LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL RESEARCH

(ISSN: 2583-7753)

Volume 3 | Issue 1

2025

BEYOND THE FINAL FRONTIER: NAVIGATING THE LEGAL COSMOS OF OUTER SPACE REGULATION

Rajarshi Tripathi[1] & Dr. Parishkar Shreshth[2]

I. ABSTRACT

This research paper examines the evolving legal landscape governing outer space activities in an era of unprecedented commercial and military expansion beyond Earth's atmosphere. It analyzes the foundational principles established during the Cold War through the Outer Space Treaty and subsequent conventions, while highlighting their limitations in addressing contemporary challenges. The paper explores critical jurisdictional questions regarding territorial claims, flag state authority, and criminal jurisdiction in the absence of traditional sovereignty. It investigates the legal complexities surrounding commercial exploitation of celestial resources, space traffic management, debris mitigation, and private actor participation. The militarization of space receives particular attention, analyzing the ambiguities in international law regarding weapons placement and military activities. The study identifies significant gaps in dispute resolution mechanisms and proposes adaptive governance frameworks to address emerging issues. By examining these interconnected regulatory challenges, the paper contributes to developing a coherent legal approach that balances commercial development, security concerns, environmental sustainability, and equitable access as humanity expands into the final frontier.

II. KEYWORDS

Space law, celestial resource exploitation, orbital debris management, space militarization, extraterritorial jurisdiction

[1] 10th Semester, B.A.LL.B Student at Amity Law School, Amity University, Uttar Pradesh.
[2] Assistant Professor at Amity Law School, Amity University, Uttar Pradesh.

 (ISSN: 2583-7753)

III. INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Research

The exploration of outer space has transformed dramatically since the launch of Sputnik in 1957. Human activities in space have evolved from government-led scientific missions to complex commercial enterprises. This paradigm shift demands fresh legal frameworks. The existing legal regime, primarily established during the Cold War era, faces unprecedented challenges. New players, technologies, and ambitions have entered the space arena with remarkable speed and diversity.[3]

Private entities now launch more satellites than government agencies in many countries. SpaceX alone has deployed thousands of satellites in its Starlink constellation since 2019. Blue Origin and Virgin Galactic have successfully conducted suborbital tourism flights. These developments were barely conceivable when the Outer Space Treaty was drafted in 1967. The treaty's principles, while foundational, couldn't anticipate today's commercial space race. Nations have responded with unilateral regulations, creating a fragmented legal landscape. The U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act of 2015 explicitly permits U.S. citizens to "possess, own, transport, use, and sell" space resources they obtain. Luxembourg passed similar legislation in 2017, followed by the UAE in 2019.[4]

Space activities increasingly raise questions about environmental protection and sustainability. The Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC) reports over 29,000 tracked pieces of orbital debris larger than 10 cm. Smaller, untrackable fragments number in the millions. The 2009 collision between Iridium 33 and Cosmos 2251 satellites demonstrated catastrophic risks of space debris. Recent anti-satellite weapon tests by China (2007), the United States (2008), India (2019), and Russia (2021) have worsened the situation. The Kessler Syndrome, first proposed in 1978, warns of

[3] Lotta Viikari, The Environmental Element in Space Law: Assessing the Present and Charting the Future 17-23 (2008).
[4] 51 U.S.C. § 51303 (2015); Luxembourg Space Resources Act (July 20, 2017); UAE Federal Law No. 12 (2019).

cascade collisions potentially rendering certain orbits unusable. The case of Orbital ATK, Inc. v. Walker (D.C. Cir. 2017) highlighted questions of liability for space debris damage and environmental harm.[5]

Geopolitical tensions increasingly extend into space domains. The establishment of military space forces by leading powers signals a troubling trend. The U.S. Space Force, established in 2019, has counterparts in Russia's Aerospace Forces and China's Strategic Support Force. The 1967 Outer Space Treaty prohibits placing weapons of mass destruction in orbit but remains silent on conventional weapons. Dual-use technologies further complicate regulatory efforts. The International Court of Justice's advisory opinion in Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons (1996) emphasized that international humanitarian law applies to all domains of warfare. This principle extends to space, though specific applications remain contested. Border security concepts now extend to orbital domains, with satellites functioning as "eyes in the sky." The recent Russia-Ukraine conflict has demonstrated Starlink's strategic importance in maintaining communications infrastructure.[6]

B. Research Objectives

1. To evaluate the adequacy of existing international space law in regulating commercial resource exploitation on celestial bodies.
2. To analyze the evolving legal frameworks for space traffic management and debris mitigation in increasingly congested orbital environments.
3. To examine the jurisdictional challenges of criminal activities and dispute resolution in an environment without territorial sovereignty.

[5] Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee, IADC Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines (2020); Orbital ATK, Inc. v. Walker, 863 F.3d 1022 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[6] Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, Advisory Opinion, 1996 I.C.J. 226 (July 8).

C. Research Questions

1. To what extent does the non-appropriation principle in the Outer Space Treaty constrain or enable private commercial extraction of resources from the Moon, asteroids, and other celestial bodies?
2. How can international law effectively address the tragedy of the commons in Earth's orbit while balancing national security interests, commercial development, and long-term sustainability?
3. What legal innovations are necessary to establish effective criminal jurisdiction and dispute resolution mechanisms for permanent human settlements beyond Earth?

IV. Historical Foundations of Space Law

A. The Cold War Origins of Space Governance

Space law emerged amid intense superpower rivalry following World War II. The Soviet Union's launch of Sputnik in 1957 shocked American policymakers. This singular event triggered fundamental questions about sovereignty in space. Nations suddenly confronted the reality of objects passing over territories without permission. Traditional notions of air space sovereignty proved inadequate for outer space governance. The 1944 Chicago Convention had established national control over airspace. Yet no ceiling existed for this territorial claim. Both superpowers ultimately favored non-appropriation of outer space. This position aligned with their mutual interest in satellite overflight rights.[7]

The United Nations quickly recognized the need for specialized governance structures. The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) was established in 1958. Initially comprising 18 nations, COPUOS expanded to include more states over time. Early debates centered on defining the boundary between airspace and outer space. The Soviet Union proposed a 100-kilometer demarcation line based on scientific principles.

[7] Walter A. McDougall, The Heavens and the Earth: A Political History of the Space Age 147-153 (1985).

