# U.S.-Russia Cooperation

## Cooperation--Shell

### Uniqueness

### Even though cooperation is high now its continuation is not guaranteed

Collins July 11

James, policy analyst for Carnegie Institute for International Peace <http://carnegieendowment.org/2011/07/27/enduring-approach-to-us-russian-cooperation/4a2m>

July 2011 marks two years since the creation of the U.S.-Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission (BPC), a critical framework for managing U.S.-Russian cooperation across multiple areas in the wake of the 2009 “reset.” Now with more than 20 working groups bringing together dozens of interagency stakeholders, the BPC has enabled effective cooperation on a broad bilateral agenda, ranging from nuclear arms control and nonproliferation to exchange programs, and from disaster response to prison reform. Yet there is still a real risk that successful U.S.-Russian cooperation could derail as it has in the past—especially in light of ongoing budgetary pressures, serious outstanding disagreements on security issues, and upcoming elections in both countries.

### **Link—Weaponization Crushes cooperation**

Krepon – 2003 [President emeritus of the Henry L. Stimson Center, is the author of Space Assurance or Space Dominance? The Case Against Weaponizing Space with Christopher Clary, Cooperative Threat Reduction, Missile Defense, and the Nuclear Future and editor of Nuclear Risk Reduction in South Asia [Henry L. Stimson Center, Space Assurance or Space Dominance?,

http://www.stimson.org/images/uploads/research-pdfs/spacebook.pdf, 6/24/11]

The likely consequences of a dynamic, but uneven, space warfare competition are not hard to envision. Potential adversaries are likely to perceive American initiatives to weaponize space as adjuncts to a U.S. military doctrine of preemption and preventive war. Depending on the scope and nature of U.S. space warfare preparations, they could also add to Chinese and Russian concerns over the viability of their nuclear deterrents. U.S. initiatives to extend military dominance into space are therefore likely to raise tensions and impact negatively on U.S.-China and U.S.-Russia relations at a time when bilateral relations have some promising, but tenuous, elements. Cooperative relations with both countries will be needed to successfully combat proliferation, but Moscow and Beijing are unlikely to tender such cooperation if they perceive that U.S. strategic objectives include the negation of their deterrents. Under these circumstances, proliferation of weapons in space would be accompanied by terrestrial proliferation.

### Impact

### Cooperation with Russia is key to Multiple Scenarios for Global Extinction

Graham 09

Thomas Graham served as special assistant to the president and senior director for Russia on the National Security Council staff, 2004–07Resurgent Russia and U.S. Purposes http://tcf.org/events/pdfs/ev257/Graham.pdf

The challenges facing the United States are well captured in the intelligence community’s most recent effort to peer into the future, the recent report by the National Intelligence Council, Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World.1 As the report notes, global dynamism is shifting from the Atlantic to the Asia Pacific region, most notably in the economic realm, but ineluctably in the geopolitical and the intellectual realms. The Middle East is in the midst of a historic—and destabilizing—struggle between the forces of modernity and tradition. Nation-states, the fundamental unit of the international system since the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, are under severe pressure from transnational forces and from sub-regional actors. There is a fundamental and growing mismatch between a global economy and nationally based regulatory systems—a mismatch graphically revealed by the current economic crisis. Globalization has laid the foundation for greater prosperity worldwide, but also it has raised new dangers and compounded old ones—the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, megaterrorism, pandemic diseases, climate change—that are beyond the capacity of states to deal with alone and for which current international organizations, notably the United Nations and the Bretton Woods Institutions, are inadequate. Population growth, and the still-hoped-for long-term prosperity, is putting stress on energy, food, and water resources and raising the risks of violent conflict over them. The United States remains the preeminent power by any measure, and will remain so well into this century. But its margin of superiority is narrowing, particularly with China, and increasingly it needs to work with other major powers to manage threats and exploit opportunities. The current deep economic crisis only reinforces that point, drastically reducing the resources the United States can devote to foreign policy and underscoring its excessive and growing dependence on foreign financing of its debt. As a result, more so than in the past, the United States will have to establish priorities, to pursue a more focused policy, and build multilateral coalitions to shape a new equilibrium that will ensure its long-term security and prosperity. What are, or should be, the U.S. priorities in this uncertain world? How important is Russia to U.S. interests? Nonproliferation There is no graver threat to U.S. security than the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to states or terrorist organizations intent on doing us harm. Dealing with this threat entails strengthening the nonproliferation regime, enhancing the security and reducing the quantity of fissile material and chemical and biological agents that can be used for weapons of mass destruction, controlling the knowledge and know-how to build such weapons, and preparing to mitigate the consequences should such a weapon be used. Russia is the second major nuclear power (the United States and Russia • together control 95 percent of the world’s nuclear arsenal), with long experience in the development, manufacturing, and dismantlement of nuclear weapons; massive stockpiles of plutonium and highly enriched uranium (the fuel for nuclear weapons) and biological and chemical agents; and a long history in civil nuclear power. It is indispensable to any effort to manage the proliferation problem and prevent terrorist organizations from gaining possession of weapons of mass destruction. Management of the International Economy The current global economic crisis has laid bare the deficiencies of the current structure for regulating the global economy. The United States has an interest in reforming the present international financial and economic institutions, and creating new ones, so that the downsides of markets could be moderated without sacrificing their dynamism and so that an open global economy can be promoted in the face of rising protectionist sentiments worldwide. Russia has played an increasing role in the global economy as it recovered • from its turbulent transition in 1990s. It has accumulated the third-largest international currency reserves (although they are being depleted rapidly as the Russian government manages the devaluation of the ruble). It deserves a seat at the table in discussions of the current global economic crisis, and it should receive a larger role in the management of the global economy in the future. That said, leading European states, Japan, China, India, and perhaps Brazil are all more important than Russia to the global economic and financial future. The Broader Middle East The broader Middle East presents sets of critical security challenges to the United States, particularly concerning Israel/Palestine, Iraq, Iran, and Afghanistan/Pakistan/India. In brief, the U.S. interest in this region includes bringing an enduring conclusion to the Middle East peace process (Israel/Palestine), stabilizing Iraq, preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons and destabilizing the region, eliminating the terrorist threat and ensuring stability in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and reducing the risk of major conflict—with the possible use of nuclear weapons—between Pakistan and India. Russia retains a wide network of contacts in the Middle East; it has • improved ties with Israel. Although its influence pales in comparison to our own, its cooperation could be helpful in managing the peace process and in dealing with Iran. Russia’s support is essential to maintaining one of the most valuable corridors—across Russia and through Central Asia—for supplying NATO and American forces in Afghanistan, a corridor that grows in value as instability deepens in Pakistan. At the same time, as a rival, it would have great potential to do mischief, to complicate our challenges, and to thwart our initiatives. Energy Security and Climate Change Providing sufficient energy for powering the global economy at affordable prices and in an environmentally friendly way is critical to long-term American prosperity. Fossil fuels, barring a major technological breakthrough, will remain the chief source of energy for decades to come. Much needs to be done in locating and bringing online new fields, ensuring reliable means of delivery to consumers, protecting infrastructure from attack or sabotage, and reducing the temptation to manipulate energy supplies for political purposes. Nuclear energy is enjoying a renaissance, but that raises proliferation concerns. Intensive scientific work will be necessary to develop new sources of energy for commercial use and to deal with climate change. As the world’s largest producer of hydrocarbons, a leader in providing • civil nuclear energy, and a major energy consumer itself, Russia is indispensable to guaranteeing energy security and dealing with climate change. As one of the world’s leading scientific powers, Russia has an important role to play in developing new sources of energy, using traditional fuels more efficiently, and managing climate change.

## Uniqueness Extensions

### Cooperation high now

### **National Security Network,** 7/1/0**9** (http://www.nsnetwork.org/node/1354

### Next week President Obama will travel to Moscow to meet with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev. From the outset of his Administration, President Obama has sought to reset U.S.-Russian relations. Over the last eight years, U.S. policy rested on maintaining the superficial personal relationship between Bush and Putin, which failed to result in any tangible achievements and led to growing estrangement in U.S.-Russian relations. The Obama administration has sought to eliminate this superficiality and develop a more business-like relationship that is focused on core issues of mutual interest and concern that produces verifiable results. Chief among these issues is non-proliferation and arms control – issues that former President Reagan also prioritized in his dealings with Russia. US-Russian negotiations for the replacement of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which is due to expire December 5th, resumed last week – marking the first time in eighteen years the world’s two largest nuclear powers have negotiated a binding and verifiable agreement to reduce their arsenals. At their July 6th summit, Obama and Medvedev will review progress – and both have suggested that the new treaty will mark the foundation for better relations, possibly laying the groundwork for further cooperation on other issues of tremendous importance to the United States, such as Afghanistan, the Middle East, international climate change negotiations, and Iran and North Korea’s nuclear programs.

### Cooperation on vital issues is happening now

Rojansky 7-13-11

Matthew Rojansky is the deputy director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment

<http://carnegie.ru/publications/?lang=en&fa=45036>

The record so far is impressive: The New START agreement limiting strategic nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles has been signed, ratified, and is being implemented at this moment. U.S. and Russian firms have already signed agreements to enhance civilian nuclear cooperation under the terms of the 123 Agreement, brought into force last year. U.S.-Russian security cooperation, on Afghanistan, counter-terrorism, and counter-narcotics, has reached unprecedented heights. The fact that more than half of supplies for NATO’s counter-insurgency operations in Afghanistan now transit Russian territory speaks volumes, while Moscow’s willingness to put “boots on the ground” in joint anti-drug operations in Afghanistan—despite the indelible trauma of 1979-89—itself attests to the importance it places on this type of cooperation.

