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## 2AC DA DOD Tradeoff

**Massively non-uq**

**Aviation Week 8/22** (8/22/2011, Michael Bruno, “U.S. Defense Budget Faces Decimation,” http://www.aviationweek.com/aw/generic/story\_channel.jsp?channel=defense&id=news/awst/2011/08/15/AW\_08\_15\_2011\_p29-358114.xml&headline=U.S.%20Defense%20Budget%20Faces%20Decimation%20Decade, mat)

The dictionary definition of “decimate” is to remove 10%, and that is what could happen to U.S. defense spending over the next decade, now that Washington has set a course to cut as much as $2.4 trillion from accumulating annual deficits. With the 11th-hour deficit deal reached this month on Capitol Hill—formally called the Budget Control Act of 2011, once President Barack Obama signed it into law—massive, embattled programs will become even bigger targets for quantity reductions and cost containment. Topping most analysts’ lists are the Lockheed Martin Joint Strike Fighter, Lockheed Martin-Austal Littoral Combat Ship program and Bell/Boeing V-22 tiltrotor. Other programs will not get away without bruises, but being smaller or still only in developmental phases will allow them to deflect painful changes immediately. And while some niches of defense spending are even expected to grow—such as cybersecurity, unmanned systems, missile defenses, long-range strike and command, control, computers, communications, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (C4ISR)—gone are the days when one huge acquisition could define a defense strategy such as air superiority against a potential but unproven threat. Analysts say the U.S. military’s roles and missions will change because of deficit-reduction efforts, for better or worse, and so will its acquisitions. “The writing is on the wall and, in reality, the roles and missions of the U.S. [Defense Department] and intelligence community could be shaped more by broadly defined, ill-conceived defense budget cuts than by the actual threat environment over the near to intermediate term,” say Michael Lewis and Michael Smith of Lazard Capital Markets. The Budget Control Act will cut at least $330 billion and possibly far more than double that amount from projected Pentagon spending over the decade starting in the next fiscal year. Tens of billions of dollars more would be cut from other security accounts such as intelligence, homeland security and veterans affairs. Lazard and Moody’s Investor Services both see the worst-case scenario as the Pentagon budget losing about $850 billion. But it certainly could go higher under the newly enacted law as details of how to make the cuts remain to be worked out. Todd Harrison, of the nonpartisan Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments in Washington, says that if the full effect of the act is allowed to happen—if lawmakers cannot come up with a deal this year to cut the federal budget by another $1.5 trillion—the Pentagon’s baseline budget will return to its fiscal 2007 level in 2013 and hold there for another eight years. “The budget deal has me partly breathing a sigh of relief [and] partly worrying that we are moving too much toward becoming an entitlement state at the expense of investments in science, education, infrastructure and national security,” the Brookings Institution’s Michael O’Hanlon says. Accordingly, both larger prime contractors and smaller manufacturers will be affected over the next 10 years, says a new report by Russell Solomon of Moody’s. While most of the Pentagon budget is consumed by operations and maintenance-related activities and military personnel, a “disproportionate” share of future cuts is “likely” to come from investment categories such as procurement, research, development, testing and evaluation, according to Moody’s and Lazard. “Programs are easier to cut quickly, and more readily enable big savings, while cutting people makes administration of the department harder,” Solomon notes. The outlook for defense programs grows more dour as expectations dim for the so-called super committee of lawmakers tasked to find cuts under the second part of the Budget Control Act. None of the members named late last week was considered a particularly strong voice for A&D interests, despite the ardent lobbying of the Aerospace Industries Association and House Armed Services Committee Republicans.

**Plan is cheap**

**Tomme, US Airforce Lieutenant Colonel, 5** (Ed, http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/cadre/ari\_2005-01.pdf, The Paradigm Shift to Effects-Based Space:

Near-Space as a Combat Space Effects Enabler”, ZBurdette)

When the cost variable is examined in isolation, near-space has no peer. Their inherent simplicity, recoverability, relative lack of requirement for complex infrastructure, and lack of space-hardening requirements all contribute to this strong advantage for near-space assets.

Requiring only helium for lift, near-space platforms do not require expensive space launch to reach altitude. Over and above the obvious cost savings when the approximately $10,000–$40,000 per payload-kilogram84 current cost85 of a space launch is unnecessary, near-space platforms offer other inherent cost advantages compared to satellites.86 If the payloads they carry malfunction, they can be brought back down and repaired; should they become obsolete, they can be easily replaced. Neither of these actions are possibilities for satellite platforms, many of which had their designs frozen ten or more years before launch and are designed to last for another decade.87 Imagine what capabilities satellites could have if we replaced their twenty-year-old electronics with modern processors. Imagine the savings when every component does not require thorough testing to ensure perfect functionality the first time in space.88 Imagine the related insurance savings.89 Not being exposed to the high levels of radiation common to the space environment, payloads flown in near-space do not require the costly space-hardening manufacturing steps required of orbital assets. Near-space payloads also are not exposed to high-G forces during launch, as are satellites. Operating in near-space obviously eliminates a great deal of expense involved in space sensor construction.

**DOD space spending increasing now**

**Moore 11** (Jack, staff writer “DoD to ‘Boost’ Space Spending?” http://www.executivegov.com/2011/02/dod-to-boost-space-spending/) BW

One of the biggest stories to come blasting out of the defense budget, which will be released next week, could be the increases in Defense Department spending on space and rocket programs, The Wall Street Journal reported.

That’s because despite the uncertain economic climate and the vigilance of deficit hawks, the Pentagon is actually expected to increase space-technology spending by buying in bulk in the upcoming year.

WSJ reports Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates and other department leaders hope that by buying satellites and rockets in higher volumes, rather than one at a time (as DoD has historically done) the department will actually save money over the long haul.

The benefits are three-fold: It allows for more streamlined payments to subcontractors, keeps a stable of necessary equipment at the ready and heads off production-line delays and bottlenecks.

DoD’s acquisition chief Ashton Carter told WSJ the new purchasing plan could help end the inefficient “boom-and-bust” cycles that often plague defense space companies.

Boeing and Lockheed Martin, two government-contracting firms that provide the Air Force with rockets, would also stand to gain from the purchasing changes.

**No link—The GCV would be cut**

**Ewing 7/6**- Journalist and staff writer for politico he has reported from more than a dozen ships at sea, the Pentagon, the Capitol, the White House, Djibouti, Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere and appeared on NPR, he was also a reporter for Navy Times (Philip, “Panetta’s challenge: Not just cut, but cut quickly” http://www.dodbuzz.com/2011/07/06/panettas-challenge-not-just-cut-but-cut-quickly/)JCP

All this is why Kaplan believes the Army will be the biggest target in Austerity America, because cutting soldiers, and their payrolls and other benefits, frees up that money on the balance sheet much faster.

And if you want to pick on the Army, you also could argue that one of its biggest and potentially most expensive priorities, the Ground Combat Vehicle, may not survive in its present form. Lawmakers have scratched their heads as to why the Army even needs a big new armored personnel carrier. Although the brass has a clear case — its current generation of vehicles is maxed out, in terms of size and power, and the Army needs something that can carry an entire squad — all the budget blades flying in Washington may find a quick and easy target in the GCV, given how early it is in development. It’s just like anything else: The more momentum the program gets, the harder it will be to stop. Everyone in the Building and on the Hill understands this, and they’ll no doubt push or pull accordingly.

## 2AC DA Politics

**The aerospace industry advocates the plan- they want to protect space assets**

**PR NewsWire 9**- Investment Needed to Combat Debris Threats to U.S. Space Assets April 28 http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/investment-needed-to-combat-debris-threats-to-us-space-assets-62012932.html

Space debris is a current and growing threat to U.S. exploration activities, and leaders must make situational awareness a top national priority, AIA President and CEO Marion Blakey said in congressional testimony Tuesday.

In written testimony submitted to the House Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, Blakey detailed the challenges created by tens of thousands of man-made objects orbiting the Earth. These items, which include both functioning satellites as well as debris, must be carefully monitored to ensure the safety of humans traveling in space and aboard the International Space Station, as well as critical U.S. space assets.

"As the number of nations placing objects in space grows, risks to U.S. space systems and our ability to operate in space also increases," Blakey wrote. "Space technology is a critical infrastructure that contributes to a strong and secure America. It needs to be adequately protected."

Blakey submitted the testimony for a hearing titled "Keeping the Space Environment Safe for Civil and Commercial Users." The subcommittee is exploring ways to minimize the growth of future space debris as well as improving information to civil and commercial users to avoid in-space collisions. Recent incidents have brought attention to - and worsened - the space debris problem. In 2007 China destroyed one of its aging weather satellites with a ballistic missile. Earlier this year, U.S. and Russian satellites collided. Both incidents resulted in large debris fields in space. Crew aboard the space station sometimes have to scramble into the Soyuz spacecraft or even make evasive maneuvers as space debris threatens the orbiting laboratory.

