

A Critical Evaluation Of Moon Treaty And It's Adequacy In Governing Outer Space In The Face Of Space Militarization And Terrorism

Bright Phiri^{1*}, Rhishkesh Dave²

Abstract

In the last 20 years, outer space has experienced tremendous growth, with the launch of Sputnik 1 by the Russians, the world has seen more countries either launch or show interest in exploring outer space and, there are currently 110 signatories to the outer space treaty.

National security has led to main countries considering establishing their military presence in space, fear of some countries or individuals it using to attack each other has shifted how concerned people perceive space in its entirety, the questions as to who owns certain areas of space still loom across because states with presence in space claim pieces of land in space, this is exacerbating the increase in military activities in space, countries have started establishing space force. Currently Outer Space is governed through Space Treaty (1967) and other five protocols by the United Nations Office of Outer Space (UNOOSA). The said treaty was signed during the cold war between USSR and the USA, the space treaty came into law almost sixty years ago and it has become absolute, private businesses and modern technological advancements witnessed in recent passed are not addressed in the outer space treaty. its intended purpose was demilitarize Outer space because of fears that space could be for military purposes during the Cold war, The intention of outer space treaty was to ensure that outer space is used for peaceful purposes only,

UNOOSA performs its mandate solely on information received from states with presence in outer space, it does not have a space station but depends on the goodwill of space agencies, and there are main questions with regards to the authenticity of information provided by the state parties because they are interested parties.

The paper aims to provide solutions to the issues raised herein, this will be achieved by getting an insight into the administration of Outer space by COPUOS, the militarization of outer space and terrorism in space. Lastly, the research will explore the effectiveness of the Outer Space treaty of 1967 in the 21st century putting into consideration sovereignty and concluding by providing solutions to the same.

^{1*}PhD law Scholar, Marwadi University

² Dean-Faculty of Law, Marwadi University

KEYWORDS: MOON TREATY, MILITARIZATION OF SPACE, SPACE
TERRORISM

2. Introduction

As earlier alluded the Space law started when USSR launched the first artificial satellite in 1967, they named it Sputnik 1, it was the world's first and part of the geophysical year, before for that super powers started having serious conversations about space and its immense benefits in terms of investment prospects.¹

The year 1957 sparked the beginning of space race, countries started collaboration to discuss the possibility of ensuring that space be used for peaceful purposes, the USA and USSR teamed up in 1958, the above collaboration led to issue being tabled at the international stage by the United Nations, in the following year the UN created the committed on the peaceful uses of outer space (COPUOS), COPOUS in turn formed two sub-committees, namely: the scientific and technical subcommittee and the legal subcommittee. The legal subcommittee has played a very important role in ensuring that it acts as a primary playing field for discussion and negotiations of international agreements relating to outer space.²

3. Administration of Outer space

UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space main objective is to implement the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and that of the. The office has the dual objective of supporting the intergovernmental discussions in the Committee and its Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and Legal Subcommittee, and assisting developing states in using space technology for development.

The mandate was several times adjusted allowing the Office, among other tasks, the coordination of the inter-agency cooperation within the United Nations on the use of space technology - UN-Space resolution 3234³ implementation of the United Nations Program on Space Applications (resolution 2601A⁴ and the UN-SPIDER Program for

¹ Andrew G. 1963, *Haley Space law and government*, at 12, Appleton century crofts

² Andrew G. Haley (1961) "*Survey of Legal Opinion on Extraterrestrial Jurisdiction*", in *proceedings of the eleventh International Astronautical Congress*, Stockholm 1960, at 37–92,

³ Mandate on UN programme on space applications, the General Assembly resolution 37/90 of 10 December, 1982 gave the following mandate in the implementation of the programme to the UN office of the outer space. UN press

⁴ *I'd at 6*

disaster risk management and emergency response (resolution 61/110).

Besides the functions mentioned above the Office is maintaining coordination and cooperation with space agencies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations involved in space-related activities and keeps the register of objects launched into Outer Space on behalf of the UN Secretary-General. The office has also been helping poor nations suffering from climate change-related problems by helping them access satellite images for free ⁵.

