SYM-AM-26-129

Excerpt from the Proceedings

of the

Twenty-Third Annual Acquisition Research Symposium and Innovation Summit

Volume III

"Accelerating Warfighting Capabilities"

When Two is Greater than Seven in Combat: The Neo-Assyrian Tragedy of the Chariot

Published: April 30, 2026

The research presented in this report was supported by the Acquisition Research Program, Graduate School of Defense Management at the Naval Postgraduate School.

To request defense acquisition research, please contact:

Acquisition Research Program
Department of Defense Management
Naval Postgraduate School
E: arp@nps.edu
www.acquisitionresearch.net

Copies of Symposium Proceedings and Presentations; and Acquisition Sponsored Faculty and Student Research Reports and Posters may be printed from the **NPS Defense Acquisition & Innovation Repository** at **https://dair.nps.edu/**.

ACQUISITION RESEARCH PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF ACQUISITION, FINANCE, AND MANPOWER
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

When Two is Greater than Seven in Combat: The Neo-Assyrian Tragedy of the Chariot

Dr. Dave Lewis, VADM USN (ret.)—Professor of the Practice, Naval Postgraduate School, former Director of the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA). [david.h.lewis@nps.edu]

Abstract

This paper examines the Neo-Assyrian Empire's military adaptation efforts in response to the emergence of steppe horse archers as a dominant form of warfare in the first millennium BCE. Drawing on Arnold J. Toynbee's framework of civilizational challenge and response, this analysis examines the technological and doctrinal evolution of Assyrian chariot warfare, the belated emergence of cavalry, and the deeper reasons for Assyria's failure to adapt effectively. The study further incorporates Chris Argyris' Model I and Model II theories of organizational learning to explain how institutional rigidity, defensive routines, and prestige-bound decision-making constrained Assyria's response. Central to this analysis is the concept of synchrony: the integrated, low-friction alignment of mobility, weapons, command, and logistics, as embodied by steppe horse archers, which were absent from chariot-based systems.

Introduction

The Neo-Assyrian Empire (c. 911–612 BCE) represents one of history's most sophisticated early imperial systems, combining administrative centralization, logistical reach, and military specialization (Gabriel, 2002, pp. 124–133). However, despite these strengths, Assyria confronted and failed to overcome a form of warfare that undermined the chariot, its core military institution. As steppe-derived horse archers penetrated Assyria's Near Eastern geographic borders, Assyria attempted to adapt through incremental modifications rather than systemic military reform (Gabriel, 2002, pp. 133–137). This paper evaluates those efforts through Toynbee's theory of civilizational response (Toynbee, 1934) and Argyris' models of organizational behavior, arguing that Assyria's failure was not technological ignorance but institutional incapacity.

Chariot Warfare and the Steppe Challenge

Assyrian military power rested heavily on chariot warfare. Chariots functioned as elite shock platforms, combining speed, missile fire, and command visibility. They were, however, inherently terrain-dependent, and organizationally complex and demanding, requiring multiple

horses, specialized crews, and supporting infrastructure. Against similarly structured opponents, advanced Assyrian chariot-based warfare systems were devastating.

Steppe horse archers introduced a fundamentally different operational model. Rather than concentrating power in elite platforms, they distributed combat capability to the individual warrior. Mounted archers employed continuous missile fire, avoided decisive collision, and actively controlled the tempo of engagement. Their tactical logic emphasized attrition, exhaustion, and dislocation rather than shock (Hanson, 2020). In Toynbee's terms, this constituted a genuine civilizational challenge, not merely a new weapon. In Frey's lexicon, steppe archers represented a *replacement for mobile warfare technology to that of chariots* (Frey, 2019, p. 13).

Early Neo-Assyrian chariots represented the apex of Near Eastern elite warfare: two-wheeled vehicles drawn by two horses, crewed by a driver and an archer, optimized for shock action and controlled missile fire on open terrain. As Assyria's operational environment expanded into hills and broken terrain and encounters with asymmetrically equipped mobile steppe opponents increased, this system began to reveal its structural and operational limitations.

The Assyrian response was incremental. Chariot crews expanded to three or four men, horse teams increased to four, and vehicle frames were reinforced. Powerfully spoked wheels increased vehicle durability in rough terrain. These changes improved survivability and visual presence but came at the cost of speed, agility, and logistical simplicity. Crucially, they did not alter the fundamental architecture of chariot warfare: mobility, weapons employment, and command functions remained distributed across specialists rather than integrated into a single fighting unit (Dawson, 2001, pp. 199–204; Fagan & Trundle, 2010, pp. 70–73; Hanson, 2020; Roy & Charney, 2020, pp. 130–137). These incremental actions represent organizational implementation of Frey's concept of *enabling* technologies, the chariot, keeping the core technology while improving it incrementally (Frey, 2019, p. 13).

