How the Pentagon Plans to Defeat Eurasia and Roll out "Robotic Warfare"

By Andrew Korybko
Global Research, June 18, 2015
Oriental Review 17 June 2015

Region: Asia, Europe, Russia and FSU, USA
Theme: Militarization and WMD

Deputy Secretary of Defense Robert Work expounded upon the US' military strategy in Eurasia during a speech at the Army War College Strategy Conference on 8 April, revealing critical insight into the Pentagon's formal approach to forthcoming conflicts. Work's words should be read in full by any strategist endeavoring to understand the imperatives that guide the world's most armed forces. He elaborates on the theoretical foundations of American military might, including how the Pentagon plans to counter the three types of wars supposedly being waged by Iran, Russia, and China.

The main strategic innovation being presented is something called the "Third Offset Strategy", which in practice amounts to electromagnetic anti-missile rail guns and seamless combat integration between man and machine. These two pronouncements mark startling military developments that will assuredly initiate a news arms race between the West and the Resistant & Defiant states most actively opposed to its domination, as the only realistic alternative is eventual submission or all-out pre-emptive war.

Part I analyzes the theory and nature of 21st-century wars, using Work's speech as a guiding instrument, and then addresses the Pentagon's overall plans against China. Part II continues off of this trajectory and details the Third Offset and all that it frighteningly entails, before ending with a brief conclusion that ties everything together.

Theoretical Foundations

There are three main ideas that Work references as underpinning the US military's overall strategy, and they are as follows:

The Two Pillars:

Highly skilled individuals and technological superiority constitute the two primary pillars from which the rest of America's strategy is built. To quote the man himself:

> Since World War II, American military strategy and our entire national defense strategy has been built upon an assumption of technological superiority, and the better-trained individual — individuals, men and women, organized to employ these technologies in an innovative way... I assume and I am confident in my assumption that we have an enduring advantage in our people...But I'm telling you right now our technological superiority is slipping.

While the [striking rate of suicide](#) in the US Armed Forces calls into question the endurance and quality of training that American servicemen receive, the main aspect to focus on in the abovementioned citation is Work's belief that the US military's technological superiority is in decline. His view is entirely subjective because there are no reliable quantitative measurements available to back it up, but it importantly conveys a sense of urgency and infers that some type of action must immediately be taken to halt and/or reverse this process. Surprisingly, he's not asking for more money to stop the [US' relative decline](#) in military spending (despite thinking that trend is "stupid"), instead pleading that:

> It doesn't matter how much money we have. This problem requires thinking. And we need to tackle it together, and not worry so much about the resources as the intellectual capital that we need to put in the bank to allow our joint force to be so successful in the future.

Work's preference for brainpower over budgetary politics is logical when one considers the second motivator of US military strategy.

The Velocity of Instability:

Early on in his speech, Work references Army Chief of Staff [Raymond Odierno](#)'s definition of the "velocity of instability" as being the pace of strategic change, which becomes one of the most influential current imperatives of the US military when it combines with the pace of technological innovation. What this simply means is that non-Western actors are creating new technologies and crafting adaptive strategies that are creating complications for the US' application of [full-spectrum dominance](#), the former of which will be discussed in detail during the next main section. In response to such rapidly changing circumstances, the US feels entitled in bullying others by never picking on an equally matched adversary.

No Fair Fight:

A remotely piloted aircraft system (drone) getting launched from the aircraft carrier George H.W.

According to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff [Martin Dempsey](#), whom Work also cites during his speech, "we never, ever want to send our troops into a fair fight", confirming what many had already suspected about militant bullying being an integral part of the US' foreign policy toolkit. The US never picks a fight with anyone who can give it a legitimate run for its money, so to speak, choosing instead to conventionally attack smaller and weaker states like Iraq and Libya whose militaries represent a negligible challenge. When it comes to more evenly matched rivals such as Russia and China or those which can inflict unacceptable collateral damage like Iran, the US understands that it must keep its destabilization just short of the conventional threshold, opting instead for asymmetrical aggression in the form of economic subversion, Color Revolutions, and Unconventional Wars.

21st-Century Wars

Keeping the concept of "no fair fight" at the forefront of one's thoughts, it's now time to look at the three types of wars that Work accuses Iran, Russia, and China of waging, before describing the radical means he proposes for countering them and thus giving the US the first-strike capability in any conflict.

Hybrid War:

In his parade of prominent US military strategists, Work speaks about [Frank Hoffman](#) and his definition of hybrid warfare, which he defines as:

"Combat operations characterized by the simultaneous and adaptive employment of a complex combination of conventional weapons, irregular warfare, terrorism and criminal behavior to achieve political objectives."

The above perfectly describes the US and its proxies' onslaught on Syria, but Work instead attributes this strategy to Hezbollah (commonly believed in American military circles as being a de-facto extension of the Iranian military) in its legendary 2006 defense against Israel's invasion of Southern Lebanon:

> Hezbollah fighters were armed with advanced anti-tank missiles, thousands of long-range rockets, Chinese-made Silkworm anti-ship missiles, advanced man-portable anti-air missiles, and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs). They had very simplistic, but very effective battle networks to employ them. They practiced irregular warfare, but at the same time maneuvered effectively against Israeli armored columns, proved proficient in indirect fire, and they used swarms of heavy anti-tank missiles to great effect.

