

Western Experts Try to Justify Ukrainian Counteroffensive's Failure

By [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#)

Global Research, July 26, 2023

[InfoBrics](#)

Region: [Europe](#), [Russia and FSU](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Militarization and WMD](#)

In-depth Report: [UKRAINE REPORT](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Faced with the failure of the overrated Ukrainian "counteroffensive", Western analysts are trying to find excuses for the humiliation of the neo-Nazi forces. In the opinion of a researcher linked to the Royal United Services Institute, the [bureaucracy](#) of NATO states damaged the Ukrainian moves, preventing the counterattack from achieving the desired objectives. In fact, these assessments sound like mere attempts to omit the evident truth that Kiev is militarily collapsed and unable to launch major maneuvers.

Jack Watling in an article for [The Observer](#) said that the Ukrainian government has been clear about its needs during dialogue with Western partners, explaining since last year which equipment it would need to win on the battlefield. There was great demand for artillery weapons and anti-aircraft defense systems, as well as for investments in military infrastructure, mobility, and engineering. He said that not all weapons were sent to the regime's troops, thus weakening the counteroffensive.

"What the Ukrainians would need in order to conduct successful offensive operations was clearly communicated to western capitals from July to September last year (...) But despite the requirement being identified in September 2022, the decision to proceed was not taken until January 2023 and has only been partially implemented. Months of delays gave Russian forces time to build their defences, significantly complicating the task for the Ukrainians. The upshot is that Ukrainian forces had around two months to master a panoply of western systems in varying states of repair, and to take new troops and try to prepare them for some of the hardest tactical tasks that can be demanded of a force", he said.

Watling believes that this Western bureaucracy also damages NATO itself. He says that the slowness in support for Ukraine increases European insecurity, since Kiev's forces would be

preventing Russia from advancing into western European territory. With this, he endorses the mainstream media's narrative that Moscow plans to "invade" other countries, needing to be "stopped" through military means.

"These bureaucratic constraints highlight a serious problem for Ukraine's partners. While not actually fighting a war, the future of European security depends upon the outcome of Ukraine's struggle. And yet western capitals continue to be process-driven and slow, applying peacetime approaches to much of their activity. Western militaries have made progress in adapting their practice since the start of the war. The rest of government has been slower to realize what must be done", he added.

Indeed, trying to find "reasons" for the Ukrainian failure seems to have become commonplace both in Kiev and in the West. Some analysts and officials suggest that the [lack of weapons](#) is to be blamed, while others suggest that the absence of NATO direct [involvement](#) is the real reason. And some others, like Watling, blame the bureaucracy. It is understandable that there is so much effort to "explain" the defeat. Western and Ukrainian media invested heavily on propaganda by predicting a victorious offensive in this year's spring-summer season, so public opinion's expectations were simply not met with the results.

The collective disappointment with Kiev simultaneously affects the Ukrainian troops, who have [their morale hampered](#), and the Western governments themselves, which lose popular support for the policy of military assistance to the neo-Nazi regime. Liberal NATO governments "justify" sending arms with the excuse that they are necessary for Ukraine to "win", but citizens are more and more convinced that Kiev simply cannot win and that this is an already lost war, not worth investing in the delivery of weapons.

The main problem is that all these "explanations" given by Western analysts are wrong. The Ukrainian counteroffensive failed simply because the neo-Nazi regime's armed forces no longer have significant operational capability, being severely destroyed after one year of persistent fighting. The Ukrainian army is currently represented mostly by inexperienced, poorly trained and forcibly recruited soldiers, without any real motivation or ability to fight. Troops of this type are incapable of being successful in any "counteroffensive" attempt, always tending to lose in clashes against experienced forces.

In the same way that this season's counterattack was neutralized by Russia, it is most likely that all of Kiev's future offensive plans fail, since the neo-Nazi forces are evidently weaker day after day. To avoid a new "meat grinder" in the future, the best thing to do is to stop Western interventionism as soon as possible. Contrary to what Watling says, Russia does not pose a threat to western nations and there is no need for NATO to help its proxy with the excuse of ensuring "Europe's security". Violence will end and stability will be achieved only when Ukraine stops serving NATO's interests and accepts Russian peace terms.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Lucas Leiroz is a journalist, researcher at the Center for Geostrategic Studies, geopolitical consultant. You can follow Lucas on [Twitter](#) and [Telegram](#).

Featured image is from InfoBrics

The original source of this article is [InfoBrics](#)
Copyright © [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#), [InfoBrics](#), 2023

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca