

Europe nation. July 19

The so-called new US way of war

BY A.H. AMIN

The US journal "Foreign Affairs" recently made a comparison between the old and new US way of war. The old way was described as one involving a grinding strategy of attrition that US generals traditionally employed to prevail in combat. But that was then. The journal then proudly stated, "Spurred by dramatic advances in information technology, the new American way of war relies on speed, manoeuvre, flexibility, and surprise."

This approach was put on display in the invasion of Iraq and should reshape what the military looks like.... Its time is now past, however. The US military has adopted a new style of warfare that eschews the bloody sloggish matches of old. It seeks a quick victory with minimal casualties on both sides. It is heavily reliant upon precision firepower, Special Forces, and psychological operations. And it strives to integrate naval, air, and land power into a seamless whole. This approach was put powerfully on display in the recent invasion of Iraq, and its implications for the future of American war fighting are profound."

It appears that US thinkers drunk with the cheap wine of victory are all set to believe that the US way of war is infallible. They have naively ignored

the following facts:

(1) That US has basically won its initial albeit semi-Pyrrhic victories not because it has adopted a new and dynamic way of war but because unlike previous wars no other major super power is aiding anti US forces. China being led by slow thinking indecisive leaders with none of Mao's brilliance and Russia led by a secret service man who has none of Stalin or Lenin's massive strength of resolve and belief in any ideology, less personal ends.

(2) The naive experts have failed to understand the fact that each US action since the First Gulf War has increased anti-US sentiment and added many hundred thousand new recruits to anti-US groups

(3) The assertion ignores the fact that the US invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan have not succeeded in pacifying the country but have actually proved to be a spur and a catalysts to an increased wave of guerrilla warfare, old discarded leaders like Hikmatyar and even Saddam once again raised to status of heroes

(4) The assertion that US way of warfare is superior ignores wars total dimensions and myopically singles out the conventional aspect of war, it

It appears that US thinkers drunk with the cheap wine of victory are all set to believe that the US way of war is infallible.

ignores the fact that wars are a social phenomena and true will to commit a terror act or to snipe at a US soldier is born in the deepest recesses of the human soul which no US gadget can detect.

(5) The fact that US occupation of Iraq was not the end but only a stage in the US war is ignored. Iraq was only one participant and not the centre of gravity of anti-US forces.

(6) The assertion ignores the fact that by occupying Afghanistan and Iraq the US has not denied freedom of manoeuvre to anti-US forces but increased the area in which anti-US forces can strike at US forces at will.

(7) The assertion ignores the fact that by endeavouring to conduct operations in widely separated global axis the US has increased its line of

logistics thus making the war more expensive while immensely shortening the lines of communication of anti-US forces.

(8) The assertion ignores the fact that by deciding to wage conventional wars of occupation occupying countries in violation of international law which has its origin in the Western world USA has reduced and as a matter of fact destroyed its old image as the bastion of Western democracy, thus while there is al Qaeda now a new Al Qaeda composed of non-Islamic men may be created, perhaps in the name of anti-globalization or to further enslave nationalism or even as a neo-Nazi European force.

(9) The USA while allying with so many third world lackey military leaders have created too many Lavals and Quislings who at some stage in history would be toppled and replaced by more anti-US governments, it could be Egypt, UAE, Pakistan or Saudi Arabia.

(10) The analysis ignores the fact that with relatively far less funds, my calculation being 10 million USD per annum per country based on existing cost of cheap weapons/equipment required to conduct brilliant low intensity war (what USA calls terrorist

outrages) the US forces can be kept occupied with ease for ten to fifteen years in Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran (if they occupy it), parts of Africa which they may enter on some pretext), North Korea, Phillipines etc. This 10 Million USD per country can be pooled by China and Russia or even by organizations having contact with drug or weapon dealers or by philanthropic billionaires.

Another viewpoint may be that by overextending without careful forethought USA is increasing the cost of war and all that the anti-US forces have to do is: (1) Keep up the job of low intensity acts whether it is bombing, sniping, industrial sabotage, cyber sabotage the cost being maximum 10 million USD per annum per country. (2) Keep up the propaganda, peaceful protests, reorganizing the cadres. (3) Stretch the affair to a decade while making the US cost to conduct the war Pyrrhic. (4) Bush is only a mean mortal, perhaps he may be knocked out in the next elections or is removed by divine design, the war is ideological and would be fought, Bush or No Bush, Usama or No Usama unless better sense prevail and the participants decide to go for the peace of Westphalia. My gut feeling is that this war shall continue till the day of judgement.