CHAPTER I
INSURGENCY: AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

The existing literature on internal political violence is beset with a great deal of conceptual confusion. This is largely due to a lack of consensus on the definition of terms such as revolution, insurgency, insurrection, guerrilla warfare, popular warfare, unconventional warfare, irregular warfare, protracted struggle, armed struggle, internal war, rebellion, liberation war, low-intensity conflict, terrorism and many more which have evolved in the course of understanding conflicts.

This array of terms has become analogous not only in common discourse but in academic literature as well. They have been used interchangeably and indiscriminately and often defined in contradictory ways. This only adds confusion to a very complex subject like insurgency. Samuel P. Huntington aptly remarked, "No doubt each term serves some purpose, although one cannot help but feel that semantics has perhaps outstripped theory."¹

In view of this conceptual confusion about internal political violence, it is imperative that the principal concepts employed in the analysis of insurgency be defined very carefully. The following section will examine the meaning of insurgency, its causes and relationship with other variables. This is followed by a discussion on different models of insurgency.

DEFINITIONAL PROBLEMS

Insurgency has been defined in various ways. Galula defines it as "a protracted struggle conducted methodically, step by step, in order to attain specific intermediate

¹ Quoted from John S. Pustay, Counter-Insurgency Warfare (New York, 1965), p.5.
objectives leading finally to the overthrow of the existing order."² Pustay writes that an insurgency is a "composite conflict phenomenon which can be defined as a cellular development of resistance against an incumbent political regime and which expands from the initial stage of subversion-infiltration through the intermediate stages of overt resistance by small armed bands and insurrection to final fruition in civil war."³

An insurgency is revolutionary in its character to the extent it seeks to radically transform an existing socio-political order into a new order with a different value system.⁴ Revolution implies a basic transformation of the society and its basic values. A Marxist revolution involves a change in the relations of production, where dominant classes are destroyed and such a transformation is inevitably associated with violence for seizure of power or protection of the new order.

A revolt is much narrower in its scope. It is a violent, reaction to centralized authority, that may lead to a revolution. "A revolt is coherent, armed rising of sufficient proportion to challenge seriously the existing central authority, but, without the capacity to create an alternative authority..."⁵

Insurrection is a term that is often used as a synonym for insurgency. Schuman applies the term "insurrection" to the "initial stages of movements of opposition to government...[It is] an incipient rebellion or revolution, still localized and limited to securing modifications of governmental policy or personnel and not yet a serious threat to the state or the government in power."⁶ An insurrection would, therefore, be narrower in scope as compared

³ Pustay, n.1, p.5.
⁴ ibid.
to a rebellion or a revolution. Though an insurrection and an insurgency refer to an armed struggle against the state, the two are not the same. While an insurrection is an attempt to defeat the enemy by inflicting a sudden but sharp and intense attack, an insurgency involves attempts to defeat the enemy in a series of encounters, usually in a protracted struggle.

The term internal war, used by Eckstein refers to "attempts to change by violence, or threat of violence, a government’s policies, rulers, or organization." Thus, by internal war, he means only the military aspect of a struggle. An insurgency is an internal war which connotes military as well as political activities. While the military aspect may be crucial in deciding its outcome, "the politics of the conflict are the fundamental causes and determinants." The term, internal war, also indicates that the struggle is purely indigenous, i.e. the causes, actors and ramifications are limited to the geographical boundaries of the country. However, in most insurgencies, the external dimension is a significant factor, with both the insurgents and the incumbent governments receiving succour from external sources. Thus, internal war gives an incomplete picture of an insurgency. Some scholars have criticized Eckstein for having dropped the term revolution for 'internal wars'. The underlying assumption of this term is that society is in a stable, self-regulating state of perpetual equipoise, and where well-defined institutional patterns exist and violent conflict is not the norm. This term basically originates from sociologists’ concern with violent change in society and develops a model of society based on universal consensus on values and complete social harmony.

The two most popular forms of armed struggle are guerrilla warfare and armed insurrection. However, there is a problem of nomenclature as there is no clear dividing line

---

9 Lawrence Stone, "Theories of Revolution," in Sam S. Sarkesian, ibid., p.28.
between these two. At times, the word terrorism is also used as a synonym for insurgency and guerrilla warfare, further complicating our understanding. It would be instructive to differentiate and understand the differences between these terms.

Much conceptual confusion surrounds the term guerrilla warfare which is defined as "being an irregular war carried on by small bodies of men acting independently." The term ‘guerrilla’ or ‘little war’ was originally used to describe military operations carried out by irregular forces against the rear end of an enemy’s army or by local inhabitants against an occupying force. Guerrilla warfare is based on mobile tactics used by small, lightly armed groups, who aim to harass their opponent rather than defeat them in battle. More recently, it has been applied to all revolutionary wars, national liberation wars, insurrections, peasant wars and acts of terrorism. Since the 1930s, guerrilla warfare, like insurgency which has implied a politico-military campaign, became revolutionary in intent and practice. For Mao, it had also become a framework for a protracted social and political revolution.

Though the dividing line between insurgency and guerrilla warfare is not clear, one can differentiate between terrorism on one hand and insurgency and guerrilla warfare, on the other. Terrorism involves violence or threats of violence by individuals or a group of people designed to instil fear in a targeted population and produce a pervasive atmosphere of

---

12 Most cases have been anti-colonial in nature in Asia and Africa. Examples of such struggles against the British include the bitter long drawn out campaigns in Burma (1824-1825, 1851, 1885), the endless wars fought by Afghans, the Sierra Leone campaign, the Boer war (1899-1902) and the Somalia campaign. See, Gerard Chaliand, Guerrilla Strategies: An Historical Anthology from the Long March to Afghanistan (Berkeley, 1982), p.3.
13 Chaliand tries to create a distinction between guerilla warfare per se and revolutionary warfare. He writes,"...guerrilla warfare is a military tactic aimed at harassing an adversary whereas revolutionary war is a military means whereby to overthrow a political regime." ibid., p.7.
insecurity and anxiety.\textsuperscript{16} This serves as a double-edged weapon to erode the ruling regime’s legitimacy and credibility and drive the masses away from supporting them. Terrorism’s objective may or may not be to destroy the opposing side but to break its will and force it to capitulate.\textsuperscript{17}

