

INHERENCY ANSWERS

The “Inherency Answers” part of this file should be used to answer the 1AC’s “Observation I: Inherency” contentions. The Inherency Answers are called a “1NC Inherency Frontline.” These pieces of evidence should be read during the 1st Negative Constructive.

The pieces of evidence marked “Inherency Ext.” should be read during the negative block, either in the 2nd Negative Constructive or during the 1st Negative Rebuttal. The “Inherency Ext.” will have a block title, which will tell you when to read a piece of evidence. For example. On page 4 of this file, the block title is “Inherency Ext. – U.S. Space Program Is Not Dead.” The student giving the 2nd Negative Constructive or 1st Negative Rebuttal should read evidence with this title to answer the affirmative argument that U.S. space programs are dead or under-funded in the status quo. This will be true for the evidence marked “Ext.” for Harms and Solvency Observations as well.

1NC INHERENCY FRONTLINE

1. INCREMENTAL PROGRESS IS MORE SUSTAINABLE THAN FLASHY SPACE MISSIONS

Roger Handberg, professor, Political Science, Univ. Central Florida, January 17, 2011

[The Space Review, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1759/1>]

Projects are the political vehicle for obtaining support for human exploration but, unfortunately, they carry an aura of completeness. Once the Eagle landed on the lunar surface in 1969, the Apollo program was done—subsequent missions were merely running out the string. That reality made it politically easy for President Nixon to pull the plug on the last three Apollo missions. Those missions more heavily emphasized the scientific component, but for the political class, that was at best of marginal importance. A process approach looks something like the Mars exploration effort, where a series of missions are launched, each as a building block for the next and building on past missions. Mission failures occur, but they are not the end of the story. Small ball can be as exciting as the home run approach and much more fundable, especially in a harsh budget environment that will exist for the foreseeable future.

2. FOCUS ON LARGE SCALE AND DRAMATIC SPACE PROGRAMS ARE UNSUSTAINABLE

Roger Handberg, professor, Political Science, Univ. Central Florida, January 17, 2011

[The Space Review, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1759/1>]

If one conceptualizes Apollo as the example *par excellence* of the home run approach, what does the small ball approach mean for NASA? Simply put, NASA needs to think of its human space exploration effort as a process, not a project. Apollo arose from the political world rather than the logical outcome from a systematic approach to space exploration. NASA provided the substance but the president, Kennedy, was looking for flashy items to highlight US prestige and technological capabilities. The latter was particularly important since the Soviets were clearly leading the United States in the space race in May 1961. This event, Apollo, with its great success, imprinted itself into NASA's organizational DNA: human spaceflight programs must be large scale and dramatic. That is what needs to change if NASA and its aspirations are to survive.

1NC INHERENCY FRONTLINE

3. CURRENT POLICIES FOCUS ON A GRADUAL PROCESS, WHICH IS MORE POLITICALLY SUSTAINABLE

Roger Handberg, professor, Political Science, Univ. Central Florida, January 17, 2011

[The Space Review, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1759/1>]

As has been repeatedly said, Apollo was *sui generis*, one of a kind, a product of unique historical circumstances. NASA's future in human spaceflight is budget wise and politically more supportable as a small ball approach. This is clearly less flashy, but today being politically sustainable must become the focus. The flexible path suggested by the Obama Administration is perceived by some as too vague and indefinite (see "[Prognosticating NASA's Future](#)", The Space Review, March 29, 2010). That may be an accurate judgment, but that plan envisions a process rather than a constituency or destination focus, which has been typical of NASA initiatives. Such a project or destination focus becomes finite, with an end date and no logical follow on into the future. Conceptualizing space exploration as a process rather than a destination or project allows you to build on success and push outward beyond the Moon and into the solar system.

4. CANCELING CONSTELLATION WON'T SLOW SPACE EXPLORATION

John Matson, Scientific American, February 1, 2011

[<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=nasa-budget-constellation-cancel>]

By scrapping the troubled program—along with its focus on a moon landing—and leaning on the private sector, the agency thinks it will actually accelerate efforts to loft astronauts beyond low Earth orbit, the farthest reach of the shuttle. NASA Deputy Administrator Lori Garver declined to specify a preliminary target for exploration in a teleconference Monday afternoon but mentioned near-Earth asteroids as a potential stepping-stone on the path to ultimately exploring [Mars](#) and its moons. She also pointed out that, although the agency will relax its focus on the moon, lunar exploration remains on the table. "We're certainly not canceling our ambitions to explore space," Garver said. "We're canceling Constellation."

5. CANCELING CONSTELLATION WILL INCREASE SPACE EXPLORATION

John Matson, Scientific American, February 1, 2011

[<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=nasa-budget-constellation-cancel>]

Garver tried to put the new approach in context, calling Constellation's stated goal of a moon landing in 2020 "wishful thinking." By stepping back from that unrealistic timeline, she said, the U.S. would be free to undertake more ambitious exploration. "We had lost the moon," Garver said, "and what this program does is give us back the solar system."

INHERENCY EXT. -- U.S. SPACE PROGRAM NOT DEAD

CANCELING THE CONSTELLATION MISSION MAKES FOCUS ON MARS MORE EFFECTIVE

David Freedman, science and tech journalist for 30 years, December 2010

[Scientific American December 2010, Vol 303, Issue 6]

The elimination of the moon missions has drawn some fire, but those missions were really just dry runs for the real long-term goal of the exploration program: getting humans to Mars. And in spite of what some foes of the new plan have implied to the public, the plan does not call for NASA to spend less money on space or abandon its longer-term human space exploration plans. Rather the plan implicitly recognizes that a round-trip visit to Mars will require significant technological advances well beyond what Constellation would be likely to provide, and by freeing up NASA from having to spend all its money and expertise on orbital ferrying, the plan gives the agency the breathing room it needs to come up with those and other advances. "The plan represents a lowering of cost and better management of NASA's low-Earth-orbit business, so that it can focus on research and development, Earth science and space science," says Eligar Sadeh, president of Astroconsulting International, a space and defense consultancy in Colorado Springs, and a researcher with the U.S. Air Force Academy's Eisenhower Center for Space and Defense Studies. In fact, the plan calls for NASA budget increases over the next few years. In many ways, the plan is an attempt to return NASA to its 1960s glory days by making it a true research and development agency again, farming out the been-there work of low Earth orbit to civilian contractors. It would make Mars the new moon.

