

OLD AND NEW INSURGENCY FORMS

Robert J. Bunker

While the study of insurgency extends well over 100 years and has its origins in the guerrilla and small wars of the 19th century and beyond, almost no cross modal analysis—that is, dedicated insurgency form typology identification—has been conducted. Until the end of the Cold War, the study of insurgency focused primarily on separatist and Marxist derived forms with an emphasis on counterinsurgency practice aimed at those forms rather than on identifying what differences and interrelationships existed. The reason for this is that the decades-long Cold War struggle subsumed many diverse national struggles and tensions into a larger paradigm of conflict—a free, democratic, and capitalist West versus a totalitarian, communist, and centrally planned East.

With the end of the Cold War and the resulting ideological and economic implosion of the Soviet Union, post-Cold War insurgency typologies began to emerge because a need existed to understand where this component of the new global security environment was heading. Over 2 decades of research and writing have been focused on this endeavor by what is a relatively small number of insurgency practitioners and/or theorists. In addition, the works of some contemporary terrorism scholars are also relevant to this topical area of focus.

For this monograph to identify what can be considered new forms of insurgency that are developing, an appreciation for and understanding of earlier insurgency forms must also be articulated. With these thoughts in mind, this monograph will initially discuss what an insurgency is and some Western viewpoints on it, describe how terrorism analysis can potentially serve an indications and warnings (I&W) function, provide a literature review of the post-Cold War insurgency typologies that exist,

create a proposed insurgency typology divided into legacy, contemporary, and emergent and potential insurgency forms, and finally provide strategic implications for U.S. defense policy as they relate to each of these forms. The work will also utilize a number of tables for organizational purposes and an endnotes section for scholarly citation requirements.

Pertaining to the insurgency and terrorism literature reviews conducted in this manuscript, the following terrorism and insurgency forms—form name(s), author(s), and year of publication—were analyzed in creating the final forms typology.

Terrorism Forms.

- Anarchist, anti-colonial, new-left, religious extremism (Rapoport, 2001)
- Utopian vision (Kaplan, 2007)
- Ethnic, religious, ideological (Schnabel and Gunaratna, 2006, 2015)

Insurgency Forms.

- Commercial and spiritual (Metz, 1993)
- People's war, Cuban-style focquismo, urban insurrection (Metz, 1993)
- Defensive (Cable, 1993 in Metz, 1995)
- Reactionary, subversive (camouflaged) (Metz, 1995)
- Liberation, separatist, reform, warlord (Clapham, 1998)
- Apolitical (Sloan, 1999)
- Economic (Thom, 1999)
- Resource-based (Cilliers, 2000)
- Revolutionary warfare, wars of national liberation, urban, superpower (Beckett, 2001)

- Globalized Islamist (Kilcullen, 2004)
- National, liberation (Metz and Millen, 2004)
- Anarchist, egalitarian, traditionalist (reactionary-traditionalist), apocalyptic-utopian, secessionist, reformist, preservationist, commercial (Metz, 1993; O'Neill, 2005)
- Virtual (Thomas, 2006)
- Virtual (Hammes, 2007 in Metz, 2007)
- Criminal (Sullivan, 2008)
- Violent new religious movements (Lauder, 2009)
- Urban (Sullivan and Elkus, 2009)
- Resource control (Tarr, 2011)
- Revolution, separatism, resistance (Jones, 2011)
- Virtual (Sloan, 2011)
- Plutocratic (Bunker, 2011)
- Proto-state, nonpolitical, state destruction (Metz, 2012)
- Urban (Kilcullen, 2013)
- Chinese state (Jones and Johnson, 2013)
- Singularity (Rectenwald, 2013)
- Radical Christian (Metz, 2015)

Derived from this analysis, the following insurgency forms with their starting dates in () have been identified as well as the strategic implications of each form for U.S. defense policy.

Legacy Insurgency Forms.

Anarchist (1880s). Generally violent, anarchism has only been viewed as a form of terrorism (Rapoport, 2001) because the end state sought is governmental – even state – destruction. No replacement government or seizure of the state is being attempted nor is any form of subversion or co-option of state institutions or the parallel building of a shadow state taking place. Still, O'Neill (2005) designates this as an insurgency form and the insurgency outcome of state-destruction exists in a later typology created by Metz (2012).

Strategic implications: None. This legacy insurgency form is an anachronism with the threat potentials downgraded to that of sporadic periods of local unrest being generated by protesters outside of political conventions and financial summits and characterized by vandalism, aggravated assault, and arson. This is solely a U.S. domestic law enforcement issue focusing on riot control, investigation of criminal activities, and limited counterterrorism response. No U.S. military response is required.