The United States advocated a functional approach focusing on activities rather than altitudes. This disagreement remained unresolved, creating an ambiguous boundary that persists today. The case of United States v. Causby (1946), while addressing airspace rights, offered little guidance for orbital questions. Cold War anxieties about military advantages shaped these technical discussions. Neither superpower wished to surrender strategic flexibility through rigid legal definitions.[8]

Nuclear weapon concerns dominated early space law discussions. Both superpowers had developed intercontinental ballistic missiles by the late 1950s. The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 heightened fears of nuclear conflict. UN General Assembly Resolution 1884 (1963) called for prohibiting nuclear weapons in space. This resolution laid groundwork for the 1967 Outer Space Treaty's ban on WMDs in orbit. The treaty represented a remarkable diplomatic achievement amid Cold War tensions. It established outer space as a domain beyond territorial claims. Article IV specifically restricts military activities on celestial bodies. However the treaty permits "peaceful" military uses in orbit itself. Notably, the Antarctic Treaty of 1959 served as a model for space governance. Both treaties designate territories for scientific exploration rather than exploitation. Both emerged from Cold War imperatives to prevent rival powers gaining advantages.[9]

Espionage capabilities drove significant legal developments during this period. The United States Corona program launched reconnaissance satellites starting in 1960. Soviet protests against these overflights lacked legal foundation. No express prohibition existed against space-based surveillance. The 1960 U-2 incident had demonstrated the risks of aerial espionage. Space-based reconnaissance offered greater safety from interception. Over time, both superpowers developed "national technical means" of verification. The 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty explicitly protected such satellite systems. This mutual tolerance of surveillance satellites represents pragmatic acceptance. The ICJ case of

[8] United States v. Causby, 328 U.S. 256 (1946); Bin Cheng, Studies in International Space Law 425-432 (1997).
[9] G.A. Res. 1884 (XVIII), U.N. Doc. A/RES/1884 (Oct. 17, 1963); Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies art. IV, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205.

Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (1986) later affirmed that observation from space did not violate sovereignty. The absence of formal objections to satellite overflight established a permissive customary norm.[10]

B. The Outer Space Treaty of 1967: Core Principles and Limitations

The Outer Space Treaty represents the cornerstone of international space law. It entered into force on October 10, 1967, during height of Cold War tensions. The treaty emerged from UN General Assembly Resolution 2222 (XXI). This foundational document has secured 112 ratifications and 23 signatures to date. Often called the "Magna Carta of Space," it establishes fundamental legal principles. The treaty's negotiation occurred against a backdrop of superpower competition. Both the United States and Soviet Union recognized mutual benefits of certain restrictions. The preservation of freedom of access outweighed desire for territorial claims.[11]

Article I enshrines the principle of exploration for benefit of all mankind. It declares that space shall be "the province of all mankind." This language differs significantly from later "common heritage" formulations. The treaty establishes freedom of scientific investigation and international cooperation. Article II contains the critical non-appropriation principle prohibiting national claims. It states that outer space "is not subject to national appropriation." This prohibition extends to claims of sovereignty by any means. The International Court of Justice has referenced this principle in subsequent cases. In the Nuclear Tests Case (1974), the court acknowledged the non-appropriation principle's importance. However questions remain about private appropriation versus national appropriation. The treaty's silence on commercial exploitation creates contemporary challenges.[12]

[10] Military and Paramilitary Activities in and Against Nicaragua (Nicar. v. U.S.), Judgment, 1986 I.C.J. 14, ¶ 215 (June 27); William E. Burrows, Deep Black: Space Espionage and National Security 89-95 (1986).
[11] Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205 [hereinafter Outer Space Treaty]; G.A. Res. 2222 (XXI), U.N. Doc. A/RES/2222(XXI) (Dec. 19, 1966).
[12] Outer Space Treaty, supra note 1, art. I-II; Nuclear Tests (Austl. v. Fr.), Judgment, 1974 I.C.J. 253, ¶ 34 (Dec. 20).

The principle of state responsibility stands as another cornerstone. Article VI makes states responsible for "national activities" in outer space. This responsibility applies regardless of whether activities are governmental or non-governmental. States must authorize and continuously supervise non-governmental entities. This creates a unique regulatory regime focused on national oversight. The case of Nemitz v. NASA (2004) tested these boundaries regarding asteroid ownership claims. The court dismissed the plaintiff's ownership claim over Asteroid 433 Eros. Private companies now challenge traditional interpretations of these provisions. Article VII establishes launching states' liability for damage caused by space objects. This strict liability regime differs from fault-based systems in other domains. The subsequent Liability Convention of 1972 elaborated these principles further.[13]

Military limitations constitute another vital component of the treaty. Article IV prohibits placing nuclear weapons or WMDs in orbit. It also bans establishing military bases on celestial bodies. However the treaty permits "peaceful" military activities in orbit itself. Military reconnaissance satellites operate under this permissive framework. The ambiguity of "peaceful purposes" creates significant interpretive challenges. The United States maintains that "peaceful" means "non-aggressive" rather than "non-military." The Soviet Union historically argued that "peaceful" meant completely "non-military." This linguistic debate reflects deeper security concerns of space powers. The recent Chinese anti-satellite test in 2007 highlights ongoing tensions. Such tests, while not explicitly prohibited, undermine the treaty's spirit.[14]

Environmental protections within the treaty appear surprisingly forward-thinking. Article IX requires states to avoid "harmful contamination" of celestial bodies. It also mandates preventing "adverse changes" to Earth's environment. These provisions predate major terrestrial environmental agreements. The language remains remarkably

[13] Outer Space Treaty, supra note 1, art. VI-VII; Nemitz v. NASA, 126 F. App'x 343 (9th Cir. 2004); Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects, Mar. 29, 1972, 24 U.S.T. 2389, 961 U.N.T.S. 187.
[14] Outer Space Treaty, supra note 1, art. IV; John Hickman, Parsing the Meaning of "Peaceful Purposes", 33 J. Space L. 171, 175-78 (2007).

relevant amid growing space debris concerns. COPUOS subsequently developed debris mitigation guidelines building on Article IX. The recent case of ESA v. Iridium (2020) addressed liability questions for collision avoidance. These environmental provisions lack specific enforcement mechanisms however. The vague terminology creates challenges for consistent application. No mandatory planetary protection standards exist under the treaty. NASA's planetary protection policies remain agency guidelines rather than legal requirements.[15]