THE SPACE STATION AND SHUTTLE PROGRAM HAS ACCOMPLISHED LITTLE

Gregg Easterbrook, Reuters columnist, Aril 15, 2010

[<http://blogs.reuters.com/gregg-easterbrook/2010/04/15/get-over-the-moon-we-need-nasa-to-save-the-earth/>]

Yes, the Apollo moon landings were significant and memorable, but the last one occurred 38 years ago. In recent decades, NASA's record has been spotty. The agency's space science program – probes of the outer planets, telescopes that scan the far heavens – is successful and cost-effective. But for decades manned space flight, which receives the bulk of NASA funds, has accomplished: um, what? More money than was spent for the Apollo moon missions has been invested in the International Space Station, whose primary function is to give the space shuttle a destination. The shuttle, in turn, exists mainly to fly to the space station. The space station has [no notable scientific achievements](#): it is such a white elephant that already NASA is studying the best way to "deorbit" the whole 380-ton structure, meaning allow it to burn in the upper atmosphere. This may happen as soon as 2016.

INHERENCY EXT. -- PRIVATE SPACE PROGRAMS CAN SOLVE

PRIVATE COMPANIES CAN FUND EFFECTIVE SPACE EXPLORATION

David Freedman, science and tech journalist for 30 years, December 2010

[Scientific American December 2010, Vol 303, Issue 6]

But just because it is a big bet with real risks does not mean it is a bad bet. There are reasons to believe private companies could quickly rise to the task of getting people to orbit--and do it more cheaply and reliably than any big NASA-run program ever could. And that in turn could open the door to a prize that, thanks to a three-decade-long near stall in human space exploration, most people had almost stopped even dreaming about: a welcome mat above Earth not just for a small corps of astronauts but also for legions of scientists, engineers and even those of us who would simply get a really big kick out of spending a few days or weeks in outer space. Even better, the wave of space visitors could kick-start a self-sustaining orbital economy, one that would establish humanity's place in space, including Mars and beyond, much more firmly than Constellation or any conventional space program ever could.

PRIVATIZATION OF SPACE COULD DRIVE COSTS DOWN AND CREATE ECONOMIES OF SCALE

David Freedman, science and tech journalist for 30 years, December 2010

[Scientific American December 2010, Vol 303, Issue 6]

THE BIGGEST POTENTIAL PAYOFF to the Obama plan would be the opportunity to drive the costs of a flight to orbit down low enough to create a virtuous circle: as prices drop, more people will fly, and as more people fly, economies of scale and increased competition will lead to lower prices, and so on. The circle would be reinforced when enough people fly to justify the creation of more infrastructure in orbit--that is, more places to stay and things to do--which would attract more people and lead to more infrastructure. And voilà: we'd have an orbital economy.

INHERENCY EXT. -- PRIVATE SPACE PROGRAMS CAN SOLVE

AMERICAN PRIVATE SECTOR SPACE WILL OUTPERFORM THE CHINESE SPACE PROGRAM

Rick Boozer, astrophysics, industrial software engineer, May 19, 2011

[http://news.yahoo.com/s/ac/20110519/sc_ac/8496119_united_states_will_beat_china_in_newest_space_race]

But the Chinese are glimpsing something that disturbs them. They are worried that the American company SpaceX can launch satellites and people into space for prices so low that the Chinese can't compete with them ! SpaceX is one of the companies NASA is hiring to come up with space vehicles for sending astronauts to the ISS under its Commercial Crew Development (CCDev) program. Other CCDev companies include veteran aerospace giant Boeing and newcomers Sierra Nevada Corporation and Blue Origin. Competition between these companies would bring down launch prices allowing NASA to have more money for developing technology we will need to send Americans to the Moon, asteroids, and Mars. However, the money hungry super rocket (that politicians are forcing NASA to build with obsolete and expensive 1980's era shuttle technology) jeopardizes the development of deep space exploration technology by potentially gobbling any money freed up with CCDev. Not relying heavily on subcontractors as its competition does, SpaceX manufactures 80% of its vehicle parts, giving them greater quality control. They use the same rocket engine in all of their launch vehicles. When they want more power, they add more engines to the vehicle, giving them economies of scale. Those are just a couple of the many ways they hold prices down while insuring high quality and safety. That affordability is allowing them to develop the most powerful launcher since the Saturn V moon rocket - totally on their own with no government money! The other companies participating in CCDev also use American ingenuity to bring prices down. In a few years because of their cost savings, more astronauts will be launched into orbit than have ever been before! And if politicians can be prevented from squandering the money freed up by CCDev, Americans will lead the way in exploration throughout the inner solar system with such proposed NASA projects as Nautilus-X at much lower cost than the traditional way of doing things. Nautilus would be the first true spaceship that would stay in space and never land, with astronauts brought to it from Earth by the CCDev vehicles. NASA can accomplish great things without a budget increase. If we have the national will, the U.S. will dominate outer space, not the Chinese!

INHERENCY EXT. -- PRIVATE SPACE PROGRAMS CAN SOLVE

ACCIDENTS WOULD NOT DISCOURAGE SPACE TOURISM

David Freedman, science and tech journalist for 30 years, December 2010

[Scientific American December 2010, Vol 303, Issue 6]

On the other hand, neither risk nor catastrophe would dissuade a large segment of the potential market, argues Scott Tibbitts, founder of the eSpace Center for Space Entrepreneurship in partnership with the University of Colorado. "Society looks at the risks of adventure tourism favorably," Tibbitts says. "After eight people were killed trying to climb Mount Everest in 1996, sales of Everest expeditions to the public skyrocketed. No one talks about shutting down the skydiving business when a sky-diver is killed. Tolerance for risk in space will increase, especially when prices come down to between \$1 million and \$5 million a seat. At those prices there could be a heck of a lot of people who want to fly as quick as a company can launch them."

HARMS ANSWERS

The “Harms” part of this file should be used to answer the 1AC’s “Observation II: Harms” contentions. The Harms Answers are called a “1NC Harms Frontline.” These pieces of evidence should be read during the 1st Negative Constructive.

