

Why the United States Will Lose a War with Russia

By [Mike Whitney](#)

Global Research, November 28, 2024

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

Theme: [Militarization and WMD](#)

I never cease to be amazed by the pervasive belief that the US military is superior to any other on the planet. Upon what basis is this faith founded? The US has not engaged in a real war since Korea. No one in the US military has ANY experience with high-intensity conflict.
—[Will Schryver](#), military analyst

*If the United States launches a nuclear “decapitation” strike on Russia that kills President Putin and his Generals, Russia has a backup system in place that will automatically retaliate. The **Dead Hand** system is designed to collect data from sensors scattered across Russia on radiation, heat and seismic activity confirming a nuclear strike. **If the system does not receive instructions from Moscow’s Command Center with a given period of time, the system will autonomously launch 4,000 tactical and strategic intercontinental ballistic missiles at the United States ensuring the complete destruction of the country and the incineration of hundreds of millions of Americans.** Moscow’s message is simple: **“Even if a preemptive strike takes out our leaders, our ‘dead hand’ will still kill you all.”** —[Dead Hand](#), Planet Report*

Most Americans continue to believe that the United States will prevail in a conventional war with Russia. But that is simply not the case. For starters, Russia’s state-of-the-art missile technology and missile defense systems are vastly superior to those produced by western weapons manufacturers. Secondly, Russia can field an army of more than 1 million battle-hardened combat troops who have experienced high-intensity warfare and are prepared to engage whatever enemy they may face in the future. Third, the United States no longer has the industrial capacity to match Russia’s impressive output of lethal weaponry, artillery shells, ammunition, and cutting-edge ballistic missiles. In short, **Russian military capability far exceeds that of the US in the areas that really count: High-tech weaponry, military industrial capacity, and experienced manpower.** In order to drive this overall point home, I’ve taken excerpts from the work of three military analysts who explain these matters in greater detail underscoring the dramatic shortcomings of the modern US military and the problems it is likely to encounter when faced with a more technologically advanced and formidable adversary. The first excerpt is from an article by Alex Vershinin titled The Return of Industrial Warfare:

The war in Ukraine has proven that the age of industrial warfare is still here. The massive consumption of equipment, vehicles and ammunition requires a large-scale industrial base for resupply – quantity still has a quality of its own.... **The rate of ammunition and equipment consumption in Ukraine can only be sustained by a large-scale industrial base.**

This reality should be a concrete warning to Western countries, who have

scaled down military industrial capacity and sacrificed scale and effectiveness for efficiency. This strategy relies on flawed assumptions about the future of war, and has been influenced by both the bureaucratic culture in Western governments and the legacy of low-intensity conflicts. Currently, the West may not have the industrial capacity to fight a large-scale war....

The Capacity of the West's Industrial Base

The winner in a prolonged war between two near-peer powers is still based on which side has the strongest industrial base. A country must either have the manufacturing capacity to build massive quantities of ammunition or have other manufacturing industries that can be rapidly converted to ammunition production. Unfortunately, the West no longer seems to have either.... **In a recent war game involving US, UK and French forces, UK forces exhausted national stockpiles of critical ammunition after eight days....**

Flawed Assumptions

The first key assumption about future of combat is that precision-guided weapons will reduce overall ammunition consumption by requiring only one round to destroy the target. The war in Ukraine is challenging this assumption..... **The second crucial assumption is that industry can be turned on and off at will..... Unfortunately, this does not work for military purchases. There is only one customer in the US for artillery shells - the military. Once the orders drop off, the manufacturer must close production lines to cut costs to stay in business. Small businesses may close entirely. Generating new capacity is very challenging, especially as there is so little manufacturing capacity left to draw skilled workers from.....** The supply chain issues are also problematic because subcomponents may be produced by a subcontractor who either goes out of business, with loss of orders or retools for other customers or who relies on parts from overseas, possibly from a hostile country....

Conclusion

The war in Ukraine demonstrates that war between peer or near-peer adversaries demands the existence of a technically advanced, mass scale, industrial-age production capability..... For the US to act as the arsenal of democracy in defence of Ukraine, there must be a major look at the manner and the scale at which the US organises its industrial base.... If competition between autocracies and democracies has really entered a military phase, then **the arsenal of democracy must first radically improve its approach to the production of materiel in wartime.** [The Return of Industrial Warfare](#), Alex Vershinin, *Rusi*

Bottom line: **The United States no longer has the industrial base or the requisite stockpiles to prevail in a prolonged war between two near-peer powers. Simply put, the US will not win an extended conventional war with Russia.**

Here's how analyst Lee Slusher summed it up in a recent post on Twitter:

.... . The US effectively had monopolies on many decisive capabilities, like precision-guided munitions, night-vision, global strike, etc. I think the absence

of high-intensity conflict between the US and other nations had a lot to do with these asymmetries. There was no need for the US to apply mass when its advanced capabilities—or even just the threat of them—were sufficient to achieve political aims..... **The list of nations with advanced capabilities continues to grow. At the same time, Western militaries and defense industrial bases continue to erode. The West exchanged its large standing armies for a reliance on boutique American capabilities that were once decisive but are now increasingly commonplace. This has left the West without its technological edge and without its previous military mass. Those who still believe in US military supremacy fail to realize these changes.** Worse still, most of them entertain cartoonishly underrated notions about Russian military capabilities. They fail to realize Russia has both a technological edge and military mass. The reputation the US military had was deserved for a time, but everything changes. Lee Slusher
[@LeeBTConsulting](#)

Bottom Line: America's adversaries—Russia, China, Iran—have either caught up to or surpassed the US in advanced missile technology, Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV), electronic warfare, cutting-edge missile defense systems etc—which is gradually increasing parity between the states while ending the period of US military supremacy. The American century is rapidly drawing to a close.



Let's move on to military analyst Number 2, Will Schyver, who draws similar conclusions to those of Vershinin but from a slightly different angle. Check it out:

I am more convinced than ever that **the US could NOT establish air superiority against Russia — not in a week; not in a year. Never. It simply could not be done.** It would be a logistical power projection challenge well beyond the current capabilities of the United States military.

American air power would prove substantially inferior to the extremely potent and abundantly supplied air defenses fielded by the Russians.

Just as the majority of HIMARS-launched GMLRS rockets, HARMS missiles, ATACMS missiles, and British Storm Shadow missiles are now being shot down in Ukraine, the vast majority of US long-range precision-guided missiles would be shot down, and **the US would very rapidly deplete its limited inventory of these munitions in a futile attempt to overwhelm the Russian capacity to keep shooting back.**

American suppression of enemy air defenses would prove inadequate to the task of defeating extremely sophisticated, deeply layered, and highly mobile air defense radars and missiles....

the war in Ukraine has made perfectly clear that all manner of western air defense systems are inferior to even the decades-old Soviet S-300 and Buk systems that Ukraine originally deployed. And even if western systems were formidable, they simply don't exist in anything approaching the numbers necessary to provide credible defense in broad scope and depth.

To complicate matters even further, **scant US munitions inventory and insuperable production limitations would allow the US to prosecute an air war against Russia or China for only a few weeks at most.**

Moreover, in a high-intensity combat scenario in either eastern Europe, the China seas, or the Persian Gulf, the maintenance demands for US aircraft would overwhelm its proximate supply. Mission-capable rates would plummet even lower than their notoriously abysmal peacetime standards.

The US would, quite literally after only a few days, see sub-10% mission-capable rates for the F-22 and F-35, and sub-25% rates for almost every other platform in the inventory. It would be a huge embarrassment for the Pentagon ... but hardly a huge surprise.....

Simply put, US air power as a theater-wide undertaking could not be sustained in the context of a non-permissive regional and global battlefield against one or more peer adversaries.

In eastern Europe, Russia would savage NATO bases and supply routes. The Baltic and Black seas would effectively become Russian lakes where NATO shipping could not venture....

Many are convinced these are unfounded hysterical assertions. In my view, the simple military, mathematical, and geographic realities of the situation dictate these conclusions, and **those who resist them are typically blinded by the myth of American exceptionalism and its attendant ills to such a degree that they are unable to discern things as they really are....**

I am increasingly persuaded that, if the US chooses to make direct war against either Russia, China, or Iran, it will result in a war against all three simultaneously.

And that, amazingly enough, is just one of multiple hard truths that the #EmpireAtAllCosts cult, and those acquiescing to its delusional designs, ought to give more serious consideration as they continue staggering towards the abyss of a war they could never win.... [Staggering Towards the Abyss](#), Will Schryver, Substack

There's a lot to chew on here but, in essence, Schryver is weighing Russia's impressive air defense capability **against America's "scant munitions inventory and insuperable production limitations"**, the combination of which suggests that a US military offensive would likely peter-out before inflicting serious damage on the enemy. Once again, our military analyst infers that the United States will not win in a direct confrontation with Russia.



Finally, we've excerpted a longer blurb from Kit Klarenberg who is more of an investigative journalist than military analyst. In a piece titled [Collapsing Empire: China and Russia Checkmate US Military](#), Klarenberg details, what he calls the "unrelentingly bleak analysis of every aspect of the Empire's bloated, decaying global war machine." If even half of what the author says is true, then we can be reasonably certain that the United States escalation with Russia is the fasttrack to a military catastrophe unlike anything the world has seen since the fall of Berlin in May, 1945. Take a look:

On July 29th, RAND Corporation published a landmark appraisal of the state of the Pentagon's 2022 National Defense Strategy (NDS), and current US military readiness...

Its findings are stark, an unrelentingly bleak analysis of every aspect of the Empire's bloated, decaying global war machine. In brief, the US is "not prepared" in any meaningful way for serious "competition" with its major adversaries - and vulnerable or even significantly outmatched in every sphere of warfare.... the Empire's worldwide dominance, are judged to be at best woefully inadequate, at worst outright delusional.

From the Rand Report:

"We believe the magnitude of the threats the US faces is understated and significantly worse...In many ways, China is outpacing the US...in defense production and growth in force size and, increasingly, in force capability and is almost certain to continue to do so...[Beijing] has largely negated the US military advantage in the Western Pacific through two decades of focused military investment. Without significant change by the US, the balance of power will continue to shift in China's favor."

"At minimum, the US should assume that if it enters a direct conflict involving Russia, China, Iran, or North Korea, that country will benefit from economic and military aid from the others...This new alignment of nations opposed to US interests creates a real risk, if not likelihood, that conflict anywhere could become a multi-theater or global war...As US adversaries are cooperating more closely together than before, the US and its allies must be prepared to confront an axis of multiple adversaries." [Commission on the National Defense, Rand](#)

As the Commission report spells out in forensic detail, Washington would be almost completely defenceless in such a scenario, and likely defeated nigh on instantly.... It's not just being spread too thinly across the Grand Chessboard that means the Empire's military "lacks both the capabilities and the capacity required to be confident it can deter and prevail in combat."...

The RAND Commission found **Washington's "defense industrial base" is completely "unable to meet the equipment, technology, and munitions needs" of the US, let alone its allies. "A protracted conflict, especially in multiple theaters, would require much greater capacity to produce, maintain, and replenish weapons and munitions" than is currently in place....**

For decades, the US military "employed cutting-edge technology to its decisive advantage for decades." **This "assumption of uncontested technological superiority" on the Empire's part meant Washington had "the luxury to build exquisite capabilities, with long acquisition cycles and little tolerance for failure or risk." Those days are long over though, with China and Russia "incorporating technology at accelerating speed".... America's "defense industrial base" is today crumbling, riddled with a myriad of deleterious issues...**

To address these problems, the Commission calls... to reindustrialise the US after years of outsourcing, offshoring and neglect. No timeframe is provided, although it would likely take decades.....

We have entered a strange, late-stage Empire era, comparable to the Soviet Union's Glasnost, in which elements of the US imperial braintrust can see with blinding clarity

Washington's entire hegemonic global project is stumbling rapidly and irreversibly towards extinction... [Collapsing Empire: China and Russia Checkmate US Military](#), Kit Klarenberg, Substack

Once again, we see the same criticisms reiterated over and over again: **Insufficient industrial capacity, dwindling stockpiles, “insuperable production limitations”, and diminished technological superiority.** When we add these to the myriad logistical problems of conducting a war in eastern Europe with an ad hoc army of inexperienced volunteers who have never seen combat, we can only conclude that **the United States cannot and will not prevail in a prolonged conflict with Russia.** Even so, Washington continues to fire ATACMS missiles into Russia (13 more were launched over the past two days) apparently believing that there will be no response to the provocation. Even so, **NATO Command continues to entertain illusions of victory by pressing for preemptive “precision strikes” on Russian territory** welcoming the prospect of a direct conflagration between NATO and Russia. And even though, both France and the UK threaten to deploy combat troops to Ukraine thinking the inexorable trajectory of the war can somehow be reversed. It's madness.

Five centuries of primacy have produced a cadre of western elites so drunk with hubris that they are incapable of seeing what is painfully obvious to everyone else, that the imperial model of western exploitation (the 'rules-based order') is collapsing and that new centers of power are rapidly emerging. It appears now that these same elites are prepared to drag the world into a catastrophic Third World War to preserve their grip on power and to prevent other nations from achieving the independence and prosperity they've earned. Fortunately, Washington will fail in this effort just as it has failed in all its other interventions dating back to 1945. Because the United States no longer has the technology, manpower or industrial capacity needed to win a war with Russia.

It's a whole new ballgame.

*

Click the share button below 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.

[Global Research's Holiday Fundraiser](#)

This article was originally published on [The Unz Review](#).

Michael Whitney is a renowned geopolitical and social analyst based in Washington State. He initiated his career as an independent citizen-journalist in 2002 with a commitment to honest journalism, social justice and World peace.

He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG).

All images in this article are from TUR

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Mike Whitney](#), Global Research, 2024

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Mike Whitney](#)

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