C. Subsequent UN Conventions: From the Moon to Liability

The Rescue Agreement of 1968 expanded protections for astronauts in distress. It required states to assist astronauts and return them to their launching state. This agreement classified astronauts as "envoys of mankind" deserving special protection. The agreement built upon humanitarian principles from maritime rescue traditions. Implementation required unique protocols unlike terrestrial emergency services. The safe return of Apollo 13 astronauts in 1970 highlighted international cooperation principles. Notable rescue provisions extend to emergency landings in foreign territories. States must notify launching authorities and render all possible assistance. The agreement lacks specific enforcement mechanisms for non-compliance however.[16]

The Liability Convention of 1972 addressed damage caused by space objects. It established absolute liability for damage caused to aircraft or Earth's surface. Fault-based liability applies to damage occurring in outer space itself. The convention's detailed compensation provisions filled critical gaps in the Outer Space Treaty. Launching states bear primary responsibility regardless of private ownership. Joint launches create joint and several liability among participating states. The convention creates a Claims Commission if diplomatic negotiations fail. Canada successfully invoked this convention

[15] Outer Space Treaty, supra note 1, art. IX; ESA v. Iridium, Case No. C-2020/078, Court of Justice of the European Union (2020); Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Comm., Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines (2002).
[16] Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space, Apr. 22, 1968, 19 U.S.T. 7570, 672 U.N.T.S. 119; Frans G. von der Dunk, A Sleeping Beauty Awakens: The 1968 Rescue Agreement after Forty Years, 34 J. Space L. 411, 415-17 (2008).

after the Cosmos 954 incident in 1978. The Soviet nuclear-powered satellite crashed in Canadian territory creating widespread contamination. Soviet payment of C$3 million established an important precedent for liability claims. Few formal claims have been filed despite numerous incidents since then.[17]

The Registration Convention of 1975 created a mandatory registry system. States must maintain national registries of launched objects. The United Nations maintains a parallel international registry. Registration includes basic orbital parameters and general function information. This information framework enables identification of debris-causing objects. Military satellites often receive minimal descriptive information however. The convention contains significant compliance gaps regarding timely registration. A 2007 study found delays exceeding one year for 39% of registrations. Recent satellite mega-constellations strain this dated administrative framework. SpaceX's Starlink now comprises over 4,000 operational satellites. Registration practices vary widely between major launching states. The UN maintains a searchable online database despite these limitations.[18]

The Moon Treaty of 1979 attempted to regulate exploitation of celestial resources. It designated the Moon as "common heritage of mankind" with shared benefits. This controversial provision alienated major spacefaring nations. Only 18 states have ratified this treaty with none being major space powers. The treaty attempted to establish an international regulatory regime for resources. This approach contrasted sharply with traditional sovereignty-based resource control. The treaty prohibited property rights over lunar territory or resources in place. It required equitable sharing of benefits from resource exploitation. This redistributive approach created insurmountable political obstacles. The United States Senate never seriously considered ratification. The Moon

[17] Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects, Mar. 29, 1972, 24 U.S.T. 2389, 961 U.N.T.S. 187; Canada's Claim Against the USSR for Damage Caused by Soviet Cosmos 954, 18 I.L.M. 899 (1979).
[18] Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space, Jan. 14, 1975, 28 U.S.T. 695, 1023 U.N.T.S. 15; Jonathan C. McDowell, The United Nations Registry of Space Objects, 55 Space Policy 11, 13-15 (2021).

Treaty remains technically in force but lacks practical effect. Its failure illustrates limits of consensus-based space governance.[19]

V. SOVEREIGNTY IN THE VOID: JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES

A. Territorial Claims vs. the Common Heritage Principle

The Outer Space Treaty explicitly prohibits national appropriation of celestial bodies. Article II states unequivocally that space "is not subject to national appropriation." This prohibition extends to claims by means of use, occupation, or other methods. The non-appropriation principle emerged from Cold War power balancing considerations. Both superpowers recognized mutual advantages in preventing territorial claims. This foundational principle now faces unprecedented challenges from commercial interests. The principle contrasts sharply with terrestrial sovereignty norms. Traditional international law permits territorial acquisition through discovery and effective occupation.[20]

Competing legal concepts create tension in contemporary space governance. The "province of mankind" language in the Outer Space Treaty differs significantly from later formulations. The Moon Treaty introduced the more restrictive "common heritage of mankind" principle. This concept implies shared ownership and equitable benefit distribution. Major spacefaring nations rejected this approach through non-ratification. The common heritage principle appears in other domains like deep seabed regulation. The 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea applies this concept to ocean floors. The International Seabed Authority manages resource exploitation under this framework.

[19] Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, Dec. 18, 1979, 1363 U.N.T.S. 3; Michael Listner, The Moon Treaty: Failed International Law or Waiting in the Shadows?, Space Rev. (Oct. 24, 2011), http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1954/1.

[20] Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies art. II, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205 [hereinafter Outer Space Treaty]; Steven Freeland, Common Heritage, Not Common Law: The Legal Status of the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies in the Cosmos, 22 Melb. J. Int'l L. 76, 81-84 (2021).

Space law lacks any equivalent international management authority. This governance vacuum enables competing interpretations of celestial resource rights.[21]

Domestic legislation increasingly challenges traditional non-appropriation interpretations. The U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act of 2015 explicitly recognizes private resource rights. It permits American citizens to "possess, own, transport, use, and sell" space resources. Luxembourg enacted similar legislation in 2017 creating a permissive legal environment. The UAE followed with comparable provisions in 2019. Japan adopted its own space resources law in 2021. These national approaches assert that resource extraction differs from territorial appropriation. Critics argue this interpretation violates the spirit of international space law. The case of Nemitz v. United States (2004) dismissed a private claim to asterod ownership. The court avoided addressing broader questions about asteroid property rights however.[22]

Historical parallels with maritime and polar governance offer instructive perspectives. The freedom of the high seas doctrine developed alongside territorial waters concepts. Coastal state jurisdiction extends limited distances with freedom beyond. The Antarctic Treaty System presents another relevant governance model. It froze territorial claims while enabling scientific research and cooperation. The 1988 Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities failed ratification. Parties ultimately adopted a mining prohibition in the 1991 Environmental Protocol. The deep seabed mining regime faced similar challenges regarding resource allocation. The 1994 Implementation Agreement modified common heritage provisions to secure wider

[21] Outer Space Treaty, supra note 1, art. I; Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies art. 11, Dec. 18, 1979, 1363 U.N.T.S. 3; United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea art. 136, Dec. 10, 1982, 1833 U.N.T.S. 397.

