to the net harm of the national security interests of the United States.

Finally, consider the symbolism of a partnership with China in space. Since its inception, the civil space program has served as a geopolitical metaphor. U.S. Presidents Dwight Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy intended to send geopolitical messages in creating NASA and launching us to the Moon. Similarly, President Ronald Reagan's administration conceived of the international space station as a demonstration of the unity and technical prowess of the western democracies in contrast to Soviet authoritarianism. When Russians overthrew communism and joined the family of democratic nations, they were welcomed into the program, further symbolizing their changed status. Partnership with China would send the signal that values held by the West, such as representative government, individual liberty, the rule of law and respect for human rights — which the leaders of the People's Republic of China do not share — are no longer as important to the relationship.

## Cooperation Bad – China - Hegemony

### (\_\_) Space cooperation destroys hegemony

Cheng – Research Fellow in Chinese Political and Security Affairs in the Asian Studies Center at The Heritage Foundation – 9

Dean, U.S.-China Space Cooperation: More Costs Than Benefits, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/10/US-China-Space-Cooperation-More-Costs-Than-Benefits?query=U.S.-China+Space+Cooperation:+More+Costs+Than+Benefits

Beyond the technical issues, however, there are more fundamental political concerns that must be addressed. The U.S. military depends on space as a strategic high ground. Space technology is also dual-use in nature: Almost any technology or information that is exchanged in a cooperative venture is likely to have military utility. Sharing such information with China, therefore, would undercut American tactical and technological military advantages.

## Cooperation Bad – China – Militarization

### Space co op with China goes nowhere and accelerates militarization

Chang Columnist Forbes 11-6

(Gordon G.-, Forbes, “The Space Arms Race Begins: Should the U.S. and China cooperate?”, <http://www.forbes.com/>

2009/11/05/space-arms-race-china-united-states-opinions-columnists-gordon-g-chang.html**)**

In response to Obama's countermove, Beijing--or at least the People's Liberation Army--has now changed tack and announced its intention to begin the space arms race in earnest. General Xu's bold words, interestingly enough, come at the same time that some in Washington are calling for civilian cooperation with the Chinese in space. And why would we do that? The U.S. shuttle fleet will be retired next year. Its replacement, the Orion Crew Exploration Vehicle, is not slated to make its first crewed flight until 2015, and it may not fly until well after that. In the interim, NASA intends to rely on Russian launch vehicles to get Americans into orbit. The United States, therefore, will be at the complete mercy of Moscow when the last shuttle is grounded--unless we are willing to hitchhike with the only other nation that will be able to put a human into space then. "I think it's possible in principle to develop the required degree of confidence in the Chinese," said John Holdren, President Obama's science advisor, in April. And he is not alone in this view. According to the just-released report of the Review of U.S. Human Spaceflight Plans Committee, better known as the Augustine report, "China offers significant potential in a space partnership." In one sense, this statement is correct. After all, China has put a man into space three times. Moreover, the Chinese have said on numerous occasions that they are prepared to work with us. So what is the problem with doing so? First, even though the United States will soon find itself without a way to put humans into orbit, any partnership would essentially be a one-way transfer of technology from us to the Chinese. Second, the Chinese did not respond favorably to past American efforts--made during the administration of George W. Bush--to involve them in cooperative space efforts. Third, there is no such thing as a civilian space program in China. The China National Space Administration is really a military operation. Therefore, we have to ask ourselves a question: Should we transfer technology to a potential adversary so that it can improve its war-fighting capabilities? General Kevin Chilton, the chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, called for a dialogue with his Chinese counterparts the day after General Xu's space-race declaration. "Where they're heading is one of the things a lot of people would like to understand better," Chilton said.

