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NSEA Section

# Counterplan Text

Text: The United States Federal Government should disband the National Aeronautics and Space Association. The United States Federal Government should establish the National Space Exploration Administration. The National Space Exploration Administration should [plan text]

# 1NC

NASA is no longer functioning, the NSEA would be created in order to further space exploration.

Harrison H. Schmitt. May 25, 2011. (Former United States Senator, aerospace and private enterprise consultant, geologist and former Apollo Astronaut, member of the new Committee of Correspondence). Former Senator Schmitt Proposes Dismantling of NASA and Creation of a New, Deep Space Exploration Agency. <http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewsr.html?pid=37176>

Is there a path forward for United States' space policy? When a new President takes office in 2013, he or she should propose to Congress that we start space policy and its administration from scratch. A new agency, the National Space Exploration Administration (NSEA), should be charged with specifically enabling America's and its partners' exploration of deep space, inherently stimulating education, technology, and national focus. The existing component parts of NASA should be spread among other agencies with the only exception being activities related to U.S. obligations to its partners in the International Space Station (ISS). Changes in the Space Act of 1958, as amended, to accommodate this major reinvigoration of the implementation of space and aeronautical policy should be straightforward. Spin-off and reformulation of technically oriented agencies have precedents in both the original creation of NASA in 1958 by combining the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics (NACA) and the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and the creation of the United States Air Force in 1947 from the Army Air Forces. The easiest change to make would be to move NASA Space Science activities, including space-based astronomical observatories, into the National Science Foundation (NSF). At the NSF, those activities can compete for support and funding with other science programs that are in the national interest to pursue. Spacecraft launch services can be procured from commercial, other [government](http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewsr.html?pid=37176) agencies, or international sources through case-by-case arrangements. With this transfer, the NSF would assume responsibility for the space science activities of the Goddard Space Flight Center and for the contract with Caltech to run the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. Also, in a similarly logical and straightforward way, NASA's climate and other [earth science](http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewsr.html?pid=37176)research could become part of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). NOAA could make cooperative arrangements with the NSF for use of the facilities and capabilities of the Goddard Space Flight Center related to development and operation of weather and other remote sensing satellites. Next, NASA aeronautical research and technology activities should be placed in a re-creation of NASA's highly successful precursor, the NACA. Within this new-old agency, the Langley Research Center, Glenn Research Center, and Dryden Flight Research Center could be reconstituted as pure aeronautical research and technology laboratories as they were originally. The sadly, now largely redundant Ames Research Center should be auctioned to the highest domestic bidder as its land and facilities have significant value to nearby commercial enterprises. These actions would force, once again, consideration of aeronautical research and[technology development](http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewsr.html?pid=37176) as a critical but independent national objective of great economic and strategic importance. NASA itself would be downsized to accommodate these changes. It should sunset as an agency once the useful life of the International Space Station (ISS) has been reached. De-orbiting of the ISS will be necessary within the next 10 to 15 years due to escalating maintenance overhead, diminished research value, sustaining cost escalation, and potential Russian blackmail through escalating costs for U.S. access to space after retirement of the Space Shuttles. NASA itself should sunset two years after de-orbiting, leaving time to properly transfer responsibility for its archival scientific databases to the NSF, its engineering archives to the new exploration agency, and its remaining space artifacts to the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. Finally, with the recognition that a second Cold War exists, this time with China and its surrogates, the President and Congress elected in 2012 should create a new National Space Exploration Administration (NSEA). NSEA would be charged solely with the human exploration of deep space and the re-establishment and maintenance of American dominance as a space-faring nation. The new Agency's responsibilities should include robotic exploration necessary to support its primary mission. As did the Apollo Program, NSEA should include lunar and planetary science and resource identification as a major component of its human space exploration and development initiatives. To organize and manage the start-up of NSEA, experienced, successful, and enthusiastic engineering program and project managers should be recruited from industry, academia, and military and civilian government agencies. NSEA must be given full authority to retire or rehire former NASA employees as it sees fit and to access relevant exploration databases and archives. An almost totally new workforce must be hired and NSEA must have the authority to maintain an average employee age of less than 30. (NASA's current workforce has an average age over 47.) Only with the imagination, motivation, stamina, and courage of young engineers, scientists, and managers can NSEA be successful in meeting its Cold War II national security goals. Within this workforce, NSEA should maintain a strong, internal engineering design capability independent of that capability in its stable of contractors. NSEA would assume responsibility for facilities and infrastructure at the Johnson Space Center (spacecraft, training, communications, and flight operations), Marshall Space Flight Center (launch vehicles), Stennis Space Center (rocket engine test), and Kennedy Space Center (launch operations). Through those Centers, NSEA would continue to support NASA's operational obligations related to the International Space Station. NSEA should have the authority, however, to reduce as well as enhance the capital [assets](http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewsr.html?pid=37176) of those Centers as necessary to meet its overall mission. Enabling legislation for NSEA should include a provision that no new space exploration project can be re-authorized unless its annual appropriations have included a minimum 30% funding reserve for the years up to the project's critical design review and through the time necessary to complete engineering and operational responses to that review. Nothing causes delays or raises costs of space projects more than having reserves that are inadequate to meet the demands of the inevitable unknown unknowns inherent in complex technical endeavors.

# Shut Down NASA

NASA is facing shut down once again.

Wall 11 – Senior Writer for SPACE.com (Mike, April 06). NASA Braces for Possible Government Shutdown. <http://www.space.com/11344-nasa-government-shutdown-500-workers.html>

NASA is once again bracing for a potential shutdown of the federal government, which could begin this weekend if Republicans and Democrats in Congress can't agree on a budget. U.S. lawmakers have [yet to pass a budget](http://www.space.com/9712-nasa-stuck-limbo-congress-takes.html) for fiscal year 2011, which began in October. As a result, the government has been operating under a series of stopgap funding measures called continuing resolutions. The latest of these is set to expire at 12:01 a.m. EDT Saturday (April 9). NASA officials expressed hope that Democrats and Republicans can reach an agreement in time to forestall a [government shutdown](http://www.lifeslittlemysteries.com/government-shutdown-effects-1400/)— but they're not necessarily counting on it. "Given the realities of the calendar, however, prudent management requires that we plan for an orderly shutdown should Congress be unable to pass a funding bill," NASA chief Charlie Bolden wrote in a recent memo to agency [employees](http://www.space.com/11317-nasa-government-shutdown-spaceflight.html) that was posted online by the website [SpaceRef.com](http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewsr.html?pid=36628) today (April 6). Furloughs could be coming At this point, Republicans are seeking deeper cuts in federal spending than Democrats are willing to concede. If the two sides can't come together by Friday, the federal government could shut down for the first time since 1995. Federal activities deemed essential to the nation's safety and economic well-being — such as air-traffic control and food inspection — would continue to receive funding. But many other operations would be suspended, and many federal employees furloughed. NASA has now begun the process of trying to figure out which of its operations and employees would be affected. "Our contingency planning for the potential funding lapse includes determining which agency functions are [excepted from a furlough](http://www.space.com/10995-government-shutdown-budget-nasa.html)," Bolden wrote. "Should it become necessary to implement our contingency plans, you will receive formal notice from your manager no later than Friday, April 8th regarding the designation of your position and furlough status." "Essential" employees exempt from a furlough would almost certainly include anyone involved with keeping astronauts safe and [healthy](http://www.space.com/11317-nasa-government-shutdown-spaceflight.html) in space, NASA officials said — not to mention the astronauts themselves. Keeping astronauts safe There are two NASA astronauts in space today – Cady Coleman and Ron Garan. They are two of the six spaceflyers making up the International Space Station's Expedition 27 crew. Coleman and two crewmates are currently living on the station. Garan and two other crewmembers will arrive at the orbiting laboratory tonight. They launched into space Monday aboard a Russian Soyuz spacecraft. "We will take the steps necessary to ensure the safety of our astronauts on the International Space Station and our other missions," said NASA spokeswoman Katherine Trinidad. "Critical personnel will remain in place." Engineers and technicians actually operating the various NASA spacecraft flying through the solar system could probably stay on as well, experts have predicted. Researchers analyzing spacecraft data, on the other hand, might have to go home for a spell — along with large numbers of support staff, from cafeteria workers to office managers. NASA's next space shuttle flight — [Endeavour's STS-134 mission](http://www.space.com/11221-photos-space-shuttle-endeavour-final-mission-sts134.html) to the space station — is slated to launch April 29. The space agency is looking into how a government shutdown might complicate preparations for that flight, the shuttle program's second-to-last before it retires later this year. "NASA is still assessing the potential impact to orbiter processing and the upcoming STS-134 mission," Trinidad told SPACE.com. It's happened before This is not the first time a possible government shutdown has loomed. Just last month, for example, lawmakers avoided a potential shutdown by passing another continuing resolution. And in November 1995, President Clinton and congressional Republicans — led by then House Speaker Newt Gingrich — couldn't come to an agreement in time. A shutdown ensued right in the middle of the space shuttle Atlantis' STS-74 mission to Russia's Mir space station. NASA employees considered essential to that mission stayed on. But many other workers were furloughed, including NASA's public affairs office. The 1995 shutdown dragged on for three weeks. While NASA officials hope lawmakers can avert such an incident this time around, they're firming up employees' resolve just in case. "Your contributions touch people's lives in so many significant ways, and I want you to know how deeply I appreciate your dedication and your expertise," Bolden wrote in the memo. "We're a determined and resilient team and we'll get through this!"

