© JMSR 2025 ‖ P-ISSN: 3107-1325 ‖ E-ISSN: 3107-1333 www.jmsrbd.com

Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies and Research
Volume 1, Issue 1, 2025
Indexed Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal

Outer Space as a Domain of Conflict: A Critical Analysis of Militarization and Weaponization

Md. Al-Amin
Lecturer, Department of Law, Bangladesh University, Dhaka

ABSTRACT

Outer space, once regarded as a peaceful global commons dedicated to scientific exploration and cooperation, is increasingly emerging as a contested domain of strategic competition. This paper critically examines the growing trends of militarization and weaponization in outer space, highlighting how advancements in space technology and the pursuit of national security interests have transformed the space environment into a potential theater of conflict. While militarization, such as the deployment of satellites for communication, surveillance, and navigation,has long been accepted as a legitimate use of space, the gradual shift toward weaponization, including anti-satellite (ASAT) systems and space-based weapons, raises serious legal, ethical, and security concerns. The study evaluates the adequacy of existing international legal frameworks, particularly the Outer Space Treaty, in addressing contemporary challenges. It argues that these frameworks are insufficient to regulate emerging threats, given their ambiguity and lack of enforcement mechanisms. Furthermore, the paper explores the implications of space militarization on global stability, the risk of an arms race, and the potential for conflict escalation beyond Earth.By integrating legal analysis with geopolitical perspectives, this research underscores the urgent need for updated international norms, transparency measures, and cooperative governance to prevent the weaponization of space. It concludes that preserving outer space as a peaceful domain requires collective action, stronger regulatory instruments, and a renewed commitment to the principle of space as the "province of all mankind."

1.1 Introduction

Outer space has long been envisioned as a realm of peace, cooperation, and scientific advancement, often described as the "province of all mankind." Since the launch of Sputnik 1 in 1957, space activities have expanded rapidly, transforming the domain into an essential component of modern life. Satellites now underpin global communication, navigation, climate monitoring, and national security infrastructures. However, alongside these beneficial uses, outer space has increasingly become an arena of geopolitical rivalry and strategic competition. Militarization refers to the use of space assets such as reconnaissance and communication satellites for defense and security purposes. In contrast, weaponization involves the development and deployment of offensive capabilities in space, including anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons designed to disable or destroy space-based systems. While militarization has been widely accepted as a legitimate extension of state sovereignty and security, the progression toward weaponization raises profound legal, ethical, and security concerns. The existing international legal framework, particularly the Outer Space Treaty, was established during the Cold War to ensure that space remains free from the placement of weapons of mass destruction and is used for peaceful purposes. However, the treaty's provisions are often criticized for their ambiguity and inability to address modern technological advancements, such as cyber warfare in space, dual-use technologies, and the testing of ASAT systems. As major space-faring nations continue to invest in military space

capabilities, the risk of an arms race in outer space becomes increasingly apparent.This paper seeks to critically analyze the transformation of outer space into a potential domain of conflict by examining the legal, political, and strategic dimensions of militarization and weaponization. It will explore the limitations of existing legal regimes, assess the implications for international peace and security, and highlight the urgent need for updated regulatory mechanisms. Ultimately, the study aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse on preserving outer space as a secure, sustainable, and cooperative environment for future generations.(Ahmed)