## Cooperation Bad – China – Espionage

### (\_\_) Cooperation fails and risks Chinese espionage

CSIS 10

Chinese Space Policy: Collaboration or Competition?, http://csis.org/blog/chinese-space-policy-collaboration-or-competition

In addition to these programs, China is a party to the Asia-Pacific Space Cooperation Organization (APSCO). Headquartered in Beijing, the organization formally started in December 2001. The members of the organization have pledged to cooperate on matters of space exploration. APSCO consists of seven members: China, Bangladesh, Iran, Mongolia, Pakistan, Peru and Thailand with Indonesia and Turkey as additional signatories. Some efforts at international cooperation have resulted in failure. China was essentially “disinvited” from the European Galileo program, which was designed to create a global locating and tracking system similar to GPS in the U.S.. China has now decided to create its own global location satellite system, named Beidou. And while China does collaborate with Russia, its relationship with Russia has been described as “anemic” and “delayed” by some observers. There has been little collaboration between the US and China on space exploration. Indeed, the situation has been tense at times. Some of China’s space technology was stolen from US firms. For example, a former engineer at Boeing, Dongfan Chung, was convicted in July 2009 of economic espionage on behalf of China. He provided information about the space shuttle and fueling system of the Delta IV booster rocket. Furthermore, the US has historically disapproved of Chinese aeronautical firms selling missile technology to countries like Iran, North Korea and Pakistan. On the other hand, China resented a plan proposed by the US delegation at the Copenhagen climate talks in December 2009, where foreign satellites would be used to monitor and verify carbon dioxide emissions in China. The Chinese argue that this would be an infringement upon their national sovereignty.

## Cooperation Bad – China – Undermines Space Ops

### (\_\_) China is too far behind the US in space tech – cooperation would undermine effective US space missions

Cheng – Research Fellow in Chinese Political and Security Affairs in the Asian Studies Center at The Heritage Foundation – 9

Dean, U.S.-China Space Cooperation: More Costs Than Benefits, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/10/US-China-Space-Cooperation-More-Costs-Than-Benefits?query=U.S.-China+Space+Cooperation:+More+Costs+Than+Benefits

The idea of relying on Chinese cooperation glosses over very real problems. At a minimum, it is an open question whether the PRC is capable of providing substantial support to the International Space Station (ISS) in the timeframes discussed by the report. It is important to recall that the PRC has had only three manned missions and has never undertaken a manned docking maneuver. Would the U.S. and its partners be comfortable inviting a neophyte Chinese crew to dock with the ISS?

## Cooperation Bad – China – Chinese Growth (1/2)

### (\_\_) Space cooperation causes Chinese growth

Cheng – Research Fellow in Chinese Political and Security Affairs in the Asian Studies Center at The Heritage Foundation – 9

Dean, U.S.-China Space Cooperation: More Costs Than Benefits, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/10/US-China-Space-Cooperation-More-Costs-Than-Benefits?query=U.S.-China+Space+Cooperation:+More+Costs+Than+Benefits

Moreover, Beijing is likely to extract a price in exchange for such cooperation. The Chinese leadership has placed a consistent emphasis on developing its space capabilities indigenously. Not only does this ensure that China's space capabilities are not held hostage to foreign pressure, but it also fosters domestic economic development -- thereby promoting innovation within China's scientific and technological communities -- and underscores the political legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party. Consequently, the PRC will require that any cooperation with the U.S. provides it with substantial benefits that would balance opportunity costs in these areas.

### Chinese economic growth fuels chinese nationalism

Carl S. Murphy, Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy, 1997 (http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/1997/Murphy.htm**)**

China's new prosperity has contributed to an unprecedented expansion of the economy and improvement in the lifestyle of the average Chinese. Increased economic strength has brought about increased pride in China's historical importance and future power. Resurgent pride is fueling nationalism and calls for the restoration of China to a greatness previously denied by Western imperialism and Japanese invasion. Economic growth has also provided The PRC with increasing resources with which to exploit opportunities for greater power and influence, including military modernization. Growth and its effect on nationalism have also built popular expectations for China's continued domestic improvement. If not satisfied, these expectations could generate increased dissatisfaction. One means to deflect anger in such a case would be to draw on nationalism and vilify an external target like the United States or Taiwan; distracting domestic discontent.

China's leaders have chosen an emotionally charged nationalistic goal to provide a unifying vision for the party and people alike: The restoration of China to its pre-Opium War boundaries and resumption of its rightful place as "a great nation." Observers in the West often discount the lingering bitterness with which the Chinese people regard over one hundred years of subjugation by outside, and predominately Western powers following the Opium Wars in the mid-1800's. China's resentment of Western imperialism is exceeded only by the well publicized rancor which remains as a result of Japan's invasion of China during the Second World War. As a result, the leadership in Beijing has embarked on a strategy to restore idealized territorial boundaries believed to exist prior to China's humiliating loss of sovereignty at western hands, concurrent with a military rejuvenation program. The regime's plan can be seen as a program to build a "rich country and strong army to guarantee that China will never again face similar treatment." The "century of humiliation" has embedded in Chinese political thinking a concept of absolute state sovereignty dating from the 19th century; a zero-sum competition between nations in which one nation's gain must mean the other's loss. Humiliation by empire building outsiders has taught China two lessons: power politics are all important in international relations and China will not receive the respect due a great nation without military power. In an address to the National People's Congress in January of 1995, Jiang Zemin, Chinese President and heir-apparent to Deng Xiaoping, articulated China's overarching drive toward repossession of historical territories and resumption of greatness as follows: It remains the sacred mission and lofty goal of the entire Chinese people to achieve the reunification of the motherland and promote the all-round revitalization of the Chinese nation.

Cooperation Bad – China – Chinese Growth (2/2)

### Nationalism makes invasion of Taiwan and the Spratleys inevitable

Carl S. Murphy, Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy, 1997 (http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report**/1997/Murphy.htm)**

Chinese nationalism builds on Mao's "One China Policy" in the interest of returning Taiwan to mainland control--by any means--peaceful or forceful. The "Rejuvenating Chinese Greatness" theme has also been used to support China's claims to sovereignty over the potentially oil rich Spratly, Paracel and Senkaku island groups. These claims have placed China in dispute in recent years with Indonesia, Vietnam, the Philippines, Taiwan and Japan. While this may reflect China's realization that it has become a net importer of crude oil, it is more plausible that these irredentist claims reflect both a growing sense of China's importance in the Asian-Pacific and a more pragmatic understanding that China's ascent to economic superpower status will depend on reliable energy supplies, domestic stability, and positive economic growth. It is estimated that China will need to import 100 million tons of crude oil annually by 2010 unless it finds new sources. While obtaining sovereignty over territories believed to contain significant petroleum reserves ties into an economic strategy of securing the means of economic production, nationalism provides the means of building domestic legitimacy for conflict over these territories and a rhetorical basis for discussion in the international forum. As an up-and-coming naval power, China's provocative territorial claims in the South China Sea have also drawn attention to the geo-political and geo-economic importance of the predominately maritime Asian-Pacific theater.

### Extinction

Kennedy & Irie ‘00

(Prof. Paul-, Prof. Akira-, Daily Yomiuri, Jan. 10, “21st Century--Dialogues on the Future/ Globalization's sway in evolution of states put **in focus”, Lexis)**

Kennedy: Over the past two or three decades, many Asian nations have increased their defense budgets, while European countries have done otherwise. During this time, there have been many flash points in Asia, such North Korea, Taiwan and Kashmir. Some Asian countries have developed nuclear weapons, as contrasted with few Europeans who even want nuclear power stations today.

We have good reason to feel worried that Asia could become a tinderbox should there be any conflict in disputed territories like the Spratly Islands and an autistic North Korean regime that does not bother to understand the outside world. Taiwan is often rash to provoke Beijing, while the Kashmir conflict could grow into an India-Pakistan war.

There is great concern about how we should ensure that bitter rivalries in the Asian part of the globe will not bring down a system that is emerging in the world now. We do not want a repeat of 1914. I am concerned that an armed conflict might arise in South or East Asia in 2008, for example, and bring down the credit, financial flow and capital in the region.

Irie: I share Prof. Kennedy's sense of pessimism about some serious problems facing the world today. There are many more sovereign nations today, and the majority of them are newly independent states. Therefore, they are even more nationalistic.