****NASA is becoming weak and ineffectual.****

Vieru 11 **– Writer on Softpedia, Background in biology, chemistry, and physics ( Tudor, May 26th)**

**Vieru. Apollo Astronaut: Replace NASA with New Agency.** <http://news.softpedia.com/news/Apollo-Astronaut-Replace-NASA-with-New-Agency-202414.shtml>

The last Apollo Program astronaut ever to set foot on the Moon, Harrison Schmitt, is proposing that the US National Aeronautics and Space Administration be shut down entirely, and replaced with a new agency, that could be called the National Space Exploration Administration (NSEA). The move would have the sole purpose of furthering the United States' involvement in space, the former astronaut said in an article he published online yesterday, on May 25. The main point of his proposal is that [NASA](http://news.softpedia.com/news/Apollo-Astronaut-Replace-NASA-with-New-Agency-202414.shtml) has become stagnant. Schmitt was a member of the Apollo 17 mission, which flew to the Moon in 1972. After completing his space career, he became a US Senator for a term. At this point, he says, [NASA](http://news.softpedia.com/news/Apollo-Astronaut-Replace-NASA-with-New-Agency-202414.shtml) has become just a shadow of its former self. The agency has literally lost its focus, as demonstrated by the hectic path it's had over the past few years. Unfeasible planning by the Bush Administration and the unwillingness to commit of the Obama Administration have drove the once-powerful agency aground. Rather than having a strong leadership in space, NASA is now reduced to working with the private sector in order to get to the International[Space Station](http://news.softpedia.com/news/Apollo-Astronaut-Replace-NASA-with-New-Agency-202414.shtml), has no manned spacecraft of its own (once the shuttles are retired), and needs Russian space capsules to sent men to the station. It is also allowing China, the emerging space power, to take over initiative. The Asian nation plans to finish constructing its first [spacestation](http://news.softpedia.com/news/Apollo-Astronaut-Replace-NASA-with-New-Agency-202414.shtml) – which will also be used for military applications – by 2020, and to put a man on the Moon by 2025. Schmitt, 75, says that a new direction is needed for space exploration in the US, since NASA is obviously unable to overcome the new challenges. “I don't blame NASA as much as I blame various administrations for not recognizing the geopolitical importance of space,” he tells [Space](http://www.space.com/11789-nasa-replacing-apollo-astronaut-jfk-moon.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank). The lack of focus on exploration is something that several Apollo astronauts complained about over the past decade or so. Even now, NASA's 2012 budget features negligible sums for this aspect. “After a half-century of remarkable progress, a coherent plan for maintaining America's leadership in space exploration is no longer apparent,” astronauts Neil Armstrong, Jim Lovell and Gene Cernan wrote in USA Today on May 24. “This is not just a competition between nations; it's a competition between freedom and tyranny,” Schmitt added, obviously referring to China. “The United States is the only power on Earth today that has in its DNA a protection of liberty, and if we decide to back off from space or any other major human endeavor, then we put that liberty in jeopardy,” he added. “The Obama administration has basically said that they won't pursue an exceptional space program for the United States and that they're just as happy to have China move forward into deep space, and be dependent on Russia for transport to the International Space Station,” he concluded.

****NASA Falling Behind China and Russia****

Ian O'Neill. June 30, 2008. BA, MSc, PhD**.** Aldrin Warns that NASA will fall Behind Russia and China in Space Exploration <http://www.universetoday.com/15325/aldrin-warns-that-nasa-will-fall-behind-russia-and-china-in-space-exploration/>

The world knows the huge potential China and Russia have for space exploration. Russia is maintaining a strong presence in space with their sturdy Soyuz program and China has set its sights on having their very first “taikonaut” EVA at the end of this year. But where does this leave NASA? The US space agency has spearheaded the exploration of space for the last 50 years, but amongst all the talk about NASA setbacks, overspending and delays, could the glory days be coming to an abrupt end? In May, the legendary astronaut [John Glenn spoke out](http://www.universetoday.com/14155/legendary-astronaut-john-glenn-speaks-out-on-shuttle-decommissioning/) against Shuttle decommissioning and last week, [US Senator Bill Nelson called a meeting](http://www.universetoday.com/15249/us-senator-nasa-job-losses-could-generate-jobs-for-russian-space-program/) at Cape Canaveral to raise concerns about announced job cuts in 2010. Now, the most famous NASA ex-employee and second man on the Moon, Buzz Aldrin has voiced warnings that the US could lose its grip on space and begin to be left behind by Russia and China… On July 20th, 1969, the Apollo 11 Lunar Module Pilot waited for [Neil Armstrong](http://www.universetoday.com/59977/pictures-of-neil-armstrong/) to make the first footprint in the lunar [dust](http://www.universetoday.com/14943/mars-dust/). Soon after, Buzz Aldrin joined Armstrong on this momentous step and making world history, setting the world alight with optimism that man was just about to embark on the next phase of evolution: leaving Earth and exploring the stars. Unfortunately this dream was only realised for three years (until 1972) after six successful lunar landings (Apollo 11, 12, 14, 15, 16 and 17), and to this day the Apollo 17 [mission](http://www.universetoday.com/62336/apollo-mission/)touch-down (December 15th, 1972) remains the last time we landed on the Moon. Although we may not have revisited our natural [satellite](http://www.universetoday.com/42723/satellite-map/) for the best part of four decades, we have been busy with our focus on the robotic exploration of the [Solar](http://www.universetoday.com/18152/solar-telescope/) System. But work has started on the Shuttle replacement, the Constellation Program, with the promise of sending man back to the Moon by 2020 and then Mars soon after, can we begin to get excited that NASA is gaining [momentum](http://www.universetoday.com/82587/conservation-of-momentum/) for the next “giant leap for mankind?” Many prominent figures are now worried that the light is beginning to dim for the future of NASA. NASA prides itself on developing new technologies, spearheading the push into space, but what happens when the funding dries up and other nations pick up where they left off? One voice that cannot be ignored is that of Buzz Aldrin who has voiced his grave concern that NASA, and indeed the USA, risks falling behind China and Russia in the “space race” if efforts were not redoubled by future US governments. With the US presidential elections looming, Aldrin has vowed to lobby both Barack Obama and John McCain to “retain the vision for space exploration,” not only to maintain, but increase NASA funding. During an interview with the UK’s Sunday Telegraph newspaper he said, “*If we turn our backs on the vision again, we’re going to have to live in a secondary position in human space* [*flight*](http://www.universetoday.com/81046/human-space-flight/) *for the rest of the century*.” And he is not alone with this concern. Both [fellow retired astronaut John Glenn](http://www.universetoday.com/14155/legendary-astronaut-john-glenn-speaks-out-on-shuttle-decommissioning/)and [US Senator Bill Nelson](http://www.universetoday.com/15249/us-senator-nasa-job-losses-could-generate-jobs-for-russian-space-program/) have recently spoken out about their concerns for NASA’s future, ensuring the space exploration debate will remain alive over the coming months. Although Russia has a long and proud history in human space flight, the Chinese are showing their thirst for a big push into space, with a manned mission to the Moon on the cards. “*All the Chinese have to do is fly around the Moon and back, and they’ll appear to have won the return to the Moon with humans. They could put one person on the surface of the Moon for one day and he’d be a national hero*,” Aldrin added. Plus, Russia’s Soyuz program could be extended for manned missions beyond Earth orbit he pointed out. There is a real worry in NASA that the US could lose its foothold in the leadership of space exploration, so it is hoped big voices within the ranks of legendary astronauts might begin to get the future government thinking about how important space exploration is to the US.

NASA doesn’t have support

Jeff Foust. August 18, 2003***.*** The gaps in NASA’s support. Senior analyst with the [**Futron Corporation**](http://www.futron.com/)in Bethesda, Maryland, focusing on various aspects of the space industry<http://www.thespacereview.com/article/41/1>

It’s long been assumed that support for NASA in the United States is widespread. From a political standpoint, NASA enjoys a degree of bipartisan support (or, perhaps more accurately at times, bipartisan neglect) not seen in many other government agencies. A typical NASA program is less likely to become a political football for one party or the other than programs at the Defense Department, EPA, or even the Department of Education. Along the same lines, NASA appears to have widespread support from the American people as a whole. While there is a fraction of the public is always critical of the space agency (a fraction that tends to fluctuate depending on NASA’s publicized successes or failures), it’s never seemed obvious that this opposition to NASA is polarized along political, racial, income, or other lines. Upon closer examination, however, that belief is not necessarily true. In late June and early July Zogby International conducted a poll for the Houston Chronicle regarding the American public’s opinions about NASA, the space shuttle, and other programs the agency is undertaking. The Chronicle [published those results](http://www.chron.com/cs/CDA/ssistory.mpl/space/2001674) in its July 21 issue, focusing on the overall numbers. Those results showed that the American public, in general, remained supportive of NASA despite the Columbia accident and its aftermath. A majority of those polled, though, thought that the shuttle should remain grounded until the space program is redefined in some fashion. The Chronicle, to its benefit, provided not just a written summary of the poll results, but the[full final report](http://www.chron.com/content/news/photos/03/07/20/nasa/finalreport.pdf) submitted by Zogby. The Chronicle also included the [“crosstabs”](http://www.chron.com/content/news/photos/03/07/20/nasa/crosstabs.pdf), a detailed breakdown of the poll results, question by question. The crosstabs include data on how different segments of the population—broken down by age, race, gender, education, income, political preference, and more—answered the questions. It’s these data that reveal that NASA’s support, as well as support for space exploration in general, among the American public is not universal.

NASA has no purpose

G. Ryan Faith. August 31, 2009. Giving NASA a clear mission. . Ryan Faith is an independent technology consultant and Adjunct Fellow for Space Initiatives at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, (CSIS) <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1456/1>

The purpose of National Aeronautics and Space Act Of 1958 (“the Space Act”), which created NASA, was to “provide for research into problems of flight within and outside the earth's atmosphere, and for other purposes.” Unfortunately, this mandate provides no particular sense of direction or reason to carry out such activities. However, this vagueness of purpose wasn’t fully apparent when NASA was created, and wouldn’t be for many years. Shortly after its creation, NASA was tasked by President Kennedy on May 25, 1961 with the very specific mission of “achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to the Earth.” This concrete, if difficult, task became, at least in fact, NASA’s reason for existence until July 24, 1969. On that date, the crew of Apollo 11 safely returned to Earth after making a successful landing on the lunar surface, answering President Kennedy’s challenge. However, once NASA had met this challenge, the agency lost, at least in fact even if not in law, its specific reason to exist. How did we get here? NASA’s precursor organization, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA), was established in 1915 to help America achieve and maintain technological leadership in aviation. NACA’s role in achieving this objective was “to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight, with a view to their practical solutions”. At the dawn of the Space Age, it was entirely unclear whether or not it was even possible to send living creatures into space, let alone humans, and most certainly whether or not humans could successfully work and live in space. Given this basic uncertainty about whether or not human spaceflight was even possible, NASA’s focus on research and technology development matched both its mandate and circumstances. Even after Alan Shepard became the first American in space with his May 5, 1961, suborbital flight, NASA was still addressing fundamental questions about the possibility of “flight… outside the earth’s atmosphere” as directed in the Space Act. Yet, twenty days later, President Kennedy gave a speech to a special joint session of Congress and called upon America to land a man on the surface of the Moon and return him safely to Earth before 1970, transforming NASA from a technology development agency into the de facto national space exploration agency. The clarity and simplicity of this directive was critical in giving NASA a guiding star to follow. But the exclusive focus of Kennedy’s challenge on a specific destination—the Moon—meant that as of July 24, 1969—after Apollo 11 successfully had achieved the goal “of landing [men] on the Moon and returning [them] safely to the Earth”—NASA’s guiding star disappeared. Its mandate as the de facto national space exploration agency had expired. The exclusive focus of Kennedy’s challenge on a specific destination—the Moon—meant that as of July 24, 1969—after Apollo 11 successfully had achieved the goal “of landing [men] on the Moon and returning [them] safely to the Earth”—NASA’s guiding star disappeared. The expiration of that de facto mandate confined NASA to its existing de jure purpose: “to provide for research into problems of flight within and outside the earth’s atmosphere, and for other purposes”. Given the nebulous nature of this directive, focus shifted to the list of nine benefits to be obtained from the fulfillment of NASA’s “research into the problems of flight within and outside the earth’s atmosphere.” Lacking any clear overarching direction for their activities, NASA directorates developed a measure of schizophrenia yielding ultimately to parasitic competition and senseless cannibalism. Should NASA focus on “preservation of the role of the United States as a leader in aeronautical and space science and technology” or “cooperation by the United States with other nations and groups of nations”? Which is a higher priority, the “expansion of human knowledge of the Earth” or “improvement of the usefulness, performance, speed, safety, and efficiency of aeronautical and space vehicles”? It may, at least sometimes, be possible to make some of these things fit together in a complementary fashion. However, NASA has generally been given insufficient policy or legislative guidance in determining which of the list of benefits to be obtained given in the Space Act can be compared, combined, balanced, or differentiated. Given the absence of any single clear objective, and faced with an ever-expanding list of new “top priorities” that the agency has been assigned over the years, it is no great surprise that the United States has not sent a person beyond low Earth orbit since 1972.