THE PIECES OF EVIDENCE MARKED “INHERENCY EXT.” SHOULD BE READ DURING THE NEGATIVE BLOCK, EITHER IN THE 2ND NEGATIVE CONSTRUCTIVE OR DURING THE 1ST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL. THE “INHERENCY EXT.” WILL HAVE A BLOCK TITLE, WHICH WILL TELL YOU WHEN TO READ A PIECE OF EVIDENCE. FOR EXAMPLE. ON PAGE 4 OF THIS FILE, THE BLOCK TITLE IS “INHERENCY EXT. – U.S. SPACE PROGRAM IS NOT DEAD.” THE STUDENT GIVING THE 2ND NEGATIVE CONSTRUCTIVE OR 1ST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL SHOULD READ EVIDENCE WITH THIS TITLE TO ANSWER THE AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT THAT U.S. SPACE PROGRAMS ARE DEAD OR UNDER-FUNDED IN THE STATUS QUO. THIS WILL BE TRUE FOR THE EVIDENCE MARKED “EXT.” FOR HARMS AND SOLVENCY OBSERVATIONS AS WELL.

1NC HARMS FRONTLINE

1. CHINA'S SPACE PROGRAM IS NOT GROWING IN THE STATUS QUO.

Alanna Krolkowski, Visiting Scholar, Space Policy Institute, GW Univ., May 11, 2011

[Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission,
http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2011hearings/written_testimonies/hr11_05_11.php]

International observers and Chinese media often describe China's civil space program as "soaring" ahead or "leaping" forward. Chinese space professionals familiar with different aspects of the program, however, tend to regard its progress as cautious and unbalanced. They also emphasize that their program is not racing with any other country. Progress has been steady but not necessarily rapid across the main areas of the civil space program, with some exceptions. The pace of launches accelerated recently. In 2010, China for the first time matched the United States in the number of launches in a single year: 15. By contrast, the human spaceflight program, although reaching new milestones since 2003, has proceeded at a cautious pace. Chinese observers note that their country's crewed launch schedule has been slower than the U.S. Apollo Program's of the 1960s. China has also experienced recent delays and setbacks in satellite production, including the on-orbit failure in 2008 of a satellite delivered to Nigeria, a launch failure in 2009, and delays in launch-vehicle development.

2. CHINA'S THREAT FROM SPACE IS EXAGGERATED – WORST CASE THINKING LIKELY WRONG

Bruce MacDonald, United States Institute of Peace, May 11, 2011

[Testimony for the US-China Economic and Security Review Committee,
http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2011hearings/written_testimonies/hr11_05_11.php]

In the face of this growing Chinese military space challenge, it is easy to assume the worst about Chinese intentions. China seeks to be able to prevail militarily at some point in the future should conflict come, but they see the United States as militarily superior to them and thus would be unlikely to consciously provoke any military conflict. While we should guard against a worst case, we should not treat it as a given. I do not believe China or the PLA is spoiling for a fight with the United States – China has come too far to want to place their substantial economic achievements at risk unless they faced an extraordinary threat to their national security. In addition, China faces serious demographic realities over the next couple of decades, where their ratio of workers to retirees will shrink substantially (the result of their one-child policy), which further underscores China's need for stability and continued economic growth for years to come.

3. CHINA'S SPACE SUCCESS NOT ASSURED, MANY TECHNICAL CHALLENGES REMAIN

Dr. James Clay Moltz, Naval Postgraduate School, May 11, 2011

[Testimony for the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission,
http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2011hearings/written_testimonies/hr11_05_11.php]

But China's recent rise in space does not guarantee its success. China remains behind world standards in a number of critical space technologies, raising questions among partner nations in terms of the quality of its spacecraft. Despite Thailand's membership in APSCO, for example, Bangkok turned to a European consortium to purchase its Thailand Earth Observation Satellite (THEOS), whose remote-sensing technology is more sophisticated than China's. Similarly, China had

technical problems with its Nigcomsat-1 due to a faulty solar array, causing the spacecraft to cease functioning in 2008. Beijing has had to offer a replacement satellite.

1NC HARMS FRONTLINE

4. THE MOON HAS VERY LITTLE MILITARY VALUE

Joe Poppolardo, Popular Mechanics, January 2011

[www.popularmechanics.com/science/space/moon-mars/china-moon-military-war-in-space]

The idea was straightforward and simple from this magazine editor's standpoint—parlay the buzz about China's lunar ambitions into a conjectural story about the weapons and tactics of a lunar battle. But my "battle for the moon" scenario started to fall apart immediately—mostly because the moon is of such little military utility.

5. NO EVIDENCE THAT CHINA IS FUNDAMENTALLY CHALLENGING U.S. PRIMACY

Ian Clark, professor of international politics, Aberystwyth Univ. January 2011

[International Affairs, Vol. 87. Issue 1, p. 22]

This line of argument would be of theoretical interest alone had it not been matched by the substance of Chinese policy. There has, to date, been little evidence of any overt strategy of balancing or soft balancing on China's part. Even in the case of Iraq in 2003, China—while clearly opposed to American military action—challenged the United States less openly than did Russia, Germany and France. In that sense, the opportunity for a practical realization of multipolarity was not seized by China, as it did not wish unduly to antagonize the US. Reportedly, Russian officials were very much disappointed by China's performance over Iraq, and criticized it for being 'half a step behind' the other three countries in their efforts to constrain American-led action. China's policy by the end of this decade may have become more self-confident, and more assertive, but the fundamentals of this assessment do not yet appear to have changed.

6. CHINA'S POWER IS EXAGGERATED

Jacques deLisle, director Asia Program, Univ of Pennsylvania, Fall 2010

[Orbis, Fall 2010 Volume 54, Issue 4, pp. 493-524]

Will China move beyond using soft power primarily for the relatively limited and primarily defensive purpose of allaying concerns about a "China threat" and avoiding balancing or containing reactions? Will it use soft power to more affirmative, transformative ends (as has been characteristic of American uses of soft power)? For the near term, the answer to these questions remains no. In several ways, China's soft power resources remain relatively weak and lag far behind those which the United States still wields, despite dissipation during the last decade and amid recent and still-uncertain efforts to rebuild. First, the degree to which China has closed the gap is easily over-estimated and frequently overstated. Like China's hard power, China's soft power is geographically uneven, appearing weaker, narrower or less securely rooted outside its neighborhood and especially in the West.