### U.S. and Russia are cooperating now

Financial Times 6/15/11 [“Foreign relations: Improved US ties point to a new era,” http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/7cf18c82-9623-11e0-8256-00144feab49a.html#axzz1PmaTpMB7]

The sight of a relaxed President Dmitry Medvedev chatting over hamburgers with his US counterpart Barack Obama on a visit to the US last year was a sign of just how much relations between the two countries have warmed in the past three years. A more tangible sign of the improvement since the US “reset” of relations, and Moscow’s shift to a more pragmatic foreign policy, was Moscow’s abstention at the UN Security Council in March on a motion allowing western intervention in Libya. In days gone by, it might have been expected to exercise its veto. That was the latest in a series of concrete advances. These have included: the new Start treaty on reducing strategic nuclear weapons; Russian backing for a UN resolution tightening sanctions on Iran; and a deal permitting Nato shipments to Afghanistan across Russian territory.

### Cooperation is high now

Rojansky 7-13-11

Matthew Rojansky is the deputy director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment

<http://carnegie.ru/publications/?lang=en&fa=45036>

Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov is in Washington this week for consultations on a wide range of issues, from lingering global financial jitters to the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. Press conferences and public statements surrounding the meetings will no doubt highlight the recent accomplishments of U.S.-Russia cooperation following the 2009 reset, and with good reason—the relationship between Moscow and Washington has never been better than it is today. Perhaps most importantly, the two governments will endorse landmark agreements on easing the conditions for granting visas to each other’s citizens and for facilitating adoptions.

### Cooperation is high now

Bystritsky 6-22 [Andrei, Chairman of The Voice of Russia, 2011, The Huffington Post, “Another Re-Set In Russian-American Relations”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/andrei-bystritsky/another-reset-in-russiana\_b\_882481.html]

It's been just about twenty years since the fall of the Iron Curtain and during that period the United States and Russia have continued to increase cooperation. Russia currently provides supply routes through Russia to the U.S. military in Afghanistan. Other advances in cooperation include nuclear non-proliferation, space exploration, drug interdiction and counter-terrorism efforts. Our opposing perspectives and interests have matured over time into mutual respect for differences based on geopolitical interests rather than ideologies, similar to that of the U.S. and France, where two partners come to the table with different perspectives and with an understanding of historical and cultural differences. Our panel discussion did not gloss over the fact that our two countries have different cultural and political approaches. However, our focus was on how best to present the Russian perspective to an American audience and hopefully to reach a large audience through online streaming options. The goal of the discussion was not to persuade as much as to provide context for understanding the audience.

### Cooperation high now

Nola 6/21/11 (New Orleans business news, “U.S. and Russia are strengthening their relationship, Ambassador says,” http://www.nola.com/business/index.ssf/2011/06/us\_and\_russia\_are\_strengthenin.html)

The Obama administration has experienced a positive reset in U.S.-Russian relations both politically and economically, U.S. Ambassador to the Russian Federation John Beyrle said during a speech in New Orleans on Tuesday. "This relationship has been reset over the last two to three years," Beyrle said at an event at the World War II Museum sponsored by the World Trade Center of New Orleans and other organizations. "We're on the threshold of a new and better period of relations." Beyrle noted recent U.S.-Russia accomplishments such as the signing of the START Treaty to reduce nuclear arms in both countries, increasing Russian support for NATO troops in Afghanistan and increased cooperation and coordination within the United Nations Security Council to curb Iran's nuclear program.

### U.S. RussianCooperation is increasing

Voice of Russia Radio 7-12-11

<http://english.ruvr.ru/2011/07/13/53145826.html>

US-Russian relations are improving according to an assessment on the current state of bilateral ties said Russian Foreign Minister Segey Lavrov on Tuesday in an interview with the "Voice of Russia" in our Washington studio. The relationship between the two countries have become more "structured and systematic," Lavrov said, recalling that Moscow and Washington have created a presidential commission on cooperation for this purpose, which is coordinated by the Russian Foreign Minister and US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

### Cooperation High Now

### **Cohen, 06-20-11** – Columbia Ph.D. in Government and Russia Studies [The Nation, http://www.thenation.com/article/161063/obamas-russia-reset-another-lost-opportunity, Obama's Russia 'Reset': Another Lost Opportunity?, Accessed June 26]

### Many commentators, like the Russia specialist Thomas E. Graham of Kissinger Associates and Peter Baker of the New York Times, believe that Obama’s reset, a term also adopted by the Kremlin, has been “remarkably successful” and already achieved a “new partnership.” Discourse between Washington and Moscow is more conciliatory. Both Obama and President Medvedev, who have met frequently, have declared the revamped relationship a success, citing their personal friendship as evidence. There are also tangible signs. Moscow is cooperating on two top US priorities: the war in Afghanistan and curbing Iran’s nuclear-weapons aspirations. In addition, in 2010, a treaty, New START, was negotiated that is designed to reduce US and Russian long-range nuclear arsenals by almost a third.

### Cooperation strong now

### **Caryl June 15, 2011** (Christian, In U.S. Russia Dialogue On Human Rights, A Tougher Tone Comes Through, Radio Free Europe, http://www.rferl.org/content/us\_russia\_dialogue\_human\_rights\_tougher\_tone/24235596.html, Date Accessed: 6/26/11)

### The Obama administration has made better relations with Russia -- sometimes known as "the reset" -- one of its foreign policy priorities, and the broad slate of bilateral talks now conducted by the two governments on a variety of topics, from education to national security, are often cited as one fruit of that rapprochement. The administration's supporters say that closer ties have paid off in the form of greater Russian diplomatic cooperation on several fronts, including military intervention in Libya, measures to isolate Iran over its nuclear program, and logistical assistance for the war in Afghanistan. "Part of the reset is to engage with the Russian government on issues of national security and it's also to engage with the Russian government on issues of democracy and human rights," said McFaul. "In all kinds of different ways that's what we've tried to do, including in our interaction with the Russian government in this particular working group."

### U.S. Russian Cooperation over Space strong now

Berger 11

Eric, reporter Houston Chronicle April 4, Today's dual anniversaries find space competitors now comrades

The Soviet Union made Yuri Gagarin the first person to journey into outer space

http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/metropolitan/7517364.html

U.S.-Russian relations in space are generally good considering the way in which the competition began following the 108-minute flight by Gagarin in 1961 and subsequent space race. The once frigid relationship began turning from competition to cooperation in 1995, when space shuttle Discovery first visited Russia's Mir space station. That was followed by other flights during which the shuttle provided supplies and returned experiments. Since then, the United States and Russia have cooperated to construct the International Space Station, a football field-sized orbiting laboratory that dwarfs the Mir station. The countries have a mutual dependency in space, said Jim Oberg, an aerospace engineer at NASA for 22 years who now is a space reporter for NBC News and other outlets.

## AT: Specific Uniqueness

### This weeks disputes over Visas, NMD’s etc have not derailed cooperation but put us on the brink

The Moscow Times 7-29-11

http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/article/dark-clouds-gather-over-us-reset/441318.html

Dark storm clouds are collecting over the much-heralded "reset" in U.S.-Russian relations, with both sides working to blacklist the other's officials, new tensions over U.S. missile defense plans, and a leaked CIA paper supposedly blaming Russia for a bomb blast near the U.S. Embassy in Georgia. But analysts said it was too early to write off the reset, and that much of this week's disquiet had more to do with both countries' domestic politics than a sharp change in relations. "The reset will continue, but with irritations, even if the Republicans return to power," said Alexei Malashenko, an analyst with the Carnegie Moscow Center.