Separatist – Internal and External (1920s). This insurgency form encompasses both separation from local authority – such as the original Irish Republican

Army (IRA) gaining Irish independence from the United Kingdom in 1921 – and the separation from foreign authority as took place in numerous regions during the decolonial period after the Second World War. Numerous theorists have identified this insurgency form, ranging from Cable's (1993) defensive articulation through a number of others into Jones's (2011) separatist and resistance types.

Strategic implications: Limited. This insurgency form now takes place only sporadically and to some extent has been replaced by more traditional secession ballot initiatives as have or may be seen in the future as taking place in Scotland, Catalonia, Flanders, and other locales. Still, the insurgencies of the 1990s that took place in the former Yugoslavia and the more recent secession of South Sudan in 2011 suggest this legacy form has not faded away. A possible U.S. military response may be required depending on the specific international incident taking place.

Maoist People's (1930s). The most identifiable insurgency form is derived from Mao Zedong's principles found in his 1937 work, *On Guerrilla Warfare*. This form, also known as "people's war," utilizes peasant armies that are drawn upon for an integrated and protracted politico-military phase strategy of eventual state takeover. A shadow or proto-state is created in parallel to the pre-existing one being targeted for elimination. This form has been identified by Metz (1993) as people's war, by Beckett (2001) as revolutionary warfare, by O'Neill (2005) as egalitarian, and Schnabel and Gunaratna (2006; 2015) as ideological.

Strategic implications: None. This legacy insurgency form is defunct. No U.S. military response is required.

Urban Left (Late-1960s). This insurgency form has been identified by a number of theorists and, as previously mentioned, is a continuation of earlier Marxist politico-military concepts with a more urbanized emphasis. Peasants no longer fight in the countryside or surround cities – their successors now engage in terrorist tactical actions within those cities. Metz's (1993) urban insurrection – devoid the Iranian experience, Beckett's (2001) urban and superpower based Soviet proxy component, Rapoport's (2001) new-left, and Schnabel and Gunaratna's (2006; 2015) ideological (which spans the earlier Marxist form and this one) all address this form.

Strategic implications: None to limited. This legacy insurgency form appears to be defunct, therefore, no U.S. military response is required. However, the promotion of such potentials by the Bolivarian alliance exists and could be facilitated by Russian, Iranian, and Hezbollah, and/or Chinese support.

Still, if this insurgency form should reappear, the impact is estimated to be limited. It would require varying U.S. Government agency involvement based on a situational response.

Contemporary Insurgency Forms.

Radical Islamist (1979). The Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1979 and the ensuing 444-day U.S. Embassy hostage crisis ushered in a new insurgency form derived from the perception that mosque and state are inexorably intertwined. The radical Islamist form has two variants—one Shia and the other Sunni based—and stems from the fact that Islam never underwent a historical reformation which ushered in secular political thought and a separation of the spheres of church (or mosque) and state. Scholars recognizing this insurgency form are Metz (1995) reactionary, Rapoport (2001) religious extremism, Kilcullen (2004) globalized Islamist, O'Neill (2005) reactionary-traditionalist, and Schnabel and Gunaratna (2006; 2015) religious.

Strategic implications: Significant. Groups involved include Hezbollah, al-Qaeda, and the Islamic State. Of all the presently active insurgency forms, this one has the most significant impact on U.S. defense policy as witnessed by the years of deployments to Afghanistan and Iraq and the ongoing operations in Syria, Yemen, and numerous other locales. This insurgency form requires either federal law enforcement or the military (typically) as the designated lead. An all-of-government approach is required to mitigate and defeat this insurgency form which possesses a terrorism component—utilizing both large scale and lone wolf attacks—representing a direct threat to the U.S. homeland.

Liberal Democratic (1989). The removal of the Berlin Wall in November 1989, the end of Communist rule in Eastern Europe thereafter, and the eventual dissolution of the Soviet Union in December 1991 marked not only the end to the Cold War but also the power of pluralist uprisings as the Polish Solidarity shipyard workers have shown. That liberal democracy could provide the basis for an insurgency form has been noted by both Beckett (2001), as the American component of the Cold War superpower based conflict, and also later by O'Neill (2005), more specifically within his pluralist form designation.

Strategic implications: Mixed (beneficial). This insurgency form should be viewed as an opportunity to extend democratic values rather than as an actual or potential threat of some sort to the United States or its allies. A variety of U.S. Government agencies may provide indirect and/or direct facilitation of such

insurgencies. The one downside of this insurgency form is unintended second and third order effects—for example, U.S. support to the mostly defunct Free Syrian Army (FSA) inadvertently strengthened the Islamic State (IS) by helping to weaken the Assad regime.