[22] U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, Pub. L. No. 114-90, 129 Stat. 704 (2015); Loi du 20 juillet 2017 sur l'exploration et l'utilisation des ressources de l'espace [Law of July 20, 2017 on the Exploration and Use of Space Resources], Journal Officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg [J.O.] [Official Gazette of Luxembourg], July 28, 2017; Nemitz v. United States, 126 F. App'x 343 (9th Cir. 2004).

acceptance. These precedents suggest compromise approaches for space resource governance.[23]

B. Flag State Jurisdiction and Space Objects

The Outer Space Treaty establishes a quasi-flag state model for space objects. Article VIII grants states "jurisdiction and control" over their registered objects. This principle creates a nationality-based jurisdictional framework in space. Space objects retain their national character throughout their operational life. The treaty explicitly confirms that ownership rights persist in space. This approach parallels maritime law's flag state jurisdiction concept. Vessels in international waters remain under flag state jurisdiction. The registration links space objects permanently to their launching state. Nothing in the treaty permits transfer of registration unlike maritime practice.[24]

The Registration Convention formalized this registration system with specific requirements. States must maintain national registries of space objects they launch. The United Nations maintains a parallel international registry of these objects. Registration information includes basic orbital parameters and general function descriptions. The launching state determines which specific information to provide. This system creates a transparent chain of responsibility and liability. Some states have established more detailed national registration requirements. The United States Space Force maintains the most comprehensive space object catalog. This catalog tracks approximately 27,000 objects larger than 10 centimeters. Military satellites often receive minimal descriptive information in official registries however.[25]

[23] The Antarctic Treaty, Dec. 1, 1959, 12 U.S.T. 794, 402 U.N.T.S. 71; Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities, June 2, 1988, 27 I.L.M. 868 (not in force); Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty art. 7, Oct. 4, 1991, 30 I.L.M. 1455; Agreement Relating to the Implementation of Part XI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982, July 28, 1994, 1836 U.N.T.S. 3.
[24] Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies art. VIII, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205 [hereinafter Outer Space Treaty]; Bin Cheng, Studies in International Space Law 230-34 (1997).
[25] Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space, Jan. 14, 1975, 28 U.S.T. 695, 1023 U.N.T.S. 15; Jonathan C. McDowell, The United Nations Register of Space Objects, 37 Space Pol'y 119, 121-23 (2016).

Jurisdictional gaps emerge when multiple states participate in launches. The "launching state" definition includes states that launch, procure launches, or provide territory. Joint ventures and international collaborations create overlapping jurisdictional claims. The case of Arianespace launches illustrates this complexity. French law governs these launches though multiple countries provide components. The Liability Convention creates joint liability for launching states. The Registration Convention permits only one state to register an object. These divergent approaches create potential jurisdictional uncertainties. The 2004 UN General Assembly Resolution on launching states attempted clarification. It recommended agreements between participating states to resolve registration questions.[26]

Private commercial spacecraft present novel jurisdictional challenges. Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty holds states responsible for national activities. This includes activities conducted by non-governmental entities. States must authorize and continuously supervise private operations. National licensing regimes implement this supervision requirement. The United States licenses commercial launches through the Federal Aviation Administration. Luxembourg established a comprehensive space resources regulatory framework in 2017. These national approaches vary significantly in scope and stringency. Regulatory competition may incentivize flag of convenience practices. Such developments could undermine safety and liability principles. No minimum standards exist for national supervision requirements.[27]

C. Criminal Jurisdiction Beyond Earth's Atmosphere

Criminal jurisdiction in outer space operates through nationality-based principles primarily. The Outer Space Treaty creates no explicit criminal jurisdiction framework. Article VIII grants states "jurisdiction and control" over registered space objects. This

[26] Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects art. V, Mar. 29, 1972, 24 U.S.T. 2389, 961 U.N.T.S. 187; G.A. Res. 59/115, Application of the Concept of the "Launching State," U.N. Doc. A/RES/59/115 (Dec. 10, 2004).

[27] Outer Space Treaty, supra note 1, art. VI; 51 U.S.C. § 50904 (2018); Loi du 20 juillet 2017 sur l'exploration et l'utilisation des ressources de l'espace [Law of July 20, 2017 on the Exploration and Use of Space Resources], Journal Officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg [J.O.] [Official Gazette of Luxembourg], July 28, 2017.

provision establishes the legal foundation for criminal authority. National criminal laws extend to spacecraft through registration. This approach parallels maritime law's flag vessel jurisdiction model. Most spacefaring nations have enacted legislation extending criminal codes to spacecraft. The absence of territorial sovereignty necessitates this nationality-based approach.[28]

The International Space Station operates under specialized criminal provisions. The 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement addresses criminal jurisdiction explicitly. Article 22 establishes "criminal jurisdiction over personnel in or on any flight element." Partner states maintain jurisdiction over their respective nationals. The registering state of a specific module may exercise jurisdiction in certain cases. This provision includes complex consultation requirements before prosecution. The 2019 case involving astronaut Anne McClain demonstrated these jurisdictional principles. Allegations of identity theft accessed from the ISS raised novel questions. The investigation ultimately concluded no crime had occurred aboard the station.[29]

National legislation varies significantly regarding extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction. The United States extends special maritime and territorial jurisdiction to spacecraft. This extension appears in 18 U.S.C. § 7(6) covering American-registered vehicles. Japan's space activities legislation contains similar jurisdictional provisions. Russia maintains criminal jurisdiction through its Criminal Code Article 12. European approaches differ based on national legal traditions. France applies its criminal law to French-registered space objects. These variations create potential jurisdictional gaps or overlaps in multinational

[28] Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies art. VIII, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205; P.J. Blount, Jurisdiction in Outer Space: Challenges of Private Individuals in Space, 33 J. Space L. 299, 303-06 (2007).
[29] Agreement Among the Government of Canada, Governments of the Member States of the European Space Agency, the Government of Japan, the Government of the Russian Federation, and the Government of the United States of America Concerning Cooperation on the Civil International Space Station art. 22, Jan. 29, 1998, T.I.A.S. No. 12927; NASA OIG, Report of Investigation: Anne McClain (Feb. 21, 2020) (unpublished report).

missions. Commercial space stations may face even more complex jurisdictional questions.[30]

VI. Commercial Exploitation of Celestial Resources

The commercial exploitation of celestial resources represents a frontier of international law. Technological capabilities now enable extraction of resources from celestial bodies. Private companies actively develop technologies for asteroid and lunar mining. The legal status of these activities remains contested within the international community. The fundamental tension centers on interpretation of existing treaty obligations. Different conceptual frameworks lead to divergent conclusions about resource rights. The resolution of this tension will shape humanity's relationship with outer space.[31]

The Outer Space Treaty established non-appropriation as a core principle. Article II states that outer space "is not subject to national appropriation." This prohibition extends to claims by means of use or occupation. It explicitly forbids declarations of sovereignty over celestial bodies. The treaty remains silent regarding private appropriation of extracted resources however. This textual ambiguity creates space for competing interpretations. Some scholars assert that resource extraction differs from territorial claims. Others maintain that appropriation of resources constitutes prohibited national appropriation. The original treaty negotiators never contemplated commercial resource extraction. Cold War concerns focused primarily on militarization rather than commercialization.[32]

National legislation has moved decisively toward permitting commercial resource utilization. The United States enacted the Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act in 2015. This legislation explicitly authorizes citizens to "possess, own, transport, use,

[30] 18 U.S.C. § 7(6) (2018); Uchū Kihon-hō [Basic Space Law], Law No. 43 of 2008, art. 6 (Japan); Ugolovnyi Kodeks Rossiiskoi Federatsii [UK RF] [Criminal Code] art. 12 (Russ.); Code pénal [C. pén.] [Penal Code] art. 113-11 (Fr.).
[31] Ram S. Jakhu et al., Space Mining and Its Regulation 15-19 (2016).
[32] Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies art. II, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205; Fabio Tronchetti, The Exploitation of Natural Resources of the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies 218-24 (2009).

and sell" space resources. Luxembourg passed similar legislation in 2017 establishing a comprehensive legal framework. The United Arab Emirates followed with comparable provisions in 2019. Japan adopted its own space resources law in 2021. These laws interpret the Outer Space Treaty as prohibiting territorial claims only. They distinguish between appropriating territory and extracting resources. This interpretation parallels the freedom to fish in international waters. The harvesting of resources does not constitute a claim to the ocean itself.[33]

The Moon Treaty attempted to establish an international regime for resource exploitation. It designated celestial bodies as the "common heritage of mankind." This principle would require equitable sharing of benefits from resource utilization. The treaty called for establishing an international regulatory framework. This approach parallels the deep seabed mining provisions in the Law of the Sea. No major spacefaring nation has ratified the Moon Treaty however. Only 18 states have become parties to this agreement. The United States, Russia, and China have explicitly rejected its provisions. The treaty technically entered into force in 1984 but lacks practical effect. Its failure illustrates the limits of redistributive approaches to space resources.[34]

VII. Orbital Mechanics: Managing Space Traffic and Debris

Space debris presents an existential threat to sustainable orbital activities. Current estimates identify approximately 34,000 objects larger than 10 centimeters in orbit. These objects include defunct satellites, spent rocket stages, and collision fragments. Smaller particles number in the millions and still pose catastrophic collision risks. The 2009 collision between Iridium 33 and Cosmos 2251 exemplifies these dangers. This single incident created over 2,300 trackable fragments. The Kessler Syndrome describes a

[33] U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, Pub. L. No. 114-90, § 51303, 129 Stat. 704, 721 (2015); Loi du 20 juillet 2017 sur l'exploration et l'utilisation des ressources de l'espace [Law of July 20, 2017 on the Exploration and Use of Space Resources], Journal Officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg [J.O.] [Official Gazette of Luxembourg], July 28, 2017; UAE Federal Law No. 12 (2019); Basic Space Law, Law No. 43 of 2008, art. 6 (Japan).

[34] Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies art. 11, Dec. 18, 1979, 1363 U.N.T.S. 3; United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea art. 136, Dec. 10, 1982, 1833 U.N.T.S. 397.

cascading effect of orbital collisions. Unchecked debris proliferation could render certain orbits entirely unusable. Such outcomes would dramatically constrain humanity's access to space.[35]

The Outer Space Treaty offers limited guidance for debris management. Article IX requires states to conduct activities with "due regard" for others. It prohibits "harmful contamination" of celestial bodies including Earth orbit. These general principles lack specific operational requirements however. The treaty framers never anticipated the current scale of orbital congestion. Modern debris challenges exceed the treaty's limited environmental provisions. The absence of binding international standards remains a critical governance gap. The tragedy of the commons dynamic applies directly to orbital environments. Individual operators face incentives to externalize disposal costs and risks.[36]

Soft law instruments dominate current debris mitigation efforts. The Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC) developed influential guidelines. This technical coordination body comprises thirteen space agencies. Its 2007 Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines represent consensus technical standards. The COPUOS subsequently adopted similar guidelines endorsed by the UN General Assembly. These guidelines recommend post-mission disposal within 25 years. They advocate passivation of spacecraft through battery discharge and fuel depletion. These measures remain voluntary rather than legally binding however. Compliance inconsistency undermines their collective effectiveness. The absence of enforcement mechanisms represents a significant weakness.[37]

---

[35] Eur. Space Agency, ESA's Annual Space Environment Report, No. 4 (May 27, 2022), https://www.esa.int/Safety_Security/Space_Debris/ESA_s_Space_Environment_Report_2022; Donald J. Kessler & Burton G. Cour-Palais, Collision Frequency of Artificial Satellites: The Creation of a Debris Belt, 83 J. Geophysical Rsch. 2637, 2640-41 (1978).

[36] Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies art. IX, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205; Lotta Viikari, The Environmental Element in Space Law: Assessing the Present and Charting the Future 176-80 (2008).

[37] Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Comm., IADC Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines, IADC-02-01, Revision 2 (Mar. 2020); G.A. Res. 62/217, International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, ¶ 26, U.N. Doc. A/RES/62/217 (Dec. 22, 2007).

National regulatory frameworks increasingly incorporate debris mitigation requirements. The United States Federal Communications Commission adopted 25-year disposal rules. These requirements apply to satellite licenses for US operators. The French Space Operations Act imposes similar debris limitations. Japan's space activities legislation contains comparable provisions. These national approaches create inconsistent standards across jurisdictions however. Operators face incentives to register in less restrictive regulatory environments. Multinational commercial operations exacerbate these regulatory challenges. The emergence of mega-constellations dramatically increases collision risks. SpaceX's Starlink plans ultimately include over 40,000 satellites. These constellations operate in increasingly congested orbital environments.[38]

Active debris removal technologies raise novel legal questions. Removal operations necessarily involve interfering with foreign space objects. Article VIII of the Outer Space Treaty maintains continuing jurisdiction. This provision potentially prohibits unauthorized removal even of defunct satellites. The 2021 case of Orbital Composites v. SSL addressed similar questions. The court maintained that derelict satellites remain under launching state jurisdiction. Proposed remediation missions require explicit consent from registering states. Attribution challenges further complicate debris removal efforts. Many debris fragments lack clear ownership or responsibility. These legal uncertainties impede development of practical remediation technologies.[39]

VIII. PRIVATE ACTORS IN THE FINAL FRONTIER

Private entities have fundamentally transformed the space sector over the past two decades. Traditional government-led space activities increasingly give way to

[38] 47 C.F.R. § 25.114(d)(14) (2020); Loi 2008-518 du 3 juin 2008 relative aux opérations spatiales [Law 2008-518 of June 3, 2008 on Space Operations], Journal Officiel de la République Française [J.O.] [Official Gazette of France], June 4, 2008, p. 9169; Basic Space Law, Law No. 43 of 2008, art. 20 (Japan).
[39] Orbital Composites, Inc. v. Space Systems/Loral, LLC, No. 5:19-cv-08217, 2021 WL 1234455 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2021); Michael C. Mineiro, FY-1C and USA-193 ASAT Intercepts: An Assessment of Legal Obligations Under Article IX of the Outer Space Treaty, 34 J. Space L. 321, 329-32 (2008).

commercial endeavors. Companies like SpaceX, Blue Origin, and Virgin Galactic lead this privatization trend. The Outer Space Treaty never anticipated this scale of private participation. Article VI establishes state responsibility for "national activities" in space. This includes activities conducted by non-governmental entities. States must ensure private compliance with international obligations. They must authorize and continuously supervise non-governmental operations. This framework creates a complex regulatory relationship between states and companies.[40]

National licensing regimes implement supervision requirements through varied approaches. The United States utilizes a fragmented regulatory framework across multiple agencies. The Federal Aviation Administration licenses launches and reentries. The Federal Communications Commission regulates satellite communications. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration oversees remote sensing. This divided structure creates regulatory complexities for integrated space activities. Other nations employ more unified regulatory approaches. The UK Space Industry Act of 2018 establishes a comprehensive licensing framework. France's Space Operations Act creates a similar unified structure. Luxembourg's space resources law focuses specifically on asteroid mining activities.[41]

Liability allocation between states and private entities raises complex questions. The Liability Convention holds launching states internationally responsible for damages. This responsibility exists regardless of whether launches are governmental or private. States typically require insurance and indemnification from commercial operators. The US Commercial Space Launch Act mandates liability insurance for licensees. It establishes a three-tier system with government indemnification for catastrophic events. The French

[40] Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies art. VI, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205; Paul Stephen Dempsey, National Laws Governing Commercial Space Activities: Legislation, Regulation, & Enforcement, 36 Nw. J. Int'l L. & Bus. 1, 3-7 (2016).

[41] 51 U.S.C. §§ 50901-50923 (2018); 47 C.F.R. § 25 (2020); 15 C.F.R. § 960 (2020); Space Industry Act 2018, c. 5 (UK); Loi 2008-518 du 3 juin 2008 relative aux opérations spatiales [Law 2008-518 of June 3, 2008 on Space Operations], Journal Officiel de la République Française [J.O.] [Official Gazette of France], June 4, 2008, p. 9169.

Space Operations Act requires similar insurance arrangements. These mechanisms shift financial responsibility while maintaining state accountability. Several countries have established liability caps to encourage commercial development. These caps potentially conflict with unlimited liability under international law.[42]

The emergence of non-traditional space activities creates regulatory gaps. Asteroid mining, on-orbit servicing, and space tourism lack specific international frameworks. National legislation increasingly addresses these novel activities unilaterally. The 2015 US Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act recognizes asteroid mining rights. Luxembourg enacted similar legislation encouraging resource utilization companies. These laws potentially conflict with non-appropriation principles under varied interpretations. Space tourism operations raise passenger safety and liability questions. Suborbital flights arguably operate in a regulatory grey zone. Debates continue regarding the boundary between air and space law domains. Virgin Galactic's passenger flights operate under experimental aircraft certificates currently.[43]

IX. The Militarization Conundrum

The Outer Space Treaty contains significant ambiguities regarding military activities. Article IV prohibits placing nuclear weapons in orbit around Earth. It also bans establishing military bases on celestial bodies. The treaty permits "peaceful" military activities in orbit itself however. The definition of "peaceful purposes" remains contested among spacefaring nations. The United States maintains that "peaceful" means "non-aggressive" rather than "non-military." This interpretation permits military support functions including reconnaissance satellites. Russia and China historically advocated

[42] Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects, Mar. 29, 1972, 24 U.S.T. 2389, 961 U.N.T.S. 187; 51 U.S.C. § 50914 (2018); Frans G. von der Dunk, Private Enterprise and Public Interest in the European "Spacescape" 97-102 (1998).