COPOUS does not have the space station or satellites to monitor activities of state parties but depends on the goodwill of States like USA, China, EU, RUSSIA and others, in short it basically administer space based on the secondary information from the above mentioned States, a situation which begs the question, how credible is the information voluntarily given by these States? the truth is no one knows, what we know is the no country can freely give information it has acquired at a great cost, one cannot be wrong to speculate that, the aforementioned States hides some valuable information from the rest of the world.

4. Sovereignty in space

The idea of the outer space being a province for all humankind as stated in Article 1 of the Outer space treaty⁶ is unattainable, states have invested huge sums of money in militarization of space and other civilian investments which needs protection from distraction, some parts of outer space must be out of bounds from undesirable people with ill motives, we can't trust everyone in outer space hence the need for sovereignty because outer space is a vast area no one can singlehandedly monitor every activity⁷.

Debates have ensued to demarcate outer space but first the term outer space must be defined, questions as to where outer space starts and ends still looms the minds of many legal scholars, despite the above debates, Countries like the USA have already began sending civilians in to space, calls for jurisdiction and sovereignty will continue, the international community must come to the realization that this is not the 1950's anymore and begin to formulate international treaties which will attend to this latest trends in the outer space.

⁵ Valarie insinna, 2019, *Trump officially organizes the space force under air force*. For now, USA Defense news

⁶ Article 1, Outer space treaty 1967

⁷ COPUOS, 2019 Session, *Committee on the peaceful uses of outer space*, UNOOSA

This paper is of the view that space shouldn't remain the territory of humanity, this has keep the private part from putting resources into clarification of minerals into space, in the long run the head of rivalry has been vanquished thus it has turned out to be progressively hard for creating nations to dispatch satellite into space.⁸

5. Shift in perspective

In the not very inaccessible past, activities in space were just accessible to the world's superpowers: specifically the USA and Russia. We've seen the quantity of nations with space programs gradually increment throughout the years.

As of late the expense of working in space has significantly diminished, permitting an enormous number of nations, and even some privately owned businesses, to end up engaged with space activities on a genuine scale.

Tragically, the expansion in the quantity of players working in space carries with it new issues. One issue is that a few newcomers may utilize their recently discovered capacities in tricky ways, for example, space terrorism.

6. Military exercises in space

The outer space treaty has prohibited states from deploying nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction but fails short of defining weapons of "mass destruction", in space everything can used as a a weapon, starting with a simple stone to space debris can cause catastrophic damage to satellites, we don't have to confuse militarization with weaponizing of outer space, USSR installed military satellite way before Sputnik 1 and military are already using the outer space for command but militarization is a new phenomenon, as far as the author is concerned there is no known military activities in space. The above mentioned is just on paper, the reality is the space is turning into an undeniably significant part of military control, all the more particularly to the United States. The USA is as of now putting billions of dollars yearly in the advancement and arrangement of a wide scope of new exactness guided weapons which are changing the lead of fighting, in face on the USA voted against the treaty to forestall the situation .of weapons in the space and of the danger or Use of power against outer space object in 2008, presented by RUSSIA and China. These weapons depend vigorously on an incorporated 'arrangement

⁸ Space Law (2016), United Nations Office of the Outer space available at <http://www.spaceresources.public.lu/en/index.html>. last visited on 8/05/22

of frameworks' that consolidates knowledge, correspondences, route and other military space frameworks.⁹

At present no nation can opponent or challenge US space predominance or then again the preferences this gives to its earthbound military purposes. Toward the finish of 2001, the USA had almost 110 operational military-related satellites, representing great more than 66% of every single military satellite circling the earth; Russia had about 40 and the remainder of the world around 20.¹⁰

The paper is quick to note that, while it is hard to bring up the advantages of US military space frameworks in respect to those of the remainder of the world, it's an error to think little of the quickness with which other states are starting to utilize space-based frameworks to improve their security also. Albeit business satellite symbolism gives capacities that are generally little contrasted with those of cutting edge US frameworks, these abilities have definitely changed in contrast with what was accessible 10 years back. The militarization is been on the plan, this is expected dangers from the USA, and it's putting billions of dollars in military exercises in space. China and Russia have led the pack in requiring the exchange of another multilateral treaty precluding the organization of weapons in space and limiting its utilization for quiet purposes. For its part, the USA has indicated little enthusiasm for understandings that would compel its military exercises in space.