NASA failing-Air Force can pick up slack

 Rand Simberg. aerospace engineer and manager as well as a commenter on space policy**.** October 3, 2007.NASA vs. the far-out space nuts. [http://www.latimes.com/la-op-dustup3oct03,0,4382440.story](http://www.latimes.com/la-op-dustup3oct03%2C0%2C4382440.story)

I certainly wouldn't dispute that some of the capabilities of the current private space industry have been spun off from NASA, but very few came from the manned space program, and I'd argue that many more of them came from the military. The early [Delta](http://kevinforsyth.net/delta/%22%20%5Ct%20%22new%20), [Titan](http://www.astronautix.com/lvfam/titan.htm%22%20%5Ct%20%22new%20), and Atlas launchers, which later became commercial, were all derivatives of ICBMs — there is no commercial equivalent of a Saturn or a shuttle (though NASA did support the development of the Delta from the Thor). The current Atlas and Delta [Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicles](http://www.aero.org/publications/crosslink/winter2004/07.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22new%20) (EELVs) were developed with private and Air Force money — NASA played no role whatsoever. In fact, by refusing to use them in its planned lunar architecture, and instead expending its scarce resources developing what many consider entirely unnecessary new, expensive and low-flight-rate vehicles for its lunar missions, NASA is at extreme variance with the national policy goal of increasing the EELV flight rate to reduce costs and increase reliability, and satisfying one of the key "vision for space exploration" goals of enhancing national security. This has forced Boeing and Lockheed Martin into a marriage to keep them profitable, resulting in a new launch monopoly. Yes, projects like Telstar helped kick off the communication satellite industry, but it was also aided by military comsats. I find it revealing that the only example you offer of "technological pump priming" is not by NASA but the development of a military rifle by the Army. And you're right that NASA has to know when to get out of the way. Unfortunately, history illustrates that it doesn't. In justifying the shuttle, NASA had to grab the entire launch market, including all commercial satellite launches, which precluded competition for launch from the private sector. This policy was reversed only after the Challenger disaster for the dumb reason that astronauts shouldn't "risk their lives to launch a satellite" (forget about the multibillion-dollar, essentially irreplaceable orbiter at risk), not because taking business away from private industry with a government-subsidized system was viewed as a bad idea. When the private [Industrial Space Facility](http://www.astronautix.com/craft/indility.htm%22%20%5Ct%20%22new%20) (ISF) was proposed in the 1980s as a way to provide a near-term research facility in low-Earth orbit and close the gap until the space station was completed, NASA lobbied Congress (successfully) to kill it because the agency (perhaps correctly) saw it as a threat to the station program rather than an augmentation or stop-gap solution. For decades, whenever an entrepreneur would attempt to raise money for some space venture, it was all too easy for a naive investor doing due diligence to go find someone at NASA to tell him that it wouldn't work, even when the NASA employee had no particular expertise in the matter. But he worked for NASA, so he must know all about this space stuff, right? In the 1990s, after the spectacular [X-33 debacle](http://www.nasaspaceflight.com/content/?cid=4180" \t "new ) over which it presided, the director of your former employer, the Marshall Space Flight Center, declared that that program had proved that we didn't have the technology for reusable launch vehicles, when drawing such a conclusion from a single flawed data point was logically absurd. As you can imagine, Homer, that did wonders for the fundraising ability of people who wanted to build such vehicles. NASA's predecessor, the [National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Advisory_Committee_for_Aeronautics%22%20%5Ct%20%22new%20), or NACA, did for the aviation industry exactly what you say that NASA should (and can?) do for space. It worked closely with private industry, determining its technology needs, and funded and executed research programs to advance those needed technologies — such as wing design, cowling shapes, jet engine parameters, propeller characteristics, etc. But the vast majority of NASA's funds do not go to such basic research anymore — they go to developing operational (sort of) systems for NASA's own use. And because it is risk-averse, NASA avoids advanced technologies in such systems to the degree possible, so there's no incentive for it to develop them for itself or anyone else. In putting all of its resources into redoing Apollo, the space program of 40 years ago, NASA has starved of funding essentially all of its advanced research, including shutting down completely the [NASA Institute for Advanced Concepts](http://www.niac.usra.edu/%22%20%5Ct%20%22new%20)in August.

# NSEA solvency

Only splitting up NASA will allow effective space exploration.

G. Ryan Faith. August 31, 2009. Giving NASA a clear mission. . Ryan Faith is an independent technology consultant and Adjunct Fellow for Space Initiatives at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, (CSIS) <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1456/1>

If neither technology-oriented nor destination-oriented objectives seem able to provide a sense of direction to guide the nation’s efforts in space, then what can? To approach this question, it is useful to ask why President Kennedy’s challenge to go to the Moon was so effective in providing NASA with leadership. The critical element of this challenge that, although never explicit, was so important to NASA’s health and growth during this period was the transformation—at least in fact, if not in law—into an exploration agency. If we wish to see NASA act effectively as a space exploration agency, then the most direct way to do this is to amend the Space Act to explicitly task the agency with the job of space exploration. However, before we do so, we must define what space exploration actually is. Space exploration is the expansion of human influence in space.

****NASA is too spread out; NSEA would be more focused.****

Mark R. Whittington. May 26, 2011. Writer of space subjects for a variety of periodicals, including The Houston Chronicle, The Washington Post, USA Today, the L.A. Times, and The Weekly Standard. Two Proposals Aim to Reorganize U.S. Space Operations. <http://news.yahoo.com/s/ac/20110526/sc_ac/8540799_two_proposals_aim_to_reorganize_us_space_operations>

A new agency would be created called the National Space Exploration Administration (NSEA), which would handle space exploration conducted by the United States and its partners. Operations at the International Space Station would also be handled by NASA until its functioning life is completed, then the ISS and NASA would sunset. Other functions of NASA would be distributed among other government agencies. Space science, for example, would go to the National Science Foundation. Earth science would go to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Aeronautics and some technology research and development would be assumed by a revived NACA, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which existed before the creation of NASA. Both proposals, that of the creation of a U.S. Space Guard and a National Space Exploration Administration, suggest that one problem facing NASA is that it is a polyglot organization with a variety of different and competing functions. Both proposals recognize space exploration, including the establishment of permanent infrastructure on other worlds, as a vital national interest. In the Space Guard proposal, NASA is downsized, but becomes more focused toward exploration. In the Schmitt proposal, a new agency handles space exploration. How the politics of such a reorganization, on a scale of the original act that created NASA in the late 1950s, is as yet unknown.

NSEA increases US dominance throughout the world. SQUO NASA can’t do that.

Natalie Wolchover. 25 May 2011. Nix NASA Completely, Apollo Astronaut Says. <http://www.space.com/11789-nasa-replacing-apollo-astronaut-jfk-moon.html>

Schmitt believes refocusing on space exploration is crucial for the United States to maintain its status as a superpower. [[Photos: John F. Kennedy's NASA Legacy](http://www.space.com/11643-photos-jfk-kennedy-nasa-space-race.html)] "This is not just a competition between nations; it's a competition between freedom and tyranny," Schmitt said. "The United States is the only power on Earth today that has in its DNA a protection of liberty, and if we decide to back off from space or any other major human endeavor, then we put that liberty in jeopardy. "The Obama administration has basically said that they won't pursue an exceptional space program for the United States and that they're just as happy to have China move forward into deep space, and be dependent on Russia for transport to the International Space Station." Schmitt, who was elected to the Senate in 1976 as a Republican from New Mexico, says China's domination of deep space and Russia's domination of near-Earth space would lower America's international standing of the U.S. in the same way the Soviet Union winning the space race would have changed the outcome of the Cold War. On top of the perceptions and politics, Schmitt argues that deep-space exploration is necessary for controlling space resources ? in particular, a fusion fuel called helium-3 that comes from the sun and is preserved in lunar soils. "Under certain financial constraints, helium-3 can be economically viable as a fuel for fusion power reactors here on Earth, and to have that dominated by another power such as China I [think](http://www.space.com/11789-nasa-replacing-apollo-astronaut-jfk-moon.html)would be very dangerous for us. That's just another aspect of the geopolitical significance of exploration," Schmitt said.

# CP is competitive-asteroids

Congress turns to NASA for asteroid missions

Russell L. Schweickart. March 16, 2007. The sky is falling, really. <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/16/opinion/16iht-edschweick.4929643.html>

TIBURON, California —People have been aware for some time now that there is a slim but real possibility — about 1 in 45,000 — that an 850-foot-long asteroid called Apophis could strike Earth with catastrophic consequences on April 13, 2036. What few probably realize is that there are thousands of other space objects that could hit us in the next century that could cause severe damage, if not total destruction. Last week two events in Washington — a conference on "planetary defense" held by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, and the release by NASA of a report titled "Near-Earth Object Survey and Deflection Analysis of Alternatives" — gave us good news and bad on this front. On the promising side, scientists have a good grasp of the risks of a cosmic fender-bender, and have several ideas that could potentially stave off disaster. Unfortunately, the government doesn't seem to have any plan to put this expertise into action. In 1998, Congress gave NASA's Spaceguard Survey program a mandate of "discovering, tracking, cataloging and characterizing" 90 percent of the near-Earth objects larger than one kilometer (3,200 feet) wide by 2008. An object that size would probably destroy civilization. The consensus at the conference was that the initial survey is doing fairly well although it will probably not quite meet the 2008 goal. Realizing that there are many smaller but still terribly destructive asteroids out there, Congress has modified the Spaceguard goal to identify 90 percent of even smaller objects — 460 feet and larger — by 2020. This revised survey, giving us decades of early warning, will go a long way toward protecting life on the planet in the future. The good news is that scientists feel we have the technology to intercept and deflect many asteroids headed toward Earth. Basically, if we have early enough warning, a robotic space mission could slightly change the orbit of a dangerous asteroid so that it would subsequently miss the planet. Two potential deflection techniques appear to work nicely together — first we would deflect the asteroid with kinetic impact from a missile (that is, running into it); then we would use the slight pull of a "gravity tractor" — a satellite that would hover near the asteroid — to fine-tune its new trajectory to our liking. (In the case of an extremely large object, probably one in 100, the missile might have to contain a nuclear warhead.) To be effective, however, such missions would have to be launched 15 or even 30 years before a calculated impact. The bad news? While this all looks fine on paper, scientists haven't had a chance to try it in practice. And this is where NASA's report was supposed to come in. Congress directed the agency in 2005 to come up with a program, a budget to support it and an array of alternatives for preventing an asteroid impact. But instead of coming up with a plan and budget to get the job done, the report bluntly stated that "due to current budget constraints, NASA cannot initiate a new program at this time."

# CP is competitive-SETI

Congress works through NASA to access SETI

Chris Impey & Erika Offerdahl. 2008. **The History of SETI.** <http://livingintheuniverse.com/IntelligentLifeInTheUniverse/TheHistoryofSETI_12May06.html>

Most SETI searches of the time were small, privately funded affairs. Things changed when, on October 12, 1992 after two decades of deliberation, NASA provided funding for the most ambitious SETI project ever. The Microwave Observing Project (MOP) searched more of the cosmic haystack in its first five minutes than all previous SETI experiments combined! During the previous two decades, NASA had conducted many workshops investigating the feasibility of a SETI search. Emerging from these workshops and discussion came two main search strategies. The first strategy was a targeted search, entailing the detailed monitoring of nearby Sun-like stars. The other strategy involved scanning of the entire sky, to allow for the possibility of more rare but more powerful signals from across the Galaxy. MOP was only under operation for one year before the U.S. Congress cut federal funding. Luckily, SETI effort was never fully dependent on NASA money. Two private organizations, the SETI Institute (founded in 1984) and the Planetary Society, were two key players in the preservation of the effort. In fact, taxpayers do not fund many of the current plans at all. Famous corporate leaders and media moguls like Steven Jobs, Paul Allen and Steven Speilberg have provided millions of dollars for a new generation of SETI experiments. Even though Congress has been dubious, the public is entranced by the idea of making contact with intelligence far beyond the solar system. The SETI Institute, a non-profit research lab, has parceled out data from the current radio experiments to millions of people around the country. Each person runs a program that uses spare capacity on their PC to look for artificial signals in a stream of radio noise. In this way, the SETI researchers can harness the power of millions of PCs to look for the elusive evidence of extraterrestrial intelligence. The new wave of SETI experiments depends on powerful receivers and large telescopes. Previous projects could only search a few hundred different frequency channels simultaneously. Projects like MOP listen in on tens of millions of channels simultaneously. The modern digital age and custom integrated circuits have made the improvements in the search possible. The receivers used for signal detection are also extraordinarily more sensitive. Astronomers achieved a radio detection of the weak signal of Pioneer 10 after it left the solar system; the detection had a changing Doppler shift due to the Earth's rotation. The waning signal has the equivalent power of a single Christmas tree light at a distance of over 5 billion miles! The 1000-foot diameter radio dish at Arecibo in Puerto Rico offers even greater sensitivity. The dish is so large that it could hold 357 million boxes of corn flakes or all the beer consumed on Earth in one year. Detectors at the focus of the Arecibo dish could detect a ½ megawatt radio signal, equal to the strength of a modest radio station on the other side of the Milky Way. Bigger, better, and more ambitious SETI schemes are underway. Two projects in particular, the Allan Telescope Array and Optical SETI, promise to catapult SETI efforts to an all-new high. Even loftier project could be further in the future. For instance, it could be possible to send a beacon and receiver hundreds of A.U. from the Earth and use the Sun as a gravitational lens to amplify and direct signals to distant targets. Future telescopes in space will allow the spectroscopic analysis of the reflected light from planets in other stellar systems. The direct detection of atmospheric chemistry that indicates life would cut through the web of anthropocentric arguments regarding technology and radio communication. In the meantime, researchers must think as broadly as possible about the nature of life. The search for life in the universe will become a truly scientific subject one step at a time. Few scientific subjects generate as strong an emotional response as SETI. Debates between SETI optimists and pessimists can be acrimonious. Pragmatists argue that the scientific basis for the optimistic calculations is flimsy and that no search strategy can be logically justified. SETI has been unpopular with some politicians, who see it as a frivolous use of taxpayers’ money. NASA has had considerable trouble in funding SETI, despite the fact that it accounts for less than 0.1% of the agency's science budget. However, popular support for SETI remains strong. "The probability of success is difficult to estimate," wrote physicists Giuseppe Cocconi and Phillip Morrison in their 1959 paper, "But if we never search, the chance of success is zero." Few people can resist the excitement of one of the most profound questions humans can ask, what is our place in the universe?

# CP is competitive-Space Mil

The US government uses NASA in order to militarize space.

Karl Grossman. 2001 Weapons in Space. <http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Militarization_Space/Weapons_Space.html>

p38 The U.S. military wants nuclear-powered weapons in space and that's been a key reason why NASA has been insisting on using nuclear power in space even when solar power would suffice. NASA coordinates its activities with the military. p48 Time magazine reported in a July 2000 article on missile defense "The heart of Ronald Reagan's 1983 Star Wars program lives on, kept beating by a mix of election-year politicking, behind-the-scenes defense-industry puppeteering and a fiercely committed group of conservative think tanks and antimissile-system advocates." "Not surprisingly, noted Time magazine in a July 2000 article on missile defense - "The Reagan-era Star War Program Lives On" "Defense contractors...have a major interest in a NMD [National Missile Defense] system, especially since its ultimate cost is estimated at more than $30 billion. The four largest weapons contractors-Boeing, Lockheed Martin, Raytheon and TRW-together received more than $2.2 billion in missile-defense research-and-development money over a recent 21-month span, according to a report issued by the World Policy Institute. In 1997 and 1998, the latest years for which figures are available, Boeing, Lockheed Martin, Raytheon and TRW spent $35 million on lobbying ' p48 Those working to make sure Star Wars "kept beating" include the Republican right, aerospace corporations that have spent huge amounts of money in lobbying the political system, archconservative foundations like the Heritage Foundation and the U.S. military, especially its U.S. Space Command. p50 Strong evidence of that can be found in the book Military Space Forces: The Next 50 Years that stresses on its title page that it was "Commissioned by Congress"- a Democratic-controlled U.S. Congress of the mid-1980s. This blueprint for space warfare is as wild and extreme as anything produced by the U.S. Space Command or the Heritage Foundation, and yet was endorsed personally by a group of mostly Democrats and commissioned by a Democratic Congress. The list of officials signing off on the "Congressional Introduction" is topped by the facsimile signatures of Representatives Ike Skelton of Missouri and John Spratt of South Carolina- Democrats and leaders in recent years for missile defense. Then there are the signatures of then Senator John Glenn of Ohio, the ex-astronaut and a Democrat given a NASA space shuttle ride in 1999); now U.S. Senator then Representative Bill Nelson, a Florida Democrat representing Cape Canaveral and the rest of the "Space Coast" who got his NASA space shuttle ride in 1986); and Representative Harold Volkmer, a Missouri Democrat. The two Republicans are Representative John Kasich of Ohio and Ben Blaz, a non-voting member of the House from Guam.

# CP is competitive-General

****NSEA is different from NASA and USFG’s normal means.****

Harrison H. Schmitt. May 25, 2011. (Former United States Senator, aerospace and private enterprise consultant, geologist and former Apollo Astronaut, member of the new Committee of Correspondence). Former Senator Schmitt Proposes Dismantling of NASA and Creation of a New, Deep Space Exploration Agency. <http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewsr.html?pid=37176>

NASA itself would be downsized to accommodate these changes. It should sunset as an agency once the useful life of the International Space Station (ISS) has been reached. De-orbiting of the ISS will be necessary within the next 10 to 15 years due to escalating maintenance overhead, diminished research value, sustaining cost escalation, and potential Russian blackmail through escalating costs for U.S. access to space after retirement of the Space Shuttles. NASA itself should sunset two years after de-orbiting, leaving time to properly transfer responsibility for its archival scientific databases to the NSF, its engineering archives to the new exploration agency, and its remaining space artifacts to the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. Finally, with the recognition that a second Cold War exists, this time with China and its surrogates, the President and Congress elected in 2012 should create a new National Space Exploration Administration (NSEA). NSEA would be charged solely with the human exploration of deep space and the re-establishment and maintenance of American dominance as a space-faring nation. The new Agency's responsibilities should include robotic exploration necessary to support its primary mission. As did the Apollo Program, NSEA should include lunar and planetary science and resource identification as a major component of its human space exploration and development initiatives. To organize and manage the start-up of NSEA, experienced, successful, and enthusiastic engineering program and project managers should be recruited from industry, academia, and military and civilian government agencies. NSEA must be given full authority to retire or rehire former NASA employees as it sees fit and to access relevant exploration databases and archives. An almost totally new workforce must be hired and NSEA must have the authority to maintain an average employee age of less than 30. (NASA's current workforce has an average age over 47.) Only with the imagination, motivation, stamina, and courage of young engineers, scientists, and managers can NSEA be successful in meeting its Cold War II national security goals. Within this workforce, NSEA should maintain a strong, internal engineering design capability independent of that capability in its stable of contractors. NSEA would assume responsibility for facilities and infrastructure at the Johnson Space Center (spacecraft, training, communications, and flight operations), Marshall Space Flight Center (launch vehicles), Stennis Space Center (rocket engine test), and Kennedy Space Center (launch operations). Through those Centers, NSEA would continue to support NASA's operational obligations related to the International Space Station. NSEA should have the authority, however, to reduce as well as enhance the capital assets of those Centers as necessary to meet its overall mission. Enabling legislation for NSEA should include a provision that no new space exploration project can be re-authorized unless its annual appropriations have included a minimum 30% funding reserve for the years up to the [project's](http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewsr.html?pid=37176) critical design review and through the time necessary to complete engineering and operational responses to that review. Nothing causes delays or raises costs of space projects more than having reserves that are inadequate to meet the demands of the inevitable unknown unknowns inherent in complex technical endeavors.