HARMS EXT. -- SPACE RACE – CHINA’S SPACE PROGRAM IS NO THREAT

CHINA’S SPACE PROGRAM IS REORIENTING AWAY FROM A MILITARY FOCUS TO A COMMERCIAL ONE

Christopher Mims, Journalist, Washington DC, Fast Company, April 27, 2011

[<http://www.fastcompany.com/1750093/what-chinas-new-space-station-means-for-china-and-the-world>]

Because its space program is a subsidiary of the People's Liberation Army, some have concluded that China's designs on space are military, but thoughtful observers disagree: the association between the country's space exploration program and the PLA is about the past, not the future. Chinese lasers won't be raining down on us from space any time soon. The future of China's space program is not about weapons, it's about putting a Chinese man on the moon. The thing about China--a nation led by engineers--is that through the vehicle of its 5-year plans, its government methodically pursues its stated goals. It's happened before in microchips, leading the Chinese government to develop a home-grown processor that may some day challenge Intel. And it's happening in space.

HARMS EXT. – A STATION ON THE MOON IS NO THREAT

THERE ARE MUCH CHEAPER ALTERNATIVES THAN USING THE MOON TO LAUNCH THINGS AT THE EARTH

Joe Poppolardo, Popular Mechanics, January 2011

[www.popularmechanics.com/science/space/moon-mars/china-moon-military-war-in-space]
Any conflict, first of all, needs a motive. So I turned to Robert Heinlein, my favorite classic sci-fi author, whose revolutionary heroes in the novel *The Moon Is a Harsh Mistress* set up a plausible weapons system that flung unstoppable rocks at the Earth from the moon. That may have worked well for a lunar colony that was already established—the Loonies in the book weaponize an electromagnetic mass driver that flings cargo from one lunar destination to another—but it makes a lot more sense for an earthbound government to drop kinetic weapons from low Earth orbit. Called "rods from God" by nerdish wags, the idea is that something dropped from orbit, even without explosives, would demolish anything it impacted. Such an orbital kinetic weapons system is a heck of a lot cheaper than setting up anything on the moon, and it would be just as effective, offering the target less warning. Any nation attacked by a space rock from the moon could see it coming and intercept it, or at least retaliate against the Earth-bound assets.

HARMS EXT. – CHINA IS NO THREAT TO U.S. LEADERSHIP

CHINA'S MODEL IS NOT BEING ACCEPTED INTERNATIONALLY – THEY ARE NO THREAT TO U.S. PRIMACY

Ian Clark, professor of international politics, Aberystwyth Univ. January 2011

[International Affairs, Vol. 87. Issue 1, p. 26]

On the international economic front more generally, China's highly visible resource diplomacy evokes widespread misgivings, whether justifiable or not, while its enormous current account surpluses have not yet translated into a commensurate role in international capital and currency markets, given the limitations of its domestic institutions in those areas. In this more complex light, the future respective standings of the US and China evidently depend upon much more than any forward extrapolation of their material capabilities. In the short term, and notwithstanding any power transition currently under way, there is simply no prospect of China acting as a hegemon in its own right. For that reason, the real issue that faces us is not whether China will succeed the United States, but whether it is possible to design an order, broadly acceptable to all, that also satisfies the particular preferences of both China and the United States simultaneously.

HARMS EXT. – CHINA IS NO THREAT TO U.S. LEADERSHIP

PROJECTIONS OF CHINA’S POWER BASED ON THEIR ECONOMIC GAINS EXAGGERATES THEIR THREAT

Ian Clark, professor of international politics, Aberystwyth Univ. January 2011

[International Affairs, Vol. 87. Issue 1, p. 28]

Future projections of material power, in any event, have been notoriously unreliable, as previous predictions of the decline of the United States in the 1970s and 1980s amply demonstrated. Similarly, projections of China’s future role, based on simple extrapolations from its current rate of economic growth, are bound to deceive. Above all, China faces a complex array of severe domestic problems that will dominate its policy priorities for many decades to come, and it is wholly speculative to assess the nature of its likely international contributions beyond those concerns.

THE SCENARIO OF CHINA AND THE U.S. COMPETING FOR PRIMACY IS UNLIKELY TO OCCUR

Ian Clark, professor of international politics, Aberystwyth Univ. January 2011

[International Affairs, Vol. 87. Issue 1, p. 28]

These reflections warn against any temptation to plot future legitimacy dynamics, as if they straightforwardly track material shifts in power. In the literature on China’s rise, accounts of so-called hegemonic succession have actually been about no more than an embryonic power transition, and rest upon narrowly materialist accounts. Martin Wight was right to warn against an exclusive focus on the ‘mechanics’, and to insist that attraction and influence are not ‘exactly correlated to mass and weight’. Serious questions are properly being asked about the US capacity to sustain its role in the future. At the same time, there are equally pertinent questions about whether China is yet able to convey an appealing international purpose that, in Wight’s words, would support a ‘common interest’, promote ‘real values’, and promise ‘real benefit’ for all. The future positions of these two states will be shaped, not simply by transitions in material power, but just as importantly by the potential to develop an institution of hegemony, resting upon widespread international consent. If this is to be achieved at all, then, in the foreseeable future, it is much more likely to be collective in form than to represent a succession of hegemonies.

HARMS EXT. – CHINA IS NO THREAT TO U.S. LEADERSHIP

CHINA'S EMERGING THREAT ENVIRONMENT WILL CONSTRAIN ITS AGGRESSION

Ely Ratner, RAND Corporation, National Asia Research Program, 2011

[The Washington Quarterly volume 34, number 1, Winter 2011 p. 40-1]

Finally, scholars have argued that China's domestic problems environmental, social, demographic, economic, and political will likely retard its meteoric rise.⁵¹ The same could be said of emergent international threats. Those who wish to see the containment of Beijing's expanding influence should consider how international security threats will likely divert and drain its resources and attention. China has managed to free ride on the U.S.-led system without having to pay its dues as a great power, but that window appears to be closing fast. The ruling regime would like to push this date back as far as possible, but at the end of the day, the decision will not be theirs. In this sense, China's rise is most likely a self-limiting process which may not require U.S. sand in its gears to slow it down. The Emergent Security Threats Reshaping China's Rise

ANALYSTS OF CHINESE "INTENTIONS" EXAGGERATE THE THREAT

Ely Ratner, RAND Corporation, National Asia Research Program, 2011

[The Washington Quarterly volume 34, number 1, Winter 2011 p. 38]

Embedded in these analyses of China's "strategic intent" is the perception that leaders in Beijing have a well-developed national security strategy that will guide its future behavior. This notion further suggests that U.S. analysts should employ some combination of Chinese writings, leadership analyses, intelligence estimates, and diplomatic and military signals to reveal China's intentions. Academic theories of international relations and power transitions have led scholars to adopt similar assumptions, positing China as a willful, proactive rising power that will choose either to assimilate into or to challenge the U.S.-led system. This framework is misconceived, however, insofar as it overstates the causal linkages between China's "strategic intentions" and future behavior. There is any number of reasons to believe that coherent, long-term strategies are not yet in place, and even if they were, would fail to persist over time. Analysts should therefore exercise caution in assuming that the CCP possesses a comprehensive and forward-looking national security strategy.

HARMS EXT. – CHINA IS NO THREAT TO U.S. LEADERSHIP

CHINA WILL INEVITABLY FACE A CONSTRAINING THREAT ENVIRONMENT

Ely Ratner, RAND Corporation, National Asia Research Program, 2011

[The Washington Quarterly volume 34, number 1, Winter 2011 p. 36]

Finally, through traditional state-to-state politics, China may also engender adversaries as a result of ultimately being forced to take a stand on internationally contentious issues. Nonalignment is fine in theory, but is increasingly difficult to practice for a permanent member of the UN Security Council with rapidly expanding economic and security interests. Even apolitical economic cooperation with countries such as Cuba, North Korea, or Venezuela can be highly political (and controversial) actions in and of themselves. Similarly, in regions such as the Middle East that are wrought with rivalry and conflict, it will be tremendously challenging for Beijing to simultaneously maintain positive relations with Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Saudi Arabia, and Syria. At some point, supporting one regime will mean opposing another. All this is not to predict a widespread phenomenon of anti-Chinese regimes around the world, but it will only take a few to cause major headaches in Beijing. Taken together, China is bound to face an extremely complex future threat environment, to be filled with some combination of terrorists, failed states, discontented publics, and outright adversaries.

HARMS EXT. – CHINA IS NO THREAT TO U.S. LEADERSHIP

CHINA NOT MAKING MEANINGFUL DIPLOMATIC GAINS

Jacques deLisle, director Asia Program, Univ of Pennsylvania, Fall 2010

[Orbis, Fall 2010 Volume 54, Issue 4, pp. 493-524]

In much of the developing world, the apparent love affair with China likely remains shallow and fragile. The ambiguous and much-debated China Model or Beijing Consensus is only superficially understood and disappointments that would accompany attempted implementation have not yet been encountered. The embrace of China may prove little more than an implicit quid pro quo for diplomatic support, modest development assistance and foreign investment. These are not the most pure or robust forms of soft power. In some cases and on some accounts, they do not even count as soft power.

CHINA'S ECONOMIC TIES ARE NO THREAT TO THE US

Jacques deLisle, director Asia Program, Univ of Pennsylvania, Fall 2010

[Orbis, Fall 2010 Volume 54, Issue 4, pp. 493-524]

With China's growing economic presence—concentrated in extractive industries, low-end service sectors, and manufactured exports—come looming and already-materializing risks to China's image in Africa, Latin America and elsewhere. Complaints of labor abuses, neocolonialism, environmental degradation and hollowing out of labor-intensive local economic sectors have already begun to surface. Nearer China's periphery, economic integration-driven bandwagoning with China is easily exaggerated. As more careful analyses have pointed out, East and Southeast Asian states are wary of China, remain more attracted to U.S. values than PRC ones, and have combined growing links to China with recommitments to ties with the United States through strategies that can be variously—if not wholly satisfactorily—characterized as balancing, double-bandwagoning or hedging.

HARMS EXT. -- CHINA SOFT POWER – NO THREAT TO U.S.

CHINA'S SOFT POWER STILL BADLY TRAILS THE US

Jacques deLisle, director Asia Program, Univ of Pennsylvania, Fall 2010

[Orbis, Fall 2010 Volume 54, Issue 4, pp. 493-524]

Throughout much of the non-Western world, seeming Sinophilia is to some extent superficial and self-indulgent tweaking of a sole superpower that is seen as having been on a binge of neglect and abuse. According to major global public opinion surveys and influential Chinese scholars' own estimates, China has scored only limited successes and still badly trails the United States in soft power.

CHINA'S MODEL HAS LIMITED APPEAL

Jacques deLisle, director Asia Program, Univ of Pennsylvania, Fall 2010

[Orbis, Fall 2010 Volume 54, Issue 4, pp. 493-524]

Third, key types of Chinese soft power resources remain thin. As many analysts at home and abroad have noted, China's political institutions and official values do not enjoy broad appeal, nor does China's record on social equity, the environment, international human rights and other matters. The international relevance, content and even existence of a China Model for development are as much foci of debate as they are rich sources of soft power that can alter foreigners' attitudes and preferences in ways that serve Chinese interests. China's soft power remains heavily statist, lacking the popular culture, commercial and civil society dimensions that provide much of the might of American soft power. A slowing of China's growth rate or rise in its perceived collateral costs is far from unimaginable and would dim the luster of the China Model. Even continued success could sap soft power as a more prosperous China would become, like Taiwan, seemingly less relevant to the developing world.

HARMS EXT. -- CHINA THREAT – ECONOMIC GROWTH EXAGGERATED

PROJECTIONS OF CHINESE ECONOMIC GROWTH ARE EXAGGERATED

Joseph Nye, professor Harvard University, October 2010

[The Washington Quarterly, Volume 33, Number 4, October 2010, p. 150]

Such projections should be viewed with some skepticism. China still lags far behind the United States economically and militarily, and has focused its policies primarily on its region and on its economic development. Even if China's GDP passes that of the United States around 2027 (as Goldman Sachs projects) the two economies would technically be equivalent in size but not in composition. China would still have a vast underdeveloped countryside, and it will begin to face demographic problems from the delayed effects of the one child per couple policy it enforced in the twentieth century.