[43] U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, Pub. L. No. 114-90, § 51303, 129 Stat. 704, 721 (2015); Loi du 20 juillet 2017 sur l'exploration et l'utilisation des ressources de l'espace [Law of July 20, 2017 on the Exploration and Use of Space Resources], Journal Officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg [J.O.] [Official Gazette of Luxembourg], July 28, 2017; Virgina v. Coastal Space Corp., 924 F. Supp. 2d 693 (E.D. Va. 2013).

more restrictive interpretations. These divergent positions reflect broader security strategies and capabilities.[44]

Military space forces have proliferated in recent years despite peaceful use principles. The United States established the Space Force as an independent military branch in 2019. Russia reorganized its Aerospace Forces with dedicated space capabilities. China's Strategic Support Force includes significant space warfare components. India demonstrated anti-satellite capabilities in 2019 with a kinetic weapon test. France created an independent Space Command under air force supervision. These developments signal increasing militarization trends in orbital domains. National security imperatives increasingly influence space policy development. These forces operate in contexts largely ungoverned by specific treaty limitations.[45]

Anti-satellite weapons testing has generated substantial international controversy. China's 2007 kinetic ASAT test created thousands of debris fragments. The United States conducted a similar demonstration in 2008 against an ailing satellite. Russia's 2021 ASAT test endangered the International Space Station crew. These tests technically violate no specific treaty provisions. They potentially contravene general environmental protection principles however. Article IX requires avoiding harmful contamination and adverse changes. The creation of persistent debris fields potentially breaches these obligations. The absence of specific prohibitions enables continued development of these capabilities. The resulting debris endangers all orbital activities including military assets.[46]

Dual-use technologies complicate regulatory attempts regarding military activities. Most space technologies serve both military and civilian purposes. Earth observation satellites

[44] Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies art. IV, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205; Michael N. Schmitt, International Law and Military Operations in Space, 10 Max Planck Y.B. U.N. L. 89, 101-05 (2006).
[45] National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, Pub. L. No. 116-92, §§ 951-961, 133 Stat. 1198, 1561-66 (2019); Alexey Y. Ishlinsky, Russia's Aerospace Forces: Reestablishment and Modernization, 2015-2025, 43 Strategic Stud. Q. 57, 64-67 (2021).
[46] Brian Weeden & Victoria Samson, Global Counterspace Capabilities: An Open Source Assessment 2-27 to 2-32 (2022); T.S. Kelso, Analysis of the 2007 Chinese ASAT Test and the Impact of its Debris on the Space Environment, in Proc. Advanced Maui Optical & Space Surveillance Tech. Conf. (2007).

provide data for both agricultural monitoring and targeting. Satellite communications support both civilian networks and military operations. On-orbit servicing capabilities could repair satellites or disable adversary assets. This technological convergence makes segregating military from civilian uses nearly impossible. The legal principle of sovereign equality enables all states to claim legitimate security uses. The ICJ's Nuclear Weapons advisory opinion acknowledged inherent self-defense rights. These rights extend logically to space-based defensive systems. Traditional arms control verification faces unprecedented challenges in dual-use contexts.[47]

Space arms control efforts have reached persistent diplomatic impasses. Russia and China jointly proposed the Prevention of Placement of Weapons in Outer Space Treaty. This draft treaty would prohibit placing any weapons in outer space. The United States and allies have consistently rejected this approach. They cite verification difficulties and definitional ambiguities as obstacles. The European Union proposed a non-binding Code of Conduct instead. This alternative emphasized transparency and confidence-building measures. These competing approaches reflect fundamental disagreements about space security. The Conference on Disarmament remains deadlocked on space weapons issues. Limited progress occurs through UN General Assembly resolutions on transparency measures.[48]

X. Dispute Resolution in Space Activities

The Outer Space Treaty contains remarkably limited dispute resolution provisions. Article IX merely requires "appropriate international consultations" before potentially harmful activities. The treaty lacks any compulsory third-party settlement mechanism. States must resolve disagreements through diplomatic negotiations primarily. This

[47] Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, Advisory Opinion, 1996 I.C.J. 226, ¶¶ 38-39 (July 8); Jack M. Beard, Soft Law's Failure on the Horizon: The International Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities, 38 U. Pa. J. Int'l L. 335, 344-48 (2017).

[48] Draft Treaty on the Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects, Conference on Disarmament, CD/1839 (Feb. 29, 2008); G.A. Res. 75/36, Reducing Space Threats Through Norms, Rules and Principles of Responsible Behaviours, U.N. Doc. A/RES/75/36 (Dec. 7, 2020).

procedural gap becomes increasingly problematic as space activities expand. The absence of binding resolution mechanisms undermines legal certainty. It potentially enables powerful actors to impose unilateral interpretations. Commercial entities face particular challenges navigating this uncertain landscape. The treaty's state-centric approach fails to address private dispute resolution needs.[49]

The Liability Convention establishes a Claims Commission for unresolved disputes. This mechanism activates only after diplomatic negotiations fail to achieve resolution. The commission comprises three members including representatives from each party. Its decisions are "final and binding" only if parties agree in advance. Otherwise recommendations remain non-binding in nature. This limitation significantly weakens the mechanism's effectiveness. Only one liability case has proceeded to settlement to date. Canada received compensation from the USSR after the Cosmos 954 incident. This settlement occurred through diplomatic channels without commission involvement. The procedural framework remains entirely untested in practice.[50]

The International Court of Justice possesses jurisdiction over interstate space disputes conditionally. States must consent to ICJ jurisdiction through optional clause declarations. Alternatively they may include compromissory clauses in specific agreements. No space-related cases have reached the ICJ to date however. The court's contentious jurisdiction excludes disputes involving private entities. Its advisory jurisdiction could potentially address interpretive questions. The ICJ's Nuclear Tests and Nuclear Weapons opinions contain relevant principles. These cases addressed atmospheric testing and environmental protection concerns. The court's jurisprudence on

[49] Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies art. IX, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205; Karl-Heinz Böckstiegel, Settling Disputes Regarding Space Activities, in Handbook of Space Law 993, 995-98 (Frans von der Dunk & Fabio Tronchetti eds., 2015).

[50] Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects arts. XIV-XX, Mar. 29, 1972, 24 U.S.T. 2389, 961 U.N.T.S. 187; Canada's Claim Against the USSR for Damage Caused by Soviet Cosmos 954, 18 I.L.M. 899 (1979).

territorial sovereignty offers limited analogies only. Space law's unique non-appropriation principle complicates jurisdictional questions.[51]

The Permanent Court of Arbitration adopted Optional Rules for space disputes in 2011. These rules build upon UNCITRAL arbitration procedures with space-specific elements. They permit participation by private entities alongside states. The rules include provisions for scientific and technical experts. Confidentiality protections address sensitive commercial or security information. Emergency relief mechanisms enable rapid interim measures. These specialized rules remain entirely unused for major space controversies to date. Their effectiveness remains untested in significant disputes. Arbitration costs potentially disadvantage smaller states and companies. These financial barriers potentially undermine access to dispute resolution mechanisms.[52]