# Solves Environment

****ESSA will solve environmental crisis.****

Mark Schaefer et al July 3, 2008. An Earth Systems Science Agency. U.S. should merge NOAA, USGS to form national Environmental Agency. <http://news.mongabay.com/2008/0703-new_agency.html>

The United States should establish a new agency "to meet the unprecedented environmental and economic challenges facing the nation" argue a group of former senior federal officials in an editorial published in the journal*Science*. The proposed Earth Systems Science Agency (ESSA) was be formed by merging the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). It would be an independent organization. "Earth system science focuses on understanding current processes and predicting changes that will take place over the next hundred years," said Charles Kennel, former Associate Administrator of NASA and Director of Mission to Planet Earth. "It merges earth, atmospheric, and ocean science into a panorama of the earth system as it is today and as it will be tomorrow. We need it to predict climate change and its impacts, and to help us mitigate and adapt to other changes that have the potential to affect our quality of life and economic well-being." "Population pressure, development impact, and resource extraction affect land and sea alike. Just as the science of the Earth is seamless, so should the government responsibility be merged for these separate Earth agencies," added co-author D. James Baker, a former NOAA administrator. The authors warn that federal agencies are presently not structured to address "such major environmental problems as global climate change, declines in freshwater availability and quality, and loss of biodiversity." "It isn't often that we are offered a real opportunity to make government work better. But the modest, sensible reorganization proposed here brings a new science-rich focus on some of our biggest contemporary challenges," said Donald Kennedy, former commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration and past president of Stanford University. "The USGS, in bringing not only its geologic, biologic, hydrologic and geospatial expertise to the understanding of natural systems, but also its research capabilities in energy, mineral, water, and biologic resources, gives the new organization a comprehensive perspective on both environmental and resource systems," added former USGS director Charles Groat. "If we effectively link these capabilities with those of NOAA, we will have a powerful research institution." The authors say ESSA should be linked with the countries universities to take advantage of scientific talenet. The recommend that at least 25 percent of the new agency's budget be devoted to grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements with academic and nonprofit institutions. "ESSA's effectiveness will depend upon the bridges it builds to other federal agencies, from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and National Science Foundation, to the Department of Energy and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency," said former presidential science adviser John H. Gibbons. The paper concludes by linking investment in R&D to economic growth. In other words, it says that funding for research will create jobs and strengthen the economy. "The quality of life of future generations will be defined by the quality of the environment we hand down to them," said Mark Schaefer, a former official at the Department of the Interior and the White House science office. "Our nation's research and development enterprise must be better structured and directed if we are to have any chance of solving the tremendous environmental challenges of our time.

# Doesn’t Link to Spending

No link to spending, NSEA cuts back on budgets and is independent from other science agency.

Harrison Schmitt**.** MAY 25, 2011. **Former Senator Schmitt Proposes Dismantling of NASA and Creation of a New, National Space Exploration Administration (NSEA).** Harrison Hagan Schmitt, a native of Silver City, NM, has the diverse experience of a geologist, pilot, astronaut, administrator, businessman, writer, and U. S. Senator. Schmitt received his B. S. from Caltech, studied as a Fulbright Scholar at Oslo, and attended graduate school at Harvard. Geological field studies in Norway formed the basis of his Ph.D. in 1964. As a civilian, Schmitt received Air Force jet pilot wings in 1965 and Navy helicopter wings in 1967, logging more than 2100 hours of flying time. Selected for the Scientist-Astronaut program in 1965, Schmitt organized the lunar science training for the Apollo Astronauts, represented the crews during the development of hardware and procedures for lunar surface exploration, and oversaw the final preparation of the Apollo 11 Lunar Module Descent Stage. He served as Mission Scientist in support of the Apollo 11 mission. After training as back-up Lunar Module Pilot for Apollo 15, Schmitt flew in space as Lunar Module Pilot for Apollo 17 – the last Apollo mission to the moon. On December 11, 1972, he landed in the Valley of Taurus-Littrow as the only scientist and the last of 12 men to step on the Moon. <http://americasuncommonsense.com/>

NASA itself would be downsized to accommodate these changes. It should sunset as an agency once the useful life of the International Space Station (ISS) has been reached. De-orbiting of the ISS will be necessary within the next 10 to 15 years due to escalating maintenance overhead, diminished research value, sustaining cost escalation, and potential Russian blackmail through escalating costs for U.S. access to space after retirement of the Space Shuttles. NASA itself should sunset two years after de-orbiting, leaving time to properly transfer responsibility for its archival scientific databases to the NSF, its engineering archives to the new exploration agency, and its remaining space artifacts to the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. Finally, with the recognition that a second Cold War exists, this time with China and its surrogates, the President and Congress elected in 2012 should create a new National Space Exploration Administration (NSEA). NSEA would be charged solely with the human exploration of deep space and the re-establishment and maintenance of American dominance as a space-faring nation. The new Agency’s responsibilities should include robotic exploration necessary to support its primary mission. As did the Apollo Program, NSEA should include lunar and planetary science and resource identification as a major component of its human space exploration and development initiatives. To organize and manage the start-up of NSEA, experienced, successful, and enthusiastic engineering program and project managers should be recruited from industry, academia, and military and civilian government agencies. NSEA must be given full authority to retire or rehire former NASA employees as it sees fit and to access relevant exploration databases and archives. An almost totally new workforce must be hired and NSEA must have the authority to maintain an average employee age of less than 30. (NASA’s current workforce has an average age over 47.) Only with the imagination, motivation, stamina, and courage of young engineers, scientists, and managers can NSEA be successful in meeting its Cold War II national security goals. Within this workforce, NSEA should maintain a strong, internal engineering design capability independent of that capability in its stable of contractors. NSEA would assume responsibility for facilities and infrastructure at the Johnson Space Center (spacecraft, training, communications, and flight operations), Marshall Space Flight Center (launch vehicles), Stennis Space Center (rocket engine test), and Kennedy Space Center (launch operations). Through those Centers, NSEA would continue to support NASA’s operational obligations related to the International Space Station. NSEA should have the authority, however, to reduce as well as enhance the capital assets of those Centers as necessary to meet its overall mission. Enabling legislation for NSEA should include a provision that no new space exploration project can be re-authorized unless its annual appropriations have included a minimum 30% funding reserve for the years up to the project’s critical design review and through the time necessary to complete engineering and operational responses to that review. Nothing causes delays or raises costs of space projects more than having reserves that are inadequate to meet the demands of the inevitable unknown unknowns inherent in complex technical endeavors.

# No Funds Stealing

NSEA is independent of climate, aeronautic and observation agencies- no funding stealing

Robert Pearlman. May 25, 2011. Former Senator Schmitt Proposes Dismantling of NASA and Creation of a New, National Space Exploration Administration (NSEA). <http://www.collectspace.com/ubb/Forum39/HTML/000280.html>.

Is there a path forward for United States' space policy? When a new President takes office in 2013, he or she should propose to Congress that we start space policy and its administration from scratch. A new agency, the National Space Exploration Administration (NSEA), should be charged with specifically enabling America's and its partners' exploration of deep space, inherently stimulating education, technology, and national focus. The existing component parts of NASA should be spread among other agencies with the only exception being activities related to U.S. obligations to its partners in the International Space Station (ISS). Changes in the Space Act of 1958, as amended, to accommodate this major reinvigoration of the implementation of space and aeronautical policy should be straightforward. Spin-off and reformulation of technically oriented agencies have precedents in both the original creation of NASA in 1958 by combining the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics (NACA) and the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and the creation of the United States Air Force in 1947 from the Army Air Forces. The easiest change to make would be to move NASA Space Science activities, including space-based astronomical observatories, into the National Science Foundation (NSF). At the NSF, those activities can compete for support and funding with other science programs that are in the national interest to pursue. Spacecraft launch services can be procured from commercial, other government agencies, or international sources through case-by-case arrangements. With this transfer, the NSF would assume responsibility for the space science activities of the Goddard Space Flight Center and for the contract with Caltech to run the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. Also, in a similarly logical and straightforward way, NASA's climate and other earth science research could become part of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). NOAA could make cooperative arrangements with the NSF for use of the facilities and capabilities of the Goddard Space Flight Center related to development and operation of weather and other remote sensing satellites. Next, NASA aeronautical research and technology activities should be placed in a re-creation of NASA's highly successful precursor, the NACA. Within this new-old agency, the Langley Research Center, Glenn Research Center, and Dryden Flight Research Center could be reconstituted as pure aeronautical research and technology laboratories as they were originally. The sadly, now largely redundant Ames Research Center should be auctioned to the highest domestic bidder as its land and facilities have significant value to nearby commercial enterprises. These actions would force, once again, consideration of aeronautical research and technology development as a critical but independent national objective of great economic and strategic importance. NASA itself would be downsized to accommodate these changes. It should sunset as an agency once the useful life of the International Space Station (ISS) has been reached. De-orbiting of the ISS will be necessary within the next 10 to 15 years due to escalating maintenance overhead, diminished research value, sustaining cost escalation, and potential Russian blackmail through escalating costs for U.S. access to space after retirement of the Space Shuttles. NASA itself should sunset two years after de-orbiting, leaving time to properly transfer responsibility for its archival scientific databases to the NSF, its engineering archives to the new exploration agency, and its remaining space artifacts to the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. Finally, with the recognition that a second Cold War exists, this time with China and its surrogates, the President and Congress elected in 2012 should create a new National Space Exploration Administration (NSEA). NSEA would be charged solely with the human exploration of deep space and the re-establishment and maintenance of American dominance as a space-faring nation. The new Agency's responsibilities should include robotic exploration necessary to support its primary mission. As did the Apollo Program, NSEA should include lunar and planetary science and resource identification as a major component of its human space exploration and development initiatives.

\*\*\*AFSPC Section

# 1nc

Text: The United States Air Force Space Command should [plan text]

NASA already relies on the AFSPC to give it data

Eligar Sadeh. December 2009. Eligar Sadeh is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Space Studies at the University of North Dakota where he directs the Space Policy track for the Department. Sadeh also serves as a Research Associate with the Space Policy Institute at George Washington University. Dr Sadeh has developed graduate level courses in Space Politics and Policy, Public Administration of Space Technology, Space Law, and Space and the Environment. He has also advised graduate students on various research projects ranging from Mars Base System Architectures, Human Adaptation to Microgravity, International Space Law, and International Space Cooperation.  Chapter 13: Spacepower and the Environment. <http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/spacepower/space-Ch13.pdf>

The U.S. Air Force Space Command, through the Space Surveillance Network, routinely tracks and catalogues all human-made debris objects. This information is provided to and used by the civil, commercial, and military space sectors. For example, NASA uses the data on every space shuttle flight and has made numerous orbital corrections over the years to avoid collision. The same holds true for the International Space Station even though the ability for orbital correction is more limited. The space environment is populated by millions of pieces of orbital debris from a range of sources, such as inactive spacecraft, spent rocket bodies, operational debris from satellites and other payloads, fragmentation debris as a result of debris collisions, paint flakes, and particulates from propellant fuels. Collisions with pieces of debris greater than 10 millimeters (mm) in size can produce catastrophic damage to spacecraft. Even smaller debris ranging from 1 mm to 10 mm can be destructive as it can produce impact damage that can be serious depending upon system vulnerabilities and defensive design provisions against debris. Orbital debris smaller than 1 mm can cause surface pitting and erosion of materials; for example, 0.1 mm debris can potentially penetrate a spacesuit. The International Space Station is shielded to protect from smaller debris, and military space assets are hardened in many cases for such protection.