A misconceived notion about terrorism is that it constitutes use of violence per se, but it actually uses violence for effect. It is important to note that it is not only the terrorists but the state as well which uses violence to instil fear.\textsuperscript{18} Thus, terrorism is only a means to an end. According to Paul Wilkinson, terrorism-related violence has the following characteristics:

(i) it is inherently discriminatory in its effects;
(ii) it is arbitrary and unpredictable both in the minds of its victims and audience and in its effects upon individuals and society;
(iii) it implicitly denies recognition of all rules and conventions of war, i.e. it does not distinguish between combatants and non-combatants and recognizes no humanitarian constraints, and
(iv) it rejects all moral constraints.\textsuperscript{19}

Some western observers use terrorism and insurgency as co-terminus terms, as sabotage and terrorism are also a part of insurgent tactics. However, most practitioners do not agree with this contention as terrorism can alienate potential support for insurgents and hinder the real revolution.\textsuperscript{20} Guevara believed acts of sabotage to be very important. "It is

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} Brian Jenkins, \textit{International Terrorism: A New Mode of Conflict} (Los Angeles, n.d), p.1. In creating an atmosphere of terror, the media plays an important role because of its tendency to give a disproportionate amount of attention to spectacular acts of violence. Chaliand, n.12, p.30.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Neil Livingstone, \textit{The War Against Terrorism} (Massachusetts, 1986), p.4.
\item \textsuperscript{18} A definition which takes into account state terrorism is provided by Grant Wardlaw, \textit{Political Terrorism: Theory, Tactics and Countermeasures}, (Cambridge, 1982), p.16.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Wilkinson, n.10, pp.54-55.
\item \textsuperscript{20} ibid., p.59.
\end{itemize}
necessary to distinguish clearly between sabotage, a revolutionary and highly effective method of warfare, and terrorism, a measure that is generally ineffective and indiscriminate in its results, since it often makes victims of innocent people and destroys a large number of lives that would be valuable to the revolution.²¹ He argues that terrorism has a role to play in the revolutionary war and is applied only against the representatives of the repressive state apparatus and not against civilians or the common man. It is a valuable tactic but an over-dependence on this may lead to severe reprisals.

The basic difference between terrorism and guerrilla warfare is that even if guerrillas fight with small numbers and inadequate weapons, they do so according to the conventions of war, such as taking and exchanging prisoners and respecting the rights of non-combatants. Terrorists place no limits on the means employed and frequently resort to widespread assassinations, terrorizing the civilian population and even killing innocent people.²² Generally, terrorism has a political motive but unlike guerrillas and insurgents who have strong ideological affiliations, terrorists are not committed to any formal ideology and are mostly driven by political motives and linked by common experiences and aspirations or a commonly perceived enemy.²³

The foregoing analysis shows that while both guerrilla warfare and terrorism are techniques of insurgency involving the use of violence, there are differences between the two.²⁴ At times, they are often used simultaneously and in differing proportions.

**A Classification of Insurgencies**

There is no consensus on the types of insurgencies. They can be classified according

²³ Livingstone, n.17, p.41.
²⁴ For a differentiation based on areas of operation (urban/rural) and nature of violence, see, Stephen Segaller, *Invisible Armies: Terrorism into the 1990s* (London, 1986), pp.16-17.
to their goals. Bard O'Neill classifies them into six --- Secessionist, Revolutionary, Restorational, Reactionary, Conservative and Reformist. According to the earlier discussion on a definition of insurgency, they can largely be of two types --- Revolutionary and Secessionist. Though, at times, autonomy seeking movements have resorted to armed struggle. Likewise, restorational, reactionary, reformist and conservative movements can not be termed as insurgent movements even if they resort to an armed struggle, as they do not attempt to fundamentally change the socio-political and economic structures. Andrew Scott using a novel classification based on the character of the counter-insurgent divides them into -- ‘civil’, ‘anti-colonial’ and ‘against an invading or occupying army’. If both the insurgents and counter-insurgents are indigenous, then it is a civil insurgency. The scope of this classification is so vast that it would include both revolutionary and secessionist insurgencies. Anti-colonial insurgency is directed against outside or colonial powers. The third type of insurgency is against an invading or occupying army.

Though it might be difficult to classify insurgencies, generally it is the revolutionary and secessionist insurgencies that have drawn our concern. In systemic terms, these can be divided into anti-systemic and extra-systemic respectively. The objective of anti-systemic insurgencies is a revolutionary change in the social and political order. The extra-systemic insurgencies are secessionist insurgencies by ethnic, religious or ethno-religious minorities which question the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state and affirm their right of self-determination.

SOME THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In order to understand how an insurgency arises, it is necessary to know why a

---

movement emerges and why it takes a militant or violent form. Since the underlying causes of insurgencies vary greatly, it is difficult to evolve a general theory of insurgency or an all encompassing, universally applicable answer to the question --- why does an insurgency take place?

Some scholars attribute disequilibrium in society, arising out of modernization as being conducive to a revolutionary situation. According to Johnson, sustained disequilibrium between the various sectors of society --- economic, political, educational and cultural could lead to dissatisfaction with the regime. Thus, if education expands faster than the economic output or if economic organization changes more rapidly than political organization or vice versa, many individuals may withdraw support to the regime.²⁷

While Johnson draws attention to disequilibrium between different sectors, Huntington emphasizes disequilibrium within the political sector. He argues that if a country’s institutional procedures for political participation are inadequate in comparison to the people’s expectations for participation, this could lead to unrest and anti-regime activity. As a result of mobilization, new social forces enter the political arena, but the political structure does not provide channels for their participation in politics, thereby leading to civil strife.²⁸

Another noteworthy contribution to the modernization approach is Ted Gurr’s analysis of relative deprivation as the basic pre-condition for any civil strife. When people perceive a discrepancy between their value expectations (what they believe they are entitled to) and their value capabilities (what they are able to get and keep), i.e. when their social opportunities no longer accord with their expectations, either because expectations are rising too quickly or welfare is falling, feelings of ‘relative deprivation’ would create fertile ground

for popular opposition to governments.\textsuperscript{29} This opposition to the government turning violent would depend on "the scope and intensity of the disposition among members of collectivity to take violent action against others".\textsuperscript{30} The attacks against the political regime may take the form of guerrilla wars, coup d'état, rebellion and riots.\textsuperscript{31}

This theory, however, provides only a partial explanation. It does not explain why in similar socio-economic and political conditions, some groups resort to violence while others do not.\textsuperscript{32} Relative deprivation may in fact exist and yet the situation may not turn explosive. Sometimes groups which are economically worse off do not revolt.