The space settlement was intended to deliver to use space for serene purposes, States will not put atomic weapons or different weapons of mass annihilation in circle or on heavenly bodies or station them in space in some other way; as can be noticed the space treaty does not disallow military use as a rule, this proviso is obscure, it needs clearness, I.e the USA deciphers that condition to mean non-forceful military use, RUSSIA it implies for Defensive purposes just, these are wellspring of unintended discussion encompassing the space arrangement henceforth require a very much organized bit of governing body since it will direct even the most power states.

Current studies have shown no significant threat with regards to terrorism in space but the international community and the United Nations are lagging behind in preparations for a possible future attack through outer space, rather than being reactive Policy makers must ensure that they foresee new terrorist methods.

⁹ Meghan Bartels (2018), *Space has always been militarized, at 67, not just weaponized-not yet anyway*, spaceflight

¹⁰¹⁰ John .P(2001), *Military uses of outer space*, available at <https://www.sipri.or/files>, last visited on 09/07/22

Undemocratic states Like North Korea and Iran with the capability to launch satellites in space can be used as a launching space for terrorism purposes.

7. Terrorism

Currently, there is no universally agreed definition of the term terrorism; terrorism definition can be defined as the deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or a threat of violence in pursuit of political change, specifically designed to have far-reaching psychological effects beyond the immediate victim(s) or objects of the terrorist attack.¹¹

Seen as a compromise component, psychological warfare can be comprehensively seen as a methodology sent by people, either individually or in groups, to determine questions. The premise of such debates could be founded on distributional issues or only existential based on religious conflict or have an establishment in the authentic past causing determined clash. Apparently, segregating between these different sources can advise ideal counterterrorism strategy, and if there is any an incentive in a method of request named The Economics of Terrorism, it ought to illuminate the causes and outcomes regarding fear based oppression.

Extremists such as Taliban, Hamans, Al-Shabaab, Al-Qeada, Boko haram, Hezbollah and other radical groups are conceivably active operating world over and terrorizing different parts of the world by using extreme religious groups by use of bombing and other gruesome tactics to achieve their political and religious aim, suicide increasingly deadly and pick suicide terrorism approach all the more regularly when they give favorable neighborhood open merchandise. The thought processes in these terrorists groups are philanthropy, constancy to rule, and a craving for equity. The longing to obliterate is fundamental to their motivation and activity. As it were, utility boost or fulfillment originates from gigantic demolition to legitimize their motivation. In any case, Kruglanski and Fishman bolster the way that terrorism is mental in nature, and a given methods will be used when the normal mental utility is higher than that of different methods, and the normal utility is controlled by how well a given methods is viewed as adding to the ideal destinations.¹² A few investigations additionally

¹¹ Huffkin, Bruce (1994), *Inside terrorism*, pp40, New York, Columbia University Press, Alex P, Discusses more that more 100 definitions off terrorism, trying to offer reasonably comprehensive application of the word Terrorism.

¹² Kruglanski, Fishman (2006), *Terrorism Beyond Syndrome and Tool*, SAGE journals

demonstrate that the requirement for political opportunity and soundness can bring about fear based oppression and gigantic obliteration as a way to challenge economic and political circumstances in nations where political flimsiness exists. For instance, Abadie demonstrated that danger of terrorism isn't fundamentally higher for less fortunate nations, and nation explicit attributes, for example, political opportunity and nations with exceptionally dictator systems, for example, Iraq and Russia that are experiencing progress have an affinity to draw in and continue psychological oppressor exercises.¹³

The investigations of Kruglanski, Crenshaw, and Combs propose that terrorism is a social mental wonder use by minority groups to impact economic, political, and social approaches.¹⁴ There is an inclination for these groups to draw in the feeble who look for acknowledgment and feel that the overwhelming class has denied them of what is legitimately theirs. The inspiration for the minority group to end up brutal depends on relative hardship hypothesis where results, for example, salary experienced by people are second rate compared to those that they hope to get or qualified for. Despite the fact that the hypothesis of relative hardship has been the overwhelm clarification of psychological oppression, Brush (1996) found that this hypothesis may never again be viewed as the essential driver of aggregate forcefulness, in spite of the fact that it might fill in as a critical contributing element under some social conditions. Utilizing a pooled relapse and proof from transformed U-formed relationship, Davis (1999) and Crenshaw (2000) likewise discovered that there is certain connection between expanded restraint and political and aggregate savagery.