The AFSPC can take on NASA missions

James B. Armor, Jr. September 15, 2008. The Air Force’s other blind spot. James B. Armor, Jr., retired as a major general from the US Air Force in January 2008, where his last position was as Director of the National Security Space Office (NSSO) in the Office of the Under Secretary of the Air Force, Washington, DC. His 34-year Air Force space career included assignments as Director, Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) Systems Acquisition and Operations at the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO); Vice Commander of the Warner Robins Air Logistics Center at Robins AFB, Georgia; and Program Director of the NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (GPS) at Los Angeles Air Force Base, California. He was qualified as a DoD Space Shuttle payload specialist. He is also Senior Advisor to the Space Business Area of JHU/Applied Physics Laboratory, and Visiting Scientist to CMU/Software Engineering Institute*.*<http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1213/1>

But overwhelming this mission confusion, the end of the Cold War in the early ’90s marked a steady decline all things military, especially “strategic” missions like nuclear and space. The tremendous military success of Desert Storm in 1991—touted as the first “space war” due to the significant contributions of GPS, satellite communication, and detection and tracking of Iraqi Scud tactical missiles by missile warning satellites—were in significant measure due to very clever use by the Air Force and other military services of all those space systems that had been developed for strategic purposes during the Cold War. Using space forces for tactical, terrestrial missions by all the services and agencies has been a major priority since then, and it requires major investment.

# AFSPC solvency- General

The AFSPC has been successful with a tiny budget, it can easily take on NASA

James B. Armor, Jr. September 15, 2008. The Air Force’s other blind spot. James B. Armor, Jr., retired as a major general from the US Air Force in January 2008, where his last position was as Director of the National Security Space Office (NSSO) in the Office of the Under Secretary of the Air Force, Washington, DC. His 34-year Air Force space career included assignments as Director, Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) Systems Acquisition and Operations at the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO); Vice Commander of the Warner Robins Air Logistics Center at Robins AFB, Georgia; and Program Director of the NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (GPS) at Los Angeles Air Force Base, California. He was qualified as a DoD Space Shuttle payload specialist. He is also Senior Advisor to the Space Business Area of JHU/Applied Physics Laboratory, and Visiting Scientist to CMU/Software Engineering Institute*.*<http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1213/1>

At this point I want to stop and defend the Air Force. The USAF, I think, rightly objects when accused of poor stewardship of space. The truth is that the Air Force has done nothing short of a spectacular job of bringing the US to its current pre-eminence in space. Every major category of space system—navigation and timing, communications satellites, missile warning, weather, imagery and signals surveillance and reconnaissance, and more—owes its heritage to Air Force visionary leadership and management, both in the USAF and as the majority partner in the NRO. The Air Force has also created a global space infrastructure—launch systems; range; satellite command, control, and tracking; technical schools and graduate education; and a cadre of trained space professionals—that is second to none. I believe the technological and independent culture of the USAF was absolutely essential to this historic success. I do not believe any other military branch could have done as well. Also, with the severe underfunding of the Air Force (of all the military services, in fact) since the “peace dividend” and “procurement holiday” of the ’90s, all Air Force missions have reached a crisis. The USAF has been put in an impossible position to properly sustain, much less modernize and recapitalize, all its vital missions. The Air Force even went to the extreme position of downsizing its manpower to pay for recapitalization. That failed, partially because the Air Force was also asked to send a large number of its airmen to gap-fill Army jobs in Iraq and Afghanistan, like convoy driving, physical security, and terrestrial communications. That airmen responded with vigor, courage, and excellence to these challenges makes me especially proud to have been a member. Some say too much focus on air superiority—F-22, F-35—was the cause for firing the Chief and Secretary. Maybe, but the need for air superiority for the security of the nation seems pretty foundational to me. With F-15’s literally falling apart in midair, they were right to put their careers on the line to insure the safety of our airmen and our nation’s security.

# AFSPC solvency- SETI

**SETI hoping to work with AFSPC. AFSPC will ensure SETI completion**

SETI Institute. 2011. AFSPC explores Allen Telescope Array for Space Surveillance. <http://www.seti.org/afspc>.

An important and high visibility mission of the United States Air Force Space Command (AFSPC) is Space Surveillance. Knowing exactly where orbiting objects are located in space at any given instant is key to ensuring safe space operations. The significance of the mission has become even more acute with the recent collision of an Iridium Satellite and an inoperable Russian Cosmos Satellite, which destroyed both satellites and created two large fields of space debris. This debris will be a risk to other satellites for years to come as the debris fields expand and their orbits degrade toward Earth. AFSPC is one of a few organizations responsible for obtaining and maintaining the awareness needed for successful and safe space operations. The command develops, maintains and shares a comprehensive and accurate catalog of orbiting space objects, while constantly seeking methods to improve their Space Surveillance Network (SSN), a global network of radar and optical sensors that detect and track orbiting space objects. AF Space Command is exploring opportunities in academia and the commercial sector that could provide suitable cost-effective means for augmenting the Space Command's Space Surveillance mission. [The Allen Telescope Array (ATA)](http://www.seti.org/ata), located at the Hat Creek Radio Observatory, 290 miles northeast of San Francisco, California is a tool with strong potential for use by AFSPC in support of the Department of Defense’s Space Surveillance mission. The ATA is a radio interferometer that is dedicated to cutting-edge astronomical research. This array of antennas is optimized to receive and process a very wide portion of the radio spectrum and can stare at many areas of the sky at once. AFSPC, through the Space Innovation and Development Center (SIDC), is currently researching the possible use of the ATA to augment the already extensive sensors of the Space Surveillance Network, potentially leveraging the array to help increase space situational awareness. Initial demonstrations show promise for the ATA to track transmitting satellites in Low Earth Orbit, Medium Earth Orbit and, most promising, in Geosynchronous Orbit (GEO), which is home to the most costly, highly-utilized, and vital satellites that orbit the earth. A collision and subsequent debris field in GEO could permanently remove the GEO belt from worldwide use. AFSPC is working with the SETI Institute, and its partner, the Radio Astronomy Laboratory at the University of California, Berkeley. These partners currently operate the ATA. The effort is to demonstrate the array’s capability of accurately surveying the GEO belt by demonstrating the array’s capability of precisely locating objects in that area, in an effort to avoid a devastating collision in GEO. The ATA may prove to be a viable and sensitive SSN sensor, capable of all-weather, day and night operations, and will hopefully lead to improved space safety.

# AFSPC solvency- Space Mil

AFSPC is designed to militarize space

C. Robert Kehler General, USAF Commander. November 2009. 2009-2010 Air Force Space Command Strategic Plan. <http://www.afa.org/EdOp/2010/AFSPC_Strat_Plan_CC_changes_11_20_09.pdf>.

Air Force Space Command (AFSPC) is at a unique point in its history. AFSPC is providing military-focused space capabilities with a global perspective to the Joint warfighting team, while taking the USAF lead role in developing cyberspace capabilities, and establishing a new operational cyberspace Numbered Air Force (NAF). Additionally, AFSPC is restoring credibility and confidence in the US nuclear ICBM deterrent force while preparing to move the force to Air Force Global Strike Command (AFGSC). Each of these is being accomplished, all the while maintaining a razor-sharp focus on the operational commitments of today. Air, space and cyberspace are inextricably connected and exponentially increase each other's capabilities. They are each a critical part of today’s battle and together they will form the future of the US military advantage over adversaries. Make no mistake; as with air, land and sea, space and cyberspace are now important and contested operational domains. The loss of control in any area could lead to loss of control in all areas. AFSPC is taking decisive steps to position resources and people to meet the challenges that America will encounter in the vital domains of space and cyberspace. Each member of AFSPC shares the privilege of serving the nation and its Air Force. AFSPC provides the most capable and remarkable military space, missile, and cyberspace force the world has ever known, and the challenge is to ensure those who follow can say this as well. Consistent leadership and commitment will realize this goal.

AFSPC prepared to militarize space

C. Robert Kehler General, USAF Commander. November 2009. 2009-2010 Air Force Space Command Strategic Plan. <http://www.afa.org/EdOp/2010/AFSPC_Strat_Plan_CC_changes_11_20_09.pdf>.

Air, space, and cyberspace are interdependent and contested operational domains. USAF operations in the air, space, and cyberspace domains support one another. AFSPC must prepare for challenges not only in the air domain, but in space and cyberspace as well. Protecting these capabilities and integrating them in other domains will create Joint warfighting effects that are greater than the sum of its parts. Space and cyberspace forces are inherently global. AFSPC delivers capabilities that transcend national and military boundaries and fulfill tactical and strategic objectives in a locality or around the world. Space and cyberspace forces provide unique global access and coverage unfettered by time and distance; thus, the men and women of AFSPC provide a global perspective that influences the way forces are commanded and presented for Joint operations. Delivering new technological capabilities to our warfighters in a timely and efficient manner is critical to our national security and welfare. AFSPC must be agile to master rapidly emerging technologies and meet ever-changing threats. This will require clear, concise, and fully funded requirements as well as internal and external accountability. AFSPC will exploit all avenues to ensure rapid and efficient acquisitions, development and delivery.

# AFSPC solves heg

The world sees the US has only working to help itself. Only the AFSPC has mitigated this.

Brig Gen Robert M. Worley II. March 2007. The New National Space Policy and Air Force Space Command’s Role in International Cooperation. Director of Strategic Plans, Programs, Analyses, Assessments and Lessons Learned Air Force Space Command. <http://www.spacedebate.org/hf/v3n2.pdf>

Domestic and international media accounts of the new National Security Presidential Directive establishing US National Space Policy could cause the casual observer to believe the US is taking a unilateral, almost gunslinger approach in space with little regard to international considerations. Editorial headlines regarding the policy such as: America wants it all–life, the Universe and everything; New space policy revolves around US; US turns space into its colony; and Toward American ‘Space Dominance,’ reinforce a common perception that the US intends to go-it-alone in space. 1 I hold a much different view based on both the policy content and the international nature of many of the operations and activities conducted by Air Force Space Command (AFSPC). International cooperation has been a consistent theme in US space policy for nearly 50 years, and the latest National Space Policy is no exception. In fact, encouraging international cooperation with foreign nations is one of the fundamental goals of the new policy. I submit that AFSPC has practiced the spirit and intent of this aspect of the policy since it was established. After brieﬂy describing the nature of policy in general and providing some information on US space policy in particular, I will provide an overview of the new National Space Policy, and then describe how AFSPC is engaged in international cooperation to collectively provide space effects from a secure space domain in support of joint operations worldwide.

Giving the AFSPC civilian missions will promote heg.

Brig Gen Robert M. Worley II. March 2007. The New National Space Policy and Air Force Space Command’s Role in International Cooperation. Director of Strategic Plans, Programs, Analyses, Assessments and Lessons Learned Air Force Space Command. <http://www.spacedebate.org/hf/v3n2.pdf>

Additionally, the policy is clear that space capabilities, including space segments and supporting links are “vital to its naSenior Leader Perspective “the exploration and use of outer space … shall be carried out for the beneﬁt and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of the degree of their economic or scientiﬁc development, and shall be the province of all mankind.” ~ Outer Space Treaty, 1967High Frontier 8 tional interests,” and that the US will preserve freedom of action in space. 8 It even goes so far to say that, “Freedom of action in space is as important to the United States as air power and sea power.” 9 New to this space policy is the mention of homeland security with respect to the stated space policy goals. It speciﬁcally calls on the Nation’s space leadership to ensure that “space capabilities are available in time to further US national security, homeland security, and foreign policy objectives.” 10 This policy also promotes the need for “a robust science and technology base supporting national security, homeland security, and civil space activities.” 11 Other goals in the policy include seeking to enable a competitive domestic commercial space sector, unhindered operations in and through space, and increasing the beneﬁts of exploration. The policy also provides general guidelines which address the development of space professionals, improving space system development and procurement, strengthening interagency partnerships, and bolstering US space-related science, technology, and industrial base. The policy goes on to provide more speciﬁc guidelines in the areas of national security, civil space, commercial space, space nuclear power, radio frequency spectrum, and orbital debris. International space cooperation plays a prominent role in the latest National Space Policy. As one of the top three guiding principles, the policy states, “The United States will seek to cooperate with other nations in the peaceful use of outer space to extend the beneﬁts of space, enhance space exploration, and to protect and promote freedom around the world.” 12 Additionally, one of the policy’s seven stated fundamental goals is to, “Encourage international cooperation with foreign nations and/ or consortia on space activities that are of mutual beneﬁt and that further the peaceful exploration and use of space, as well as to advance national security, homeland security, and foreign policy objectives.” 13 Finally, there is a separate section dealing exclusively with international space cooperation which encourages cooperation with foreign nations on mutually beneﬁcial activities. Areas in which the policy speciﬁcally addresses cooperation include space exploration, providing space surveillance information, as well as developing and operating Earthobservation systems. Efforts currently underway within the national security space sector, and AFSPC in particular, are consistent with the international cooperation guidelines outlined in the National Space Policy. AFSPC is inherently a global command with personnel and facilities located around the world in the United Kingdom (UK), Greenland, Australia, Germany, Spain, Norway, Diego Garcia, Kwajalein, and Ascension Island to name a few. The agreements we have in place with our international partners go a long way toward fostering understanding and support of the mutual interests and foreign policy objectives of all involved. We have long operated hand-in-hand with Canada under the North American Aerospace Defense Command Agreement in conducting the critical mission of defending North America. This takes the form of, among other things, the integration of Canadian military members into our crew/watch activities in the US, as well as in places like Thule AB, Greenland. As a former base commander at Thule, I speak ﬁrst hand that there is no substitute for working side-by-side with our allies (in this case both Canada and Denmark) to accomplish an important mission on behalf of our respective countries. Space operations missions are an important part of our relationship with the UK as well, and we likewise exchange military members at various locations within the US and the UK. Additionally, we share close ties with Australia, exchanging military ofﬁcers and engaging in space operations activities of mutual interest and beneﬁt. When it comes to providing space data and capabilities to our allies and the broader international community, I believe AFSPC and the Air Force are delivering in a signiﬁcant way. We provide space surveillance information (speciﬁcally called out in the space policy) as the maintainers of the catalog of space objects. Customers around the world, with a validated need to know, have Web access to information from our space surveillance network under the Commercial and Foreign Entities (CFE) program which assists all concerned with exact satellite location information. This information is critical for situational awareness in space and preventing objects from colliding. We also share missile warning data, weather information and intelligence, not to mention the most pervasive US contribution to the international community, free of charge, the positioning, navigation, and timing information provided by the global positioning system. Rounding out this list are AFSPC international cooperative efforts in ﬁelding future military satellite communications systems

\*\*\*AFF ANSWERS

# Keep NASA

Splitting up the science department of the US would make them inefficient.

Turner Brinton. 17 June, 2011. Official Urges Against Breaking up NOAA. <http://www.spacenews.com/civil/110617-official-urges-against-breaking-noaa.html>

WASHINGTON — As the White House considers organizational changes for federal economic and trade offices, it should not break apart the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) because of the integral nature of air and water observation, NOAA’s deputy administrator said June 15. One improvement that could be made within the White House’s Office of Management and Budget (OMB) would be to move NOAA funding from the category of General Government Programs to Natural Resource Programs, said Kathryn Sullivan, assistant secretary of commerce for environmental observation and prediction and NOAA deputy administrator. U.S. President Barack Obama, in his State of the Union address in January, called for a reorganization of the federal government to cut waste and duplication and to better help American businesses compete. The recommendations of a six-month study were delivered to Obama June 9 and will be reviewed over the summer, White House spokesman Jay Carney said during a June 16 press briefing. NOAA is aligned under the U.S. Department of Commerce. The study floated options for moving NOAA to the Interior Department or splitting it up between the Interior Department and NASA, according to an industry source. NASA has long built weather satellites on behalf of NOAA. NOAA should remain with the Department of Commerce because weather and climate observation are strongly linked to the U.S. economy, Sullivan said in an interview. If a decision to move NOAA is made, it should keep the agency whole wherever it is placed, she said. NOAA “is really an agency of the globe because the phenomena that we need to understand and have reliable forecasts of as a country to have an effective economy and a safe populous are global,” Sullivan said. “I can’t give you a two- to three-day weather forecast for anywhere on the planet unless I’ve got observations and measurements from everywhere on the planet.” When OMB crafts its budget proposals each year, NOAA funding is lumped in with funding for unrelated agencies such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development. For the sake of making more comparable budgetary trade-offs, it would make sense to list NOAA in the Natural Resource Programs category with agencies such as NASA, the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture, Sullivan said.

NASA has been successful and Obama plans to continue its success.

Christopher C. Kraft. 14 December, 2009. U.S. Space Program: a Common-sense Approach. America's first human space mission flight director, four NASA Distinguished Service Medals and the Goddard Memorial Trophy. He is also the recipient of the National Space Trophy from the Rotary National Award for Space Achievement Foundation. He received a Bachelor of Science degree in Aeronautical Engineering. He joined the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA) <http://spacenews.com/commentaries/space-program-common-sense-approach.html>

The U. S. human space program has a number of assets: 1. The space shuttle, despite its detractors, is a highly capable vehicle for transporting humans and cargo to space. It has proved to be uniquely reliable and with proper attention could continue to be the workhorse for operating to and from Earth orbit for quite some time to come. Yes, it is expensive to operate, but replacing it with an equivalent system will require a large investment, and it will be difficult to reproduce its versatility for conducting spaceflight operations at a lower operating cost. 2. The international space station is a space laboratory created by the U.S. and its international partners at a high price. It is now operational to the point where it may be used for scientific and technological research enabled by the environment of zero gravity and a nearly perfect vacuum. With proper maintenance, the space station will be able to operate for a reasonably long time. We do not know the scope of maintenance that will be required as it ages, but it will most likely require a vehicle like the space shuttle to transport the large parts necessary to keep it productive. In addition, as experience is gained, it is probable that additional equipment will be required to support the experimental activity. Also, the number and rate of exchange of experimenters required to go to and from the space station is yet to be determined, and this too may well require a system such as the shuttle. 3. The Constellation program is envisioned to provide the next generation of vehicles to conduct human and other space activities involving the space station and a return to the Moon to conduct extended human exploration. NASA has been working on this program for four years and has spent about $10 billion designing, developing and testing the systems to conduct these activities. These include the Ares 1 launch vehicle; the Orion spacecraft to transport people into space; modifications at Cape Canaveral to launch Ares; the preliminary design and development of Ares 5, a new heavy-lift launch vehicle; and the vehicles that will eventually be used to land and live on the Moon. 4. All of these activities are the work of another important asset: a NASA-aerospace industry team of engineers and scientists that has been built up over a number of years, and a relatively new group of NASA and industry personnel managing Constellation. The spectacular success of space activities such as the assembly of the space station and the repair of the Hubble Telescope is due to the outstanding groups of highly trained and motivated people assembled by NASA. Because of the long period since the shuttle’s development, considerable time and effort have been required to rebuild the engineering and manufacturing capability necessary to design, build and test these new machines. Former NASA Administrator Mike Griffin spent substantial time and resources rebuilding this unique group in NASA and industry, and it has become a valuable asset for both ongoing work and the next generation of exploratory vehicles. Six months ago, U.S. President Barack Obama appointed former Lockheed Martin chief Norman Augustine to lead a review of NASA activities and goals, and to recommend a course for the U.S. space program. Mr. Augustine’s report was released to the president in October, and is now under review by NASA and the White House. Probably the most important factor of the report is it clearly highlights that the Constellation program is seriously underfunded. The report suggests that another $3 billion be added to the NASA annual budget.

NASA’s methods are the only way to efficiently explore space.

Christopher C. Kraft. 14 December, 2009. U.S. Space Program: a Common-sense Approach. America's first human space mission flight director, four NASA Distinguished Service Medals and the Goddard Memorial Trophy. He is also the recipient of the National Space Trophy from the Rotary National Award for Space Achievement Foundation. He received a Bachelor of Science degree in Aeronautical Engineering. He joined the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA) <http://spacenews.com/commentaries/space-program-common-sense-approach.html>

In addition, the suggestion that the NASA budget supply $5 billion to support these systems is contrary to the basic idea of “commercial” space development, which is that seed money from NASA together with private capital should be used to finance these companies. If these vehicles are to be subsidized by the U.S. government, that subsidy should not be a burden to NASA. At the same time, NASA technical and management support could be used to aid these companies. I must make another point in regard to the program content and direction suggested by the Augustine committee, where sorties into deep space and eventually to Mars are made to sound as if they should be considered as near-term goals. This view is in contrast to every study that has been done by NASA and other learned groups, which point out that a mission to Mars requires considerable new technology. Most crucially, new technology is required for power and propulsion to replace chemical propulsion systems and solar arrays now in use. Until this issue has been resolved by the necessary research and development, the goal of the Constellation program of returning humans to the Moon for scientific research and learning to live on another planet is a challenging yet much more realistic objective. It will provide a proper steppingstone to the exploration of more distant places. This is particularly true if the funds are limited in the near term. Therefore, NASA should essentially stay the course that has been pursued for the past several years. It makes good common sense to preserve and continue the use of the present NASA assets. Specifically, NASA should: Continue to operate the space shuttle until a suitable replacement is available, and initiate a study to consider a modernization program aimed primarily at reducing the operating costs. Operate and maintain the international space station until it ceases to be economically reasonable and scientifically productive. Continue to push forward with orderly haste to accomplish the goals set forth by the Constellation program. Initiate an aggressive research and development program aimed at the technology required to make space exploration to Mars and other deep-space objectives rational and affordable. Estimate a realistic set of budget requirements for the total NASA program based on the above goals and the other elements and goals of the agency

# AFSPC bad

The AFSPC is bad with space missions

James B. Armor, Jr. September 15, 2008. The Air Force’s other blind spot. James B. Armor, Jr., retired as a major general from the US Air Force in January 2008, where his last position was as Director of the National Security Space Office (NSSO) in the Office of the Under Secretary of the Air Force, Washington, DC. His 34-year Air Force space career included assignments as Director, Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) Systems Acquisition and Operations at the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO); Vice Commander of the Warner Robins Air Logistics Center at Robins AFB, Georgia; and Program Director of the NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (GPS) at Los Angeles Air Force Base, California. He was qualified as a DoD Space Shuttle payload specialist. He is also Senior Advisor to the Space Business Area of JHU/Applied Physics Laboratory, and Visiting Scientist to CMU/Software Engineering Institute*.*<http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1213/1>

But there’s another domain equally important to the security of the nation, and equally ebbing under Air Force custodianship: space. Space has experienced the same long slide since the ’90s as the nuclear mission. In fact, responsibility for organizing, equipping, and training both space and ICBMs forces is assigned to the same Major Command (MAJCOM), Air Force Space Command (AFSPC). AFSPC was first created in 1982. In 1992 Strategic Air Command (SAC), responsible for all US air- and land-based nuclear forces, was disestablished. The management of nuclear forces went briefly to Air Combat Command (ACC), but then in a “marriage of convenience” the ICBM mission moved to AFSPC. Partly because of its “catchall” nature, there has been confusion about the true mission of AFSPC ever since. For example, “near space” (very high altitude airships) was temporarily assigned to AFSPC earlier in this decade. Even today many in Air Force leadership would further assign Cyberspace or Integrated Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) missions to AFSPC, in a blur of mediums and missions. In addition to being assigned to the same Command, the personnel management specialty code for ICBM and space operators is one and the same. Basically, the Air Force does not distinguish between ICBM and space professionals and assignments and training track back and forth. An insightful vignette on this confusion: the Air Force combined the space and missiles uniform badges into a single badge in 2006, affectionately called “Space Wings”. After the recent nuclear incidents and the criticism for lack of management focus, the missile badge—the “Pocket Rocket”—was again split out in 2008.

AFSPC continually angers Congress and can’t succeed at space missions

James B. Armor, Jr. September 15, 2008. The Air Force’s other blind spot. James B. Armor, Jr., retired as a major general from the US Air Force in January 2008, where his last position was as Director of the National Security Space Office (NSSO) in the Office of the Under Secretary of the Air Force, Washington, DC. His 34-year Air Force space career included assignments as Director, Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) Systems Acquisition and Operations at the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO); Vice Commander of the Warner Robins Air Logistics Center at Robins AFB, Georgia; and Program Director of the NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (GPS) at Los Angeles Air Force Base, California. He was qualified as a DoD Space Shuttle payload specialist. He is also Senior Advisor to the Space Business Area of JHU/Applied Physics Laboratory, and Visiting Scientist to CMU/Software Engineering Institute*.*<http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1213/1>

To say that there has been discontent with Air Force stewardship of space is a major understatement. All the services and agencies, the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), and Congress have cycled from skepticism to rage at “Air Force shenanigans” in shorting the space budget. Every year there’s a process game where the Air Force cuts the space budget and OSD and Congress, with the loud support of the services and agencies that depend on Air Force space systems, restore it. Cynics point out that this is a Machiavellian way to increase the total Air Force budget—which works. It may work, but it comes at the expense of outrage by all who must intervene. Other organizations manage this discontent in different ways. For example, the Navy, true to its own traditions, simply ignores the Air Force and builds some of its own communications satellites. The National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), on the other hand, engages in outright warfare, the recent, late Space Radar program being a case in point. The Air Force and NRO fought so fiercely over budget, acquisition, and operational authority that the program failed to crystallize and was cancelled by a disgruntled OSD and Congress, both of which support the need for the program. Over the last few years, Congress directed first a virtual, and now an actual, separate Major Force Program (MFP) to insure visibility into Air Force handling of the $12+ billion space budget. At this point I want to stop and defend the Air Force. The USAF, I think, rightly objects when accused of poor stewardship of space. The truth is that the Air Force has done nothing short of a spectacular job of bringing the US to its current pre-eminence in space. Every major category of space system—navigation and timing, communications satellites, missile warning, weather, imagery and signals surveillance and reconnaissance, and more—owes its heritage to Air Force visionary leadership and management, both in the USAF and as the majority partner in the NRO. The Air Force has also created a global space infrastructure—launch systems; range; satellite command, control, and tracking; technical schools and graduate education; and a cadre of trained space professionals—that is second to none. I believe the technological and independent culture of the USAF was absolutely essential to this historic success. I do not believe any other military branch could have done as well. Also, with the severe underfunding of the Air Force (of all the military services, in fact) since the “peace dividend” and “procurement holiday” of the ’90s, all Air Force missions have reached a crisis. The USAF has been put in an impossible position to properly sustain, much less modernize and recapitalize, all its vital missions. The Air Force even went to the extreme position of downsizing its manpower to pay for recapitalization. That failed, partially because the Air Force was also asked to send a large number of its airmen to gap-fill Army jobs in Iraq and Afghanistan, like convoy driving, physical security, and terrestrial communications. That airmen responded with vigor, courage, and excellence to these challenges makes me especially proud to have been a member. Some say too much focus on air superiority—F-22, F-35—was the cause for firing the Chief and Secretary. Maybe, but the need for air superiority for the security of the nation seems pretty foundational to me. With F-15’s literally falling apart in midair, they were right to put their careers on the line to insure the safety of our airmen and our nation’s security. But all that said, and despite Air Force protestations that air and space are a seamless “aerospace” medium, USAF priorities for space are clearly lower than for air superiority. Getting past the shortfall in overall Air Force resources, the space doctrine of the USAF has been primarily to support terrestrial operations, precision strike in particular. There is nothing inherently wrong with space support to terrestrial operations—in fact, it’s a clear asymmetric advantage—but it has had the effect of neglecting the space superiority mission. Although the Air Force has some extraordinary localized space surveillance capabilities, global space situational awareness (SSA) is barely rudimentary compared with that for the air domain. It can take weeks to find a satellite that changes its orbit, something that is especially important if you are trying to avoid conjunctions (collisions) in the increasingly crowded space domain. Lack of timely characterization of space debris, space weather, and capabilities of foreign satellites and anti-satellite systems is disconcerting at best. Lack of ability to promptly attribute the cause of an incident in space—a satellite that ceases to function, for example—is an invitation to bad behavior by those who know they can’t be traced. Piracy and jamming of commercial satellite communications is already becoming commonplace. Keep in mind 80% of military satellite communication is over commercial satellites. Also, space operational command and control (C2) is severely outmoded. It has been especially difficult to extricate the space C2 capabilities out of the nuclear C2 system in Cheyenne Mountain for budgetary reasons and Congressional concerns (BRAC related). Fortunately, US Strategic Command’s (STRATCOM’s) Joint Space Operations Center (JSpOC) under 14th Air Force leadership appears to have turned the corner. Furthermore, the JSpOC has made excellent progress in collaborating with the NRO Operations Center (NROC). Just as troubling given the shortfall in resources for US military space is the lack of initiative in military-to-military relationships with spacefaring friends and allies including NATO, and with commercial interests. Congress had to order the Air Force to share space surveillance data with commercial and foreign entities (CFE), which the USAF does now with considerable reluctance. The failure to engage with European allies to encourage them to make their Galileo system more fully compatible with GPS is infamous. (This was consistent with White House policy at the time, so the Air Force can to some extent be legitimately excused.) Now, in their newly released defense policy, Europeans contemplate the development of their own space surveillance network since, again in part, they cannot rely on SSA support from the US. They also envision enhanced space support capabilities and an independent European space C2 infrastructure. In another disheartening example of the Air Force’s space blind spot, many space system users represented by STRATCOM and other experts in government and industry have for years asked the Air Force to look into smaller, more responsive satellites. Again, these new space technologies consistently fell below the Air Force cut line. It took Congress and OSD to direct the establishment of a Joint Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) Office, plucking primarily Air Force people and resources, before anything happened. (Ironically, it was the Air Force Undersecretary, acting as the DoD Executive Agent for Space, who implemented the Joint ORS Office over the objections of the Air Force Chief and Secretary.)

AFSPC is causing US to lose heg and fall behind Russia and China

James B. Armor, Jr. September 15, 2008. The Air Force’s other blind spot. James B. Armor, Jr., retired as a major general from the US Air Force in January 2008, where his last position was as Director of the National Security Space Office (NSSO) in the Office of the Under Secretary of the Air Force, Washington, DC. His 34-year Air Force space career included assignments as Director, Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) Systems Acquisition and Operations at the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO); Vice Commander of the Warner Robins Air Logistics Center at Robins AFB, Georgia; and Program Director of the NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (GPS) at Los Angeles Air Force Base, California. He was qualified as a DoD Space Shuttle payload specialist. He is also Senior Advisor to the Space Business Area of JHU/Applied Physics Laboratory, and Visiting Scientist to CMU/Software Engineering Institute*.*<http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1213/1>

Most space professionals have their own similar recommendations on how to end the long slide. Although alternatives vary, they all call for unified, accountable leadership and more autonomy for space. (My own alternative is to create a Space Corps inside the Air Force with its own personnel, budget, and HQ staff, much like the Army Air Corps General HQ created during World War 2. ) But it is clear that the status quo, using existing Air Force management and doctrine, simply will not work in an age of an increasingly contested space domain. Support of a non-existent “aerospace” regime not only prevents space from thriving, it equally undermines Air Force leadership of the vital air superiority mission. We’ve reached a point where we can no longer live with this faltering national security space mission. The rest of the world is fast approaching in space capabilities, and not all necessarily have US best interests in mind—including and especially Russia and China—while the US is at best treading water. The Allard Commission spends a significant portion at the opening of their report explaining the vital importance of space to the future of the US economy, technology base, and national security, and the deep crisis we face as a nation. I hope this commission stays intact until next year to convey their strong message to the next administration. I also fervently hope we don’t have a space tragedy before action is taken.

# Notes

1) 1NC card for NSEA. 1st proposal and not many people have released replies to the proposal by Harrison Schmitt. Also since the organization does not exist yet, it would be difficult to find answers against the NSEA. It also clearly outlines how NASA will be split up and how all the results would be separate organizations.

2) NASA has had a lot of success in the past and the USFG has not seriously considered changing it (and those that have, decide against it). There is no concrete reason, only subjective ones against splitting up NASA.

3) When NASA splits up, it will be split into four groups: NSEA, ESSA, NSF and NACA. Each one is an independent organization and won’t be able to steal from each other. You would also be able to claim advantages off this, since they each have a different goal (space exploration, environment, space science, and aeronautics)

4)