### Disputes over NMD in Europe is not derailing cooperation now

### Cooperation is high now and current disputes don’t derail it

Voice of Russia Radio 7-16-11

http://english.ruvr.ru/2011/07/16/53314119.html

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov has paid an official visit to the United States this past week. In three days, he met US President Barack Obama, held talks with US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, signed a bilateral agreement on child adoptions, and chatted with US politicians and Russian Americans. At the start of his visit, he granted an extensive interview to the Voice of Russia at this station’s recently opened studio in Washington. In the interview, he formulated Russia’s foreign policy priorities, from Russia’s stance on the Libyan crisis to cooperation between the Arctic countries. The signing of a bilateral agreement on adoptions, a rapprochement between the two countries’ positions on easing the visa regime and an agreement to continue the dialogue on building an ABM system for Europe are the main practical results of Sergei Lavrov’s visit to the US capital. The agreement on child adoptions was drafted and signed in just one year, as against the four years that it took Moscow and Rome to sing a similar agreement. Drafting the Russian-US agreement on adoptions was prompted by another scandal involving a US couple waiving their rights of adoption of a Russian boy. This wore Russia’s patience thin, and Moscow insisted on an ad hoc agreement to be signed between the two countries. That was also the reason why Sergei Lavrov pointed out a special importance of the agreement during the signing ceremony at the US State Department. "The agreement signed, Sergei Lavrov says, provides reliable guarantees that foster parents are psychologically and mentally stable, that they have been checked by relevant US Government-authorized agencies, and that the foster parents ensure Russian diplomats’ access, whenever necessary, to the children that they have adopted." According to the Russian Foreign Minister, Russia will bend every effort to see to it that the agreement will come into force at an early date. When meeting the US President, Sergei Lavrov focused on the situation in South Sudan, Iran’s nuclear programme, and the role of the international community in preventing violence in Syria and Yemen. Barack Obama voiced support for Russia’s mediation efforts in a political settlement of the Libya crisis despite the fact that Washington and Moscow differ on a number of points in Libya. The two countries specifically differ on the way the UN Security Council resolution 1973 on imposing the no-fly zone over Libya is being implemented. Moscow feels that NATO overstepped the mandate when it began to deliver strikes at ground-based targets, said Sergei Lavrov in his interview with the Voice of Russia. "Russia would like to specify the limits of the use of force, Sergei Lavrov says. Unfortunately, our partners in the talks rejected the Russian proposals for this item of the resolution, and submitted the original draft to voting. Russia did support the objectives of the resolution, but not the means currently being used to attain them. We chose not to use the right of veto, along with China, Germany, India and Brazil. Lamentably, our apprehensions proved well-grounded, for the UN resolution is pushed far beyond its intended scope of action, - the imposition of a no-fly zone over Libya, that is." Barack Obama and Sergei Lavrov clearly took up the hottest issue of Russian-American relations, - cooperation in the field of antimissile defences in Europe. So far, there’s been little progress to that end, Lavrov says, and elaborates. But however important, the ABM issue cannot be seen as the one that determines Russia-US relations after the “reset”. Now we are enjoying a far better developed cooperation with the United States that’s based on good personal relations between the two Presidents, the Russian Foreign Minister said. To make his point, Sergei Lavrov cited as an example the performance of the presidential commission that coordinates 20 working groups in all areas of cooperation. All of these have obtained important results. It was partly thanks to the “reset” that the START-3 treaty was signed at long last. But the hopes to sign an agreement on an easier visa regime between the two countries were dashed. Some technicalities were still to be agreed, said Sergei Lavrov, but offered assurances that the agreement would take effect before the end of this year. Nor was he able to agree the date of President’s Obama’s visit to Moscow over the differences on the ABM system that the US is currently deploying in Europe. A visit by the US President to Moscow would make sense if the two countries’ leaders could for example sign a joint declaration on ABM. But the effort to reach a compromise continues to be made, and a major change in the two countries’ relations so far is that these relations have become structured and systemic in character, Sergei Lavrov said in conclusion.

## Link Extensions—Weaponization Links

### Weaponizing space will crush cooperation

Krepon – 2003 [President emeritus of the Henry L. Stimson Center, is the author of Space Assurance or Space Dominance? The Case Against Weaponizing Space with Christopher Clary, Cooperative Threat Reduction, Missile Defense, and the Nuclear Future and editor of Nuclear Risk Reduction in South Asia [Henry L. Stimson Center, Space Assurance or Space Dominance?,

http://www.stimson.org/images/uploads/research-pdfs/spacebook.pdf, 6/24/11]

U.S. initiatives to “seize” the high ground of space are likely to be countered by asymmetric and unconventional warfare strategies carried out by far weaker states—in space and to a greater extent on Earth. In addition, U.S. initiatives associated with space dominance would likely alienate longstanding allies, as well as China and Russia, whose assistance is required to effectively counter terrorism and proliferation, the two most pressing national security concerns of this decade. No U.S. ally has expressed support for space warfare initiatives. To the contrary, U.S. initiatives to weaponize space would likely corrode bilateral relations and coalition-building efforts. Instead, the initiation of preemptive or preventive warfare in space by the United States based on assertions of an imminent threat—or a threat that cannot be ameliorated in other ways—is likely to be met with deep and widespread skepticism abroad.

### Weaponization collapses Cooperation with Russia

Krepon – 2003 [President emeritus of the Henry L. Stimson Center, is the author of Space Assurance or Space Dominance? The Case Against Weaponizing Space with Christopher Clary, Cooperative Threat Reduction, Missile Defense, and the Nuclear Future and editor of Nuclear Risk Reduction in South Asia [Henry L. Stimson Center, Space Assurance or Space Dominance?,

http://www.stimson.org/images/uploads/research-pdfs/spacebook.pdf, 6/24/11]

The likely consequences of a dynamic, but uneven, space warfare competition are not hard to envision. Potential adversaries are likely to perceive American initiatives to weaponize space as adjuncts to a U.S. military doctrine of preemption and preventive war. Depending on the scope and nature of U.S. space warfare preparations, they could also add to Chinese and Russian concerns over the viability of their nuclear deterrents. U.S. initiatives to extend military dominance into space are therefore likely to raise tensions and impact negatively on U.S.-China and U.S.-Russia relations at a time when bilateral relations have some promising, but tenuous, elements. Cooperative relations with both countries will be needed to successfully combat proliferation, but Moscow and Beijing are unlikely to tender such cooperation if they perceive that U.S. strategic objectives include the negation of their deterrents. Under these circumstances, proliferation of weapons in space would be accompanied by terrestrial proliferation.

### Plan kills US Russia cooperation and causes prolif and a space race

Krepon 04 [President emeritus of the Henry L. Stimson Center, is the author of Space Assurance or Space Dominance?, “Weapons in the Heavens: A Radical and Reckless Option,” Arms Control Today, November, 2004, “Weapons in Space?” ]

Weaponizing space would poison relations with China and Russia, whose help is essential to stop and reverse proliferation. ASAT weapon tests and deployments would surely reinforce Russia’s hair-trigger nuclear posture, and China would likely feel compelled to alter its relaxed nuclear posture, which would then have negative repercussions on India and Pakistan. The Bush administration’s plans would also further alienate America’s friends and allies, which, with the possible exception of Israel, strongly oppose the weaponization of space. The fabric of international controls over weapons of mass destruction, which is being severely challenged by Iran’s and North Korea’s nuclear ambitions, could rip apart if the Bush administration’s interest in testing space and nuclear weapons is realized.

### Plan crushes Russian cooperation

Englehart 8, Pacific Rim Law & Policy Journal [Common Ground in the Sky: Extending the Outer Space Treaty to Reconcile U.S. and Chinese Security Interests; Seattle: Pacific Rim Law & Policy Journal, University of Washington School of Law, 2008-01] http://digital.law.washington.edu/dspace law/bitstream/handle/1773.1/568/17PacRimLPolyJ133.p df?sequence=1; Acessed 6/22/11

Even though Russia is now much weaker than the Soviet Union of the Cold War era, it still has thousands of ICBMs, and the United States should carefully consider the ramifications of its planned space weapons deployment in light of that reality. Russia’s opinion cannot be ignored. While it may not be capable of effectively deploying space-based weapons in the near to mid-term, it may well have an operational ASAT capability and, in any case, its ICBMs demand respect. Like China, Russia depends on its ICBM capability to maintain its international respect. By being able to threaten any potential adversary with nuclear annihilation, Russia maintains its strength and independence in a changing world. Also like China, Russia is understandably worried about the American pursuit of space weapons, which have the potential to undermine the effectiveness of ICBMs. Russia has long been a strategic player in the space weapons arena. In the late 1970s, the United States and the Soviet Union entered into negotiations on an ASAT ban, but the discussions fell apart before any agreement was reached. Ever since, the Soviet Union (later Russia) has been wary of American plans to deploy any kind of weapon in space or further pursue ASAT capabilities. The Strategic Defense Initiative under the Reagan administration—a predecessor to twenty-first century American space weapons programs—arguably hastened the collapse of the Iron Curtain. The actual deployment of satellite-based weapons in the coming decades is sure to inflame Russia and drive it further away from the United States. If Russia moves away from the United States, it will move towards China. Now that China has taken the geopolitical lead in opposing the United States—particularly with respect to space weapons development —a disillusioned Russia is sure to find a strong ally in its neighbor to the east. In fact, it already has. In 2002, Russia and China jointly submitted a working paper to the Conference on Disarmament on a treaty to completely ban space weapons. The preamble to this proposed treaty states that “for the benefit of mankind, outer space shall be used for peaceful purposes, and it shall never be allowed to become a sphere of military confrontation.” The basic obligations proposed include “[n]ot to place in orbit around the Earth any objects carrying any kinds of weapons, not to install such weapons on celestial bodies, or not to station such weapons in outer space in any other manner” and “not to resort to the threat or use of force against outer space objects.” This sweepingly broad language was too much for the United But even so, the proposal should serve as a strong warning to the United States of the close alignment between China and Russia on the space weapons issue. If the United States completely flouts the manifest wishes of China and Russia on this issue, those two countries will be driven more closely together—not just on space weapons, but generally. The United States would be wise to consider the significant long-term consequences of fortifying the Moscow-Beijing axis in this way. The combined geopolitical—and specifically, military—might of these two nations would pose a grave threat to U.S. interests all over the world. If a united Russia and China decided to support Iran or North Korea, the United States would be effectively blocked from pursuing its interests and security vis-à-vis those states. As China inevitably becomes more powerful economically and militarily, the United States must do its best to maintain good relations with Russia and prevent it from moving completely into the Chinese camp. Showing a willingness to negotiate on the space weapons issue would serve that goal well.

Weaponization Kills Russian Cooperation

Podvig and Zhang 08 - Pavel Podvig is an affiliate and former research associate at the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University and Hui Zhang is a Senior Research Associate at the Project on Managing the Atom in the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University [Pavel and Hui, Russian and Chinese Responses to U.S. Military Plans in Space, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, http://www.amacad.org/publications/militarySpace.pdf, June 24 2011]

Russian military leaders and civilian experts have closely analyzed discussions within the United States about military uses of space, as well as the doctrinal documents of the U.S. military. These analyses have heightened concern in Russia about the effects that the development of space-based military systems might have on the U.S.-Russian military balance. Russians see the development of military space systems by the United States as evidence of a growing gap between military capabilities of the two countries. This gap challenges the condition of strategic parity that Russia still believes to be the underlying principle of its relationship with the United States.

## Unilateral Space Policy Links

### Space underlies ALL other aspects of cooperation unilateral action crushes relations

Logsdon and Millar 01 [February 2001, John, Director of the Space Policy Institute at George Washington, and James, emeritus professor of economics and international affairs at George Washington University, “U.S. -Russian Cooperation in Human Space Flight Assessing the Impacts”, Space Policy Institute and Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies Elliott School of International Affairs The George Washington University, http://www.gwu.edu/~spi/assets/docs/usrussia.pdf DH]

Yet, to one participant, "If nothing else, good relations in the area of space policy help provide us with a cushion when they are failing in other areas. . . . Moscow’s military as well as its space program are in very dire straits. Both would seem to be close to cardiac arrest. Having said that, I think our interactions with the Russians in both of these areas are critical to our future bilateral relationship. It would be easy to dismiss the Russians as serious players given their internal situation- an attitude often heard around Washington. To a large degree, we have to carry the ball for them. . . . So why should we continue to pick up the tab? Why should the American taxpayer continue to subsidize the Russian space program - or our military to military contacts? It seems to me that there are two answers to this question. First, when it comes to the space program we are dealing with a very high visibility program. If we ignore the Russian space program, we run the risk of wounding their pride in a very serious way. They don?t need to be told that they are down and out. They know it better than we do. My experience with Russians tells me that they are experts when it comes to knowing the extent of their technological inferiority vis-a-vis the West - or put differently, just how far they are behind us. But by keeping them involved in the space program we are at least giving them a psychological fig leaf." This participant noted that "the more ties we can develop with the Russians in sensitive areas like space and the military the better off our overall relationship will be. . . . It is also worth noting that we have a unique, and even unparalleled opportunity. Both the Russian military and space programs will shortly be forced to undergo some major reforms. It is clear to everyone - and especially the Russian professionals for whom I have developed considerable respect over the years - that something must be done. And it is not just a question of money, although that is critical. Putin is addressing this issue in the military area right now. It is only a matter of time before the space programs undergo the same process. The closer our ties are to these two critical institutions the better will be our chances of impacting on the evolution of these structures. I am not suggesting that either the Russian military or space program will mirror what we have in this country. Both will be Russian and carry an indelible Russian trade-mark. Nevertheless, I think we would be silly to underestimate the impact these two programs will have on our bilateral relations." He concluded that "further development of our bilateral space and military to military relations is a win-win process." 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 revise 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.

### NASA decline has forced us to depend on Russia – causes a new “spirit of cooperation”—plan’s unilateral action would reverse this

O’Flynn 10 – (3/24/10, Kevin O’Flynn, special to Russia Now, “Russia makes space for U.S.,” http://rbth.ru/articles/2010/03/24/240310\_space.html)

On April 2, new Soyuz crew members, two Russians and one American, are scheduled to launch from the Baikonur Cosmodrome in Kazakhstan. Circling the planet, the crew will engage in intense cooperation unknown on the ground. Down on earth, Russian-American space cooperation has increased, but there is also unease as the power of the players is shifting. Russia will fuel space exploration once again, while the U.S. vision appears dampened. America is relying more and more on the Russian federal space program for key assistance. As the United States reprioritizes its programs, the country will rely on Russia to take its astronauts into space. NASA has long spent more money on more programs than Russia’s space agency. But President Barack Obama has slashed NASA’s dreams of going to the moon again. Building new spacecraft for the exploration of Mars is again a flight of fancy. At the same time, the Russian space industry is feeling the warm glow of state backing once again. There has been concerted investment in recent years, an investment that fits in well with the Putin doctrine of trying to restore Russian pride through capacity. And while both countries feel they are the front runners, their dominance could be challenged in the next decade by India and China as they fund their own programs. The Russian government has increased spending on the space industry by a remarkable 40 percent for each of the past five years, spending $2.8 billion in 2009, Euroconsult reported. “It’s like night and day,” said Igor Lissov, editor of News of Cosmonautics (Novosti Kosmonavtiki), comparing funding today with funding in the penurious 1990s. President Putin launched an initial $10 billion program for the space industry between 2006 and 2015. When Putin congratulated space industry workers in 2008 on Cosmonauts' Day (April 12), he called on them to pursue “really ambitious projects.” The U.S. Constellation human-flight program that Obama has all but abandoned was designed, according to President George W. Bush, to “establish an extended human presence on the Moon” that would then lead to flights to Mars. Obama cut it from the 2011 budget as the effects of the financial crisis continue to be felt and program expenditure soared. The government said that though NASA has already spent $9 billion on it, the program is “fundamentally unexecutable.” Instead, America will look to private companies to invest in future spacecraft. In the meantime, U.S. astronauts will hitch a lift on Russian spacecraft, a move that has NASA supporters crying foul. In the wake of recent criticism, Obama announced he will make a visit to Cape Canaveral, Fla., the home of NASA, in April. Russian and American space watchers wonder if this may herald another policy shift. For now, the United States will rely solely on the Russian space program as the U.S. Shuttle retires from service. No private companies have so far secured investment for spacecraft, so this arrangement will likely continue for much longer. Russian academic Yury Zaitsev told Interfax news agency that he thought the United States would be dependent on Russia to transport its astronauts until at least 2020. “In order to bring a craft to the standards of quality and safety for a piloted flight, you need years and years,” he said. NASA has signed a $306 million contract with the Russian Federal Space Agency (Roscosmos) for U.S. astronauts to fly to the International Space Station in 2012. While it is hard for some to get used to the power shifts, others support the new spirit of cooperation, a far cry from the start of the space race when new flights and feats in space were spurred by Cold War fear and one-upmanship as well as scientific endeavor.

Space cooperation is a sign of positive relations- unilateral approaches undermine these efforts

Ilya Kramnik in 10 (European Dialogue, RUSSIAN DEFENSE MINISTER VISITS UNITED STATES: RESETTING IN PROGRESS, http://eurodialogue.org/Russian-Defense-Minister-Visits-United-States-Resetting-In-Progress)

The American and Russian military have had close relations for years, despite the Cold War the two sides shared information and created working groups to deal with issues ranging from safe warship and airplane maneuvers to the drafting of new START treaties and discussing potential space exploration projects. One of the many benefits of this ongoing information exchange was its significant contribution towards keeping the peace between those two powers, each of which had nuclear arsenals large enough to destroy human civilization several times over. The end of the Cold War seemed to open up a genuine opportunity for effective cooperation between the two military superpowers. However, the subsequent disintegration of the Soviet Union and later U.S. policies comprising a unilateral approach to security, through attaining an overwhelming military superiority over all other nations jeopardized those prospects.

### Space cooperation encourages stronger relations that enhance nonproliferation efforts

Mikhail I. Rykhtik Nizhny Novgorod State University December 2001 A Fresh Start in U.S.-Russian Relations?, Prepared for the PONARS Policy Conference Washington, DC January 25, 2002, http://www.gwu.edu/~ieresgwu/assets/docs/ponars/pm\_0228.pdf

Some results of cooperation between Russia and the United States can be found in the areas of space exploration, science, and nonproliferation. The Shuttle-Mir Program taught both states how to work across international boundaries on complex human space flight operations, improved understanding of the effects of long-term living in space, and contributed to the success of the International Space Station through reduced risk and more efficient assembly techniques. Cooperation in the peaceful use of space is important to both countries. Equally important is mutual cooperation to ensure the prevention of the militaristic use of space, such as missile proliferation. Nonproliferation in all its aspects is an area of great importance to the United States and Russia. Weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their missile delivery systems, according to official U.S. statements, pose a direct and serious threat to U.S. national security. The United States and Russia currently work together as members of the Missile Technology Control Regime to halt the transfers of missiles and missile-related technology.