CHINA'S ECONOMIC GROWTH RATE AND INFLUENCE WILL DECLINE

Joseph Nye, professor Harvard University, October 2010

[The Washington Quarterly, Volume 33, Number 4, October 2010, p. 150]

Moreover, as countries develop, there is a tendency for growth rates to slow. Assuming six percent Chinese growth and only two percent American growth after 2030, China would not equal the United States in per capita income until sometime in the second half of the century. Since per capita income provides a measure of the sophistication of an economy, aggregate economic size will not necessarily mean that China will economically surpass the United States in 2027. During the past decade, China moved from being the ninth largest exporter to the largest in the world, but China's export-led development model will probably need to be adjusted as global trade and financial balances become more contentious in the aftermath of the recent financial crisis. That means that the financial crisis may eventually hurt Chinese power in the medium term by reducing the rest of the world's willingness to effectively allow China to free ride on open global markets without liberalizing its own exchange rates, interest rates, and markets. And although China holds huge foreign currency reserves, China will have difficulty increasing its financial leverage by lending overseas in its own currency until it has a deep and open financial market where interest rates are set by the market and not the government.

HARMS EXT. – CHINA’S SPACE PROGRAM IS NO THREAT

CHINA’S SPACE THREAT IS EXAGGERATED FOR POLITICAL REASONS

Rick Boozer, astrophysics, industrial software engineer, May 19, 2011

[http://news.yahoo.com/s/ac/20110519/sc_ac/8496119_united_states_will_beat_china_in_newest_space_race]

America is laying the groundwork for its greatest space endeavor since sending astronauts to the Moon. But that's not the story you will hear from a few senators and congressional representatives who are more concerned with bringing home pork than significantly advancing U.S. spaceflight prowess. Exaggerating China's future spaceflight plans is one of their favorite strategies. In fact Chinese space ambitions are modest. Their yet-to-be-started space station won't be complete until 2020 at the earliest. It will weigh only 60 tons compared to the International Space Station's 400 tons and less than half the defunct Russian MIR station's 130 tons.

POLITICIANS EXAGGERATE CHINESE SPACE PROGRAM TO WIN PORK PROJECTS

Rick Boozer, astrophysics, industrial software engineer, May 19, 2011

[http://news.yahoo.com/s/ac/20110519/sc_ac/8496119_united_states_will_beat_china_in_newest_space_race]

China's state news announced they are tentatively considering a gigantic super rocket. It prompted Rep. Frank Wolf of Virginia to say, "The announcement made clear that if the United States does not get serious about its own Exploration Program, the next flag planted on the moon may be a Chinese flag." Even before the announcement, Rep. Bill Posey of Florida made similar dire predictions about future Chinese space accomplishments. However, careful reading of the Chinese article reveals it is a preliminary feasibility study, NOT any actual plan to build the rocket. Furthermore, given that the rocket would carry a 130-ton payload, which is exactly the same payload weight as the super rocket demanded by certain U.S. Senators, the Chinese study is probably just a knee-jerk response to the Senators' efforts.

CHINA’S SPACE THREAT IS EXAGGERATED

Gregg Easterbrook, Reuters columnist, April 15, 2010

[<http://blogs.reuters.com/gregg-easterbrook/2010/04/15/get-over-the-moon-we-need-nasa-to-save-the-earth/>]

China? The Chinese space program is about where the United States was in 1965; China's best manned-space hardware is equivalent to NASA's obsolete Gemini rocket-capsule stack. If China lands a man on the lunar regolith half a century after the United States reached "been there, done that" status for this objective, it is hard to see how that threatens America – let China be the country to waste a huge chunk of national treasure looking for ice on the Moon! Old-timers from NASA, and pork-barrel proponents such as Rep. Olson, want to depict China's 1960s-vintage space effort as a national threat, because then money will flow without any need to prove the case. If a return-to-the-Moon made sense on its own, proponents would argue on the merits.

HARMS EXT. – NO THREAT TO AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

THE U.S. STILL HAS UNMATCHED PRIMACY

Richard Maher, PhD. candidate, Brown University, ORBIS, March 2011

[ORBIS, Winter 2011 Volume 55, Issue 1 p. 54]

The United States today accounts for approximately 25 percent of global economic output, a figure that has held relatively stable despite steadily increasing economic growth in China, India, Brazil, and other countries. Among the group of six or seven great powers, this figure approaches 50 percent. When one takes discretionary spending into account, the United States today spends more on its military than the rest of the world combined. This imbalance is even further magnified by the fact that five of the next seven biggest spenders are close U.S. allies. China, the country often seen as America's next great geopolitical rival, has a defense budget that is one-seventh of what the United States spends on its military. There is also a vast gap in terms of the reach and sophistication of advanced weapons systems. By some measures, the United States spends more on research and development for its military than the rest of the world combined. What is remarkable is that the United States can do all of this without completely breaking the bank. The United States today devotes approximately 4 percent of GDP to defense. As a percentage of GDP, the United States today spends far less on its military than it did during the Cold War, when defense spending hovered around 10 percent of gross economic output. As one would expect, the United States today enjoys unquestioned preeminence in the military realm. No other state comes close to having the capability to project military power like the United States.

ECONOMIC AND MILITARY POWER ARE NOT LINKED DIRECTLY WITH INFLUENCE AND POWER

Richard Maher, PhD. candidate, Brown University, ORBIS, March 2011

[ORBIS, Winter 2011 Volume 55, Issue 1 p. 54]

And yet, despite this material preeminence, the United States sees its political and strategic influence diminishing around the world. It is involved in two costly and destructive wars, in Iraq and Afghanistan, where success has been elusive and the end remains out of sight. China has adopted a new assertiveness recently, on everything from U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, currency convertibility, and America's growing debt (which China largely finances). Pakistan, one of America's closest strategic allies, is facing the threat of social and political collapse. Russia is using its vast energy resources to reassert its dominance in what it views as its historical sphere of influence. Negotiations with North Korea and Iran have gone nowhere in dismantling their nuclear programs. Brazil's growing economic and political influence offer another option for partnership and investment for countries in the Western Hemisphere. And relations with Japan, following the election that brought the opposition Democratic Party into power, are at their frostiest in decades. To many observers, it seems that America's vast power is not translating into America's preferred outcomes. As the United States has come to learn, raw power does not automatically translate into the realization of one's preferences, nor is it necessarily easy to maintain one's predominant position in world politics.

