

which are, inter alia, space-based or include space-based elements. Thus, in all respects the SDI programme constitutes a violation of the ABM Treaty. The same delegation emphasized that its State had been observing fully and precisely the ABM Treaty and that no work similar to the work on the SDI programme was being conducted by it. Nor is this State engaged in the development of an ABM system outside the framework of the 1972 Treaty. It carries on basic research in the exploration of outer space. This has been stated on numerous occasions by the political leadership of this State.

20. With regard to those weapons that are ABM systems or their components, one delegation noted that paragraph 1 of Article V of the ABM Treaty prohibits the development, testing, or deployment of space-based ABM systems or their components as defined in Article II of the Treaty. With regard to those weapons that are ABM systems or their components, this delegation stated that the ABM Treaty prohibited their deployment either in earth orbit or in outer space generally, unless there is agreement between the parties to permit such deployment.

21. Delegations of a group of socialist countries stated that stationing weapons in outer space would inevitably lead to growing mutual mistrust and whip up the arms race and make the world still more vulnerable. They resolutely rejected so-called "Star Wars" plans, proposing instead a series of initiatives aimed at establishing wide-ranging co-operation in the peaceful exploration and development of outer space in the interests of all humanity.

22. One delegation noted that from the above commentary, one might conclude that no other country had any programmes comparable to the SDI programme. Such a conclusion would be far from correct in this delegation's view. One other country has also been pursuing since the 1960s research into advanced technologies for strategic defence which were precisely the same types of technologies being researched in the SDI programme. This delegation also noted that its country's strategic defence research efforts would last for some years and that there were no preconceived notions about the options that the research will generate. It was therefore obvious just how preposterous the aforementioned criticisms directed solely against the SDI programme were.

23. Some delegations considered that the examination of existing agreements revealed the continuing need to resolve conflicting interpretations with a view to arriving at a common understanding of what is forbidden and what is permitted under the legal régime applicable to outer space. They noted that basic terms such as "peaceful purposes", "militarization", remain to be defined in a satisfactory and generally acceptable fashion. They stressed that there already exists a considerable body of international law applicable to outer space and that the arms control régime in that environment is much more comprehensive than that on Earth. These delegations also believed that broader participation in existing multilateral agreements and strict observance of both multilateral and bilateral agreements would strengthen the legal régime applicable to outer space. They noted that many elements of the existing outer space legal régime were relatively simple; the more complicated any arms control agreement for outer space is, the more difficult it would be to verify compliance with it. These delegations believed that there was need for in-depth consideration of the question of terminology to arrive at greater precision in the use of terms, and referred to document CD/OS/WP.15 as a good basis for work. In this regard, one delegation