Space cooperation enhances US diplomacy and relations with other countries-unilateralism undermines efforts

James D. Rendleman and Faulconer in 10, (Colonel, USAF (Ret.), Colorado Springs, Colorado J. Walter Faulconer, Ellicott City, Maryland , Improving International Space Cooperation, http://strategicspacesolutions.com/Public-papers/Intl-Space-Coop%206-5-10.pdf)

A turnabout? Maybe, but the reality is that the United States is the absolute leader in terms of human, science and commercial spaceflight. But what are the United States’ real interests in international space cooperation? Does the United States need to cooperate as a fundamental part of its space strategy? The United States National Space Policy accurately proclaims that for five decades the nation ―has led the world in space exploration and use and has developed a solid civil, commercial, and national security space foundation. Space activities have improved life in the United States and around the world, enhancing security, protecting lives and the environment, speeding information flow, serving as an engine for economic growth, and revolutionizing the way people view their place in the world and the cosmos.‖3 International interest in space continues to grow. In 2000, there were 40 different countries that had registered space agencies. By 2009 that number has continued to grow to 55. The National Space Policy’s assertions of U.S. space leadership are easily supported by studies including the Futron Corporation annual 2009 Space Competitive Index. This assessment contends the United States still makes the largest investment in its space community in terms of its human capital.4 According, ―The [U.S.] remains the current leader in space competitiveness, but its relative position has declined marginally based on increased activity by other space-faring nations. The U.S. still leads in each of the major categories: government, human capital, and industry, however, its comparative advantage is narrowing…‖5 The National Space Policy also declares that the conduct of U.S. space programs is guided by the following principle: 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…6 This sentiment to support international cooperation and collaboration is growing. As we will discuss, there is considerable justification for this. Indeed, the new NASA Administrator, Charlie Bolden, has announced that greater international cooperation is coming, affirming he believes that the two organizations who do more for U.S. diplomacy than anyone else are its armed forces and NASA. Changes in future international cooperation, he added, would include ―non-traditional partners‖, such as China. ―There are not a lot of things I can tell you with certainty, but I can tell you that; he said do that,‖ Bolden said, referring to the President. Later, in a brief question and answer session, the Administrator jokingly commented about working with the Chinese: ―I’d rather work with them than fight them.‖7 There is a strong and powerful case to be made for the United States to conduct international space cooperation activities. We will discuss how cooperation allows a nation to leverage resource and reduce risk; improve global engagement; and enhance diplomatic prestige of engaged states, political sustainability and workforce stability. Although the case for international space cooperation is powerful, its success is often achieved from a U.S. perspective only after the undertaking of great expense as demonstrated by problems that have arisen within the International Space Station (ISS) and James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) programs. The obstacles and impediments to cooperation are substantial, and are manifested through various anti-collaborative behaviors. To achieve success, these obstacles and impediments must be understood and confronted. To that end, we will examine the substantial challenges posed by technology transfer constraints, international and domestic politics, and exceptionalism perspectives. Given the imperative to cooperate, four frameworks (cooperation, augmentation, interdependence, and integration) can be employed to overcome these challenges and achieve success.

### The US must not explore and develop space unilaterally-it would undermine cooperation with countries like Russia and China who benefit from joint ventures

Lou Friedman in 11 (Space Review, American leadership, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1778/1)

It is true that American leadership can be used as a nationalistic call to advance American interests at the expense of non-American interests. But more often it may be used as an international call for promoting mutual interests and cooperation. That is certainly true in space, as demonstrated by the International Space Station, Cassini-Huygens, the James Webb Space Telescope, the Europa Jupiter System Mission, Mars 2016/2018 and Earth observing satellites. These are great existing and proposed missions, which engage much of the world and advance the interests of the US and other nations, inspire the public, and promote cooperation among technical and scientific communities worldwide. Yet space exploration and development are often overlooked in foreign relations and geopolitical strategies. Sometimes, the connection between space exploration and foreign relations has even been belittled in the space community. I refer to the NASA administrator’s foray into the Middle East last year, promoting science, math, and technology as a way to reach out to Muslim nations. It is true that he used some unfortunate wording, such as “foremost purpose,” but it was great that the administration wanted the space program to be part of its overarching international efforts to engaging the Muslim community in peaceful pursuits. Apollo and the International Space Station were both accomplishments motivated more by international and geopolitical interests than they were by space enthusiasm. It’s my view that space ventures should be used to advance American engagement in the world. (For example, with China on the space station and Russia in Mars Sample Return.) American leadership in space is much more desired that resented—except when it gets used unilaterally, as in the past Administration’s call for “dominance in cislunar space.” Asian countries (China, Japan, India) are especially interested in lunar landings; Western countries, including the US, much less so. However, cooperating with Asian countries in lunar science and utilization would be both a sign of American leadership and of practical benefit to US national interests. Apollo 11 astronaut Buzz Aldrin has been a leader advocating such cooperation. At the same time American leadership can be extended by leading spacefaring nations into the solar system with robotic and human expeditions to other worlds. The US can’t do everything alone. Climate monitoring, Earth observation, space weather prediction, and ultimately asteroid deflection are huge and vital global undertakings that require international participation. That is also true with exploration projects sending robots and human to other worlds. American leadership in these areas is welcomed and used by other countries, even as they develop their own national programs. The US government should make more of this and not treat it as an afterthought—or even worse, prohibit American leadership as the House of Representatives is doing this week by banning any China collaboration or cooperation. (The proposed House continuing resolution for fiscal year 2011 prohibits OSTP or NASA funds to be used for anything to do with China.)

### Conflicts over space policy spill over and effect cooperation in other areas

Krepon – 2011 [President emeritus of the Henry L. Stimson Center, is the author of Space Assurance or Space Dominance? The Case Against Weaponizing Space with Christopher Clary , Cooperative Threat Reduction, Missile Defense, and the Nuclear Future and editor of Nuclear Risk Reduction in South Asia [Arms Control Wonk, What Next?, http://krepon.armscontrolwonk.com/archive/3006/what-next, 6/22/11]

In contrast, certain actions in space can have profound implications for national security and deterrence, which depend on the ability of various satellites to perform as planned. A growing number of nations now have the ability to interfere with these satellites. Space is becoming, as the Pentagon likes to say, more congested, competitive, and contested. A competition in space characterized by thinly disguised or overt anti-satellite weapon tests, and a space environment with weak norms governing space traffic management and debris mitigation, will have far greater strategic significance than how many tactical nuclear weapons major powers possess, or how many theater missile defense interceptors they deploy. The way major powers relate to each other in space is intertwined with how they relate to each other here on earth. If the United States and Russia do not reach agreement on rules of the road for space, nuclear dangers will rise, and prospects for the next New START will become more remote. More importantly, behavior in space will shape U.S.-Chinese relations, especially since Beijing doesn’t talk very much about nuclear weapons.

## Impact Extensions

### The disad turns the case and preemptively destroys all solvency--Russia will retaliate to space based brilliant pebbles by preemptively exploding a nuke in space destroying all affirmative solvency

Defense Daily International 06

http://www.missilethreat.com/archives/id.273/detail.asp

Russian leaders are concerned that the U.S. may deploy space-based missile defense assets, reports Defense Daily International. At a recent symposium hosted by the Henry L. Stimson Center, a Washington DC think tank, analysts noted that Russia could respond by detonating a nuclear weapon in space to create a radiation belt that would render U.S. space-based defenses useless. Such a move would also annihilate functioning of Russian satellites, although Russia has far less to lose. According to retired Russian General Vladimir Dworkin, now senior researcher with the Center for International Security at the Institute for World Economy and International Relations of the Russian Academy of Science, Russia’s concerns about lasers in space do not apply to existing components of the multi-layered U.S. missile defense system, such as the Airborne Laser. “We’ve gotten used to it,” Dworkin said. “But if you’re talking about reviving … Star Wars,” perhaps by resurrecting Brilliant Pebbles or developing a laser BMD system, then that “would be a shock” to Russians that they would not easily get used to. The more the U.S. pushes to develop a space-based BMD system, the more sharply Russia would be likely to respond, Dworkin warned.

### The aff weapons cannot prevent any of our impacts because the relations impact scenarios are all short term – it would take decades before the aff has effective weapons in space

Bonsor 11

Kevin, freelance science writer http://science.howstuffworks.com/space-war2.htm The former U.S. Space Command, which is now part of the U.S. Strategic Command as of June 2002, doesn't hide the fact that it wants to establish U.S. supremacy in space. In its Vision for 2020 report, the Space Command points out that military forces have always evolved to protect national interests, both military and economic. The report suggests that space weapons must be developed to protect U.S. satellites, and other space vehicles, as other countries develop the ability to launch spacecraft into space. In 1997, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Space, Keith R. Hall, said, "With regard to space dominance, we have it, we like it and we're going to keep it." The Pentagon has said that as space enterprises begin to gain commercial advantage, there will be those who try to take some of the profits by attacking those space enterprises. Here are some of the space weapons currently under development: •Chemical Lasers •Particle Beams •Military Space Planes There are at least three laser systems being developed for either space-based or ground-based weapons. All three are a type of chemical laser that involves the mixing of chemicals inside the weapon to create a laser beam. While a space-based laser system is still about 20 years from being realized, there are three lasers being considered for it, including hydrogen fluoride (HF), deuterium fluoride (DF) and chemical oxygen iodine (COIL).