Blakey called upon lawmakers to provide robust funding for space situational awareness and protection of U.S. space assets. This investment should advance our nation's capabilities,

including hardening satellites from attack and establishing contingency plans to provide backup to space assets.

**They’re the most powerful lobby in congress- they’d rally bipartisan support for the plan**

**Lasker 8** (John, IPS, “Aerospace Lobby Wages Its Own Election Campaign,” Sep 5, http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=43804)

What is notable about AIA's claim is how it is being used - as part of a stepped-up campaign to convince politicians, voters and aerospace employees that "America's future depends on maintaining space leadership". It is a broad statement encompassing several aspects of the U.S. space industry, such as educating the aerospace workforce of the future. But some experts say it also means the U.S. needs to somehow find a way to protect its 400-plus satellites - an undertaking that could result in billions for aerospace industry defence contractors. A powerful lobby in Washington, the aerospace industry accounted for over 650,000 jobs and 184 billion dollars in sales in 2006. The AIA's president and CEO, Marion Blakey, was a former head of the Federal Aviation Administration. Her predecessor, John Douglass, is a former assistant secretary of the Navy, and was named one of Washington's top lobbyists last year by "The Hill", an influential congressional newspaper. Patrick McCartan, AIA's director for legislative affairs, is a former aide to Maine Senator Olympia Snowe. He, too, was ranked a "top rainmaker" by The Hill. With election season in full swing, the AIA is calling for "cutting-edge defence research", along with defence spending being "no less than 4 percent of the U.S. GDP", which was 13.8 trillion dollars for 2007, amounting to roughly 550 billion dollars. That is near the current level, if you include the spending for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is widely known that "Star Wars II" - resurrected this decade by George W. Bush administration "space hawks" - has been a cash cow for aerospace industry giants Lockheed Martin and Boeing, the Pentagon's top two defence contractors. Together, they currently have 73 lobbying groups working Capital Hill, according to Opensecrets.org, which tracks campaign funding and its relation to public policy. Also telling is the campaign money the aerospace industry has contributed during the 2008 election cycle. Historically, the industry has given more to Republicans than Democrats - millions more. Yet as of mid-summer, OpenSecrets.org reports the aerospace industry has split its staggering total of 6.9 million dollars down the middle: half to Democrats, and half to Republicans. "We have met with every campaign staff for months now - McCain, Obama and every other campaign," Matt Grimison, AIA's communications director, told IPS. "We are casting a wide net to make sure these issues are being considered by everybody."

**Plan is popular—past votes prove**

**Larrimore 7** – Lt Col, USAF (Scott C., April 2007, AIR FORCE FELLOWS AIR UNIVERSITY, “A NEW PARADIGM OR ANOTHER FALSE START?” Advised by Dr, Richard Van Atta, Institute for Defense Analyses https://www.afresearch.org/skins/RIMS/display.aspx?moduleid=be0e99f3-fc56-4ccb-8dfe-670c0822a153&mode=user&action=researchproject&objectid=5ea32116-b119-43ab-8fcb-9565110bb741 Ajones)

Political While the United States and its allies generally enjoy strategic peace, there is increasing apprehension over China’s rise as a near-peer military competitor. China’s defense budget grew 17.8 percent in 2007 and 14.7 percent in 2006. In response to China’s ASAT test and continued military build-up, Vice President Cheney stated these actions “are less constructive and are not consistent with China’s stated goal of a peaceful rise.”54 While China may be a strategic rival in the long term, the United States immediate attention is on regional powers. Regional conflicts, particularly the Middle East, will likely embroil the United States for years to come. Concern is increasing, however, that some regional actors such as Iran or North Korea might develop ASAT weapons to ride atop their proven intermediate ballistic missiles. Concern over United States’ satellite vulnerability is one reason Congress decided to fund robustly the ORS initiative in 2006 and 2007.

**Kyl loves the plan**

**Larrimore 7** – Lt Col, USAF (Scott C., April 2007, AIR FORCE FELLOWS AIR UNIVERSITY, “A NEW PARADIGM OR ANOTHER FALSE START?” Advised by Dr, Richard Van Atta, Institute for Defense Analyses https://www.afresearch.org/skins/RIMS/display.aspx?moduleid=be0e99f3-fc56-4ccb-8dfe-670c0822a153&mode=user&action=researchproject&objectid=5ea32116-b119-43ab-8fcb-9565110bb741 Ajones)

Official United States’ reaction to the ASAT has been muted. National Security Council spokesperson Gordon Johndroe said the country “expressed our concern” about the test to the Chinese.4 Secretary of Defense Robert Gates testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the test was “troubling”5 while the Department of State wanted the Chinese to “clarify their intentions in seeking to develop” their anti-satellite capability.6 The most visible sign of United States’ disapproval of the test was the suspension of cooperative civil space endeavors between China and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).7

Criticism has been much louder from several members of Congress. Senator Jon Kyl argued, “Key policy makers seem oblivious to the nature and the urgency of the threat.”8 In speeches following the Chinese ASAT test, Senator Kyl, as well as the former Ranking Member on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Representative Jane Harman and current Chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, Representative Terry Everett,9 called on the nation to create new Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) capabilities as a means to mitigate the Chinese ASAT threat.10

The members of Congress look to ORS as a means to reconstitute critical assets lost in space combat. “In a world where our space assets are likely to be threatened, operationally responsive space capabilities will allow us to quickly and affordably replace assets lost to anti-satellite attacks,” Senator Kyl advocated. While a key motivator, ORS is more than just a satellite replenishment strategy. In a broader sense, Congress seeks ORS “to launch – and activate quickly – militarily useful satellites”11 in order to “supplement a battlefield commander’s capabilities.”12

**He’s key to the agenda**

**McConnell 10** (Mitch, Senate Minority Leader, “Jon Kyl,” Time 100, http://www.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1984685\_1984864\_1984901,00.html, EMM)

In the Senate, Arizona's Jon Kyl has built a reputation for his encyclopedic knowledge of domestic and foreign policy, and his hard work and leadership. Few people have his command of policy, his knowledge of its nuances or his grip on how they fit together. This is why so many of his Senate colleagues look to him for policy advice. Kyl, 68, is a principled conservative who knows what is attainable. He believes in the wisdom contained in a sign on President Reagan's desk that said, "There's no limit to what a man can do or where he can go if he doesn't mind who gets the credit." Jon Kyl is a great persuader. As minority whip, the No. 2 position in the Senate Republican leadership, he is responsible for rallying his Republican colleagues for key legislative votes. What is unique is his single-minded focus on convincing them that a particular vote is in the best interests of their state and the nation. Jon demonstrates continually that the essence of Senate power is the power to persuade.

**Issues in Congress are compartmentalized – political capital not key**

**Dickinson, 09** – professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt (5/26/09, Matthew, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/, JMP)

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee.

**Winners win – space policies specifically regenerate political capital**

**Swilley, Army Major, 11** – Professional Engineer, Major in the US Army at the School of Advanced Military Studies, US Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth (Scott F, “Space Power: A Theory for Sustaining US Security Through the Information Age,” http://dodreports.com/pdf/ada545154.pdf, mrs)

Space power contains substantial demonstrated potential for political influence, influence which affects both the domestic population and international actors. The political influence of space power lies within the perception of possibilities. Status as the global space leader provides a critical political overmatch in crafting the perceived possibilities within space commercialization, space militarization, and space exploration into real political influence. The Reykjavik Summit held between President Ronald Reagan and Secretary-General of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Mikhail Gorbachev in early October of 1986 is an example of the political influence associated with the possibilities within US space power. The US Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), or star wars program, proved to be the most valuable bargaining chip for the US in negotiating an arms reduction of nuclear weapons with the Soviet Union. Despite the significant technological challenges and limited progress of the SDI Program at the time of the Reykjavik Summit, the perceived possibilities of the program supplied enormous political power to President Reagan. Negotiating for the significant reduction in SDI research, Secretary-General Gorbachev proposed the extreme measure of complete mutual dismantlement of nuclear arms. However, recognizing the political influence of even the possibility of the SDI program, President Reagan countered the offer with limiting the SDI Program to laboratory research while retaining a mutually acceptable level of nuclear arms reduction. The negotiations concluded without reaching an agreement on the continuation of nuclear arms reduction. However, the possibilities of space power overmatch clearly influenced political outcomes.

The political influences of space power are equally mobilizing on domestic populations. Public statements by political leaders stating awe-inspiring goals associated with space exploration create considerable political capital. Political capital is generated through reinforced national pride and confidence in the government to achieve seemingly unfathomable results. Examples include the Saturn Project, the Space Shuttle Program, and the recent global access to position, navigation, and timing (PNT) capabilities. As the global leader in space, US political influence is only limited by imagination and the audacity to set goals at the edge of the possible.