From Toynbee's perspective, this was a *technical adjustment without civilizational synthesis*, a hallmark of failed creative response (Toynbee, 1948, p. 209).

As battlefield effectiveness declined, chariots were increasingly reassigned to ceremonial, symbolic, and command roles. Palace reliefs from the ruins of Nineveh and Khorsabad depict richly adorned chariots carrying kings and generals rather than engaging in decisive combat (Fagan & Trundle, 2010, p. 73). Toynbee described such persistence as *"mimesis after breakdown":* institutions preserved for their symbolic value long after their functional relevance has passed (Sorokin, 1940, p. 384).

The most revealing Assyrian innovation was neither the heavy chariot nor fully independent cavalry, but an intermediate form I describe as "chariots without a chariot." In this system, Assyrian cavalry initially operated in pairs: two men on two horses, riding side by side, one controlling movement while the other wielded a bow. Functionally, this preserved the cognitive and organizational logic of chariot warfare while removing the physical vehicle (Healy, 2023, p. 221; Roy & Charney, 2020, pp. 135–137).

This arrangement addressed several immediate constraints. It eliminated dependence on wheeled platforms, expanded access to terrain, and improved operational reach in mountainous or uneven regions. However, it remained fundamentally conservative. Rather than integrating control and combat into a single rider as steppe horse archers had long done, the Assyrians preserved their traditional role separation, elite specialization, and command hierarchy. The institution modified the combat platform while protecting underlying assumptions. The chariot was removed, but chariot thinking remained.

Only late in the empire's history did newly developed Assyrian cavalry approach the integrated effectiveness of steppe models, by which point the strategic environment had already shifted decisively.

Synchrony and the Steppe Horse Archer Advantage

The decisive advantage of steppe horse archers lay in *synchrony*: the seamless integration of movement, firepower, command, and logistics at the level of the individual warrior (Hanson, 2020). Horse, weapon, and operator formed a single adaptive system. Riders could advance, retreat, fire, maneuver, and communicate simultaneously, without reliance on external coordination or specialized infrastructure. Synchrony represented a new form of mobile horse warfare, more effective and more efficient than the chariot form. It was a revolution, not an evolution of mobile equine warfare.

Assyrian chariot systems, by contrast, were structurally desynchronized. Drivers did not fight, archers did not steer, and vehicles could not function independently of terrain and support networks. Under the fluid conditions imposed by Assyria's steppe opponents, this desynchronization proved fatal. Horse archers expanded the battlespace, while chariots constrained it. Steppe cavalry exerted sustained, continuous combat pressure, while Assyrian chariots relied on localized, episodic shock assaults.

Logistically, the contrast was equally stark. Steppe warriors carried their combat system with them; chariot warfare depended on roads, workshops, forage planning, and skilled artisans. Command and control among horse archers was emergent and resilient, while chariot armies relied on centralized elite leadership, which was vulnerable to disruption.

The Scythians used a weapon composed of two components: horse and rider. The Neo-Assyrian system utilized between five (archer, driver, chariot, and two horses), seven (driver, archer, spearman, chariot, and three to four horses), and finally, three (two horses, an archer, and a "driver"). Two were proven to be better than seven.

As horse breeding improved and stronger mounts became available in the seventh century BCE, Assyria gradually fielded independent, armored cavalry, sometimes with lancers, capable of functioning as integrated combat units. By this point, cavalry had replaced chariots in most operational roles, though chariots persisted in ceremonial and symbolic roles (Healy, 2023, pp. 217–19).

Toynbee would recognize this as an adaptation arriving too late and too cautiously to reverse the strategic imbalance (Sorokin, 1940, p. 377).

Organizational Analysis: Argyris' Models I and II

The Neo-Assyrian military did not fail to innovate; it failed to unlearn. Its response to the steppe challenge was characterized by single-loop learning: adjusting parameters while preserving identity-defining structures. Chariot enlargement, role-preserving cavalry pairs, and ceremonial retention of obsolete platforms all reflect defensive routines designed to protect elite status and institutional coherence.

Assyria's response to the threat imposed by steppe archer civilizations exhibits classic Model I behavior: defensive routines, single-loop learning, and preservation of existing hierarchies. Chariot modifications adjusted performance parameters without questioning underlying assumptions about elite warfare, control, and prestige. Feedback that challenged those assumptions, most notably repeated failures (combat defeats) against mobile opponents, was absorbed without triggering institutional reevaluation (Healy, 2023, pp. 220).

A best response would have required abandoning the chariot paradigm altogether—embracing mounted warfare earlier and in its fully integrated form, decentralizing tactical decision-making, and accepting the erosion of elite monopoly control (represented by the chariot form) over violence. The “chariot without a chariot” represents the moment where Assyria stood at that threshold and stepped back.

Instead, Assyria clung to legacy systems whose symbolic value exceeded their operational utility.

Toynbee’s Diagnosis: Failure of Creative Response

Toynbee argued that civilizations collapse when they cannot convert external challenge into internal transformation. The Assyrian experience confirms this diagnosis. The steppe horse archer was not merely a tactical enemy but an organizational alternative: leaner, more adaptive, and better aligned with its environment (Toynbee, 1948, p. 56).

Assyria perceived the threat, experimented with responses, and even gestured toward synchrony. However, its commitment to prestige systems delayed the final transition until the strategic window had closed.

Toynbee called this “Challenge and Response”: *“Civilizations, I believe, come to birth and proceed to grow by successfully responding to successive challenges. They break down and go to pieces if and when a challenge confronts them that they fail to meet”* (Toynbee, 1948, p. 56).

Comparative Synthesis

Dimension	Chariot Systems	Steppe Horse Archers
Tactical Logic	Shock and display	Attrition and control
Organizational Form	Centralized, elite	Distributed, emergent
Terrain Dependence	High	Low
Logistics	Externalized	Embedded
Learning Mode	Model I (single loop)	Model II-like adaptability

Conclusion

The Neo-Assyrian Empire's struggle against steppe horse archers illustrates an early example of a recurring historical pattern: technologically advanced but prestige-bound systems failing against simpler, more integrated organizational forms. Steppe horse archers prevailed not because they possessed superior weapons, but because they embodied a superior alignment of people, technology, and doctrine.

The transition from chariot to cavalry in the Neo-Assyrian Empire illustrates the difference between Frey's enabling technologies and replacement technologies, and between adaptation and transformation. The Assyrians attempted to adapt the chariot by equipping it with innovative technologies (spokes, wheels, additional horses, etc.) rather than replacing the chariot and transforming their military doctrine. The "chariot without a chariot" stands as a vivid historical example of institutional compromise: a system designed to change just enough to survive, but not enough to win.

Steppe horse archers prevailed because they embodied a transformational technology that replaced chariots organizationally, tactically, and logistically. Assyria's failure was not one of intelligence or capacity, but of timing and willingness to abandon the assumptions that had once made it great.

Toynbee's civilizational framework, Hanson's insights, and Argyris' organizational theories together explain why Assyria's adaptations were too limited and too late. **The lesson is enduring: survival in the face of disruptive change depends less on incremental improvement than on the willingness to abandon obsolete assumptions.**

References

Dawson, D. (2001). *The first armies*. J. Keegan (Ed.). Cassel & Co.

Fagan, G., & Trundle, M. (Eds.). (2010). New perspectives on ancient warfare. BRILL. *ProQuest Ebook Central*. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ebook-nps/detail.action?docID=583698.

Frey, C. B. (2019). *The technology trap.* Princeton University Press.

Gabriel, R. A. (2002). *The great armies of antiquity*. Praeger.

Hanson, C. (2020). Synchrony: An aspect of the abilities of steppe horse archers in Eurasian warfare (525 BCE–1350 CE). Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers.11563. https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/11563.

Healy, M. (2023). *The ancient Assyrians.* Osprey Press.

Roy, K., & Charney, M. W. (Eds.) (2020). *Routledge handbook of the global history of warfare*. ProQuest Ebook Central. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ebook-nps/detail.action?docID=31054998.

Sorokin, P. A. (1940). Arnold J. Toynbee's Philosophy of History. *The Journal of Modern History*, *12*(3), 374–387. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1874765

Toynbee, A. J. (1934–1954). *Challenge and response*. School of Cooperative Individualism. Retrieved February 5, 2026 from https://cooperative-individualism.org/toynbee-arnold_challenge-and-response-1934-1954.htm

Toynbee, A. J. (1948). *Civilization on trial*. Oxford University Press.


Acquisition Research Program
Department of Acquisition, Finance, and Manpower
Naval Postgraduate School
555 Dyer Road, Ingersoll Hall
Monterey, CA 93943

www.acquisitionresearch.net