### We outweigh on magnitude—The only scenario for a nuclear war that can cause extinction is one in which the U.S. and Russia end up on opposite sides of a conflict—Only a U.S. Russian war is an existential threat

Bostrum 02. (Dr. Nick, Professor of Philosophy and Global Studies at YALE, "Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards," 3-8-02, http://www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html) Risks in this sixth category are a recent phenomenon. This is part of the reason why it is useful to distinguish them from other risks. We have not evolved mechanisms, either biologically or culturally, for managing such risks. Our intuitions and coping strategies have been shaped by our long experience with risks such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous foods, automobile accidents, Chernobyl, Bhopal, volcano eruptions, earthquakes, draughts, World War I, World War II, epidemics of influenza, smallpox, black plague, and AIDS. These types of disasters have occurred many times and our cultural attitudes towards risk have been shaped by trial-and-error in managing such hazards. But tragic as such events are in the big picture of things – from the perspective of humankind as a whole – even the worst of these catastrophes are mere ripples on the surface of the great sea of life. They haven't significantly affected the total amount of human suffering or happiness or determined the long-term fate of our species. With the exception of a species-destroying comet or asteroid impact (an extremely rare occurrence), there were probably no significant existential risks in human history until the mid-twentieth century, and certainly none that it was within our power to do something about. The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by "igniting" the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don't know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[2] At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[3] A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind's potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

## Turns U.S. Hegemony

### Low US-Russian cooperation will crush US leadership.

Simes, president of the Nixon Center, 2003 (Dimitri, Federal News Service, 9/30, lexis)

Seventh, as a veto-wielding permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, Russia can substantially ease, or complicate, American attempts to work through the UN and other international institutions to advance other vital and extremely important U.S. interests. In a world in which many are already concerned about the use of U.S. power, this can have a real impact on America's success at providing global leadership. More broadly, a close U.S.-Russian relationship can limit other states' behavior by effectively eliminating Moscow as a potential source of political support.

### Cooperation iskey to hege

SIMES 3 (DMITRI, PRESIDENT OF THE NIXON CENTER, FDCH POLITICAL TESTIMONY, 9-30)

At the same time, U.S. leaders increasingly recognized the emerging, inter-related threats of terrorism and proliferation. Though policy makers and experts had devoted some attention to these issues earlier, the tragic events of September 11 rapidly crystallized American thinking about these threats and transformed the struggle to contain them into the principal aim of American foreign policy. Notwithstanding its diminished status and curtailed ambition, Russia has considerable influence in its neighborhood and a significant voice elsewhere as well. Moscow can contribute importantly to U.S. interests if it chooses to do so. Accordingly Russia can markedly decrease, or increase, the costs of exercising American leadership both directly (by assisting the United States, or not) and indirectly (by abetting those determined to resist, or not).

### Russia will block the affs effort to create hegemony through counter balancing

Graham 09

Thomas Graham served as special assistant to the president and senior director for Russia on the National Security Council staff, 2004–07Resurgent Russia and U.S. Purposes http://tcf.org/events/pdfs/ev257/Graham.pdf

Second, Moscow views what it sees as the American ambition to build a unipolar world as a direct challenge to its goal of regaining great-power status: by definition, a unipolar world exists with only one great power. Consequently, another top priority for Russia has been constraining the United States, or transforming it into what might be called a “normal great power,” that is, one among many poles in world affairs that realizes that it has to take into account the interests of other great powers if it is to advance its own. In broad terms, there are three approaches Russia can take toward this goal: (1) building countervailing coalitions, if not precisely anti-American ones (for example, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, or through coordination between Brazil, Russia, India, and China—known as the BRICs); (2) raising the authority of institutions such as the U.N. Security Council, which the United States cannot dominate (in a sense, a variant of the first method), and (3) working with the United States as a genuine partner, preferably on the basis of legally binding agreements.

## Nuclear risks

### U.S. Russian Cooperation is key to solve prolif, nuclear terrorism and nuclear use

Perry and Scowcroft, ’09 (William and brent, Chairs CFR, april, “US Nuclear Weapons Policy”)

Despite nearly universal opposition, North Korea has developed a small nuclear arsenal, and Iran appears to be following in its footsteps. Other states, particularly in the Middle East, are starting nuclear power programs modeled after that of Iran. The proliferation of nuclear weapons and fissile materials is thus dangerously close to a tipping point. Beyond this danger, there are still tens of thousands of nuclear weapons in the world. If just one of these thousands of weapons fell into the hands of terrorists, it could be detonated with catastrophic results. So, although the old danger of a massive nuclear exchange between great powers has declined, a new risk looms of a few nuclear detonations being set off by a terrorist group or a nuclear-capable rogue state, or of a nuclear power making a tragic mistake. The threat of nuclear terrorism is already serious, and, as more nations acquire nuclear weapons or the fissile material needed for nuclear weapons, it will increase. Of course, the detonation of a relatively primitive nuclear bomb in one American city would not be equivalent to the type of nuclear exchange that was feared during the Cold War. Nonetheless, the results would be catastrophic, with the devastation extending well beyond the staggering fatalities. The direct economic losses would amount to many hundreds of billions of dollars, but the indirect economic impact would be even greater. The social and political effects are incalculable, especially if the detonation were in Washington, DC, and disabled a significant part of the U.S. government. The terror and disruption would be beyond imagination. High priority should be accorded to policies that serve to prevent such a catastrophe, specifically programs that reduce and protect existing nuclear arsenals and that keep new arsenals from being created. All such preventive programs, by their nature, have international dimensions. Their success depends on the United States being able to work cooperatively with other countries, most notably Russia. That such international cooperation can be successful is illustrated by the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program in the 1990s. U.S.-Russian efforts on that program led to thousands of nuclear weapons and their launchers being dismantled and thus made the world safer. But unless U.S.-Russia relations improve, it is difficult to imagine those two governments cooperating on future programs that require such a high level of mutual trust.

### Proliferation causes nuclear war

Victor Utgoff, Summer 2002, Survival, vol 44, no. 2, ProQuest

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed to a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear ‘six-shooters’ on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

### US-Russian cooperation prevents multiple scenarios of war and terrorism and is key to U.S. leadership

Nixon Center 3 (“Advancing American Interests and the U.S.-Russian Relationship Interim Report” The Commission on America’s National Interests and Russia. The Nixon Center. September 2003. http://www.nixoncenter.org/publicants/monographs/FR.htm)

The proper starting point in thinking about American national interests and Russia—or any other country—is the candid question: why does Russia matter? How can Russia affect vital American interests and how much should the United States care about Russia? Where does it rank in the hierarchy of American national interests? As the Report of the Commission on American National Interests (2000) concluded, Russia ranks among the few countries whose actions powerfully affect American vital interests. Why? First, Russia is a very large country linking several strategically important regions. By virtue of its size and location, Russia is a key player in Europe as well as the Middle East and Central, South and East Asia. Accordingly, Moscow can substantially contribute to, or detract from, U.S. efforts to deal with such urgent challenges as North Korea and Iran, as well as important longer term problems like Iraq and Afghanistan. In addition, Russia shares the world’s longest land border with China, an emerging great power that can have a major impact on both U.S. and Russian interests. The bottom line is that notwithstanding its significant loss of power after the end of the Cold War, Moscow’s geopolitical weight still exceeds that of London or Paris. Second, as a result of its Soviet legacy, Russia has relationships with and information about countries that remain comparatively inaccessible to the American government, in the Middle East, Central Asia and elsewhere. Russian intelligence and/or leverage in these areas could significantly aid the United States in its efforts to deal with current, emerging and still unforeseen strategic challenges, including in the war on terrorism. Third, today and for the foreseeable future Russia’s nuclear arsenal will be capable of inflicting vast damage on the United States. Fortunately, the likelihood of such scenarios has declined dramatically since the Cold War. But today and as far as any eye can see the U.S. will have an enduring vital interest in these weapons not being used against America or our allies. Fourth, reliable Russian stewardship and control of the largest arsenal of nuclear warheads and stockpile of nuclear materials from which nuclear weapons could be made is essential in combating the threat of “loose nukes.” The United States has a vital interest in effective Russian programs to prevent weapons being stolen by criminals, sold to terrorists and used to kill Americans. Fifth, Russian stockpiles, technologies and knowledge for creating biological and chemical weapons make cooperation with Moscow very important to U.S. efforts to prevent proliferation of these weapons. Working with Russia may similarly help to prevent states hostile to the United States from obtaining sophisticated conventional weapons systems, such as missiles and submarines. Sixth, as the world’s largest producer and exporter of hydrocarbons (oil and gas), Russia offers America an opportunity to diversify and increase supplies of non-OPEC, non-Mid-Eastern energy. Seventh, as a veto-wielding permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, Russia can substantially ease, or complicate, American attempts to work through the UN and other international institutions to advance other vital and extremely important U.S. interests. In a world in which many are already concerned about the use of U.S. power, this can have a real impact on America’s success at providing global leadership. More broadly, a close U.S.-Russian relationship can limit other states’ behavior by effectively eliminating Moscow as a potential source of political support.

## U.S. Russian Miscalc war

### Russian cooperation is key to miscalc

Cirincione 2007 Joseph, Director for Non-Proliferation at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (“Nuclear Summer,” 7/23/11, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/07/nuclear\_summer.html/print.html, accessed 6/26/11)

With Russian early-warning capabilities eroding, we increasingly rely on good relations between the White House and the Kremlin to ensure that no Russian president will misinterpret a false alarm and make a catastrophic decision. This summer, behind the smiles at the “Lobster Summit" in Maine, that good will was in short supply, weakening an important safety net crucial to preventing an accidental nuclear exchange. Later in July, the mutual diplomatic expulsions between Russia and the United Kingdom, which fields 185 nuclear weapons, ratcheted tensions up another notch and should shake current complacent policies that take good relations for granted and scorn any further negotiated nuclear reductions.