**Winners win-Even controversial policies boost Obama’s political capital**

**Singer 9**—degree in Politics from Pomona College, cum laude (Jonathan, 3 March 2009, By Expending Capital, Obama Grows His Capital, http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428, RBatra)

"What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weekswith as much or more capital in the bank." Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

**President will be shielded from blame – posturing**

**Schoenbrod 93** – PolSci Prof (David, Power Without Responsibility, p 95, AG)

Second, presidents must take personal responsibility for laws embodied in statutes that they sign, but they can shift some of the blame for agency laws to the agency. Shifting blame is easy when an independent agency has made the law, because the leaders of such agencies do not serve at the president’s pleasure. Presidents also often avoid substantial political losses they might sustain for the unpopular actions of appointees who do serve at the president’s pleasure by taking no position on what the agency has done or even by expressing some disagreement. Indeed, even incumbent presidents try to “run against the government, President George Bush tried to distance himself from agency laws promulgated during his administration by declaring a ninety-day moratorium on new agency laws before the 1992 elections

## 2AC DA Russian Relations

**No link and alt causes**

**Charap 11** (3/11/11, Samuel, Associate Director for Russia and Eurasia and a member of the National Security and International Policy team at the Center for American Progress, interview with Rianovosti, a Russian news agency, “U.S.-Russian relations: The reset process may not be irreversible,” http://en.rian.ru/valdai\_op/20110311/162949812.html)

I don’t think Vice President Joe Biden’s visit was at all connected to the upcoming presidential elections in the United States. But the fact that he met with both members of the Russian governing tandem in Moscow indicates that the United States is ready to cooperate with either man after the elections, whoever the Russians elect. In my opinion, domestic political processes and election results in Russia and the United States could influence the relationship. If the current presidents are re-elected, the elections’ outcome will not influence it, but internal political tensions during the election period sometimes affect a country’s foreign policy actions… As for the most promising areas of U.S.-Russian relations, bilateral cooperation is possible in many spheres, from economic development to strategic nuclear weapons. The immediate issues on their agenda include Russia’s accession to the World Trade Organization, cooperation on ballistic missile defense, and developing trade and economic ties. I am not sure that we have entered a phase of bilateral relations where the current positive atmosphere could be said to be irreversible. In my opinion, we have not yet disarmed all the time bombs that still threaten to take our relations back to where they were 2.5 years ago. I think that, unfortunately, should certain circumstances arise, this process could be reversed.

**Russian relations resilient**

**Fenenko 11** (6/21/11, Alexei, leading researcher at the Russian Academy of Sciences' Institute for International Security, “The Cyclical Nature of Russian-American Relations,” http://en.rian.ru/valdai\_op/20110621/164739508.html)

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. The first rapprochement cycle was observed in the early 1990s. Yeltsin’s government needed U.S. support in recognizing Russia within the 1991 borders of the RSFSR. Boris Yeltsin also needed U.S. assistance in addressing the problem of the Soviet “nuclear legacy” and taking on the Supreme Council. The administrations of George Bush Senior and Bill Clinton were willing to help the Kremlin solve these problems. However, the Americans demanded major strategic concessions from Russia in return, outlined in START-III: making the elimination of heavy intercontinental ballistic missiles a priority. The parties reached an unofficial compromise: U.S. recognition of the Russian leadership in exchange for the rapid decrease in Russia’s strategic nuclear forces (SNF). However, the stronger Russian state institutions became, the weaker the impetus to the rapprochement. In autumn 1994, Russia refused to ratify the original version of START-II and declared NATO’s eastward expansion unacceptable. The United States adopted the concept of “mutually assured safety” (January 1995) under which Russia’s democratic reforms qualified as inseparable from continued armament reduction. The “Overview of U.S. nuclear policy” in 1994 also confirmed that America deemed Russian strategic nuclear forces a priority threat. The crises that unfolded during the late 1990s in Iran and Yugoslavia were, like NATO expansion, the logical results of a restoration of the old approach to Soviet-American relations. It was actually the events of 1994, not 2000, that in fact predetermined the subsequent development of Russian-American relations. The second cycle of Russian-American rapprochement was also rooted in strategic considerations. In 2000 START-II and the ABM Treaty collapsed. Both Washington and Moscow were faced with the problem of their agreed decommissioning of nuclear systems dating back to the 1970s. These events pushed presidents Vladimir Putin and George W. Bush to reach a strategic compromise at a meeting in Crawford (12 November 2001). The United States agreed to sign a new Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT), and Russia did not object to Washington’s withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. Instead of the ABM Treaty, the parties signed the Moscow Declaration on May 24, 2002, under which the United States pledged to consult with Russia on all issues pertaining to missile defense deployment. However, after the “compromise at Crawford,” the agenda for Russian-American rapprochement was exhausted. The disputes between Moscow and Washington over Iraq, Iran, Georgia, Ukraine and Beslan, which had been gathering steam since 2003, necessitated a return to the traditional format for Russian-American relations. At the Bratislava meeting (February 24, 2005) President Vladimir Putin refused to accept George W. Bush’s suggestion of including issues of fissile material safety in the agenda. Since then, the “rapprochement” between Russia and the U.S. has reached a dead end, including at the official level.

**Relations are unsustainable and only exist for Russia to take advantage of the US—maintaining relations makes great power war inevitable**

**Mankoff 10** (Foreign Affairs, JEFFREY MANKOFF is a 2010–11 International Affairs Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and the author of Russian Foreign Policy: The Return of Great Power Politics. 9/7/10, " Changing Course in Moscow ", http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66743/jeffrey-mankoff/changing-course-in-moscow, nkj)

Over the past decade, Russian foreign policy has experienced a number of dramatic shifts. Following 9/11, Russia pursued a strategic partnership with the United States, pledging cooperation in Afghanistan while downplaying its long-standing opposition to NATO expansion and European missile defense. But then, during Vladimir Putin’s second presidential term, Russia took advantage of rising energy prices to push back against the United States and the West, seeking to undermine pro-Western regimes in Georgia and Ukraine, and even threatening to point nuclear missiles at European countries that hosted U.S. missile defense facilities. The resurgence of Russian power in opposition to the United States and the European Union reached its apex with the August 2008 war in Georgia. Since the war, Russian foreign policy has begun to swing back toward cooperation with the West. The public face of this new course is Dmitry Medvedev, who succeeded Putin as president in 2008. Its fundamental premise is the belief that Russia needs better relations with the wealthy world -- especially the United States and the European Union -- in order to modernize its economy. Both the 2008 war in Georgia and the onset of the global economic crisis discredited the notion that Russia’s energy riches had decoupled its economy from the rest of the world. The war sparked a large-scale outflow of foreign capital, as international investors increasingly saw Russia as a risky and unpredictable place to keep their money. This capital flight was then greatly exacerbated by the fallout of the global financial crisis: by early 2009, the main Russian stock market index had fallen by more than 90 percent from its May 2008 peak while foreign direct investment dropped by more than 45 percent between 2008 and 2009. The global recession has been particularly savage in Russia: in 2009, Russian GDP declined by almost 8 percent, whereas U.S. GDP fell by 2.6 percent during the same period. As the aftereffects of the war and economic crisis continued to unfold, the argument made by Putin and his advisers that Russia had overcome its post-Soviet decline and again become a major world power seemed to unravel. Moscow was stunned to find that almost none of its supposed allies -- including Belarus, China, and Kazakhstan -- recognized the independence of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, which Russia had fought to “liberate” from Georgia. Similarly, Moscow’s campaign to expel U.S. forces from the Manas airbase in Kyrgyzstan was undone in June 2009, when Bishkek realized Washington would pay more to keep the base than Moscow could pay to close it. Medvedev’s new foreign policy strategy essentially argues that Russia’s limited influence is a direct result of its lack of global competitiveness. In today’s world, economic prowess matters more than military might. This new strategy aims to harness Western investment and technology in order to develop the Russian economy, reducing its dependence on oil and gas sales while promoting technological innovation. Since the West is the principal source of the investment and technology that Russia needs, there is no room for pointless confrontations. Supporters of the new course, who include senior economic officials, businessmen, and academics (especially at the Institute of Contemporary Development, of which Medvedev is the nominal chair), argue that Russia should pursue what Medvedev has termed “modernization alliances” -- especially with the United States and major EU states such as Germany, France, and Italy -- in which Russia offers investment opportunities and greater political cooperation in exchange for foreign capital and know-how. In his state of the nation address last November, Medvedev argued that the success or failure of Russian foreign policy should be judged by a single criterion: “whether it contributes to improving living standards in our country.” And in what may have been a subtle dig at Putin, he suggested that Russia focus on accessing foreign capital, technology, and ideas, rather than “puffing out its cheeks” to threaten others. This argument was advanced further in a Foreign Ministry strategy paper that was leaked to the Russian press in May. It made a detailed case for improving relations with the United States and Europe, though it also stressed Russia’s continued commitment to restoring its global standing and to playing a dominant role in the former Soviet region. Russia’s new course has already produced some results, most importantly in relations with the United States. In part, the warmer tone between the two countries is the result of the Obama administration’s “reset” policy, but Moscow, too, has proven more receptive to Washington’s outreach than in the last several years. In recent months, Russia and the United States signed the so-called New START nuclear arms reduction treaty, cooperated on sanctions against Iran (always a sensitive subject in Moscow), and agreed to open new supply routes for the U.S.-led war in Afghanistan. In June, Medvedev traveled to Silicon Valley to drum up investment for a high-tech center the Kremlin is building outside of Moscow. His biggest success was convincing Cisco Systems to invest $1 billion in Russian technology ventures, providing a tangible vote of confidence on the part of the U.S. business community. Yet it remains too early to pronounce an end to the West’s difficulties with Russia. Although Medvedev is constitutionally responsible for steering Russian foreign policy, Putin remains powerful as prime minister, especially in light of speculation that he will return to the Kremlin in 2012. Below the offices of president and prime minister, Russia’s bureaucracy is unwieldy and resistant to change, and much of the military and security services remain overtly hostile to the West. And as the leaked Foreign Ministry document suggests, Russia has not given up its great power ambitions, even though it may desire better relations with the West. Finally, a fusion of state and corporate power in Russia has given oligarchs and managers of state corporations the ability to block initiatives that threaten their economic interests -- such as opening up the Russian economy to foreign competition. It is also impossible to separate the new direction in foreign policy from the economic downturn, which has cast doubt on Russia’s post-Soviet economic model of relying on a heavily centralized, state-dominated energy sector to the exclusion of innovation and entrepreneurship. When the Russian economy was booming, Moscow felt confident enough to ignore many of the policy preferences of the United States and the European Union. But as oil prices fell and Russia’s economy started contracting, this hubris became harder to maintain. If oil prices start climbing again and Russia’s fiscal situation improves, Moscow may well conclude that an energy-fueled status quo is preferable to the expensive and uncertain prospect of modernization. If so, the case for better relations with the West could be badly undermined -- which suggests that Western leaders have an interest in taking advantage of the current moment to emphasize they are serious about putting relations with Russia on a new foundation.

