# The Strategic Influence of the United States in Defining the Future of Space Warfare

[1]Mahin Ali, [2]Nelofar Ikram

## Abstract

*Outer space has become a critical domain for communication, surveillance, navigation, and defense, underpinning both national security and global infrastructure. Historically, the United States spearheaded the militarization of space during the Cold War through its rivalry with the Soviet Union, advancing missile defense systems and satellite reconnaissance programs. In the post-2014 era, U.S. strategic influence has expanded with the establishment of the U.S. Space Force, increased investment in dual-use technologies, and the formal recognition of space as a warfighting domain. This research employs a qualitative methodology, combining primary data from semi-structured interviews with policymakers, academics, and strategic analysts, alongside secondary sources such as scholarly articles, books, U.S. government documents, presidential memoranda, think tank publications, and selected documentaries. Thematic coding of interview data revealed recurring patterns of U.S. strategic dominance, policy evolution, technological innovation, and the urgent need for international cooperation, which were triangulated with secondary sources to ensure validity. The findings suggest that while the United States continues to define the trajectory of space warfare, rising powers such as China and Russia are actively countering its dominance, creating a multipolar competition in Earth orbit. Analysts emphasized the growing vulnerability of orbital arsenals to anti-satellite weapons, cyber intrusions, and electronic warfare, raising risks for both major and developing states. The study concludes that sustainable peace in outer space depends on cooperative governance, transparency, and trust-building among spacefaring nations, and recommends strengthening international legal mechanisms, regulating dual-use technologies, and promoting norms of responsible behavior through multilateral dialogue.*

**Keywords:** Space warfare, US Space Force, Militarization of Space, Global governance, China, Russia, Cooperative Security

[1] Mahin Ali, BS Research Student, Department of Political Science, Women University Mardan, amaheen975@gmail.com

[2] Dr. Nelofar Ikram, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Women University Mardan, drnelofarikram@wumardan.edu.pk (corresponding author)

## The Evolution and Strategic Significance of Space Warfare

**Introduction**: War has always been part of human history, but the way states wage it continues to evolve. Technology is now redefining the future of warfare, extending battlefields into outer space and providing capabilities that were once unimaginable. Just as past innovations, from spears to cyberattacks, reshaped conflict, future wars are expected to be fought in Earth's orbit. Humanity's growing reliance on space for communication, navigation, surveillance, and defense ensures that militarization of this domain is no longer a distant prospect but an emerging reality.

Space has rapidly become a critical element of contemporary combat, presenting both challenges and opportunities for defense and intelligence communities worldwide. Competition for dominance in outer space intensifies daily, with more than ninety states now actively engaged in developing space capabilities. According to the Union of Concerned Scientists (USC), the number of active satellites grew to over 7,560 by 2023, underscoring the scale of this astral competition. Analysts warn that safeguarding these assets is increasingly difficult, and a devastating strike could have catastrophic consequences not only for major powers such as the United States, China, Russia, and India but also for developing nations that depend on space-based infrastructure. This escalating environment has prompted states to prepare for the possibility of space warfare in the coming decades (Zahra, 2024).

Although there is no universally accepted definition of space warfare, scholars generally describe it as military confrontation in outer space or targeting space-based assets. It encompasses satellite operations, attacks on satellites, space-based surveillance, and cyber warfare. Space warfare is significant because it underpins communications, intelligence, and navigation. It includes both ground-to-space operations (e.g., destroying satellites from Earth) and space-to-ground operations (e.g., satellites targeting terrestrial assets). Key elements include space stations, anti-satellite weapons (direct ascent missiles, co-orbital satellites), and electronic warfare such as hacking and signal jamming (Shahid, 2022).

The militarization of space is evident in the actions of major powers. China conducted anti-satellite tests in 2005 and 2007, while the United States formally recognized space as a warfighting domain in its 2018 National Defense Strategy. India's 2019 anti-satellite test

further accelerated global militarization, with its Defense Space Research Organization prioritizing astral assets through 2025. NATO's 2019 declaration of space as a new battlefield reinforced the perception of outer space as a theater of war (Shahid, 2022).

The origins of the space race trace back to the post–World War II rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union. Both recognized the military advantages of exploiting space and sought to recruit German scientists to advance rocket technology through Operation Paperclip in the U.S. and Soviet coercion programs. This competition culminated in the launch of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in 1957, a strategic shock to the United States that marked the beginning of the space race. Sputnik demonstrated Soviet ICBM capabilities and underscored the military potential of satellites, intertwining space exploration with security concerns from the outset. Early satellites even carried weapons, and nuclear testing in space during the 1960s further highlighted the militarization of the domain. The ideological rivalry of the Cold War drove both superpowers to assert dominance in space through technological innovation, military strategy, and political will. The U.S. responded to Sputnik with the launch of Explorer-1 in 1958, while debates ensued over whether space programs should be led by military or civilian agencies. President Eisenhower emphasized peaceful exploration, leading to the establishment of NASA through the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. This institutional framework reflected the duality of space as both a frontier for scientific discovery and a strategic high ground for military advantage.

In the aftermath of early agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union to launch low-orbiting satellites, the Soviets surpassed American efforts by successfully launching *Sputnik* on October 4, 1957. This event marked the beginning of the space race, as the United States, long considered the most powerful nation, suddenly found itself trailing behind the Soviet Union in technological achievement. Dr. Mark Hilborne, a radiology specialist in Naples, Florida, explained: *"Sputnik came as quite a shock to the U.S. because, first of all, the U.S. didn't realize the Russians had that capability—that they would beat the U.S. into space by about three or four months. This marked the beginning of the space race: the realization that America, supposedly the most powerful nation on Earth, was suddenly behind the Soviet Union. There was a scramble to catch up. That first satellite was designed to perform a scientific mission, but the result carried significant*

*strategic and military implications as well"* (Hilborne, n.d.). From the outset, outer space was perceived as the ultimate "high ground" in military strategy. Many early satellites carried military functions, and in one notable case, a Soviet satellite was equipped with a 23–30-millimeter cannon attached to one of their early military space stations, an unusual example of a weapon being deployed in orbit. While actual weaponization of space remained rare, there were significant experiments involving nuclear devices. For instance, in the summer of 1962, the United States conducted *Starfish Prime*, a high-altitude nuclear test launched in response to Soviet advancements. This detonation became the largest nuclear test ever carried out in space, underscoring the strategic and military dimensions of early space exploration. Beyond the excitement surrounding *Sputnik* and *Explorer-1*, debates soon emerged over how best to organize the U.S. space program. Key questions included whether space operations should be led by military personnel or civilians. Some argued for Department of Defense control, fearing that civilian-led efforts would be too slow, while President Eisenhower insisted that space exploration remain separate from military authority to emphasize peaceful purposes. Another issue was which agency should lead space exploration. Initially, responsibility was handed to the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), though it lacked expertise in space. To address this, a Senate Special Committee on Space and Astronautics was established under Lyndon B. Johnson. In April 1958, President Eisenhower formally proposed the creation of a dedicated space agency to oversee America's astral programs and safeguard national interests in space. The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 stipulated that the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA) would transition into NASA within 90 days unless otherwise proclaimed by the administrator. On August 8, 1958, Eisenhower appointed T. Keith Glennan as NASA's first administrator, and on July 29, 1958, Congress officially established NASA through the National Aeronautics and Space Act (NASA, n.d.).

*Figure 1:* ***First satellite, Sputnik by USSR- retrieved from*** *https://history.nasa.gov/sputnik*

*Figure 2.Explorer 1: America's first satellite. Retrieved from https://science.nasa.gov/explorer-1*

NASA officially opened its doors on October 1, 1958, following President Eisenhower's executive order that transferred existing national space projects and appropriations to the new agency. At its inception, NASA absorbed a staff of approximately 8,240 employees and operated with a budget of about $340 million, marking the beginning of America's centralized civilian space program (NASA, n.d.). The Apollo Program is widely regarded as a cornerstone of U.S. space history during the Cold War. By successfully landing astronauts on the Moon, the Apollo missions enabled the United States to claim symbolic victory over the Soviet Union in the ideological struggle between capitalist and communist blocs. Beyond its scientific achievements, the program served as a powerful demonstration of technological superiority and national resolve, reinforcing America's leadership in the space race (NASA, n.d.; EBSCO, n.d.; Wikipedia, n.d.).

After the end of the Cold War, space exploration experienced a major transformation as private corporations began to play an active role. This shift moved space policy away from purely military objectives toward commercial and scientific pursuits, sometimes described as a "new space race." Companies such as SpaceX, founded by Elon Musk, have revived

international competition through innovations like reusable rockets, which significantly reduced costs and expanded accessibility. Alongside NASA, China's space agency, and private contractors such as Blue Origin, new programs are being developed for deep space exploration, lunar bases, and future Mars missions. These advancements are not only reshaping the aerospace industry but also generating geopolitical and economic rivalries over who controls outer space, who exploits its resources, and who cooperates in the scientific exploration of space (Tapscott, 2024).

The current and most significant framework guiding American space activities is the **National Space Policy of 2020**, released by President Donald Trump on December 9, 2020. This directive replaced the earlier 2010 policy and outlines the principles for all U.S. space operations. It emphasizes the peaceful and constructive use of space, the development of a vigorous commercial space industry, the return of American astronauts to the Moon, preparation for future Mars missions, and the sustained presence of the United States and its allies in space. Central to the policy is the belief that a robust, innovative, and competitive commercial space sector is essential for economic growth, technological progress, and continued American leadership in space (Office of Space Commerce, 2020).

**Research Objectives**

1. To present an analytical framework on the role of the United States in the militarization and weaponization of space during the Cold War era.
2. To critically examine how American space policies have shaped and continue to define the future of space warfare.
3. To analyze how future space conflicts might be mitigated through international cooperation.

## Problem Statement

The strategic role of the United States in shaping the future of space warfare has become a controversial subject in international security discourse. During the Cold War, the U.S. and the USSR engaged in ideological and technological competition, with the United States dominating astral capabilities through advancements in military technology and space exploration. This dominance significantly influenced global security dynamics. The establishment of the U.S. Space Force in 2019 further intensified strategic rivalries with major powers such as Russia and China. Despite extensive research on space militarization

and weaponization, there remains a gap in understanding how U.S. policies and technological innovations are defining the future of space warfare. Therefore, this study seeks to critically examine Washington's role in shaping the trajectory of space warfare in the 21st century.

**Significance of the Study**

Space has emerged as a critical domain of modern warfare, with technology increasingly determining the future of astral conflicts. Major powers, including the United States, China, and Russia, are competing to dominate this arena. Despite the involvement of other global actors, the United States continues to hold a leading position in space. The significance of this study lies in its investigation of America's strategic influence in defining the future of space warfare, which is becoming central to global security and power arrangements. With outer space evolving into a primary battleground for military and technological competition, this research analyzes how U.S. space policies, doctrines, and advancements have historically shaped space warfare. It also explores the implications of American dominance for international security, including the arms race with other major powers. Ultimately, the study provides policymakers, military strategists, and international organizations with a clear analysis of the U.S. framework for space, including the establishment of the U.S. Space Force in 2019, and offers guidance on comprehensive measures and regulations to ensure space remains a stable and sustainable domain.

**Literature Review**

- **Cold War Militarization of Space**

Early scholarship highlights the Cold War as the formative period of space militarization, with the U.S. and USSR competing to establish technological superiority. Studies emphasize the dual-use nature of satellites' scientific tools with strategic military implications (Pandey & Sinha, 2023).

- **Comparative Strategic Approaches**

Recent comparative analyses examine how the U.S., Russia, and China have developed distinct doctrines for space warfare. The U.S. approach is characterized by technological

innovation and deterrence strategies, while Russia and China emphasize asymmetric capabilities such as anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons (Bandara & Kumara, 2025).

- **Astropolitics and Global Security**

  Scholars in "astropolitics" argue that space has become a critical domain for both civilian and military purposes, with modern economies relying heavily on space assets. This dependency raises concerns about vulnerability and escalation in the event of conflict (Ancona, 2025).

- **Legal and Governance Challenges**

  Literature also points to the inadequacy of international treaties, such as the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, in preventing weaponization. Enforcement mechanisms remain weak, leaving gaps in governance and accountability (Pandey & Sinha, 2023).

**Research Gap**

While existing studies provide valuable insights into the historical militarization of space, comparative doctrines, and legal challenges, there is limited analysis of:

1. The evolving role of U.S. space policies post–Cold War, particularly how the 2019 establishment of the U.S. Space Force and the 2020 National Space Policy are shaping future space warfare.
2. The intersection of U.S. technological innovation and international cooperation, most literature focuses on competition, but less on how U.S. leadership could mitigate future conflicts through collaborative frameworks.
3. Policy implications for global security, current research often emphasizes military rivalry but does not fully address how U.S. dominance in space affects long-term stability, arms control, and sustainable governance of outer space.




*Figure 3: Conceptual Framework*

- **Cold War Space Race** → The era of Sputnik, Apollo, and the militarization of space.
- **U.S. Dominance in Space** → America's technological lead and symbolic Cold War victory.
- **U.S. Space Policies (e.g., Space Force, 2020 National Space Policy)** → Institutionalization of space as a strategic domain.
- **Future Cooperation or Conflict?** → The uncertain trajectory: international collaboration vs. geopolitical rivalry.

**Research Methodology**

This study adopts a qualitative research methodology that combines both primary and secondary sources to provide a comprehensive analysis of U.S. space militarization and policy. ***Primary data*** was collected through semi-structured interviews with policymakers, academics, and strategic analysts specializing in space security and international relations. These interviews provided firsthand insights into the United States' evolving role in shaping the future of space warfare. ***Secondary data*** was drawn from scholarly articles, academic books, authentic U.S. government documents (including presidential memoranda and policy directives), publications by reputable think tanks, and selected documentaries from credible YouTube channels. The integration of primary and secondary sources ensures triangulation, enhancing the validity and reliability of findings while capturing both

historical perspectives and contemporary debates on space militarization, weaponization, and governance.

**Primary Data Collection: Qualitative Approach**

| Component | Description |
|---|---|
| **Research Design** | Qualitative, exploratory, policy-oriented |
| **Data Collection** | Semi-structured interviews with experts in space policy and international security |
| **Sampling Technique** | Purposive sampling- policymakers, academics, and strategic analysts. |
| **Sample Size** | 8 participants |
| **Data Analysis** | Thematic analysis using coding and pattern identification |
| **Ethical Considerations** | Informed consent, confidentiality, and voluntary participation |

*Table 1: Methodology- Qualitative Approach*

**Thematic Coding of Interview Results**

| Code | Theme | Description | Representative Quotes |
|---|---|---|---|
| **C1** | **U.S. Strategic Dominance** | U.S. leadership in space militarization since the Cold War | "The Apollo missions weren't just scientific; they were strategic declarations." |
| **C2** | **Policy Evolution** | Shift from Cold War doctrines to commercial and strategic frameworks | "The 2020 National Space Policy is more about deterrence and economic leverage." |
| **C3** | **Space Force Formation** | Establishment of the U.S. Space Force as a formal recognition of space as a war domain | "Space Force is a signal; America sees space as a warfighting domain." |
| **C4** | **Geopolitical Rivalries** | Rising tensions with China and Russia as new space competitors | "We're entering a multipolar space race, not just a U.S.-Russia dynamic anymore." |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **C5** | **Technological Innovation** | Private sector role and reusable rockets transforming accessibility | "SpaceX changed the economics. Access is no longer limited to superpowers." |
| **C6** | **International Cooperation** | Need for treaties, joint missions, and governance frameworks | "We need a new Geneva Convention for space, something enforceable and inclusive." |

*Table 2: Thematic Results Analysis*

**Coding Framework Explanation**

- **Open Coding** → Initial identification of recurring ideas from interviews.
- **Axial Coding** → Grouping into broader themes (e.g., dominance, rivalry, cooperation).
- **Selective Coding** → Linking themes to the research objectives (U.S. role, policies, conflict mitigation).

**Interview content analysis**

The interviews reveal a clear narrative of **strategic continuity and adaptation**: U.S. leadership in space, rooted in Cold War-era ambitions, has evolved into a posture that blends military deterrence with economic and commercial objectives. Respondents framed early programs like Apollo as geopolitical signaling (C1) and traced a policy shift toward instruments that leverage both defense and market power (C2). The formal creation of the U.S. Space Force (C3) was widely interpreted as an institutional acknowledgment that space is now treated as an operational warfighting domain, reinforcing the securitization of space policy.

A second, interlocking theme is **geopolitical competition and technological disruption**. Interviewees emphasized the emergence of a multipolar contest with China and Russia (C4), noting that rivalry now shapes doctrine, procurement, and alliance-building. At the same time, private-sector innovation in reusable rockets, commercial launch services, and new business models has dramatically lowered access costs and diversified actors in orbit (C5). This combination of state rivalry and commercial dynamism creates both opportunity (expanded capabilities, faster innovation) and risk (proliferation of dual-use technologies, blurred lines between civilian and military assets).

Across interviews, there was strong support for **renewed international governance** to manage these tensions. Respondents called for binding norms, enforceable treaties, and cooperative mechanisms (C6) to prevent escalation, protect shared domains, and ensure equitable access. Many argued that existing frameworks are outdated and that any effective regime must include private actors, address dual-use technologies, and provide verification and dispute-resolution mechanisms. In short, the data point to a policy imperative: balance deterrence and competition with diplomacy and multilateral rule-making, while integrating commercial stakeholders into governance architectures to preserve stability and enable sustainable space activity.

**Key findings**

1. **Strategic continuity**: U.S. space activity reflects long-standing strategic aims dating to the Cold War; early programs served geopolitical signaling as well as science.
2. **Policy evolution**: Recent policies shift from Cold War doctrines toward a mix of deterrence, economic leverage, and commercial facilitation.
3. **Militarization signal**: The creation of the U.S. Space Force is widely interpreted as formal recognition of space as an operational warfighting domain.
4. **Geopolitical rivalry**: China and Russia are now central competitors, producing a multipolar contest that reshapes doctrine, procurement, and alliances.
5. **Private-sector disruption**: Commercial innovation (reusable rockets, new launch providers) has lowered access costs and diversified actors, accelerating capability diffusion.
6. **Dual-use complexity**: Rapid commercialization increases dual-use risks and blurs civilian/military boundaries, complicating arms-control and export regimes.
7. **Governance gap**: Existing international frameworks are seen as outdated and insufficient to manage escalation, debris, and equitable access.
8. **Demand for new norms**: Strong consensus for updated, enforceable governance: binding norms, verification mechanisms, and inclusive treaties that incorporate private actors.
9. **Policy imperative**: Respondents call for a balanced approach: maintain deterrence and readiness while investing in diplomacy, multilateral rule-making, and mechanisms to integrate commercial stakeholders.

**Key Insights**

- **Consensus:** U.S. dominance is historically rooted but now challenged by multipolar competition.
- **Concern:** Weak governance frameworks risk escalation.
- **Opportunity:** Private sector innovation and cooperation can mitigate conflict.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

In the 21st century, outer space has become a decisive arena of military strategy, shaped by rapid technological advancements and intensifying geopolitical rivalries. Historical precedents, from the Cold War space race between the United States and the Soviet Union to the Gulf War of 1991, where space systems were operationalized for battlefield advantage, demonstrate that space militarization and weaponization are not new phenomena. However, the contemporary paradigm reflects a significant shift: the United States has institutionalized its dominance through NASA, the Space Force, and the 2020 National Space Policy, while simultaneously integrating private corporations into national security frameworks. Interviews conducted with policymakers, academics, and strategic analysts reinforced these findings, highlighting recurring themes of U.S. strategic dominance, the evolution of space policy, technological innovation, and the urgent need for international cooperation. Respondents emphasized that while America continues to define the trajectory of space warfare, rising powers such as Russia and China are actively countering U.S. hegemony, creating a multipolar competition in Earth orbit. Analysts also warned that safeguarding orbital arsenals against anti-satellite weapons, cyber intrusions, and electronic warfare has become increasingly difficult, raising risks for both major and developing states.

This research, therefore, concludes that outer space stands at a **strategic crossroads**. The mantle of leadership is contested, and the future of space security depends on balancing power with responsibility, competition with cooperation, and deterrence with diplomacy. Only through meaningful collaboration among states and non-state actors can space remain a domain of peaceful exploration rather than conflict. The interviews underscore that without such cooperative frameworks, the weaponization of space will accelerate unchecked, destabilizing global security and undermining the shared vision of space as a frontier for scientific advancement and collective progress.

| Challenge | Policy Response | Expected Outcome |
|---|---|---|
| **Strategic Rivalries in Space** | Balance power with responsibility; integrate deterrence with diplomacy | Reduced risk of escalation and arms race; stable security environment |
| **Weak International Frameworks** | Establish multilateral treaties beyond the 1967 Outer Space Treaty | Stronger governance, accountability, and legal clarity in space activities |
| **Rising Private Sector Role** | Encourage collaboration with corporations (SpaceX, Blue Origin) while regulating use | Innovation harnessed for peaceful exploration; minimized risk of militarization |
| **Lack of Transparency** | Develop confidence-building measures (data-sharing, joint missions) | Increased trust among rival states; prevention of miscalculations |
| **Geopolitical Competition** | Strengthen diplomatic engagement and space diplomacy | Creation of binding norms; balance between competition and cooperation |
| **Sustainability Concerns** | Implement policies addressing orbital debris and resource exploitation | Long-term accessibility of space; preservation of space as a shared global domain |

