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## 1NC—Russia Condition CP

### Text: The United States federal government should offer to engage in joint operations over (insert plan), including sharing all data gathered, if and only if the Russian Federation agrees to pay for all costs associated with the launch.

### Conditioning solves – they will say yes and it boosts the Russian economy.

Office of Technology Assessment, April 1995, “U.S.-Russian Cooperation in Space”, OTA-ISS-618 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office), PDF

Russia operates a fleet of reliable, relatively in- expensive launch vehicles. However, Russian space and earth sciences instrumentation and science spacecraft are generally not up to U.S. standards of sophistication and long-term reliabil- ity. 15 Russian strengths lie in theoretical science, materials, software development, space propul- sion, and mechanical engineering. To counter their technical weaknesses, the Russians have ac- tively sought foreign instruments for their space- craft. Flying U.S. instruments on some Russian spacecraft continues to be an attractive way for the United States to gain additional flight opportuni- ties at minimum cost. For example, from August 1991 until February 1995, a NASA Total Ozone Mapping Spectrometer (TOMS) delivered impor- tant data from aboard a Russian Meteor-3 polar- orbiting weather spacecraft. NASA has recently concluded an agreement with the Russian Space Agency (RSA) to fly a Stratospheric Aerosol and Gas Experiment (SAGE) instrument and a TOMS instrument on Meteor-3M spacecraft in 1998 and 2000, respectively. At the same time, the U.S. par- ticipants in these cooperative efforts must be keenly aware of the risk that Russian agencies or enterprises may be late or unable to perform be- cause of technical, economic, and/or political dif- ficulties. l6 Well-developed contingency plans are, therefore, a necessity. In the past, NASA has almost always arranged its cooperative projects so that there is no ex- change of funds with the other countries or agen- cies involved. OTA’s workshop participants believed that under normal circumstances, this practice was sound because it helps ensure bal- anced projects and avoids the political difficulties that could arise from sending funds abroad. More- over, they agreed that foreign agencies that find a place in their budgets for their part of cooperative projects tend to be more fully engaged and com- mitted partners. Consistent with this approach, the use of Rus- sian launch vehicles for U.S. space science and ap- plications spacecraft is an attractive cooperative option that may permit some projects that would not be undertaken otherwise. Normally, such cooperative agreements should be made on the ba- sis that Russia would supply the launch vehicle in return for participating in the activity and receiv- ing access to the data returned. Nevertheless, as a short-term measure, U.S. support of some portion of the launch costs for an experiment may be ap- propriate—for example, to ensure the project’s completion. 1 7

### Cooperation is necessary to solve the militarization of space and US-Russia war

John M. Logsdon and James R. Millar ET AL, Editors , Space Policy Institute and Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies Elliott School of International Affairs The George Washington University , February 2001 , “U.S. -Russian Cooperation in Human Space Flight Assessing the Impacts” , PDF

Another participant suggested that "The best evidence suggests that we were able to get some of thebest Russian space engineers into the ISS program." For one thing, "the Russians gave up on a number of high-ticket programs with military space implications [Energia and Buran] while buying into cooperation with the United States to sustain parts of space infrastructure. There is much less talk for the last decade of militarization of space." Also, "Openness and transparency in the area of manned space flight has allowed the development of a deeper and broader network of contacts in the scientific and technical communities. Whether these new relationships are sufficient to change Russian policy in a crisis seems to be asking much. On the other hand, channels of communication in the information age often have unanticipated consequences -- especially where informal channels are involved." For, according to another participant, "I cannot think of anything -with the exception of military to military contacts -that can be more indicative of changes in US-Russian relationships than cooperation in the area of human space flight and military to military contacts. To begin with, there is the critical area of trust." "Closer ties in the area of space" are likely to result in "greater realism on both sides," and such "realism works against rabid nationalism."

# 2NC/1NR

## Russia Will Say Yes

### Russia wants nothing less then to cooperate with the US over – normally the costs is spit but they still want a means cooperation – conditioning it is necessary to gain leverage over Russia – that’s Office of Technology Assessment 1995

### Russia will say yes – wants deeper relations now

WSJ, MAY 19, 2010 Russia Seeks Cooperation With U.S. in Space Effort , http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704912004575252842393481092.html

Russian leaders are trying to use the current thaw in relations with the U.S. to enhance cooperation in space, pushing for joint exploration efforts extending past the life of the international space station. Russian Deputy Prime Minister Sergei Ivanov spoke over the weekend with Charles Bolden, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and gave the Kremlin's strongest indication to date that it wants to team with the U.S. to explore more deeply into the solar system. In a speech and brief interview Monday, Mr. Ivanov said the time is right for the two countries to share financial and engineering resources on possible ventures that would be launched past 2020 and travel beyond low-earth orbit. The two countries already collaborate extensively on the space station, an international consortium that includes Russia, the U.S. and several other countries. The station, which operates in low-earth orbit, is slated to continue for at least another decade. Both countries need increasing international support to advance in space. With the U.S. space-shuttle fleet slated for retirement next year and Congress and the White House at loggerheads over its replacement, NASA will be entirely dependent on Russian rockets and capsules to get astronauts to the space station for the next several years. Russia's space ambitions, meanwhile, require outside financial support. In his speech to a meeting organized by the Nixon Center, a foreign-policy group, on Monday, Mr. Ivanov pointedly referred to the immense cost of space exploration. The Obama administration has also opened the door for enhanced space cooperation, and Kremlin officials appear persuaded the time is right to begin talks about new ventures. Mr. Ivanov said in the speech that "I firmly believe that all our cooperation in space" so far "should bring more and more fruits." Although he didn't mention details, Mr. Ivanov said that "it's time to look beyond" low-earth orbit. Mr. Ivanov, who has oversight of Russia's aerospace efforts, said after the speech he was "pleased with the tenor of the discussions" with the NASA chief. A NASA spokesman said Tuesday that "building upon several decades of successful cooperation," agency officials and their Russian counterparts "are continuing discussions on potential future cooperative activities in space." Preliminary discussions have focused on ways to team up to develop more-powerful rockets capable of reaching Mars and other destinations, according to people familiar with the matter. But even with both sides eager for cooperation, major difficulties remain. Mr. Ivanov, for example, was quoted in the Russian media as saying his country wants to aggressively push ahead to develop nuclear-powered engines for rockets. But such a project would run into huge political and technical opposition in the U.S., which instead is looking to develop less-costly conventional boosters for longer space flights.

### US-Russia space cooperation empirically proven

Cheryl Pellerin, 2/21/07 (Space Cooperation Highlights 200 Years of U.S.-Russia Relations: Astronauts, cosmonauts lead other nations into space exploration frontier. USINFO. http://www.america.gov/st/washfileenglish/2007/February/20070221131459lcnirellep0.7167169.html)

Washington – On the same day that NASA commemorated the 45th anniversary of John Glenn’s orbits of Earth in Friendship 7 in 1962, the U.S. Department of State celebrated 200 years of U.S.-Russian diplomatic relations with a February 20 program on U.S.-Russia cooperation in space. From the early days of spaceflight to the International Space Station, the United States and Russia, as competitors and partners, have paved the way for all nations into the frontier of space exploration. “While countries can successfully pursue space programs on their own,” said Claudia McMurray, assistant secretary of state for oceans, environment and science, “as the Soviet Union and the U.S. did in the past and as several countries are doing now, international cooperation has a powerful logic, particularly in an era of limited funds.” Even at the peak of the Cold War, McMurray added, NASA and its Soviet counterparts cooperated on a technical level through various data exchanges. COMPETITION TO COOPERATION “In exploring outer space,” said Yuri Ushakov, Russia's ambassador to the United States, “we are not only partners but rivals as well. That rivalry, that competition, however, produced brilliant results. ... A half a century ago, in 1957, the Soviet Union launched the first man-made satellite, and America [responded] by establishing NASA and the launch of their own space vessels.” In 1972, the United States and the Soviet Union signed the Agreement Concerning Cooperation in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space for Peaceful Purposes. The agreement expanded cooperation in space science, earth science, satellite-based search and rescue and human spaceflight. It also led to the first joint human space mission, the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project, and engagement on a wide array of cooperative programs. The Apollo-Soyuz Test Project, July 15-24, 1975, was the first international manned spaceflight. The mission tested rendezvous and docking systems compatibility for American and Soviet spacecraft and opened the way for international space rescue and future joint manned flights. During this project, the first international handshake in space occurred when astronaut Thomas Stafford and cosmonaut Aleksei Leonov greeted each other after the Soyuz and Apollo docked July 19. The Space Shuttle-Mir Joint Program, February 1994 to June 1998, included 11 space shuttle flights and seven U.S. astronaut residencies, called increments, on the Russian space station Mir. Space shuttles also conducted crew exchanges and delivered supplies and equipment. Shuttle-Mir showed that space exploration did not have to be competitive, and helped Americans and Russians develop the expertise to build and maintain the International Space Station, the largest international science collaboration in space. The United States, Japan, Canada, Russia and 11 countries represented by the European Space Agency have come together to build and inhabit the station, and make future space exploration possible. SEA LAUNCH AND LAND LAUNCH Among the projects that are important today in U.S.-Russia cooperation, said Thomas Pickering, a consultant to the Boeing Company and a former U.S. diplomat, is the Sea Launch Company, an international partnership of U.S., Russian, Ukrainian and Norwegian businesses formed in 1995 to provide reliable, cost-effective heavy-lift launch services for commercial customers. “For years, scientists have understood that launches from the equator would produce more weight-lift capacity with less fuel burn and expense,” Pickering said. Sea Launch is a spacecraft launch service that uses a mobile sea platform for equatorial launches of commercial payloads on special rockets. It has assembled and launched 24 rockets. Partners are the Boeing Commercial Space Company (United States), RSC Energia (Russia), SDO Yuzhnoye/PO Yuzhmash (Ukraine) and Aker ASA (Norway). “Over the years, our Russian friends encouraged us to use the same setup for land launches,” Pickering said, and Land Launch was formed in 2004. Sea Launch Company, based in California, provides contracting and management services for Land Launch. Space International Services in Moscow provides hardware and services originating in Russia, Ukraine and Kazakhstan, in a subcontracting arrangement with Sea Launch. Land Launch, Pickering added, “is now in a position to have launched several commercial satellites from the Baikonur space station in Kazakhstan.”

### Russia wants further cooperation – space key

Sergey Ivanov, 3/16/11 (Deputy Prime Minister of Russia, U.S.-Russia Relations, <http://www.unc.edu/depts/> diplomat/item/2011/0104/spch/spch\_ivanov.html)