The technique for these groups is to pick an objective that would arch the greatest mischief or wounds on the lion's share gathering to show their capacity and presence. Their principal targets are normally business-related regions with the serious monetary expense to the legislature and society. Using board information, Greenbaum, Dugan, and LaFree found that terrorist assaults decreased the number of firms and work in the year following an assault in Italy. The financial expense of psychological warfare is to prevent new business definitions and extensions along these lines expanding the joblessness rate in the zone following the terrorist assault.¹⁵

¹³ Abadie .A(2005), *Poverty, Political Freedom and the Roots of Terrorism*, MIT Economics

¹⁴ Id at 67

¹⁵ Lafree .G (2006), *Introducing Global terrorism Database: terrorism and politics*

Krueger and Maleckova found that there is a positive connection between interest in human capital and suicide assaults.¹⁶ For instance, a suicide aircraft would be knowledgeable and stable to survey and pass judgment on the exchange of and probability or likelihood of being gotten or caught if misguided thinking is worked out. Benmelech and Berrebi if experimental proof to help the hypothesis that higher interest in human capital gives a bigger peripheral advantage to terrorist militant groups, terrorist groups working under personal circumstances are streamlining on benefits.¹⁷

8. Space terrorism

At present the Outer space treaty of 1967 is a governing international convention, it calls on state parties to explore and use outer space in the interest of all states and for the benefit of all mankind but the space weaponizing the outer space has significantly increased lately is posing a serious to the use of space for peaceful purposes, we don't know what kind of military activities and which states or organizations operating in space, currently military activities are confined to gathering and transmitting information but may soon change, there are growing concerns over emplacement of lethal weapons, these activities are taking place in the name of international security and are being conducted by States in the name of international peace and national security.

Security concerns keep on increasing States like the USA have put in place electromagnetic beat (EMP) terrorist assault systems to identify and shoot down enemy satellites in its track or jam them, this if it ever occurs will make huge blasts making an entire scope of circles unusable for both regular citizen and military purposes for a considerable length of time to come.

The aforementioned military activities are dangerously dragging the international community into a space war like we have never seen, already unable to deal with extremist groups on earth, we have lamentably failed to curtail the activities and the execution of millions of innocent civilian population by terrorist groups, is there are chance that is we can defeat them in outer space? The world is currently experiencing war in Ukraine and Russia is by far one of the biggest players in space, it turns hostel are we going to contain it and later on defeat it and save massive investments and in outer space.

¹⁶ Kruegar (2003), *Education Poverty and terrorism, is there a causal Connection?*, American Economic association

¹⁷ Benmelech .E(2007), *Human capita and the productivity of the suicide bomber*, journal of economic prospective

Military activities in outer space must be discouraged and if possible prohibited by all states even for defensive purposes because, it's difficult to monitor and inspect the purpose and amount of damage these may cause because ramifications will be enormous not only in outer space but on earth as well.

9. Space Treaty

The Outer Space Treaty Settlement on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies received by the General Assembly in its goals 2222 (XXI), opened for mark on 27th January 1967, came into force on 11th October 1967.¹⁸

Understanding Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies Embraced by the General Assembly in its goals 34/68, opened for mark on 18th December 1979, came into force on 11th July 1984.

The moon treaty and other conventions have assumed an exceptionally crucial role in overseeing the external use of space for as long as 50 years, that's why moon treaty which is a mother of the various space governing conventions some contend that it is a magna carter of space. It has made due in the course of the most recent 5 decades from 18 signatories when it was enacted to current 110 signatories, from 2 states with a presence on space in 1967 to more than 40 states now and the number is still increasing.

Innovation is moving at a quick pace, the space treat has not been changed or amended to conform to present day developments, a portion of the super power have been exploiting the shortcoming and the equivocalness of the treaty to propel their interests.

10. Analysis of Treaty

The paper argues that a portion of the essential terms utilized in the space treaty like space tourism, dispatch vehicle, serene reason, situation in earth circle, space object, space flotsam and jetsam, weapons of mass demolition, region of humankind, and so forth could have been characterized plainly. Some legitimate researchers can discover space to confuse and change the entire motivation behind the arrangement, is to be sure indefensible, some starting states get enticed serving their interests and possess progression Legal researchers have occupied with arguments in court with the genuine significance of the goals I of a portion of the provisos contained in the Treaties.

¹⁸ *Moon treaty 1967*, available at <http://www.unitednations.org/disarmamentaffairs.org/> last visited 10/07/22

The understandings of the arrangement should in accordance with some basic honesty and in its conventional importance the Idea which has not worked; it has prompted contrasts even among space researchers who have misjudged similar statements to propel their national intrigue. The most recent models are the counter satellite (ASAT) tests attempted by China and later by the US to kill their own satellites in circle in an outrageous showcase of mechanical prevalence and causing impressive space flotsam and jetsam without risk of punishment. These activities were positively not quiet exercises, nor could be decisively named as military missions however the obligation of causing pointless and fake flotsam and jetsam appends to both. Further, a few conditions are excessively dubious. for example 'the territory of humankind', this announcement is so vague with the end goal that it is even hard to make priority out of it.¹⁹

It is a commendable proviso however with minimal lawful import or significance. Another model can be "Space travelers are Envoys of Mankind in space'. The radiance of ambassadorial status is unimportant without different customs and certifications. As a matter of first importance, who is an Astronaut? Additionally, every space explorer in a circumstance of products like in the International Space Station (ISS) can't be an envoy of humankind. In this way, effectively and clearly characterizing the significant terms in an arrangement turns into a significant and unavoidable undertaking.

As earlier alluded, the outer space treaty does not in any way address the imminent threat possess by global terrorism, truth be told the world does not fully comprehend the financial capability of terrorism groups and which countries supports them, not confronting the situation will result in a dangerous catastrophe for the world.

1.1. Settlement of Disputes

The legislative idea of space law and space exercises when all is said in done has made a worldview where debates that emerge out of space exercises are carefully the region of government offices and representatives. Debates that emerge in this field are regularly managed through conciliatory channels and only here and there utilize lawful contest goals instruments to accomplish an answer. In any case, as private business interests become progressively predominant in space exercises, space law, both household and international, has started to converge with territories of conventional law including property, contract, and licensed innovation.

¹⁹ Reynolds G.H (1995), *The moon treaty: prospects for the future*, v11,pp116, Science Direct

Since the space manages states the private network has been forgotten about in the said fights in court and much of the time they retain their speculations since it is excessively unsafe.

Debate which emerges with respect to space exercises has been in presence for quite a while. The Liability Convention of 1972 was intended to manage risk perspective when questions emerge during the time spent propelling satellites or during circling in space, the said debates can't be settled through discretionary methods yet through elective contest goals. If at least two states associated with a case for pay can't arrive at understanding as to pay, Article XIV of the Liability Convention offers an elective question system as the Claims Commission.²⁰

1.2. The present and future debate goals

The paper is quick to note of that without debate goals system implied explicitly for cases arising from liability convention, there's no any other provisions which provide alternative means of conflict resolution for states apart from those provided for under the liability convention, the same provisions only applies to states and not private individuals or organizations, lately, they're some reforms made regarding the rules of arbitration, e.g. rules depend on the 2010 UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules and have been amended to consider the specific needs of debates including the use of space by states, international organizations and private individuals but the space still remain very much states-centric and leaves out many interested parties because private organizations and individuals have invested heavily more than majority of states, we cannot entrust the affairs of space in states because states have a lot to protect in terms of states security and may be in conflict or at wars with each other and space program will be negatively affected like what is currently obtaining now with regards to conflict between Russia and Ukraine, it has become increasing difficult for the USA to engage Russia on any matter, later on any space program.

The Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) is an international court responsible with the jurisdiction to mediate disputes arising from space, the fore-mentioned courts does not just handle outer space disputes its overwhelmed by other international cases, considering the magnitude of international law components regarding disputes of states and the use of space, the court only has universal jurisdiction on disputes such as:

²⁰ Zedalis R (1980), *Will Article III of the moon treaty improve existing law? A textual Analysis*, pp85 University of Tulsa College of Law Digital Commons

- Setting up the committee to preside over a disputes, seeking the consent of the United Secretary General and of the Court to provide parties to the dispute an opportunity to choose mediators or Arbitrator Council composed of either one, two up to five people.
- Setting up a specific rundown of mediators versed in the topic of the question and a rundown of logical and specialized specialists to address specialized issues that might be appropriate to a contest; and
- Enabling the gatherings to demand that data displayed as a component of the intervention, including master declaration, stay classified so as to secure appropriateness data, exchange privileged insights, and so forth.

The noteworthiness of the PCA's reception of the Rules goes past giving a feasible party to elective question goals for debates emerging from space exercises. The arrangement of a medium to determine contract and settlement questions may have the side advantage of making a domain favorable for the exchange and production of international treaty identifying with space.²¹

The present collection of international space law is tormented by uncertainty and is basically unenforceable and, with the conceivable special case of the Claims Commission accommodated in the Liability Convention, the main methods for contest goals lies in discretionary moving. In a discretionary situation slanted by delicate power, the probability is thin of settling a debate fairly. On the off chance that the Rules demonstrate be powerful, they could give an objective gathering to states to adequately settle debates identifying with space. Counting the stipulation in a settlement that the Rules be utilized to determine questions could furnish states with the certainty to arrange lawfully restricting treaty identifying with space exercises, realizing that in case of a debate their complaints would be tended to unbiasedly.

Similarly, non-administrative, private elements could discover equivalent trust in arranging decreases by depending on the Rules for question goals. Private international understandings identifying with space exercises, for example, the dispatch and activity of a satellite could be consulted in certainty that should a question emerge that complaint would locate a capable, fair arrangement.

1.3. Adequacy of Space Treaty in the 21st Century

As prior implied in the presentation the moon treaty are a result of the Cold War and basically addresses worries that were winning around

²¹ Theodore(1995)

then, including atomic war. So for a long time, the treaty has kept hawkish countries from putting weapons of mass pulverization into space.

Yet, this isn't the situation now, space has been popularized, more organizations both private and government has invested huge amount of cash into mining, direct satellite telecom, remote detecting in addition to other things.

As indicated by The Space Report 2016, distributed by the Space Foundation, a charitable promoter for space-related undertakings, at any rate 19 nations have, are creating or are intending to have spaceports for orbital and suborbital dispatches. The report tallies 86 orbital dispatches endeavored the world over in 2015, and it says "the worldwide space industry developed in 2015," totaling \$323 billion.²² This economic movement is still to a great extent driven by national space organizations, yet private interests have not been forgotten about either. Almost 50 years after the U.S. beat the USSR to arrive the primary people on the moon, the space race is as yet in progress.

As referenced over, the 21st century has presented new difficulties; the establishment of room law is still established in a progression of old convention, starting with the outer Space Treaty. The designers of the arrangement use international custom and general standards of law perceived by two propelling states around then, just as two-sided understandings among countries. Also, progressively, countries are sanctioning enactment and guidelines for business space action.²³

The paper contends that law has lingered behind with regards to space, what may have made a military showdown spying by satellite ended up acknowledged, if not authoritatively lawful. At the point when Sputnik 1 circumnavigated the globe in 1957, the Soviet satellite abused universal air law that stretches out a country's power vertically to the airspace over its domain. But since President Dwight D. Eisenhower knew the U.S. would need to send its own satellites over the Soviet Union, he implicitly acknowledged its entitlement to work a satellite in circle over U.S. region. Henceforth, it was built up that the standards overseeing shuttle would contrast from those for flying machine.