**This makes nuclear and biological war with Russia inevitable**

**Nyquist 2k5** (J.R. 4/29 Former Contractor in Soviet/Russian Analysis Group for U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency, Former Ph.D. Student at UC-Irvine in Political Sociology, and widely syndicated columnist and published author, , “Eternal Recurrence,” Financial Sense, http://www.financialsensearchive.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2005/0429.html [10/8/11], nkj)

I have warned my readers, again and again, about Russia. There is a dangerous chemistry in that country. The Russian people, said Stalin, is a tsarist people.� The formula appears again; only this time the man who strikes the tsarist pose is not a pockmarked thief from the Caucasus, but a spy from Leningrad. Russian President Vladimir Putin is not hindered by the meanness of Stalin. He is not driven by spite, revenge or envy. His spirit is healthier. Therefore, he is less subtle, more efficient, more dangerous. Putin is not a sly drunkard, like Khrushchev, or a falling-down drunk like Yeltsin. He is not a doddering old man, like Brezhnev. He is not Yuri Andropov, stuck with failing kidneys. He is not a liberal reformer and actor, like Gorbachev, globetrotting with an empty slogan. Putin is unlike previous Russian rulers. He represents a new reptilian species. In a recent televised speech, Putin said, �it is worth acknowledging that the demise of the Soviet Union was the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the century.� Imagine the chain of logic that holds this monstrosity to the light of day. The American newspapers write dismissively of Putin�s prospects. His popularity, they say, is falling. A new democratic revolution is bound to sweep him away. But dictators specialize in manufacturing popularity. And sometimes they dispense with popularity altogether. There will always be teachers or bosses who boldly announce that they are �not engaged in a popularity contest.� After all, men do not obey popularity. They obey from habit, hope and fear. As Aristotle noted, the dictatorship of one depends on the work of an oligarchy. The oligarchy that stands behind Putin is Russia�s old KGB and Communist Party elite. A new book has come out which outlines, indirectly, the problem with this oligarchy. (But before reading further you must understand that genuine change is rare. Human beings are what they are, and fundamental change is not the normal course. In fact, it rarely happens.) I refer to a book titled Biological Espionage, written by former KGB officer Alexander Kouzminov who worked for something called �Department 12, Directorate S.� This is the directorate that oversees Moscow�s �illegals� (i.e., Russian agents posing as Westerners, operating under deep cover). In an interview with the California Literary Review, Kouzminov said: �[KGB Department 12 was charged with] planning and preparation for acts of biological terrorism and sabotage on the territory of target countries, carrying them out in an event of war and/or a large-scale military conflict�.� It is worth noting that Alexander Kouzminov has relocated to New Zealand, the remotest large island in the world, located in the southernmost outwash of the South Pacific. According to Kouzminov, the work of Department 12 �has grown� since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Genetic engineering has brought forth new biological horrors. And these are to be unleashed in the event of something called �Day X,� which signifies the beginning of the next world war. Soviet military thinkers believe that such a war will involve the mass use of nuclear as well as biological weapons. �The formula �Day X� in our documents meant the beginning of a large-scale war against the West,� Kouzminov explained. Department 12 and Department 8 of the KGB were tasked with preparing �clandestine acts of biological sabotage against �potential strike targets� on the enemy�s territory.� These potential targets include military research labs, combat units, weapon stockpiles, public drinking water, food stores, vaccine repositories, pharmaceutical plants and the overall economy of the target country. These departments would also assassinate Western officials and �important persons� (where �important� is determined by the exigencies of war). Diversionary attacks are also part of Day X. Kouzminov doesn�t admit that Russia is still counting down to Day X. He talks as if Putin�s Russia would never contemplate such an attack. Only �rogue states� would do such a thing. And yet, Kouzminov is � of all places on this earth � living in New Zealand! Kouzminov also mentions something called �false flag recruitment,� which is very important in Russian espionage work. False flag recruitment is important for understanding extremist political movements, terrorist attacks, sabotage and subversion. �Russian intelligence carries out recruitment in such a way that it cannot be found out that in reality he or she has agreed to work for Russian Intelligence,� Kouzminov explained. It may be, in fact, that a person thinks they are working with Islamic Fundamentalists or MOSSAD; but in reality, they are working for the KGB (SVR). The charade might last for years. �Directorate S would continue to preserve the source�s belief that he or she is being controlled by people from [name your favorite cause or country] � and not from the Moscow Centre.� Because of false flag recruitments, the real history of the past fifty years has yet to be written. We now learn that Moscow ordered the assassination of Pope John Paul II. Since the KGB has not disappeared, since its files remain under lock and key, the deepest secrets remain buried for a reason. After all, a KGB officer is Russia�s head of state. The old agenda, therefore, becomes the new agenda when the new boss mourns the passing of the old Soviet Union. People always give themselves away. Hitler mourned the passing of the German Empire as he decried the �November criminals.� Putin mourns the passing of the USSR as he decries the �corrupt oligarchs� and capitalist profiteers. Those who cannot read danger in these details are either na�ve or suffering from an ideological blockage. The universe is made up of a finite number of particles, and the brain of a simple-minded person is more finite still. What has happened before will happen again. The foolishness that preceded the last world war is already far advanced before the next. Those who believe there is �peace in our time� will congratulate themselves. The dictators will rejoice in private, licking their chops. After the signing of the Anglo-German Naval Agreement in 1938 Hitler was overheard telling his foreign minister: �Oh don�t take it so seriously. That piece of paper is of no further significance whatsoever.� Can we imagine that KGB Lieutenant Colonel Putin values �pieces of paper� any more than Hitler? In his outline of Russia�s long range deception strategy (see The Perestroika Deception), KGB defector Anatoliy Golitsyn wrote: �The West has failed to comprehend the deceptive, controlled nature of the new �democratic� and �non-Communist� structures which have been introduced in the USSR and Eastern Europe.� The communists, he added, �have succeeded in concealing from the West that this so-called �political opposition� of �dissidents� has been created, brought up and guided by the Bloc�s Communist Parties and security services during the long period of preparation for �perestroika.� The Bloc�s political and security potential have been fully developed in the interests of this strategy.� Even the revelations of KGB retirees in New Zealand mask the layered levels of disinformation, deception and misdirection coming out of Moscow. To understand chess one must study and play the game. An apprenticeship of one month or one year is not sufficient. A course of many years is required. Even then, mastery is given to the few. It is likewise difficult for Americans to understand the many subtle mechanisms of totalitarianism. By some accounts, two thirds of the population cooperated with the secret police during the Stalin era by informing on their neighbors, friends and relatives. Two thirds were corrupted, and two thirds sought advantage for themselves at the expense of the honest few. Americans have no experience to compare with this demoralizing sequence. We do not understand the power of secret organizations unencumbered by checks and balances, run by murderers. We reserve a bad name for Senator Joseph McCarthy (whose demeanor left much to be desired); and some still insist that Whittaker Chambers was a liar. But now, a whole generation has grown up in ignorance of Whittaker Chambers and his Witness. In the 1950s Americans learned of a secret communist apparatus on U.S. soil. They learned of this through the testimony of American communists like Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers. In the 1960s and 1970s anti-communism was ridiculed by popular culture. Now it is totally forgotten and we have no context � as a people � for understanding KGB Lieutenant Colonel Vladimir Putin. Our poverty of knowledge leaves us unable to grasp the twisted thinking of a man who bemoans the fate of the USSR. The KGB president of Russia wants to reestablish the USSR. Whether America likes it or not, this very fact leads us to a new Cold War.

**Extinction**

**Ochs 02** – MA in Natural Resource Management from Rutgers University and Naturalist at Grand Teton National Park [Richard, “BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS MUST BE ABOLISHED IMMEDIATELY,” Jun 9, http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html]

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE. Ironically, the Bush administration has just changed the U.S. nuclear doctrine to allow nuclear retaliation against threats upon allies by conventional weapons. The past doctrine allowed such use only as a last resort when our nation’s survival was at stake. Will the new policy also allow easier use of US bioweapons? How slippery is this slope? Against this tendency can be posed a rational alternative policy. To preclude possibilities of human extinction, "patriotism" needs to be redefined to make humanity’s survival primary and absolute. Even if we lose our cherished freedom, our sovereignty, our government or our Constitution, where there is life, there is hope. What good is anything else if humanity is extinguished? This concept should be promoted to the center of national debate.. For example, for sake of argument, suppose the ancient Israelites developed defensive bioweapons of mass destruction when they were enslaved by Egypt. Then suppose these weapons were released by design or accident and wiped everybody out? As bad as slavery is, extinction is worse. Our generation, our century, our epoch needs to take the long view. We truly hold in our hands the precious gift of all future life. Empires may come and go, but who are the honored custodians of life on earth? Temporal politicians? Corporate competitors? Strategic brinksmen? Military gamers? Inflated egos dripping with testosterone? How can any sane person believe that national sovereignty is more important than survival of the species? Now that extinction is possible, our slogan should be "Where there is life, there is hope." No government, no economic system, no national pride, no religion, no political system can be placed above human survival. The egos of leaders must not blind us. The adrenaline and vengeance of a fight must not blind us. The game is over. If patriotism would extinguish

## 2AC DA Russian Nationalism

**The Russian public doesn’t care about space**

**Ria Novosti 11** (“A Fallen Giant: The Soviet Space Industry,” April 4, http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/A\_Fallen\_Giant\_The\_Soviet\_Space\_Industry\_999.html)

Ordinary Russians see little connection between space exploration and economics. If anything, they see expensive space programs as a permanent drain on the nation's resources. Some are inclined to take it personally, as if the dark vacuum of space somehow sucked the money right out of their pockets.

**And the Russian space industry is failing now**

**REUTERS 11** (“Analysis: Stagnation fears haunt Russian space program,” http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/04/10/us-russia-space-gagarin-idUSTRE73910C20110410)

But half a century after Gagarin's 108-minute voyage put the Soviet Union ahead in the Cold War space race, critics charge that reliance on Soviet designs as cash cows has stunted innovation, and that Russia has irretrievably lost its edge. "While we bask in the glory of having the only operating spacecraft, we are only making money off old rockets," said Vladimir Gubarev, the Soviet spokesman for the 1975 Apollo-Soyuz program, which achieved the first docking of U.S. and Russian spacecraft.

**Nationalism is key to Russian economic reform**

**Tuminez 2k** – Vice Dean (Research) PhD (Political Science), Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Master (Soviet Studies), Harvard University (April 2000, Astrid, “Russian Nationalism and Vladimir Putin's Russia”, PONARS Policy Memo 151 American International Group, Inc. and Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.gwu.edu/~ieresgwu/assets/docs/ponars/pm\_0151.pdf) MGM

Should Putin's nationalism be feared? It is too early to conclude. What seems evident is that this nationalism currently serves some necessary purposes. First, it helps to legitimize Putin as a leader. By putting on the nationalist mantle and claiming to speak on behalf of the nation and its core interests, Putin--previously a relatively unknown political entity--is able to legitimize his political position and his exercise of power. Second, in a destroyed empire, nationalism helps offset feelings of humiliation, resentment, and helplessness, and creates some space for generating collective optimism and self-esteem. Nationalism creates a new basis for collective beliefs and consensus, without which it would be extremely difficult for Putin to implement the economic and political measures that he believes necessary to improve Russia's internal welfare and external status.

**Further economic decline risks extinction**

**FILGER 9** (Sheldon, author and blogger for the Huffington Post, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction” http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356)

In Russia historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation’s history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia’s economic crisis will endanger the nation’s political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama’s national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation’s nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

## 2AC DA Space Debris

**No link**

**Tomme, PhD in plasma physics, 5** (Ed, lt Col, former professor at the air force academy, AND Col Sigfred Dahl, BA, director of Air Force Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities, http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/cadre/ari\_2005-01.pdf, The Paradigm Shift to Effects-Based Space:

Near-Space as a Combat Space Effects Enabler”, ZBurdette)

Again, we do not advocate eliminating satellites or UAVs. However, in many circumstances near-space assets are the better choice for providing tactical/operational communications and ISR space effects for a number of reasons. When cost is the concern, near-space has no peer. Their inherent simplicity, recoverability, relative lack of requirement for complex infrastructure, and lack of space-hardening requirements all contribute to this strong advantage for near-space assets. Requiring only helium for lift, near-space platforms do not require expensive space launch to reach altitude. If the payloads they carry malfunction, they can be brought back down and repaired. Should they become obsolete, they can be easily replaced. Additionally, the infrastructure cost savings involved with near-space are huge. Near-space assets require extremely minimal launch infrastructure. Compare the cost of a simple tie-down and an empty field or an inflatable hangar to building a space-launch complex or even to building a hard-surface runway. The low price of near-space assets enables operational commanders to own and control fleets of them, for the price of a single national asset.

**Alt cause—China**

**Schroeder 11** Stan Schroeder, China Daily Contributor, 4-26-2011, “China To Launch Its Own Space Station by 2020,” Mashable, http://mashable.com/2011/04/26/china-space-station-2020/

China plans to launch a space station into orbit by 2020, China Daily reports. The station will be made of three capsules — a core module and two modules for conducting experiments, with total weight of the station being 60 tons. China also plans to develop a cargo spaceship that will transport supplies to the station. At 60 tons, China’s space station will be small compared to the International Space Station, which weighs 419 tons and is the only space station in orbit. Russian Space Station Mir, which was deorbited in 2001, weighed 137 tons. However, Pang Zhihao, a researcher and deputy editor-in-chief of the monthly magazine, Space International, said, “It’s only the world’s third multi-module space station, which usually demands much more complicated technology than a single-module space lab.”

**Debris high now but plan solves**

**Donahue 10** – USAF Major (Jack, “CATASTROPHE ON THE HORIZON: A SCENARIO-BASED FUTURE EFFECT OF ORBITAL SPACE DEBRIS,” https://www.afresearch.org/skins/rims/q\_mod\_be0e99f3-fc56-4ccb-8dfe-670c0822a153/q\_act\_downloadpaper/q\_obj\_af691818-359f-4999-be24-f88ca154bd94/display.aspx?rs=enginespage)

The warning signs and leading indicators for a catastrophic collision between orbital debris and satellites or manned spaceflight missions are all around us. If significant strides are not made within the next 5 years to clear and remove orbital debris it could result in the loss of satellites and the death of space crew. Furthermore, if something isn‘t done to better protect space assets now it could lead to adversaries exploiting vulnerabilities through various kinetic, nuclear, and cyber attacks causing satellites to become inoperative. This would lead to the generation of new debris which will further compound the orbital debris problem. The effects of this would be felt worldwide with the disruption of communications, internet access, navigation, military surveillance, environmental research, and the banking industry. The best way to avoid these consequences is to continue to harden satellites, improve space monitoring, and develop backups/alternatives to satellite capabilities. As mentioned, the US must also continue to partner with other countries to implement solutions of clearing and reducing the proliferation of orbital debris. The world can change the potential alarming future of a catastrophic collision from orbital debris, but the time to act is now.

**No impact—**

**1) US solves**

**Selding 10** (Peter, Space News Writer, “NASA May Move Orbital Debris Mitigation Off Back Burner,” July 23, http://www.spacenews.com/civil/100723-nasa-orbital-debris-mitigation.html, EMM)

BREMEN, Germany — NASA’s Orbital Debris Program Office expects to begin active work on how to remove debris in orbit on the strength of the new U.S. National Space Policy, according to the office’s chief scientist. Nicholas L. Johnson said the office, which assembles data from the U.S. Air Force-run Space Surveillance Network, has been working on these issues for years, but only on an informal basis, with few resources and no formal mandate. That changed on June 28, when President Barack Obama issued an updated space policy that specifically orders NASA and the U.S. Defense Department to “pursue research and development of technologies and techniques … to mitigate and remove on-orbit debris.” Attending the 38th Congress of the Committee on Space Research (Cospar) here July 18-25, Johnson said it is too early to tell exactly how the new policy will be transformed into programs and budgets. But the specificity of the wording, he said, gives reason to conclude that NASA will be able to increase its efforts. In addition to asking NASA and the Defense Department to research debris mitigation — making satellites and rockets less likely to break up in orbit, and removing satellites from the orbital highways upon retirement — the policy’s inclusion of orbital debris removal may take the NASA office in a new direction.

**2) Russia solves**

**City News 10** [“Russia Allocated $2 Billion to Remove Space Debris” 12/2/2010, http://www.starcitynews.com/russia-allocated-2-billion-to-remove-space-debris/2023/]

Natural resources are gradually declining and humans are looking for alternative means, either in the form of resources or in the form of areas to extract from. Space exploration is one of the key subjects in this aspect. Looking for a distant planet which supports human life form is a back up plan, in case the search for alternative resources fail or some catastrophe takes this earth away from us. It is said that practice makes us perfect but that notion seems to be failing in the case of space travel or alternatively it can be put it in a way that the hazards of practice are restricting the very act of space travel. Over the past 40 years since space exploration started, abandoned and obsolete man made objects have been left in orbit around the earth; these objects include rocket stages, redundant satellites, coolants released by nuclear powered engines, paint flakes and even solid rocket fuel slag. Although currently it is a manageable threat, it can seriously hinder space exploration if it is not properly dealt with. Fortunately different kind of steps have been taken to overcome this space pollution and the United States military and NASA both have agencies that are monitoring the space debris and are trying to find out a workable solution to tackle them. Different schemes for cleaning up space debris have been presented but Russia is the first country to plan a real project and invest $2 billion on this program. Russia’s space corporation, Energia, announced a program to capture some of the thousands of pieces of dangerous debris that threaten the future of space technology. A hefty amount of $2 billion will be invested to building a special space pod which will grab around 600 defunct satellites and will push them from the orbit in a hope that they will burn on their own after entering the earth’s atmosphere. This project will help to reopen the orbits which were previously closed due to severe pollution of debris above. The pod will travel in space through nuclear propulsion and it has an ion drive with which it gently pushes the scrap out of the orbit. The testing of the pod will be completed in 2020 and a further three years will be needed to bring it to a fully functional form. After completion it has a life span of 15 years, which means it can perform the task of cleaning for 15 whole years, effectively reducing the size of space debris. Energia is also working on similar ion technology to build an interceptor aircraft which can identify and encounter the incoming comet by derailing it from its original path by changing its trajectory so that it misses earth and burns in air.

**3) Tungsten decay makes space debris self-correcting**

**Physics arXiv 11** [The Physics arXiv Blog produces daily coverage of the best new ideas from on which scientists post early versions of their latest ideas, Published by Technology Review, “Orbiting Dust Storm Could Remove Space Junk” http://www.technologyreview.com/blog/arxiv/26634/]

Space junk is a serious problem, particularly in some orbits where debris is increasing at alarming rates. While there are some 900 active satellites orbiting the Earth, there are 19,000 bits of junk larger than 10 cm across. This stuff is big enough to be tracked and catalogued on the ground so that operational satellites can move away if it becomes a threat. But it's the smaller stuff that represents a more insidious threat since it cannot be seen and therefore can't be avoided. Most experts agree that there's at least an order of magnitude more of this small stuff than large bits up there. So what to do? Various organisations have suggested ways of minimising junk, such as reducing the amount of deliberately jettisoned junk such as lens caps, and by deorbiting defunct satellites or moving them into safe orbits using space tugs. But these measures will only help reduce the amount of big junk. The smaller stuff is much harder to clean up. There is a natural process that can help. Below 900km, the Earth's atmosphere generates a small but significant amount drag, which deorbits small junk in 25 years or less. So here the orbits are naturally flushed clean. But above 900km, the life time of junk stretches into centuries. Today, Gurudas Ganguli at the US Naval Research Laboratory and a few pals describe a novel way of getting it down. Their idea is to increase the drag on the stuff above 900 km so that their orbits decay more rapidly. That sounds perfectly sensible but their method is likely to be controversial. Their scheme is to release some 20 tons of tungsten dust at an altitude of 1100km, creating a thin shell of particles that will entirely envelop the Earth. These tungsten particles will be just 30 micrometres across but still capable of packing a punch, tungsten being 1.7 times denser than lead. Ganguli and co say that the dust's interaction with the atmosphere will cause its orbit to decay slowly. But within 10 years or so, it should drop below the critical 900 km level. After that, it will deorbit more quickly. However, the crucial point is that the tungsten particles will naturally collide with any debris it encounters, taking this junk with it. The dust and the debris will then burn up in the Earth's atmosphere over the next 25 years or so. So over period of 35 years, the orbits up to 1100km will be scrubbed clean. Ganguli and co call it a "dust snow plow". There's an obvious question here: what of larger objects that get caught up in the dust storm, operational satellites, for example? Ganguli and co say the risk is manageable. First, these satellites could be designed to move above the cloud. But even if they don't move, Gangulia and co claim these spacecraft will not be significantly damaged by the dust. "Dust grains of the size proposed by NRL will certainly not penetrate thermal blankets, spacecraft structure, or sensor baffles," they say. They add that more sensitive equipment, such as the optics of Earth observing sensors or space telescopes, usually point straight up or straight down and so should be protected from dust flying in from the side. One concern is solar panels which are likely to be sand blasted by the cloud. But Ganguli and co say that panels for the next generation of spacecraft could be strengthened to cope with this kind of problem. There's also the question of the tungsten cloud's dynamics. Ganguli and co imagine it forming a shell about 30 km thick. This shell would then deorbit steadily. But there's another possible scenario: that the tungsten band simply widens to form a cloud several hundred kilometres thick! The NRL will need to do more work on this problem. Then there is one group of people whose concerns Ganguli and co fail to address entirely in this paper: astronomers. While a cloud of tungsten particles would have little affect at visible frequencies, astronomers will want to know what kind of effect this cloud will have at other wavelengths. Is it possible that a cloud of metal particles encircling the Earth could significantly degrade our view of the Universe at certain frequencies, perhaps even acting like a giant spherical mirror? More work is needed here too. But before dismissing the proposal out of hand, the alternative has to considered. In 2007, the destruction of a defunct communications satellite at 900km by a Chinese anti-satellite weapon created, in an instant, 2400 pieces of large debris and countless smaller ones. The collision between the Iridium 33 and Kosmos 2251 satellite in 2009 created a similar amount of debris. It's likely that we'll see more events of this kind in future and the possibility of a catastrophic cascade of collisions from the debris they produce. So Ganguli and co are presenting the space-faring world with a choice: the controlled exposure of all satellites to a low level of small collisions or the uncontrolled exposure of a few satellites to catastrophic collisions.

## 2AC DA Space Weaponization

**Plan funding offsets with offensive weaponization**

**Redifer 11** - LtCol, USMC, Master of Science in Applied Physics and Master of Science in Space Systems Operations, Naval Postgraduate School (Stephen, “TAKING THE INITIATIVE – PROTECTING US INTERESTS IN SPACE,” https://www.afresearch.org/skins/RIMS/display.aspx?moduleid=be0e99f3-fc56-4ccb-8dfe-670c0822a153&mode=user&action=researchproject&objectid=be97b3ea-7800-44ee-b6ff-76dcdb7c2960)

Second, the United States should make developing and fielding a terrestrial and space-based surveillance architecture a national priority. Making such an architecture a reality would support any of the possible strategies proposed in the preceding section of this paper, as space surveillance will support space being protected as a sanctuary, will be required for verification of any space treaties, and would be used to provide intelligence and targeting information should the United States ultimately elect to pursue a policy of space dominance. Making a comprehensive surveillance architecture a national priority would also focus US spending precedence on only one aspect of space control (possibly postponing and/or halting development of space-based weapons as a cost offset), thereby ensuring unity of effort toward a common goal.

**Non-unique—The US X-37B test**

**The China Post 10** [The China Post, “Weapons of the Future the Sky should be the Limit” December 7, http://www.chinapost.com.tw/editorial/world-issues/2010/12/07/282551/Weapons-of.htm]

Dec. 3, 2010 may go down in history as one of the most undervalued milestones in modern history, much like May 26, 1908, when British businessman William D'Arcy found oil in Persia (now Iran). On Dec. 3, the U.S. Air Force's unmanned spacecraft X-37B landed at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California after orbiting the Earth for more than 220 days. The military is secretive on the X-37B, named Orbital Test Vehicle 1,that was first designed by National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in the late 1990s as a cheaper and safer alternative to the manned space shuttle and later taken over by the military. The cost and other details of the mission were classified. The seven-month maiden flight was a test for the technologies necessary for long duration reusable space vehicles with autonomous re-entry and landing capabilities, according to the website Space.com. Although the Vandenberg Air Force Base's website described the X-37B program as one that performs risk reduction, experimentation and concept of operations development for reusable space vehicle technologies, the spacecraft's capability to carry a payload, to orbit the earth unmanned and to perform autonomous reentry makes it a [has the] potential [to be a] space weapon. In this light, the X-37B might well herald the age of space weaponization and the space arms race that will surely follow. The idea of the military use of space is not new but it was mostly a farfetched idea and is mostly modeled for defensive or area-denial purposes. The Strategic Defense Initiative (also known as the Star Wars program) created by U.S. President Ronald Reagan mostly remains in the realm of theory. Media reports showed China tested its space-denial capability with the launch of its anti-satellite system, which destroyed a Chinese Feng Yun 1C polar orbit satellite in 2007. Such a system is intended to provide area denial by knocking down military or intelligence satellites but not for first strikes. With the X-37B coming into orbit, the world might witness the first spacecraft with potential first-strike capability.

**Space is weaponized now**

**Smith, Air force colonel, 8** – Air Force Colonel, PhD student in the strategic studies program under Professor Colin Gray at the University of Reading in the UK, former Chief of Future Concepts for the National Security Space Office at the Pentagon, and the Director of the Space Solar Power Study (M.V., Message board post in response to a post by “Hsdebater”, 7/12,

http://spacesolarpower.wordpress.com/2008/04/09/ad-astra-special-report-space-based-solar-power/#comment-2680)

Here’s a comment which is always controversial; space is already weaponized. There already exists in space and on the Earth the types of systems that we use every day for routine civil, commerical, and military space operations that can also be used as weapons to negate satellites. Everything for ramming one satellite into another or merely jamming satellite signals is already in place…it merely depends on how you use the systems we currently have. We’ve already witnessed a number of episodes of hostile satellite jamming and bandwidth piracy around the globe. Fortunately, most space faring states are highly motivated to use space peacefully. But if war between space faring nations breaks out here on Earth I believe it is highly likely that those nations will negate each other’s satellites–the alternative to negating uninhabited satellites may be the killing of more people on Earth. This places advocates of “space sanctuary” in a strange moral dilemma. Unfortunately, achieving orbit does not place activities in space beyond the realm of human affairs. It is really a matter of politics as usual, no matter where your assets lie; air, land, sea, or space. Preventing battles in space depends on preventing wars on Earth.

**Non-unique—the US Atlas rocket test**

**Presscore 10** (“US launches a first strike military spacecraft - the X-37B,” 4/28/10, PressCore, http://presscore.ca/nbg/index.php?entry=entry100428-214754 DA: 6/22/11)

On April 22, 2010 an unmanned Atlas rocket carrying a miniature space shuttle blasted off from Cape Canaveral Air Force Station. The US military has built and launched an unmanned military aircraft in orbit around Earth, in direct violation of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967. The unmanned spacecraft can stay in orbit for months on end. It was built as a first strike spacecraft. The latest unmanned spacecraft launched by the US has triggered concerns in China over a new arms race in space as the “small shuttle” is reported to have platforms to launch various types of missiles. The US could position this spacecraft over any country, open its cargo bay doors and launch a nuclear, biological or any other WMD. This spacecraft gives the US the capacity and capability to launch missiles from space and with the aid of Earth’s gravity and the zero gravity of space, a missile being launched can achieve Mach 7 or faster. The US has been very secretive about this mission. Perhaps it is because the X-37B is carrying a missile or missiles or the spacecraft itself is a weapon. No matter, the US has made it be known that it is its intention to militarize space in violation of the Outer Space Treaty - a treaty ratified by ninety five nations and entered into force on October 10, 1963.

**Non-unique—backlash against China**

**Myers 8** (Steven, International Herald Tribune, “Is an arms race in space a given?; U.S. not backing down from quest to defend orbiting interests,” 3-11-08, Lexis)

Is war in space inevitable? The idea of such a war has been around since Sputnik, but for most of the Cold War it remained safely within the realm of science fiction and the carefully proscribed U.S.-Soviet arms race. But a dozen countries now can reach space with satellites - and, therefore, with weapons. China strutted its stuff in January 2007 by shooting down one of its own weather satellites 530 miles above the planet.

''The first era of the space age was one of experimentation and discovery,'' a congressional commission reported just before Bush took office in 2001. ''We are now on the threshold of a new era of the space age, devoted to mastering operations in space.'' One of the authors of that report was Bush's first defense secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, and the policy it recommended became a tenet of U.S. policy: The United States should develop ''new military capabilities for operation to, from, in and through space.''

Technology, too, has become an enemy of peace in space. Twenty-five years ago, President Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative was considered so fantastical by its critics that it was known as ''Star Wars.'' But the programs Reagan began were the ancestors of the weaponry that brought down the American satellite.

The Chinese strike, and now the Pentagon's, have given ammunition to both sides of the debate over war in orbit.

Arms-control advocates say the bull's-eyes underscore the need to expand the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, which the United States and 90 other countries have ratified. It bans the use of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in orbit or on the moon.

Space, in this view, should remain a place for exploration and research, not the destructive side of humanity. The grim potential of the latter was hinted at by the vast field of debris that China's test left, posing a threat to any passing satellite or spaceship. The Pentagon said its own shot, at a lower altitude, would not have the same effect - the debris would fall to earth and burn up.

The risk posed by space junk was the main reason the United States and Soviet Union abandoned antisatellite tests in the 1980s. Michael Krepon, who has written on the militarization of space, said the Chinese test broke an unofficial moratorium that had lasted since then. And he expressed disappointment that the Pentagon's strike had damaged support for a ban, which the Chinese say they want in spite of their 2007 test.

''The truth of the matter is it doesn't take too many satellite hits to create a big mess in low earth orbit,'' he said.

The White House, on the other hand, opposes a treaty proscribing space weaponry; Bush's press secretary, Dana Perino, says it would be unenforceable, noting that even a benign object put in orbit could become a weapon if it rammed another satellite.

A new American president could reverse that attitude, but he or she would have to go up against the generals and admirals, contractors, lawmakers and others who strongly support the goal of keeping U.S. superiority in space.

The reason they cite is that the United States depends more than any other country on space for its national security.

And so, research continues on how to protect U.S. satellites and deny the wartime use of satellites to potential enemies - including work on lasers and whiz-bang stuff like cylinders of hardened material that could be hurled from space to targets on the ground. ''Rods from God,'' those are called. For now, such weapons remain untested and, by all accounts, impractical because the cost of putting a weapon in orbit is huge. ''It is much easier to hold a target at risk from the land or sea than from space,'' said Elliot Pulham, who heads the Space Foundation, a nonprofit group in Colorado Springs.

**There won’t be backlash against the US**

**Dolman, 5**—Professor of Comparative Military Studies at the US Air Force’s School of Advanced Air and Space Studies (Everett C., “U.S. Military Transformation and Weapons in Space,” 9-14-05, http://www.e-parl.net/pages/space\_hearing\_images/ConfPaper%20Dolman%20US%20Military%20Transform%20&%20Space.pdf)

This rationality does not dispute the fact that US deployment of weapons in outer space would represent the addition of a potent new military capacity, one that would assist in extending the current period of American hegemony well into the future. This would clearly be threatening, and America must expect severe condemnation and increased competition in peripheral areas. But such an outcome is less threatening than any other state doing so. Placement of weapons in space by the United States would be perceived correctly as an attempt at continuing American hegemony. Although there is obvious opposition to the current international balance of power, the status quo, there is also a sense that it is at least tolerable to the majority of states. A continuation of it is thus minimally acceptable, even to states working towards its demise. So long as the US does not employ its power arbitrarily, the situation would be bearable initially and grudgingly accepted over time. On the other hand, an attempt by any other state to dominate space would be part of an effort to break the land-sea-air dominance of the United States in preparation for a new international order, with the weaponizing state at the top. The action would be a challenge to the status quo, not a perpetuation of it. Such an event would be disconcerting to nations that accept the current international order (including the venerable institutions of trade, finance, and law that operate within it) and intolerable to the US. As leader of the current system, the US could do no less than engage in a perhaps ruinous space arms race, save graciously decide to step aside.