Disagreeing that disequilibrium or relative deprivation causes civil strife, Tilly in his `Resource Mobilization' theory argues that the outcome between the government and contenders of power and the probability of a popular protest occurring would depend on how the resources available to the latter compares to that of the incumbents. The ability of groups to achieve power would be determined by the extent to which they are in control of:
(a) normative resources by which Tilly meant, commitment of members to the group itself and its ideals;
(b) coercive resources or means of inflicting punishment on opponents;
(c) utilitarian resources which basically meant rewards.

If the group was to be effective in collective action against its contenders, acquiring these resources was necessary.\textsuperscript{33} This collective action led to violence when members of one

\textsuperscript{29} Gurr defines relative deprivation as "actors' perception of discrepancy between their value expectations and value capabilities. Value expectations are the goods and conditions of life to which people believe they are rightfully entitled. Value capabilities are the goods and conditions they think they are capable of getting and keeping". See, Ted Robert Gurr, \textit{Why Men Rebel} (New Jersey, 1974), p.24.
\textsuperscript{30} ibid., p.29.
\textsuperscript{31} ibid., pp.3-4.
\textsuperscript{32} Paul Wilkinson, n.22, p.127.
\textsuperscript{33} Charles Tilly, \textit{From Mobilization to Revolution} (Massachusetts, 1978), p.5.
group mobilized to attack its opponents' resources, which would further lead to violence ---
groups which had lost their resources, responded to reclaim them.\textsuperscript{34} According to Tilly, only
mobilized sections of the population were involved in this violence.

Gurr, subsequently, has tried to incorporate his relative deprivation theory with Tilly's
resource mobilization theory. The basic premise of this theory is that political action is
motivated by peoples' deep-seated grievances, in combination with the capability of the group
leaders to articulate these grievances. If grievances regarding differential treatment and a
sense of group identity are strong, then it can be organized and articulated by group
leaders.\textsuperscript{35}

As for the Marxist approach, the theory of internal colonialism provides a noteworthy
explanation. In most of the newly independent, erstwhile colonies, national boundaries were
drawn by the departing colonial power, without any regard to the ethno-linguistic or cultural
composition of the population. Despite the formal withdrawal of the colonial power, forms
of oppression which could be described as colonial, have continued in these countries. The
national bourgeoisie have not recognized the rights of the minority ethnic groups and have
treated them as colonies --- as a source of raw material and a market for finished goods. But
this theory does not explain the rise of insurgencies among groups which are not backward
in terms of socio-economic development.

The role of the regime and the nature of state in fostering insurgencies, have been
critical factors in all insurgent movements. Centralization of administration, especially where
it threatens regional and cultural autonomy, can intensify the discontent of an ethnic group
and deepen the conflict. Further, when ends are moderate (for greater autonomy) and means

\textsuperscript{34} ibid., pp.52-55.

non-violent, the regime may not deal with the problem. This often leads to the exacerbation of the crisis and soon the movement may turn insurgent and separatist. In the process of state building, sometimes, rapid social change leads to dislocation and demands the repudiation of the old and the forging of new institutions and relationships. When a ruling class resists fundamental reforms (which means reduction, if not liquidation of its power and privileges), a confrontation between the new political forces and those who wish to retain status quo becomes inevitable and violent.36

In countries, where rulers are willing to abdicate their monopoly of power in favour of greater popular participation, the change is brought about in an orderly and non-violent manner. In South Asia, historical examples of this kind include the British colonial administration’s decision to grant independence to India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. A more recent example is the Nepalese monarch’s decision to allow a more participatory democracy. Even if an insurgent movement were to arise in such situations, it would fail due to lack of popular support.37 But when the regime refuses to allow popular participation, their authority is rejected. The regime then resorts to repression to ensure obedience or as it justifies, to maintain law and order. Violence perpetuated by the government that appears to be arbitrary and indiscriminate, tends to undermine its legitimacy and raises the society’s revolutionary potential.38

While every concept or theory discussed above does not provide a complete explanation for the emergence of an insurgent movement, all point to the state’s crucial role in fostering an insurgency. On account of growing political awareness and participation, the aspirations of a certain class or ethnic group increases for a share in the political and

38 ibid., pp.150-153.
economic power. And the refusal or failure of the ruling regime to satisfy these aspirations leads to discontent among a particular group which blames it for its grievances. When this resentment is shared collectively and mobilized, it becomes a politically relevant discontent. If the leadership succeeds in bringing the people together for collective action, a movement emerges and when they resort to an armed struggle to alter the status quo, it turns into an insurgency.

MAJOR ANALYTICAL VARIABLES

In order to achieve their goals, insurgents devise certain strategies for maximizing the effectiveness of their political and military techniques. These strategies are influenced by six general variables --- the environment, popular support, organization, cohesion, external support and the effectiveness of the government. Sometimes cohesion and organization are treated as one variable but both may be very important in specific cases. These variables are a significant factor in determining the outcome of insurgencies and may be used as a criteria for assessing the political and military achievements, as well as strategies of the insurgents.

Environment

The first major variable used to study an insurgency is the environment. It has two dimensions --- the physical and the human. The first refers to the terrain and the transportation-communication infrastructure. The human dimension focusses on the demographic patterns, socio-economic conditions and the political system and culture. The environment conditions insurgent's strategies and plans and policies of the state.

39 These variables have been used by analysts earlier to examine insurgencies. See, Bard O’Neill and others, n.25, p.5; and Bard O’Neill, Insurgency and Terrorism: Inside Modern Revolutionary Warfare (New York, 1990), pp.53-159.
The Physical Environment

Terrain

This determines the choice of a strategy to a large extent. Historically, successful guerrilla warfare has been waged from rugged terrain like mountains, jungles and swamps. Countries that are small and urbanized are unsuitable for strategies that have to be based on rural guerrilla warfare.

Favourable terrain not only hinders security forces but also provides inaccessible hideouts for establishing guerrilla bases. However, the advantages of a terrain may be limited by its size and proximity, in the sense that only when the terrain is extensive, can insurgents take advantage by expanding their area of operations; reducing firepower concentration, and by isolating the populace from the centralized authority. Proximity is essential to facilitate planning, command, control and communication, and the establishment of logistical support.