Something which make space law and the Outer Space Treaty insufficient is that the treaty has put the all duty on states for any exercises its natives take part in. particularly, Article VI is the establishment on which any laws or guidelines with respect to

²² Guide to global space, available at <https://www.spacefoundation.org-files-the-authoritative-guide-to-global-space-activities-2016>, last visited 8/06/22

²³ Outer spaces treaty available at <https://www.un.org/outer-space-treaty>. Last visited on 11/06/22

business space action are based. This area makes states in charge of the exercises of private elements, requiring "approval and proceeding with supervision" of space exercises by business undertakings.

1.4. Proposals

The moon treaty must be supplanted with an increasingly exact and successful overseeing treaty which will oblige current technological advancements of the 21st century.

UNOOSA must procure space stations for checking purposes and report any infringement of international law instead of depending on the data provided by the member states.

Establishment of United Nations military space force to monitor and counter any possible threat to international peace and security.

The space must be available to private ventures and be issued business licenses to make it progressively aggressive; this will make the starting of satellites less expensive and open to creating countries.

Need for a negotiation on a comprehensive multilateral treaty on common security in outer space on the basis of far-sighted peaceful purposes contained in the outer space treaty.

1.7 Conclusion

In conclusion the moon treaty vague, most significant provisos are not unmistakably characterized this has prompted error by propelling states with national interests. It has even neglected to characterize where space is. The treaty is just serving the enthusiasm of significant super power.

As of late has seen an upsurge in the manner by which states participate in space, space innovation and militarization has turned into the focal point of consideration from both the administration and private organizations, the threat of global terrorism which is constantly threatening international peace, the current space treaty was figured to address the circumstance which was occurring during the virus war in 1940s, the designers of the space treaty 1957 couldn't have predicted the present development over 50 years later on, there is requirement for new bit of governing body which can suit current technological advancements the starting states are making and even private division.

As innovation makes space progressively open, the legitimate system encompassing it will develop also. Questions are part of the development and regulation are step forward to address perspective disagreements, whether or not they obey the same and demonstrate to viable will be known just once the legislative and non-administrative parties that they are planned for start to use them. Consequently, call

for setting up a particular court to settle disputes between states and a legitimate observing space station to screen exercises into space. The possibility of power is very much established as nations put resources into this costly innovation there is have to verify the ventures and it will not be right to accept that each nation engaged with space movement are doing as such for tranquil purposes, the space can be utilized as a takeoff platform to assault different nations, as prior implied legitimate components must be set up to screen as well as adequate laws and approvals this must be accomplished if the United Nations have the nearness in space as opposed to depending in part states who have some enthusiasm to serve.

1.5. Bibliography

1. Andrew G. Haley (1963) *Space Law and Government*, page xii, Appleton-Century-Crofts
2. Ajele Lele (217)50 years of outer space treaty, tracing journey, Pentagon Press
3. Benmelech .E(2007), Human capita and the productivity of the suicide bomber, journal of economic prospective
4. Huffkin, Bruce (1994), *Inside terrorism*,pp40, New York, Columbia University Press, Alex P, Discusses more that more 100 definitions off terrorism, trying to offer reasonably comprehensive application of the word Terrorism
5. Inesap.org Archived 2008-03-18 at the Wayback Machine. Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and International Law.
6. John .P(2001), *Military uses of outerspace* Henry Campbell Black, Black's law dictionary, west publishing co, at 230,standard edition, 2009
7. Kruegar(2003), *Education* Poverty and terrorism, is there a causal Connection?, American Economic association
8. Lafree .G(2006), *Introducing Global terrorism Database: terrorism and politics*
9. Merghan Bartels (2018), *Space has always been militarized*, at 67, not just weaponized-not yet anyway, spaceflight
10. UN website UN Resolution 1148 (XII). Archived August 14, 2011, at the Wayback Machine.
11. Nagendra Singh; Edward MacWhinney . *Nuclear Weapons and Contemporary International Law*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers. 1989
12. Remuss NL (2005), *need to counter space terrorism*, European space policy insti
13. Rose, Neil (2009-08-13). *Can you buy an acre of the Moon?"*. The Times. London.
14. United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space". United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs.