

## WORLD SPACE ORGANIZATION

### Draft Outline

#### I. INTRODUCTION

On August 15, 1985, The Soviet Foreign Minister Edward Shevardnadze sent a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, requesting to have the question of the nonmilitarization of outer space included in the agenda for the Fortieth General Assembly. He also proposed that the Assembly convene an international conference to discuss setting up a world space organization to promote international cooperation in peaceful outer space activities. He pointed out that specific actions aimed at creating space strike weapons were already under way, and if the process were not stopped, the arms race would intensify and broaden in scope, consuming still more resources and creating insurmountable obstacles to joint peaceful space activities on the part of States. Annexed to his letter was a draft resolution by which the Assembly would call on States to do everything possible with regard to stopping the arms race in outer space, thereby creating conditions for wide-ranging international cooperation in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes. He suggested that the Assembly should decide to convene not later than 1987 an international conference on cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space. The conference would consider practical arrangements for setting up a world space organization, once agreement had been reached to ensure effectively the nonmilitarization of outer space.

In a memorandum accompanying the Foreign Minister's letter, the Soviet Union listed the advantages that would result from international cooperation to prevent an arms race in space. It said such cooperation would not only be in the interests of world peace, but would also make possible a sharing of the scientific benefits obtained from space exploration, which could be applied in biology, medicine,

weather forecasting, environmental studies and communications. Remote sensing of the earth by satellites could yield global data for geology and agriculture, for exploration of seas and oceans, and for locating and rescuing disaster victims.

As envisioned in the Soviet memorandum, the new space agency would ensure the equal access of all States to the scientific and technological benefits derived from the exploration of outer space. It could promote the pooling of international resources in joint space projects for peaceful purposes and assist developing countries in that field. It could also help to monitor the observance of international agreements for the nonmilitarization of outer space. (Document A/40/192).

On September 24, in his statement to the General Assembly, the Foreign Minister, formally introduced the proposal.

Space, until recently the realm of science fiction writers, has now become an area of man's practical activity. Peaceful exploration of space holds out for mankind truly limitless prospects of utilizing scientific and technological achievements to promote the economic and social progress of the peoples and to solve the vast problems that face mankind on Earth.

However, these truly cosmic dimensions -- and I am not speaking figuratively -- also present new requirements to the inhabitants of the Earth and above all to the leaders of States.

There should be no repetition of the mistake made four decades ago when the States and peoples of the world were unable to prevent the great intellectual achievement of the mid-twentieth century -- the release of energy of the atom -- from becoming a means for the mass annihilation of human beings. This folly should not happen again at the end of this century when,

having filled the first pages of its space history, mankind is facing a choice -- either space will help to improve the living conditions of our planet or it will become the source of a new mortal danger.

Wishing to contribute to mankind's progress towards new heights of civilization, our country has taken a new major initiative by proposing the inclusion in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly of an item "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in Conditions of Its Non-Militarization."

The Soviet Union has also submitted to the General Assembly specific proposals concerning the main directions and principles of broad international cooperation in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes. Outer space is indivisible and all States should take part in its peaceful exploration.

This implies that progress should be made by joint efforts in both basic and applied areas of space exploration and that all the peoples should be able to benefit from space research. It is our view that such cooperation could best be carried out within the framework of a world space organization. But this could become a reality provided that all channels for militarizing the boundless reaches of outer space are closed off.

To counter the sinister plans of "Star Wars," the USSR is putting before the international community a concept of "Star Peace."

In August 1967, the Ambassador of Malta, Dr. Arvid Pardo, requested the inclusion of an item in the agenda of the following General Assembly, entitled, "Question of the peaceful uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor, and the Subsoil

thereof, beyond present limits of national jurisdiction."

On November 1, 1967, he formally introduced this item, in his now classical three-hour address to the First Committee of the General Assembly. In that address, essentially, he proposed the same substance and procedure with regard to the deep seabed, or "inner space." Space law and sea law have interacted from the beginning -- one picking up some basic principle from the other and developing it further, and this is then being taken over again by the other. But the analogy between the Maltese initiative of 1967 and the Soviet initiative of 1985 is absolutely striking, both with regard to procedure and substance.

As is well known, the Maltese proposal eventually led to the calling of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, the adoption of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 1982, its signature by 159 States and the setting up of the International Seabed Authority through the Preparatory Commission.

The procedure initiated by the Soviet Union in 1985 is identical. Projecting the analogy into the future, one would obtain the following sequence of possible events:

Oceans

Space

1. Placing item on GA Agenda

1. Placing item on GA Agenda

2. Introduction of item in address to GA

2. Introduction of item in address to GA

3. Creation of Ad Hoc Committee

3. Reference to Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

4. Adoption of Declaration of Principles

4. Adoption of Declaration of Principles (re-examination and further development of Outer Space Treaty and Moon Treaty, in consideration of new scienc-

tific and strategic developments)

5. Preparation of Agenda for  
UNCLOS III

5. Preparation of Agenda for U.N. Conference  
on World Space Organization

6. UNCLOS III

6. UNCWSO

7. Adoption of Convention  
establishment of Prep.Com  
to set up Authority

7. Adoption of Convention; establishment  
of Prep.Com to set up WSO

In terms of strategy, the main difference in the two approaches appears to be that, in the ocean case, demilitarization was to be part of the process; in the Soviet approach to the establishment of a World Space Organization, demilitarization of Outer Space appears to be a sine qua non pre-condition. Whether this second procedure is politically more practical or less practical, will have to be examined.

In terms of substance, there are a number of basic concepts common to both developments.

The seabed and its resources have been declared to be a common heritage of mankind, with the implications of

- non-appropriability
- joint management
- benefit sharing
- reservation for peaceful purposes
- preservation for future generations.

Outer space has already been declared "the common province of mankind" which corresponds to the concepts of "global commons" and is characterized by the absence of management.

The moon with its resources has already been declared a Common Heritage of Mankind, and "machinery" for the

management of these resources is prescribed, when they become economically interesting.

The issue is to move, in outer space, from the concept of "common province" to that of "common heritage". The Soviet proposal provides for joint management of scientific research, benefit sharing, and reservation for peaceful purposes.

There are some basic differences as well, which, however, will tend to disappear.

The primary purpose of the Seabed Authority originally was resource exploitation; technological cooperation was conceived as instrumental to the fulfilment of this purpose;

the primary purpose of the World Space Organisation would be technological cooperation i.e., research, development and exploration, with economic benefits accruing as by-product, as it were.

With ocean mining as a primarily economic and commercial activity having receded into the future, the primary purpose of the Seabed Authority may be shifting towards international cooperation in exploration, research and development. There will indeed be ample opportunity for cooperation between the International Seabed Authority and the World Space Organization, the connecting link being constituted by the Marine Satellite Organization (INMARSAT). The possible institutional modes of cooperation should be examined by this Study.

Both institutions will be involved in research and development of high technologies which are part and parcel of the new phase of the industrial revolution. A characteristic of these technologies is that their development is so costly that it can be undertaken only in either one of two ways:: On a national basis under the auspices of the arms race which is cost-indifferent; or on an international co-operative basis which is cost-sharing.

There is no other way. "Star Wars" exemplifies the first model; "star peace," the second. International cooperation in research and development in inner and outer space technology, between East West North and South therefore would have a strong disarmament effect and enhance not only scientific/industrial cooperation but peace and security as well.

The purpose of this study is

-- to explore the similarities and differences between these two initiatives, both with regard to procedure and to substance;

-- to study the lessons that can be drawn from the ocean experience for the space agenda, both as to what to do and what not to do. (E.g., the new organization should be simple, not overloaded with details, and flexible so as to be able to adjust to changing scientific and economic circumstances; there is an important lesson to be learned from the seabed experience.)

Relations with the Baruch/Lilienthal Plan for the international management of nuclear resources and technologies for peaceful purposes will also be examined. The recent Soviet documents indeed refer to the negotiations on that proposal and to the failure in reaching an agreement on international control and cooperation in the field of atomic energy. There is as much to be learned from the positive inspiration of that proposal as from its political flaws and eventual failure. For this positive inspiration was the same as that behind the more recent initiatives. As Acheson, Lilienthal, et al., put it in "A Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State Publication No. 2498, March 16, 1946), there was "hope and reason to believe that in solving [the problem of atomic energy by international means], new patterns of cooperative effort could be established which would be capable of extension to other fields, and which might make a contribution toward the gradual achievement of

a greater degree of community among the peoples of the world." The most positive and innovating aspect of the proposal was that it suggested the establishment of an international Atomic Development Authority instead of a prohibitory convention or "police-like" inspection system -- an approach that undoubtedly was suggested by the very nature of nuclear science and technology: its developmental and its destructive potential. Exactly the same applies to the deep-sea technologies which are to be internationalized in accordance with the Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982 and the outer-space technologies that are the subject of the new Soviet proposal.

The French proposal for an international satellite organisation for the monitoring of compliance with disarmament and arms control agreements on earth, should also be examined in this context. The Soviet proposal itself enumerates, among the functions of the proposed world space organization, "to help, where necessary, in monitoring the observance of agreements which have already been concluded or will be concluded, with a view to preventing an arms race in space." One could imagine that this function be expanded to include monitoring observance of disarmament agreements also on the earth itself. A merger of the Soviet and the French proposals could be considered for this purpose.

In the case of the Sea-bed, the functions of arms control and of scientific/industrial development were separated at an early stage, and regulated in two separate Treaties, the Sea-bed Treaty of 1972 and the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982. Discrepancies between the two Treaties may cause problems in the future and, considering that reservation for exclusively peaceful purposes (disarmament) and development for the benefit of mankind are twin aspects of the concept of the Common Heritage of Mankind, the moment may come when the two treaties will have to be harmonized or even merged. In Outer Space, the two aspects have not yet been separated and it might be well to keep them together, by merging the French and the Soviet proposals.



The study will conclude with a set of recommendations, with specific attention to possible Canadian policy options.

The study will be a "think piece," setting a framework. Its length will not exceed 10,000 words. It might be followed up by more technical studies on the institutional, economic and political aspects of the new initiative. Such studies might be submitted in the form of Canadian Working Papers to the Outer Space Committee in case the Soviet initiative is taken up by that Committee, as would be highly desirable.

It need not be stressed that a study on the national/international implications of space policy is in any case extremely timely and necessary. The role of the Canadian space industry, Canadian participation in international research and development all are under discussion at present. The Soviet initiative, especially if coupled with the French initiative, could provide a new focus for Canadian internal and international concerns.

## II. PROJECT STRUCTURE

### 1. Presentation and analysis of Soviet Proposal

#### (a) Primary Documents to be examined:

General Assembly: A/C.1/40/L.1:  
International Co-operation in the  
Peaceful Exploitation of Outer Space  
Under Conditions of its  
Non-Militarization. Union of Soviet  
Socialist Republics: Draft Resolution  
A/C.1/40/4 Letter dated 9 October 1985  
from the Representative of the Union of  
Soviet Socialist Republics on the First  
Committee addressed to the Chairman of  
the First Committee.

Statement by Eduard A. Shevardnadze,  
September 24, 1985.

#### (b) Existing Treaties and their implications:: The Limited Test Ban Treaty; the Outer Space Treaty, and the ABM Treaty.

#### (c) Related documents:

The French proposal for an International  
Satellite Monitoring Agency, 1978. Study  
by the International Group of Experts,  
1981.

Pugwash, 1985.

SDI: Washington: Office of Technology  
Assessment (OTA): Anti-Satellite  
Weapons, Countermeasures, and Arms  
Control.

Washington (OTA): Ballistic Missile  
Defense Technologies

2. The emerging principle: The reservation of resources and/or technologies for peaceful purposes and their international control and management  
Disarmament implications. Development implications.

3. Precedents

The Baruch Lilienthal Plan. Joint Management of peaceful uses as the only guarantee for the prevention of military uses. Atomic resources and technologies as common heritage of mankind. - Structural and political mistakes to be avoided.

The Monet/Schuman Plan. Joint management of coal and steel as the only guarantee for the prevention of their utilization for the German rearmament industry.

The International Seabed Authority. The reservation of the sea-bed and its resources for exclusively peaceful purposes.

4. Merging SDI and Star Peace. The fate of SDI is most uncertain. While the extension of the arms race into outer space is morally repugnant, technologically absurd, and economically insane, SDI, nevertheless, is also the expression of the need for a new institutional/financial framework for the conduct of high tech R&D which must include the public and the private sector.

The Reagan administration itself apparently realizes that this framework must also be inter-

national, but the present political/military orientation of the "Initiative" is flouting international cooperation. A future Administration might change this orientation while forced to maintain the institutional/financial framework. The OTA studies themselves suggest that SDI is impossible without a considerable degree of cooperation between USA and USSR (the present level of US/USSR cooperation in space should be analysed). A future Administration may find internationalization in the form of a merger between SDI and Star Peace to offer the only way to save enormous investments in space technologies and to utilize established institutional and trained manpower infrastructure.

Between 1963 and 1972, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency commissioned a number of research projects to determine the likely effects of conversion on the US economy. (see Inga Thorsson, In Pursuit of Disarmament: Conversion from Military to Civil Production in Sweden, Vol. 1A, p.51). The problem that has not been confronted in these conversion studies is that the cost of "star wars" technology are so staggeringly high, that conversion from military to civil production within a national framework is not practical. This conversion can only go from military to international, and the Soviet initiative, for a productive World Space Organization is the only solution.

#### 5. The case for Canadian leadership in this initiative

- (a) Mediation between East and West on disarmament
- (b) Mediation between North and South on development and cooperation in high tech R&D.

(c) political and industrial advantages for Canada

III. DOCUMENTATION