Criminal (Early-2000s). Elements and components of this insurgency form have been projected and identified by numerous scholars: Metz's (1993) commercial, Clapham's (1998) warlord, Sloan's (1999) apolitical, Thom's (1999) economic, Cilliers's (2000) resource-based, Tarr's (2011) resource control, and Metz's later (2012) non-political. Of these various articulations, Sullivan's (2008) criminal designation—directly derived from Metz's 1993 perceptions—has become the dominant one as it relates to the insurgent-like activities of the gangs and cartels in Mexico and Latin America.

Strategic implications: Limited to moderate. Typically, the groups involved in this insurgency form—Colombian and Mexican cartels, Central American gangs, and the Italian mafia—are viewed as a law enforcement concern. However, some of the African warlords and the more operationally capable cartel groups, such as *Los Zetas* and CJNG (*Cártel de Jalisco Nueva Generación*), have overmatch capability to any law enforcement response. For the United States, the response to this insurgency form requires either federal law enforcement (typically) or the military as the designated lead. An all-of-government approach is required to mitigate and defeat this insurgency form that springs out of Mexico and is bringing corruption into U.S. border zones along with sporadic incidents of narco-terrorism.

Plutocratic (2008). Of all of the insurgency forms offered in this monograph, this may be one of the most contentious. It specifically views the rise of globalized capital devoid of any ties to the state—in essence, representative of an emerging form of 21st century postmodern capitalism—in direct conflict with earlier forms of 20th century state moderated capitalism promoted by liberal democratic governments. It views the rise of stateless multinational corporations, and the global elites (.001% to 1%) they serve as the major stakeholders, as insider insurgent threats to the international order. This insurgent form serves as a corollary to the preceding criminal form and represents another variant to Metz's (1993) commercial articulation postulated by Bunker (2011).

Strategic implications: None presently. The U.S. military has no current role in the response to the rise of predatory global capitalism and the emerging “sovereign free” entities engaging in it. Rather, varying governmental agencies with a legalistic and economic

mandate will be required to promote state moderated capitalist values and laws. Federal law enforcement agencies will be tasked to support such efforts as they relate to financial crimes, tax avoidance, and related offenses.

Emergent and Potential Insurgency Forms.

Blood Cultist (Emergent). The existence of this type of insurgency form has been recognized by a number of scholars (O'Neill, 2005; Kaplan, 2007; Lauder, 2009) primarily within the last decade and ultimately represents a fusion of criminality, spirituality, and barbarism. It is most recognizable with recent Islamic State activity involving mass ritual beheadings, crucifixions, child rape, and related atrocities and their "end of days" type of pursuits. Attributes of this insurgency form can also be found with the *La Familia Michoacana* (LFM) and *Los Caballeros Templarios* (The Knight's Templars) cartels in Mexico which engage in Christian cultish behaviors and elements of *Los Zetas* and *Cartel del Golfo* that are involved in extreme forms of *Santa Muerte* worship which seek supernatural protection, death magic spells, power, and riches.

Strategic implications: Limited to moderate. This insurgency form can be viewed as a mutation of either radical Islam and/or rampant criminality, as found in parts of Latin America and Africa, into dark spirituality based on cult-like behaviors and activities involving rituals and even human sacrifice. To respond to this insurgency form, either federal law enforcement or the military will be the designated lead depending on the specific international incident taking place. An all-of-government approach will be required to mitigate and defeat this insurgency form which has terrorism (and narco-terrorism) elements that represent direct threats—especially concerning the Islamic State—to the U.S. homeland.

Neo-urban (Emergent). This emergent insurgency form is not a resurgence of the old urban left form dating back to the late-1960s that was derived from small numbers of politicized leftist-leaning urban guerrillas. Rather, this form is post-modernistic in orientation with concerns over feral cities and sprawling slums—such as in Karachi, Rio, Lagos, and Nairobi—controlled by inner city gangs, local militias, organized crime and private security groups. Theoretically, it can be considered a kludge of Metz's *commercial* (1993) and *urban insurrection* (1993) forms updated by means of Sullivan and Elkus' *urban* (2009) and Kilcullen's *urban* (2013) focused insurgencies writings. Kilcullen's competitive control focus is further indicative of fractured sovereignty and state deconstruction. It is thus conceptually allied with

the neo-Medievalism works of Hedley Bull (1977), Jorg Friedrichs (2001) and Phil Williams (2008). This insurgency form has become the focus of present "megacities issue" studies by U.S. Army insurgency experts and is highlighted by such works as the Army Chief of Staff's Strategic Studies Group/Concept Team's *Megacities and the United States Army* (2014) and William Adamson's "Megacities and the US Army" published in *Parameters* (2015).