1.2 Article 4 of the Outer Space Treaty and Space Exploration

Outer space has traditionally been regarded as a domain reserved for peaceful exploration and scientific advancement. This foundational principle is embedded within the Outer Space Treaty, particularly in Article 4, which serves as a cornerstone in regulating military activities in space. As technological advancements and geopolitical rivalries intensify, Article 4 has become increasingly significant in shaping the legal and strategic landscape of space exploration.Article 4 primarily aims to prevent the extension of armed conflict into outer space by prohibiting the placement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) in orbit or on celestial bodies. It also mandates that the Moon and other celestial bodies be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, explicitly banning the establishment of military bases, fortifications, and weapons testing in such environments. This provision reflects the global consensus during the Cold War era to avoid the catastrophic consequences of an extraterrestrial arms race.Despite its clear normative objectives, Article 4 contains notable limitations that have allowed the gradual militarization of space. One of the most significant gaps is its narrow focus on WMDs, which leaves room for the development and deployment of conventional weapons. As a result, states have increasingly invested in anti-satellite (ASAT) technologies and other space-based capabilities that, while not explicitly prohibited, pose serious threats to the sustainability and security of space operations. This legal loophole highlights the distinction between militarization, widely accepted as the use of space for defense purposes, and weaponization, which involves the deployment of offensive systems. Furthermore, the treaty's reliance on the concept of "peaceful purposes" introduces interpretative ambiguity. While some scholars argue that "peaceful" should mean strictly non-military, the prevailing interpretation among major space-faring nations equates it with "non-aggressive" use. This broader interpretation has enabled the continued use of military personnel and assets in space exploration, provided such activities are not overtly hostile. Consequently, dual-use technologies such as satellites for communication, navigation, and surveillance blur the line between civilian and military applications, complicating regulatory efforts. In the context of space exploration, Article 4 has had both enabling and constraining effects. On one hand, it has fostered international cooperation by ensuring that celestial bodies remain free from military conflict, thereby encouraging joint scientific missions and peaceful exploration initiatives. On the other hand, its limited scope has allowed strategic competition to flourish in Earth's orbit, where military activities are not comprehensively regulated. This has led to increasing concerns about the potential for conflict escalation, particularly as states develop capabilities to disrupt or destroy space-based infrastructure.The contemporary relevance of Article 4 is further challenged by rapid technological advancements and the emergence of new actors in space. The testing of ASAT weapons, the proliferation of space debris, and the growing involvement of private entities underscore the inadequacy of existing legal frameworks. Article 4 lacks effective enforcement mechanisms and does not address modern forms of warfare, such as cyber operations targeting space assets. These shortcomings raise critical questions about the treaty's ability to maintain space as a peaceful domain in the twenty-first century.(United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs, 1967)

2. Amendment of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty and the Resolution

The rapid transformation of outer space into a strategically contested domain has intensified calls for the amendment of the Outer Space Treaty and the adoption of more effective international resolutions to address emerging challenges. When the treaty was adopted in

1967, it reflected the geopolitical realities of the Cold War and sought primarily to prevent the extension of nuclear conflict into space by prohibiting the placement of weapons of mass destruction in orbit and ensuring that celestial bodies would be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. While these principles remain fundamentally important, the treaty's provisions are increasingly viewed as outdated in light of contemporary technological advancements, the diversification of space actors, and the growing militarization and potential weaponization of outer space. As a result, scholars, policymakers, and international organizations have emphasized the urgent need to revisit and strengthen the existing legal framework through amendments and supplementary resolutions.One of the primary shortcomings of the Outer Space Treaty lies in its limited scope. The treaty does not explicitly prohibit the deployment of conventional weapons in space, nor does it adequately address the development and testing of anti-satellite (ASAT) technologies, which pose significant threats to both military and civilian space infrastructure. Modern conflicts are no longer confined to traditional domains; instead, they increasingly rely on space-based assets for communication, navigation, intelligence, and surveillance. The absence of clear legal restrictions on such activities creates a regulatory vacuum that allows states to pursue aggressive space capabilities without formally breaching international law. Consequently, any meaningful amendment to the treaty must expand its scope to include a comprehensive prohibition on the weaponization of outer space, encompassing both nuclear and conventional weapons, as well as emerging technologies such as cyber and electronic warfare targeting space systems. (Ahmed)