In urban warfare, base area and topography are not important considerations. Containment of urban warfare is feasible if the state demonstrates a reasonable commitment towards contesting the insurgents. Insurgents face tactical losses or are defeated in the long run if they do not have the sympathy of a large section of the urban population and perhaps the security forces too.

Transportation-Communications Infrastructure

The state of the transport and communication network has an important bearing on the fate of an insurgency. If the road communications system is highly developed and extensive, regular government forces stand to gain because their mobile units can move expeditiously and utilize their technological superiority better. On the other hand, poor roads and communications favour the guerrillas. Gurr comments on this point:

---

41 Gurr, n.29, p.266.
Guerrilla war is common in underdeveloped countries because of poor transportation and communication networks and the isolation of rural areas, which facilitate guerrilla incursions. Free access to rural people enables guerrillas to propagandize, control, and secure support from them... Given the technological capabilities of the best-equipped modern military forces, the terrain that offers the most effective physical protection for the guerrillas must be mountainous, without roads or tracks, and almost continuously cloud-covered.42

The Human Environment

The Demographic Distribution

Demographic factors bear upon the support and strategy of an insurgent movement. If the population is less but concentrated, it is easier for the government to control the people and sever their links with the guerrillas. In case of highly urbanized society, the government can control and monitor the people and prevent establishment of guerrilla bases. Thus, the location of the majority of population in cities is not favourable for the insurgent movements as compared to the situation in which they are concentrated in rural areas. It is important to note, however, that some insurgencies have increasingly made use of the urban population as well, particularly in the case of ethno-nationalist movements controlling certain amount of territory. But when the authorities demonstrate a strong resolve as well as capacity to combat the insurgent threat, thus forcing the insurgents into protracted warfare, an urban environment although conducive to terrorist activities does not suffice. On the other hand, a rural and underdeveloped environment is more conducive.

Social Structure

Division of society along lines of class, ethnicity, religion and language (and any other primordial identities) is another important factor in shaping the progression of an insurgency. If the deprived groups comprise a majority of the population, mobilizing support becomes a

42 ibid., pp.263-264.
much easier task. In this regard, colonial and minority governments are particularly vulnerable.

The same divisions may, however, have an adverse impact on an insurgent movement. For instance, despite their similar goals, internal differences may arise leading to splits into rival groups, affecting the cohesion of the movement. And such rivalries may be utilized by the state to infiltrate the organizations and play one group against the other.

**Popular Support**

An insurgency without popular support cannot be considered as revolutionary. Besides indicating that such an insurgency has the backing of the aspirations of the masses, it is also important for strategic considerations. Popular support is significant because it is a means to offset the advantages the government possesses by virtue of its control of the administrative apparatus of the state, most specifically the repressive apparatus.

Popular support may take two forms: active support and passive support. Passive support is provided by individuals who sympathize with the insurgent's aims and activities. Active supporters are willing to work for a movement even at risk to their lives. They provide intelligence information, shelter and hideouts to the insurgents and some take part in acts of disobedience or protests often inviting reprisals from the state. While active supporters are important to sustain an insurgency, the significance of the passive supporter should not be undermined.

---

43 In Afghanistan, all the ethnic and religious groups were involved in the insurgency against the Soviet-backed state, but at the same time, they were split along tribal and ethnic identities --- Hazara, Tajik, Uzbek, Baluchi and Pathan --- resulting in disunity and internecine strife. See, Bard O’Neill, n.39, p.61. However, it must be kept in mind that these divisions were promoted and consolidated by certain powers who wanted to use these groups for their own agendas.

44 Bard E. O’Neill and others, n.25, p.6.
The intelligentsia\footnote{The importance of intellectuals has been noted by Gurr, who points out that their opposition to the incumbent regimes can offset the balance. Gurr, n.29, p. 337. In Argentina, the state carried out a ‘dirty war’ against the entire intelligentsia to offset this balance. Richard E. Rubenstein, \textit{Alchemists of Revolution: Terrorism in the Modern World} (London, 1987). p.88.} is a principal source for recruitment at both high and middle-level leadership positions. It is important to have assertive and dynamic leaders who can motivate the masses by their personalities or oratorial skills and ensure a sizeable following. An insurgent movement may also deliberately encourage a personality cult in order to attract a following.\footnote{Bard O’Neill, n.39, p.7.} This phenomenon, akin to ‘charismatic attraction’, was exemplified by Lenin, Mao, Castro and Guevara.

Esoteric appeals is another way of obtaining support even from a small strata of people. Mostly, it is directed at the intelligentsia and it attempts to explain political complexities in an ideological framework.\footnote{Gurr, n.29, p.195.} For instance, the Marxist revolutionaries realized that Lenin’s formulation on imperialism has powerful intellectual attraction in Third World countries because it provides a coherent, logical and all-encompassing explanation of the poverty, illiteracy, and oppression that characterizes their political and social milieu. Further, by establishing the linkages of the \textit{compradore} feudal and capitalist classes with external imperialist elements, it targets the immediate enemies of many of the Third World revolutionaries.

Exoteric appeals focus on concrete grievances of the intelligentsia as well as the masses. For the masses, it is day-to-day issues such as corruption and repression by local officials, as well as the need for food, land reform, jobs and medical assistance. According to the insurgents, such problems can be effectively resolved after achieving their goals.

Popular support based on a combination of esoteric and exoteric appeals, could be a very potent variable in an insurgent movement. But when such appeals fail because of
counter-action by the state, it is likely that the insurgent movement may resort to using excessive violence for obtaining popular support, by demonstrating the state’s weaknesses vis-a-vis their own strength.48

Selective terrorist acts against symbols of oppression may enhance popular support. On the other hand, an indiscriminate use of terrorism may alienate potential domestic as well as international support.49 Popular support could also be garnered by provoking arbitrary and indiscriminate government reprisals against people at large. Insurgents also seek to meet the basic needs of the people through social services and a governing apparatus. By doing so, they try to involve the masses with the insurgent movement, either actively or passively.

Popular support is crucial for the success of an insurgency and they may employ various strategies to win over the masses. The orchestration of such a campaign is a complex task and its outcome may be influenced significantly by other variables such as the government’s response and the insurgents’ organizational skills.

