

i.e., submarines and bombers (now assisted by air-launched cruise missiles). Yet the direction of movement would be important psychologically.

Also under negotiation is a treaty about ASAT (anti-satellite weapons). This is a topic quite apart from SDI. However, in UN discussions on curbing the arms race in space, some nations want to widen the concept to include all space weapons (space-to-space, space-to-earth, earth-to-space), not only anti-satellite weapons specifically. The more modest ASAT proposal has a better chance of becoming embodied in a treaty, and it would be helpful since surveillance satellites are important in verification and therefore enhance stability; though the more ambitious plan would be even better if it could be obtained.

The Outer Space Treaty of 1967 banned only the stationing of weapons of mass destruction in orbit around the Earth, or on celestial bodies such as the moon. This obviously does not go far enough, and needs supplementing. A comprehensive space ban should include anti-satellite weapons (ASAT) aimed from the earth to space and from space to space (killer satellites); not only mass destruction weapons but also specific-destruction weapons (e.g., directed-energy beams of light or particles, kinetic-energy weapons); not only in orbit or on the moon, but anywhere in space. Some experts distinguish "militarization of space" (which includes reconnaissance satellites) from "weaponization of space," and would ban only the latter.

Regarding process in bilateral negotiations, it has been suggested that talks about strategic, intermediate, and tactical nuclear weapons could be variously combined (either strategic plus intermediate, or intermediate plus tactical, or all three). This might make possible certain trade-offs and