# Russian Satellite Shadowing Tests Allied Space Deterrence

**By**
**Burak Oktenli**

*Published: November 17, 2026*

A satellite can be pressured without firing a missile. In mid-October 2026, Russia's Cosmos 2612 approached an ICEYE radar-imaging satellite operated by a company that supplies imagery to Ukraine, as Reuters reported on November 5. Some analysts viewed the encounter as a possible attack rehearsal, while others cautioned that a close approach does not establish intent. That uncertainty creates an immediate question for the U.S.: how can allied spacecraft move quickly to protect themselves without creating new hazards or confusion among friendly operators?

In September 2026, U.S. Space Command took a crucial step toward answering this question. Its Apollo Maneuvers 2026 exercise practiced coordinated activity across low, medium, and geosynchronous Earth orbits, with participants from multinational Operation Olympic Defender and commercial partners. The exercise advanced maneuver warfare and contested-logistics concepts. The next test should examine not simply whether spacecraft can move for advantage, but whether several independently controlled spacecraft can make compatible decisions under pressure.

Maneuver is becoming a form of deterrence by resilience because a satellite that can change position is harder to hold at risk. But movement can also consume fuel, interrupt service, create close approaches, and be read by an observer as preparation for an attack. An adversary may gain leverage by forcing repeated defensive maneuvers even without striking the target. Credible deterrence requires the ability to move without letting the response become its own source of vulnerability. The service a spacecraft provides greatly matters. A defensive maneuver that interrupts allied tracking or communications at a critical moment could hand an opponent the effect it wanted without destroying an asset. Coordination should test whether a movement protects the mission as well as the vehicle.

The coordination problem is more demanding than a standard collision calculation. Imagine two allied satellites receiving the same uncertain warning of a threatening approach. Each selects a reasonable evasive maneuver using the other satellite's previously predicted orbit. Both then move, invalidating the assumptions behind both plans. No commander intended a collision or an escalation, but independent protective decisions created a joint hazard. This is a hypothetical failure to test, not a reported outcome of the Apollo Maneuvers exercise.

NASA has already identified the underlying engineering issue. Its collision-avoidance handbook, revised in 2026, addresses how spacecraft operators assess and coordinate maneuvers, while a NASA study of automated maneuvering explains why plans must be screened against other objects before execution. Military operations add a complication. An ally cannot disclose every sensitive maneuver in advance, and a threatened spacecraft cannot wait indefinitely for consensus. The answer is not universal permission to move. It is a tested coordination process with clearly defined exceptions.

U.S. Space Command should make maneuver-intent coordination a distinct exercise objective within Operation Olympic Defender. Allied and participating commercial operators should share a minimal, protected status record for actions that could affect one another. Each record should distinguish a proposed maneuver from an authorized one, an executing maneuver from a completed one, and an aborted plan from an active trajectory. A message that merely says "maneuver planned" leaves too much for another system to guess.

The record should also state which operator can revise the plan, when the information was last confirmed, and whether another spacecraft has acknowledged a material change. Sharing need not reveal classified mission objectives or precise future tactics to a potential adversary. Allies can exchange what is necessary for flight safety through controlled channels and release suitable safety information separately. The purpose is to make friendly actions interpretable, not predictable to an opponent.

The difficult case is lost contact. A jammed link, delayed message, disputed tracking feed, or failed propulsion system may leave another operator relying on a plan they cannot execute. A coalition rule should specify which limited protective actions remain preauthorized, what decisions require higher review, and how an isolated spacecraft rejoins coordinated operations. Reconnection should reconcile what happened before full trust returns. Otherwise, an old instruction may reappear as if nothing changed during the outage.

The next live-fly campaign should therefore include adversarial but controlled coordination drills. Give participants conflicting maneuver plans, stale tracking data, a late cancellation, a communications break, and a false warning that triggers several systems at once. Measure unresolved conflicts, time to detect disagreement, avoidable fuel use, interrupted missions, and legitimate protective actions blocked by the coordination rules. A perfect demonstration with uninterrupted links would prove much less. Evaluators should compare isolated safeguards against a shared coordination procedure, rather than crediting the procedure for improvements it did not produce.

Establishing safeguards would strengthen, not restrain, deterrence. The U.S. cannot assume a rival will explain an approach, cooperate in collision avoidance, or respect commercial satellites supporting allied forces. It can, however, make its own coalition difficult to confuse or exhaust. Faster movement has military value only when operators know which plans are in force and which partners may be affected.

The Russian approach to an ICEYE satellite underscores a new strategic reality: orbital uncertainty can itself be a tool of coercion. America and its allies must be able to maneuver decisively, but not blindly. A coalition that can move without tripping over its own decisions will present a more credible deterrent than a collection of individually agile spacecraft.

*Burak Oktenli is an independent researcher working on resilient space systems, autonomous operations, and mission assurance. His commentary has appeared in The Space Review, RealClearDefense, and the Modern War Institute at West Point. Views expressed in this article are the author's own.*