Organization

Organization is a major factor enabling insurgents to compensate for the material superiority of their opponents. An insurgent organization may be studied in its three structural dimensions --- scope, complexity and cohesion and two functions, namely provision of instrumental services and establishment of channels for expressive protest.50

Scope of an organization refers to the number of people actively supporting the movement or playing a key role therein. There is a constant effort to increase its membership by penetrating villages and cities, particularly in the contested areas. Insurgents often create

---

48 The impact of terrorism has led some scholars and practitioners to contend terror as the most powerful weapon for establishing popular support. The idea behind it is that by making people feel insecure it causes them to lose confidence in the regime and gets them drawn to the insurgents for protection. See, Roger Trinquier, Modern Warfare (New York, 1964), pp.16-17 and Brian Cozier, The Study of Conflict (London, 1970), p.7.


50 Gurr, n.29, pp.274-316.
parallel hierarchies to compete with government institutions. The parallel hierarchy may take two forms: penetration of the official administrative structures by subversive agents or creation of autonomous insurgent structures designed to take over full administrative responsibility under appropriate military-political conditions. Further, in order to broaden its support base, the insurgent organization may create functional auxiliaries or front organizations such as youth groups, peasant organizations, workers groups and women's organizations. It may also create fronts through tactical alliances with other independent groups opposing the government.  

Insurgents engaged in a protracted armed struggle may also diversify their military organization by creating logistics units and guerrilla forces, including full-time and part-time fighters. The full-time guerrillas, operating from secure bases, constantly attack government military units and installations and constitute a nucleus for a regularized force in the event the movement progresses to mobile-conventional warfare. The part-time or local guerrillas, on the other hand, stay in their communities and provide valuable services like collecting intelligence, storing supplies, and providing a coercive arm to protect the political organizers. Besides, the local guerrillas could attach themselves to main force units for local attacks either as combatants or as scouts and guides. The effective functioning of both parallel hierarchies and military units may convert people by simply demonstrating the insurgent's ability to control an area in defiance of the government.

By improving the organizational structure, the insurgents will be able to perform its instrumental and expressive functions better which attract followers. At an individual level, participation may yield material benefits (rewards) provided the organization has the resources and it may also generate a good deal of psychological satisfaction by virtue of a new sense

---

of identity.\textsuperscript{52}

Cohesion

The third major variable that bears upon the fortune of an insurgency is cohesion. Many experts and practitioners emphasize the importance of unity in the insurgent ranks which is the basic principle behind all effective insurgent strategy, planning, tactics and organization. Though authority and execution of operations may be delegated to local leaders, a general headquarters is necessary to provide political direction, coordinated strategy and discipline. As Mao pointed out in \textit{The Strategy of Partisan Warfare}:

\begin{quote}
without centralized strategic command the partisans can inflict little damage on their adversaries, as without this, they can break down into roaming, armed bands, and then find no more support by the population.\textsuperscript{53}
\end{quote}

In order to maintain unity, insurgent movement emphasizes common attitudes, sanctions and organizational scheme. An ideology may form the basis for cohesion since it helps members of an insurgent movement develop shared values, goals and orientations toward the political world. However, if an insurgent movement has rival factions, each with a different ideology, then ideology works against cohesion and may result in the factions splitting from the movement and reconstituting themselves as separate groups.

Organizational formats are also important in achievement of cohesion. There are three possibilities here --- control by the political leaders, control by the military, and independent political and military commands. Wherever rival movements may exist, the insurgents attempt to coordinate activity by creating a unified command. A unified command is most effective because it helps evolve an overall strategy to deal with the ideological, tactical, and personality differences dividing the movement. But for a unified command to be successful,

\textsuperscript{52} Gurr, n.29, pp.297-301.

\textsuperscript{53} Cited in Bard O’Neill and others, n.25, p.13.
rival factions must subordinate their parochial interests for the larger interests of the movement.

**External Support**

Insurgents seek external support from the states as well as from like-minded ideological groups. This may be divided into four categories --- moral, political, material and sanctuary.\(^{54}\) Moral support involves minimum political costs and risks for the third country, which publicly acknowledges and appreciates the just nature and causes of an insurgent movement. Political support is given by friendly countries which champion and support the strategic cause of the insurgent movement in the international fora.\(^{55}\) Insurgents seek external support not only from states but also from like-minded ideological groups.

Material assistance ranges from providing financial support, food and medical supplies, to arms, ammunition, training, military advice and fire support for combat units. Evidently, it involves more risks for an external power, especially as the insurgents raise the scale and intensity of violence, necessitating greater logistical inputs. Material and military support from contiguous states to the insurgents is vital because their positive response would provide access to overland transportation routes, facilitating the flow of materials.

External powers also play an important role in providing sanctuary to the insurgents, where they could train their members, stockpile arms, plan operations and if required, establish a provisional government. Material aid as well as sanctuaries are usually more important in the terminal stages of an insurgency. But if the insurgents fail to establish a secure base in the target country and lack popular support, this may become indispensable

---

\(^{54}\) ibid., p.15.

\(^{55}\) An example of this kind would be the support the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) has got from most of the Third World countries in various international fora. Pakistan’s constant references to Kashmir in various international fora such as the Organization of Islamic Countries (OIC) and United Nations, is another case in point. Further, some non-governmental organizations like Amnesty International has been raising the issue of human rights violations by the Indian security forces in the Kashmir valley.
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in the early stages of the struggle. Because under such circumstances, the insurgents are forced to rely on adjacent countries to establish bases in the target country.

**The Government's Role**

The government's response to an insurgency is the most fundamental variable determining its outcome. Its success or failure would depend essentially on the skills and determination of the state to meet their challenge. Governments confronting an insurgency have to face various political challenges and different types of violence at the same time. This may include propaganda-organizational activity, terrorism, guerrilla warfare and mobile-conventional warfare.\(^{56}\)

Since each threat involves different techniques and poses a unique problem for the government, effective and appropriate counter-measures would depend heavily on its ability to differentiate among them and emphasize a particular facet of counter-insurgency. McCuen points out that in order to cope successfully with the organizational challenge, the government will have to stress civic action, effective administration and low-level police activity, whereas a terrorist threat necessitates intensified police work. Guerrilla warfare calls for a low-level military response, while mobile-conventional warfare will require conventional operations by the military.\(^{57}\)

The planning and implementation of a counter-insurgency programme is a complicated task because of insurgents varying their tactics in different regions of the country. Keeping this in mind, an effective state response may not be a single purpose strategy applied indiscriminately in all sectors, but adoption of a flexible differentiated policy that coordinates a variety of counter-measures in different areas, depending on the nature of the threat.