Nationalism has often served as the only symbol of national unity for some African, Asian and Middle Eastern countries that have been grated in their regions without national traditions comparable to those of European countries. This has made matters even worse. Nationalism is all that can keep a country together. It is essential to ensure that local conflicts will be kept from blowing up the entire world.

## AT Cooperation Good – Cost Reduction

### (\_\_) Cooperation doesn’t save money – International Space Station proves

Col Rendleman and Faulconer – 10

James and J. Walter, Improving international space cooperation: Considerations for the USA, Space Policy 26 (2010) 143**-151**

International cooperation efforts are often secured only at a tremendous expense. The ISS can be considered a stunning melding of international politics, technology, and cooperation, whose research capabilities and benefits have been much trumpeted. However, the ISS has turned out to be a very expensive offering on the altar of international cooperation. Billions of dollars have been squandered in order to construct, supply, and operate it. Its success has been forged only to the detriment of other much more scientifically productive projects such as robotic spacecraft missions and little scientific research on it has been planned and executed.29 There are also technical deficiencies in the ISS design that limit its utility, including its need for high levels of maintenance to be carried out by the crew, accomplished via recurring and risky extra-vehicular activities. The high inclination of the station’s orbit also leads to a higher cost for US-based Space Shuttle launches to the station.30

# \*\*Cooperation Defense\*\*

## Cooperation Fails – Protectionism

### (\_\_) Cooperation fails – space programs overwhelmingly protectionist

Col Rendleman and Faulconer – 10

James and J. Walter, Improving international space cooperation: Considerations for the USA, Space Policy 26 (2010) **143-151**

International civil space cooperation is admired as a lofty and worthy goal, but space program managers confront a far different reality from the diplomats as they direct such efforts as described in Table 2. Hopes for cooperation can soon be overwhelmed by competing interests and priorities, and also by reduced or constrained budgets. These anti-collaborative behaviors are demonstrated in the recent rash of lunar flights, which have seen five different spacecraft sent to the moon by the USA, ESA, China, Japan and India; each mission essentially performing the same basic science missions.38 Expenditures for these repetitive efforts totaled between $2 and 3 billion dollars. More astounding, scientific data from several of the missions have not been shared. Were these just expensive stunts or merely lost opportunities? Perhaps better science and exploration could have been achieved if these activities had been consolidated into a single mission, with the excess funds spent on other scientific objectives. Now it seems the South Koreans, Brazilians, Iranians, and others want to launch their own Moon missions; their rationale draped in the words of great tribal patriots and accompanied by the best expressions of national pride. Similarly the international launch market is well over capacity for launching the current and foreseeable demand for communications, remote sensing and navigation satellites. Eight different countries continue to subsidize their own launch capability and other nations are developing their own launchers. The USA prohibits US civil and commercial spacecraft from launching on Chinese vehicles. ESA demands that European satellites be launched on Ariane. These directions are driven by important national or regional interests. However, there maybe no easy way to foster improved international cooperation if such protectionist behaviors stand in the way. And there are further obstacles to cooperation.

## Cooperation Fails – Laundry List 1/2

### (\_\_) Cooperation fails – information asymmetries, lack of binding agreements

Col Rendleman and Faulconer – 10

James and J. Walter, Improving international space cooperation: Considerations for the USA, Space Policy 26 (2010) 143-151

Some suggest the USA is an unreliable partner because its political processes and tradition of biennial and quadrennial elections bring uncertainty to international agreements. For example, in 2004 President George W. Bush unveiled his Vision for Space Exploration which put a near-term emphasis on returning humans to the Moon. International partners, especially in Europe did not immediately embrace this policy because they were more interested in performing Mars missions. However, after four years of international workshops, bilateral meetings, then intense hectoring and haggling, a collective “global vision” was forged with prospective partners, especially ESA. The new global vision outlined important roles for the partners to return to the Moon and reinvigorate lunar exploration. ESA worked to cajole its members to program funds to support the Vision. Then, just as ESA was announcing that its membership had synched its planning and programming roadmap to match the Vision’s, the USA, led by a newly elected internationalist president, announced interest in a radically different plan, that recently identified by the Augustine committee. The USA is no win the process of abandoning the Vision’s “lunar base” concept and moving to a “flexible path” to manned space exploration. The change has devastated the ESA partners. Similarly, about-turns and difficulties have been experienced in collaborative work on Russian rocket engines following the collapse of the USSR. The problem cuts both ways - not all partners work reliability with the USA. For example, NASA administrator Sean O’Keefe cancelled the Crew Return Vehicle (CRV) initiative in 2001 arguing it was cheaper in the long run to buy Russian Soyuz capsules to park as an escape pod at the ISS, instead of investing $1.5e3.0 billion to develop and build a US rescue capability.44 Once the Space Shuttle program comes to an end, the USA will be reliant on the Russians to transport astronauts to the ISS for at least seven years (according to the Augustine Committee’s Report).45 Now Russia has nearly doubled the cost of an escape pod capsule to $65 million each.46 It’s easy to reason that the Soviets, rebranded as Russian capitalists, have learned the lessons of capitalism all too well.

Cooperation Fails – Laundry List 2/2

### (\_\_) Cooperation fails – 3 reasons

Fukushima – National Institute for Defense Studies, Ministry of Defense, Japan – 10

Yasuhito, An Asian perspective on the new US space policy: The emphasis on international cooperation and its relevance to Asia, December

Yet it should be noted that there are some obstacles to having substantial cooperation in space. First, as many have noted, collaboration among nations does not necessarily contribute to cost savings. Rather, it sometimes causes budget overruns and delays. Even if one can expect cost reductions, space-related activities still entail a lot of costs. Some countries may therefore hesitate to collaborate and prefer continued reliance on the USA or commercial services. Second, the future of the ongoing reform of the US export control system is uncertain while the domestic political scene in the USA remains cloudy. Lastly, some American lawmakers have voiced concerns that even civil space cooperation with China may strengthen Chinese military capabilities.26 These are the issues which need to be considered when promoting international cooperation.

## Cooperation Fails – China 1/2

### (\_\_) Cooperation with China fails – program is strategic

Cheng – Research Fellow in Chinese Political and Security Affairs in the Asian Studies Center at The Heritage Foundation – 9

Dean, U.S.-China Space Cooperation: More Costs Than Benefits, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/10/US-China-Space-Cooperation-More-Costs-Than-Benefits?query=U.S.-China+Space+Cooperation:+More+Costs+Than+Benefits

Indeed, China's space program is overwhelmingly military in nature. And nowhere more so than in the manned space program, the "commanders" or "directors" of which include the head of the General Armaments Department, one of the four general departments responsible for day-to-day management of the entire People's Liberation Army (PLA). The challenges presented by the Chinese space program's strong ties to the PLA are exacerbated by the generally opaque nature of China's space program on issues ranging from who the top decision-makers are to the size of their budget. Any effort at cooperation is likely to be stymied so long as the PRC views transparency as a one-way affair.

Cooperation Fails – China 2/2

### (\_\_) Cooperation will not influence the orientation of China’s space program

Sterner – Fellow @ the George C. Marshall Institute, held senior staff positions with the House Armed Services and Science Committee – 9

Eric, US-China space relations: maintaining an arm’s length’, Space News, (2 March 2009), p. 19.

Others will be tempted to promote a partnership in the vain hope of influencing the direction of China's space program. The simple truth is that China's space program exists to serve the interests — both domestic and foreign — of the rul-ing party in Beijing. It is not merely an appendage of the U.S.-PRC relationship to be directed by western carrots and sticks. The Chinese people are immensely proud of their accomplishments in orbit, as well they should be. They represent technical prowess that once be- Beijing's space behavior through the promise of a close partnership any more than King Canute could order the tides to stop. Indeed, a true partnership may exacerbate the conflict of interests by strengthening China's technical capabilities and political weight in space matters. Instead of seeing new potential partners in China, space policymakers must watch the full range of developments in China closely with an eye toward improving our understanding of Beijing's capabilities and intentions.