### Relations solve miscalc and nuclear war

Gottemoeller 8 (Rose Gottemoeller was appointed Director of carnegie moscow center in January 2006. formerly, Gottemoeller was a senior associate at the carnegie endowment, where she held a joint appointment with the Russian and eurasian Program and the Global Policy Program. a specialist on defense and nuclear issues in Russia and the other former soviet states, Gottemoeller’s research at the endowment focused on issues of nuclear security and stability, nonproliferation, and arms control, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to advancing cooperation between nations and promoting active international engagement by the United States, “Russia-US Security Relations after Georgia” available at http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/russia\_us\_security\_relations\_after\_georgia.pdf)

No holds barred, no rules—the United States and Russia may be heading to a confrontation more unpredictable and dangerous than any we have seen since the Cuban missile crisis. A confrontation today would be different—the two countries are in constant and intense communication, unlike the situation in 1962—but if those exchanges provoke mutual anger and recrimination, they have the potential to spark a dangerous crisis. This effect is especially dangerous because both countries are in presidential transitions. Russia, whose government is riven by corruption, internal competition, and disorder, is attempting an unprecedented tandem leadership arrangement. The United States is in the midst of its quadrennial election season, with both political parties competing to show that their man is more skilled and tough on national security issues than his opponent. The unpredictability of these two transitions stokes the potential for misunderstanding and descent into crisis. We must avoid such a crisis, because we have never succeeded in escaping the nuclear existential threat that we each pose to the other. We never even came close to transforming the U.S.–Russian relationship into one that is closer to that which the United States has with the United Kingdom or France. What if Russia had refused to confirm or deny that no nuclear weapons were on the bombers it flew to Venezuela? Our nuclear weapons are still faced off to launch on warning of an attack, and in a no-holds-barred confrontation between us, we could come close to nuclear catastrophe before we knew it. What next? Is it possible to outrun confrontation and return to a pragmatic working relationship in pursuit of mutual interests? Clearly the answer should be “yes,” if the Russian Federation completely withdraws its troops from Georgian territory according to the Sarkozy–Medvedev plan. But, following Russia’s recognition of the independence of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, that process may take months and perhaps years. Some Russian commentators have been arguing that a relevant time frame to consider is how long Cyprus has been the site of an unresolved territorial dispute between Turkey and Greece: nearly thirty years. In the meantime, the United States and Russia have about six months of intense political transition to get through, until the new U.S. president settles into place. This begs for a short-term modus vivendi that would enable the two countries to avoid a potential crisis and establish an agenda to confront some of the severe problems that have emerged in their relationship. Ultimately, the United States and Russia should want to re-create a book of rules that both will embrace, corresponding to international law and in fact strengthening it. Seize the Superstructure The first step in this process, and the best way to begin it, is to grab onto the existing superstructure of the U.S.–Russia relationship. This is the system of established and well-understood treaties, agreements, and arrangements that has been built up over time. Beginning in the 1950s, many efforts have been made to insert predictability and mutual confidence into the relationship in the form of both bilateral and multilateral arrangements. For the next six months, both governments need to take advantage of this established and well understood system. Derided in recent years as a Cold War relic not worthy of the friendship the two countries had developed, it could now be a lifeline.

### Miscalc equals Extinction

PR NEWSWIRE 98 [“NEJM STUDY WARNS OF INCREASING RISK OF ACCIDENTAL NUCLEAR ATTACK; OVER 6.8 MILLION IMMEDIATE U.S. DEATHS POSSIBLE,” APR 29, LN]

Despite the end of the Cold War, American and Russian nuclear arsenals remain on high-alert. That, when combined with significant deterioration in Russian control systems, produces a growing likelihood of an "accidental" nuclear attack, in which more than six million American[s] men, women, and children could die, according to a study published in the April 30 New England Journal of Medicine. The authors, physicians, public health professionals, and nuclear experts, will hold press conferences on April 29 in seven U.S. Cities, including Boston, beseeching the U.S. Government to seek a bilateral agreement with the Russians that would take all nuclear missiles off high-alert as an "urgent interim measure" toward the only permanent solution: the abolition of nuclear weapons worldwide. "It is politically and morally indefensible that American children are growing up with the threat of an accidental nuclear attack," says Lachlan Forrow, MD, principal author of the NEJM article, "'Accidental' Nuclear War: A Post-Cold War Assessment," and internist at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center. His study cites numerous instances of 'broken arrows' -- major nuclear accidents that could have killed millions and exposed millions of others to potentially lethal radiation from fallout if disaster had not been averted. "Nuclear weapons do not make us safer, their existence jeopardizes everything we cherish." Forrow adds, "We are calling upon the mayors and citizens of all U.S. and Russian cities to join us in appealing to Presidents Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin to end this threat by taking all weapons off high-alert status immediately." A strike on Boston would likely target Logan Airport, Commonwealth Pier, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Harvard University, resulting in 609,000 immediate fatalities, according to the researchers. Depending on wind patterns, says Dr. Forrow, hundreds of thousands of other Boston-area residents could be exposed to potentially lethal fallout. Launching nuclear missiles on false warning is the most plausible contemporary 'accident' scenario, according to the authors. More than mere conjecture, this scenario almost played out to horrifying results in 1995 when a U.S. scientific rocket launched from Norway led to activation of the nuclear suitcases carried by the top Russian command -- the first time ever in Soviet- Russian history. It took eight minutes for the Russian leadership to determine the rocket launch was not part of a surprise nuclear strike by Western nuclear submarines -- just four minutes before they might have ordered a nuclear response based on standard launch-on-warning protocols. An 'accidental' nuclear attack would create a public health disaster of an unprecedented scale, according to more than 70 articles and speeches on the subject, cited by the authors and written by leading nuclear war experts, public health officials, international peace organizations, and legislators. Furthermore, retired General Lee Butler, Commander from 1991-1994 of all U.S. Strategic Forces under former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell, has warned that from his experience in many "war games" it is plausible that such an attack could provoke a nuclear counterattack that could trigger full-scale nuclear war with billions of casualties worldwide.

## Economy

### Cooperation is key to U.S. Economy

Good June 21, 11 (Alison, U.S. and Russia are strengthening their relationship, Ambassador says, New Orleans Business News, http://www.nola.com/business/index.ssf/2011/06/us\_and\_russia\_are\_strengthenin.html, Date Accessed 6/26/11)

The ambassador also emphasized that relations with Russia are not only politically advantageous for the United States, but also economically essential. "Good political relations are not enough, and we need more solid foundations of trade and business. Our prosperity is closely intertwined with Russia, since it's a major market for U.S. goods and services," he said during the luncheon program, which was called "The Current State of U.S.-Russia Relations." While trade between the United States and Russia has doubled over the past four years, the scope of economic cooperation between Russia and New Orleans has also expanded. "Our exports to Russia from New Orleans grew exponentially between 2006 and 2010," said Mayor Mitch Landrieu. "There's a great partnership between New Orleans and Russia." American companies have taken the reset to heart, added Beyrle. "U.S. companies are now well-established in Russia and are creating jobs," he explained, citing the recent activities of Ford, General Motors, and high-tech entities such as Microsoft, Cisco and Boeing. Democratic development in post-Soviet Russia has also had positive implications for United States tourism."Russia is now more open and increasingly connected with the world," the ambassador said. "Russians recently discovered the American South, and now there are direct flights to and from Houston and Atlanta."

## AT: relations resilient

### Doesn’t answer the disad—Even if relations are resilient it doesn’t mean cooperation is resilient—that’s the Collins evidence in the 1nc—All of our impacts coming from reductions in cooperation

### Cooperation can be reversed

Rojansky 7-13-11

Matthew Rojansky is the deputy director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment

<http://carnegie.ru/publications/?lang=en&fa=45036>

Lavrov’s visit to Washington comes at a historic high point for U.S.-Russia ties, and his work with U.S. counterparts will secure even greater success. Yet the relationship is still vulnerable, with real risk factors on the horizon. Rather than allowing these threats to dominate, the United States and Russia should take steps now to build a foundation for cooperation that is so broad and deep it cannot easily be upset. When faced with seemingly impossible challenges throughout history, both Americans and Russians have defied skepticism and proven equal to the task. Now, let us show what we are capable of doing when two great nations work together.

### **Relations not resilient – collapse possible**

Perry and Scowcroft, ’09 (William and brent, Chairs CFR, april, “US Nuclear Weapons Policy”)

The dangers of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism are real and imminent, and any serious effort to reduce them will require the leadership of the United States. The risk of a new Cold War–like hostility developing between the United States and Russia is also real, and efforts to reduce it will require opening a positive strategic dialogue with Russia, at the same time hedging against the possibility that such a dialogue may not be successful. In short, the nuclear policy of the United States should be to lead when possible and hedge when necessary.

### **Cooperation is not inevitable**

Graham 09

Thomas Graham served as special assistant to the president and senior director for Russia on the National Security Council staff, 2004–07Resurgent Russia and U.S. Purposes http://tcf.org/events/pdfs/ev257/Graham.pdf

Nothing in Russia’s understanding of its interests precludes close cooperation with the United States on a wide range of issues critical to American security and prosperity. That said, there is no easy or quick path to renewed relations. The past several years have left a residue of bitterness, ill will, and wariness, and have created an atmosphere in which an effort to reach out to the other side is just as likely to be seen as a concession born of weakness as a gesture of good will born of strength. The growing global turmoil has exposed vulnerabilities in both countries, and in each country the premium is on projecting strength and confidence, in part to mask the vulnerabilities.