On April 4, Russian Deputy Prime Minister (and former Defense Minister) Sergey Ivanov provided the New York-based Council of Foreign Relations with a tour d'horizon of U.S.-Russian relations. Ivanov accentuated the positive. He ran through a checklist of "reset" results, including New START, an agreement on U.S. air transit of troops/equipment to Afghanistan, and coordinated operations against Afghan drug production. He even noted the possibility of cooperation on protecting Europe against missile threats, commenting that "Russia doesn't think missile threats don't exist. It's a matter how we try to counter them." The basis for such progress is "reciprocal preparedness to pursue a pragmatic dialogue." Ivanov urged the elimination of the Jackson-Vanik amendment as a Cold War "relic" no longer relevant. He noted Russia and Israel have a visa free regime and Russia is recognized as having a free economy. But Ivanov's main thrust was to press for greater economic and technological cooperation. He foresaw Russia's accession to WTO this summer or fall. He noted the low level of bilateral trade and investment. In 2010 bilateral trade was only $23.5 billion. Russian exports to the United States were $12.4 billion; American exports to Russia totalled $11.1 billion. The U.S. share in Russia's foreign trade was 3.8 percent (eighth among Russia's trade partners). Russia isn't even in the U.S. top 20 trade partners with less than 1 percent. Obviously, there is opportunity for more exchange. A tantalizing point was Ivanov's proposal for expanded U.S.-Russian space cooperation, including the moon and Mars; combined control of deep-space missions; and creation of new vehicles for interplanetary flights (which would require nuclear power). International space station cooperation has been successful, but the station may not be viable after 2020. Consequently, we should be planning creatively for our next steps. And joint financing for such very expensive projects is a "reset" possibility.

### Cold war proves – no political backlash to cooperation and Russia will say yes

Office of Technology Assessment, April 1995, “U.S.-Russian Cooperation in Space”, OTA-ISS-618 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office), PDF

Many of the scientists and engineers in the Rus- sian civil and military space programs have exper- tise that could be usefully applied to space science missions. Even during Cold War periods when the political atmosphere made larger, high-profile cooperative science efforts unacceptable, small, low-profile science projects involving Russian and U.S. scientists continued. That ongoing coop- eration kept the lines of communication between the two countries open and fostered commonality of interest. With the lessening of tensions follow- ing the end of the Cold War, opportunities have in- creased for including Russia in international science projects and for joint U.S.-Russian sci- ence missions.

## Solvency Advocate

### **Conditioning the plan on Russia paying for the launch will work**

Office of Technology Assessment, April 1995, “U.S.-Russian Cooperation in Space”, OTA-ISS-618 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office), PDF

Although the Clinton Administration’s National Space Trans- portation Policy2 directs the U.S. government to negotiate and implement agreements controlling trade in commercial space- launch services, it expressly authorizes the use of foreign launch services on a no-exchange-of-funds basis for cooperative govern- ment-to-government programs. The policy also states that “the U.S. Government will seek to take advantage of foreign compo- nents or technologies in upgrading U.S. space transportation sys tems or developing next generation space trans- portation systems.” The policy clearly was framed, among other things, in the knowledge that the greatest strength of the Russian space program (and the principal strength of the Ukrainian program) lies in launch vehicles and associated technologies, particularly propulsion and rapid payload processing and in- tegration. The availability, robustness, and estab- lished reliability of Russian and Ukrainian launch vehicles, built on large-volume series production over many years, are potentially major assets for cooperative civil space activities. The use of those launch vehicles on a no-exchange-of-funds basis could permit some missions that would not be un- dertaken otherwise. Private sector development of these capabilities could also be a significant eco- nomic asset for Russia and Ukraine, but this dimension is currently limited by Western unwill- ingness to allow those states full access to the launch market.

## A2: Buy Vehicle Instead

### Comparative solvency evidence concludes neg – purchasing from Russia is worse then the counterplan

Office of Technology Assessment, April 1995, “U.S.-Russian Cooperation in Space”, OTA-ISS-618 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office), PDF

Russian launch vehicles and related systems (particularly propulsion systems) have the most obvious potential for commercial use. Russian launch experience is unmatched, and both existing hardware and underlying technological developments can fill important gaps in U.S. capabilities. On the other hand, U.S. national security interests demand that the United States maintain its national launch capability and technology base. The simple purchase of vehicles or launch services appears to be less attractive than joint ventures, co-production of vehicles and/ or systems, and analogous business arrangements as ways of accommodating these differing interests.

## Spending Net-Benefit

### Empirically cooperation is cheaper and more effective

John M. Logsdon and James R. Millar ET AL, Editors , Space Policy Institute and Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies Elliott School of International Affairs The George Washington University , February 2001 , “U.S. -Russian Cooperation in Human Space Flight Assessing the Impacts” , PDF

In 1992, and in particularly 1993, the two years following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the United States entered into a number of agreements with the Russian government and the emerging Russian private sector related to expanded cooperation in outer space activities. The centerpiece of those agreements was a December 1993 invitation to Russia to become a full partner, along with the United States, Japan, Canada, and nine European countries acting through the European Space Agency, in the design, development, operations and utilization of an international space station -a permanently occupied, long duration orbital laboratory. From the U.S. perspective, enhanced space cooperation with Russia was driven by a number of considerations. Many related to taking advantage of Russian space capabilities and experience to enhance U.S. space program efforts and potentially to reduce the costs of achieving various space objectives, particularly with respect to the space station program.

## Key To Russian Economy

### Cooperation avoids the DAs and is key to economic growth.

John M. Logsdon and James R. Millar ET AL, Editors , Space Policy Institute and Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies Elliott School of International Affairs The George Washington University , February 2001 , “U.S. -Russian Cooperation in Human Space Flight Assessing the Impacts” , PDF

This listing of benefits to U.S. interests from expanded U.S.-Russian space cooperation closely parallels the rationales used by pro-cooperation advocates inside the U.S. government as the debate over expanded cooperation took place in 1992 and 1993. During the George H. W. Bush (1989-1993) administration, the primary rationales for expanded cooperation were to provide employment opportunities on non-military projects for Russian scientists and engineers, and to give U.S. industry access to Russian space technologies. As the Soviet Union collapsed, U.S. intelligence estimates suggested that there was a very real possibility of "the possible purchase of the services of a number of Russian scientists and engineers with nuclear expertise [including the missiles and rocket engines needed for the delivery of nuclear weapons] by Third World dictatorships intent on building their own weapons of mass destruction." According to this account, in mid-1991, Russian laboratories, in dire economic straits, "began to signal their eagerness to sell both technology and the services of their scientists." While some in the Bush Administration welcomed the possibility of acquiring Russian technologies and capabilities, others "mired in Cold War thinking and animated by suspicion" opposed such a course of action. The Washington Post suggested that "today, the United States stands to profit from the end of the Cold War. The benefits of acquiring certain Russian technologies appear plain: U.S.-Russian ventures would help American industry, save taxpayer dollars, enhance national security, and, at the same time, keep Russian scientists employed." And, according to one unnamed government official, 'We can get real advantages. And, if we don't, someone else will." 4

### Solves Russian prolif and econ

Office of Technology Assessment, April 1995, “U.S.-Russian Cooperation in Space”, OTA-ISS-618 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office), PDF

As noted earlier, by including the Russians in high-profile projects in space, U.S. officials hope to reduce possible proliferation of Russian mili- tary technology and assist the stabilization of Russian economic and political institutions. Suc- cessful execution of the space station agreement would also be an important symbol of the chang- ing world order—a demonstration both of the ability of two former superpower adversaries to substitute cooperation for competition and of Russian integration into a major Western coopera- tive venture.

### We solve better – boosts the Russian economy but maintains US competitiveness

Office of Technology Assessment, April 1995, “U.S.-Russian Cooperation in Space”, OTA-ISS-618 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office), PDF

Russian companies have much to offer U.S. companies, especially in liquid-fuel propulsion, launch vehicles, and launch services. Incorpora- tion of Russian technologies into U.S. launch ve- hicles and launch operations could make U.S. launch services more competitive in the interna- tional marketplace than they are today. Russian launchers such as Proton and Soyuz are highly ca- pable and have a strong record of launch success. Russia also has significant skills in satellite re- mote sensing and now markets, through several Western companies, the highest-resolution re- motely sensed data25 that are commercially avail- able.26 However, Russian skills in the global marketplace are just developing. The combination of Russian know-how and U.S. marketing skills can improve the international competitiveness of U.S. companies and also help Russian companies earn much-needed hard currency.

### Cooperation is key to solve non proliferation

John M. Logsdon and James R. Millar ET AL, Editors , Space Policy Institute and Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies Elliott School of International Affairs The George Washington University , February 2001 , “U.S. -Russian Cooperation in Human Space Flight Assessing the Impacts” , PDF

This analysis continued: "In Russia's fluid political and economic situation, it is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of its national export control system in general and its components under RKA's jurisdiction in particular. However, hardly any of Russia's known major ISS contractors has been publicly implicated in serious export control violations or sanctioned by the United States for illegal transfers to the countries on its proscribed list. .. . This record is due in part to the growing incentive of being closely associated with Western companies and relevant contracts." In summary, "U.S.-Russian cooperation in manned space flight has strengthened Russia's nonproliferation commitment. There is clear evidence to conclude that Russia has been more sensitive to and cooperative on nonproliferation issues than it would have been in the absence of the ISS project. ISS activity has also kept more Russian space personnel engaged in civilian activities and reduced the likelihood of their involvement in military related activities and with states of concern. At the same time, U.S. support and cooperation with Russia has kept a military-related sector of the Russian economy afloat that could have negative military and proliferation consequences under different political scenarios in the future. This strikes us as a gamble that the United States should be prepared to take." Another participant noted that "it was in part because of the ISS program that the Russian government agreed to abide by the MTCR and to establish a special channel between [U.S.] National Security Adviser Sandy Berger and Yuri Koptev to deal with missile proliferation issues." Taking a broader view, one participant suggested that "cooperation with the Russian space program and Russian military has practical benefits as part of a multi-faceted U.S. strategy. Take proliferation. The U.S. has to use numerous mechanisms to try to get a handle on the problem of proliferation of weapons of massdestruction and their delivery systems. No one part of this effort will suffice. To the extent that discussions within the Permanent Joint Council established by the NATO-Russian Founding Act or programs to assist Russian engineers in working on civilian projects can help, these programs are valuable components of a strategy. Again, no one should be under any illusions. The space program is not going to cause the Russian government to cancel its relationship with Iran. That relationship is too lucrative for Russia. But as part of a broader strategy to contain proliferation efforts, U.S.-Russian cooperation in space makes a contribution."

## Politics Net-Benefit

### Cooperation with Russia on space is incredibly politically popular

John M. Logsdon and James R. Millar ET AL, Editors , Space Policy Institute and Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies Elliott School of International Affairs The George Washington University , February 2001 , “U.S. -Russian Cooperation in Human Space Flight Assessing the Impacts” , PDF

Another important rationale for U.S.-Russian cooperation was increasing U.S. domestic political support for aspace station program, which in 1993 was in danger of either Executive Branch or Congressional cancellation. This strategy was successful. While funds for the space station were approved by a slim one-vote margin (216-215) in a June 1993 House vote, a similar vote one year later lead to an over one hundred vote margin in favor of the redesigned space station, with Russia as an ISS partner.

## A2: CP Hurts Hegemony

### The counterplan secures heg – their funding tanks it

James Oberg, world's leading popularizer and interpreter of space exploration. As the NBC News 'Space Consultant' and frmr rocket scientist', Oberg had a 22-year career as a space engineer in Houston, where he specialized in NASA space shuttle operations for orbital rendezvous, as a contractor employee. He was a 'NASA Trainee' at Northwestern University in 1966-9, and worked at the Johnson Space Center in Houston 1975-1997, 2010, “September 9, 2002, page 15: Are Russian Space Bargains Really Such A Good Deal?”, <http://www.jamesoberg.com/093002russianbargains.html>

Western customers have enjoyed short-term benefits from recent purchases of Russia’s space expertise, but the almost $5 billion that has been transferred to Russia over the past decade may have unwittingly constrained future Western space options, particularly in the United States. Russia provides reliable, cheap space flight services for Western customers. This makes possible space activities ranging from bargain-basement rocket engines, to cheaper satellite launchings, to servicing the international space station. In turn, Western money funds the entire Russian civil and military space program, allowing its infrastructure to be upgraded and providing critical support for training the next generation of Russian space workers. This cash flow, little noticed in the West but crucial to the future of Russia’s space industry, is on the order of $600 million to $800 million per year. The atrophy of Western space capabilities caused by reliance on cheaper Russian services may lead to serious technological and diplomatic disadvantages once the Russian economy is again strong enough to not require Western cash. Russia may wind up with significant influence — and even control — over key Western projects. The mutual interdependence of the world’s space activities has expanded, which was the main diplomatic intent of many participants from the beginning. A theory of international relations known as functionalism maintains that mutual reliance can foster more friendly relations among nations. Consequently, the international space station was designed to be impossible to operate or maintain without Russian participation, and now probably would fall from the sky within a year of a Russian withdrawal. Commercial Russian launchers keep launch prices low enough to enhance the competitiveness of Western commercial satellites. Even the plutonium batteries for U.S. deep space probes come from Russia since the equivalent U.S. production facilities have been scrapped. However, and this is the catch, the interdependence appears to be strikingly asymmetrical. As the West realizes that the Russians could do much better without the West than the West could do without Russia, the dynamics of diplomacy become skewed in Russia’s favor. Russia’s tiny cash contribution to the international space station may, because of the leverage of Russian space monopolies, become a controlling share. This is made more ironic by the embarrassing fact that Russia’s modest investments are almost entirely financed with Western money.

## A2: Perm – Do Both

### Joint operations with the US are tactical leverage for concessions – Russia will say yes

John M. Logsdon and James R. Millar ET AL, Editors , Space Policy Institute and Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies Elliott School of International Affairs The George Washington University , February 2001 , “U.S. -Russian Cooperation in Human Space Flight Assessing the Impacts” , PDF

To another participant, "U.S. policy with regard to space cooperation was successful in that it grabbed the attention of Russian policymakers at a high level as well as down into the aerospace industry, and resulted in some tactical victories, such as cancellation of the ISRO9sale. . . . Space cooperation policy was therefore a powerful opening round in a U.S. campaign to convey effectively the strategic choice most likely to succeed in bringing Russia into the world economic community. . . . The Russian military-industrial elite should come to conclude, from cooperation with the United States, that a choosing a high standard of nonproliferation policy behavior would pay off for them in economic terms, opening doors to playing in the world market that would not be available if they stuck to the 'bottom feeders'." After seven years, "the picture is overall positive, not least because a number of U.S. companies have become closely intertwined with their Russian aerospace counterparts. These close working relationships, if they are successful, produce a community of interests that invest Russian industry specialists in the cooperation. Their paychecks become regular, and they experience other worthwhile perquisites such as occasional trips to the United States. They also experience collegial relationships with their U.S. colleagues that enhance their sense of the strength of Russian technology to compete in the world market. Although not tension-free, such relationships create a common understanding of technical and other requirements, including export control requirements."

## A2: Perm – Request

### Conditioning is key – Russia is looking for leverage in space now

M&C Online, online news paper and reporter, Monsters and Critics, Mar 9, 2010 “Uncertain US space future launches international shake-up”, http://www.monstersandcritics.com/science/features/article\_1539531.php/ANALYSIS-Uncertain-US-space-future-launches-international-shake-up

For a world that depended on the United States as the cornerstone of international cooperation in space, NASA's uncertain way forward has triggered a reshuffling of global ambitions. Will Russia gain unprecedented leverage in space and on Earth? Will China build its own competing coalition of manned space efforts? These questions are raised by the looming retirement of the ageing US space shuttles later this year and the scrapping by US President Barack Obama of a new moon-worthy spacecraft under the Constellation programme. The most obvious change will be the rise in Russian prominence. After 2010, its Soyuz will be the only way for humans to reach the ISS, after a decade-long cooperation by space agencies, including the US, Russia, Japan, Canada and Europe. Russian space agency chief Anatoli Perminov indicated that Moscow plans to jack up the price of its services in 2012 after existing agreements expire. While he did not give any exact figures, the US is already paying 306 million dollars to use Russian shuttles through 2011. And it's clear to many that Russia hopes to boost its share of the space technology market with the profits. In the US Congress, worry grows about NASA being left at the whim of Russia. 'My hope is our relations with the Russians are going to get better, but who knows what geopolitics will be for the next 10 years?' Florida Senator Bill Nelson said.

### Russia wants to maximize its profits but realizes they need the US

PETER LEONARD, Associated Press, Jul, 21, 2011, “Russia relishes chances created by end of shuttle”, http://www.abc12.com/story/15106379/russia-relishes-chances-created-by-end-of-shuttle

Sensing a commercial opportunity, Russia has regularly raised its prices for berths in what is described derisively by some as a "space cab." The Soyuz's imminent monopoly status has given Russia even more bargaining leverage. The $56 million price that the Russian Space Agency charges NASA to send up astronauts is set to go up to $63 million per passenger from 2014. A recent contract extension totals $753 million and covers trips for a dozen NASA astronauts from 2014 through 2016. If NASA is annoyed, then it is trying not to show it. "When you look at inflation, when you look at what they are providing with the service and the capability, I look at it as a good investment. It's necessary," said Patrick Buzzard, NASA's representative to Russia. James Oberg, a NASA veteran and currently a space consultant who has closely followed the Russian space program, played down concerns about excessive dependence on the Soyuz, saying the Russians "are equally dependent on us for power and communications at the space station."

## A2: Perm – Lie

### There will be leaks about the process

Savage, L.A Times 2010 (David G. Savage and Noam N. Levey, “Harder to suppress leaks in Internet age” 4-27-2010, <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/27/nation/la-na-wikileaks-legal-20100728>)

Reporting from Washington — The publication this week of classified military reports from Afghanistan has brought home to the nation's capital what Hollywood has seen of late with the raw tapes of Mel Gibson's angry voice: the Internet has fundamentally transformed how secrets are disclosed. No longer can lawyers for the government or a big star rush to court or phone a top news executive to head off a damaging disclosure in a newspaper or on television. Now raw secrets can be posted online for all the world to see or hear. [WikiLeaks](http://wikileaks.org), the website that obtained the documents, operates mostly outside the United States, making it difficult if not impossible for the government to block publication. "In the digital age, once classified information has been leaked by a government employee, there is no practical remedy available to the government" to stop its disclosure, said Rodney Smolla, a 1st Amendment expert and president of Furman University in South ina. "Even if the government were to march into an American or foreign court to seek an injunction against the release of the documents, there is no way to recall the millions of cites and retransmissions that occur almost instantly on the Internet." The Obama administration has said it may pursue a criminal case against the leaker of the classified reports, but it made no effort to stop their publication or availability on WikiLeaks. Floyd Abrams, a lawyer who represented the New York Times against the Nixon administration's effort to halt publication of the Pentagon Papers in 1971, said the Internet left the Obama administration with no practical options when faced with a similar disclosure on a foreign-run website. "We seem to be moving to a world in which few secrets are safe from disclosure, including genuine ones," he said. Several Hollywood websites have gained fame by posting embarrassing information about celebrities. This month, RadarOnline posted audio of Mel Gibson ranting over the phone to an ex-girl end. What has changed is not the law, but the number and variety of sources of information, said Cindy Cohn, legal director for the Electronic Frontier Foundation in San Francisco. "The Internet has given all the rest of us a megaphone," she said. "Now, the government can't arm twist a publisher and convince him not to publish." Websites can be sued for disclosing trade secrets or for an invasion of privacy, just like other publishers. However, they also have the same free-speech and free-press protections. And as a practical matter, WikiLeaks may be out of reach of many courts anyway, legal experts say. If WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange or anyone else associated with the website stays in a country that won't honor a subpoena or an extradition order from a court in the United States, Britain or elsewhere, they probably will continue to enjoy a level of protection not available to a more traditional publisher or broadcaster.

### Russia needs certain US cooperation

Anatoly Zak, 4/14/04 (U.S.-Russian Space Cooperation in Doubt: Unease spreads on former Soviet side. http://spectrum.ieee.org/aerospace/space-flight/usrussian-space-cooperation-in-doubt)

14 April 2004--The grounding of the U.S. shuttle fleet last year after the Columbia disaster and the increasingly parlous state of the International Space Station have left the United States more dependent than ever on its erstwhile rival Russia for support. Yet the Bush administration's redirection of U.S. space efforts to emphasize manned missions to the Moon and possibly to Mars has unleashed an avalanche of questions in the former Soviet state, leaving partners deeply confused about how to make constructive proposals for future cooperation. At the heart of the uncertainty are NASA budget projections implying that all U.S. financial support for the International Space Station will end in 2016, along with recent White House hints that support may continue longer after all, with money coming from the space exploration budget [see " Budget Breakdown," IEEE Spectrum, April 2004]. Uncertainty about fundamentals like that have left NASA partners wondering what's really going on. "They [the Americans] have not made a single step to meet our offers [of cooperative help] --neither do they give us any clues on their future intentions," says Yuri Grigoriev, a deputy designer general at RKK Energia, Moscow, Russia's prime contractor in the ISS project. "My impression is they are rather lost," Grigoriev told IEEE Spectrum in a telephone interview. An engineer who joined the legendary Russian space development firm at the height of the race to the Moon in the 1960s, Grigoriev has spent the last decade forging closer ties between the U.S. and Russian manned space-flight programs. Among his many duties was to sit on the Stafford-Anfimov commission, an advisory group of leading experts from the two countries, which evaluates issues of space cooperation. Always outspoken about problems hampering the Russian space industry, Grigoriev outlined serious challenges facing the space station program. At this time, because of the Shuttle's grounding, no major elements of the space station, including all-but-ready European and Japanese laboratories, can be shipped to it--for months to come at least. To make matters worse, even if the shuttle were flying, inadequate rescue capabilities would continue to limit the space station's crew to three, leaving no room for permanent European or Japanese researchers. As a result, Grigoriev reminded Spectrum, partners who have invested millions of dollars and years of work in the station are reaping few of the benefits they expected. Russian attempts to sell NASA or Europe a second Soyuz lifeboat to enable the emergency evacuation of an additional three crew members from the station have gone nowhere. (At present, two cosmonauts are working aboard the space station.) Meanwhile, critical space station systems have begun to degrade. First, a Russian-built oxygen generator failed and had to be replaced with a brand-new unit delivered from Earth. Then, in March, a second of four U.S.-built gyrodynes--complexes of electrically driven wheels, which maintain the station's attitude in space--stopped working. Even with the failure of a third unit, the space station could still be correctly oriented, but frequent firing of the control thrusters would be required, consuming precious propellant reserves, Grigoriev explained. Gyrodynes are too bulky to fit into the Russian Progress cargo ship, currently the only supply line to the station. For that reason, Russian space officials have begun to brace themselves for the possibility of sending up extra Progress tankers to refuel the station, he said. Admittedly, in his 14 January speech announcing the new U.S. space initiative, President George W. Bush acknowledged Russian contributions to the space station and invited U.S. allies to join in the new Moon-Mars venture. But captains of the Russian space program were initially skeptical. "I suspect this might be more of election politics [than a serious intention]," Grigoriev says, echoing the reaction of Yuri Koptev, until recently the director of the Russian Aviation and Space Agency, Rosaviakosmos. Immediately following Bush's speech, Koptev dismissed it as an election-year gimmick. Yet only a few weeks later, he indicated that Russia may want to be aboard if Bush's space initiative is indeed for real. Koptev revealed that RKK Energia was developing a new vehicle, capable of replacing the reliable but cramped Soyuz, a workhorse of the Russian program since the late 1960s. Called Kliper (Clipper), the spacecraft is designed as a partially reusable wingless glider capable of carrying six crew members into the Earth orbit or beyond. It turns out that RKK Energia has been quietly working on the vehicle since 2000, and so Koptev's high-profile disclosure of the project just one month after Bush's space speech can hardly be a coincidence. With Russians and Americans exchanging complaints about who is the more unreliable partner, unexpected developments in Moscow further muddied the water. In March, the Putin government replaced Koptev as head of the aviation and space agency. Koptev had led the organization since its formation in 1992 and had a reputation as a progressive leader, one who worked hard to maintain a close relationship with the United States. His successor is a former commander of the Russian Military Space Forces, General Anatoly Perminov. Grigoriev, though he knows little about the personality and attitude of the new Russian space boss, expressed concern that the change in agency leadership could further delay progress in resolving critical space station issues. "[The agency] does not have much time for the station now," Grigoriev said, "New people are in town. They need time to form the team, to figure out what's going on."

### Genuine consultation key to maintain growing relations

Mikhail Gusman, 6/30/2011 (ITAR-TASS, Hillary Clinton, Next step in U.S.-Russia reset is “building trust and understanding”, http://rbth.ru/articles/2011/06/30/hillary\_clinton\_next\_step\_in\_us-russia\_reset\_is\_building\_trust\_build\_13101.html)

ITAR-TASS: Madam Secretary, first of all, thank you very much to have us today. How important, in your opinion, is it to build this understanding with us? Hillary Clinton: I think it’s very important. There are so many relationships between Americans and Russians – historical, cultural, family, in every walk of life. And I think there is a lot in common between Russians and Americans, and so we have been working very hard to really deepen that relationship for the 21st century. And our governments, of course, work together, and I think our so-called reset has been very positive and the relationship among our government officials has really evolved. But the best foundations for a strong relationship are between the people of the two countries. So that’s why I think it’s essential that we do what we’re doing today – to talk more and understand each other. I-T: You are the coordinator from the American side of the Presidential Medvedev-Obama Commission. Do you think it’s effective enough, and what do we have to do to improve it perhaps? H.C.: I think the commission that our two presidents established has been very important because it provided an organizing mechanism for our governments and for our citizens to find ways to cooperate. So look at what we’re doing, of course, in the media, as you are one of the leaders of. But on energy efficiency and renewable energy, on nuclear security, how we protect nuclear power plants, especially after what happened in Japan. On sports exchanges – there were a group of young Russian basketball players who came and played basketball with President Obama on the White House court. So I think what we’re doing is building these connections. In international politics, countries have to work hard to find ways of cooperating, and we have done that on this New START Treaty, on Iran’s nuclear threat, on Afghanistan, on counternarcotics, on counterterrorism. We have a very important and growing set of activities between our two governments, and then the commission takes that and then adds onto it cultural exchanges, artistic exchanges. We’re going to have a year-long exchange of cultural programming coming to Russia – the seasons of America, everything from ballet to jazz to hip-hop. So this commission that Foreign Minister Lavrov and I co-chair for our presidents, I think, has made a lot of progress. I-T: You and your partner, Minister Lavrov, pushed the button of the resetting of Russian-American relations. What has to be the next step? H.C.: I think it’s exactly what we’re talking about. The reset was a political decision taken by the governments of both countries, led by our presidents. Now we want to move into a very deep, growing relationship. The reset was like turning the car on; now we’re on the journey together. And we want to travel many miles over the next many years together. I really believe that Russia and the United States have an opportunity in a very complex world to provide leadership in ways that my father or grandfather could not have imagined. So the next step is to keep building trust, building understanding, building confidence at all levels. I-T: In Russia we are waiting for the next summit of our presidents. Probably it will be during the visit of President Obama to Russia. What will you recommend to put on the agenda of this summit? H.C.: Well, I think the summits that have been held, both in the United States and in Russia, have been very important because it’s not only been the official meetings. There have been opportunities for more informal settings – meals together, bringing their wives together; I mean, getting to know each other as people. And in addition to that, both presidents have reached out to the larger society. I was very pleased when President Medvedev came and went to Silicon Valley. And now we have a Russian innovation center in Silicon Valley, and we have two American companies working in Russia to establish an innovation center like Silicon Valley. So the two presidents have been emphasizing the importance of our government-to-government relations, our business-to-business relations, involving civil society because ultimately it’s the strength of the people that are the base of any strong country.

## Definitions

**1. “Resolved” means “to make a firm decision about”, American Heritage Dictionary, 03 – indicates certainty**

**2. “Should” means “used to express obligation”, Dictionary.com, 03.**

# Aff Answers

## Kills Relations

### Conditioning tanks relations

John M. Logsdon and James R. Millar ET AL, Editors , Space Policy Institute and Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies Elliott School of International Affairs The George Washington University , February 2001 , “U.S. -Russian Cooperation in Human Space Flight Assessing the Impacts” , PDF

Another reason for continuing cooperation was suggested: "it is important for U.S. decisionmakers to recognize that even the short-term cutoff of ISS cooperation could have severe costs, undermining changes that have not yet become consolidated and incurring other risks. . . . It can be argued convincingly that U.S. withdrawal of support or conditioning of funding for cooperative space projects on the proliferation-related behavior of other Russian entities not involved in the project but under some form of state control (as some critics have suggested) would be counterproductive to U.S. policy aims. Specifically, not engaging these Russian companies would greatly exacerbate proliferation problems (by reversing market forces that make the United States their currently preferred partner), cause the ISS to suffer scientifically (from the loss of Russia's considerable experience and expertise in manned space flight), and remove one of the few positive signs of long-term cooperation in the current U.S.-Russian relationship (which has suffered greatly in the past two years due to NATO expansion, U.S./NATO bombing of Yugoslavia, and U.S. national missile defense tests and attempts to evise the ABM Treaty). Alienating firms currently involved in cooperative projects may push Russian space know-how into the willing arms of India or China, possibly encouraging the formation of new alliances in space activities. Thus, while enterprises directly involved in the ISS should be held to a very high nonproliferation standard, the United States should exercise restraint in considering blanket sanctions that punish innocent as well as guilty enterprises, just because both are nominally under Russian state control."

## Say No / Cooperation Impossible

### International Space Cooperation Impossible

Nezavisimaya Gazeta May 2010 (International Cooperation in Space Is Impossible, http://english.pravda.ru/science/tech/20-05-2010/113443-space\_cooperation-0/)

According to the official space exploration program of the Russian Federation, the nation’s space agency, Roskosmos, does not see activities outside Earth’s orbit without cooperation with other countries. In the past, space exploration programs were based on national ambitions of the states which conducted those programs. The ambition to show the power of its science and technology made the Kremlin launch the world’s first-ever satellite and then first man in space. The White House stunned the world with its Apollo program. The defeat of the USSR in the lunar race made Soviet scientists develop orbital stations Salyut and Mir. The success of the Soviet Union at this point was so impressive that it made the United States proceed in the same direction. In 1984, Ronald Reagan announced the start of works to develop Space Station Freedom with the participation of America’s friends and allies. Russia Today: Russian space agency to dictate terms Tom Moser, the director of the program, clearly stated in 1987, when he tried to convince the Congress to fund the orbital complex, that Space Station Freedom would be developed to leave the Russians behind. The construction of the station with the participation of international partners was supposed to show that “free nations” could cooperate in space as successfully as communist ones (the Soviet Union was working on the Interkosmos program in cooperation with its political allies during those years). The end of the cold war and the space race deprived the USA of its goals. Moreover, it turned out that coordinating efforts of different countries in one space project was a very complicated objective. Space Station Freedom was supposed to enter orbit at the end of the 1980s. However, the designers of the complex, who had already spent $8 billion on engineering works, could only present a pile of documents to the president and the Congress. The program was eventually scrapped in the beginning of the 1990s. However, NASA suggested the White House should invite Russia in the project to celebrate the start of the new era in US-Russian relations and to build the complex faster, better and cheaper. NASA believed that Russia’s participation in the construction of the station, which was called the ISS, marked an obvious achievement both from the political, technological and economic point of view. US specialists thought that Russia would help save one year and $2 billion. In total, the construction of the ISS was evaluated at $17.4 billion. Russia helped in the solution of two vital problems in the program. It provided the service module (SM) known as Zvezda (Star) and Soyuz spaceships. The module, which provided some of the station’s life support systems, was launched to the station four years later that planned. US congressmen calculated that the delay resulted in the losses of $5 billion. Russia was primarily responsible for the delay in the start of the exploitation of the complex, not to mention the increased spending. US congressmen repeatedly offered to either exclude Russia from the ISS program or simply purchase its service module. Now it is obvious that if Russia had been deprived of its membership in the program, the space station would have stopped operating after the crash of Shuttle Columbia in 2003. Russia’s Soyuz and Progress booster rockets remained the only option to deliver cargoes and astronauts to the space station before NASA resumed shuttle launches. The fate of the ISS will solely depend on the Russian rockets after 2010, when the shuttle program is shut down completely. If Columbia had not crashed, astronauts would have continued flying to the ISS and back on board NASA’s shuttles, whereas Russia’s role would have been much less important. The problems connected with international cooperation between the members of the ISS project and their dependence on Russia and the USA made NASA’s John Logsdon come to conclusion that the ISS program experience was negative for its members. As for the international cooperation in post-ISS projects, Barack Obama traditionally sees his major objective at this point in preserving America’s leadership in the organization of international efforts to explore the Moon, Mars, etc. Unlike Russia, the USA has no official document related to the space exploration program that would stipulate the nation’s future dependence on cooperation with other countries. The possible consequences of such dependence can be seen in the canceled program of another manned flight to the moon. If the USA had accepted Roskosmos’s request to include Russia in the project, the results would have led to lamentable consequences for Russia. Michael Griffin, a former head of NASA, said in 2006 that cooperation works best only if it is based on you-pay-for-yourself principle. Russia would have ended up with nothing if it had been accepted. A look back at the history of space exploration clearly shows that most significant and technological progress was achieved at the time when it was connected with the solution of strictly national, not international problems of space exploration. Superpowers used space technologies to demonstrate their scientific and technological strength. This competition gave a powerful incentive to the development of space industries in Russia and the United States. International cooperation in space nowadays is impossible.