

Space Lusitania: India and Pakistan

Move 3 U.S. Team Briefing

June 15, 2023

What might be the best way to de-escalate the conflict? Who should take the lead in doing what toward this end?

- China should lead this effort and should make a unilateral pledge to not conduct any further space operations
- The fastest way to de-escalate would be if China “backs off” – however this might not be likely
- Regarding the 2022 National Defense Strategy: There is some precedence for trying to set up diplomacy early – this is a great tool for dealing with conflict – this is a route we could have taken as players if we wanted to realistically play the US

What would be the optimal state of relations between the U.S. and India before the conflict? What is the best way to achieve this optimal state?

- It is possible for the US to be much more aligned with India in the future
- As we do with other combined space operation partners, we would have had a special quad operation center in the Indo-Pacific – there would have been real-time communication of data as it happened and some level of prior wargaming.
- India wants to be a strategic partner with the US. Reduce terrorism and promote trade and economic growth

What would be the optimal state of relations between the U.S. and Pakistan before the conflict? What is the best way to achieve this optimal state?

- It is not conceivable that we would view India and Pakistan on the same level. There is no gain for us in tilting toward Pakistan
- We have done work with them identifying internal terrorism before – we can do this again and establish trust on that front
- Making sure there are updates from US Ambassador to Pakistan
- The optimal state would be that Pakistan ceases and chooses to side with India than China – there is zero chance of this happening, however.
 - What is in it for Pakistan, however, when they feel left out of US-India relations?

Is it useful to have the U.S. as a trusted broker? What does this require before any conflict?

- No
- Pakistan and China may not perceive the US as a trusted broker
- PAK pitches a geo-economic growth, but the US was not buying its sincerity. PAK does not want to be caught on either side with the US or China which has led to stressed relations – Pakistan is likely to have a stronger relationship with the Chinese than the US
- Pakistan would want to drive any conversation to internationalize their view of Kashmir – India sees this as illegitimate and would not come to the table/they would see through that
- A trusted broker would mean that we already had India in a real-time operational capacity to observe intel as we received it.
- If there was any hope of being treated as a trusted broker, then a lot of trust by Pakistan is needed (a lot of this was tarnished in the beginning because Pakistan was told that the US was giving special intel just to India even though this did not occur)

What are the benefits and the risks of tilting U.S. relations towards either Pakistan or India?

Tilting US relations toward Pakistan:

- **Benefits:**

- Weaken their drift toward China (if you are willing to go all in against India)
- Not many benefits

- **Risks:**

- Alienation between the US and India – Hasten India's identity as a completely separate pole and weaken US deterrence structure with respect to China
- Embolden Pakistan to be more aggressive with India
- Embolden China to be more aggressive with India

Tilting US relations toward India:

- **Benefits:**

- Stronger relations and democracy
- They will be in one of the top three economies
- Better intelligence sharing with India and better coordination for this type of crisis
- Pakistan less likely to do border or terrorist things

- **Risks:**

- Continue to create tensions between US and Pakistan and China - China will feel contained and Pakistan will feel ignored and like they won't be getting a fair hearing
- Make the China-Pakistan cooperation much more likely – this is a given

Should any of the teams have shared more information, officially, earlier in the game?

- Given the state of things as they were it is hard to imagine that we could have.
- We could have shared more information earlier with India if we had the operational centers and daily exchange and presence. However, we are not configured for releasing data in a crisis.
- China could have told us what they were doing – they could have communicated in advance what they were doing and why. They could have communicated what they want from us in this situation
- India should have provided intelligence on the ground more quickly
 - India could have told the US of the conventional missile strike before they did it

What treaties, national laws, and international political understandings, if any, should nations be held to regarding how non-state actors might be able to access commercial, dual-use satellite services?

- The Outer Space Treaty makes states responsible for their entities – states can already be held accountable for non-state actors that misbehave over their space assets
- Nonstate actors must not use space capabilities for harmful interference or non-peaceful purposes. States should endeavor to prevent the use of their systems by non-state actors from being used for harmful interference or non-peaceful purposes. When made aware of such actions, states have a duty to prevent such actions. Except in cases of self-defense as per the UN charter.
- There is already strong language about not supporting terrorism in general
- A commercial and state-owned satellite must register with the UN – you would know the state of registry, what country that satellite is broadcast to. All satellites are supposed to be registered – meaning there is a state you can draw that asset to **in theory**.
 - This is an ongoing challenge