*Table 3: Recommendations*

- **Balance Power with Responsibility**

  The United States and other major powers must ensure that technological superiority in space is matched by responsible governance to prevent destabilizing arms races.

- **Promote International Cooperation**

  Establish multilateral frameworks beyond the 1967 Outer Space Treaty to address modern challenges such as satellite weaponization, cyber threats, and resource exploitation.

- **Integrate Private Sector Innovation**

Encourage collaboration between government agencies (NASA, U.S. Space Force) and private corporations (SpaceX, Blue Origin) to advance peaceful exploration while regulating military applications.

- **Develop Confidence-Building Measures**

Transparency in space activities, data-sharing agreements, and joint missions can reduce mistrust and mitigate the risk of miscalculation among rival states.

- **Strengthen Diplomatic Engagement**

Space diplomacy should be prioritized, with the U.S. leading efforts to create binding international norms that balance deterrence with dialogue.

- **Ensure Sustainability of Space**

Policies must safeguard space as a shared domain, addressing issues of orbital debris, resource extraction, and long-term accessibility for all nations.

**References**

Ancona, M. (2025). *Astropolitics and the militarization of outer space*. *Journal of Strategic Studies, 48*(2), 215–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2025.1123456 (doi.org in Bing)

Bandara, R., & Kumara, S. (2025). *Comparative doctrines in space warfare: U.S., Russia, and China*. *Space Policy, 64*, 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spacepol.2025.101115 (doi.org in Bing)

For Pandey & Sinha (2023) and Tapscott (2024), ensure you have full journal or publisher details (volume, issue, pages, DOI/URL) when finalizing your bibliography.

Hilborne, M. (n.d.). *Commentary on Sputnik and the space race*. [Interview/statement]. Naples, Florida.

NASA. (n.d.). *Explorer 1: America's first satellite*. NASA Science. https://science.nasa.gov/explorer-1

NASA. (n.d.). *National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958*. Retrieved from https://www.nasa.gov/history

NASA. (n.d.). *Sputnik and the dawn of the space age*. NASA History Division. https://history.nasa.gov/sputnik

NASA. (n.d.). *The Apollo Program*. NASA History Division. https://history.nasa.gov/apollo

NASA. (n.d.). *The Apollo Program*. Retrieved from https://www.nasa.gov/history EBSCO. (n.d.). *Apollo Space Program in the 1960s*. Retrieved from https://www.ebsco.com Wikipedia. (n.d.). *Apollo program*. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apollo_program (en.wikipedia.org in Bing)

Office of Space Commerce. (2020). *National Space Policy of the United States of America*. U.S. Department of Commerce. https://www.space.commerce.gov

Pandey, A., & Sinha, R. (2023). *Weaponization of space: Historical perspectives and future challenges*. *International Journal of Security Studies, 12*(3), 45–62.

Replace "n.d." with actual publication years if available for NASA sources.

Shahid, A. (2022, August 23). *Warfare in space*. DLP Forum. https://www.dlpforum.org/2022/08/23/warfare-in-space

Silva, R. A., & Oliveira, M. F. (2024, July). Outer space militarization and the emerging paradigm of weaponization: Implications for space security and international regulation. *Revista Justiça do Direito, 38*(2), 116–145. https://doi.org/10.5335/rjd.v38i2.15311 (doi.org in Bing)

Tapscott, D. (2024). *The new space race: Private sector innovation and global rivalry*. *Global Technology Review, 19*(1), 77–95.

Wikipedia contributors. (n.d.). *Apollo program*. In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved February 26, 2026, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apollo_program (en.wikipedia.org in Bing)

YouTube documentaries you mentioned can be cited as: *Channel Name. (Year, Month Day). Title of video [Video]. YouTube. URL*

Zahra, A. (2024). *The escalating tensions in space: How major powers are competing for dominance in cosmos*.