In addition to broadening substantive prohibitions, amendments to the treaty should address its lack of enforcement mechanisms. Currently, the Outer Space Treaty relies heavily on the principle of good faith and voluntary compliance, which is insufficient in an era of intense geopolitical competition. There is no dedicated international body with the authority to monitor compliance, investigate violations, or impose sanctions. This institutional weakness undermines the effectiveness of the treaty and limits its ability to deter unlawful activities. Therefore, a revised framework should consider establishing an independent international monitoring authority, possibly under the auspices of the United Nations, with the mandate to oversee space activities, ensure transparency, and facilitate dispute resolution among states.Another critical area for amendment concerns the ambiguity surrounding key concepts such as "peaceful purposes" and "due regard." The lack of precise definitions has allowed states to interpret these terms in ways that justify a wide range of military activities in space. For instance, many space-faring nations adopt the view that "peaceful" means "non-aggressive," thereby permitting military uses that do not involve direct hostilities. While this interpretation has enabled the continued development of space-based defense systems, it also weakens the normative foundation of the treaty. Clarifying these concepts through formal amendments or interpretative resolutions would help establish a more consistent and enforceable legal standard, reducing the risk of misinterpretation and conflict.

The role of international resolutions is equally important in shaping the evolution of space law. Although amendments to the Outer Space Treaty require consensus among state parties, a process that is often politically challenging, United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) resolutions can serve as important instruments for developing customary international law and guiding state behavior. Over the years, the UNGA has adopted several resolutions aimed at promoting the peaceful use of outer space, enhancing transparency, and preventing an arms race in space. To address this limitation, states should work towards transforming key principles articulated in these resolutions into binding legal obligations, either through treaty amendments or the negotiation of new international agreements.Strengthening regulatory oversight of private actors is essential to ensure that commercial interests do not undermine the principles of peaceful use and sustainability. Another pressing concern is the issue of space debris, which has been exacerbated by military testing, particularly ASAT demonstrations. The creation of debris not only threatens active satellites but also endangers future space missions, thereby undermining the long-term sustainability of outer space activities. While the Outer Space Treaty emphasizes the need to avoid harmful contamination, it does not provide specific guidelines or enforcement measures to address the

problem of debris. Amendments should therefore incorporate binding obligations to minimize debris generation, promote responsible behavior, and establish liability mechanisms for damage caused by space debris. In light of these challenges, a comprehensive approach to reforming the Outer Space Treaty must combine formal amendments with the strategic use of international resolutions. While amendments can provide legally binding rules, resolutions can serve as importantstepping stones for building consensus and shaping state practice. Together, these mechanisms can help bridge the gap between existing legal norms and contemporary realities, ensuring that the governance of outer space remains effective and relevant. The amendment of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, supported by robust and enforceable international resolutions, is essential to address the evolving challenges of space security and governance. The current legal framework, though foundational, is insufficient to regulate modern technological developments, prevent the weaponization of space, and manage the increasing involvement of private actors. By expanding the scope of prohibitions, clarifying key legal concepts, establishing enforcement mechanisms, and strengthening international cooperation, the global community can preserve outer space as a peaceful and sustainable domain. Without such reforms, the risk of conflict, environmental degradation, and legal uncertainty in outer space will continue to grow, threatening not only the future of space exploration but also the stability of international peace and security.