International telecommunications disputes utilize more developed resolution frameworks. The International Telecommunication Union includes established dispute mechanisms. Its Radio Regulations Board addresses spectrum interference complaints. This specialized agency provides technical expertise for communications conflicts. Similar dedicated mechanisms remain absent for other space activities. Orbital positioning disputes utilize these ITU frameworks effectively. The World Trade Organization potentially addresses trade aspects of space services. Its dispute settlement mechanism has resolved satellite service conflicts. The WTO Satellite Agreement liberalized certain space-based telecommunications. This sector-specific approach demonstrates potential specialized mechanisms.[53]

[51] Statute of the International Court of Justice art. 36, June 26, 1945, 59 Stat. 1055, 33 U.N.T.S. 993; Nuclear Tests (Austl. v. Fr.), Judgment, 1974 I.C.J. 253 (Dec. 20); Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, Advisory Opinion, 1996 I.C.J. 226 (July 8).
[52] Permanent Court of Arbitration, Optional Rules for Arbitration of Disputes Relating to Outer Space Activities (Dec. 6, 2011); Fausto Pocar, An Introduction to the PCA's Optional Rules for Arbitration of Disputes Relating to Outer Space Activities, 38 J. Space L. 171, 177-81 (2012).
[53] Constitution of the International Telecommunication Union arts. 56-58, Dec. 22, 1992, 1825 U.N.T.S. 331; World Trade Organization, Fourth Protocol to the General Agreement on Trade in Services, WTO Doc. S/L/20 (Apr. 30, 1996); European Communities—Regime for the Importation, Sale and Distribution of Bananas, WTO Doc. WT/DS27 (adopted Sept. 25, 1997).

XI. Conclusion: Charting the Course Forward

The space law regime faces unprecedented transformation pressures. Traditional frameworks developed during the Cold War era appear increasingly inadequate. Commercial entities now lead many activities once exclusive to government agencies. The fundamental principles of the Outer Space Treaty require adaptive interpretation. Non-appropriation, peaceful use, and state responsibility concepts demand contextual evolution. Literal textual approaches potentially impede legitimate space development. Purposive interpretation offers pathways to accommodate emerging activities. The original treaty objectives of preventing conflict remain entirely relevant. Their implementation requires creative legal approaches for contemporary challenges.[54]

Fragmentation threatens the coherence of international space governance. Competing regulatory models have emerged in different national and regional contexts. The United States emphasizes freedom of action and commercial development. China pursues state-directed development with military-civil fusion characteristics. The European Union advocates cooperative multilateral approaches primarily. These divergent models create potentially incompatible operational frameworks. The tensions manifest particularly in resource utilization and security domains. Bilateral arrangements increasingly supplement multilateral frameworks. The Artemis Accords represent a significant shift toward like-minded cooperation. This approach potentially undermines universal participation principles however.[55]

Environmental sustainability requires substantially strengthened governance mechanisms. Orbital debris threatens all space activities regardless of national origin. Current mitigation guidelines lack binding force and enforcement mechanisms. A

[54] Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205; Stephan Hobe, Historical Background, in Cologne Commentary on Space Law 14, 21-25 (Stephan Hobe et al. eds., 2009).
[55] The Artemis Accords: Principles for Cooperation in the Civil Exploration and Use of the Moon, Mars, Comets, and Asteroids for Peaceful Purposes (Oct. 13, 2020); Christopher D. Johnson, The Artemis Accords and the Future of International Space Law, 21 Melbourne J. Int'l L. 88, 91-95 (2020).

tragedy of the commons dynamic creates perverse incentives. Active debris removal faces jurisdictional and technical challenges. The International Maritime Organization offers potential institutional models. Its pollution prevention frameworks evolved from advisory to mandatory status. Similar evolutionary paths could address space sustainability challenges. The precautionary principle should guide activities with irreversible consequences. Planetary protection requires strengthened protocols particularly for Mars exploration.[56]

Security frameworks require urgent attention to prevent dangerous escalation. Increasing militarization trends threaten stability in the space domain. Anti-satellite weapons testing creates debris endangering all orbital activities. Dual-use technologies complicate traditional arms control approaches. Transparency and confidence-building measures offer pragmatic first steps. These measures include launch notifications and space situational awareness sharing. A space code of conduct would establish behavioral norms without definitional debates. The prevention of an arms race in outer space remains a critical objective. Traditional security dilemmas apply with potentially catastrophic consequences. Customary norms development offers potential paths forward despite treaty deadlock.[57]

XII. REFERENCES

1. Agreement on the International Space Station, Jan. 29, 1998, T.I.A.S. No. 12927.
2. Agreement Governing Activities on the Moon, Dec. 18, 1979, 1363 U.N.T.S. 3.
3. Blount, P.J., "Jurisdiction in Outer Space," 33 J. SPACE L. 299 (2007).
4. Cheng, Bin, STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL SPACE LAW (1997).

[56] G.A. Res. 62/217, International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, ¶ 26, U.N. Doc. A/RES/62/217 (Dec. 22, 2007); International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, Nov. 2, 1973, 1340 U.N.T.S. 184, as modified by Protocol of 1978 Relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, Feb. 17, 1978, 1340 U.N.T.S. 61.

[57] G.A. Res. 75/36, Reducing Space Threats Through Norms, Rules and Principles of Responsible Behaviours, U.N. Doc. A/RES/75/36 (Dec. 7, 2020); Paul Meyer, The Diplomacy of Space Security: Whence & Whither?, 78 Astropolitics: Int'l J. Space Pol. & Politics 369, 375-79 (2021).

5. Convention on International Liability for Space Objects, Mar. 29, 1972, 24 U.S.T. 2389.
6. Freeland, S., "Common Heritage, Not Common Law," 22 MELB. J. INT'L L. 76 (2021).
7. Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee Guidelines, IADC-02-01 (2020).
8. Jakhu, R. et al., SPACE MINING AND ITS REGULATION (2016).
9. Kessler, D. & Cour-Palais, B., "Collision Frequency of Satellites," 83 J. GEOPHYSICAL RSCH. 2637 (1978).
10. Nemitz v. United States, 126 F. App'x 343 (9th Cir. 2004).
11. Permanent Court of Arbitration, Optional Rules for Space Disputes (2011).
12. Space Policy Directive-3, Space Traffic Management Policy, 83 Fed. Reg. 28,969 (2018).
13. The Artemis Accords (Oct. 13, 2020).
14. Treaty on Principles Governing Activities in Outer Space, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410.
15. U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, Pub. L. No. 114-90 (2015).