HARMS EXT. – NO THREAT TO AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

**AMERICA’S POSITION IN THE WORLD COULD BE STRENGTHENED EVEN AFTER ITS
DOMINANCE IS REDUCED**

Richard Maher, PhD. candidate, Brown University, ORBIS, March 2011

[ORBIS, Winter 2011 Volume 55, Issue 1 p. 55]

As we witness the emergence (or re-emergence) of great powers in other parts of the world, we realize that American predominance cannot last forever. It is inevitable that the distribution of power and influence will become more balanced in the future, and that the United States will necessarily see its relative power decline. While the United States naturally should avoid hastening the end of this current period of American predominance, it should not look upon the next period of global politics and international history with dread or foreboding. It certainly should not seek to maintain its predominance at any cost, devoting unlimited ambition, resources, and prestige to the cause. In fact, contrary to what many have argued about the importance of maintaining its predominance, America’s position in the world—both at home and internationally—could very well be strengthened once its era of preeminence is over. It is, therefore, necessary for the United States to start thinking about how best to position itself in the “post-unipolar” world.

**AMERICAN POWER SHARING IS INEVITABLE, WHAT MATTERS IS HOW THE U.S. ACTS
DURING THAT TIME**

Richard Maher, PhD. candidate, Brown University, ORBIS, March 2011

[ORBIS, Winter 2011 Volume 55, Issue 1 p. 68]

It still remains inevitable that America’s outsized role in world politics will decline in the years and decades ahead. Rather than seeking to desperately prolong this position at undue expense, which would serve only to hasten America’s decline and weaken its long-term position, the United States should start thinking now about how it will exercise its power and influence once its preeminent position is over. The United States is still in a position to shape this new world order, by defining the rules, institutions, and patterns of legitimacy that will prevail in this new era of global politics. Periods of change in the global distribution of power are often chaotic, unstable, and violent. The United States will be responsible for maintaining some kind of global equilibrium so the end of one era of world politics and the emergence of a new, different era avoids the overt power competition and instability of previous transitions. While the United States will face more constraints and pushback from the rest of the world, it may actually be able to preserve and in some cases even expand its influence in this new era.

HARMS EXT. – NO THREAT TO AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

GOVERNMENT POLICIES ARE ONLY A FRACTION OF THE FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO A NATION'S LEADERSHIP

Joseph Nye, professor Harvard University, October 2010

[The Washington Quarterly, Volume 33, Number 4, October 2010, p. 146]

Despite being blamed for the financial crisis, U.S. soft power remained greater than that of China as measured by both The Chicago Council on Global Affairs and BBC polls. Great powers try to use culture and narrative to create soft power that promotes their advantage, but much of it is created by civil society rather than government. American soft power rests on a variety of resources that range from Hollywood to Harvard; from Madonna to the Gates Foundation; from Martin Luther King's speeches to Barack Obama's election. It is not easy for governments to sell their country's charm if their narrative is inconsistent with domestic realities. In that dimension, except for its economic success, China still has a long way to go.

HARMS EXT. – NO THREAT TO AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP, INCLUDING EFFECTIVE USE OF OUR MILITARY STRENGTH, WILL INCREASINGLY DEPEND ON “SOFT POWER” MECHANISMS – SPACE PROGRAM IRRELEVANT

Joseph Nye, Professor of International Relations, Harvard, March 18, 2008

[http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/18173/america_must_learn_the_hard_facts_of_soft_power.html]

The American presidential race commands attention around the world. The fact that the final three contenders include a woman, an African American, and an older man who often challenged his own party suggests that the United States, after a decline in popularity during the Bush years, retains a capacity to reinvent itself. But the next president must recognise that the nature of leadership is also changing. The information revolution is transforming politics and organisations. People today have become less deferential to authority in organisations and in politics. Soft power — the ability to get what you want by attraction rather than coercion or payment — is becoming more important. Even the military faces these changes. The Pentagon reports that American army drillmasters do "less shouting at everyone", because today's generation responds better to instructors who play "a more counseling-type role". Of course, the hard power of command remains important. Hard and soft power are related, because they are both approaches to achieving one's objectives by affecting the behavior of others. Hard and soft power can reinforce or undermine each other. In response to al-Qaeda's terrorist attacks on the US, Vice-President Dick Cheney argued that strong military action would deter further attacks. But the indiscriminate use of hard power — illustrated by the invasion of Iraq, the Abu Ghraib prison photos, and detentions without trial — served to increase the number of terrorist recruits. The absence of an effective soft power component undercut the strategic response to terrorism.

HARMS EXT. – NO THREAT TO AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

WARS ARE INEVITABLE WITH OR WITHOUT AMERICAN HEGEMONY – AND HEGEMONY ENTAILS STARTING SOME WARS

Daniel Larison, PhD University of Chicago, The American Conservative April 5, 2010

[<http://www.amconmag.com/larison/2010/04/05/a-bright-post-hegemonic-future/>]

In other words, unsustainable U.S. hegemony will not be as great as it was, and that will mean that other major and rising powers will be able to exert something more like the normal influence in their regions that such powers have exerted throughout most of modern history. Will there be conflicts in such a world? Of course, there will be, but we already have a number of conflicts in the world that have either been deemed irrelevant to the maintenance of Pax Americana or they are the products of policies designed to perpetuate Pax Americana. In practice, securing this “peace” has involved starting several wars, the largest and most destructive of which has been the war in Iraq, as well as supporting proxies and allies as they escalated conflicts with their neighbors.

CHALLENGES TO THE U.S. ARE INEVITABLE AND MAY EVEN BE CAUSED BY OUR HEGEMONIC POLICIES

Daniel Larison, PhD University of Chicago, The American Conservative April 5, 2010

[<http://www.amconmag.com/larison/2010/04/05/a-bright-post-hegemonic-future/>]

China will build up its military, as it is already doing, and Russia will continue to extend its influence into its “near-abroad,” and Iran will develop nuclear weapons. What is important to stress here is that all of these things already are or soon will be happening anyway. These things are happening despite, and perhaps in some cases because of, American military presence in their respective regions. The reality of multipolarity makes these first two more or less unavoidable, and as we have been seeing over the last few years there is nothing short of full-scale war with Iran that could realistically interrupt the development of its nuclear program. If Iran definitely decides to acquire nuclear weapons, there is remarkably little that any outside government can do to prevent this from happening. One sure way to guarantee that Iran pursues this route is to continue to act punitively towards Iran. If Western powers actively resist Russian efforts to exercise influence along its own borders as the U.S. and some European states have been doing, all that will result is the use of Russia’s smaller neighbors as Western proxies. This will have very unfortunate consequences for the proxies, which the Russians will intimidate and/or attack and which Western powers will not aid in direct conflicts with Russia.

SOLVENCY ANSWERS

The “Solvency” part of this file should be used to answer the 1AC’s “Observation III: Solvency” contentions. The Solvency Answers are called a “1NC Solvency Frontline.” These pieces of evidence should be read during the 1st Negative Constructive. The pieces of evidence should be referenced, or extended, during the 2nd Negative Constructive or 1st Negative rebuttal.

1NC Solvency Frontline

1. CHINA WON'T QUIT BUILDING ITS SPACE PROGRAM

Alanna Krolkowski, Visiting Scholar, Space Policy Institute, GW Univ., May 11, 2001

[Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission,
http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2011hearings/written_testimonies/hr11_05_11.php]

Today, the broadening and maturing space program more directly serves specific economic development goals. An important recent change in the relationship of the space sector to the rest of the economy is growth in the usage of space-derived products and services. New indigenously supplied space products and services and new users have emerged. Some of the most rapidly growing new applications are in remote sensing for mapping and surveying, natural-resource management, and urban planning, satellite navigation, weather forecasting, and disaster monitoring and mitigation.

2. SPACE IS BECOMING MORE IMPORTANT IN CHINA AS AN ECONOMIC ASSET

Alanna Krolkowski, Visiting Scholar, Space Policy Institute, GW Univ., May 11, 2001

[Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission,
http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2011hearings/written_testimonies/hr11_05_11.php]

The main users of space-derived data are still primarily central government agencies and large state-owned enterprises,³ but local and provincial governments and small and medium enterprises are increasingly important. One source reports over 20,000 companies in the surveying and mapping industry alone.⁴ Multiple levels of government also participate in large-scale space-related infrastructure projects such as the Digital China Geospatial Network, an initiative that will eventually deliver space-derived data to the public. The implications of this usage and user growth for economic development are that the space program today has more stakeholders and can be used to advance more policy agendas and commercial interests than ever before. Space is gradually becoming embedded across China's economy and governance structures.

3. CHINA USES SPACE TO DEVELOP EXPORT MARKETS GLOBALLY

Alanna Krolkowski, Visiting Scholar, Space Policy Institute, GW Univ., May 11, 2001

[Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission,
http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2011hearings/written_testimonies/hr11_05_11.php]

Developing markets occupy an important place in the Chinese space industry's export strategy. The Chinese government and space industry have taken note of the growing demand for space products and services in developing markets. Within the past five years, China has reached agreements to export or effectively donate satellites or launch services to Bangladesh, Bolivia, Indonesia, Laos, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Venezuela. These transactions were not internationally competed sales. Excluded from important global space markets by restrictions on U.S. technology exports, the Chinese space industry finds opportunities in developing countries that are subject to restrictions similar to those imposed on China. Venezuela and Pakistan are examples of this type of market.

1NC SOLVENCY FRONTLINE

4. CHINA IS INCREASING THEIR SATELLITE SERVICES SALES WORLDWIDE

Alanna Krolikowski, Visiting Scholar, Space Policy Institute, GW Univ., May 11, 2001

[Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission,
http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2011hearings/written_testimonies/hr11_05_11.php]

China's approach to space exports also leverages its firms' and government's unique advantage at operating in developing-world markets. Chinese satellite manufacturers are in a position to offer generous terms to buyers in developing countries, for whom price can be a decisive factor. Offering concessional financing terms, providing development assistance (formally or informally) tied to satellite purchases, and even accepting payment for satellites in barter has made it possible for China to create buyers of satellites where none previously existed. These arrangements are made easier by the fact that many buyers in developing countries are governments or state-owned enterprises like their Chinese counterparts.

5. CHINA SEES ITS SPACE PROGRAM AS IMPORTANT FOR ITS GREAT POWER STATUS AND PEACEFUL RISE

Alanna Krolikowski, Visiting Scholar, Space Policy Institute, GW Univ., May 11, 2001

[Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission,
http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2011hearings/written_testimonies/hr11_05_11.php]

Chinese leaders and policymakers emphasize the need to foster international attitudes and institutions that are supportive of their country's peaceful economic rise. The space program serves this end by reinforcing China's position as a capable party requiring inclusion in major international processes affecting space and by enhancing its influence in the developing world. Conspicuous and autonomous achievements in space also reinforce China's great power status and its membership in the elite club of advanced spacefaring countries. Chinese leaders emphasize the growing importance of space in international and security affairs and in the global economy. Regarding assured access to space as both an economic and national security interest, they fear exclusion from any international process that bears upon how space could be used in the future. Achieving significant space capabilities ensures that China will have a "seat at the table" when decisions about space are made.

6. CHINA'S SPACE PROGRAM IS INCREASINGLY TIED TO REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Alanna Krolikowski, Visiting Scholar, Space Policy Institute, GW Univ., May 11, 2001

[Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission,
http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2011hearings/written_testimonies/hr11_05_11.php]

Another industrial strategy for the space sector is also taking shape. Central, provincial, and local governments are investing in several space-technology industrial hubs near major historical centers of aerospace research, development, and production across the country. These efforts will leverage existing local competencies to create economies of agglomeration and clusters of networked expertise, conditions usually regarded as conducive to innovation, firm specialization, and small-business development in the lower tiers of high-technology industries. In addition, China is entering a phase of space-sector development during which even greater emphasis is placed on the commercialization of space technology. A policy priority during this time is making space more

relevant to lives of ordinary people and increasing domestic demand for space-related goods and services.