3. Recommendations

1. **Strengthen International Treaties**: Amend existing space treaties to explicitly prohibit the deployment of space-based weapons and establish clear definitions around militarization and weaponization.
2. **Establish Space Weapon-Free Zones**: Propose the creation of demilitarized zones in space, particularly around sensitive regions such as geostationary orbit, to avoid the escalation of conflicts.
3. **Promote Arms Control for Space**: Establish new arms control frameworks that address the unique challenges of space-based warfare, including regulations on anti-satellite weapons (ASAT) and space-based lasers.
4. **Enhance Transparency in Space Activities**: Foster global transparency through the creation of an international space operations registry, ensuring that nations disclose their military-related space activities.
5. **Develop Confidence-Building Measures**: Encourage confidence-building measures (CBMs) that involve the regular exchange of information about space capabilities to reduce the likelihood of misunderstandings and accidental escalation.
6. **Incorporate Space Sustainability**: Integrate sustainability protocols to minimize space debris caused by military operations, such as ASAT testing and satellite collisions, which pose long-term risks to all space actors.
7. **Prevent the Militarization of Dual-Use Technologies**: Limit the military use of dual-use technologies, ensuring that civilian innovations are not easily repurposed for military objectives, thus preventing unintended militarization.
8. **Foster Multilateral Cooperation in Space**: Create more multilateral forums and agreements for cooperation in space, ensuring that space remains a global commons rather than becoming a militarized domain of competition.
9. **Strengthen International Space Law Enforcement**: Establish an independent international body to monitor compliance with space treaties and resolutions and impose sanctions on violators.
10. **Limit the Testing of Anti-Satellite Weapons**: Ban the testing of anti-satellite weapons in space to reduce the creation of space debris and minimize the risk of escalating space conflict.
11. **Develop Space Norms and Ethics**: Work to define ethical norms surrounding military activities in space, ensuring that space operations adhere to broader international humanitarian law principles.
12. **Increase Space Traffic Management**: Develop global space traffic management systems to avoid satellite collisions and improve coordination between military and civilian space activities.

13. **Adopt an International Code of Conduct**: Implement a global code of conduct for space-faring nations to promote responsible behavior and collaboration in space exploration and military activities.
14. **Engage Non-Space-Faring Nations**: Involve countries without space capabilities in international discussions about space security, ensuring a global approach to space governance.
15. **Create Space Security Alliances**: Foster the development of international space security alliances that encourage countries to collaborate on space defense capabilities, rather than engage in an arms race.
16. **Implement Space Resource Sharing**: Create protocols for the equitable sharing of space resources to prevent conflicts over space mining and other space-based economic activities.
17. **Promote Research on Non-Weaponized Space Defense**: Fund research into defensive technologies that can protect space assets without resorting to offensive weapons, such as space-based shields or collision-avoidance technologies.
18. **Invest in Diplomatic Engagement on Space Issues**: Establish permanent diplomatic teams dedicated to addressing space-related conflicts and arms control, providing continuous dialogue between space powers.
19. **Encourage Civilian and Military Collaboration**: Promote greater collaboration between civilian space agencies (e.g., NASA, ESA) and military entities to ensure space technologies are used for peaceful purposes.
20. **Ensure Accountability for Space Militarization**: Hold nations accountable for any militarization of space that violates existing international agreements, ensuring enforcement of peacekeeping mechanisms.
21. **Create Space Conflict Prevention Mechanisms**: Develop early-warning systems to detect any potential conflict in space and offer mechanisms for peaceful resolution before escalation occurs.
22. **Establish a Space Conflict Resolution Forum**: Establish an international forum for resolving space-related conflicts, similar to the United Nations Security Council, where space-faring nations can engage in negotiations and mediate disputes.
23. **Improve Space-based Surveillance**: Implement space surveillance systems that can monitor hostile actions or potential threats in space, promoting proactive defensive measures.
24. **Develop and Promote Space Diplomacy**: Promote space diplomacy as a central part of international relations, encouraging countries to focus on peaceful collaboration rather than competition in space.
25. **Enhance Public Awareness of Space Security**: Conduct public awareness campaigns to educate citizens about the importance of space security, fostering support for international efforts to prevent space conflicts.
26. **Strengthen National Space Security Policies**: Encourage countries to develop their own space security policies that align with international norms and support peace and sustainability in space.
27. **Support Space-Based Research on Conflict Prevention**: Fund research projects that explore new methods of preventing conflict in space, particularly focusing on technologies that can neutralize threats without causing harm.
28. **Monitor the Militarization of Space Infrastructure**: Create a global monitoring body to track the militarization of space infrastructure and enforce policies that ensure compliance with peace-focused regulations.

