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Space is becoming a critical determinant of how states behave in the arena of international relations. The Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 has accentuated this dynamic, especially in how states strategize or utilize space to change how other states respond. Roscosmos Director General Dmitry Rogozin tweeted that U.S. sanctions affected the Russian aerospace industry, thereby severely undermining Russia’s capability to support the International Space Station (ISS) built on the cooperation of the U.S., Russia, Canada, Japan, and the European Space Agency (ESA). Rogozin implied that without Russian support for ISS positioning and orbiting, the plausibility of an uncontrolled fall towards Earth was high, and could impact countries like the U.S., India, or China. While NASA dismissed such claims, the strain of the Ukraine conflict directly affected space cooperation and revealed Russia’s willingness to use the ISS for strategic bargaining. Russia and ESA cancelled high-level space cooperation, forcing delays for the ExoMars program, and cancelled their joint lunar missions; Russia withdrew all its staff from the Kourou spaceport in French Guiana and suspended all space cooperation with ESA.

Consequently, the Russian invasion of Ukraine offers insights into how competition and conflict move into space. How do they affect allies’ and adversaries’ views of space-related capacities, and how have strategic alignments changed and adapted to new realities?

There are three drivers informing how space is being constituted, and how states are adapting to the realities of the 21st century. These include leadership and norm building; strategic alignment and space as “critical infrastructure and a national security asset”; and the salience of the commercial space sector in providing vivid images of the Ukrainian conflict to include Maxar’s images of the 40-mile-long Russian convoy outside of Kyiv. Moreover, when we speak of great power cooperation, we are really speaking about cooperation between countries that would otherwise compete for strategic advantage. So, while the Artemis Accords, for lunar development, led by the U.S. and signed by U.S. allied partners, is critical for space cooperation, it is not as much of a “game changer” in comparison to if India signs the Artemis Accords. Strategic alignments are playing out at the level of geopolitics vis-à-vis Ukraine with both China and India abstaining from deploring Russia’s Ukrainian invasion at the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and at the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA).

Considering these factors and recent events, what has changed, if at all, as competition and cooperation move into space? How do they affect allies’ and adversaries’ views of space-related capacities, and how have strategic alignments changed and adapted to new realities?
United Nations.

Leadership and Norm Building
Space is becoming an integral part of great power grand strategy for signaling leadership and the constitution of norms. Unlike the Cold War when space was perceived as part of ideological and technological prestige signaling by the U.S. or the erstwhile Soviet Union—a competition between capitalism and communism—today, great powers like the U.S. and China specify the economic contributions of space to the global economy. China has articulated ambitions for the utilization of space resources to include asteroid mining and developing space-based solar power (SBSP). The U.S. passed the Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act in 2015 that offers U.S. citizens the ability to own the resources that they would mine in space. India, which according to its Minister of External Affairs, S. Jaishankar, in his book The India Way, as a leading power, has articulated ambitions of playing a key role in constituting internal space regulations and external norm-building for space governance. Great powers are vying for establishing regional leadership by offering their space capabilities to countries in their region that lack it. China offers its BeiDou navigation system to countries in the Indo-Pacific. In 2014, India launched the South Asia satellite to cater to countries in South Asia. China also announced its Belt and Road Spatial Information Corridor in 2018 to develop the space infrastructure of member countries with China as the lead actor. Critically, one of the rationales for India's anti-satellite (ASAT) test in 2019 was to ensure that India is part of the ASAT regime, if and when constituted. This Indian strategic thinking is informed by the country's inability to become part of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty regime as a nuclear weapon state in 1970, due to its lack of a nuclear weapon test (India conducted its first nuclear tests in 1974). This, in turn, India argues, has created a discriminatory nuclear regime between the “nuclear haves” and the “nuclear have-nots.” India does not want a repeat of that strategic trauma in regard to space governance.

Strategic Alignment and Space as “Critical Infrastructure and National Security Asset”
While Russia’s invasion of Ukraine indicates that there are geopolitical fissures in regard to strategic alignment, these alignments played out in space well before February 2022. For instance, Russia and India signed a ten-year defense agreement in December 2021 to collaborate in high-end defense technologies and space cooperation. Indian astronauts trained for India's 2023 Low Earth Orbit mission (Gaganyaan) in the Yuri Gagarin Cosmonaut Training Center. China and Russia signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to develop a lunar research base by 2036. Russia indicated in mid-2021 its intention to leave the ISS by 2025, perhaps sooner now due to the Ukraine conflict, and plausibly partner with China's space station, the Tiangong. The U.S. announced its Artemis Lunar program in 2020, whereby it would sign bilateral agreements with democratic space nations to develop a lunar presence and resource utilization. In April 2020, Beijing designated space as part of “critical infrastructure.” The national security dimensions of space to include its direct support to Earth military capabilities and alignments forms a vital part of great
power competition and/or cooperation impacted by strategic alignments. Both China and Russia view their space development, both civilian and military, as augmenting national defense. China established the People’s Liberation Army Strategic Support Force (PLASSF) in 2015; the U.S. and India established their space forces in 2019. This trend has influenced middle powers like France (2019) and Japan (2020) to establish their own respective space forces.

**Salience of the United Nations for Space Governance**

Great power competition and/or cooperation have influenced member state activities in the UN. The concern over ASAT tests and space debris has motivated countries like the United Kingdom (UK) to introduce UNGA Resolution 75/36 to reduce space threats “through norms, rules, and principles of responsible state behavior.” In November 2021, the UN First Committee responsible for international security voted 163-8 to establish an Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) to develop rules and guidelines for military space activities, again sponsored by the UK. Luxembourg signed an MoU with the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA) to launch a project on space law for new space actors in 2019. In 2019, UNOOSA signed an MoU with the Asteroid Foundation of Luxembourg to raise awareness on asteroids and to build intergovernmental cooperation in regard to planetary defense via UNOOSA’s International Asteroid Warning Network (IAWN) and the Space Mission Planning Advisory Group (SMPAG). China and Russia introduced their draft treaty on the prevention of placement of weapons in outer space to the Conference of Disarmament in 2008. In 2019, Belgium and Greece introduced a resolution on regulating space resources to the Legal Sub-Committee of the UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS).

Great power competition and cooperation have resulted in broadcasting both civilian and military capacities. These have included signing civilian space cooperation agreements to explore the Moon and Mars along divergent strategic alignments resulting in competition between blocs (U.S.-led versus China-led). Cooperation between adversarial blocs (U.S.-China) in space is not possible due to legal stipulations (the 2011 Wolf amendment, which prevents NASA from cooperating with Chinese entities without permission), and due to genuine concerns of civil-military fusion of space activities in China. Strategic alignments are occurring along predictable lines; for instance, partners of the U.S.-led Artemis Accords include U.S. allies, with India still not a participant of either the U.S.-led or China-led space bloc. Middle powers are responding to great power alignments with a willingness to collaborate with both sides, based on their own strategic interests (Luxembourg is part of both the Artemis Accords and China’s BRI). Middle powers are utilizing their UN membership to constitute space norms that could restrain military activities of the great powers in space. The future of space depends on which great power can offer the most compelling inclusive vision backed by financial investments in the space infrastructure of partner nations.
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