Strategic implications: Moderate to significant potentials. At its more benign levels of criminality, this is a law enforcement concern, but when public safety resources are overwhelmed and internal stability is threatened it increasingly becomes a military concern. A major issue is governmental inability to effectively control sprawling slums and the possible role of gangs, militias, and organized crime as a stabilizing and norm inducing force. Of further concern is the fact that this insurgency form readily has the capacity to merge with the criminal insurgency form. An all-of-government approach is required for megacities which are in advanced stages of this insurgency form because it ultimately signifies that urban competitive control has shifted to informal networks and non-state entities.

Virtual (Potential; Near to Midterm). Initial thinking on this potential form solely focused on its being an adjunct to physical based insurgency. It was simply viewed as a means of virtual communications—a more efficient type of "propaganda of the deed" or cyber *levée en masse* (form of mobilization)—which was initially discussed by Thomas (2006 and 2007), Hammes (2007 in Metz), and Betz (2008). The initial "adjunct to physical insurgency" viewpoint has since been challenged by new perceptions articulated by Sloan (2011). He sees the virtual realm as its own reality in which insurgency can now be waged—a view shared by this author given his past collaborative work with Sloan. As a result, this potential insurgency form is reflective of a changing 21st century battlefield composed of dual-dimensional space-time attributes, derived from humanspace and cyberspace, with its increasing virtual overlay placed over our physical reality.

Strategic implications: Initially limited but increasing over time. This potential insurgency form spans a basic criminal or terrorist act (e.g., recruiting and fundraising for the Islamic State) through increasing levels of sophistication such as the release of classified governmental documents (e.g., WikiLeaks), the shutdown of components of a state's public and private infrastructure, and actual destructive cyberattacks. Ultimately, it may represent an entirely new component of insurgency taking place

both in cyberspace and eventually as a component of dual-dimensional (e.g., humanspace and cyberspace) operations. An initial response to virtual support of terrorists and insurgents will need to come from federal law enforcement and specialized computer forensic and cyber task forces. More systemic and malicious type attacks, approaching what can be considered *virtual* insurgency levels, will result in military and intelligence agency cyber forces also being utilized for response purposes.

Chinese Authoritarianism (Potentials; Near to Midterm). China is now not only in the process of industrializing, but has been running a massive mercantilist-like trade surplus, and investing in countries across the world in order to gain access to raw materials and resources. In addition to China's Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) and "Belt and Road" initiatives in Asia and within the former lands traversed by the old Silk Road, it has made significant political and economic investment inroads into both Africa and Latin America. The insurgency potentials identified by Jones and Johnson (2013) can thus be seen vis-à-vis the U.S. "Pivot to Asia" and the ensuing engagement and containment strategy being directed at China. Steven Metz has voiced an opposing view on the viability of such a potential insurgency form.

Strategic implications: Significant potentials. Given that China is rising as a great power and now has global economic and political interests and reach, this proposed insurgency form could in the near to midterm represent a threat to U.S. national security. However, significant barriers to implementation exist stemming from a lack of a transnational ideology that can solidify ties to insurgents. Ongoing monitoring and analysis by the intelligence community of such threat potentials is warranted for strategic early warning purposes. Additionally, behavioral and environmental shaping by the Department of State and Department of Defense to promote desirable futures should be implemented.

Cyborg and Spiritual Machine (Potentials; Long Term/Science Fiction-like). This insurgency form can be considered a "blue sky" scenario, but must still must

be considered for its potentially dire implications. This insurgency form is derived from the merging of the spiritual (Metz, 1993) and plutocratic (Bunker, 2011) forms and has also been raised in neo-Marxist singularity form thinking (Rectenwald, 2013). Such concerns have been the lore of science fiction for decades and can be found in Isaac Asimov's "Three Laws of Robotics" meant to protect humanity from such threats through the dystopian Terminator series in which the self-aware Skynet computer system targets humanity for eradication.

Strategic implications: None presently. This proposed insurgency form is viewed as having long-term threat potentials, although it is presently science fiction-like in nature. The appropriate U.S. response is achieved through the Defense Science Board monitoring of technologies related to cybernetic implants and strong artificial intelligence and the shaping of policies and laws that promote democratic and constitutional values.

More information about the programs of the Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) and U.S. Army War College (USAWC) Press may be found on the Institute's homepage at www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil.

Organizations interested in reprinting this or other SSI and USAWC Press executive summaries should contact the Editor for Production via e-mail at SSI_Publishing@conus.army.mil. All organizations granted this right must include the following statement: "Reprinted with permission of the Strategic Studies Institute and U.S. Army War College Press, U.S. Army War College."



This Publication



SSI Website



USAWC Website