Conclusion

Outer space, historically conceptualized as a domain of collective human endeavor and scientific exploration, has increasingly evolved into a contested strategic environment. The processes of militarization and weaponization, while distinct in nature, are converging to transform the space domain into a potential theater of conflict. Militarization, through the deployment of satellites for reconnaissance, communication, navigation, and early-warning functions, has become an integral and largely accepted component of national security

architectures. Conversely, weaponization manifested in the development of anti-satellite (ASAT) systems, directed energy technologies, and other space-based offensive capabilities poses profound risks to both global security and the sustainability of space operations. These developments underscore the vulnerability of space assets and elevate the likelihood of strategic miscalculations that could extend conflict beyond terrestrial boundaries.The Outer Space Treaty provides the foundational legal framework governing outer space, establishing prohibitions on the placement of weapons of mass destruction in orbit and mandating the peaceful use of celestial bodies. Despite its historical significance, the treaty'sprovisions are increasingly insufficient to address contemporary challenges. Notably, the absence of explicit restrictions on conventional weapons, the ambiguous interpretation of "peaceful purposes," and the lack of enforceable compliance mechanisms have created regulatory lacunae. The dual-use character of modern space technologies further complicates enforcement and interpretation, allowing states to pursue strategic capabilities under the guise of legitimate military or scientific activity.In sum, the militarization and weaponization of outer space represent critical challenges to international security, law, and the sustainable utilization of the orbital environment. Preserving space as a domain for peaceful exploration, scientific collaboration, and human advancement requires urgent multilateral engagement, legally binding reforms, and robust institutional oversight. Without such measures, the outer space environment risks becoming an arena of strategic conflict, with potentially profound implications for global stability, technological progress, and the collective interests of humanity.

Reference

1. Ahmed, D. P., 2022.*Cologne Commentary on Space Law (Bengali)*. Vol. 1. Dhaka: Kamrul Book House.
2. United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs, 1967. Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (UN Doc A/RES/2222 (XXI)).
3. NASA, 2020. Artemis Accords: Principles for Cooperation in the Civil Exploration and Use of the Moon, Mars, Comets, and Asteroids for Peaceful Purposes. Available at: https://www.nasa.gov/specials/artemis-accords/index.html
4. Jakhu, R.S., Pelton, J.N. & Nyampong, Y., 2019. The Commercialization of Space: Legal Challenges and Opportunities. Space Policy, 45, p.101.
5. Johnson-Freese, J., 2021. Artemis Accords and the Law of the Moon. Journal of Space Law, 52, p. 33.
6. Liou, J-C., 2020. Space Debris and Sustainability. Acta Astronautica, 66, p. 999.
7. Tronchetti, F., 2018. Jurisdiction and Legal Control in Outer Space: The Future of Space Law. Journal of Air Law and Commerce, 43, p. 55.
8. Bangladesh Space Research and Remote Sensing Organization (SPARRSO), 2023. Towards a National Space Policy.
9. United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs, 2022. International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. Available at: https://www.unoosa.org
10. Space Security Index, 2024. Space Traffic Management and Cybersecurity Challenges. Available at: https://spacesecurity.org [Accessed 21 August 2025].
11. Hammack, K., 2021. 'International Relations in Space: The Role of Miscalculation, Militarization, and Weaponization.' Astropolitics
12. Johnson-Freese, J. & Burbach, D., 2019. 'The Outer Space Treaty and the weaponization of space.' Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 75(4), pp. 137–141.
13. Farooqui, M. O. & Qureshi, T., 2024. 'Outer Space Militarization and the Emerging Paradigm of Weaponization: Implications for Space Security and International Regulation.' Revista Justiça do Direito, 38(2), pp. 116–145.
14. Pelton, J. N., 2017. 'Space Security, Defense and Weapons.' In: The New Gold Rush.
15. Tehsin, M., 2020. 'Space Weaponization and Strategic Stability in South Asia.' Global Social Sciences Review, V (I), pp. 689–695.