---


\(^{57}\) Ibid., pp.43-44.
The execution of a multi-faceted and sophisticated counter-insurgency programme requires coordination of political, administrative and coercive arm of the state, including military, police and intelligence operations. This is essential to avoid various counter-insurgency agencies working at cross purposes. As McCuen puts it:

Counter-revolutionary warfare requires the use of military, political, psychological, economic and organizational action from the village to national levels. These actions must be co-ordinated in a unified doctrine and plans to achieve specific objectives... Unified planning, centralized control and a single point of responsibility are the very minimum requirements for a unity of effort which will offer success against a unified revolutionary movement.  

In order to undermine the support base of insurgents, a government’s primary aim should be to win popular support by meeting their basic needs through an effective local administration. For instance, in certain cases where land reform may be a grievance, it may be addressed. Along with a political and administrative action plan, an effective counter-insurgency operation invariably involves a number of security measures such as detention without trial, curfews, severe penalties for carrying unauthorized weapons, besides resettlement of sections of the population, control over distribution of essential foodstuff, issuance and checking of identity cards and so on. While such sanctions may be morally undesirable, they have proved to be very effective if applied consistently, fairly and judiciously. Accurate information about the insurgent organization, identification and location of its members and their plan of action are a pre-requisite for proper security measures. Governments have also used psychological warfare measures to instigate defections by promising them amnesty, security, and material benefits.

Large-scale guerrilla action poses a more serious threat to the government. In such
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situations, the government’s strategy must be to first consolidate the areas under its control before gradually expanding to other areas with the twin objectives of gaining control over the population, food supplies and other resources, while inflicting losses on guerrilla units and defending vital lines of communication. An essential component of the counter-insurgency campaign is territorial offensive, which emphasizes the use of sophisticated detection technology and constant patrols, attacks and ambushes by small dispersed units. Once an area has been cleared of guerrillas, the government should establish its initial administrative presence through civic action teams.\(^6\)

To further deprive the guerrillas of the initiative, the government could employ mobile forces, commandos, air power and artillery to attack insurgent’s bases in remote and thinly populated hinterlands. In case of a mobile-conventional warfare by the insurgents, the government should first consolidate its base areas even at the cost of sacrificing large areas of the country. After securing base areas and then expanding, mobile strike forces may be used against the insurgent’s bases. If the government is facing a defeat, it may need to seek help from external sources.

Although an insurgency essentially poses a politico-administrative threat, the importance of military success should not be under-estimated. Military victories enhance the government morale besides inflicting human and material losses on the insurgent movement and in some cases, forces the insurgents out of their familiar operating terrain. Some counter-insurgency experts argue in favour of using a strategy based on application of the insurgent’s strategy and principles in reverse.\(^6\) The insurgents also try to convince the general populace about their strength and ability to succeed but it undermines their credibility when the security forces are winning constantly. However, a military victory should not be achieved

\(^6\) Hyde, n.51, pp.94-95.

\(^6\) McCuen, n.56, pp.77-78.
at the expense of the local population, in terms of casualties and property losses. This may be counter-productive because it may further alienate the population, thereby, increasing the ranks of the insurgents. Therefore, all military operations should be planned and executed in such a way as to minimize civilian losses.

Undoubtedly, a counter-insurgency programme is a demanding task in terms of morale, patience and determination of the security forces. In order to be successful, they need firm backing of the government and the public at large which, in turn, would depend upon the nature and implementation of the strategies being used by the ruling regime. This would also be subject to the ability of insurgents to meet other important criteria for a successful insurgency.

The foregoing analysis shows that a determined government, backed by a military which is not demoralized, may force the insurgents to wage a prolonged conflict. That is why the government’s response is the most critical variable in insurgent conflicts. Where its response is poor or uncoordinated, the insurgents can tolerate shortcomings in popular and external support, organization, cohesion, and the environment.

MODELS OF INSURGENT STRATEGIES

Numerous insurgent strategies have been developed since the storming of the Bastille in 1783. However, only three among these had the theoretical rigour outlining general patterns of an insurgency: the Maoist, Cuban and the Urban models.

While these models originated in Marx’s philosophy, they were modified by Lenin in Russia and Mao and Giap in Asia. This was later revised drastically in the focos of Latin America. The roots of a communist insurgency may be traced to Marx and Engels who held that the final change in social evolution after the creation of an industrialized means of production, would be the transfer of the means of production to the working class. But they
were aware that the ruling class would not relinquish control over the means of productions without a struggle. In their earlier years, both Marx and Engels strongly believed that violence was the engine of social change. Marx "had no expectation that his scheme of society could be realized other than by violent insurrection." In fact, this notion was strengthened by the failure of the Paris Commune in 1871. The lesson of that historic episode was that the working class should not only take up arms in its defense, but must not permit 'conscientious scruples' to prevent it from using warfare to overthrow the ruling class.

The Maoist Strategy

Mao evolved a new strategy since Lenin's strategy of urban insurrection had failed to win power in a predominantly peasant society like China. He argued that in such situations, people in the countryside could be successfully organized and led in a movement to encircle and eventually take over the cities. The peasantry, which is not considered as a progressive force in traditional Marxism, was transformed into a revolutionary force. Although Mao wrote extensively on this subject, different elements of his strategy and political concepts were never integrated into a single coherent formula. On the contrary, Mao evolved his theory out of practice in the field by mobilizing the masses.

Mao's strategy prescribes that a successful insurgency would have to pass through three stages. The first stage, the strategic defensive is characterized by a section of armed forces starting an insurgency and gradually retreating before the enemy retaliates. This retreat results in a loss of space but gain in time. Mao's method of guerrilla warfare was based on a key postulation of space against time. The theoretical concepts of protracted
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warfare and evolution of the stages of insurgency warfare derive from this postulation. Mao is willing to trade space for time because it is through time that a technologically inferior force can win over a far superior enemy.