**Plan doesn’t derail cooperation**

**MacDonald 9** – Former Navy Vice Admiral (Bruce, March 18, “Testimony to Strategic Forces Subcommittee House Armed Services Committee”, http://i.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/\_Testimony\_031809.pdf WSX)

Diplomacy and Arms Control

One important drawback of current U.S. space policy is its explicit rejection of space arms control. The U.S. literally was alone in the UN and elsewhere on space arms control issues, which eroded our international leadership in this area with our allies and allowed Russia and China to credibly mischaracterize our stance as provocative and hostile. The Bush administration was interested in voluntary steps on code of conduct, rules of road, and especially space debris, which was commendable but needed more emphasis than it received. My colleague Michael Krepon has done fine work on the code of conduct issue over the years; I highly recommend it to this Subcommittee and believe it offers a good early opportunity for U.S. diplomatic leadership in space.

The space dependence of our military power suggests we could gain from diplomatic attempts to limit space threats, yet we have done little. The choice was never arms control vs. unilateral programmatic and other steps to protect our space assets: we need both approaches, and more. Recall that the Reagan Administration was quite successful in its dual track strategy of combining military programs with arms control, and there is no reason to think such a strategy would not continue to be a useful guide to policy today. While diplomacy and arms control cannot by themselves solve our space security problems, they can help mitigate our risks. Our space arms control allergy should end, and U.S. diplomacy should have a stronger role in the future. 1996 U.S. space policy set two requirements for space arms control agreements that remain relevant today:

• They should promote U.S. security interests, and

• They should be verifiable

Interagency review of space diplomacy and arms control should be a priority of the Obama Administration. One option deserving special attention is a ban on any space testing that creates significant debris, explicitly including kinetic energy ASAT (KE-ASAT) weapons. A logical extension of concerns over space debris, this option would seek to discourage the development of KE-ASAT weapons by banning testing against orbiting objects. Carefully crafted language need not constrain missile defense testing.

Clearly more review of space arms control options is needed, but there is ample room to move forward, with broad civilian and commercial backing, in the areas of space traffic management and space debris. Such steps would be an affirmative U.S. response to China’s and Russia’s largely unrealistic space arms control proposals at the UN and would position us to take the lead in shaping a more responsible space regime. Further, by making realistic space arms control proposals, the U.S. would remove one of China’s arguments they have used in the past to deflect action on a fissile materials cut-off treaty, which the U.S. has long supported but China opposes.

## 2AC DA Spending/Downgrade/Supercommittee

**Plan is cheap**

**Tomme, US Airforce Lieutenant Colonel, 5** (Ed, http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/cadre/ari\_2005-01.pdf, The Paradigm Shift to Effects-Based Space:

Near-Space as a Combat Space Effects Enabler”, ZBurdette)

When the cost variable is examined in isolation, near-space has no peer. Their inherent simplicity, recoverability, relative lack of requirement for complex infrastructure, and lack of space-hardening requirements all contribute to this strong advantage for near-space assets.

Requiring only helium for lift, near-space platforms do not require expensive space launch to reach altitude. Over and above the obvious cost savings when the approximately $10,000–$40,000 per payload-kilogram84 current cost85 of a space launch is unnecessary, near-space platforms offer other inherent cost advantages compared to satellites.86 If the payloads they carry malfunction, they can be brought back down and repaired; should they become obsolete, they can be easily replaced. Neither of these actions are possibilities for satellite platforms, many of which had their designs frozen ten or more years before launch and are designed to last for another decade.87 Imagine what capabilities satellites could have if we replaced their twenty-year-old electronics with modern processors. Imagine the savings when every component does not require thorough testing to ensure perfect functionality the first time in space.88 Imagine the related insurance savings.89 Not being exposed to the high levels of radiation common to the space environment, payloads flown in near-space do not require the costly space-hardening manufacturing steps required of orbital assets. Near-space payloads also are not exposed to high-G forces during launch, as are satellites. Operating in near-space obviously eliminates a great deal of expense involved in space sensor construction.

**Non-unique—Obama is increasing space expenditures now**

**Chang 10** – science reporter for The New York Times (Kenneth, February 1, “Obama Calls for End to NASA’s Moon Program”, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/02/science/02nasa.html) WSX

In place of the Moon mission, Mr. Obama’s vision offers, at least initially, nothing in terms of human exploration of the solar system. What the administration calls a “bold new initiative” does not spell out a next destination or timetable for getting there.

In the meantime, instead of using the Constellation’s Ares I rocket and Orion crew capsule to ferry astronauts to the International Space Station, $6 billion would instead go to financing space taxi services from commercial companies.

Under the proposal, NASA’s budget would rise to $19 billion in the 2011 fiscal year from $18.7 billion. It would also get additional increases in subsequent years, reaching $21 billion in 2015. In total, NASA would receive $100 billion over the next five years.

Whether Congress agrees to the restructuring of NASA remains to be seen. As reports of the impending cancellation of Constellation leaked out last week, members of Congress, particularly in Alabama, Florida and Texas, the homes of the NASA centers most involved with Constellation, expressed concern.

“If early reports for what the White House wants to do with NASA are correct, then the president’s green-eyeshade-wearing advisers are dead wrong,” Senator Bill Nelson of Florida said in a statement last week.

Congress may also balk at the price tag. After spending $9 billion over the past four years on Constellation, canceling the contracts with Boeing, Lockheed Martin, Alliant Techsystems and other companies will cost an additional $2.5 billion, Dr. Logsdon said NASA officials had told him.

If implemented, the NASA a few years from now would be fundamentally different from NASA today. The space agency would no longer operate its own spacecraft, but essentially buy tickets for its astronauts.

**Alt causes**

**Dwyer 6/22** (6/22/11, Devin Dwyer, ABC News, “Afghanistan War Costs Loom Large Over Obama Troops Announcement,” http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/afghanistan-war-costs-soar-obama-troops-announcement/story?id=13902853)

President Obama's planned drawdown of U.S. troops in Afghanistan next month fulfills a promise he made more than a year ago, but also underscores the overwhelming costs of America's longest war. While the United States grapples with debt and deficit crises, taxpayers are expected to spend more than $118 billion this year in Afghanistan for military operations, base security, reconstruction, foreign aid, embassy costs and veterans' health care. That's more than double the amount the Department of Homeland Security spends per year to secure the nation's borders, screen air travelers and help Americans recover from natural disasters, among other services. Afghanistan war spending is roughly six times the annual budget of NASA. All told, the war that began in October 2001 has cost taxpayers more than an estimated $443 billion, according to the Congressional Research Service, and the lives of more than 1,523 U.S. military service members. Polls show the U.S. public has become increasingly war weary, leading members of both parties -- including some Republican candidates for president -- to pressure Obama to expedite his Afghanistan plan and reprioritize the war funds. The pace of U.S. withdrawal proposed by Obama "sounds a little slow and a little cautious, when you look at one out of every six Defense Department dollars going in support of what we're doing in Afghanistan," former Utah governor and GOP presidential candidate Jon Huntsman said today on "GMA." "Nine years and 50 days into this conflict, the money that has been spent on both conflicts, well over $1 trillion, I think we have to say, 'What have we accomplished in Afghanistan?'" he said. Huntsman is not alone. While 57 percent of Americans in the latest ABC News poll say the war has contributed to long-term national security, far fewer, 25 percent, say it has contributed "a great deal," which is the kind of payback many want to see, given the war's steep price tag. The Pentagon says all of its war-related costs since Sept. 11, 2001, including in Iraq, have topped $1 trillion. Add diplomatic expenses and care for veterans and total government spending reaches an estimated $1.3 trillion. In a Senate speech Tuesday, freshman Democrat Joe Manchin of West Virginia said it was time to "rebuild America, not Afghanistan," and that Obama should pursue significant troop reduction immediately. Earlier in the week, members of the U.S. Conference of Mayors also urged Congress to end both the Afghan and Iraq wars and invest the money instead on jobs at home. Still, while Obama is expected to announce a reduction of 5,000 to 10,000 troops from Afghanistan by the end of the year, and as many as 30,000 "surge" troops next year, the shift won't dramatically reduce the burden of war on America's budget, statistics show. The Pentagon estimates show that taxpayers could save $30 billion in the first year of a drawdown. But the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office projects war costs in both Iraq and Afghanistan in the next decade could still top $496 billion, even if troop levels fall to 45,000 from 99,000 by 2015.