Moreover, improved relations by definition cannot come from unilateral action, but only from a process of mutual give–and-take. To be sure, the new administration needs to take the initiative, if only because it is new. The Russian side has made it clear it is not prepared to act first, beyond expressing a desire for better relations.

In this situation, the challenge for the new administration is to take steps that do not jeopardize our long-term, strategic interests; that are grounded in current realities; that demonstrate a willingness to accommodate Russian interests and concerns to the extent they do not threaten our own strategic interests; and that harness Russia’s desire for power and prestige in international affairs to American purpose by showing how Russia can gain in both by cooperating with the United States. Such steps—and, one hopes, some initial visible successes in cooperative efforts—would help create an atmosphere in which even relatively large differences in goals and approaches can be addressed calmly in a search for common ground.

### The New Russia has an underlying nationalist fervor that makes backlash possible

Graham 09

Thomas Graham served as special assistant to the president and senior director for Russia on the National Security Council staff, 2004–07Resurgent Russia and U.S. Purposes http://tcf.org/events/pdfs/ev257/Graham.pdf

No one would gainsay the Russian temptation to counter the United States at times, especially along Russia’s periphery; or the obstacles to Russia’s long-term accumulation of power; or the vexations in engaging Russia, particularly now. A decade of socioeconomic collapse and national humiliation (at the hands of the West, Russians believe), followed by the remarkable recovery of the past eight years and efforts to reclaim Russia’s great power status (against the West’s wishes, they are certain), now threatened by the mounting global economic crisis (made in the United States, they say) has produced a heady nationalism, a petulant brew of pride and resentment, of self-confidence and self-doubt, often expressed in caustic anti-American rhetoric and actions. The case for U.S. engagement with Russia, however, is not based on the absence of conflicts in interests and values, an exaggerated assessment of its future power, or expectations that dealing with Russia will be easy. It is based on a hardnosed assessment of American long-term strategic interests, and the impact engagement or conflict with Russia could have on our ability to protect and advance them.

## Aff Answers

### Russian relations are resilient – mutual deterrence

Fenenko 6/21 - Leading Research Fellow, Institute of International Security Studies of RAS [Alexei, “The cyclical nature of Russian-American relations,” 6/21/11, http://en.rian.ru/valdai\_op/20110621/164739508.html, accessed 6/26/11]

There is nothing special or unusual about the current difficulties. Over the past twenty years, both Russia and the United States have experienced several cycles of convergence and divergence in their bilateral relations. It seems that Moscow and Washington are doomed to repeat these cycles time and again. Such changes in bilateral relations are no mere coincidence. Russia and the United States base their relations on mutual nuclear deterrence. The material and technical foundations for Russian-American relations differ little from those underpinning the Soviet-American relations of the 1980s. Thus, these cycles of Russian-American rapprochement are due to two factors. First comes the desire to consistently reduce aging nuclear systems so that during disarmament neither party risked destroying the military-strategic parity. Second, the reaction to a major military-political crisis after which the parties seek to reduce confrontation and update the rules of conduct in the military-political sphere. After confronting these tasks, Russia and the United States returned to a state of low intensity confrontation.

### Relations resilient

DesMoines Register 8/26/09 (“Renew the focus on relations of U.S., Russia,”)

In recent years, U.S.-Russia relations have again taken a turn for the worse. Both nations have routinely portrayed the other in negative terms. Mutual distrust and suspicions have grown over many political, defense and economic issues. We have returned to describing each other in stereotypes.  The 50th anniversary of Khrushchev's visit is an excellent opportunity to focus again on the importance of better U.S.-Russia relations, honest dialogue and shared need to tackle nuclear and other global challenges. As President Barack Obama said in Moscow in early July, "But I believe that on the fundamental issues that will shape this century, Americans and Russians share common interests that form a basis for cooperation."

### US-Russian relations low– ABM, Iran, Liya

Fenenko June 21, 2011 (Alexia, The Cyclical nature of Russian-American relations, Rianovosti, http://en.rian.ru/valdai\_op/20110621/164739508.html, Date Accessed: June 26th, 2011)

The “reset policy” crisis has been discussed in the Russian and U.S. media for nearly a year. Both the Kremlin and the White House reported progress: from START-III entering into force to expanded economic contacts. But after the Washington summit that brought presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev together on 24 June 2010, there has been an increasingly dominant sense that the “reset” process is, somehow, going very wrong. The U.S. refusal to compromise over its ABM system, ongoing tensions over Iran, Libya and Georgia, Washington’s support for Japan in its territorial disputes with Russia, the U.S. media’s infatuation with the “Khodorkovsky case” -- all these are symptoms of a deeper problem.

### US-Russian relations low – TNW and missile defense

Fenenko June 21, 2011 (Alexia, The Cyclical nature of Russian-American relations, Rianovosti, http://en.rian.ru/valdai\_op/20110621/164739508.html, Date Accessed: June 26th, 2011)

At first glance, the cyclical character of U.S.-Russian relations seems encouraging. Even taking this negative scenario into consideration, Russia and the United States should enter a new rapprochement cycle in about 2016. That is when they will need to have agreed on the decommissioning of their aging nuclear systems and overcome this unnecessary hostility. However, the problem is that in the second half of the 2010s the potential for a “rapprochement cycle” may well have been exhausted for the following reasons. First, Russia and the United States have now reached critical ceilings in reducing strategic nuclear forces: up to 1,550 operational warheads deployed by each side. A further ceiling reduction may result in a possible strike to disarm the strategic forces of either party. With the development of missile defense systems and precision weapons accelerating, Moscow is unlikely to agree to develop a new, more fundamental, START-IV. Second, over the past twenty years, Russia and the United States have upgraded their strategic nuclear forces much more slowly than they did in the 1970s and 1980s. The potential to decommission these nuclear systems will be far less than it was pre-2009. If it is to maintain the current groupings of strategic nuclear forces, Russia will be forced to extend the operating life of its nuclear weapons. Presumably, the United States, in turn, will not agree to compromise on missile defense without substantial concessions from Moscow. Third, the parties are not ready to begin a dialogue on tactical nuclear weapons (TNW) reduction. For Russia, this functions as compensation for NATO’s superiority in conventional forces. For the United States it is a mechanism by which they preserve their nuclear presence in Europe, especially in Germany. Theoretically, Russia could exchange the partial reduction of tactical nuclear weapons for the involvement of Britain and France in the INF Treaty (Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty) and thus get guarantees for the non-development of Britain’s nuclear capability. But the experience of 2010 proved that Washington is unlikely to be able to convince London and Paris to join these Russian-American agreements. Fourth, Russia and the USA have ever fewer compromise opportunities on missile defense issues. Washington has allocated vast resources for this project, and American business gets big military orders. Americans do not yet know what major concessions Moscow should make in exchange for an agreement on limiting anti-missile systems. Russia, in turn, is not prepared to reduce the strategic potential for the sake of attractive promises about partnership on ABM issues. In this sense, the failure of June’s missile defense talks is a greater cause for anxiety than any of the previous obstacles encountered. Strategic relations between Russia and the United States are dwindling. In the sphere of arms control both Moscow and Washington will go through a really difficult period in the second half of the 2010s. Will it be possible to expand the agenda of the Russian-American dialogue before that starts?

### Not Unique Relations tubed now

Feifer 7-29-11

Gregory, reporter Radio Free Europe http://www.rferl.org/content/us-russia\_reset\_faces\_biggest\_challenge/24280956.html

The White House touts its "reset" policy toward Russia as one of its key diplomatic successes. But the Russian authorities were caught off-guard when Washington quietly barred some of their officials from traveling to the United States this week, a move that threatens to undo some of the gains Washington has made boosting ties with Moscow. The State Department blacklist targets those connected to a scandal that's drawn widespread international condemnation: the death of Sergei Magnitsky, a Russian lawyer jailed in 2009 after accusing police of bilking the government of more than $200 million. A report commissioned by President Dmitry Medvedev himself concluded Magnitsky was denied medical care and probably severely beaten before he died. Magnitsky's supporters have been lobbying Western countries to ban Russian officials implicated in Magnitsky's death. But speaking on a talk show on Ekho Moskvy radio, Leonid Slutsky, first deputy chairman of the Russian Duma's Foreign Affairs Committee, said he couldn't believe the United States went ahead and did it, adding the information could have been made up as a provocation to harm ties. The Kremlin soon reacted more strongly. Medvedev's spokeswoman told the "Kommersant" newspaper the president was preparing retaliatory steps. "We were bewildered by the State Department's action," she said, adding that nothing like it happened "even in the deepest years of the Cold War." Ironically, the blacklist appears to have been intended to head off an effort to impose even stronger sanctions. A group of U.S. senators is sponsoring a bill that would include more Russian officials, freezing their U.S. assets in addition to denying them visas. Fyodor Lukyanov, editor of the journal "Russia in Global Affairs," said the nuance seems to have been lost on Russian officials. "Everybody expected the U.S. Senate to act," he said, "but the preventive or preemptive measure by the State Department was quite unexpected." Other signs of fraying ties emerged this week. Senator Jon Kyl (Republican, Arizona) has called for more investigation into a recent bomb blast outside the U.S. Embassy in Georgia that U.S. intelligence officials say may have been linked to a Russian agent. In Brussels on July 28, the Russian ambassador to NATO dredged up old complaints about plans for a U.S. missile-defense shield in Europe.