Guerrilla warfare is the traditional weapon of a militarily weak movement which enjoys popular support. It emphasizes flexibility, surprise, quick decision, initiative and careful planning. Because of their inferior position, the insurgents seek to fight only at times and places of their choosing and try to avoid being forced into a battle. To do so, they must be highly mobile without being highly visible. Guerrilla warfare, by nature, takes a long time to have any significant impact because of their weak position vis-a-vis the state. In a protracted armed struggle, it is vital for the guerrilla to establish base areas. "A guerrilla base may be defined as an area, strategically located, in which the guerrillas can carry out their duties of training, self-preservation and development." Further, there are 'guerrilla base areas' which are controlled by the guerrilla units and 'guerrilla areas' that are intermediate zones contested by both sides.

The second stage of an insurgency is called strategic stalemate or equilibrium. In this phase, minor guerrilla operations spread in their scale and territory and the guerrilla war turns into a mobile war. Mao writes:

To transform guerrilla units waging guerrilla warfare into regular forces waging a mobile warfare, two conditions are necessary, an increase in numbers and an improvement in quality... the development of guerrilla warfare into mobile warfare means not the abandonment of guerrilla warfare, but the gradual formation, in the midst of widespread guerrilla warfare of a main force capable of conducting mobile warfare, a force around which there must still be numerous guerrilla units carrying on extensive guerrilla operations.
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The strategy prescribed that after raising and training this regular force, the main forces are to be deployed in mobile warfare over flexible indefinite fronts. Its success depends on a high degree of mobility and flexibility of the regular forces and involves a swift attack and subsequent withdrawal, concentration and dispersal of forces. The third phase is that of the strategic offensive when the balance would have clearly tilted in favour of the revolutionary movement and the struggle would assume the characteristics of a people's war. It is important to keep in mind that creation of a regular conventional army was always the ultimate aim and guerrilla warfare was only a means to survive and gain time necessary for bringing about the revolution. In this phase, the regular army units grow in size and positional warfare begins to dominate the mode of conflict. The regular insurgent army assisted by the guerrillas pursue the war to a successful termination. The central feature of the Maoist strategy of "people's war" was that its fundamental features were not purely military but political and psychological factors. Mao underlined the significance of complete political control and carefully coordinated political, economic, psychological and military measures to win popular support. The political considerations shaped military planning and action and military goals were never pursued for its own sake. This is the true meaning of Mao's famous aphorism, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." The principle was that the party commands the gun and the gun must never be allowed to command the party.\(^70\)

Mao's Communist-led peasant insurgency adopted a model of military and political resistance that could prevail against a vastly superior enemy. Following its success in China in 1949, this model was widely emulated elsewhere. The works of Truong Chinh and Vo Nguyen Giap, the two principal Vietnamese theorists of revolutionary war, were heavily based on Mao. Truong Chinh also stressed total mobilization of the masses at all levels in a

\(^70\) Mao, "Problems of War and Strategy," n.66, p.224.
prolonged struggle. But while they accepted Mao’s three-stage model of insurgency, they were unable to clearly demarcate the different stages. Thus, they modified Mao’s three phases and Truong Chinh re-defined them as: contention, equilibrium and general counter-offensive.\(^{71}\)

Giap expanded Mao’s theory of revolutionary stages particularly with regard to the transition of the second to the third stage. He delineated three preconditions for entry into the last stage: superiority of revolutionary forces, a favourable world situation and a noticeable weakening of the enemy’s resolve.\(^{72}\)

Giap further revised Mao’s third phase by specifying four sub-phases:

(i) gaining absolute moral superiority over the enemy that is, achieving full support of the populace for the cause of the insurgency;

(ii) regularization and modernization of the army;

(iii) the occurrence of an international situation that weakens the enemy or directly aids the communist insurgency, and

(iv) the gaining of momentum that expresses itself in strong and more purposeful direction of the war effort by the communist leadership, with a corresponding decrease in positive command and control by the enemy.\(^{73}\)

Giap and Mao differed on two points. Giap stressed on the mobilization of international opinion in support of the revolution. Secondly, Giap placed less emphasis on mass support and more on the role of the conventional military operations. He believed in the concept of a bloody blow\(^{74}\) to break the opponent’s will. Consequently, in practice,

\(^{71}\) Beckett, n.15, pp.200-201.


\(^{73}\) Pustay, n.1, p.44.

\(^{74}\) Beckett, n.15, p.201.
Giap sought to achieve a short cut in the protracted struggle by moving too early into the third phase.

**The Cuban Strategy**

The Cuban model was an alternative to the Maoist protracted warfare strategy. It was an attempt to put into practice the *foco* theory, first formulated by Guevara and later systematized by Regis Debray. Guevara’s book *Guerrilla Warfare* begins with the following statements:

We consider that the Cuban Revolution contributed three fundamental lessons to the conduct of revolutionary movements in America. They are:

1. Popular forces can win a war against the army.
2. It is not necessary to wait until all conditions for making revolution exist; the insurrection can create them.
3. In underdeveloped America the countryside is the basic area for armed fighting. 75

Clearly, Guevara lays more stress upon the initial phase of insurgency than Mao did. This could be because Castro and Guevara had to start by recruiting at the grass-roots level and then build a revolutionary force to achieve victory. Guevara emphasizes the need for advanced planning for establishing intelligence networks and arsenals and maintaining absolute secrecy throughout about the potential insurgency. 76

On the setting up of parallel political and military structures, Mao stressed on the former. In contrast, Debray and Guevara argued that the guerrillas themselves were a fusion of political and military authority. The military arm and the party are the same. In fact, the guerrilla force was considered to be the political embryo from which the party would arise. This was reflected by Debray in the following passages:

The guerrilla force is the political vanguard *in nuce* and from its development a real party can arise.
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That is why the guerrilla force must be developed if the political vanguard is to be developed.

That is why, at the present juncture, the principal stress must be laid on the development of guerrilla warfare and not on the strengthening of existing parties or the creation of new parties.

That is why insurrectional activity is today the number one political activity.\footnote{Regis Debray, "The Principal Lesson for the Present," in William Lutz and Harry Brent, \textit{On Revolution} (Massachusetts, 1971), p.293.}

Writing in \textit{Revolution in the Revolution} he states:

The Latin American revolution and its vanguard, the Cuban revolution, have thus made a decisive contribution to international revolutionary experience and to Marxism-Leninism.

Under certain conditions, the political and military are not separate, but form one organic whole, consisting of the people's army, whose nucleus is the guerrilla army. The vanguard party can exist in the form of the guerrilla force itself. The guerrilla force is the party in embryo.

This is the staggering novelty introduced by the Cuban Revolution.\footnote{Regis Debray, \textit{Revolution in the Revolution} (New York, 1974), p.106.}

In other words, Debray concluded that "guerrilla warfare is the crucible from which the party will be forged" and that "the people's army will be the nucleus of the party not the other way round."\footnote{Gerard Chaliand, \textit{Revolution in the Third World}, (Sussex, 1977), p.46.}

Instead of developing a comprehensive infrastructure through a prolonged period of political preparation, both Guevara and Debray assumed that objective conditions favourable to revolution already existed in a minimum level of discontent with the authorities. Revolutionaries should not wait until all the objective conditions are right to launch their struggle, since the \textit{foco} or focus for the revolution will be able to create it by its very existence. The injection of a small guerrilla \textit{foco} in the countryside by their activities and setting examples could begin a chain reaction to mobilize the masses and create sympathy for further \textit{focos}. Guevara believed that thirty to fifty men were adequate to start an
insurgency in Latin American countries given "their conditions of favourable terrain for operations, hunger for land and repeated attacks upon justice, etc."80

In Guevara’s words, this is how the foco would operate:

Relatively small nucleus of people choose favourable places for guerrilla warfare... and thus they begin to act. The following must be clearly established: at first, the relative weakness of the guerrilla movement is such that it must work only to settle in the terrain, establishing connections with the populace and reinforcing the places that will possibly become its base of support.

There are three conditions for the survival of a guerrilla movement that begins its development under the situation just described: constant mobility, constant vigilance, constant trust.81

The foco would progressively attract larger number of sympathizers as the guerrillas decisive action would provoke the frustrated authorities into over-reaction against the whole population. This would result in the collapse of the incumbent regime. Although the foco was initiated from the countryside, Guevara recommended urban action to assist the guerrillas to ease off pressure on them. Urban guerrilla warfare extended over a wide area could be used to completely paralyse the commercial and industrial life of the area and cause disturbances and distress to the entire population. This would make people anxious for violent developments to bring an end to their troubles.82

Lest the urban guerrilla units lose direction, Guevara laid down certain conditions for their operation. He emphasized complete subordination of the urban units to the guerrilla movement based in the countryside. It should not carry out independent actions except in accordance with pre-determined strategic plans. The urban units basically played a supporting

80 Guevara, n.21, p.112.
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role but they had the potential to contribute to the success of some tactical objectives.\textsuperscript{83}

**The Urban Strategy**

After the repeated failures of rural-based guerrilla warfare, the *foco* theory was discredited. Later, in the 1960's the focus shifted from the countryside to the cities, leading to the development of urban guerrilla warfare in theory and practice.\textsuperscript{84} Owing to social and demographic changes, especially the rapid urbanization in Latin America, the concept of rural-based guerrilla warfare and the countryside as a whole had been rendered irrelevant. The idea of the countryside encircling the cities seemed outdated.

Urban guerrilla strategy was based on the recognition of the fact that since the politico-military and economic hub of power centered around large urban areas, it should be attacked there and not from the periphery. However, urban guerrilla strategists did not reject rural guerrilla operations in principle. They considered their city-based operations as the first stage of a general insurrectionary movement.

The theory of urban guerrilla warfare was articulated by Abraham Guillen, a Spaniard and Carlos Marighella, a Brazilian Communist. Guillen did not exclude cooperation with the rural guerrillas but he argued that in highly urbanized countries, revolutionary battles ought to be waged in the urban areas "for the revolutionary potential is where the population is."\textsuperscript{85} He wrote that a small armed minority would have to lead a clandestine existence throughout the struggle with the support of the population. Their basic principle should be to live separately and fight together. Urban guerrillas should mainly use light arms, but machine guns and bazookas would also have to be employed to give them the advantages enjoyed by a highly mobile infantry. They should not try to aim for larger objectives but concentrate on

\textsuperscript{83} ibid.
\textsuperscript{85} Walter Laqueur, n.14, p.345.
small and successive actions.

Marighella’s approach was to provoke and compel the enemy to "transform the political situation into a military one." He assumed that in the process, large sections of the population, particularly the intelligentsia and the clergy, would be alienated from the government, which would then seek help from North American imperialists. This would add to the popularity of the insurgents struggle. Its fundamental objective was to shake the economic, political and military foundations of the system.

The struggle was to proceed on three fronts --- the guerrilla front, the mass front and the support network. The urban guerrillas’ basic unit was a firing group consisting of four or five members. The advantages for the urban guerrillas were surprise-attack, better knowledge of the terrain, greater mobility and speed and a better information network. Their basic tactics were based on the hit-and-run principle, and combat and decisive battle was to be avoided.

But the function of urban guerrilla warfare was only to tie down government forces in the cities so as to permit the emergence and survival of rural guerrilla warfare, "which is destined to play the decisive role in the revolutionary war." The future society would be built by those steeled in the struggle, including an armed alliance of workers, peasants and students. The participation of intellectuals and artists in urban guerrilla warfare and the clergy’s support would be of crucial importance for communicating with the masses.

Marighella’s theory of urban guerrilla warfare was only one element in his broader
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revolutionary strategy. He assigned only a tactical role to the urban guerrillas and strategic significance to the rural guerrillas. But he was not prepared to wait in vain for the rural guerrilla foci to emerge. His attempt was, in the long run, to integrate urban and rural guerrilla warfare strategy.

CONCLUSION

Although history is replete with various kinds of insurgencies, most have followed the above-mentioned three models in toto or as a combination of one or more of them. However, at present one notices that in some insurgencies, excessive use of violence draws inspiration from a distorted understanding and application of the urban strategy. This makes insurgency a complex phenomenon that defies easy and clear generalizations. This is largely due to their variations with respect to causes, ultimate goals, strategies, tactics and achievements.

This chapter attempted to propose a broad analytical framework which synthesizes the lessons and principles from past experience in terms of six major inter-related analytical variables like the environment, popular support, organization, cohesion, external support and government role that may be used to analyze and compare insurgencies. The framework also posits three general strategies being used by many insurgents.

The following chapters would utilize this framework to analyze the nature of various insurgencies in South Asia in general and the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (People's Liberation Front) in Sri Lanka in particular.