Again, this sounds exactly like how the US is behaving in Syria, specifically with its anti-tank and anti-air armament supply to terrorist groups active in the country, but nonetheless, the Pentagon representative insists that "in the future, without question, hybrid adversaries will pose a qualitative and quantitative challenge" to the US. It's not clear if he's foreshadowing that US troops will soon be fighting against the same proxy agents they helped arm and train for hybrid war, but it's unmistakable that he's identifying this type of fighting with the Mideast theater, where thus far it's been most popularly practiced.

Non-Linear Warfare:

Euromaidan is the classic example of a legitimate public protest turning violent through the hybrid warfare technics.

Work continues linking various novel warfighting innovations with certain geographic zones and actors through his description Russia's application of non-linear warfare in Eastern Europe, which he reports as:

> Evolve[ing] from covert actions by special operations forces, to sustained unconventional combat waged under an umbrella of denial. And then ultimately escalating to high-end force-on-force proxy warfare with the state actively involved in combat operations .

One could be forgiven for mistaking this with Washington's strategy of Color Revolution 2.0, otherwise known in practice as the "Arab Spring" or EuroMaidan, seeing as how both instances perfectly correlate with Work's definition. He even manages to express the exasperation that the embittered Syrian and Ukrainian authorities felt when he says that:

"Non-linear adversaries make those avenues (of approach) harder to detect, using agents, paramilitaries, deception, infiltration, and persistent denial to make those avenues of approach very hard to detect, operating in what some people have called "the gray zone."

One can now begin to see a pattern of ironic rhetoric emerge; the US is accusing its primary Eurasian rivals (Iran, Russia, and next to be seen, China) of engaging in the exact same type of warfare that Washington itself has perfected, and which has been used as its calling card in the victimized states that it recently attacked (be it directly or indirectly). The American ideology of Exceptionalism means that it would never openly recognize this fact and will instead always try to assign such strategies to its adversaries, but this doesn't take away from the reality that the US has become the most apt practitioner of these concepts.

"Informationalized" Warfare:

The third military innovation that Work outlines as posing a challenge for the US is what he says the Chinese call "informationalized" warfare, which he considers being:

"The combination of cyber, electronic warfare, information ops, deception and denial to disrupt our command and control to give the enemy an advantage in the decision cycle."

It's curious why he attaches this strategy to China, since Beijing hasn't fought a war since its 1979 one against Vietnam before the advent of cyber warfare, but be that as it may, once more, it's the US that's actually the prime practitioner of this misattributed art (or least came close to it). The reader should recall the 2011 NATO War on Libya when the US seriously considered [that very same plan](#) before deciding to more easily use [Tomahawk missiles](#) to destroy Gaddafi's [command and control centers](#). While it's obvious that this so-called "informationalized" warfare can realistically be =exercised by any Great Power in the world today, so far US-controlled NATO appears to be the most capable actor in doing so due to its multi-national (UK/Poland/Italy/Baltic States) deployment of "[strategic communication centers](#)", which will predictably augment its capability in carrying out the "information ops, deception and denial" components of this strategy.

Clashing With China

USS Fort Worth, based in Singapore, is closely monitoring
Chinese activities near Spratly Islands

The Deputy Secretary of Defense not-so-subtly refers to China as a prospective target of the Pentagon's warfighting machine when he speaks about the challenge posed by A2/AD (anti-area, area-denial) strategies, which Beijing has [previously been highlighted](#) by the US military for [partaking in](#). Work lists three steps by which the US plans on countering this concept:

1. "Take the first salvo" (likely inferring a provocation or false-flag scenario) using raid-breaking technology (to be elaborated upon shortly)
2. "Break into (the) theater"
3. "Think about Air Land Battle 2.0", predicted to be "against enemies which have lots of guided rockets, artillery, mortars and missiles, and are using informationalized warfare to completely disrupt our heavily netted force", but which "the Army needs to figure…out" because it has yet to be witnessed in battle.

It's anticipated that the "first salvo" will be when the enemy "throw[s] guided munition salvos as dense as our own and sometimes over long range" (essentially making it "AirLand Battle 2.0" before the US breaks through the theater and gets close enough to physically respond), meaning that "the competitor who can demonstrate the ability to defeat the guided munitions salvo competition is going to have a unique advantage at the operational level of war." The US seeks to acquire this said advantage through its implementation of the Third Offset Strategy, which is also envisioned with providing it the ability to defeat both human and robotic military units during the theater break-in and subsequent Air Land Battle 2.0.

To be continued…

Andrew Korybko is the political analyst and journalist for Sputnik who currently lives and studies in Moscow, exclusively for Oriental Review.

The original source of this article is Oriental Review
Copyright © Andrew Korybko, Oriental Review, 2015

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Andrew Korybko

About the author:

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China's One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca